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The Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) policy was first implemented in government schools in New South Wales in 1991. The policy was an attempt to reward teachers deemed to have advanced skills for remaining in the classroom. As such the policy was recognition that the traditional promotion path for proficient teachers increasingly removed them from classroom teaching. By rewarding classroom teachers with advanced skills, the policy intended to make classroom teaching more attractive for teachers and thus improve the educational outcomes for students. Original policy intent envisaged student outcomes would be improved, not only through the activity of an Advanced Skills Teacher in their own classroom, but also through their mentoring of other teachers at the school via their Advanced Skills Teacher role.

This study explored the belief that at a school level, teachers had been witness to the disparate implementation of the policy. The Bowe, Ball and Gold, (1992) cyclical model of policy implementation was used to illustrate the opportunities and motives which made this disparate implementation not only possible but likely. Accepting this proposition, a questionnaire was designed to ascertain changes, if any, in teachers' attitudes towards the policy pre and post implementation. This was further examined by comparing the attitude changes of groups of teachers based on selected personal and school characteristics identified through a review of the literature. With a view to informing future policy development in this area, the questionnaire also used a framework based on theories of employee motivation and compensation to determine the school level implementation practices which had resulted in teachers having a positive attitude toward the policy.
Questionnaires were sent to a stratified random sample of teachers to ascertain their personal characteristics, the characteristics of the schools in which they taught, their pre and post implementation attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and their experiences of policy implementation. The data were analysed using *t* tests, analysis of variance and step wise multiple regression. Interviews were also conducted with willing respondents to enhance the statistical results.

Analysis revealed that policy implementation had a negative impact on teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. A major determinant of this change in attitude was an arbitrariness of policy implementation which resulted in perceived inequities. Further analysis revealed that teachers with a positive attitude toward the policy post implementation had experienced significantly different implementation practices than teachers who had a negative attitude toward the policy post implementation. Analysis also revealed a significant difference in attitude change post implementation between secondary and primary teachers. Secondary teachers pointed to the faculty structure and certain satisfying behaviours adopted by school leadership to accommodate faculties as major factors behind this finding.

Although at an inferentially insignificant level, teachers with more years of teaching experience were less positive toward the policy having experienced policy implementation. This was attributed to a degree of disenfranchisement for these teachers from a merit based selection process.

Classroom teachers were more positive toward the policy having experienced policy implementation than teachers occupying executive positions. This result was a function of the executive type roles which Advanced Skills Teachers had tended to be given, a decision which seemed to simultaneously galvanise executive support for, and teacher opposition to, the policy.
Teachers who held or had held Advanced Skills Teacher positions were more positive toward the policy. This result illustrated the divisiveness the policy produced in some schools, manifest in the perception of many teachers, that the selection process had not ensured the selection of teachers with advanced skills.

Finally, in decreasing order of partial correlation, the step wise multiple regression revealed that the following implementation practices characterised schools where teachers had a positive attitude toward the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:

1. The performance of the Advanced Skills Teacher was assessed.
2. Feedback was provided to staff on why certain candidates were chosen to be Advanced Skills Teachers.
3. The selection criteria was relevant to teaching and learning.
4. Advanced Skills Teacher roles had a focus on the improvement of classroom practice.

The study revealed that these implementation decisions should not be seen as functioning in a discrete way to influence teacher support for the policy. In schools where the policy was supported by teachers, the implementation of these practices was a feature of an approach to school management characterised by broad based participation in decision making. The results of the study suggested that particular to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, this management style countered some of the equity issues which the policy had produced in schools and took advantage of some of the professional development models available in professions such as teaching.
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I'm not very far away from the end of my teaching career and I've loved every single solitary second of it. I could never put into words how great is my passion for teaching and I think it is tragic that a good idea has come along and before we know where we are they have made things worse rather than better through mismanagement.

(Primary teacher commenting on the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy December 12, 1995)
Chapter One
An Introduction to the Study

An Overview of the Chapter

Chapter One describes the educational context in which the Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) policy was formulated and implemented in New South Wales. It provides a brief overview of the public education system in New South Wales in 1991 and describes some of the issues surrounding teaching and teachers at both a state and national level which led to the development of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Chapter One also provides a rationale for the study, the aims and significance of the study and an outline of the methodology on which the study is based.

The New South Wales State Education System in 1991

The New South Wales Department of School Education was first established as the Department of Public Instruction in 1880. It has been described as one of the largest centralised systems in the world, both in terms of geographic area, 801 000 square kilometres and in terms of number of employees (Scott, 1990). In 1991 the New South Wales Department of School Education employed 45 942 teachers and 10 176 support staff responsible for the primary and secondary education of 746 417 students in 1 636 Infants and Primary schools, 446 Central and Secondary schools, 113 Schools for Specific Purposes and 18 Field Studies Centres (Statistical Bulletin, New South Wales Department of School Education, 1991).

Since the late 1970's, every Australian state and territory government had
commissioned at least one major review of school education (Scott, 1990). During 1991, the New South Wales public school system was in the early stages of a process called Schools Renewal. This was a major review of school education aimed at making schools more responsive to the educative needs of students, teachers and local communities. This was to be achieved through the reorganisation of the centralised bureaucracy into a decentralised model, where schools were to have increased managerial, financial and educational responsibilities (Scott, 1990).

The reorganisation of the Department of School Education commenced during the latter half of 1989 and saw the creation of The Central Executive of the Department of School Education (see Appendix A). This body was responsible to the Minister of Education and therefore the New South Wales Parliament. It had specific responsibility for corporate planning, the development of broad guidelines for policy development, oversight of management systems and the evaluation of the education system (Scott, 1990).

The Central Executive was supported by ten regional offices each having responsibility for the overall management and educational performance of schools within their boundaries. The ten regions of education and their geographic boundaries are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Regional offices were responsible for human resource allocation and development, the supervision of financial and administrative operations and the coordination and supervision of performance evaluation (Scott, 1990). A typical regional structure is shown in Appendix B.
Figure 1
Geographical Boundaries of Regions of School Administration in New South Wales, 1991
Figure 2
Geographical Boundaries of Regions of School Administration in Sydney Metropolitan Area, 1991
Each region was divided into clusters. Typically a cluster contained 14 or 15 schools normally grouped according to a secondary school and its feeder primary schools. Clusters were supervised by Cluster Directors who were accountable to an Assistant Director General (Region) for the administrative and educational performance of cluster schools. In 1991, schools had responsibility for a range of functions previously held by the regional and central levels of administration. Schools were responsible for developing their own five yearly strategic plan and annual management plans. Schools were also responsible for their own financial management and were allocated an annual budget calculated on needs. Schools utilised funds within this budget according to broad policy guidelines and as a response to their own identified needs. Schools also had an increasing responsibility to manage their own staffing arrangements. An earlier model of state wide recruitment administered at a central level was progressively being replaced by local selection on merit. This selection process was designed to allow schools to select executive members and teachers who best suited individual school needs (Scott, 1990).

The administrative and leadership structures within schools were determined according to whether the school was a primary or secondary school as well as the number of students attending the school. Typical administrative structures for both primary and secondary schools are shown in Appendix C and Appendix D respectively.

The salary structure for teachers in New South Wales was characterised by a common incremental scale where increments were based on years of service and the possession of academic qualifications. This was similar in most Australian states and resulted in teachers reaching a salary plateau relatively early in their careers, this plateau only being exceeded through promotion (DEET, 1988). The salary scale was common to all unpromoted teachers however two, three, four and five year trained teachers entered the salary scale at a different level and progressed to different levels. For example, two
year trained teachers entered the common incremental scale at the second level on a salary of $22,748 per annum, three year trained teachers entered at the third level with a salary of $24,264 per annum, four year trained teachers entered at the fifth level with a salary of $26,907 and, five year trained teachers entered at the sixth level with a salary of $28,294. The maximum salary which could be earned by a two and three year trained teacher was at level nine with a salary of $32,453. Four and five year trained teachers could progress to level thirteen where they earned $38,000 (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991). The common incremental salary scale is shown at Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary level</th>
<th>$ Per annum</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>22,748</td>
<td>2 YT ENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>24,264</td>
<td>3 YT ENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>25,521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>26,907</td>
<td>4 YT ENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>28,294</td>
<td>5 YT ENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>29,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>31,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>2 YT 3 YT TOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>33,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>35,226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>36,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>4YT 5YT TOP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Industrial Commission of New South Wales, The Education Teaching Service Case, 1991, p. 18)

Promotion structures at both primary and secondary levels were characterised by an increasing level of administrative responsibility with higher levels of promotion. Recognition of this was the introduction of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and, at the secondary level, the introduction in 1988 of the Leading Teacher position, a position commensurate with that of Deputy Principal and designed to provide excellent teachers with the option of staying in the classroom and providing an example to other teachers (Metherell, 1987).
Teaching and Teachers in 1991

As part of the review process, Scott (1990) identified low morale and an increasing level of cynicism amongst teachers in New South Wales and provided the following reasons: a fall in intellectual esteem, a fall in community esteem, a fall in job satisfaction and inadequate remuneration levels. This was not the only report of the day which expressed concerns about the state of the teaching profession. National reports into education conducted by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET, 1988) and the Schools Council (1990) also highlighted an emerging discontent amongst teachers. These reports also identified the decline in teachers' salaries as one factor impacting on the morale of teachers and the overall image of teaching. In Australia's Teachers: An Agenda for the Next Decade, (1990) the Schools Council cited teacher salaries as a major determinant of perceived low levels of morale amongst the teaching force. The report found “....the morale of the teaching force is low. Talented graduates are not entering the profession and experienced teachers are seeking other jobs. Salaries are inadequate” (p. 19).

While these and other reports identified a need to increase the salaries of teachers, financial realities posed particular problems for the New South Wales government. Education was already a major component of the state government's budgetary outlay at 22% of the total budget payments in 1989-90 (Scott, 1990). This level of expenditure on education was not unique to New South Wales. The Schools Council (1990) described education as the largest industry in Australia in terms of both work force and budget. This expenditure is itemised for each state in Table 2 and shows that in New South Wales, the wages of teaching staff consumed almost two thirds (63%) of the total recurrent education budget. This was slightly above the national average where the wages of teaching staff comprised 61% of state education budgets.
Table 2
Elements of Government Schools Expenditure 1986-87 ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>AUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff Salaries</td>
<td>1,457,264</td>
<td>1,301,623</td>
<td>663,347</td>
<td>359,498</td>
<td>432,146</td>
<td>137,774</td>
<td>64,725</td>
<td>91,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching staff salaries</td>
<td>213,110</td>
<td>165,807</td>
<td>116,761</td>
<td>73,152</td>
<td>88,822</td>
<td>35,326</td>
<td>20,460</td>
<td>21,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Salary Goods And Services</td>
<td>349,758</td>
<td>302,013</td>
<td>181,931</td>
<td>129,835</td>
<td>113,266</td>
<td>38,562</td>
<td>33,379</td>
<td>25,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>135,454</td>
<td>83,393</td>
<td>60,129</td>
<td>30,470</td>
<td>19,182</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>4,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings And Grounds</td>
<td>142,797</td>
<td>131,292</td>
<td>121,932</td>
<td>54,990</td>
<td>30,676</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>17,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,298,383</td>
<td>1,984,128</td>
<td>1,144,100</td>
<td>647,945</td>
<td>684,092</td>
<td>236,171</td>
<td>128,596</td>
<td>160,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Australian Education Council National Schools Statistics Collection, cited in Australia’s Teachers: An Agenda For The Next Decade, 1990, p.14)

In spite of this level of funding and the proportion of this funding directed at teacher salaries, Scott (1990) identified a declining relativity in the salaries of New South Wales teachers, highlighting that in the five years from 1984 to 1989, while the Consumer Prices Index increased by 6.9% per annum and average weekly earnings increased by 5.7% per annum, teachers’ wages increased by just 4.2% per annum. In 1989 as a result of this fall, relative to other professional groups, the salary of the average teacher was 8% behind that of an architect, 12% behind that of a mechanical engineer and 27% behind that of a social worker (Scott, 1990). The fall in the relative value of teachers’ wages through this period is shown in Table 3.
Table 3
Examples of the Relative Value of Teacher Earnings as a Percentage of Average Weekly Earnings, New South Wales Government System, Selected Years 1970-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level GA1</th>
<th>Level GA8</th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>195.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>198.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>188.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>180.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>186.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>157.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>152.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This decline in teacher salaries can be attributed to a number of factors. Notable amongst these was the increasing number of teachers, a product of teacher union campaigns for smaller class sizes (from 1: 21.3 in 1972 to 1:14.9 in 1986) and the automatic progression of increasingly experienced teachers on the basis of experience up the salary scale (Schools Council, 1990).

The picture that this data illustrates is one of continued and high levels of government expenditure on education; the bulk of this being teachers' salaries. However, because of a salary structure which incorporated increasing numbers of teachers and automatic progression up the salary scale, little to no increase in teachers' salaries relative to the rest of the population. Compounding the policy difficulties in improving the salaries of teachers was an increasing pressure being felt by governments to decrease the amount they spent on education. During the mid eighties, the total expenditure on school education by State and Commonwealth governments dropped from a ".... high of 5.7% of Gross Domestic Product in 1982/3 to 4.9% of Gross Domestic Product in 1988" (Schools Council, 1990, p.13). The Schools Council (1990) described the drop in funding for education towards the end of the eighties as a response to ".... one of the lessons learned from the experiences of the 1970's ... that a massive increase in resource
allocation will not of itself necessarily improve the quality of education." (p. 13). Ashenden (1990) described the drop in government spending on education as being not only a function of the larger economic and budgetary realities of the time but also widespread public cynicism about teachers' unions claims that increased spending on education led to increased quality of education. Any policy change in the area of teacher remuneration had to improve the quality and outcomes of education while at the same time maintain or reduce the cost per student of education (Schools Council, 1990). The Department of Employment, Education and Training (1988) expressed their concerns about the efficiency and productivity of education and the need to look at alternate ways of increasing the efficiency of school education and reported these concerns to the Federal Government thus:

.... much has been done over the last fifteen years to improve key components of the teaching environment. Class sizes and school facilities have been improved.... A range of initiatives including many Commonwealth specific purpose programs have been mounted to improve the functioning of schools and their relationships with their communities. Notwithstanding the considerable cost of these betterments there is a dispute about whether they have been translated into measurable gains in student outcomes. Necessary though these improvements have been, there is now a need to look deeper into the environment of teaching and to take further steps to lift educational performance (p. 53).

That concerns about the efficiency and productivity of education existed in the early 1990's was not surprising. The structure of the work of teachers had changed little; this from an enterprise which had so much, some would argue most to gain from the technological advances of the preceding twenty years. Ashenden (1990) described this situation thus:

Schooling is the last of the mass cottage industries. There is almost no division of labour in teaching, scarcely any technology, and the work groups are anything but autonomous. Along the
corridors of any school is one standard sized room after another. In each room there will be one teacher and twenty, twenty-five, thirty students. There will be the odd exception, a teacher aide or a parent taking reading with a small group of students, a couple of class groups working on research in the library, students doing drill work or practice work on computers. Nine times out of ten there will be the cottage classroom with its long-familiar labour process; the hard working teacher, the more or less absorptive students, working sometimes and talking when they can (p. 4).

The concerns of efficiency and productivity stem in part from the description Ashenden provides. It was as a result of these concerns in the Australian setting that policy formulation in the area of teacher compensation and motivation developed a duality of origin, industrial relations and education.

Similar concerns about the efficiency and productivity of education systems were also being expressed overseas. In the United States Hanushek (1981, 1986, 1987) distinguished two types of efficiency emanating from schools vis; social efficiency and production efficiency. Hanushek (1986, 1987) argued that while social efficiency related to the goals of a society, production efficiency was a measurement of the schools' utilisation of resources. With this latter definition in mind, Hanushek (1981) described the limitations of the uniform salary schedule in rewarding superior teaching performance or penalising inferior teaching performance:

... the evidence does indicate that given the current operation of schools, there should be no presumption that simply providing more money or improving schools in conventionally accepted ways will have any perceptible impact on student achievement (p. 30).

... incentive schemes of various sorts might be a fertile area for experimentation. The essential questions involve alternative types of incentive schemes and the behavioural responses of teachers and administrators (p. 37).
Critics of the uniform salary schedule like Hanushek advocated the idea that improving the quality of education offered by public schools required a change from uniform salary schedules to a compensation arrangement which based teachers' salaries on their productivity as measured by gains in students' test scores or by supervisors' evaluations of their efforts in the classroom (Murname and Cohen, 1986). As criteria for teacher effectiveness, these measures were not rigorously adopted in New South Wales or other states as part of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, however the idea that superior teaching performance had to be recognised and rewarded was accepted. The search for a policy which would simultaneously recognise and reward superior teaching performance, and increase the efficiency of the school system through the development of these skills in other teachers, led to the development of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy.

**The Advanced Skills Teacher Policy**

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy was first introduced into the state school system in New South Wales through the Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award, September 12, 1991. Bluer (1993) as Counsellor of the National Board of Employment, Education and Training described the aim of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as "... the improved productivity of the enterprise (school) by increasing the skills and knowledge levels of the teaching work force" (p.1). The original policy document, *Advanced Skills Teacher Policy, New South Wales Department of School Education, 11 November, 1991* (Appendix E) described the aims of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as:

... the retention in the classroom of highly skilled teachers. The Advanced Skills Teacher category is a way of recognising and rewarding outstanding teachers who have a commitment to classroom teaching and are willing to provide such things as
educational leadership, professional support and provide guidance to beginning and less experienced teachers (p. 1).

Although the policy aimed to give teachers greater rewards and improve their career paths by providing an option other than the traditional path to school administration (Ashenden, 1990; Ingvarson, 1992), the policy also aimed to increase student learning outcomes through increasing the productivity and efficiency of the school system. This perceived duality of benefits for both teachers and students was described by Bluer (1993) as an attempt to achieve a 'win/win' situation.

Original policy intent saw the nexus between the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and the improvement of the efficiency and productivity of education as bifurcate in nature.

In the first instance, the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was designed to reward and encourage superior classroom practitioners in their efforts in the classroom. As such, the attainment of an Advanced Skills Teacher position was not seen as another step on an already existent salary scale, but was seen as an alternate career path. Traditionally the career path in schools had taken those teachers designated as superior via the inspection system, further away from classroom teaching and into career roles dominated by school administration. By providing teachers with a career path which kept them in the classroom, policy designers hoped to utilise their 'advanced skills' for longer periods of time thus increasing the efficiency and productivity of the school system. The concept of a career path as opposed to a discrete position was vital to the success of the policy which aimed to offer teachers a professional career path comparable in status to that enjoyed by administrators. At a national level, the original proposal had three levels of Advanced Skills Teacher status: Advanced Skills Teacher 1 was worth an extra $1200 per year; Advanced Skills Teacher 2 was equivalent in salary to a head of a department; and, Advanced Skills Teacher 3 was equivalent in
salary to a deputy principal (Chadboume and Ingvarson (1991). Ingvarson (1992) described this new view of a career path as one which paid teachers for advances in their knowledge and skill, rather than one which linked pay to specific jobs or specific tasks. Chadboume and Ingvarson (1991) stated:

"... it gives teachers direction and purpose for their skills formation. It indicates the standards teachers are to achieve, what counts as quality teaching and learning in the eyes of their colleagues, and what they are expected to get better at. It would be an evaluation of their professional knowledge and skill (p. 11)."

The second way in which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was to impact on the efficiency and productivity of education was in the significant mentoring role successful Advanced Skills Teachers were to have in their schools. The Advanced Skills Teacher policy was to be underpinned conceptually by a contagion type model of staff development, where not only were teachers deemed to possess advanced skills to be rewarded for the development of those skills, but there was an expectation that their knowledge and expertise would be shared with their colleagues. This conception of an Advanced Skills Teacher role is consistent with the literature on Award Restructuring in education dating back to some of the earlier Schools Council publications:

"... teachers achieving the classification should play a major role in the supervision of trainee and beginning teachers... and should be expected to make their proven array of capacities, experience and maturity available to the school in a role such as team leadership (Schools Council, 1990, p.120)."

"... the overriding role of the Advanced Skills Teacher is to increase the productivity of the enterprise - the school - by increasing the skills and knowledge levels of the teaching work force (Bluer, 1993, p.1)."

In performing these roles, Advanced Skills Teachers were seen as a catalyst
for the dynamic improvement of the skills and knowledge of other teachers. It was envisaged that school effectiveness would increase with an increase in the knowledge and skills of all teachers; those who were appointed Advanced Skills Teachers and those who were to work and learn with Advanced Skills Teachers (Bluer, 1992).

**An International and Historical Context**

The implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales was not the first attempt to find an alternative to the uniform salary schedule as a way of compensating teachers. Attempts to find a better way to compensate and motivate teachers were not new. Dear (1975) described the Victorian 'Result System' of 1864 as:

This system which involves the individual examination of each child in the subjects of reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar and geography, in every school aided by the State, and which makes the income of the teacher dependent, to a certain extent, on the number of children submitted to and passing the examination is generally known as the 'Result System' (p.70).

Braithwaite (1989) described teachers in New South Wales as having been rewarded by various forms of merit pay last century. In 1971, a Commission of Enquiry into Teacher Education in New South Wales in discussing the low morale of teachers of the time suggested:

Another measure is the offering of suitable challenges with appropriate financial rewards to highly intelligent and gifted teachers irrespective of seniority. People with the highest intelligence and the greatest initiative are the people who are most frustrated by the system and seek to leave it. (Hansard, Report of Enquiry into Teacher Education in New South Wales, September 7, 1971, p. 80).
Teacher compensation and motivation have also been concerns which have crossed international boundaries. Notably, the United States has a history of adopting various types of merit pay propositions in various states. In 1916, Dutton and Sneden, two American educationalists, wrote somewhat apocalyptically:

What is evident with regard to the salaries of teachers in most American communities is that they are too low to enable the teaching profession to develop as it should. Doubtless at any given moment, a marked increase in salaries would not greatly affect the efficiency of the teaching force; but nonetheless certainly, an advanced scale of salaries maintained in the face of competition would soon tend to draw into the profession men and women of better natural qualifications, better preparation, and more willingness to devote themselves persistently and professionally to their work (cited in Guernsey, 1986, p.3).

What is notable about current international attempts at motivating and compensating teachers is their similar raison d'être namely, an increasing recognition of the importance of education systems to economic productivity and therefore societal well being and a desire to manage education systems more efficiently. In the United States, it was the recommendations of the Presidential Report 'A Nation At Risk' backed by such influential associations as Phi Delta Kappa which "...popularised alternative compensation and motivation programs with innumerable claims of mystical powers" (Frase, 1992, p. xiii). In Great Britain, the Vocational Education and Training Task Force of the Confederation of British Industry produced a report (CBI 1989) "... which recognised the importance of the education service for achieving the radical transformation of industrial performance which they judged to be essential if Britain was to improve its economic performance" (Tomlinson, 1992, p.11). Finally in Australia, it was through a micro economic reform package and the concept of Award Restructuring which aimed at revitalising Australian industry that the Advanced Skills Teacher initiative had its genesis.
Rationale for the Study

While the intentions behind the Advanced Skills Teacher initiative seemed empathetic with some of the concerns outlined in this chapter, three years after first being implemented, anecdotal evidence and the limited research in the area suggested there were signs of a lack of total acceptance of the policy by classroom teachers. Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1991) suggested in relation to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy that what was transparently good theory was not translating into good practice stating:

It is an innovation that originates in clear and defensible ideals but has already been reshaped by economic and political implications. It has been referred to by one authoritative research team as potentially the jewel in the Award Restructuring crown but as being perceived in practice (italics added) as a mere industrial relations exercise and a bastardisation of the concept (p. 41).

More recent evidence suggested that this initial apprehension was indeed a reality. Dinham's (1996) study of sources of teacher dissatisfaction revealed that Advanced Skills Teachers were the most dissatisfied group in teaching with only 41% rating themselves as satisfied to any degree. There had also been an unmet quota of Advanced Skills Teacher positions in some schools. Figures from the New South Wales Teachers Federation showed that in 1994 there were 65 unfilled teaching and learning Advanced Skills Teacher positions in New South Wales. These unfilled positions were filled by offering them across clusters. In May, 1995 there were 140 unfilled Advanced Skills Teacher positions necessitating for the first time, the offering of these positions across regions in an attempt to fill them (Seymour, 1995). Also significant in indicating a lack of total acceptance of the Advanced Skills Teacher concept was the relaxing of eligibility criteria to allow positions to be filled by teachers who were not considered eligible when the policy was first implemented, in spite of the fact that the New South Wales Teachers Federation argued for a larger quota to be granted. In May, 1995, a report to
the Council of the New South Wales Teachers Federation stated:

.... it seems timely to suggest a reconsideration of all aspects of Advanced Skills Teacher. There are reports of Advanced Skills Teacher saturation and disinclination to take up Advanced Skills Teacher positions. There are also the promises of additional Advanced Skills Teachers which are part of ALP policy. The following options are for debate for 1996. These options could become combinations of options and all raise matters concerned with access, remuneration, procedures, responsibilities, demographics etc (Seymour, 1995, p. 62).

From the same report:

.... It has been my experience as an Officer on the Advanced Skills Teacher Committee under the Teachers and Related Employees Enterprise Agreement to observe that the procedures for filling Advanced Skills Teachers need streamlining. It is the experience of teachers that they are being asked to do more and more for very little remuneration. Advanced Skills Teacher positions are currently available to approximately only half of those who are eligible to gain it. Some locational factors obviously affect this but the idea of a permanent and portable Advanced Skills Teacher identification is not possible while there are fewer positions than persons eligible. There is also a trend where 'eligible' and 'suitable' teachers to use the terms in the Enterprise Agreement are indicating their non interest in the extensive responsibilities and in the small monetary value of the allowance (p. 63).

While remuneration and demographics are factors beyond the control of school level policy implementors, procedures, (an all encompassing term underpinned by numerous school level decisions and activities), and responsibilities are significant components of school level implementation.
Aims and Significance of the Study

This study aimed to identify those factors significant in determining teacher attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales public schools. These factors were considered to be either the personal characteristics of teachers or teachers' experiences of school level policy implementation. This study did not attempt to measure either the actual or perceived 'effectiveness' of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Indeed, one of the underlying axioms of the study, that teachers have experienced disparate policy implementation practices, precludes any objective assessment of overall policy effectiveness in anything other than single case study scenarios. Analogous to this, the study did not pretend or imply, that "what teachers like" is necessarily antecedent to effective educational policy. There was a need however, to explore how the policy had been implemented and, as the targets of the policy change, what teachers' attitudes to the changes had been. In the course of reviewing the literature for this research, the author found no other study which attempted to describe the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and teacher experiences of Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation. While this was not surprising as the Advanced Skills Teacher policy had only been implemented since 1992, overseas evidence indicated that the success of any alternate compensation system for teachers would be determined by four related factors:

(a) the processes of program development, (b) program design, (c) the ability of state education agencies that initiate these programs to support their implementation over time politically, financially, administratively and technically; and (d) teacher support (Smylie and Smart, 1990 p. 140).

While it could be argued that these four factors were crucial to the success of any educational policy, they have a particular relevance where the issue of teachers and their work are considered. While highlighting the importance of
teacher support in the eventual success of alternate pay programs. Smylie and Smart (1990) described teacher support as the "... least understood of these factors" (p.140).

If teacher support is critical to program success, it is imperative to understand those factors that relate to teachers' acceptance of or opposition to these programs. Such understanding is imperative not merely to test explanations for why previous attempts to implement merit pay and career ladders have succeeded or failed. It is essential to suggest factors that may predict and explain teacher support of current merit pay and career ladder programs and to identify issues that must be addressed to garner teacher support for newly developing career enhancement initiatives that represent variations of these programs (p.140).

The necessity for a degree of congruence between the processes and intentions of the policy on remuneration and what teachers perceived as the reality of their work, had also been described by other writers notably Johnson (1984) and more recently Conley (1994 citing Lawler, 1983).

It is important to address teachers' perceptions regarding pay systems because, as private sector theorists have demonstrated, such systems must be viewed as credible, valid and fair. Without these characteristics, the manager cannot expect the pay system to be an effective component of the management structure of any organisation (p.49).

Teachers' attitudes could be considered central to the success of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1991) described one of the ways teacher attitudes can be influenced by an aspect of school based policy implementation in their description of the selection process:

... if the selection process is seen as too demanding, teachers may decide it is not worth the effort. If the process is seen as automatic, then teachers may decide there is no need to make an effort. In circumstances where those types of perceptions exist,
the process does not provide an effective incentive for career-based professional development (p.11).

This study may give insights to researchers and policy designers alike as to which groups of teachers find the policy attractive and, where teachers have a positive attitude toward the policy, the implementation decisions they have witnessed. At a macro level, this study may also reveal whether there are significant differences in attitude between teachers, on variables such as participation in the Advanced Skills Teacher selection process, the level of schooling at which people teach and the length of tenure in teaching.

Answers to these propositions were essential if the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy or policies like it were to be effective. At an industrial level, the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was increasingly being seen by both teachers' unions and political parties as the way forward. The Labor Party elected to state government in New South Wales in March 1995, included in its policy on education the commitment to employ an extra 400 Advanced Skills Teachers, (Australian Labor Party Policy Paper on School Education, 1995). The Annual Conference of the New South Wales Teachers Federation, (1994) Council agreed to pursue Advanced Skills Teacher Level 2 and 3 categories. The sanguine and optimistic intentions of these two groups however seemed at odds with the reality of what seemed to be happening in schools, as evidenced by Motion Number 26 put forward at the Annual Conference of the New South Wales Teachers Federation in July, 1995 by the Camden/Campbelltown Teachers Association:

That all Advanced Skills Teacher positions be disbanded in their present form from 1995 and that the pool of money available for these positions be used statewide to make a further incremental stage on the salary scale. This process would halt the unfair practises involved in handing out areas of responsibility to these people (p.5).
Research Questions

To investigate teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and the impact, if any, of policy implementation on these attitudes, the following eight research questions were set.

1. How did the experience of school level policy implementation affect the attitudes of teachers towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy?
2. Did the attitudes of teachers towards the policy change pre and post implementation and if so, did those teachers with a positive attitude towards the policy post implementation experience different implementation processes to teachers with a negative attitude toward the policy post implementation?
3. Did primary school teachers and secondary school teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
4. Did teachers of less experience and teachers of more experience differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
5. Did three year trained teachers and four year trained teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
6. Did teachers holding executive positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
7. Did teachers who were holding or had held Advanced Skills Teacher positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
8. What was the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and their experiences of policy implementation?
Methodology

This research viewed policy formation and implementation as cyclical in nature. This cycle has implementing agencies, in this case schools, interpreting policy documents in the first instance and in the second instance, (on the basis of this interpretation), shaping and reshaping policy intent to make it suit their personal or organisational needs.

Accepting this view of policy, and the potential therefore for disparate implementation of policy, this study used theoretical perspectives of workplace motivation and performance, research evidence on career ladder schemes implemented in the United States as well as evidence from research conducted into the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales and other states as organising foci through which to survey teachers to view school level implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Within the questionnaire, measures of two dependent variables were taken: teachers’ attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre implementation and teachers’ attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy post experience of school level policy implementation. The independent variables which were measured were a function of either teacher and school characteristics or teachers’ experiences of school level policy implementation. Follow up interviews were also conducted with some survey respondents. These interviews followed a semi structured format. The purpose of the interviews was to add further information to that provided by the questionnaire with the intention of extending the rationale for some of the major propositions emanating from the survey data. As expected, data provided by interviews also raised issues outside those covered by the questionnaire. These issues were also pursued through the course of the interviews.
Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is in two sections. Section One is the result of detailed document analysis, reviews of relevant literature and interviews with representatives of stake holder groups. It provides the necessary background information to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and evidence from other countries which was instructive in the development of the survey, the principal data gathering instrument for this study.

Chapter Two traces the origins of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and provides the reader with a synopsis of the educational and industrial relations mind set of the late eighties within which the policy was first conceptualised.

Chapter Three examines the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as a policy issue and provides the policy model on which this study is based. After examining the relevance of more traditional policy models, this chapter describes the Cyclical Model of Bowe, Ball and Gold, (1992). Acceptance of this model of policy processes is fundamental to an understanding of the aims of this study. It is through this model of policy formation and implementation that an understanding is gained of the opportunities for policy to be implemented differently in different sites and therefore the potential to examine the relationships between aspects of implementation and teacher attitudes.

Chapter Four examines the policy space; the actions and motives of the individuals and organisations who were responsible for providing schools with broad guidelines for implementation. Chapter Four also identifies some of the constraints, inducements and major policy influences which were determinants of eventual policy guidelines. Chapters Two and Four reveal an incongruence between policy intent as identified by the origins of the policy and the eventual policy guidelines.

Chapter Five draws together the literature from three discrete areas. From
an examination and review of these three areas and the author's interpretation of their implications, the research questions clearly emerged. These research questions then formed the theoretical framework which underpinned the development of the questionnaire. The first area examined was the theoretical perspectives on workplace motivation and compensation. While a full discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of these perspectives is beyond the scope of this study, these perspectives provided a framework for viewing school level implementation decisions and contributed to the development of the questionnaire. To lead the reader toward an understanding of the contribution of these theories to questionnaire construction, the implications of each theory for Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation are also discussed. Chapter Five also reviews the literature on teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes, an alternative to the uniform salary schedule similar to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Thirdly, Chapter Five reviews the literature which has examined the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales and other states.

Section Two describes the design and implementation of the survey instrument used to complete this study, the results of the statistical analyses, a discussion of these results and finally some policy options based on these results. Specifically, Chapter Six provides an overview of the research methodology employed to collect and analyse the data for the study. A questionnaire complemented by semi structured interviews was considered the most effective way to collect the information necessary to complete this study.

Chapter Seven provides the outcomes of the study based on the research questions the study sought to answer. It explains the results of the statistical analysis of the quantitative data obtained through the questionnaire. An analysis of the qualitative data obtained through interviews is used to explain and illuminate the statistical outcomes.
Chapter Eight recaps the major issues examined in the study. Policy options and directions on the basis of the findings of the study and in light of the perceived policy directions of both State and Commonwealth governments are also discussed.
Chapter Two

The Origins of the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy

An Overview of the Chapter

While the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was not exogenous to the educational arena, some of the impetus for policy formation can be traced to concerns outside education. In New South Wales, the policy was first implemented in the state school system as part of the salary agreement titled *The Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award* dated September 12, 1991. While this industrial agreement between teachers and the state government represented the initial attempt to implement the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales, the broader contextual origins of the policy are found in the process of award restructuring, a federal government response to the declining competitiveness of Australian industry.

This chapter will consider the forces emanating from two discrete areas, industrial relations and education. Both areas were important in the formation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, firstly at a national level and later through salary agreements at a state level.
The Industrial Origins of the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy

Mathews (1990) described the Australian economy from Federation in 1901 through to the mid eighties as characterised by three basic elements:

1. The backbone of the economy being the production of primary resources which were supplied to world markets and generated substantial export earnings.
2. On the strength of these earnings, wages were kept high through industrial arbitration, across the whole economy ('comparative wage justice').
3. Industry was protected from overseas competition to allow it to pay these high wages, through tariff barriers.
4. The labour market and wages were regulated (p. 5).

This model served Australia well until markets for our primary produce fell, resulting in an accompanying drop in our Gross Domestic Product and therefore terms of trade. The Fraser Government's (Coalition) response to this was the unsuccessful engineering of the 'resources boom' derided by unions as the 'quarry Australia model' (Mathews, 1990).

In 1983, the Labor Party led by Bob Hawke was elected to government at the Federal level. In 1986, the Federal Government via the Trade Development Council sponsored a joint delegation to Western Europe comprising members of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) and the Trade Development Committee (TDC). The mission members ".... sought to examine the experiences of other countries which had overcome balance of payments constraints in ways which produced low unemployment, low inflation and economic growth which was more equitably distributed" (ACTU/TDU, 1987, p. xi). The emphasis was on finding solutions to Australia's economic and industrial problems some of which were mentioned in the Executive Summary of the report vis; ".... a growth in the deficit on the current account from 1.7% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1979/80 to 5.9% of GDP in 1985/86" (ACTU/TDU, 1987, p. xi). The mission and its subsequent report
titled *Australia Reconstructed: A Report by the Mission Members to the ACTU and the TDC* ".... identified the need for Australia to modernise its whole industrial structure in order to raise our overall competitiveness and standing in the world" (Zbar, 1991, p. 4), and to achieve this via a consensus based approach on the negotiation of national economic and social objectives (Seddon, 1991). From this report came a process called Award Restructuring, a process where industrial efficiency and productivity were improved through the reorganisation of awards, (agreements between employers and trade unions representing employees).

*Award Restructuring and the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy*

Initially, the education system and teachers' unions were not seen as primary targets for change. A more direct approach was envisaged, ".... which included the reform of industries like the Metals Industries, characterised by 364 fine and inflexible divisions of labour leading to an intricate, slow and inefficient labour process" (Ashenden, 1990). On publication of the Australia Reconstructed report however, the education system via its potential contribution to the national technological base was identified as a significant determinant of economic well being. The school system was the subject of Recommendation 4.4 of the report which in part read:

.... improve the quality of outcomes from the education system so that Australia's young people's skills and qualifications are internationally competitive by improving the education and training institutions.... (ACTU/TDU, 1987, p. 201).

The report was significant in the eventual development of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in two ways, firstly by creating a new link between wages and productivity and secondly, by placing an increased emphasis on skills formation and reformed work practices. The new link between wages and productivity quickly became part of general wages policy. The report
envisaged a ".... two tiered approach to wage fixation in an attempt to marry equity with efficiency without threatening the integrity of the centralised system" (p. 54). A first tier increase was a universal increase to all workers. This gave special protection to the low wage earner by being a flat rate increase and therefore representing a larger percentage rise for the low wage earner (ACTU/TDU, 1987). A second tier increase had to reflect the restructuring and efficiency principle. ".... Pay rises were justified in this tier by the implementation of significant efforts directed at achieving changes in work practices, work organisation and improvements in productivity at the enterprise or industry level" (ACTU/TDU, 1987, p. 55). The concept of Advanced Skills Teacher positions was developed as part of a second tier increase.

Reinforcing the move toward concerns of productivity and efficiency was the Federal Government's reorganisation of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, the arbitrator of the centralised wage fixing system. This Commission had previously approved wage increases as a response to cost of living increases. The reorganised agency called the Australian Industrial Relations Commission (AIRC) became the new arbitrator in the centralised wage fixing system and adopted what it called the structural efficiency principle to measure increased productivity as a basis for wage increases. The fundamental purpose of the structural efficiency principle was described by the full bench of the Australian Industrial Relations Commission in their August 1989 decision on the National Wage Case thus:

.... the fundamental purpose of the structural efficiency principle is to modernise awards in the interests of both employees and employers and in the interests of the Australian community: such modernisation without steps being taken to ensure stability as between those awards and their relevance to industry would, on past experience, seriously reduce the effectiveness of that modernisation (AIRC, 1989, p. 92).
From the same decision:

.... to sustain real improvement in productivity and efficiency, we must ensure that work classifications and functions and the basic work patterns and arrangements in an industry meet the competitive requirements of that industry (AIRC, 1989, p. 92).

The Australian Industrial Relations Commission (1989) also provided criteria on which it would view proposals put to it in terms of a second tier increase. Specific to the future Advanced Skills Teacher policy was the stipulation that:

.... parties to an award have cooperated positively in a fundamental review of that award and are implementing measures to improve the efficiency of industry and provide workers with access to more varied, fulfilling and better paid jobs (AIRC, 1989, p. 102).

The increased emphasis placed on skills formation and reformed work practices also became significant features of award restructuring. This requirement is evidenced in the following extracts from the Australia Reconstructed document:

Skill formation should not be seen as a cost but as an investment in people who are productive resources. ... Old style management in Australia, dominated by accounting concepts, views skill formation as a cost, whereas in stark contrast, the Norwegians and Swedes view people as a resource, and education as an investment (ACTU/TDU, 1987, p. 155).

This emphasis was not about selecting individuals within the work force for advancement, but more firmly linked to notions of upskilling the entire work force. In the case of the Advanced Skills teacher policy, this was manifest in the mentoring role that early policy formulation envisaged the Advanced Skills Teacher role would incorporate. It was also recognition that the vertical divisions within teaching were both small in number and immutable. These divisions increasingly took teachers away from the classroom and the lack of
mobility through these divisions experienced by many teachers, was hampering the recognition of teacher skills and the development of further skills in other teachers.

The Advanced Skills Teacher classification was seen as the only manifestation of award restructuring in the teaching profession and was designed to produce more effective schools while giving teachers greater rewards. It was seen as a means of increasing the knowledge and skills of all teachers; those who were appointed as Advanced Skills Teachers and those who were to work with and learn with Advanced Skills Teachers (Bluer, 1992, p. 3).

The Educational Origins of the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy

Just as the industrial relations literature and outlook of the late eighties was an influence on the eventual Advanced Skills Teacher policy during policy formulation, so too was some of the educational literature and prevailing mood of the same time.

In 1987, the Commonwealth Schools Commission commenced a major policy development project on in-service teacher education at the request of the then Minister of Education, Senator Susan Ryan (DEET, 1988, p. 1). In 1987 when John Dawkins became Minister For Employment, Education and Training it was announced that the Schools Commission would not continue beyond 1987. The development project continued under the Schools Council, one of the four constituent councils of the National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET) whose role it was to provide advice to the Federal Minister on matters relating to his portfolio. The report of the project was published in 1988 and was titled Teachers Learning: Improving Australian Schools through In-service Teacher Training and Development. The report described the prevailing view of the Federal Government that "... a national effort to strengthen Australia's schools is required as part of a national
economic readjustment" (DEET, 1988, p. 3).

The report's contribution to the formulation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy lay in its connection of three issues for which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy later came to be seen as a panacea (a) the significance of the teacher in the educational process, (b) the need for increased teacher in-service and, (c) the need for a rethink of the career options available to teachers and an appraisal system to support movement through this career path.

The report acknowledged the centrality of good teaching to educational outcomes and ".... that with appropriate teaching strategies there can be substantial gains in learning outcomes" (DEET, 1988, p.53). In recognising that teaching was complex and that good teaching could make an important difference to learning outcomes, the report also highlighted that increased financial support of education had been directed at the environment of education; schools and class sizes and that facilities had not reached teachers themselves. The report was not only diverting attention towards teachers' remuneration but specifically at a lack of in-service training for teachers which it defined as ".... all further training and development of teachers once they have joined the service" (DEET, 1988, p. 4). The report cited a study which the steering committee had commissioned which revealed that while ".... teachers are making a substantial contribution to their own continuing training and development .... the evidence also shows that systems provide more release time for senior personnel than for classroom teachers" (DEET, 1988, p. 13). The report called for one percent of total spending on schools to be devoted to in-service teacher training and development (DEET, 1988).

A major concern of the report was the nature of a teaching career and teachers themselves. The report recognised the demanding nature of the teaching task, describing it as a:
... complex, cognitively demanding enterprise during which the teacher needs to draw upon a repertoire of appropriate teaching strategies, a knowledge of cultural context and subject content and be able to interpret classroom events and adjust teaching behaviour constantly throughout the day (DEET, 1988, p. 53).

The report was also critical of the teaching environment. In discussing the competitive market from which the school system attempted to attract its future teachers the report suggested the reward structure of teaching needed to be altered to not only attract more capable graduates in the first instance but also "... provide recognition and incentives for more highly skilled and more successful teaching performance" (DEET, 1988, p. 54). The report noted that teaching competence itself was not rewarded, detailing a salary structure which related to years of service, academic qualifications and additional administrative responsibilities. The report argued that this salary structure was characterised by an early salary and responsibility plateau after which teachers' salaries and responsibilities remained constant. In describing these characteristics of a teaching career, the report highlighted the anomaly of a pursuit of increased remuneration taking the efficient classroom teacher away from teaching and towards increasing administrative loads. The report argued "... new career paths need to be developed within teaching to retain highly skilled teachers in classrooms. Appropriate status and salary rewards are required" (DEET, 1988, p. 55). The report connected the separate issues of a lack of teacher in-service opportunities with the need for a new career structure for teachers by proposing a complementary function which later came to be reflected in the conceptualisation of Advanced Skills Teacher roles when it suggested these career paths:

... utilise the flexible deployment of the school's most skilled teachers ... teachers who qualify for the new career structure might be deployed in a variety of roles such as leading a curriculum team, improving an area of school performance, planning and organising professional development activities, acting as mentor to beginning teachers ... (DEET, 1988, p. 56).
In relation to this new career structure, the report identified two tasks "....a professional task of selecting and possibly certifying, highly skilled teachers and an industrial relations task of developing new career structures and assignments for teachers identified as having advanced skills" (DEET, 1988, p. x).

Bluer (cited in Gaffney and Crowther, 1993) maintained that the importance of this statement lies in the clear dichotomy drawn between the professional and industrial elements of this process and the role the teaching profession should have had in establishing the mechanisms and criteria for selection, vis:

".... the Committee envisages a selection system voluntarily entered into, extended over a period of perhaps a year, thorough and demanding in the range of knowledge, attributes and skills it was designed to assess, and, above all, one which the teaching profession helped to design and to maintain its integrity (DEET, 1988, p. 57).

The report also provided what the authors argued should be characteristics of this new career structure which, as well as including the characteristics described above was also characterised by a ".... consistency of approach across the nation to key elements of the selection process within what would necessarily be a decentralised operation" (DEET, 1988, p. 57).

The report described the need for a system of teacher appraisal to support the new career structure. It suggested teachers needed feedback on their standards of teaching and proposed the development of a nationally developed, and therefore recognised, blueprint for the identification and statement of advanced teaching skills (DEET, 1988). In stating this, the report recognised the anomaly between various systemic attempts at gauging teacher effectiveness and the relative success of these attempts as part of the more overriding concern of a clear conceptualisation of what constituted
'advanced teaching skills'. The report saw the solution to this situation in the involvement of an education faculty within a higher education institution and the eventual development of a Certificate of Advanced Teaching Skills (DEET, 1988). Finally, this report described the framework within which policy in this area should be developed. Recommendation 3 of the report stated:

That the industrial relations partners, employers of teachers and teacher unions, work within their respective industrial relations structures to develop and implement new career structures for the teaching profession (DEET, 1988, p.xi).

The document *Teacher Quality: An Issues Paper*, was published in 1989 by the Schools Council after Australian teachers in government and non-government schools had put a joint claim through the ACTU to the Australian Industrial Relations Commission which featured the Advanced Skills Teacher Scale as one possible outcome of negotiations (Schools Council, 1989). This document contributed to the development of Advanced Skills Teacher policy through its assertion that teachers' professional growth should be viewed as a continuum commencing with initial teacher training and including a significant in-service component relevant to a teacher's career stages and needs. The paper asserted the belief that this in-servicing/staff development should be the responsibility of teachers deemed to have advanced skills and seeking an alternate career path. The paper also focussed on the teacher appraisal procedures which would be necessary to determine progression along this career path. In describing the issue of teacher appraisal as central to the question of how teachers move to the new scales, the report provided a list of criteria which indicated the sorts of skills required for such scales, including:

(a) communication and human relations skills of a high order, (b) thorough preparation and imaginative teaching strategies, (c) mediation and conflict resolution skills, (d) co-operative working and team building, and (d) patience and maintenance of strategy for long
In stating these criteria, the authors were placing a new emphasis on the classroom role and teaching skills, and appraisal mechanisms which could measure these skills. In preempting some difficulties that systems and schools faced in developing these appraisal mechanisms, the document touched on the complexity of the classroom teachers role when it stated:

This in itself flies in the face of the whole development of the role of teachers for the last thirty years which has had the effect of exalting their social role as counsellors, organisers, administrators and cultural change agents. If this is true, new forms of teacher appraisal will need to be developed which take account of this emphasis (Schools Council, 1989, p. 56).

In 1990, the Schools Council published *Australia's Teachers: An Agenda For The Next Decade*. This publication expanded on many of the issues raised in the Teacher Quality document. The overriding concern of the paper was the productivity of teaching. It encapsulated and connected the issues of the work of teachers, teacher appraisal and teacher careers, all of which were significant considerations in the development of Advanced Skills Teacher policy. The paper argued, that with the exception of decreasing class sizes, the basic structure of teachers' work had been static for many years. The authors pointed to a lack of flexibility in industrial agreements and the resultant system wide implementation of these agreements as hindering any real chance that schools or teachers may have had to make their teaching structures more flexible and responsive to the needs of their students. In effect, education systems had evolved into an educational 'production line' with all the accompanying side effects of those production lines found in industry including worker frustration and disengagement (Schools Council, 1990).

Like the earlier paper, Teacher Quality: An Issues Paper (1989), the authors
described the centrality of effective appraisal systems for other aspects of teachers' work including productivity, careers and relationships with the school community (Schools Council, 1989). In expressing their support for the Advanced Skills Teacher initiative, the authors envisaged a generic, periodic appraisal system which would include coverage of the following areas:

- professional attitudes, content knowledge (subject) and methodology and pedagogical knowledge and which includes an informative and comprehensive feedback component and suggestions for professional development for the teacher (Schools Council, 1989, p. 99).

In arguing that promotion, and salary increases should be based on merit, the authors specified that entry to the Advanced Skills Teacher classification should be based explicitly on classroom performance and cited Bluer (1989) to further justify this stand in terms of award restructuring vis-a-vis: ".... it is difficult to see how such a scale can emphasise skills other than teaching and still be consistent with a structural efficiency principle" (p. 120).

The authors of the report stated their support for the Advanced Skills Teacher classification for the following reasons:

1. It is a recognition of the fundamental importance of classroom teaching in schooling.
2. It is a recognition that many teachers get their strongest sense of fulfilment from classroom teaching and do not wish to pursue careers in administration (Schools Council, 1989, p. 120).

Finally, in recognising the fundamental importance of classroom teaching, and the fact that many teachers received greatest satisfaction through their face to face teaching commitment, the report affirmed the importance of quality classroom performance and argued:
The main justification for the introduction of this classification is to encourage teachers of high quality to continue their work in the classroom and in all cases the classification should be framed with this in mind. It should not be framed as an additional duty statement with the exception that teachers achieving the Advanced Skills classification should play a major role in the supervision of trainee and beginning teachers. However, teachers achieving the classification should be expected to make their proven array of capacities, experience and maturity available to the school in a role such as team leadership (Schools Council, 1989, p. 120).

**Summary and Implications**

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy represented a point of educational and industrial coalescence and it is difficult to be exclusive in describing the origins of the policy. While the earlier educational literature emphasised the way aspects of teacher welfare can impact on student outcomes, it still held issues like teacher quality, attrition rates and teacher morale as legitimate concerns in themselves. Likewise the literature revealed no evidence of causation; that concerns in either education or industrial relations were responsible for the development of concerns in the other area. What is clear however is that the dominant national themes of productivity and efficiency resulted in an emerging emphasis being placed on the role education and education systems could play in moving Australia away from its traditional reliance on resources and towards a reliance on technology and industrial innovation. This new found importance on education was occurring at the same time as the structural efficiency principle was placing a new emphasis on links between wage rises and efficiency and productivity. This principle facilitated some of the changes education writers were suggesting were required in the work of teachers, and was recognised by Scott (1990) in his review of the New South Wales Education Portfolio as offering hope to rewarding outstanding and experienced teachers.
Bluer (1992) a Counsellor of the National Board of Employment, Education and Training gave some insight into the intention of policy makers of the time when he states that at the time of the Teachers Learning document, (DEET, 1988) the aim of policy makers was to develop the Advanced Skills Teacher concept in a professional context, then once developed, to put it into the industrial relations arena. However this did not happen. In early 1989, the Advanced Skills Teacher concept was incorporated in the ACTU blueprint for restructuring awards (along with the metal trades award).

.... since then it has remained in the industrial relations context. This is unfortunate since that context is formal, basically adversarial and not conducive to developing the concept (Bluer, 1992, p. 3).

While the paradigms of education and industrial relations can be considered partners in policy formation, the major influence on eventual policy were proceedings within an industrial environment. This came about via the vacuum which was created when significant aspects of policy were not detailed by educationalists. Policy was not translated straight from the educational theory into an educational reality. Rather, through its formation, it became subject to the vagaries of industrial reconciliation. Through an examination of the policy space, chapter four will describe the process through which original policy intent was modified and the resultant policy directives.
Chapter Three

A Policy Issue

An Overview of the Chapter

This study explored the notion that policy is open to interpretation and therefore may be disparate in implementation. The results of this implementation can be viewed as being on a continuum between two extremes. At one extreme are genuine attempts to implement the policy, faithful to the intent of the policy. At the other extreme are attempts to implement policy with a view to satisfying some organisational or personal needs without genuine concern for the intent of the policy. Acceptance of this view of policy implementation is crucial to the basic premise of this study; that teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy were a function of personal characteristics on the one hand and their experiences of policy implementation on the other.

This chapter sets out to detail a model of policy making which explores the opportunities for disparate implementation and the political features of a system which made this possible. In so doing, a definition of policy is provided, as is a critique of earlier models of policy making, to act as points of contrast with the model adopted for this study.

Definitions of Policy

The complexity of defining 'policy' is indicated by Guba, (1984) who listed eight different definitions of the term. Guba stated policy is or may be, one or more of the following:
1. An assertion of intents and goals.
2. The accumulated standing decision of a governing body by which it regulates, controls, promotes, services and otherwise influences matters within its sphere of authority.
3. A guide to discretionary action.
4. A strategy undertaken to solve or ameliorate a problem.
5. A sanctioned behaviour, formally through authoritative decisions, or informally through expectations and acceptance established over time.
6. A norm of conduct characterised by consistency and regularity in some substantiative action area.
7. The output of the policy making system: the cumulative effect of all the actions, decisions and behaviours of bureaucracies.
8. The effect of the policy making and policy implementing system as it is experienced by the client (p.64).

Despite receiving the attention of many writers over the years, a definition of policy stable over time and across paradigms is still not evident. As a result of this, writers such as Heclo (1972) and Dye (1987) have adopted simplistic definitions. Heclo (1972) noted that policy is not a self evident term but that it ".... may usefully be considered as a course of action or inaction rather than specific decisions or actions" (p.84).

Dye (1987) provided what he called a simple definition of policy vis; ".... whatever governments choose to do or choose not to do" (p. 3) but in so doing, stated that ".... attempts to define policy in academic or proper terms have proven futile, even exasperating and they often divert attention from the study of public policy itself" (p.3).

When seen as part of a policy process, the inaction described earlier by Heclo and earlier by Dye is a major consideration where a definition of policy is concerned as through inaction, the status quo remains and the creation of a policy through relative policy inertia results. Heclo (1972) maintained that non decisions ".... prevent certain items or grievances from either entering
the agenda or from developing any sort of force or power of their own to become fully fledged issues" (p.2).

Other writers have attempted to attach more specific meanings to the term policy via definitions which tend to have their genesis in the discipline or orientation in which the writer worked. From a political science discipline, Easton (1953) defined policy as ".... the authoritative allocation of values for the whole society.... consisting of a web of decisions and actions that allocate values" (p.129).

Lasswell and Kaplan (1970) writing from political science and philosophy disciplines respectively defined policy as ".... a projected program of goals, values and practices" (p.71). While succinct, this definition has difficulty embracing that policy is often made 'on the run' and at the time of formation may not have 'projected goals values and practices'. From a public policy discipline Anderson (1975) defined policy as ".... a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern" (p.3).

While these definitions add to the theory of policy it seems their specificity makes them difficult to apply consistently and therefore detracts from any policy analysis based on them as definitive explanations.

Winder (1991) provided a broader definition of policy. He contended that policy was not always the result of sound debate or the consideration of societal goodwill or the goodwill of all stakeholders. He stated that policy is ".... merely reflections of human interactions in the particular time and place context" (p.9). What seemed to be an ambivalent view of policy was a result of Winder's experience as the Director General of Education in New South Wales, (1985-1988). Winder was witness and sometimes subject to, policy being created over a car telephone by an Education Minister while talking to
talk back radio announcers. The resultant policy was a direct contradiction of the platform of the political party in power but was in line with the predisposition of the particular Education Minister of the time (Winder and Fasano, 1991).

While not desirous of adding to the definitions of policy already provided, and keeping in mind Winder's comment as a general caveat for all definitions of policy, this study accepts the general definition provided by Dye (1987) vis: ".... whatever governments choose to do or choose not to do" (p. 3). This study will also utilise an adjunct to this definition, proposed by McDonnell and Elmore (1988, cited in Palumbo and Calista, 1990) and of particular relevance to this study that these actions (policies) are:

.... intended to evoke some change in a target population, that population ranging from an audience expected to change their minds about those adopting a policy to a set of people from whom behavioural changes in order to solve a problem are expected (p.67).

**A Traditional View of the Policy Process**

Wildavsky (1979) stated that ".... policy is a process as well as a product. It is used to refer to a process of decision making and also to the product of that process" (p.387). Up to and including the 1980's, researchers working in the field of public policy described the policy process as a continuum. This continuum varied in length according to the antecedents of the policy, but still revolved around inputs and outputs in a linear arrangement of problem identification, formulation, legitimation, implementation and evaluation (Crump, 1993). Along this continuum, policy implementors were either accommodating and therefore inert or, reactive and therefore obstructive.
Models reflecting this view of the policy process are increasingly viewed as of little relevance by some authors working in the field of educational policy. In recent years, these authors have begun to critique these models and reascertain their relevance. Most of the criticisms flowing from this critique have revolved around the notion that in practice, the stages of these models are not mutually exclusive and that policy making is often incremental on the basis of the decisions of implementing agencies when implementing policy mandates. These models failed to recognise the opportunities available to policy implementors to change policy intent through their implementation decisions or non decisions. Policy making for example, did not terminate in the earlier stages of formation or formulation but was still evident in the implementation stage of the policy process, Walker (1989) suggesting “... there is no point at which policy making stops and implementation begins” (p. 4). Specific to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, the acceptance of a traditional view of policy making would have policy being implemented consistently across the state of New South Wales, (801 000 square kilometres) and within 2 213 schools.

Crump (1993) described the inadequacies of the traditional models thus “.... classical models with their predetermined assumptions,... struggle to represent the practices of policy actors” (p.24). Crump (1993) also argued that the linear, traditional models:

.... are not an adequate tool for making sense of a policy environment that can be portrayed as in disarray, beset by contradictions and caught between competing interests... for example while policy is a means of maintaining control, the rhetoric of much contemporary policy is devolutionary, free market and entrepreneurial (p. 27).

On considering a model of the policy process through which to view the Advanced Skills Teacher policy it seems unwise to accept unquestioningly these linear models. In New South Wales in the late 1980's and early 1990's,
the Schools Renewal process gave rise to a period of sustained and significant policy changes. Policy processes during this time occurred during what Crump (1992) described as "... clearly a period of intended reform, yet the number of reports and the rate of change, coupled with the internal ambiguities, contradictions, duality of purposes and unreconciled tensions, as a period of policy burlesque" (p. 418). In light of this, how should a contemporary educational policy process be modelled and what are the features of this model which better reflect educational policy making in New South Wales during the 1990's?

**The Cyclical Model of Educational Policy**

Contemporary literature in the area of education policy provides a model which offers to researchers in educational policy an alternative to the linear, classical model of policy processes. This literature (Ball and Bowe 1991; Bowe, Ball, and Gold 1992; Crump, 1992 and 1993) describes a model which is cyclical in nature and "... draws attention towards the work of policy recontextualization that goes in in schools" (Bowe, Ball, and Gold, 1992, p. 19). As such it may better reflect educational policy implementation in New South Wales since 1989.

The Cyclical Model (Ball and Bowe, 1991) of the educational policy process recognises that policy documents in their various forms, be they legislation, decisions of courts of law or even memorandum, are the products of a policy process which emerges from and continually interacts with a variety of interrelated contexts (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992). The Cyclical Model recognises that any policy being implemented across 2,213 schools within a climate characterised by school level empowerment and the devolution of decision making from the centre, will be implemented in a disparate manner.
The Cyclical Model proposed by Ball and Bowe (1991) is underpinned by a number of beliefs including:

1. Individuals implementing policy bring to their implementation decisions their own histories, values, purposes and vested interests (Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992).

2. While attempting to accommodate political intent, schools will "... also recontextualise the intent through policy-in-use, through micro politics" (Crump, 1992, p.419).

3. "Even with a highly detailed piece of legislation on the statute books, educational policy will still be generated and implemented both within and around the educational system in ways that have intended and unintended consequences" (p.99).

Whereas the earlier linear models saw policy from a top down perspective, concluding in some sort of formative evaluation or assessment, a cyclical model recognises that policy itself may not be that which is pronounced or legislated. Rather policy may be reconstructed at an implementation level as a result of earlier pronouncements and directives and the institutional power of the stake holders at the level of implementation.

The Cyclical Model proposed by Ball and Bowe (1991) depicted in Figure 3 is characterised by ".... cyclical and overlapping phases; intended policy, actual policy and policy in use" (p.99). Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) revised these labels because of their concern that the earlier labels introduced a rigidity they did not want to imply, ".... that there are many competing intentions that struggle for influence, not only one intention, .... actual seemed to us to signal a frozen text, quite the opposite to how we wanted to characterise this aspect of the policy process" (p.19).

As a result of these concerns, component stages of their policy model were renamed, vis; context of influence (intended); context of policy text production (actual); context of practice (policy in use). While providing the reader with
the above mentioned modifications and their rationale, the original labels will be applied in this study while remaining cognizant of the concerns expressed by Bowe, Ball and Gold, (1992).

**Figure 3**

**A Cyclical Model of the Policy Process**

---

Ball and Bowe (1991) described this policy process as:

.... a dialectical process in which the moments of legislation (the Act), the documentation (bureaucracy) and implementation (the work of teachers) may be more or less loosely coupled. Policy texts are not closed, their meanings are neither fixed nor clear, and the carry over of meanings from one policy arena and one educational site to another is subject to interpretational slippage and contestation (p.99).

Ball and Bowe (1991) described intended policy as what the various interest groups want, where interest groups combine to put in place documentation for discussion and consideration, and where ".... competing ideologies signal the complexity of official pronouncements and the continual struggle for power they reflect and contain" (p.99).

For the purposes of this study, the term interest groups include the social networks in and around political parties and bureaucracies, formal public arenas like committees and national bodies and the wider public arena of the mass media (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992).
Ball and Bowe (1991) described actual policy as that document, report or piece of legislation, whose intention is sanctioned either by governments, federal or state, courts of law or employing authorities. While accepting that the text of these policy documents themselves are constant across the school system, Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) state they are “.... written in relation to idealisations of the real world and can never be exhaustive and cannot cover all eventualities” (p.21). Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) borrow from the field of semiotics to describe two types of texts, “.... that which gives the reader a role, a function, a contribution to make, and that which renders the reader idle or redundant,....an inert consumer to the author's role of producer” (Bowe, Ball and Gold, citing Hawkes, 1977, p.11).

When considering the inclination of teachers to be active in the educational policy process, the authors suggest that educational policy documents fall into the first category and as such leave themselves open to interpretation based on the meaning each reader brings to it. As a result, while policy statements are mandated, their actual meanings are as much a function of the individual interpreting them, or the particular site in which they are interpreted, as they are the intentions of the original policy designers. “.... The simple point is that policy writers cannot control the meanings of their texts” (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992, p.22).

This lack of a common implementation outcome across implementing agencies can be compounded by the continual attempts of stake holder groups to influence eventual policy in use by providing official commentaries on the meaning of the policy text. In the case of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, these stake holder groups were the Department of School Education and the New South Wales Teachers Federation. To demonstrate this point consider the rhetoric of the respective journals of the two organisations, around the time of policy formation; the School Education News of the Department of School Education and, Education, the journal of the New South Wales
Teachers Federation. In School Education News (June 12, 1991), Dr Fenton Sharpe, the Director General of School Education described Advanced Skills Teachers as "... outstanding teachers who might be of leadership assistance with those people who needed special assistance" (p. 5).

Around the same time in the Education journal (March 9, 1992), Phil Cross the President of the New South Wales Teachers Federation wrote in less effusive and contradictory terms, "... the use of the terms outstanding teachers or exceptional ability should not be construed as to deter any member from making an application to be an Advanced Skills Teacher. If you meet the criteria, (service) then you will be classified as such" (p.3). Clearly these commentaries on intended policy had the potential to further obfuscate implementation.

Ball and Bowe (1991) described policy in use as the regional and school level reaction; the implementation by street level authorities through whose action or inaction policy is eventually operationalised. Part of this response will derive from having to address the problems that policy engenders in specific situations and which therefore make it amenable to interpretation and recreation. Crump (1992) suggested "... policy, therefore, reflects the responses of practitioners to intended and actual policy, to the peculiarities and particularities of their school" (p.420).

Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) argued that school level policy implementors approach policies with histories, experiences, values and vested and organisational interests. As part of implementing behaviour therefore, teachers and principals could choose to ignore, reject, select out, deliberately misunderstand and adopt frivolous responses to certain requirements of a policy in an attempt to make that policy best serve their personal or organisational interest.
Practitioners will be influenced by the discursive context within which policies emerge. Some will have an eye to personal or localised advantage, material or otherwise, which may stem from particular readings of policy texts. The meanings of texts are rarely unequivocal. Novel or creative readings can sometimes bring their own rewards (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992, p.23).

When seen through the Cyclical Model, policy is constantly evolving; new problems arise, new conditions are set and new contradictions emerge as old ones are resolved (Crump, 1992). Further to this, stake holders in the policy process, whether they are generating, clarifying or implementing policy, do not function as discrete participants. Rather, they have the ability to shape and to some extent determine the policy work of the other. This cyclical policy process better recognises the opportunity afforded to schools in New South Wales since 1989 to be the developers and implementors of policy which has already been formulated at a central level. These opportunities and the author's belief that school leadership could utilise them to make policy empathetic with school and personal interests is central to this study.

**Summary and Implications**

In describing the emergence of the Cyclical Model, it appears that its' genesis lay in the broader political climate which impacted on education both in Australia and overseas during the late nineteen eighties. Education and the school system have always been the tools of government to bring about social, cultural and economic change. Crump (1992) argued that "... schools traditionally operate within a pronounced political context" (p.416). Ball, (1990) described the policy expression resulting from the political context of the 1960's and 1970's as "... fragile, progressive consensus, ... ideals of egalitarianism, progressivism democracy and social engineering as teacher unions, academics and bureaucrats contributed to policy decision making" (p.8).
In 1989 however, with the election of a Liberal and National Party coalition in New South Wales policies reflective of the so called New Right emerged. These policies essentially represented an economic rationalist point of view (Crump, 1992). Similar policies had previously been implemented in Britain by the Conservative Government of Margaret Thatcher through the Education Reform Act of 1988. Through their own Education Reform Act, (1989) and a policy of School Centred Education (1990) the New South Wales Government began to dismantle the bureaucracy at a state (central) level and empower schools with decision making responsibilities normally the preserve of the central bureaucracy. The main aspects of School Centred Education which was to become known during implementation as Schools Renewal included financial delegation to the school level, (global budgeting) rather than central accountability; comparative assessment (merit selection) rather than promotion through seniority; dezoning rather than open enrolment; parent control of governance through school councils and a centralised (state) curriculum in place of the school based development of curriculum.

In policy terms, the dismantling of the central bureaucracy was significant. Traditionally, the central bureaucracy had acted as a conduit between the government, (policy makers) and the school, (policy implementors). In itself, the bureaucracy was capable of obfuscating the nature, source and extent of educational policy making (Crump, 1992) and therefore became a significant determinant of policy itself. As a bureaucracy not only could it institute and modify policy, but through the District Inspector role, was also capable of monitoring the extent to which policy was being implemented and the extent to which individual schools were reflecting Head Office decisions. In his Report of the Management Review of the New South Wales Education Portfolio, Scott (1990) identified the role of what was then known as the Department's Policy Unit as "... while reporting to the Director General, tended to be engaged in reviews of existing policy or in incremental policy development (italics added) to accommodate initiatives often introduced by the
Government” (p.54).

The implementation of Schools Renewal saw the Department's Policy Unit disbanded and the formation of the Central Policy Committee comprising fifteen of the new Executive Service including the Director General, Deputy Director Generals and Assistant Director Generals. This new body lacked the mediating role of its predecessor. Scott (1990) described the role as “....policy development to provide direction and broad guidelines for regions and schools” (italics added) (p. 24). This disbandment of some sections of the bureaucracy and the reorganisation of the remnants meant that despite efforts to see policy implemented faithfully across the system, schools had been given the opportunity to recontextualise policy reforms in the process of implementation (Crump, 1993).

The idea that implementing agencies and actors can affect policy direction and flavour is not new. Rein and Rabinovitz (1978) suggested that formal policy statutes did not necessarily determine the shape of policy as implemented but rather just established its boundaries. Lipsky (1980) suggested that under certain circumstances lower level bureaucrats can actually make policy by redefining the intention of policy and giving it concrete meaning through their actions and inactions. Lipsky argued that this was most likely to occur when implementation involved the substantial exercise of discretion by street level bureaucrats like social workers, teachers and others who deal directly with social program clients. Lipsky (1980) contended that the work environment which street level bureaucrats will experience is characterised by the following conditions:

1. Resources inadequate to the task workers are asked to perform.
2. The demand for services tends to increase to meet the supply.
3. Goal expectations tend to be ambiguous, vague or conflicting.
4. Performance oriented toward goal achievement tends to be difficult if not impossible to measure.
5. Clients are typically nonvoluntary (p.27-28).

While it is not the intention of this research to describe schools in terms of Lipsky's criteria, it is clear that many of the conditions described by Lipsky are part of the organisation of a school. As such, according to Lipsky, they are encouraging of the work of street level bureaucrats in this case, teachers and principals, in their implementation of education policy.

Bowe, Ball and Gold's (1992) conceptualisation of what Lipsky labelled street level bureaucrats however does not have principals and teachers as inert forces in a linear model, what Bowe, Ball and Gold described as ".... the silent voices which are heard, but speak either as theoretically over determined mouthpieces of a world beyond their control or as potentially free and autonomous resisters or subverters of the status quo" (p.6). Rather, the significance of implementors behaviour in the cyclical model is two fold.

At the first level it lies not in their subversive activities or their potential to simply mouth theories, but in their implementation decisions based not on the common good paradigm of policy documents but based more specifically on the needs of their school and the individuals in it. In the case of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, their own beliefs about who should be rewarded, what constituted advanced skills, what roles these teachers should perform and how their performance should be assessed. As a result, implementation affected by these variables will be inconsistent and disparate across the system.

Anecdotal evidence suggested that this axiom was indeed the reality. In spite of a policy mandate that Advanced Skills Teacher roles would be determined by the principal following discussion with the Advanced Skills Teacher, research by Weppler (1995) found inconsistency regarding when Advanced
Skills Teachers were informed of their role statement with some being given the role outline before they applied, while others were informed of the duties they were expected to perform after they had been selected. The Teachers Federation also reported on inconsistency in policy implementation with Cameron (1992) a Teachers Federation Industrial Officer describing Advanced Skills Teacher implementation as variable and citing verbal reports and the results of an Association meeting that had "... revealed significantly differing experiences in terms of policy processes" (p. 9). The President of the Teachers Federation while editorialising about Advanced Skills Teacher implementation described:

"... the appointment of Advanced Skills Teachers could only be described as a fiasco. The rules continually changed because the department never negotiated a complete set of procedures. There was no training of panels. Regional information was varied and often inaccurate. The department totally failed to monitor procedures and to ensure compliance either with the Award or its guidelines (Cross, 1992, p.2).

...a nonsensical award ... the vagueness and subjectivity of the process is not fair on applicants, principals, or panelists (Cross, 1992, p.6).

At the second level it lies in the extent to which this implementation behaviour is fed back into the cyclical system resulting in policy change. Evidence in the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was the introduction in 1993 of an additional 3163 Advanced Skills Teachers labelled the Advanced Skills Teacher Teaching and Learning Positions. (Department of School Education Memorandum, 93/30-10 25/3/94). These positions were negotiated as part of the Teachers and Related Employees Enterprise Agreement reached on December 10, 1993 and were supplementary to the original 7318 Advanced Skills Teachers introduced as part of the Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award granted on September 12, 1991. The roles of these Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teachers were specifically
aimed to support teachers in the implementation of new curriculum. This, in spite of the fact that from its conceptual beginnings, the position of Advanced Skills Teacher had always contained a specific teaching and learning focus both in terms of criteria for selection and ultimately role statements. In short, the Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teacher positions were a response by policy makers to the diverse roles the original (quota) Advanced Skills Teachers were being asked to perform as part of school level policy implementation. The respecification and reinforcing of a teaching learning focus for their duties represents one policy cycle as per the Bowe, Ball and Gold model.

The cyclical model of policy processes is central to this study. The cyclical model recognises that policy will be interpreted and implemented differently across the school system. As a result teachers will be exposed to different interpretations and later implementation of policy and their attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy will be a function of these experiences. Accepting Johnson's (1984) proposition that alternate compensation systems in schools must fit the worker and the workplace, uncovering teacher attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and examining the relationship between teacher attitudes and teacher experiences of policy implementation will improve future policy development in this area.
Chapter Four
Policy Development

An Overview of the Chapter

When examining policy implementation consideration of the events preceding implementation is necessary. Yanow (1990) suggested that when implementing policy, school personnel relate as much to the issues embodied within the policy as they do an interpretation of the policy itself. He described implementing agencies as acting within the context of a specific policy issue's culture which includes:

.... the accumulated and often competing values and beliefs concerning that issue collected over successive debates.... while legislation may include a new formulation of a specific piece of policy, most policy issues are not new, the accretion of preexisting values influences policy debate over the new formulation (p. 219).

These debates occur within what writers term the policy space. Hogwood and Gunn (1991) used the concept of policy space to describe the machinations of government and private agencies which eventually result in policy as we know it:

This concept can be used to illustrate the way in which a policy space typically tends to become more 'crowded' over time with more and more governmental interventions and increasingly complex interactions among them (p.13).

This thesis has described the origins of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in terms of an industrial relations context and an educational context. Some writers considered it desirable that the policy be fully developed in a professional context before being affirmed in an industrial context (Bluer,
In New South Wales this development did not happen. Although having some links with the educational literature of the day, policy was formed in the Industrial Commission of New South Wales where it was dominated by the actions of the three policy elites: the Commonwealth Government, the New South Wales Teachers Federation, and the New South Wales Department of School Education. A timeline of police formation is shown in Figure 4.

To provide the reader with a sense of the culture of the policy, this chapter identifies and traces the influence of each of these policy elites on eventual Advanced Skills Teacher policy and examines the policy documents which were implemented in schools. By implication, the culture generated by a policy issue is all pervasive. An examination of the culture generated within the policy space will inform this study, not only of the possible motives of implementors and their constraints but most importantly, teachers' reactions and attitudes to policy being implemented.

The Policy Process and the Role of the State

Policy originates from within the legitimate decision making body of the day, or a group which draws its power from this decision making body. In Australia, school education policy is traditionally the responsibility of state governments. At times the Commonwealth Government can contribute to education policy through the allocation of funds which are tied to various programs which the Commonwealth Government initiates or maintains. Significant among these in recent years was the establishment of the Disadvantaged Schools Program, a product of the Whitlam government.

In designing policy, governments either state or commonwealth, do not operate in isolation and political scientists have refined models of power or
Figure 4

Time line of Policy Formation

1987

Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 proposed by NSWTF.
Australian Teachers Union establishes National Framework including AST1 and AST2

1988

Excellence, Equity and Reward: A Career and Salary Structure for Schools in the 1990's DOSE

1989

Limited agreement reached between DOSE and NSWTF but rejected by the Industrial Commission
Commonwealth intervenes with concerns for 'hard', rigorous entry standards and job requirements

First tier 3% awarded with agreement to reconsider AST proposals in 1990

1990

Pilot scheme proposed by DOSE but rejected by Industrial Commission (April)

1991

Teachers and Related Employees Enterprise Agreement introduces 3163 Teaching and Learning ASTs

1992

Non government school sector (NSW) and ACT unions reach agreement which excludes quotas

1993

Transitional Implementation proposed by NSWTF but rejected by Industrial Commission (June)

Revised scheme proposed by DOSE and accepted by Industrial Commission (September)

Policy arrives in schools (November)
theories, to describe the interplay between governments and competing groups which eventually results in public policy. Policies may be considered to belong to either one, or even a number of these. Tye (1987) suggested models allow for the identification of aspects of policy which are significant; for the suggestion of relationships between participants, their relative weight of influence and importance and the later testing of these relationships.

Two of these models are identified by Ham and Hill (1984) as Elite theory and Pluralist theory. Elite theory challenges Pluralist theory which suggests that power is widely distributed among many groups; that no group is without power to influence decision making and that no group dominates. (Ham and Hill, 1984). Elite theory maintains that power is in the hands of political elites. This power may be based on a variety of sources; the occupation of formal office, wealth, technical expertise, and knowledge. (Ham and Hill, 1984) With these models in mind, the development of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy is best viewed through Elite theory. The various policy elites responsible for the Advanced Skills Teacher policy were the Commonwealth Government and later the Department of School Education and the New South Wales Teachers Federation.

These organisations may be considered policy elites in two ways. Firstly, by virtue of their position in the development and regulation of wages policy, the Commonwealth Government provided broad policy guidelines. In particular, its' offer to subsidise the salaries of Advanced Skills Teachers if certain conditions were met, meant it could provide mandatory guidelines and therefore become a significant determinant of eventual policy intent. Later, regulations which restricted input into industrial commissions from anyone other than union and employer industrial officers (Chadboume and Ingvarson, 1991) made the Department of School Education and the New South Wales Teachers Federation the other policy elites.
Each of these policy elites may be identified as having different agendas. All of these agendas had the potential to obfuscate policy implementation. The Commonwealth Government was concerned with issues like workplace restructuring and the increasing perceived significance of the school education system to the national economic well being. Through the Australian Industrial Relations Commission it was also concerned with the extent to which a future policy was a reflection of its restructuring and efficiency principle. The New South Wales Teachers Federation was concerned with the working conditions of teachers and as such, the extent to which Advanced Skills Teacher positions would be accessible to all its members. The Department of School Education was concerned with the place of the policy within its broader education agenda and the way in which it was to be incorporated into ongoing salary negotiations with the Teachers Federation. These differing agendas are illustrative of what Dye (1987) described when he stated that "... elitism implies that policy does not reflect demands of the people so much as it does the interests and values of the elites" (p.30).

A National Framework

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales can be traced to a publication titled *Excellence, Equity and Reward - A Career and Salary Structure for Schools in the 1990's*. This document, tabled in 1989, was produced by the Department of Education for the New South Wales Government and represented the Government's offer to teachers during salary negotiations. While it is in this document that the term Advanced Skills Teacher was first used by either the Teachers Federation or the Government, the concept had been proposed earlier by the Teachers Federation in a salary claim in 1987 under the labels 'Teacher 1' and 'Teacher 2' (Burrow and Gilmore, 1993). This was an attempt to recognise the increasing experience of the teaching service in New South Wales and to pay
teachers accordingly. The Federation's proposal was designed "... not only to increase the salary levels for experienced teachers, but to reinvest significant recognition and reward for the primary work of our schools - teaching and learning" (Burrow and Gilmore, 1993, p. 25). While these negotiations were occurring at a state level, the Australian Teachers Union commenced the construction of a National Framework for salary negotiations. This National Framework established four benchmarks in an attempt to create professional equity across Australia. These benchmarks included:

1. A starting rate.
2. A common incremental scale with access for three year trained teachers to the top of the scale.
3. A salary rate to peg the top of the scale.

This National Framework largely reflected the claims of the Teachers Federation and resulted in the change of the nomenclature from 'Teacher 1' and 'Teacher 2' to 'Advanced Skills Teacher' (Burrow and Gilmore 1993). The Advanced Skills Teacher concept was strongly supported by teachers in New South Wales and nationally, by the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Commonwealth Government and the Schools Council. The expectations held by the New South Wales Teachers Federation for this classification were clear vis:

.... the Advanced Skills Teacher classification was to be a professionally based classification. Its introduction would enhance the contribution of teachers and assist in the development of less experienced colleagues within the profession, through the creation of an alternate career path which maintained rewards for good classroom practice and provided appropriate leadership models and support for other teachers (Burrow and Gilmore, 1993, p.25).

These salary negotiations, like other industrial matters in the period post 1986, should be viewed in the light of the Australia Reconstructed document
(ACTU/TDU, 1987) and in particular the wage fixing principles emanating from this document; a two tier approach to wage fixation in an attempt to marry equity with efficiency, and, an emphasis on skill formation and reformed work practices. The Australia Reconstructed document also provided guidelines for the larger environment within which the application of these principles was to occur. The first of these was the desire to create a situation where the results of negotiations and eventual award changes were in the interests of both parties. In short this represented a desire to move away from a confrontational style of industrial negotiations. The second guideline was a concern with a long term view; that parties did not take into negotiations concerns of immediate economic expediency, but rather looked towards the longer term requirements of the industry in a competitive environment.

The Department of School Education and the New South Wales Teachers Federation

The document *Excellence, Equity and Reward - A Career and Salary Structure for Schools in the 1990's* was tabled by the Department of Education in October, 1989 as part of their negotiations over teachers' salaries with the Teachers Federation. Within the preamble of this publication are statements reflective of the wage fixing principles described in the Australia Reconstructed document:

.... it is essential that a new career structure and salary structure permits personal development and the efficient utilisation of our human resources .... it is clear from the structural efficiency guidelines established by the State Wage Case Decision that improvements in productivity and efficiency are essential components of any Award restructuring package (Aldersey, 1989, p. 1).
Many of the objectives of the proposed salary package were based on the introduction in the 1991 school year of the position of the Advanced Skills Teacher. The fundamental objectives of the salary package were listed as:

Ensure the provision of excellence and equity for students in public education by:

1. Attracting and retaining teachers of the highest calibre.
2. Enhancing the development of teaching skills and the opportunities to perform a broader range of activities.
3. Establishing skill related career paths and merit based salary maintenance and promotion opportunities in which rewards relate to the utilisation of skills and performance levels.
4. Increase the flexibility and effectiveness of the use of all resources within schools by (a) remove existing rigidities in working patterns, (b) permitting school and staffing to directly reflect needs and priorities, and (c) rewarding the introduction of new initiatives (Aldersey, 1989, p. 1).

The proposal was that any teacher at the then unpromoted salary step 8 could apply for assessment and placement as an Advanced Skills Teacher. Selection was to be made by the principal on the basis of performance appraisal and confirmed by the Cluster Director. A maximum of three percent of teachers on salary step eight were to be appointed at any time to Advanced Skills Teacher positions; up to two percent in 1991 and the remainder in 1992. This salary offer provided for the first time an employer's view of the selection criteria on which applicants were to be judged and the duties successful applicants were to perform (Aldersey, 1989). Essential and desirable criteria were described by the document as:

1. Demonstrated excellence in (a) classroom teaching, (b) interpersonal communication skills, (c) programming, lesson preparation, follow up, evaluation of student performance and recording (d) knowledge of curriculum and syllabus requirements, (e) current theoretical and practical
supervision techniques.

2. Evidence of genuine concern for students and teacher welfare.

3. Evidence of excellent parent and wider community rapport.

4. Evidence of additional relevant academic studies.


The duties of Advanced Skills teachers were described as ".... widening the range of responsibilities of classroom teachers by complementing all the duties assigned to teachers as well as supporting members of the school executive across faculties and departments" (Aldersey, 1989, p. 14). In particular, this document envisaged roles for Advanced Skills Teachers which were consistent with those described in the educational literature of the day (DEET, 1988, Schools Council, 1989) viz:

1. (a) Demonstration lessons to student teachers and interns, and (b) demonstration lessons to other teachers.

2. Supervision of student teachers (including interns) undertaking practicum.

3. Assistance, in consultation with the appropriate supervisor, to other teachers with programming, lesson preparation, delivery, follow up and evaluation.

4. Assistance in the provision of in school in-service for all teachers in the areas of programming, lesson preparation, classroom management, teaching strategies and methodologies, testing and evaluation, record keeping, lesson follow up and evaluation, interpersonal communication skills.

5. Assistance to teachers of non English speaking background in adapting to the New South Wales school system.

6. Responsibility for teacher development in more than one school or short term regional consultancy assignments.

7. Higher face to face teaching loads by at least two and up to three additional periods (Aldersey, 1989, p.14).
Burrow and Gilmore (1993) provided the following reasons for the Teachers Federation's rejection of this proposal:

1. The denial by the employer of the range and complexity of the additional responsibility already being undertaken by all teachers.
2. The proposal provided for only three percent of teachers to be paid for the work carried out by all experienced teachers.
3. The increased workload associated with the proposed additional period loading of two to three periods per week.
4. The clear intention of the Government to create de facto promotions positions which were paid by allowance and subject both to limited tenure and an increased workload (p.26).

Although the criteria, numbers and remuneration issues of the Advanced Skills Teacher classification remained unresolved, in December 1989 the Teachers Federation and the Department of School Education put a joint agreement to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales for a first tier three percent wage increase. Part of this agreement was a commitment by both parties to further investigate, with a view to establishing, a category of Advanced Skills Teacher (Burrow and Gilmore, 1993).

At the beginning of 1990, negotiations resumed between the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation regarding the nature and conditions of the Advanced Skills Teacher classification. Limited agreement was reached on August 22, 1990, however this agreement was never ratified by the Industrial Commission of New South Wales. The Commission considered that the agreement failed to address the issues of teacher appraisal, the numbers of Advanced Skills Teachers or the distribution of Advanced Skills Teachers throughout the system (Industrial Commission of

With regard the numbers of Advanced Skills Teachers, the main issue of contention, the Department of School Education used the agreement reached in the non government schools sector to support their case. While the Federation pressed for a "... relatively unfettered and extensive movement" (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, p.56) of teachers to the classification, evidence put to the Commission by the Manager, Industrial Relations for the Department of School Education on April 29, 1991 established that, in the non government school sector, teachers could:

... only move to the new classification of ST 1 (similar to Advanced Skills Teacher 1) if they had been on top of the four year trained (not the three years trained scale as well) salary scale for one year or more. (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p.53)

The Role of the Commonwealth Government

The tabling of the December, 1989 agreement led to the Commonwealth Government seeking and being granted leave to intervene. While not in a direct employment relationship with teachers in state schools, the Commonwealth Government had taken an active, broadly based involvement in the fixation of salaries and conditions as part of its agenda for micro economic reform. Particular attention was directed toward the education and training sectors which were seen as having a pivotal role in the award restructuring process generally and having a particular contribution to make to the future economic well being of Australia (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991). The Commonwealth Government's influence came via its Award Restructuring and Assistance Scheme where it subsidised any increase in salaries above the six percent allowed at the time under the structural efficiency principle. This subsidisation provided it with influence
in the proceedings which were taking place in New South Wales and other states and territories, notably Victoria, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991).

The influence of the Commonwealth Government within the policy space can be best viewed as a series of what Goggin (1990) labelled inducements and constraints. Goggin examined the interplay between levels of government in the development and implementation of policy. Although this model is derived from the North American system, the two tiers of government in both countries make it appropriate to describe the processes of intergovernmental policy development in Australia and specifically the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. The Goggin model highlighted the processes through which levels of government respond to each other within the policy space and further, described how the agents of policy implementation respond to the different levels of government.

Goggin's model was based on the observation that state government policy decisions are not made in a vacuum, but depend on and are influenced by, external governmental influences and intrastate influences. These observations result in a conceptual model which has the state level of policy implementation being influenced by three clusters of variables. Goggin labelled these variables as inducements and constraints which impact on state governments from above by the higher level of government and, decisional outcomes and capacity to act which impact state governments from below (Goggin, 1990).

The Commonwealth Government's inducement was its subsidisation of salaries if implementation decisions conformed to the structural efficiency principle. Constraint came through its determination for a consistent national approach to the fixation of salaries and conditions as part of the Commonwealth's agenda for micro economic reform. Goggin's model is
congruent at a macro level (formulation) with the larger cyclical model of policy process advocated by Ball and Bowe described earlier in this paper. Central to the Goggin model are two characteristics also fundamental to the Ball and Bowe model of policy processes. These are described below as:

1. A process of feedback through which action at a certain level is responded to by actors at other levels resulting in eventual policy redesign.
2. Interpretation is a function of context, a single message transmitted at a Commonwealth level can be reinterpreted at both a state level of government and at a local level of implementation (Goggin, 1990).

The Commonwealth's reaction to the agreement between the Teachers Federation and the Department of School Education is described in this statement from the Commonwealth representative at the Industrial Commission of New South Wales:

Because the Commonwealth is interested in a qualitative teaching force and proper career paths for teachers, it is imperative Advanced Skills Teachers are seen to be of a high quality. To ensure this there must be hard rigorous entry to the classification. The Commonwealth has indicated that it will only assist with the cost of establishing Advanced Skills Teachers if there are strict appraisal methods. ... the Commonwealth supports both criterion based access and the creation of a definite career structure for teachers which is firmly based on the job requirements underpinning the role of an Advanced Skills Teacher. Taken together, these principles are not compatible with mass entry to Advanced Skills Teacher positions nor the idea that Advanced Skills Teacher 1 should be a de facto additional step on the salary scale (Industrial Commission of New South Wales 1991, p. 48).

In relation to teachers' salaries, the Commonwealth wanted the Advanced Skills Teacher policy to include the following characteristics, all of which can
be identified as constraints as per the Goggin model:

1. A separate structure distinct from the incremental range and within which there would not be automatic movement between Advanced Skills Teacher levels.
2. A commitment to classroom teaching, to provide educational leadership, enhance professional support and provide guidance to student and beginning teachers.
3. Hard rigorous selection criteria and regular performance reviews.
4. Outstanding classroom practitioners with a normal teaching load with minimal discounting for additional duties.
5. Selection criteria which encompassed the needs of the system.
6. Renewable tenure, that is staff should not remain in them unless they continue to satisfy performance criteria.


The mixture of constraints and inducements held by the Commonwealth over the state via its funding role and in particular the Commonwealth's determination that Advanced Skills Teacher positions be only available to outstanding teachers was to become a significant point of disagreement between the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation. From the Federation's point of view, the situation it faced would have contrasted starkly with the situation that existed in the non-government school sector in New South Wales and the state school sectors in Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory where unions had won an agreement that quotas would not apply (Chadboume and Ingvarson, 1994). Even before final policy was produced, Cameron an Industrial Officer with the Teachers Federation wrote in the Federation journal *Education*:

.... now they want to use terms like "outstanding" and "exceptional" to frighten people off before they apply, to appeal to elitism, ignoring the fact that some 75% of eligible applicants in the Catholic system have already been given AST status (Education, October, 14, 1991, p. 6).
Although it was never ratified by the Industrial Commission of New South Wales, the agreement reached between the Teachers Federation and the Department of School Education on August 22, 1990 was significant. It represented the only occasion that the concept of Advanced Skills Teacher 2 and beyond was considered in negotiations. The subsequent omission of Advanced Skills Teacher 2 from later negotiations represented the failure of the two parties to achieve one of the primary goals of the policy; a classroom based career path through the pursuit of Advanced Skills Teacher status. This despite the fact that these classifications were, and are, a feature of Advanced Skills Teacher policies in other states notably Victoria and Queensland, as well as featuring in the New South Wales, non government schools sector. Precise information detailing the reasons why these advanced classifications, Advanced Skills Teacher 2 and Advanced Skills Teacher 3 have not been incorporated into salary negotiations was not available in a printed form. Interviews conducted with relevant Teachers Federation and Department of School Education officials on the subject of the Advanced Skills Teacher 2 and 3 classifications provided some insight into the views of the two organisations. They revealed a degree of congruence of thought on the failure of the Advanced Skills Teacher 2 and 3 classifications to materialise. From the Department of School Education:

While there are a number of states where Advanced Skills Teacher 2 positions have been implemented, teachers salary levels in these states do not equate with the salary levels of New South Wales teachers. In other words, New South Wales teachers are already ahead of their interstate colleagues. As well as that it must be remembered that in New South Wales we are dealing with much greater numbers of teachers which of course has repercussions for funding. It also has to do with relativities with other promotions positions. In other states and in the New South Wales non government sector in particular, Advanced Skills Teacher 2 positions are basically doing the job of Head Teachers. Having said all this however, it should be noted that at the recent annual conference of Federation, Federation was urged to put Advanced Skills Teacher 2 classifications back on the agenda (New South
Wales Department of School Education official, December 14, 1994).

From the Teachers Federation, the following comment reflected the feelings expressed from the Department official, albeit in a more pejorative tone:

The other Advanced Skills Teacher positions on the agenda never progressed due to the first one being such a mess...... the second stages the Department was not prepared to put the money up for anyway (New South Wales Teachers Federation official, December 13, 1994).

Ingvarson (1992) described this mismatch between policy intention and policy implementation thus:

Little has changed in effect. There is one more step on the incremental pay scale. Teachers have been shortchanged severely as compromises have been made in the industrial arena which mean that a professional career path has not been introduced. The career development concept has not been implemented (perhaps not even understood) and teachers' career structure has reverted to the career ladder concept (p. 5).

A Pilot Scheme - The Department's First Proposal

On April 29, 1991, the Department of School Education proposed the implementation of a pilot scheme with the intention to:

.... provide the opportunity for identification of and dealing with problems and difficulties on a manageable scale, and to provide the capacity to improve implementation on a broader scale. Introduction of a new classification by way of trial provides the opportunity for the necessary arrangements to be tested before the necessary details are firmly settled (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p. 54).
Under the pilot scheme, it was proposed to appoint a group (three percent) of Advanced Skills Teachers in the two regions which historically took more than half of the states beginning teachers, Metropolitan West and Metropolitan South West. Because both regions also contained high concentrations of schools on the Disadvantaged Schools Program and high Non English Speaking Background enrolments, these regions best reflected the priorities of the Department of School Education regarding the perceived roles of Advanced Skills Teachers. The Industrial Commission saw this proposal as avoiding the main point of contention between the Teachers Federation and the Government namely the numbers of teachers who might proceed to the Advanced Skills Teacher classification.

.... on the one hand a relatively unfettered and extensive movement was being proposed by the Federation and on the other hand the Departmental proposal being propounded by Mr Baldwin was based on a pilot scheme of limited scope. The Bench expressed the view that both parties were taking a narrow approach to the interpretation of the terms of the agreement which would provide little or no pragmatic assistance to the actual managerial problem of the implementation of the scheme. At this stage the Commission felt that the parties were entirely out of touch with each other on issues that could not be avoided (Industrial Commission of New South Wales 1991, p. 55).

The Federation's Final Proposal

The Teachers Federation proposal titled Proposal for Transitional Implementation of Advanced Skills Teacher was tabled on June 6, 1991. That proposal contained the following major features which were to operate until January 27, 1992.

1. A system wide, "ball park" figure of 60% of eligible teachers will be classified as Advanced Skills Teacher by the end of the 1991 school year.
2. All schools will be allocated a notional entitlement to
Advanced Skills Teachers on the basis of 40% of the number of unpromoted teaching positions on the school establishment.

3. Schools or clusters may apply on a needs basis for an additional allocation to the notional figure.

4. Applicants for Advanced Skills Teacher will be assessed and recommended for progression to classification as Advanced Skills Teachers by school panels which included elected staff representatives.

5. Where the number of successful applicants is excess of the schools established entitlement, the selection panel or the unsuccessful applicants may apply to increase the number. Such applications are to be considered by regional panels. Any Advanced Skills Teachers approved by this process would not be at the expense of entitlements to Advanced Skills Teachers in other regions.

6. Advanced Skills Teacher is to be a permanent, portable classification. Where, as a consequence of an Advanced Skills Teacher transferring into a school the number of Advanced Skills Teachers exceeds the school's entitlement no reduction in Advanced Skills Teachers will occur (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p. 58).

The Industrial Commission saw the personal and permanent feature of the Teachers Federation proposal in conflict with that advocated by the Department of School Education which placed an emphasis on school related duties and obligations. The Commission was also concerned with the numbers, in particular that the 60% "ball park figure" would mean many schools would have more non promoted teachers becoming Advanced Skills Teachers than there would be in all the other incremental classifications put together (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991). The Commission referred back to the criteria established by the Commonwealth Government and from which it proposed supplementary funding:

.... The Commonwealth was concerned that the Advanced Skills Teacher structure might be distorted by easy access by the majority of classroom teachers. The Advanced Skills Teacher
position was not to be seen as an additional step on the incremental scale for all relevantly competent teachers. The principles governing the approach to Advanced Skills Teachers was not compatible with mass entry to Advanced Skills Teacher positions. There had to be hard and rigorous selection criteria. What is proposed by the Federation contradicts these stated positions either directly or by unavoidable inference (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p.60).

The Commission also saw what it called major budgetary and organisational consequences in the Federation's proposal, vis:

.... viewed as a single step in classification, it could well be the largest single movement of senior teachers in the history of the teaching service. To establish the new Advanced Skills Teachers where they presently were to be found would create manifest and undesirable anomalies. Schools, well supplied by teachers with senior professional abilities would have that position confirmed and extended with substantial numbers appointed Advanced Skills Teacher. Less advantaged schools were likely to do less well whereas their needs would dictate positive improvement (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, p.61).

Policy and School Level Implementation Advice

The Department tendered a further proposal which sought to address some of the policy considerations advanced by the Commonwealth Government (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991). The main features of this proposal became policy and were included in the policy document which appears as Appendix E. The Full Bench of the Industrial Commission of New South Wales awarded this package on September 12, 1991, culminating a process it described as "... long and complex" (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p. 2). Based on interstate criteria and Commonwealth submissions, the Commission decided there would be two tranches of 15%. The Commission recommended an early commencement to the program with
the initial 15% being appointed in first term, 1992 and completed by July, 1992. The Commission required the further 15% of appointments of teachers then at the top of the three year trained and four year trained pay scales to be called for in 1992 for appointment at the beginning of 1993 (Industrial Commission of New South Wales 1991). As a result of this agreement, 7318 Advanced Skills Teacher positions were made available in New South Wales across the primary and secondary levels of schooling, according to a formula based on the number of unpromoted teachers compared to the number of beginning teachers in a school.

The agreement related to only Advanced Skills Teacher Level 1 and was consolidated in a document titled *Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award* dated September 12, 1991. Missing was any mention of Advanced Skills Teacher 2 positions which were to have been accessible to Advanced Skills Teacher 1 after the satisfaction of other criteria including demonstrated expertise in classroom instructional methodologies, program development and evaluation, curriculum design, student assessment and improvements in learning outcomes (Industrial Commission of New South Wales 1991).

The Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award also offered two and three year trained teachers other alternate pathways apart from the Advanced Skills Teacher classification to progress beyond the top of the three year trained scale and access the same salary levels as graduate, four year trained teachers. These other pathways appeared as subclause 7.8.1 and 7.8.2 in the Award. The first pathway allowed the teacher to progress to the top of the four year trained scale in biennial increments only. The teacher was assessed on their achievement of one or a combination of experiences including:

1. Supervision of practice teachers in a school including the
provision of demonstration lessons to practice teachers.

2. Conduct of seminars updating parent's knowledge on educational techniques, curriculum development and methods of student assistance and assessment.

3. The delivery of refresher courses at night for existing or newly returning teachers.

4. The delivery of components within CAE or regionally run departmental courses.

The criteria by which teachers were to be assessed in light of these experiences were, pedagogic knowledge, teaching ability, curriculum knowledge and practice, educational programming and subject knowledge (Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award, 1991).

The second pathway also allowed the teacher to progress to the top of the four year trained scale in biennial increments. Teachers accessing this pathway were required to prove that they had undertaken 250 hours of approved professional development over the five years preceding the application (Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award, 1991).

On November 27, 1991, all primary and secondary public schools in New South Wales received by facsimile a document titled *Advanced Skills Teacher - Level 1 Policy*. This document represented the only time that the word 'policy' was used by the Department of School Education when communicating with schools in relation to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and detailed for the first time the roles and responsibilities of Advanced Skills Teachers. In itself it is a reflection of the divergent definitions of policy provided in Chapter Three. It is included as Appendix E. The application form which teachers used when applying for consideration as an Advanced Skills Teacher is included as Appendix F.
In November, 1992 principals received a document titled *Advanced Skills Teachers Guidelines for Principals* in time for the second round of Advanced Skills Teacher appointments. This document detailed a suggested Summary of Process for the appointment of Advanced Skills Teachers during 1993. (See Appendix G). At the same time principals received this document, teachers received an *Advanced Skills Teachers Application Form and Information Kit.* (See Appendix H). These documents were made available to the author by the Personnel and Employee Relations Directorate of the Department of School Education. Handwritten modifications which are visible in Appendix G are those modifications which were made to the 1992 information to make it appropriate for the 1995 staffing operation.

*Teachers and Related Employees Enterprise Agreement*

On December 10, 1993 the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation signed an enterprise agreement covering all teaching service with the exception of Chief Education Officers and teachers in charge of field studies centres who were the subject of another award claim (New South Wales Government, 1993). Between the date of this agreement and the Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award which had introduced the Advanced Skills Teacher classification into state schools, the Commonwealth Government had been active in the negotiations between other state Departments of Education and state teacher unions. On February 21, 1992, before the Australian Industrial Relations Commission, the Commonwealth Government intervened in the case between the Australian Capitol Territory Teachers Federation and the Australian Capital Territory Administration. The Commonwealth Government's advice to the Australian Industrial Relations Commission which is illustrative of the inducements/constraints variables described by Goggin, included in part:

It is not the Commonwealth's intention to impose quotas for supplementation purposes on the number of teachers progressing
to Advanced Skills Teacher 1 positions. However I should like to stress again that the Commonwealth considers that promotion to these positions should only be open to the most outstanding teachers. In 1992, should the proportion of all classroom teachers promoted to the Advanced Skills Teacher classification (Levels 1, 2, and 3) exceed 30% of all classroom teachers, the Commonwealth may consider (a) reviewing its supplement arrangements for Advanced Skills Teachers and (b) imposing a ceiling on the number of Advanced Skills Teacher positions it is prepared to supplement (Australian Industrial Relations Commission, 1992 p.5).

In the same decision:

Quotas can be counter productive, that is, quotas may work against system requirements and against the principle that not only is the acquisition of skills important but also the need to exercise those skills. The Commonwealth moreover, is not an employer of teachers and consequently does not believe that it has a role to set quotas on the number of Advanced Skills Teachers introduced into a particular system (Australian Industrial Relations Commission, 1992 p.5).

Unfortunately systems do not appear to have implemented sufficiently tight eligibility requirements and hard and rigorous selection criteria for Advanced Skills Teachers. Large numbers of teachers are being promoted to the Advanced Skills Teacher classification to the point where there is a danger of eligibility becoming equated with automatic entitlement to gain access to the Advanced Skills Teacher level and the credibility of the Advanced Skills Teacher classification is compromised (Australian Industrial Relations Commission, 1992 p.6).

The Teachers and Related Employees Enterprise Agreement represented the decision of the New South Wales Government to implement policy irrespective of Commonwealth Government funding thereby removing its influence. Concerns about 'outstanding' and 'highly' as they related to the skill level of potential Advanced Skills Teachers seemed to disappear from commentaries provided by both the Teachers Federation and the Department of School
Education through their respective journals *Education* and *School Education News*. This Enterprise Agreement also introduced a number of new principles relevant to the Advanced Skills Teacher position. Among these was the decision to provide an additional 3163 Advanced Skills Teachers to support teaching and learning in major curriculum focus areas. These focus areas were English and Personal Development, Physical Education and Health in primary grades and Key Learning Area Profiles and Literacy across the curriculum in secondary grades. These positions were distributed according to the new criteria of number of teachers in the school thus equitably facilitating the innovations of curriculum change described above. The formulas used to distribute these positions are shown in Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

**Table 4**

**Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teacher Positions - Primary and SSP Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIVALENT FULL TIME TEACHING STAFF</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ASTS PER SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF ASTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 +</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0 - 40.999</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 - 20.999</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 10.999</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 7.999</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1618</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provided there is a minimum of five full time classroom teacher positions in the school. Schools with less than five full time classroom teacher positions in this band will have access to the services of an AST from the pool of 199 positions allocated across regions.

**regions will be allocated the 199 positions on the following basis:**

One AST for each:

- 5 schools with EFTs below 1.999
- 4 schools with EFTs 2.0 - 3.999
- 3 schools with EFTs 4.0 - 5.999
- 2 schools with EFTs 6.0 - 7.999

(Memorandum 93/30-10 New South Wales DOSE, p. 4)
Table 5
Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teacher Positions - High and Central Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIVALENT FULL TIME TEACHING STAFF</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AST'S PER SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF AST'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.0 +</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 **</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0 - 80.999</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4 **</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.0 - 60.999</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0 - 40.999</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 20.999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 *</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schools in the up to 20.999 band will be allocated up to two Advanced Skills Teachers in accordance with the following:

• One primary AST where there is a minimum of five primary teachers on the staff;

• One secondary AST where there is a minimum of five secondary teachers on the staff;

• One AST K-12 where there is more than five primary and secondary teachers.

** High schools with three Advanced Skills Teachers must assign an AST to each of the categories; Profiles, Literacy and Vocational Education. High schools in the two highest bands with more than three Advanced Skills Teachers allocated may assign responsibilities to the additional AST positions which, whilst within the general areas of responsibilities of Advanced Skills Teachers stated in the enterprise agreement, may have a specific focus, eg senior studies. (Memorandum 93/30-10 New South Wales DOSE, p. 5)

Other changes to the original policy included the inclusion of additional criteria to allow unfilled positions to be distributed across clusters and then regions, and the decision to allow schools who did not have staff who met the criteria to be the additional Advanced Skills Teachers, to pay teacher(s) the Advanced Skills Teacher supplement for performing the Teaching and Learning roles (New South Wales Department of School Education, 1993).

In recognising that smaller primary schools tended to be located in sparsely populated areas, the memorandum went on to describe these Advanced Skills Teachers serving these smaller schools through telephone and facsimile communications and professional development activities.

In an interview with an official of the Department of School Education
(December 14, 1994), these new Advanced Skills Teacher positions were described as the Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teachers and said to be New South Wales Treasury supplemented rather than Commonwealth funded. Notable by its absence was any change to the selection criteria through which these Advanced Skills Teachers were being selected, vis; ".... The procedures used by principals in determining Advanced Skills Teacher eligibility and suitability of applicants have not been changed" (Department of School Education Memorandum, 93/30-10).

Memorandum 93/30-10 was sent to schools on March 25, 1994. It was followed by another Memorandum on the April 8, 1994. As communiques of policy intent they were significant for two reasons.

First, they described the criteria and processes by which unfilled Advanced Skills Teacher quota positions were to be filled. These processes initially encouraged eligible teachers who had not considered being assessed for suitability as an Advanced Skills Teacher to apply for determination of Advanced Skills Teacher suitability. Principals then returned the list of teachers who had been assessed as suitable for Advanced Skills Teacher positions through Regional Offices to State Office along with the number of quota Advanced Skills Teacher positions which were unfilled. Regions were then allocated a number of previously unfilled quota positions and these were allocated to schools. That there were unmet quota positions is significant when considered alongside the quota itself which had earlier been set at 15% of all teachers on the top of the three year trained and four year trained incremental scales. In itself, this quota was not considered large by the Teachers Federation who had earlier wanted 60% of eligible teachers to be classified as Advanced Skills Teachers (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991).

The second reason these memorandum were significant as policy documents
is that for the first time the additional category of Advanced Skills Teacher to support teaching and learning was outlined to schools. Earlier categories were not designated teaching and learning, yet quite clearly the original intent of the Advanced Skills Teacher position was exactly that. The creation of designated Advanced Skills Teacher positions with the title Teaching And Learning was more than just recognition that Advanced Skills Teachers should possess skills suitable for supporting the curriculum change described in the Enterprise Agreement. It was also recognition that the teaching and learning focus which should have been integral to all Advanced Skills Teacher roles and responsibilities was increasingly being lost in schools.

Summary and Implications

This chapter, and evidence cited in Chapter One, details the progression of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy from a theoretically sound idea to a policy being implemented in state schools throughout New South Wales, with varying degrees of success. A number of issues stemming from this development of policy are worth highlighting for the potential they have to contribute to the construction of the questionnaire, the main data gathering tool for this study and further, an understanding of teacher reactions to the policy as implemented.

By the time it reached implementation, this policy was very much an industrial relations compromise rather than an educational initiative, having been one component of a drawn-out industrial relations agreement. What Yanow (1990) described as the culture of a policy had the potential to pervade implementors' decisions and teachers' attitudes to eventual policy implementation. The Teachers Federation, while originally supportive of the Advanced Skills Teacher concept, was scathing in its interpretation of the
Industrial Commission agreement:

.... despite some success in the AST negotiations, it remains a restricted access, poorly paid post of responsibility, maybe a dumping ground for jobs no longer being done by a 'flexibly' reduced executive staff, and certainly the worst AST decision in Australia (Cameron, 1991. p.3).

Seven months later having experienced the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, some rank and file membership of the Teachers Federation, were equally as scathing of the policy as implemented, as their Federation leadership was of the policy mandates. The following statement is part of one letter typical of the letters published on the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in the Letters column of the Teachers Federation journal Education during early to mid 1992:

.... it is a fiasco, or rather a scandal, in that, yet again, a grade has been established with no recognition given for the excellent classroom practitioner who just wants to get on with the job at the chalk face. It seems the least valued and most easily dispensed with function within education is teaching itself (Taper, 1992. p.10).

In practice, the differential incremental salary scales for three year trained and four year trained teachers meant that while achievement of Advanced Skills Teacher status represented a pay rise of only $1200 to teachers at the top of the four year trained salary scale, for three year trained teachers it represented an eventual salary increase of $15 000 over six years when compared with gaining four year trained status via the other pathways which gave only biennial increments (Cameron, 1992). This was after twelve months in an Advanced Skills Teacher role irrespective of the process of selection which had been in place in their school, whether they retained their role in latter years or the nature of their role. As a means of achieving four year trained status and therefore salary, this compared favourably with the
other alternate pathways listed by the Award and described earlier in this chapter. In terms of pure rewards, there was much to be gained in the eventual policy for three year trained teachers but much less for four year trained teachers.

Yanow (1990) suggested purposeful ambiguity in policy language is an attempt to accommodate conflicting interests. This rationale best describes many components of eventual Advanced Skills Teacher policy as purposeful ambiguity came to dominate the mode of most written policy directives. The facsimile which represented policy (Appendix E) was primarily a restatement of the industrial judgment. Most significant among these restatements was the selection criteria and role statement. In practice this meant that the language and meaning of an industrial judgment was all that was available to principals trying to implement a policy which had no precedent in the New South Wales school system.

The selection criteria were in some respects questionable. Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1997) stated that ".... rather than indicate what constituted accomplished practice or what represented achievement of the standard, the criteria simply identified the domains of teachers' work that selection panels were expected to examine" (p.13). The ambiguity of the criteria left them open to interpretation and misinterpretation. They were very general and were used when assessing teachers working at different year levels and in different subject areas. While they rhetorically stated that they represented skills which ".... while possessed by all experienced and competent teachers have been developed to a high level" by successful Advanced Skills Teachers, no attempt was made to operationalise what it is that is meant by, for example, innovation in planning and teaching. Without this operationalisation, measures of 'high level' and by implication, 'low level' became at best inconsistent and even unreliable. What is considered innovative by some, may be second nature to others. It was this semantic argument over
'outstanding skills' versus 'highly developed skills' which continued to be the centrepiece of the Teachers Federation objection to the policy. This resulted in a revision of the guidelines before the second round of offers in November, 1992.

The second point which needs to be made about the selection criteria is that they viewed teaching skills as generic. They separated teaching skills and knowledge from the context of what is being taught and to whom. They virtually ignored the knowledge component that earlier educational literature stated Advanced Skills Teachers should possess (DEET, 1988; Schools Council 1989). In itself this result was a reflection of the inability of the industrial bargaining process to accommodate and later realise educational priorities. At the time, career restructuring required unions and employers to set standards for what counted as quality practice and to develop valid procedures for evaluating teachers' work. Whether these responsibilities were compatible with the traditional priorities of union and employer representatives and the compromises they must make in order to be seen to serve their members remains uncertain (Chadbourne and Ingvarson, 1994).

The final point to be made relative to the assessment criteria is the emphasis which the selection criteria placed on the behaviour of potential Advanced Skills Teachers at the individual school site at the expense of each applicant's skills or knowledge. Although the criteria mentioned advanced skills, the methods of assessing teachers, (school based panels) and some of the criteria which applicants had to meet, meant that applicants only had to be advanced relative to their direct peers within the school site. Chadbourne and Ingvarson, (1991) described this situation thus:

.... Advanced skills, by definition are not determined by the context - it is not purely a function of the particular school. Advanced skill in teachers is a capability of the person, not a position in the school. They must represent a guarantee about the knowledge and
skill of the person (p. 11).

The first paragraph of the roles and responsibilities statement first detailed in the facsimile of November, 1991 and currently operative reads:

The specific additional duties for the Advanced Skills Teachers in school positions will be determined by the school principal following discussion with the Advanced Skills Teacher. The specific duties for an Advanced Skills Teacher position with cluster duties will be decided by the Cluster Director and the teacher's principal following discussion with the Advanced Skills Teacher (p. 3).

This paragraph lacked precision in defining Advanced Skills Teacher roles. Rather than being consistent with original policy intent and even the Departments' Excellence Equity and Reward (1989) document, this policy did not specify that Advanced Skills Teachers were to have their responsibilities restricted to the sharing of their expertise and the dynamic improvement of other teachers. Rather the policy provided these broad guidelines, albeit consistent with the policy of the time toward empowering schools through school based decision making, but open to the processes of school level interpretation described in Chapter Three. This purposeful ambiguity was also reflected in the statements to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales (1991) by the Director General of Education of the time, Dr Fenton Sharpe who took a particular view of the Advanced Skills Teacher classification, one to which the Federation never agreed vis:

While I must say at the outset that I clearly regard Advanced Skills Teachers as classroom teachers rather than executive staff, they clearly can be called upon to undertake a range of responsibilities which would also properly fall within the range of responsibility which executive staff might properly be called on to undertake. I say "some" because there are clearly a number of responsibilities of executive staff which I would not expect Advanced Skills Teachers to undertake. In the broad, those are functions related to administration itself (p.52).
Chapter Five

Review of the Literature

An Overview of the Chapter

This chapter examines the literature in three discrete areas, all of which contributed to the theoretical framework of the study.

Firstly, it examines the theoretical perspectives on employee motivation and compensation and the extension of these theories into a teaching context. While each of these theories provide their own discrete paradigm for viewing the various stages of Advanced Skills Teacher implementation, some of them notably Herzberg and Vroom have a cumulative applicability to the extent that they underpin the Job Enrichment Model of Hackman and Oldham (1980), a useful framework for viewing one aspect of Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation, the nature of the job itself. This framework has been used by other authors notably Hart (1987) and Conley and Levinson (1993) to examine teachers' attitudes to work and career restructuring.

Secondly, this chapter examines teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes. Career ladder schemes are an alternative to the uniform salary schedule which have been implemented in the United States and which Ingvarson (1992) and Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1994) stated the Advanced Skills Teacher policy had come to resemble and which other authors writing on the Advanced Skills Teacher policy notably Gaffney and Crowther (1993) typically used as a point of comparison for the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. While organisational and systemic precedents and characteristics mean that data based on any North American policy is not immediately transferable to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, similarities in terms of origins and implementation processes make the available data on career
ladder schemes of some use to inform this study.

Thirdly, this chapter examines the research which has been conducted into the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales and other states. In particular, those studies which have considered teachers' attitudes towards aspects of policy implementation were examined.

From an examination and review of these three discrete areas and the authors interpretation of their implications, the research questions clearly emerged. These research questions formed the theoretical framework underpinning the questionnaire. At the same time, this review also provided a theoretical basis on which the generalisability of the results could be tested.

Theoretical Perspectives on Employee Motivation and Compensation

*Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory*

Abraham Maslow developed a general theory of human motivation which has been extensively used to describe organisational behaviour. Although significant in itself, Maslow's theory is particularly significant to the extent that it underpins the theories of Vroom (1964) and Herzberg (1966).

According to Maslow (1970) the driving force that causes people to join an organisation and work towards its goals is actually a hierarchy of needs. As lower order needs are satisfied, higher order needs become more potent motivators and an individual works towards achieving these needs.

The most basic and therefore lowest order needs according to Maslow are *physiological* needs including water, food and shelter. While typically these lower order needs are guaranteed for individuals, as wages and salaries earned through employment are in the first instance directed towards these
needs, they remain a primary motivator for all employees (Owens, 1991).

The next level of needs are security and safety needs. Maslow's theory suggested that these needs are considered by an individual once physiological needs have been met. In the physical sense, security and safety needs are met through the creation of an environment where the individual feels free from harm. In an organisational sense, this security and safety is achieved through feelings of guaranteed tenure with the organisation or the achievement of higher levels of income in order to establish self sufficiency away from the organisation (Owens, 1991).

The next level of needs are social affiliation needs. These needs are met once an individual is earning enough through their position and feels secure enough in their position, (both lower order needs) to seek out affiliation, approval or a sense of belonging within the organisation. Owens (1991) suggested that an individual seeks out ways of having these needs met therefore behaving in ways that are intended to provoke a response from the organisation to fulfil this need.

The fourth level of needs are ego or status needs. These needs represent the need to be recognised, to be respected, and to have status and prestige (Owens, 1991). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) suggested that these needs also relate to one's self esteem. The final and highest level of need is the level of self actualisation. At this level Maslow (1954) suggested the individual develops ".... the desire to become everything that one is capable of becoming" (p 91).

Porter (1961) omitted one level of needs and added another. Porter omitted physiological needs which he considered would be so adequately satisfied for his target group that questions concerning them would appear irrelevant. Between self actualisation and self esteem, Porter added another level of needs to the hierarchy, which he called autonomy. Porter saw autonomy as
being the “.... degree to which an individual has control over the work environment, demonstrated by independent thought and action, their participation in important decisions and their influence and authority within the organisation” (p.3). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) in describing the inclusion of autonomy into a needs hierarchy, suggested the modification made by Porter seemed to have particular relevance to education for “.... while physiological needs have tended to depreciate in importance, teachers and students have expressed a demand for more control over their work environment” (p.139). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) cited studies by McClelland (1953) and White (1958) which incorporated into the needs model competence and achievement to develop the notion of professional motives, both related to the concept of efficacy, and the desire to test and retest competence at successively higher levels and achieve for the sake of achievement. In support of this, Owens (1991) made the following conclusion of some significance to the Advanced Skills Teacher classification and its implementation:

.... there is strong support for believing that job security, salaries, and benefits though far from being irrelevant to teachers have little likelihood of motivating them. A greater motivational need, it seems clear, is for teachers to achieve feelings of professional self worth, competence and respect; to be seen increasingly as people of achievement, professionals who are influential in their workplaces, growing persons with opportunities ahead to develop even greater competence and a sense of accomplishment (p. 113).

Needs Hierarchy theory has the following implications for the development and implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:

1. For higher order needs (where we can assume most teachers are operating) to be met, Advanced Skills Teacher roles should be characterised by a collegial approach to mentoring other teachers, (affiliation and autonomy).
2. Advanced Skills Teacher roles should be demonstrably achievable and feedback should be provided to Advanced Skills Teachers regarding their success, *(status)*.

3. Advanced Skills Teacher roles should be challenging and significant within the education function of the school *(autonomy)*.

4. Money, *(lower order need)* should be a component of, but not the only reward offered to teachers in pursuit of Advanced Skills Teacher status.

*Motivation and Hygiene Theory*

Hackman and Oldham (1980) described Herzberg's (1966) two factor theory of satisfaction and motivation as ".... the most influential behavioural approach to work redesign" (p.56). Where the prevailing orthodoxy regarding satisfaction and motivation was based on the assumption that certain job factors were either present, therefore leading to satisfaction or absent, and therefore leading to dissatisfaction, Herzberg's work was based on the belief that ".... job factors which satisfy workers and job factors which dissatisfy workers are not arranged on a conceptual continuum but are mutually exclusive" (Sergiovanni, 1967, p.66). Herzberg's Motivation and Hygiene theory suggested that worker behaviour is influenced by two categories of rewards; motivators and hygiene factors, the satisfaction of each determining the level at which employees will participate in the workplace.

Hygiene factors are rewards extrinsic to the content of work such as salary, normally pertaining to the environment in which the work is performed and which help to reduce job dissatisfaction by making the work less unpleasant. These rewards do not promote psychological growth and have little effect on increasing effort (Jacobson, 1992). When hygiene factors are the only ones operant in the workplace, the employee is likely to engage with the workplace at a participatory level. According to Herzberg, while pay incentives may be
used to prevent job dissatisfaction, they cannot be used to increase performance (Jacobson, 1992).

Motivators are "... rewards intrinsic to the content of one's work; rewards that stimulate psychological growth, a necessary precondition for job satisfaction and enhanced performance. These intrinsic motivators include achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself" (Jacobson, 1992, p. 38). When hygiene factors are complemented with motivators, Herzberg maintains that employees will be prepared to exceed the minimal requirement and make extra contributions to the workplace. From Motivation and Hygiene theory comes the belief that removing those aspects of the work environment which make work unsatisfying will not necessarily lead to the work becoming motivating or satisfying. Rather an employee is brought up to a minimum level of dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1964) described the roles of Hygiene and Motivation factors thus:

Satisfaction and motivation are the result of a separate set of factors. The factors associated with satisfaction but not dissatisfaction are called motivators because of their ability to motivate performance. The factors associated with dissatisfaction, but not satisfaction are called hygienic because of their ability to cause trouble if neglected (p.3).

Contemporary research suggests Herzberg's work should be treated with caution. Monetary rewards can play an important role in attracting and retaining teachers, Monk and Jacobson (1985) and Jacobson (1990, 1991) and "... may influence the participation of high quality individuals in teaching, but not their level of engagement" (Jacobson, 1992, p. 39).

Motivation and Hygiene theory has the following implication for the development and implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:

1. Attached to any Advanced Skills Teacher position must be more
than just financial rewards. As well as financial rewards (hygiene factor) there should also be recognition, advancement and responsibility, (motivation factors).

**Expectancy Theory**

Vroom (1964) developed the first model of what has become known as Expectancy Theory. Expectancy theory maintains that employees will act in anticipation of favourable outcomes (rewards) and at the same time, act to avoid unfavourable outcomes. Vroom's theory is variously described as a contingency theory in that motivation is considered to be a function of and therefore contingent on each individual's perception that increased effort and ability will result in certain rewards (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). Expectancy theory maintains that performance will be influenced positively only if employees believe:

1. That a certain level of effort will achieve a certain performance. *(expectancy)*
2. That a certain level of performance will be rewarded in certain ways *(instrumentality).*
3. If the individual believes these rewards to be attractive, *(valence)* *(Heneman, 1992).*

Heneman (1992) maintained that "... in making the decision to act, these perceptions are assumed to combine in a multiplicative manner. What this means is that if either expectancy, instrumentality, or valence has a value of zero, then motivational force will be zero" (p. 25).

Jacobson (1992) used the expectancy theory model to look at the conditions present in schools. Jacobson stated that the financial reward of teachers deemed meritorious, assumes implicitly the existence of the first and third perceptions, (expectancy and valence), that meritorious teaching can be
achieved through increased effort and that teachers find increased monetary rewards attractive. With these in place, the second condition, instrumentality can be established. Jacobson however provided the following caveat to this finding:

If, for example, teachers come to believe that certain conditions of school employment, such as overcrowded classes, limited or outdated materials, misdirected curricula goals, prevent the translation of increased effort into improved performance, then the motivation to raise one's level of effort will diminish .... if teachers perceive that increased effort does not result in increased performance, low expectancy will cause teachers to withhold effort (p. 36).

Expectancy theory has the following implications for the development and implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:

1. The performance of teachers and therefore subsequent selection as an Advanced Skills Teacher must be accurately and conclusively measured. If it is not then teachers cannot make the perceived link between effort and performance (expectancy) and performance and rewards (instrumentality). These measurements must vary with performance and therefore Advanced Skills Teachers must be the subject of stringent performance appraisal mechanisms.

2. All teachers considering Advanced Skills Teacher selection should be aware of the criteria against which assessment will be based.

3. Increased pay must be a more valuable outcome (valence) than other rewards which the school can offer. Where increased pay is not the only reward, the implementation of policy must ensure that these other rewards are in place and structured so that potential Advanced Skills Teachers find them rewarding.
4. If increased pay is to be one of the rewards for Advanced Skills Teachers it must be sufficient to motivate teachers. Lawler (1971, cited in Johnson, 1986) suggested that a bonus system must include a bonus worth at least three percent of the base salary.

5. Opportunities to improve performance must exist. If the opportunity to improve does not exist both expectancy and resultant motivation will not be present. In a school setting this means that teachers must have the requisite time, equipment and most importantly supervision to become better teachers. It also means the position of Advanced Skills Teacher must be seen in terms of a career path and not an end in itself. Implicit in accepting this notion is a clear statement of what successful Advanced Skills Teachers in English at the secondary level know and are able to do.

An application of Motivation and Hygiene theory and Expectancy theory in the workplace was demonstrated in Hackman and Oldham’s model of job enrichment (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). The model proposed by Hackman and Oldham assesses the motivating potential of the job itself, (Hart, 1987) and comprises three psychological states considered critical in determining a person’s motivation for and satisfaction with a job. Each of these psychological states was seen as a function of various core job characteristics (Hackman and Oldham, 1980), meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of results.

Hackman and Oldham, (1980) described meaningfulness as determined by skill variety, task identity and task significance. Skill variety is the extent to which individuals have their abilities extended in performing their jobs and is linked to the concept of efficacy through the testing and implementation of individual skills and abilities. Task identity is the extent to which individuals are responsible for the completion of complete tasks with visible outcomes.
Task significance is the impact their responsibilities have on others either within or outside the organisation (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Responsibility is determined by the degree of autonomy which the role provides in terms of scheduling and procedures. Any increase in autonomy is accompanied by a commensurate increase in accountability as individuals feel more responsible for successes and failures (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Knowledge of results is the degree to which information about the effectiveness of performance is incorporated into the responsibility as well as feedback provided by peers or supervisors (Hackman and Oldham, 1980).

Hart (1992) examined career ladder schemes in terms of these job characteristics and psychological states with a view to determining their incentive power for teachers. Hart found that where the duties of career ladder teachers were seen as significant and could be identified with teaching and learning, the core work of the school (task significance and task identity) both participants and colleagues praised the contribution of the new roles. Hart's research also revealed that participants were most supportive where roles were structured such that individuals could self-select in and out of extra responsibilities (autonomy) depending on individual circumstance. The model of job enrichment therefore, suggests that in itself, the nature of the role given to an Advanced Skills Teacher can be a determinant of teacher enthusiasm for and therefore attitude towards the policy as a whole.

Early policy deliberations particularly those within the educational literature relating to the potential roles of Advanced Skills Teachers, reflected the importance of each of the three job characteristics which underpin meaningfulness. The report Teachers Learning (DEET, 1988) in describing some of the roles of potential Advanced Skills Teachers was describing roles which encompassed skill variety, task identity and task significance respectively, vis; ".... improving an area of school performance, leading a curriculum team and acting as mentor to beginning teachers" (p.56).
Equity Theory

Equity theory suggests that motivation not only depends on the pay and performance relationship but also the pay and performance relationship that other employees with whom that person compares themselves with experience (Heneman, 1992).

Central to Equity theory are concerns that employees believe that equals are rewarded equally. Heneman (1992) described Equity theory as being based on an input and output view of the employee and employer relationship. This view has the employee providing inputs like education, expertise and effort and the employer providing outputs like monetary rewards and recognition. Heneman maintained there must be a perception from each individual employee that the ratio between inputs and outputs is consistent for all employees. In any system where effort or expertise (inputs) are rewarded differentially through outputs (salary, recognition), employees are constantly engaged in exercises to balance their own inputs and resultant outputs with those that they perceive around them. If employees feel unrewarded, they may increase the quantity of performance (inputs) in the hope of receiving larger rewards (outputs). If larger increases are granted then the employee’s outcomes will be increased which will restore feelings of equity. If under rewarded however, employees decrease the quality of their performances to decrease their inputs and once again restore feelings of equity.

Equity theory is central to arguments which suggest that the uniform salary schedule pushes good teachers out of teaching and conversely encourages poor teachers to remain in teaching. It is also fundamental to advocates of alternatives to the uniform salary schedule and those who argue that to pay classroom teachers throughout a career on the basis of initial training in spite of competence and contribution to the school is inequitable.

Equity theory has the following implications for the development and
implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:

1. Any decision to grant a teacher an Advanced Skills Teacher position and therefore salary will have an impact on the equity perceptions and resulting behaviour of other teachers. As a result, information detailing why the successful applicant has been chosen must be provided to other staff members.

2. Inputs must be clearly defined. In granting an Advanced Skills Teacher position, the school leadership must state what extra and level of inputs are to be expected from the Advanced Skills Teacher. This allows other teachers to make correct assessments of the ratio of inputs to outputs.

3. The perceived relationship between pay and performance is as important as the actual relationship. Information regarding the relationship between pay and performance can become distorted as policy gets put into practice and is thereafter interpreted at an individual level (Heneman, 1992). Principals must ensure that the perception of Advanced Skills Teacher abilities and responsibilities matches the rhetoric of policy announcements and school level statements.

**The Contracts Literature**

The Contracts Literature does not provide a theory about motivating and compensating employees but rather a perspective on the types of compensation plans that organisations should consider. The Contracts literature suggests that an organisation's approach to compensation should be determined by the nature of the work required by it's employees (Jacobson, 1992). "... This literature takes seriously the evaluation problem .... less than perfect knowledge of all worker behaviour may elicit unpredicted and potentially destructive responses from workers" (Murnane and Cohen, 1986, p.1). The continued reliance on the uniform salary
schedule and the hesitancy displayed by authorities to implement alternatives, to some extent are indicators that education systems have recognised this characteristic of teaching or rather, recognised the lack of a blueprint of teacher competencies with which to overcome this characteristic of teaching.

Murname and Cohen (1986) argued that the imprecise nature of the teaching task makes accurate evaluation of teachers difficult and therefore conducive to opportunistic behaviour:

.... the nature of teaching with its closed classroom doors and its network of relationships among teachers and between teachers and parents provides great opportunities for opportunistic behaviour. There are many things that a teacher can do to impress a principal.... thus teachers have reason to question whether merit pay is awarded to teachers who are in fact the most productive or to those who are the most facile in impressing supervisors (p.8).

The Contracts literature warns that attempts to increase the salary of teachers on the basis of perceived abilities and skills can have a number of dysfunctional outcomes. These dysfunctional outcomes are:

1. Teachers who become disillusioned when not considered to be operating at a meritorious level.
2. Teachers who are unwilling to discuss classroom practice with their supervisors for fear they will hurt their chances of being considered meritorious.
3. Staff disagreement over whether the best teacher(s) are selected for the higher paying positions.

The Contracts literature has the following implications for the development and implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy:
1. The selection process has to be effective. Only meritorious candidates should be granted Advanced Skills Teacher status.

2. If the Advanced Skills Teacher policy is to reward the best classroom teachers, only criteria relevant to classroom teaching should be considered during the selection process. If the successful applicant is to have specific responsibilities, specific criteria relevant to these responsibilities should be considered during the selection process. These responsibilities should be known by all eligible teachers before assessment of individuals takes place.

**Teachers' Attitudes Towards Career Ladder Schemes**

North American educational systems have utilised various forms of work redesign as alternatives to the uniform salary schedule. Despite experimentation with these alternatives, the single salary schedule remains the dominant mode of remuneration in the United States. (English, 1992 cited in Frase). One alternative to the single salary schedule has been career ladder schemes. Dickson et al (1992) described career ladder schemes as ".... a ladder on which each rung represents a level of accomplishment characterised by a particular level of classroom performance as well as assumption of additional duties outside the classroom" (p. 27).

Career ladders contrast with merit pay schemes the other major alternative to the uniform salary schedule implemented in the United States. Merit pay schemes have typically represented a one off payment on a competitive basis for identified high teaching performance. In recent years this payment has been broadened from a salary supplement to include other incentives like sabbaticals and attendance at conferences (Jacobson, 1992). In some states students' test scores are still used as the measurement to determine teacher merit (Murname and Cohen, 1986).
The concept of career ladders can be traced to the late 1960's and early 1970's when "... virtually all early experiments with these programs failed; only a handful survived their initial years of implementation" (Smylie and Smart, 1990, p. 139). Interest in career ladders re-emerged during the early 1980's. Notable about this reemergence was the symmetry between the emerging rationale for career ladders and the emerging rationale for the Advanced Skills Teacher policy a number of years later; broad economic concerns on the one hand and concerns for teachers and teaching as a career on the other.

From an economic and accountability concern, career ladders were seen as an approach to alleviate a perceived and actual decline in American productivity and competitiveness identified in a series of reports notably, A Nation At Risk, produced in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (Bacharach, Conley and Shedd, 1986). Like the Australia Reconstructed (1986) document, this was one of a series of reports which arrived at a consensus that reforming teacher compensation was central to school improvement and national economic well being. These reports "... urged that teacher salaries, particularly at the entry level, must become more competitive with those offered by other professions if public education were to attract and retain high calibre individuals" (Jacobson, 1992, p.34). This view of career ladders emphasised "... performance assessment to reward outstanding teaching, motivate individual effort and provide public accountability" (Henson and Hall, 1993, p.323).

At the same time as politicians and national commissions were pursuing economic and accountability concerns, educators were stressing the need to reorganise the work of teachers to overcome flat organisational structures, provide teachers with opportunities for career development and make teaching more attractive to potential teachers (Bacharach, Conley and Shedd, 1986). This view of career ladders emphasised "... teacher growth, development and differentiated responsibilities" and was underpinned by "...
intrinsic, collegial, cooperative and professional values” (Henson and Hall, p. 324).

Sharing this common derivation, it is not surprising to find that career ladder schemes and the Advanced Skills Teacher policy also share common aims. Johnson (1986) described the career ladder as a response to a career which can be repetitive, albeit challenging, to those teachers who elect to remain classroom based and not pursue the typical pattern of promotion to administrative or managerial positions within the school system. Like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, career ladders were meant to “.... serve as an incentive to prospective and experienced teachers who seek increasing variety and responsibility in their work” (p.70). While career ladders and the Advanced Skills Teacher policy share a similar rational and intent, they also share characteristics at an implementation level. Notable amongst these are the qualities necessary for selection including (a) demonstrated exemplary teaching ability, (b) effective communication skills and a knowledge and mastery of teaching strategies, (c) supplementary duties which could be either administrative or teaching focused (but with a focus on a mentoring role for other teachers) and (d) the imposition of quotas on the number of successful applicants (Guernsey, 1986).

What then of the literature available on teachers’ attitudes towards career ladder schemes. The first point that needs to be made is that there is a lack of literature on this subject. Smylie and Smart (1990) stated “.... despite the substantial attention given to these plans in education policy development, little empirical evidence exists about their effects or about the reasons for their success or failure” (p.140). From the same authors, “.... few studies have examined empirically reasons for teacher advocacy for or opposition to merit pay and career ladders, virtually none have explored the relative importance of different factors thought to explain teacher support of these programs” (p.143). Hart (1987) also found little opinion data existed on teacher support for career ladders.
From the available literature, Smylie and Smart (1990) suggested that the factors which explain levels of teacher support for alternate compensation programs fall into two categories (a) teachers' assessments of program characteristics and implementation and (b) teachers' perceptions about the effects of these programs on various dimensions of their work.

*Program Characteristics*

Two overarching themes emanating from the literature need to be identified before specific program characteristics are addressed. The first of these supports the main thesis of this study; that teachers' attitudes will be affected by the inconsistent implementation of policy. Ebmeier and Hart (1992) found that in relation to teachers' attitudes towards career ladders, "... the biggest problem they saw came from the inconsistent application of the career ladder rules from school to school and from district to district" (p.279). This suggests that the opportunities for disparate implementation of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy are a reality and that this disparate implementation will impact on the attitudes of teachers towards the policy.

The second finding identifies the need for teacher input into the implementation of career ladder schemes if they are to maintain teacher support. Ebmeier and Hart (1992) in their review of a number of career ladder plans concluded "... teachers felt that substantial teacher input and ownership of the plans were essential to their success" (p.279). Smylie and Smart (1990) found new structures put in place as a result of work redesign will only be successful if teachers fully support the initiative. Henson and Hall (1993) found that plans should "... rather than being a series of unrelated activities be organised and integrated around the goals of meeting student needs and enhancing learning" (p.344). Plans that have been imposed on teachers have rarely been successful (Robinson, 1984). Poston and Frase (1991) identified teacher cooperation in planning as one feature of
successful plans which unsuccessful plans did not embrace.

At a micro level of implementation, Smylie and Smart (1990) suggested teachers will oppose programs with the following characteristics:

1. They believe their work cannot be appropriately evaluated.
2. Financial rewards are too small for the extra duties required.
3. The programs are based around quotas.
4. Where teachers doubt the commitment of the administration to the program.

There is a general consensus that teacher opposition to non uniform salary schedules is based around a lack of confidence in the teacher assessment process and in particular the perceived fairness of teacher evaluations. Freiberg (1987) found inadequate teacher evaluation led to dissension and opposition to differentiated staffing plans. Elam (1989) found that 63% of teachers surveyed agreed that either teacher evaluations would not be fair or that teaching administrators cannot evaluate teachers fairly. Johnson (1984) confirmed these concerns of rater reliability and validity in two separate studies which confirmed that principals in the same school district used different criteria in evaluating teachers. Henson and Hall (1993) found principals had similar concerns. In their study of career ladder schemes, they cite one principal as stating:

.... people are recognised for being exceptional when they aren't and most of the people on staff know that they aren't, and so it becomes demoralising. How can I say to the exceptional teacher that, 'Yes, you get career ladder but because I'm not a strong enough individual (evaluator), I also let the weakest person on staff get that too?' (p.336).

Other measures of assessing teacher effectiveness for salary supplements have also been researched. Johnson (1984) found teachers often resist
alternate pay schemes based on student performance because of a belief that achievement is often influenced by factors outside the control of the teacher. Henson and Hall (1993) found that teachers did not believe career ladder schemes reflected accountability but rather record keeping skills. Murmane and Cohen (1986) found the public nature of being considered 'non meritorious' as dysfunctional in terms of teacher attitudes and future teacher development.

Other research has found some negative teacher reactions are a function of involvement in these schemes. Cramer (1983) found teachers who failed in their first attempt at gaining a merit status or who had their status removed tended to work at lower levels of performance as a result.

Another program characteristic which has been examined has been the nature of the role. Taken together these findings confirm a number of studies notably Lortie (1975) and McLaughlin and Marsh (1978), that teachers most value the intrinsic features of their work such as student achievement and growth, and their role in this achievement and growth. Smylie and Smart (1990) found that teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes could vary dependent on the role successful teachers were asked to perform:

.... career ladders may, in fact, provide few meaningful opportunities to improve practice or student learning. They may be viewed as antithetical to the improvement of practice and student learning if expanded roles and responsibilities are not clearly linked to the classroom (p.152).

Consistent with this finding relating to teachers' attitudes was the conclusion reached by Ebmeier and Hart (1992):

.... career ladder activities that support teaching and learning receive support. Those activities seen as new names for old tasks or as busy work are soundly excoriated by teachers ... features of
the career ladder plans that focused on school wide improvement and student outcomes stood the greatest chance of having a long term impact on the quality of teaching and learning in schools. The job assignments of teachers appointed to career ladder roles with these characteristics were more likely to be well integrated into the routine work and shared goals of the schools (p. 278).

Henson and Hall (1993) in their study of career ladder schemes found that ".... refocusing or redefining the career ladder to emphasise the classroom more would help and would at the same time be less stressful for teachers" (p.332). Hart and Murphy (1990) reporting on successful career ladder schemes identified the ".... integration of clear and common career ladder goals with the core activities of instruction and curriculum aimed at improved student outcomes" (p.236). Timar (1989) identified successful career ladder programs as satisfying two conditions vis: "(a) It must be connected to school improvement, that is, improvement of the organisational competence of schools, and (b) it must be connected to teachers' professional growth and development" (p.331). Edelfelt, (1972, cited by Johnson, 1986) found that ".... the search to identify new teaching roles got shunted aside because it was much easier to identify hierarchical roles" (p.70). Hart (1992) identified that ".... the contribution of the new roles to the good of the school appears to be a vital component of their social acceptance in schools" (p.375).

Further to the necessity for roles to be linked to classrooms and students was the need identified by Hart (1992) for all teachers to be aware of the roles and their relationship to the core tasks of the school. Hart warned of the perceptions teachers held of these positions when this was not the case:

Poor articulation of the relationship of projects and tasks to the core work of the school - teaching and learning - and retreat into conventional activities identified and renamed as career ladders to avoid the censure of peers has resulted in accusations that many tasks are 'Mickey Mouse', 'busy work' or 'redundant'. Adherence to career ladder regulations from the State Office of Education then
sinks to the level of 'pro forma' or procedural compliance or completely breaks down (p.374).

The inability of principals and administrators to adequately define the roles of teachers who had achieved increased status under a merit scheme was also found to affect teacher attitudes. Soar, Medley and Coker (1983) found teachers differed in their opinions of what should comprise mentor teacher behaviour and were suspicious of programs which defined these behaviours loosely.

*Effects of Career Ladder Programs on Teachers' Work*

Smylie and Smart (1990) found that teacher support for career ladder schemes was strongly related to their perceptions about their own professional learning and concerns about the effect of the program on relationships with other teachers. Smylie and Smart (1990) stated "...although both of these variables appear strongly related to teacher support for this program, the relationship of effects on professional learning appears substantially greater than that of effects on relationships with other teachers" (p.13). Dickson et al (1992) confirmed these findings concluding that teachers did not perceive career ladders positively affected school climate, made teachers feel better about themselves or increased collegiality. They compared the attitudes of teachers participating in career ladder schemes with teachers who were not participating in career ladder schemes and found "... the one area where polarisation of attitudes was mitigated was regarding the question of whether the career ladder promoted divisiveness. The majority of both non-career ladder teachers and career ladder teachers described the program as divisive" (p. 30).

Smylie and Smart (1990) argued that differentiated salary scales ran counter to teachers' predispositions towards intrinsic rewards and professional equality. Darlington-Hammond and Berry (1988) found that teachers feared
the competition which would result from alternate pay schemes would affect the cooperation needed to make schools effective. In citing research which defined effective schools as those which encouraged professional dialogue and collaboration, Rosenholtz (1985) described competition for rewards as leading to increased professional isolation and decreased work related problem solving among teachers. Malen and Hart (1987) found that while teachers welcomed the recognition available through career ladder schemes, they remained concerned about the impact the attainment of these positions could have on their relationships with their peers. Bacharach et al (1984) and Murname and Cohen (1986) found this to be especially significant when the scheme included a quota or ceiling for successful numbers. Poston and Frase, (1991) likewise concluded that, "... quotas cause inequitable distribution of rewards. Limiting the number of teachers who could earn rewards was demoralising and caused teacher dissatisfaction" (p.318). Some of this divisiveness could be attributed to a view commonly held by teachers that extra money obtained by career ladder positions was compensation for extra duties always performed without pay (Henson and Hall, 1993).

Freiberg, (1987) found that "... pay plans which increased the salaries of a few rather than becoming a bonus available to many became locked in place and became an incentive for a very few and a disincentive for very many" (p.331). Bacharach, Conley and Shedd (1986) found that teachers were more inclined to become involved in career ladder schemes which did not feature quotas and a differentiation of duties. Bacharach, Conley and Shedd (1986) and Henson and Hall (1993) cited the rotation of mentor teacher positions in the school as one response to the problem of low collegiality and job satisfaction engendered through competition.

Ballou and Podgursky (1993) compared teachers' attitudes towards merit pay and career ladder schemes. The authors found that teachers were most favourably disposed to pay schemes that involve higher pay for additional duties, for example mentoring new teachers, (58.8%) and salary increases
based on a progression through various levels, (career ladder) 40.9%.

Research suggests a relationship between some personal characteristics of teachers and an attitude toward career ladder schemes. Hart (1987) found significant differences between groups of teachers based on years of experience. Highly experienced teachers (more than ten years) not only did not involve themselves in interaction with career ladder teachers but were not as positive in their assessment of the efforts of career ladder teachers. In contrast, teachers with one to three years of teaching experience were most positive about the career ladder concept and their own likelihood of seeking assistance from career ladder teachers. Dickson et al (1992) and Ebmeier and Hart (1992) found that beginning teachers were more positive toward career ladder schemes than were their more experienced colleagues. Ebmeier and Hart suggested that this more positive view was attributable to two possible factors, either (a) the program being viewed as a future career incentive or (b) the need for group inclusion being felt more strongly by beginning teachers and satisfaction with the mentoring roles played by some career ladder teachers.

Hart (1987) examined teachers' attitudes towards their work and career ladders. Hart's findings confirmed earlier research by Nelson (1986) that there were significant differences in attitudes towards the career ladder between elementary and secondary teachers, this finding being confirmed later by Dickson et al (1992). Hart found that secondary teachers did not believe the increased attention paid to curriculum, instructional methods or professional development via the career ladder concept improved the quality of their schools. Related to this was the finding that secondary school teachers of long experience were the group most negative towards the career ladder concept.

Hart (1987) found that the attitudes of teachers occupying promotions positions in schools (teacher leaders) were highly divergent, suggesting the
quality or appeal of their experiences must have been variable. Hart (1987) also found that participation in career ladder systems had a direct impact on teacher attitudes. Teachers who competed for and obtained career ladder positions were most supportive of the new opportunities for growth. This finding was confirmed by Dickson et al (1992) and Conley and Levinson (1993) who found that having experienced career ladder positions, teachers valued the opportunity to develop special abilities and the opportunities for progression.

**Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy**

Outside of the periodic tinkering with class sizes common to most education systems in Australia, the introduction of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in 1991 represented the first genuine attempt to restructure the work of New South Wales teachers. In spite of this, Watkins (1994) notes that ".... literature pertaining specifically to the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher category is more sparse than more general discussions of teachers' work" (p.6). While research which specifically examined teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was almost non existent, research conducted in numerous states provided some indication of the progress of policy implementation and the reactions of teachers towards the policy.

Gaffney and Crowther (1993) provided one of the few analyses of Advanced Skills Teacher implementation available in the research. The authors conducted a series of seminars across New South Wales and The Australian Capital Territory titled *The Advanced Skills Teacher: Selection, Performance and Career Planning*. Participants included Advanced Skills Teachers, other teachers, school administrators and system personnel (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993). As the title of the seminar series suggests, the focus was firmly on the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy which was into its
second year in New South Wales state schools. The findings from this series of seminars provided one of the few insights into the school level experiences of policy implementation. Implementation practices analysed through the seminars included (a) selection procedures including identification of Advanced Skills Teachers, (b) the performance of Advanced Skills Teachers including Advanced Skills Teacher roles and the impact of these roles on teaching and learning and (c) the evaluation of Advanced Skills Teacher performance and career path planning including preparation for Advanced Skills Teacher selection, feedback procedures for unsuccessful applicants and expectations communication to successful candidates. As part of the analysis, participants were asked to identify for each implementation practice, both positive features and concerns as well as propose suggestions for future implementation.

The seminars revealed that despite mandatory guidelines, selection processes were not consistent across the system. Participants questioned the rigour of some selection procedures they had either witnessed or heard of and expressed concerns for equity as a result of these. The potential for the policy to be divisive was also seen as a concern and indeed some teachers described the breakdown of school relationships after the initial aftermath of Advanced Skills Teacher selections. In particular, the lower morale experienced by unsuccessful candidates was identified as having the potential to leave them less inclined to continue to undertake extra responsibilities. Divisiveness was also described by Ingvarson (1992) who maintained that much of this was caused by the imposition of quotas, led to competition between staff members and obfuscated the further development of the policy by hindering peer review processes and collegial support networks. Another concern was the mismatch evident between some Advanced Skills Teachers and their designated role, a result of selection criteria and role statements which were not seen as specific enough. Recommendations regarding selection processes included the refining of criteria including consideration of research and performance relating to advanced skills, the linking of Advanced
Skills Teacher criteria to role statements and the standardisation of criteria to ensure the comparability of teachers deemed advanced (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993).

The disparate nature of policy implementation was also manifest in the performance of Advanced Skills Teachers. Participants expressed concerns that Advanced Skills Teacher positions could be treated as both a reward, with no extra duties attached to it, or a position which involved the designation of extra work. Gaffney and Crowther found that participants wanted Advanced Skills Teacher roles to be clearly demarcated from traditional executive type roles, and in particular, a classroom based focus for Advanced Skills Teacher roles was stressed (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993).

The seminars revealed that teachers desired specific professional development programs to prepare applicants for Advanced Skills Teacher positions and that these programs should continue once appointments were made. This was more in keeping with a career development model and the original intention behind the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Participants also questioned the portability and tenure of Advanced Skills Teacher appointments and suggested the adoption of a regular review of Advanced Skills Teacher appointments at two to three year intervals rather than annually (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993).

As a result of the findings of their seminars, Gaffney and Crowther proposed three changes to school level policy implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. First they suggested the reconceptualising of advanced skill teaching and a focus on classroom practices relevant to subject or age of students taught rather than generic criteria. Secondly, the authors proposed the specialised extension and refinement of teachers deemed to have advanced skills, so that not only were their skills extended but their abilities to improve and inspire their colleagues also enhanced. Thirdly, they proposed the inclusion of Advanced Skills Teachers into the leadership
structures of the school, where a position within the established school hierarchy was made available for Advanced Skills Teachers to assume specific leadership obligations (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993).

Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1991) interviewed teachers, principals, employers' representatives and union officers in all Australian states except Tasmania and the Northern Territory. Although in discussing their data the authors do not discriminate between states, some general conclusions about the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in New South Wales can still be made. The authors found that 90% of applicants had been granted Advanced Skills Teacher status. Some employer representatives commented on this being, "... a successful early flush that the teachers unions got (that) won't continue" (p.3). Other employers were ambivalent about the much higher than to be expected number and justified the percentage successful on the basis that teachers were happier and morale increased. This finding suggested that at this early stage of policy implementation, there was already a lack of rigour being applied to the selection of teachers deemed to possess advanced skills. Chadbourne and Ingvarson maintained that the 90% success rate was a function of the generic nature of selection criteria recommended in the policy. The authors argued that selection panels would have had difficulty justifying a decision not to recommend an applicant on the basis of the selection criteria provided, commenting that "... when standards are not explicit, anyone who misses out has reasonable grounds for believing that the panel decision was based on prejudice or irrelevant, unstated criteria rather than on a demonstrable shortfall in ability to meet the standard" (p.8).

Selection panels also came under criticism from some teachers. Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1991) described selection panels as generalist and fixed according to a formula. Selection panels often lacked the subject matter background necessary to judge the expertise of applicants in their chosen discipline. In other cases, interviews were dispensed with altogether. Some
teachers interviewed resented this 'automatic' selection for Advanced Skills Teacher status, commenting that "...what matters most for teachers is professional recognition. They want the pride in their work and the respect that comes from belonging to a professional culture which sets and rewards high standards" (p.9).

Chadbourne and Ingvarson shed some light on the reasons behind some hesitancy on the part of teachers to consider Advanced Skills Teacher selection. Representatives of union groups interviewed for the study revealed that only 75% of those eligible to apply for Advanced Skills Teacher consideration had done so and suggested:

... the reasons the application rate was low was because of a higher priority for family and community commitments, objections to the ideological nature of the criteria, lack of confidence in school based panels and a view that the reward after tax is not worth the hassle (p.4).

Teachers interviewed for the study did not see any connection between an Advanced Skills Teacher position and professional development. The authors argued that what should have been seen as a process of professional development, appraisal and review was seen as an event, something "... which flies in the face of everything we know about educational change and teacher education" (p.11).

Dinham (1992) mentioned anecdotal evidence of teacher dissatisfaction with the policy on the basis of 'wrong' people being selected as Advanced Skills Teachers and Advanced Skills Teachers being 'overloaded' with responsibility comparative to the financial reward they were receiving for the extra duties. Weppler's (1995) unpublished doctoral thesis investigated the question of whether the Advanced Skills Teacher classification was attractive to what the author described as 'good' teachers. Based on interview data collected from Advanced Skills Teachers and Advanced Skills Teacher selection panel
members, the author concluded that aspects of the selection process were dysfunctional and cited the interview process and selection criteria as two aspects of total policy implementation with which some teachers were dissatisfied. Also notable from this research was the author's finding that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was not being implemented consistently across the state school system and that decisions like the delivery of role statements were not being implemented faithful to the policy mandates of the November 27, 1991 facsimile. Dinham's (1996) study of sources of teacher dissatisfaction also revealed that Advanced Skills Teachers were the most dissatisfied group in teaching, with only 41% rating themselves as satisfied to any degree. Most of the Advanced Skills Teachers surveyed for the study described the additional administrative responsibilities which came with being an Advanced Skills Teacher as being responsible for the feelings of dissatisfaction.

Watkins (1994) located his research in labour process theory, ".... an examination of how management controls and organises work" (p.6). Through case studies of two Victorian primary schools Watkins noted teachers perceived the notion of advanced was related more to 'new' skills of curriculum vitae preparation and interviewing than to teaching abilities themselves. In effect merit based selection processes had led to a shift of emphasis away from classroom teaching skills and onto the mechanisms of selection. Watkins noted that this situation had its genesis outside school based implementation decisions and was firmly linked to the prevailing climate of industrial relations and political pressures. This finding was congruent with that of Henson and Hall's (1993) study of career ladder schemes where teachers reported resentment of the essentially administrative process of seeking and obtaining career ladder positions.
Summary and Implications

This review of the literature on both career ladder schemes and the Advanced Skills Teacher policy identified an emerging congruence between research findings. While a degree of caution must be exercised in transposing any research findings from the United States context into an Australian context, three findings are clear:

1. A lack of teacher confidence in the identification of advanced teaching skills.
2. The nature of the extra roles required of successful teachers and the extent to which these roles impact on two things; student academic outcomes and teacher growth.
3. The potential for these schemes to become divisive.

This review of the literature also identified personal and school level variables worthy of examination when considering teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. In particular, years of experience, level of schooling taught and participation as an Advanced Skills Teacher appear to be related to differing teacher attitudes. The literature also stressed the antecedent role teachers should have in the implementation decisions associated with these career plans. Opportunities for teachers to have input and ownership seem essential if the plans are to have the ongoing support of teachers.

By examining the theory on motivating and compensating employees and relating this back to a school context, this chapter has also provided a theoretical framework to view implementation decisions relevant to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Hackman and Lawler (1971) argued the need for such a framework when in relation to research on job enlargement they stated:
... little cumulative knowledge has been gained regarding the effects and effectiveness of job redesign,... more case studies are not likely to contribute very much to the development of answers to crucial questions, what appears to be needed are conceptual frameworks which generate testable propositions about how job characteristics affect employees under various circumstances, and empirical research which is designed explicitly to test these propositions (p.260).

Some of the theoretical perspectives which have been discussed are primordial to an understanding of others while other perspectives share degrees of reciprocity. Neither the individual nor the cumulative applicability of these theories was used to measure the appropriateness of implementation decisions. Rather, these theories ensured that selectivity did not intrude into the determination of which implementation decisions were important and therefore worthy of inclusion into the study and which ones would not be considered. The integration into the questionnaire of these theories and the other findings uncovered by this review is described in the next chapter.
Chapter Six
Research Methodology

An Overview of the Chapter

This chapter describes the methodology employed to collect and analyse the data necessary to complete the study. It describes the development and final form of the questionnaire, and provides a rationale for the theoretical framework which underpinned the questionnaire. This chapter also describes the sampling technique used to define the sample group for the questionnaire and the statistical techniques used to analyse the quantitative data. Semi structured interviews were used to explain the statistical findings of the study. A rationale for the sampling method which formed the basis of the interviews, a description of the interview procedure and details on the trustworthiness of the interview data are also provided.

Five major themes emanated from the review of the literature described in Chapter Five:

1. Few studies have examined teacher support for policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy (Hart, 1987; Smylie and Smart, 1990) or indeed the Advanced Skills Teacher policy itself (Watkins, 1994).

2. There was a tendency for policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy to be implemented disparately (Ebmeier and Hart, 1992) and indeed, that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy itself was implemented disparately (Gaffney and Crowther, 1993; Weppler, 1995).

3. Where career ladders were concerned, there were some aspects of policy implementation that teachers supported over other aspects (Robinson, 1984; Smylie and Smart, 1990; Poston and

4. Analogous to point three, that to be effective, policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy needed to include certain implementation practices (Soar, Medley and Cocker, 1983; Bacharach, Conley and Shedd, 1986; Timar, 1989; Hart and Murphy, 1990; Smyle and Smart, 1990; Hart, 1992; Ebmeier and Hart, 1992; Henson and Hall, 1993).

5. Some groups of teachers were more supportive of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy than other groups of teachers (Cramer, 1983; Nelson, 1986; Hart, 1987; Dickson, 1992; Ebmeier and Hart, 1992; Conley and Levinson, 1993).

From these findings, the following proposition was explored; that teachers were witness to disparate implementation of policy and that their attitudes towards the policy were a function of their experience of policy implementation and some personal characteristics. In short, where teachers were in favour of the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, who were they, and what school level policy implementation processes had they experienced? To answer this central question, the following research questions were examined.

**Research Questions**

The review of the literature suggested the following research questions needed to be examined.

1. How did the experience of school level policy implementation affect the attitudes of teachers towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy?

2. Did the attitudes of teachers towards the policy change pre and post implementation and if so, did those teachers with a positive attitude towards the policy post implementation experience
different implementation processes to teachers with a negative attitude toward the policy post implementation?

3. Did primary school teachers and secondary school teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

4. Did teachers of less experience and teachers of more experience differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

5. Did three year trained teachers and four year trained teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

6. Did teachers holding executive positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

7. Did teachers who were holding or had held Advanced Skills Teacher positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

8. What was the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and their experiences of policy implementation?

The Questionnaire

Data for this research were collected by questionnaire and interviews. A timeline illustrating the data collection procedure is shown in Figure 5. In the first instance, teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, their experiences of school level policy implementation and some personal and school characteristics were ascertained through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was in three parts and is included as Appendix I.
Figure 5

Time line of Data Collection

- Review of literature plus anecdotal evidence to provide framework for questionnaire development.
- Approval in principle gained from Research Approvals Committee, Department Of School Education.
- Meeting with Validating Committee.
- Meeting with Validating Committee.
- Final approval gained on submission of questionnaire.

Development and refinement of questionnaire

January, 1995
28 February, 1995
31 March, 1995
17 May, 1995
1 June, 1995

Meeting with Validating Committee
Questionnaire piloted on 30 teachers from South Coast Region. Interviews piloted on 5 teachers.
Questionnaire posted directly to residential addresses of sample.
Questionnaire closed. Return rate of 56%.
Interviews commence
Interviews concluded

Development and refinement of questionnaire

11 July, 1995
8-15 August, 1995
14 September
20 October, 1995
10 November, 1995
20 December, 1995

Questionnaire data cleaned and analysed
Interview data collected and analysed
Part A sought information pertaining to variables related to teacher and school characteristics. There were six questions in Part A each requiring a single response. Questions one, two, five and six were included to ascertain the impact of factors highlighted by the review of literature as potentially impacting on teachers' attitudes towards the policy. Of particular value was that literature relating to teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes which had been described by Ingvarson (1992) as the model which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy had come to resemble. These studies notably Cramer (1983), Murname and Cohen (1986), Nelson (1986), Hart (1987), and Conley and Levinson (1993) identified those factors exogenous to school level policy implementation which could impact on teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes. Only the research based on career ladder schemes was considered. In particular the following factors were included for consideration in the study: (a) level of students taught (Nelson, 1986; Hart, 1987), (b) years of teaching experience (Hart, 1987; Conley and Levinson, 1993), and (c) whether the respondent had ever nominated for Advanced Skills Teacher assessment or held an Advanced Skills Teacher position (Cramer, 1983; Murname and Cohen, 1986). Data on years of teaching experience were collected in preference to teachers' age in recognition of the number of teachers for whom teaching is a second career, the number who enter teacher training as mature age students and the number whose careers are characterised by interruption (Conley and Levinson, 1993).

Questions three and four in Part A of the questionnaire also provided data related to teacher and school characteristics. The inclusion of these questions was based on anecdotal evidence experienced by the author as a teacher in the state school system in New South Wales. Question four
determined whether the respondent held an executive position in the school. This question was included on the basis that in spite of the fact that school executives were not the targets of the policy, teachers successful at becoming Advanced Skills Teachers were given a salary allowance in some cases equalling that provided to executive teachers and, like executive members, were also expected to complete extra roles.

Question three determined the number of years of teacher training respondents had undertaken. The significance of years of teacher training as a factor lies in the fact that up until January 1, 1995 base and subsequent salary steps were determined by initial training. As a result of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy however, teachers who were initially three year trained and were appointed as Advanced Skills Teachers were provided with automatic access to the four year trained incremental scale and remained on that scale regardless of whether they still performed Advanced Skills Teacher duties.

Scoring - Part A

Data collected in Part A of the questionnaire were nominal. Therefore, responses were used to categorise respondents into groups for statistical analysis.

The Theoretical Framework - Part B

Part B of the questionnaire sought information pertaining to teachers’ experiences of school level policy implementation. It was comprised of twenty four questions which reflected those implementation experiences examined by Gaffney and Crowther (1993) vis: selection, roles, rewards, and assessment. Part B of the questionnaire also used the perspectives of employee motivation and compensation and relevant data from research into career ladder schemes (Hart, 1992) as theoretical referents. These perspectives were
viewed both holistically and in terms of specific dimensions or discrete topics and subtopics (Foddy, 1993). Questions were generated by an analysis of the perspectives through a procedure described by Tuckman (1988). The topics, subtopics and the theory which informed their inclusion are listed in Table 6.

Table 6
Theories Informing Topic and Sub-Topic Inclusion in Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Sub-Topic</th>
<th>Theory Informing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Preperparation</td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aware of criteria</td>
<td>Contracts/Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role known beforehand</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of criteria</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback (on self) (to staff on selected AST)</td>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Relevance to teaching/learning</td>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging/Significant</td>
<td>Two Factor/Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicated to staff</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Relative to tasks</td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Assessment of AST</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to AST</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 7 for the questions and their relevant topics and subtopics.

Foddy (1993) maintained that in questionnaire design, each sub topic should be identified to allow each respondent to align to the question in the same way. For this questionnaire, this concern remained largely academic as question wording was sufficient to provide each respondent with enough context to specify what aspect of total policy implementation was being addressed. The accuracy of this assertion was established through the pilot of the questionnaire.

The use of these perspectives as the theoretical framework for the questionnaire did not mean that the study became an attempt to correlate
policy implementation decisions with theoretical correctness. Rather, the perspectives provided a framework for looking at different aspects of policy implementation, a feature of earlier studies specifically examining teachers' attitudes to workplace change (Hart, 1987; Conley and Levinson, 1993). To relate the implementation decisions of principals with theoretical correctness would have been inequitable to the principals of schools from which the sample population was drawn as significantly, some policy directives to principals were contrary to some of these established theories. To illustrate this point, while the Contracts Literature (Murname and Cohen, 1986) suggested that the imprecise nature of teaching means the roles of potential Advanced Skills Teachers should be known prior to the application and evaluation process, the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy stated:

The specific additional duties for the Advanced Skills Teachers in school positions will be determined by the school principal following discussion with the Advanced Skills Teacher (Advanced Skills Teacher Policy, November 27, 1991, p.3).

Scoring Part - B

The twenty four questions in Part B were randomly listed on the questionnaire and comprised twelve scales of two questions each. Each scale represented one process of school level policy implementation. The final score for each scale was ascertained through aggregating the scores on both questions. Variables measured and relevant questions are shown in Table 7.
Table 7
Variables and Relevant Questions Appearing in Part B of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Subtopics (Variables)</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>3, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aware of criteria</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Role known beforehand</td>
<td>2, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of criteria to teaching/learning</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback (self)</td>
<td>20, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to staff on selected Advanced Skills Teacher)</td>
<td>5, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Relevance to teaching/learning</td>
<td>22, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging/significant</td>
<td>9, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role communicated to staff</td>
<td>6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Relative to tasks</td>
<td>8, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>Assessment of Feedback to Advanced Skills Teacher</td>
<td>13, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B of the questionnaire used a five point Likert Scale. Likert Scales had been described by Oppenheim (1992) as being most relevant to explore attitude patterning and experiences behind attitudes. Response categories were 'Nearly Always' which was scored as 4, 'Often' which was scored as 3, 'Sometimes' which was scored as 2, 'Rarely' which was scored as 1 and the filter of 'No Comment' scored as 0. A maximum score on each scale was 8. A minimum score was 0. An aggregate score of 8 on any scale was interpreted as respondents having a high level of experience of the implementation process being considered. An aggregate score of 2 was interpreted as respondents having a low level of experience of the implementation process being considered. A score of less than 2 indicated that respondents had no real comment to make on this scale. Scores for each scale were gained through aggregating the scores on each of the two questions in each scale. In one case (Question 8) the score was reversed. A mean for each respondent on each scale was also calculated. The 'No Comment' option was included in
order to exclude non attitudes (Converse and Presser, 1986) and establish the relevance of the question to each respondent (Foddy, 1993). The inclusion of this filter was of particular importance in Part B. Some aspects of policy implementation would have been communicated through informal or one to one means. Therefore knowledge of these implementation practices would not have been available to every respondent. Responses in the filter category were not included in the statistical analysis.

The Theoretical Framework - Part C

Two scales were constructed in Part C of the questionnaire. One scale measured teachers' attitudes towards the policy pre implementation, and one scale measured teachers' attitudes towards the policy post implementation. Tuckman (1988) warned of the need to make the actual purpose of an attitude questionnaire less visible and suggested that an awareness of the topic may influence responses. With this in mind, one scale ascertained teachers' attitudes towards the intent and general thrust of the policy. This scale was taken as an indice of a pre implementation attitude toward the policy. The second scale considered their position regarding whether or not post implementation, they thought the policy was still a positive initiative and whether or not the policy had been implemented effectively. This scale was taken as an indice of their post implementation attitude.

Henerson, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1988) described an attitude as a construct; an abstract concept which the authors maintained served the human need to see order and consistency in human thought and behaviour. While it is outside the scope of this study to examine in any detail the vast array of literature dealing with attitude definition, formation and measurement, the following emergent issues from the relevant literature were considered in the development of Part C of the questionnaire.
Olson (1993) maintained that despite years of research, "....there is no universally agreed upon definition" (p.119) of an attitude. Olson confirmed the view expressed earlier by writers including Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) who suggested that any attempt to define what constitutes an attitude would be exaggerating the degree of agreement reached by writers on the subject. While accepting this subjectivity about any definition of the term, this study was based on the following definition of an attitude, ".... a learned predisposition to respond in a consistent favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object" (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975, cited in Kottkamp, 1990, p. 86).

Also useful in setting the parameters for the use of the term in this study were the following adjuncts proposed by Kottkamp (1990) that "... the object may be a person, institution, process or event. Attitudes are considered to be hypothetical or unobservable constructs that are inferred to exist through responses an individual makes to an object" (p. 87).

While acknowledging disparate definitions, Olson proposed that most attitude theorists agree on the centrality of the following three characteristics of attitudes:

.... that evaluation constitutes a central perhaps predominant aspect of attitudes, that attitudes are represented in memory and that affective, cognitive and behavioural antecedents of attitudes can be distinguished, as can affective, cognitive, and behavioural consequences of attitudes (p.119).

The importance of attitudes being a learned predisposition on the basis of some evaluation highlighted a central premise underpinning this study. This premise maintained that each teacher's attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy would be a product of either personal or school characteristics or factors relating to their experiences of policy implementation and by implication a basis for these evaluative judgments. Both these factors are
included as variables at Part A and Part B of the questionnaire respectively.

The research on attitudes also identified the conditions which lead to the development of the evaluative judgments which eventually lead to the formation of an attitude toward a particular object, all of which are present within the confines of this study. Olson (1993) cited these as including:

".... the expectation that the individual will interact with the attitude object, (Gerard and Orive, 1987), being asked about ones attitude (Fazio, 1987) and having a lot of knowledge about an issue" (Judd and Downing, 1990) (p.127).

**Scoring Part - C**

Part C of the questionnaire was based on Likert Scale items described by Sproull (1988) as ".... widely used in assessing employees' attitudes" (p.183). Both pre implementation and post implementation attitudes were ascertained by aggregating the responses to the two questions of each scale to arrive at a composite score for each variable. Response categories were 'Strongly Agree' which was scored as 4, 'Agree', which was scored as 3, 'Disagree', which was scored as 2, 'Strongly Disagree' which was scored as 1 and the filter of 'No Comment', which was scored as 0. Attitudes measured and the relevant question numbers from Part C of the questionnaire are shown in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Implementation</td>
<td>Part C .. 2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Implementation</td>
<td>Part C .. 1,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both pre and post implementation attitudes, an aggregate score of 8 was interpreted as being a very positive attitude towards the policy. An aggregate
score of 2 was interpreted as being a very negative attitude towards the policy. An aggregate score of less than 2 was interpreted as the respondent having no real comment to make on this scale. Mean scores for each respondent on each scale were also calculated.

**Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire**

*Content Validity*

To determine the validity of the questionnaire, a panel of experts was formed and consulted during various stages of the development of the questionnaire. The panel included two academics experienced in questionnaire construction, an assistant principal and a practising teacher (Appendix J). The approval of this group was accepted as determining the content validity of the questionnaire.

*Reliability*

Trials preliminary to the eventual pilot were conducted with a view to examining the questionnaire for the meaning of questions, shared understandings of terms used and instructions to the respondents. As a result of these preliminary trials, some questions were reworded and others were discarded. For example two questions which asked respondents to describe how professionally rewarding Advanced Skills Teachers had found their roles were discarded on the basis that this information was only available from Advanced Skills Teachers themselves. Likewise two questions relating to size of financial reward for Advanced Skills Teachers were discarded on the basis that this issue was outside school level policy implementation.

The questionnaire was piloted on a group of thirty teachers from the South
Coast Region of School Education on August 8, 1995. The internal reliability of each set of questions was measured using the Cronbach’s Alpha in the SPSS statistical package. Table 9 provides the results of this analysis. Henerson, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1988) suggested that in attitude research, correlations of .70 and over are considered desirable and lower correlations are tolerated. Therefore the questionnaire as a whole had a high degree of internal reliability.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Sub Topic</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Skills</td>
<td>Aware of criteria</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Role known beforehand</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of criteria</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback (self)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to staff on selected AST)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Skills</td>
<td>Roles of Advanced Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Relevance to teaching/learning</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging/significant</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role communicated to staff</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Relative to tasks</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Skills</td>
<td>Assessment of</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Feedback to AST</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Pre policy implementation</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post policy implementation</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To complete the pilot of the research methodology, five of the teachers in the pilot group were approached to be involved in a pilot of the semi structured telephone interviews, the second data collection technique. The importance of piloting questions to be asked over the telephone with a sub group of the target population had been identified by Borg and Gall (1983) who described the need for the researcher to examine possible communication problems and methods of data coding and analysis. The five teachers were each interviewed over consecutive nights and provided information to the researcher on questioning technique and a shared understanding of question
The Sampling Technique

In New South Wales, permission to conduct research in government schools is required prior to the sample schools being approached. Approval in principle was gained on February 31, 1995 and final approval was provided on June 1, 1995 after the author submitted the survey instrument to the Approvals Committee (Appendix K).

Initially the research design was based on a random sample through survey only, across the state of New South Wales. One major problem endemic to any survey research involving schools was foreseen; the lack of control over the distribution of the questionnaire and in particular the reliance on the school principal as the distribution point for each questionnaire. As a result of these concerns, a stratified random sampling technique across one Department of School Education region was used. This was facilitated by the direct mailing of the questionnaire to randomly selected teachers from each sub stratum at the appropriate percentage. The stratified random sampling technique to selecting the sample population increased the external validity of the results of the study. In New South Wales the formula used to staff schools was consistent across regions. Making the sample a reflection of this formula rather than a random sample made the sample group representative of the state as a whole on the relevant major variables identified in the literature review.

The South Coast Region was selected as the region from which the sample would be drawn, and the Personnel Directorate of this region was approached to provide data detailing the names and addresses of teachers employed in schools in this region.
The Sample of Questionnaire Respondents

The South Coast Region of School Education was one of ten Department of School Education regions across the state of New South Wales. Bounded by the Pacific Ocean in the East, it extended from Otford in the North, to Delegate in the South and West to the foothills of the Snowy Mountains, a total of 53,678 square kilometres. (Source: South Coast Region, Department of School Education) Appendix L shows the location of this region relative to the state of New South Wales. The region comprised one hundred and seventy six primary schools, (Years K - 6), thirty seven secondary schools, (Years 7 - 12), one central school (K - 12), one Senior College, (Years 7 - Open), eight Schools For Specific Purposes and two Field Study Centres, (Environmental Education).

After confirmation that the research had the approval of the Department of School Education, the Personnel Directorate of the South Coast Region provided information detailing the names and addresses of teachers employed in schools in the region. This information which had been originally supplied to regional office by principals as part of their staffing return responsibility, was based on Equivalent Full Time (EFT) positions. Where possible, this data was further broken down to detail the number of teachers relevant to the major variables required by the study including level of teaching, (primary or secondary), the numbers of executive and non executive teachers at each level and the numbers of Advanced Skills Teachers at each level. The data showed that in 1995 there was a total of 4,462 teachers in the South Coast Region. Of these, 2,253 taught at the primary level and 2,209 taught at the secondary level. There were 552 primary teachers holding executive positions and 131 secondary teachers holding executive positions. Of the non executive teachers, there were 327 Advanced Skills Teachers at the primary level and 354 Advanced Skills Teachers at the secondary level. This data as percentage figures is shown in Figure 6.
Questionnaires were sent to the cohort groups depicted in Figure 5 proportional with a total sample of five hundred.

**Distribution and Return of the Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was posted directly to the selected teachers in September, 1995. Each teacher was sent a covering letter which included approval to conduct the research from the Department of School Education and the aims of the study. Also included was one copy of the questionnaire and a postage paid return envelope. The covering letter included the date by which the questionnaire had to be returned in order for individual results to be included in the analysis. After consultation with other researchers experienced in survey methodology, a return period of four weeks was set.

Due to the sensitivity of the topic, respondents were guaranteed confidentiality. Unless they chose to respond to the request to be interviewed
they were also assured of anonymity. This meant that the author could not number the questionnaires and therefore could not send follow up letters to respondents who did not respond within the set period of time. Although follow up of individuals who do not respond is common practice in survey research, two factors influenced the author's decision to offer anonymity and therefore negate the possibility of follow up. The first of these was the opportunity to post questionnaires directly to teachers. Although this ensured that each sub stratum of the stratified sample received the appropriate numbers of questionnaires, the author was concerned that the arrival of a coded questionnaire at a private address would lead to concerns about anonymity. The second factor which influenced the author's decision to offer anonymity was the sensitivity of the topic. In asking teachers to detail their experiences of school level policy implementation, the researcher was effectively asking teachers to describe the actions of school leadership. It was the opinion of the author that anonymity had to be offered to ensure the veracity of this information. The total response rate of 56% without follow up demonstrates the topicality of the research in the teaching community. The response rate and profile of the respondents on whom the analysis is based is detailed in Table 10 in Chapter Seven. Of the respondents who returned the questionnaire, 46% also agreed to be included in the interview component of the study. Of those respondents who chose not to be interviewed, some wrote letters, up to three pages in length, detailing their experiences. This information was added to that gained through the semi structured interviews.

**Statistical Analysis of Data**

As questionnaires were returned they were numbered, collated and willingness and preferred time to be interviewed was recorded. The data provided by each questionnaire were analysed using the Stat View 512+ statistical package. Given that in Part B and Part C of the questionnaire, the data was in the form of a subjective judgment expressed on a numbered
scale, it was most appropriate to treat the data as ordinal. For descriptive purposes this typically results in the use of the median as the statistic for comparing the central tendency of scores and non parametric techniques for the analysis of scores (Siegel, 1988). However there were cases in the literature which argued that empirical evidence supported the treatment of ordinal variables as if they conformed to interval scales. Anderson (1961) described as a well known fact that "... an interval scale is not prerequisite to making a statistical inference based on a parametric test" and that "... the type of measuring scale used has little relevance to the question of whether to use parametric or non parametric tests" (p.316). Labovitch (1970) maintained that the treatment of ordinal scales as interval data provided the researcher with numerous advantages including the use of more powerful and interpretable statistics and greater versatility in statistical manipulations including partial and multiple correlation and regression. Based on these findings, the mean score was used as a substitute for the median to indicate broad differences and broad agreement or disagreement and parametric tests were used for the data analysis.

Research question one investigated any change in teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy having experienced implementation of the policy at the school level. As all the teachers who comprised the sample group had different experiences, a repeated measures (pre implementation and post implementation) design was considered most appropriate (Gravetter and Wallnau, 1996). Initially data pertaining to the sample as a whole were analysed. For each respondent, a pre implementation attitude score was calculated and a post implementation attitude score was calculated. This was done by summing the scores on each set of questions to provide an aggregate score for each respondent for both attitudes. This aggregate score was then calculated into a mean score for each respondent on both attitudes. Pre and post implementation means were then analysed using a two tailed $t$ test. Although the review of the literature (Chadbourn and Ingvarson, 1992; Dinham 1992; Gaffney and Crowther, 1993) suggested the possibility that
post implementation mean scores would be lower than pre implementation mean scores thereby encouraging the use of a directional hypothesis and a one tailed t test, pilot results were sufficient to mediate this decision and pre and post implementation means were analysed using a two tailed t test. A significance level of .05 was set, the norm in social science research. The sample group was then partitioned into sub groups according to identified independent variables related to personal and school characteristics ascertained in Part A of the questionnaire viz; level of school, years of training, years of service, executive/classroom teacher, Advanced Skills Teacher/classroom teacher. Two tailed t tests were used to analyse the differences between the pre and post implementation means.

Research question two investigated the specific aspects of school level policy implementation which may have been responsible for any change in teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. A between groups design was used. Respondents were assigned to one of two groups on the basis of their post implementation attitude score. An aggregate score of six or above on the scale which measured the attitude towards the policy post implementation was taken to demonstrate a positive attitude toward school level policy implementation. This decision was based on the fact that a score of six represented combined minimum answers of 'Agree' to both questions. An aggregate score of five or below on the same scale was taken to represent a negative attitude toward school level policy implementation. Once these two groups had been formed, group mean scores on each of the twelve identified subscales related to processes of school level policy implementation were compared. Group mean scores on each sub scale were then analysed with a two tailed t test. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question three investigated whether following implementation, teachers working at the primary level of schooling held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy than did teachers working at the secondary level. A between groups design was used. To calculate an indice
of change, each respondent's pre implementation attitude score was compared to their post implementation attitude score to create implementation change scores for both groups. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, pre implementation attitude scores for both groups were analysed for significant differences. This was done using a two tailed $t$ test. Similarly, implementation change scores for both groups were then analysed for significant differences using a two tailed $t$ test. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question four investigated whether following implementation, teachers with differing years of experience held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. A single factor independent measures design was used (Gravetter and Wallnau, 1996). To calculate an indice of change, each respondent's pre implementation attitude score was compared to their post implementation attitude score to create implementation change scores for each group. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, pre implementation attitude scores for each group were analysed for significant differences. Because there were more than two groups of scores, differences were analysed for significance using an Analysis of Variance. A significance level of .05 was set. Implementation change scores for each group were then analysed for significant differences using an Analysis of Variance. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question five investigated whether following implementation, teachers of different years of teacher training held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. A between groups design was used. To calculate an indice of change, each respondent's pre implementation attitude score was compared to their post implementation attitude score to create implementation change scores for each group. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, pre implementation attitude scores for both groups were analysed for significant differences. This was done using a two tailed $t$ test. Similarly, implementation change scores for both groups were then analysed
for significant differences using a two tailed $t$ test. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question six investigated whether following implementation, teachers holding executive positions in a school held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy to classroom teachers. A between groups design was used. To calculate an indice of change, each respondent's pre implementation attitude score was compared to their post implementation attitude score to create implementation change scores for each group. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, pre implementation attitude scores for both groups were analysed for significant differences. This was done using a two tailed $t$ test. Similarly, implementation change scores for both groups were then analysed for significant differences using a two tailed $t$ test. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question seven investigated whether following implementation, teachers who were holding or had held Advanced Skills Teacher positions held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy than did classroom teachers. A between groups design was used. To calculate an indice of change, each respondent's pre implementation attitude score was compared to their post implementation attitude score to create implementation change scores for both groups. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, pre implementation attitude scores for both groups were analysed for significant differences. This was done using a two tailed $t$ test. Implementation change scores for both groups were then analysed for significant differences using a two tailed $t$ test. A significance level of .05 was set.

Research question eight sought to investigate and identify the relationship between school level policy implementation decisions and positive teacher attitudes towards the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy.
A stepwise multiple regression was carried out where a measure of each teacher's post implementation attitude was regressed against their experiences of the twelve sub scales representing school level implementation processes ascertained in Part B of the questionnaire. A significance level of .05 was set.

**Semi Structured Interviews**

The second means of collecting data drew on the qualitative traditions of educational research and utilised semi structured interviews. Sixty interviews were conducted over a period from November 10, 1995 to December 20, 1995. Interviews ranged in duration from fifteen minutes to over sixty minutes and were conducted by telephone. As a means of collecting data for educational research, the telephone interview has been described most recently by Dinham (1994) whose review of the literature relevant to telephone interviews revealed certain advantages of the telephone interview over the face to face interview. Included among a number of advantages identified by Dinham (1994) are the greater frankness on the part of the respondent during the telephone interview and the lesser feeling of threat experienced by the respondent particularly if the subject matter is of a sensitive nature. One respondent who agreed to be interviewed but later refused, sent her reply to the major questions in writing.

Four main questions formed the focus of the interviews. These questions reflected those asked by Dickson, Walton and Guy (1992) in their descriptive study of teachers' attitudes towards career ladder schemes:

1. What have you experienced in relation to the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy?
2. What were the best aspects about this implementation?
3. What were the worst aspects about this implementation?
4. What would you do if you had the power to improve policy implementation in this area?

The Sample of Interviewees

The questionnaire included an attached proforma which gave respondents an opportunity to be involved in the semi structured interviews. From these respondents, another sample was selected using a purposive sampling technique. Lincoln and Guba (1985) cited Patton (1980) in identifying six purposes for using purposive sampling. Of particular relevance to this study were the following purposes:

1. To obtain information about unusual cases that may be troublesome or enlightening (extreme or deviant cases).
2. To avoid rejection of information on the grounds that it is known to arise from special or deviant cases (typical cases).
3. To document unique variations that have emerged in adapting to different conditions (maximum variation sampling).

Analysis of Qualitative Data

The aim of the interviews was to illuminate the findings reached on the basis of the statistical analysis via examples and non examples (typical and deviant cases) of these findings. In this way the semi structured interviews served to explain and clarify the major findings of the study. A process of content analysis was used to analyse the data from the semi structured interviews. Patton (1987) maintained that the aim of content analysis is to organise and simplify the complexity of data into meaningful themes or categories. Unlike other data analysis techniques used with qualitative data notably the constant comparative technique, the aim of content analysis is generality; the results of
the analysis should have theoretical relevance, permitting generalisation from the analysed text to some theoretical model (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Content analysis involves identifying coherent and important examples, themes and patterns in the data by combining all the data that address a particular research question (Patton, 1987) on the basis of hypotheses and related literature (Marshall, 1995). This planning suggests several categories which can serve to code the data for subsequent analysis (Marshall, 1995). In this study, the literature review and the research questions became the organising foci around which the themes and patterns were examined and data were coded. Data from semi structured interviews were further analysed through the identification of two cohorts for each research question (a) those who conformed to the trends apparent in the statistical analysis, (typical cases) and (b) those who did not conform to these trends, (extreme or deviant cases).

In addition, participants were given an opportunity to identify issues of concern that went beyond the bounds of the study and issues pertinent to their own experiences. These issues were also pursued through interviewing members of the same group and determining whether what seemed to be individual experiences were actually more general, and possible reasons for their occurrence. Information provided by each interview was transcribed freehand before being entered electronically. From a reading of these transcriptions, data were then categorised according to the major variables under examination in the research. Respondents and the data they provided were also identified as being either typical or extreme or deviant cases relevant to each research question.

**Trustworthiness of Qualitative Data**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) described three activities that make it more likely
that qualitative data will be reliable (a) prolonged engagement, (b) persistent
observation and (c) triangulation. For this study triangulation was the most
appropriate means of determining the reliability of the data gained from the
semi structured interviews. Data gained from semi structured interviews was
triangulated using three main sources:

1. The trends identified through an analysis of the data from the
   questionnaire.
2. The major themes emanating from the literature.
3. Reference to data from other participants who shared similar
   characteristics, attitudes or experiences.

Each of these three sources served in a recursive process of triangulation.
Data gained from interviews was constantly compared against each of the
three sources for both generalisability and divergence. In this way, not only
could trustworthiness be ascertained but emerging issues pursued.
Trustworthiness was also assured through member checking whereby the
veracity of the data recorded with each respondent was confirmed before
concluding the interview. Individual responses were read back to each
respondent and where appropriate, clarification was sought.
Chapter Seven

Results and Analysis

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy was an attempt to restructure the work of teachers. As a policy initiative it had the twin aims of increasing the productivity and efficiency of the school system while at the same time motivating classroom teachers by rewarding those considered to possess advanced skills.

Studies on similar policies implemented in other countries suggested that the implementation of policy in this area would not be consistent (Ebmeier and Hart, 1992). Anecdotal evidence collected by the author suggested this to likewise be a reality with the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. This study explored the notion that in spite of mandatory policy guidelines, the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was open to interpretation and therefore disparate implementation. As a result of this, teachers experienced a range of implementation decisions and practices at the school level. Given this variability, the purpose of the study was to identify teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as well as those school level policy implementation decisions which were associated with self reported positive teacher attitudes towards the policy.

An Overview of the Chapter

This chapter provides the results of the statistical analysis of each research question and discusses them in light of the data gained through the semi structured interviews. In this way, the qualitative data extends the rationale for the major propositions emanating from the analysis of the survey data while at the same time raising issues outside those covered by the
questionnaire. Desirous of providing the reader with the context of each respondents experience, the interview data is provided in as much detail as possible.

The review of the literature suggested that teachers' attitudes towards policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy would be variable (Cramer, 1983; Nelson, 1986; Hart, 1987; Dickson, 1992; Ebmeier and Hart, 1992; Conley and Levinson 1993). Other studies confirmed teacher support for certain implementation practices (Robinson, 1984; Smylie and Smart, 1990; Poston and Frase, 1991; Ebmeier and Hart, 1992; Henson and Hall 1993). While the review of the literature indicated that teachers' attitudes were fundamental to the success of policies in this area, (Hart, 1987; Smylie and Smart 1990) few studies have examined the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy (Watkins, 1994) or teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of the policy. The review of the literature suggested the following research questions needed to be investigated.

Research Question One
How did the experience of school level policy implementation affect the attitudes of teachers towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy?

Research Question Two
Did the attitudes of teachers towards the policy change pre and post implementation and if so, did those teachers with a positive attitude towards the policy post implementation experience different implementation processes to teachers with a negative attitude towards the policy post implementation?

Research Question Three
Did primary school teachers and secondary school teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?
Research Question Four  
Did teachers of less experience and teachers of more experience differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

Research Question Five  
Did three year trained teachers and four year trained teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

Research Question Six  
Did teachers holding executive positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

Research Question Seven  
Did teachers who were holding or had held Advanced Skills Teacher positions and classroom teachers differ in their attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post implementation?

Research Question Eight  
What was the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and their experiences of policy implementation?

The Sample  
The sample was taken from teachers in the South Coast Region of School Education. Details of this region are provided in Chapter Six and illustrated in Appendix L. Five hundred questionnaires were posted to teachers in the region proportional to the numbers required for each sub group. Two hundred and seventy nine were returned complete, resulting in a return rate
of 56% being achieved. Notable however were the higher return rates for Advanced Skills Teachers in both primary and secondary schools (63.5%) and executives (60%) compared to return rates for classroom teachers (53%). Of the respondents who returned their questionnaires, one hundred and twenty eight (46%) indicated a willingness to be involved in the semi structured interviews, the second data gathering component of the study. Of these, sixty teachers were interviewed.

When compared to demographic characteristics of teachers in the south coast, the sample of respondents was shown to be representative. The Chi Square Goodness of Fit-test was used to determine the generalisability of results according to information available on the characteristics of teachers across the South Coast Region. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 10 and revealed that the survey sample was not significantly different to the population of teachers in the South Coast Region, \( \chi^2 = 1.95; df = 5, p > .80 \).

### Table 10
**Distribution of Survey Respondents by Major Identified Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Group</th>
<th>Number in Region</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sample (500)</th>
<th>Number in Survey</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary classroom teachers</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary classroom teachers</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary executives</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary executives</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4462</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>Av 58 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a uniform response rate across each substratum
Research Question One

Research question one investigated change in teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy having experienced implementation of the policy at the school level. Data were obtained through the questionnaire which asked respondents to provide their pre implementation attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and their post implementation attitude towards the policy.

Initially data pertaining to the sample as a whole was analysed. This analysis revealed strong support for the policy pre implementation, \( M = 7.2, SD = .96 \) but lack of support for the policy following school level implementation, \( M = 4.1, SD = 1.7 \). When the difference between the pre and post implementation attitude means were analysed for significance using a t test it was found to be significant. This result is shown in Table 11. The sample was then partitioned into sub groups according to identified independent variables related to personal and school characteristics ascertained in Part A of the questionnaire, viz; level of school, years of training, years of service, executive/classroom teacher, Advanced Skills Teacher/classroom teacher. Two tailed t tests were used to analyse the differences between the pre and post implementation means for each of these sub groups. Table 11 shows there were notable differences in pre and post implementation means for each of the sub groups. All of the sub groups with the exception of the group of teachers who had between zero and five years of service with the Department of School Education exhibited significant differences. Given the size of the differences between the pre and post policy implementation means for the overall sample and the consistency of this trend across the sub groups, the results indicated that although respondents had been supportive of the policy pre implementation, they were less supportive of the policy having experienced policy implementation.
Table 11
Mean Scores for Attitudes Towards the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy Pre and Post Implementation for Sample Group and Identified Sub Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre Policy Implementation Attitude</th>
<th>Post Policy Implementation Attitude</th>
<th>Difference Between Pre and Post Means</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Sample</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Skills Teachers</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 year trained</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year trained</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 years of service</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years of service</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years of service</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years of service</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years of service</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two

Research question one highlighted significant differences in teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre and post school level implementation. While this analysis indicated that policy implementation had altered teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, the second research question considered the specific processes of school level policy implementation which may have been responsible for this change in teachers' attitudes.

To answer this research question, two groups were formed on the basis of a post school level implementation attitude. This was determined for each respondent by aggregating their scores on the two relevant questions. An aggregate score of six or above was taken to demonstrate a positive attitude toward school level implementation. This decision was based on the fact that a score of six represented combined minimum answers of 'Agree' to both questions relating to post school level policy implementation. An aggregate score of five or below was taken to represent a negative attitude toward school level policy implementation. Once these two groups had been formed, group mean scores on each of the twelve identified independent variables related to processes of school level implementation were compared. These comparisons revealed differences and the significance of each difference was tested using a $t$ test. These results are shown in Table 12.

There were significant differences between both groups on each experience of policy implementation variables with the exception of the level of the reward relative to tasks variable, which assessed the extra work that teachers had experienced Advanced Skills Teachers were required to do relative to the extra amount they were paid. With the exception of this variable, teachers with a positive attitude towards the policy had experienced significantly different implementation decisions and practices. The importance of this finding lies in its substantiation of one of the major premises of this study;
that teachers have not experienced the consistent implementation of this policy. Further, it encourages an examination of the relationship between teachers' experiences of policy implementation and their attitudes' towards the policy. This issue is investigated in research question eight.
Table 12
Comparison of Mean Scores on Experiences of Policy Implementation Processes for Teachers with a Positive and Teachers with a Negative Post Implementation Attitude Towards the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Variable</th>
<th>Teachers with a Positive Attitude toward Policy Implementation</th>
<th>Teachers who did not have a Positive Attitude toward Policy Implementation</th>
<th>Difference Between Two Groups for this Variable</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for AST selection</td>
<td>4.4 1.8</td>
<td>2.9 1.5</td>
<td>- 1.5</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of selection criteria</td>
<td>6.3 1.8</td>
<td>4.4 2</td>
<td>- 1.9</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role known beforehand</td>
<td>5.8 2.1</td>
<td>3.5 1.8</td>
<td>- 2.3</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of criteria</td>
<td>4.4 1.8</td>
<td>3.3 1.7</td>
<td>- 1.1</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to applicant</td>
<td>4.8 2.5</td>
<td>2.5 1.7</td>
<td>- 2.3</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to staff on selected applicant</td>
<td>4.8 2.1</td>
<td>2.6 1.3</td>
<td>- 2.2</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of roles to improving classroom practice</td>
<td>5 1.8</td>
<td>3.8 1.6</td>
<td>- 1.2</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of role</td>
<td>6.2 1.6</td>
<td>2.9 1.2</td>
<td>- 2.4</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role communicated to staff</td>
<td>5.8 1.9</td>
<td>3.9 1.8</td>
<td>- 1.9</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward relative to tasks</td>
<td>4.2 1.9</td>
<td>4.3 2.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of AST Assessed</td>
<td>5.4 1.8</td>
<td>3 1.6</td>
<td>- 2.4</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to AST</td>
<td>4.8 2.5</td>
<td>2.7 1.7</td>
<td>- 2.1</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of quantitative data for question one revealed that although teachers were supportive of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre implementation \((M = 7.2, \ SD = .96)\), they were significantly less supportive having experienced the school level implementation of the policy \((M= 4.1, \ SD = 1.7)\).

Interviews revealed that the main reason that teachers' attitudes towards the policy changed post school level implementation were perceptions of incongruities between the intentions of the policy and the reality of the policy. The policy did not deliver what teachers expected. These incongruities reemerged as teachers holding various positions in both primary and secondary schools discussed their experiences of policy implementation. While the lack of teacher support for the policy as implemented reflected the findings of Weppler (1995) and Dinham (1996) the reasons underlying this lack of support were also similar to the reasons teachers have opposed similar policies in the United States (Smylie and Smart, 1990). These reasons can be categorised as:

1. A belief that selection procedures were inadequate to make decisions about advanced skills.
2. The nature of the supplementary role given to Advanced Skills Teachers some of which were not seen as commensurate with the additional financial reward and in keeping with policy intent.
3. The imposition of quotas.

To view these implementation practices as operating discretely and therefore being individually or even cumulatively responsible for changing teachers' attitudes would be simplistic. The broader issue underneath these specific concerns and the issue most responsible for changing teacher attitudes towards the policy post implementation, was a perceived and actual inequity particularly in regards to the assessment of teachers for Advanced Skills Teacher positions and the roles these teachers subsequently performed. This
inequity was a function of disparate and arbitrary policy implementation across the system, hypothesised in this study through the Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) model of policy implementation. The inequities which resulted from this range of implementation practices led to another major theme emanating from the impact of the policy; divisiveness among staff members.

The following two comments best capture what teachers described as the deficiencies of the policy having experienced it implemented:

Maybe I got it wrong from the start, but because it was called AST I thought it was some basic recognition of teaching skill, but although there is a big long rigmarole associated with becoming an AST, it has nothing to do with classroom teaching and the AST roles have nothing to do with classroom teaching. My role is just an extension of my Year Advisers role. (Teacher No: 43)

I expected it to contain encouragement for our better teachers however AST eligibility has become a foregone conclusion for anybody interested. Not the slightest scrap of merit has entered into the system. Then a job description would be imposed on potential applicants and people so far removed from advanced skills that you couldn't imagine it would apply and get the position, do nothing in it and nobody seemed to care. I wonder how this system has managed to keep its teachers who truly have advanced skills. (Teacher No: 4)

Foremost amongst teacher concerns was the belief that selection procedures used to either determine Advanced Skills Teacher suitability or select an Advanced Skills Teacher from a suitability pool were not only incapable of gauging teacher competencies but were applied inconsistently. Reinforcing this belief in the minds of some teachers were selection procedures like the one described below by a primary Advanced Skills Teacher:

The principal just came up to me and asked me to be the AST because he knew it would have given me four year trained money. I had already made it quite clear on numerous occasions that I
wasn't going to go off and complete a university course because I believe that a teacher's teaching suffered when they did that. (Teacher No: 60)

Policy mandates in the area of Advanced Skills Teacher selection were not clear. The advice faxed to principals as policy, (Appendix E) while providing almost two pages of advice on selection procedures was ambiguous and open to interpretation. While including the statement that, ".... an assessment panel will be responsible for identifying those eligible applicants who satisfy the assessment criteria for appointment to vacant positions as Advanced Skills Teachers" (p.5), it concluded with the statement, ".... The interview can be dispensed with by agreement between the panel and the teacher" (Appendix E, p.6). Later, again by incremental change, this directive was clarified and those situations when an interview could be dispensed with was restricted

Although these procedures were later adjusted through incremental change, (Memorandum to Principals SC/HR04) broad guidelines left this aspect of the policy open to interpretation across the system. As a result, teachers described a wide range of selection procedures which had been used to select Advanced Skills Teachers. This finding is consistent with those of Gaffney and Crowther (1983). Although some respondents described selection procedures as 'arduous' and 'legitimate', many teachers described selection procedures where individual teacher merit was not even a consideration for Advanced Skills Teacher suitability. One teacher described a colleague being told that in spite of not having answered any of the interview questions appropriately, he was still going to be made an Advanced Skills Teacher. Another teacher revealed:

At my school the staff agreed to only allow three year trained teachers to go for it until they all had it. I couldn't even go for it so you had these people who had been sitting on their arse for fifteen years, doing nothing about their own professional development who
were getting an arm chair ride to the salary I had to spend five years at university to get. (Teacher No: 121)

In contrast and illustrating the impact of arbitrary implementation of policy across the system, another teacher explained that:

There is a need to be scrupulous in the selection of the AST. It not only has to be fair but also look fair. Our selection process is gruelling. We have an interview panel which includes the Cluster Director, and as a result there was a lot of angst over two teachers who weren't considered suitable as AST's. The boss had great difficulty in explaining to those people but he did. He sat down with them and told them where they needed to brush up their professional knowledge and encouraged them to apply again. But we know that in the school down the road the whole thing is treated as a big joke. There is no selection process so the teachers at our school who miss out are left with these gross examples of inequity. (Teacher No: 33)

In some schools the lack of a merit component in selection procedures was manifest in Advanced Skills Teacher positions being rotated around the school. In some of these schools teachers were satisfied with this procedure seeing it as one way of alleviating the problems associated with the teacher assessment and the quota components of the policy. From a school management point of view, the decision to rotate Advanced Skills Teacher responsibilities approximated one of the options utilised by school administrators in the United States to get greater staff acceptance of career ladder and differentiated staffing schemes (Bacharach et al, 1986; Henson and Hall, 1993). In the case of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy however, the issue remained that because this practice was most suited to schools with smaller staff sizes, it was not a mainstream educational practice and system wide equity issues eventuated. One respondent from a small primary school reported the dichotomy in this way:

In small schools there are less eligible teachers to choose from so
we all take turns. Even with the quota requirement, you know your turn will come around. Everyone seems happy with it. I have been in a larger school and there they have interviews which is a lot more pressure. Now the problem is, that teachers in small schools talk to teachers in larger schools and these inconsistencies arise. (Teacher No: 57)

One result of selection procedures which made no attempt to gauge teacher competencies was a perception amongst teachers that not all Advanced Skills Teachers demonstrated advanced teaching skills. Typical of comments made during interviews which illustrated this view was the comment from a classroom teacher who explained that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy could not be saved because:

So many people have abused it. It isn’t just the people who have appointed teachers who are not skilled; these people who are not skilled, they know they are not skilled but they have accepted it because it is worth a bit of extra money. You always know the teachers who are not skilled because they are the ones who always write ‘AST” after their name. (Teacher No: 111)

The second incongruity which led to teacher dissatisfaction with the policy as implemented was that teachers successful at becoming Advanced Skills Teachers were asked to perform a supplementary role. Teachers believed that what was intended as a reward for being a teacher of advanced skills had become payment for extra duties. Many teachers expressed bewilderment that teachers supposedly judged as having advanced teaching skills should be encumbered with extra duties that took them away from classroom teaching. Again, it was the perception of inequity as a result of disparate implementation practice which galvanised teacher opposition to this aspect of the policy. This inequity is illustrated in the following contrasting comments:

I don’t have a role as such but anything that comes up during the year that no one else will do gets passed onto me. The reason I’m
on leave now is because I was worn out. It can be such a bucket on top of a normal class load. As soon as you have finished something you get something else. (Teacher No: 13)

I haven't done anything extra as an AST. The supposed role I was given was just my Year Advisers responsibility. (Teacher No: 48)

Although the requirement that Advanced Skills Teachers perform a supplementary role was identified as one aspect of policy implementation which impacted to change teachers' attitudes towards the policy, the reward relative to task variable was the only non significant difference between the experiences of the group with a positive attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy post implementation and the group with a negative attitude toward the policy post implementation. Mean scores on the reward relative to task variable for the group who held a positive attitude of \( M = 4.2, SD = 1.9 \) and for the group who did not hold a positive attitude of \( M = 4.3, SD = 2.1 \) revealed strong agreement from both groups that Advanced Skills Teachers had been asked to do too much. The analysis of mean scores on each other independent variable of policy implementation revealed significant differences between the two groups. The finding that with the exception of one variable the two groups had experienced significantly different implementation practices highlighted two factors important in this study. Firstly, teachers who were in favour of the policy post-implementation had experienced different implementation practices than teachers who were not in favour of the policy post implementation. This suggested a strong relationship between school level policy implementation decisions and teachers' attitudes towards the policy. Clearly if there had not been significant differences between the two groups on measures of policy implementation, it could be argued that what teachers had experienced through school level implementation was not an important determinant of their eventual attitude toward the policy.

Secondly, this result dismissed the simplistic notion that on its own, the decision to attach an extra role to the Advanced Skills Teacher position would
lead to negative teacher attitudes towards the policy. On its own, the imposition of an Advanced Skills Teacher role was not sufficient to deter teachers from supporting the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. This finding is consistent with previous research (Ballou and Podgursky, 1993), that teachers prefer alternatives to the uniform salary schedule that involve higher pay for additional duties.

While this finding appeared to conflict with the interview data cited earlier, two sets of data clarified this apparent dichotomy.

Quantitative data revealed that it was not the role as such which teachers objected to, but the nature of the role. Specifically there was a significant difference between the two groups on the relevance of roles to improving classroom practice variable. Mean scores on this variable of \( M = 5, \ SD = 1.8 \) for the group with a positive attitude toward the policy post implementation and \( M = 3.8, \ SD = 1.6 \) for the group with a negative attitude toward the policy post implementation revealed a significant difference. There was also a significant difference between the two groups on the importance of role variable with mean scores of \( M = 6.2, \ SD = 1.6 \) for the group with a positive attitude toward the policy post implementation and \( M = 2.9, \ SD = 1.2 \) for the group who did not have a positive attitude toward the policy post implementation. These results would suggest that it was not the issue of Advanced Skills Teachers being asked to perform extra duties, but the nature of the extra duties that these teachers were required to perform which influenced teachers' attitudes.

The second data set which clarified this issue and supported the statistical findings cited above was qualitative data from interviews. There was widespread agreement from teachers that Advanced Skills Teachers should have some kind of mentoring role within a school; that while teachers designated as having advanced skills should be rewarded for the attainment of those skills, they should share those skills with other teachers as part of
their Advanced Skills Teacher designation. This comment from an Advanced Skills Teacher illustrated this view:

I see it as an alternative pathway, where you're getting some recognition for working in the classroom. Some are seeing it as an executive move and they shouldn't be. I just see myself as a resource. With some staff I work in a structured way; other staff are referred to me for ideas and assistance. The staff have always recognised my expertise in certain areas and are aware that they can come up to me and that I will share with the other members of staff. I have read all the blurb on it and that's what I see the AST as having to do. It is not an executive type role. (Teacher No: 103)

Other teachers supported a similar view of what they considered to be the efficient use of Advanced Skills Teachers. One primary teacher described her ideal Advanced Skills Teacher role. This view reflected original policy intent described in the DEET (1988) and Schools Council (1989, 1990) documents reviewed in Chapter Two:

I like all AST’s to be genuine mentors. Someone who can be approached for advice. Unfortunately most of them have all been given meaningless jobs and seem fairly dispirited with the whole situation. (Teacher No: 115)

These findings are consistent with the findings of Smylie and Smart (1990). In their analysis of career ladder schemes, Smylie and Smart found that teachers’ attitudes towards career ladder schemes varied according to the role successful teachers were asked to perform and that in schemes where teachers supported career ladder positions, these roles were clearly linked to the classroom vis:

.... career ladders may, in fact, provide few meaningful opportunities to improve practice or student learning. They may be viewed as antithetical to the improvement of practice and student learning if expanded roles and responsibilities are not clearly linked to the classroom (p. 152).
Interviews also provided insight into Advanced Skills Teacher roles which teachers did not support, the prescription of which led to teacher dissatisfaction with the policy as implemented:

AST's are performing such a wide range of roles. Some are purely administrative and I would have to put into this category things like organising Sport. Even though I know it's a lot of work how is it using supposedly advanced skills? Others are all about teaching. We have two fantastic AST's. One has been helping teachers develop strategies for extending Gifted and Talented students in the classroom, (a real need at our place,) and the other has been working with teachers in the computer room at lunch time, helping them develop their own computer skills. (Teacher No: 101)

The finding that teachers supported Advanced Skills Teacher roles with a learning and teaching focus was supportive of Herzberg's (1966) description of the role that motivators play in sustaining teacher commitment, and also the work by Lortie (1975) and Smylie and Smart (1990) which suggested that teachers are motivated by the intrinsic nature of their work. The finding that Advanced Skills Teachers in particular most resented roles which were administrative in nature reflected Dinham's (1996) finding where Advanced Skills Teachers related their dissatisfaction to the additional administrative responsibilities which came with some Advanced Skills Teacher roles. The association between a positive attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy post implementation and the types of roles Advanced Skills Teachers were asked to perform is supported and discussed further in the analysis of research question eight.

Some teachers described the impact of Advanced Skills Teacher implementation as a divisive force in their school. This finding is consistent with Smylie and Smart's (1990) research which identified a negative impact of differential salary schedules on collegial relationships. Teachers holding Advanced Skills Teacher positions reported some animosity generated by their selection as an Advanced Skills Teacher and subsequent salary
increase. For many this was manifest in situations like the one described by a secondary teacher below:

It's divisive in the way some non AST's see AST's; you know groups of kids misbehaving at the swimming pool and someone will say to you "You're the AST you speak to them" even though the swimming lessons were in no way connected to your AST role, ... or behaviour problems from the playground will be brought to you with the comment "You're the AST, you earn more than anyone else so you can deal with it.". (Teacher No: 77)

The divisiveness was attributed by some to the quota requirement of the policy. One teacher described the impact of the quota component of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as:

They have thrown us a few crumbs and we have started to fight over them. Quotas have pitted one teacher against another, yet there is no meaning in it, you get it for one year and not another year. (Teacher No: 2)

The impact of quotas reflected the findings of Smylie and Smart (1990) that teachers would not support differential salary schedules where quotas were a component. The issue of quotas however cannot be separated from the broader issue of inconsistent policy implementation particularly that in regards to selection and roles described earlier. Quotas meant that some teachers deemed suitable for Advanced Skills Teacher positions were not going to gain one. Across the system, some teachers who had endured selection procedures with an obvious merit consideration failed to gain Advanced Skills Teacher status or positions while other teachers were given Advanced Skills Teacher positions either on a rotational basis or through other processes lacking merit. Likewise, teachers not successful in gaining Advanced Skills Teacher positions but who still performed extra roles of importance in their schools, were witness to roles of little educational value in other schools being labelled the work of an Advanced Skills Teacher. One
primary school teacher captured the impact of these scenarios in the following comment:

The AST policy is the most divisive policy which has ever been produced by the New South Wales Department of School Education. Teachers ended up vying between themselves because of the number of eligible teachers. Some teachers were given the positions with no explanation why and fantastic teachers were missing out. Some AST's have been asked to perform ludicrous roles of little educational value to the school, while others deemed not suitable for AST positions are still seen by their peers as stimulating people with specific expertise (Teacher No: 9)

Teachers identified the divisive impact of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as also being the product of coalescence with other policy decisions. These comments reflected what Yanow (1990) described as the culture of a policy. One respondent described the other policies as ".... all those policies introduced by Metherell", a reference to the changes overseen by the then Minister for Education, Dr Terry Metherell. This period and some of the accompanying changes had also been identified by Dinham (1995) who identified them as a major source of teacher dissatisfaction. Interviews highlighted two specific policies in this period which had impacted on teachers' attitudes towards the implementation of the policy. The first of these policies was the significant salary increase awarded to teachers in 1991 where all teachers gained a 13% increase, secondary principals gained a 25% increase and primary principals gained a 29% increase (Industrial Commission of New South Wales 1991). The increase awarded to teachers significantly increased the gap between three and four year trained teachers. The nexus between the Advanced Skills Teacher policy and this policy decision was described by one teacher as:

The staff was already split because those who were four year trained got this big pay rise. Then the AST policy split us further because those who weren't four year trained had to compete for a
limited number of AST positions to be on similar money. (Teacher No: 11)

The second 'policy' which impacted on teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was never implemented. This was the suggestion that statewide staffing formulas would be abolished and principals would determine the executive makeup of their school. This had been earlier described by Dr Fenton Sharpe, Director General of School Education before the Industrial Commission hearing that finalised the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as:

Principals will be able to design a wide range of organisation structures within the available salaries budget. *This would permit virtually any mix of staff within the three levels of executive staff, classroom teachers and Advanced Skills Teachers and ancillary staff. Responsibilities could be allocated on a more or less completely flexible basis* ....(italics added) (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991 p.13)

With the realisation that extra roles were attached to an Advanced Skills Teacher position, some teachers saw the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as one way of achieving this aim. This was described by one secondary teacher as:

The half hearted commitment from the Department's part. It arrived at a time when executives were going to be phased out and there was talk that executive positions would be eliminated and that principals would choose certain people to do certain jobs for which they got certain remuneration. The AST policy got somehow caught up in that. Once these positions arrived in schools and the selected people were being given jobs to do, many of which seemed to be executive roles, then there was an understandable uproar. (Teacher No: 36)

Another teacher describing the same connection suggested:
I suspect they would still like to do away with executive teachers and have flexible executives with certain roles attached for a set period. Metherell did talk along those lines for a while and this is what the AST role is approximating. (Teacher No: 40)

Teachers also pointed to the contribution that contrasting commentaries provided by the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation (the importance of which was hypothesised in Chapter Three) made toward teacher disillusionment with eventual Advanced Skills Teacher policy. One teacher recalled how:

It was brought in without it being thought through very well. There were problems with the Federation right from the start who interpreted it differently to the Department. While Federation was running round saying "Don't worry, you will all get this because you all deserve it", the Department was talking about "exceptional teachers doing extra jobs." A friend of mine who teaches in Canberra told me that when it came in down there, virtually all teachers applied for it who had been teaching upwards of about ten years and it was recognition of good teaching. It didn't go with any extra jobs and if you were a competent teacher who was doing your job you automatically got it, no interviews no extra jobs, it was a pat on the back for a job well done. That is how I think it was originally supposed to happen in our system, but then through negotiations with the Department and the Federation it all seemed to change. I think that's when a lot of the good will was lost and teachers in schools said "Blow it, it's not worth all the trouble". (Teacher No: 15)
Research Question Three

Research question three investigated whether teachers working at the primary level of schooling viewed the Advanced Skills Teacher policy differently to teachers working at the secondary level. This question was answered by comparing the attitude change pre and post policy implementation for both groups and analysing the significance of any attitude change with a $t$ test applied to the implementation change scores.

Table 13 provides the mean scores for the pre and post implementation attitudes of both groups, implementation change scores for both groups and the statistical significance of any difference in attitude change.

Table 13
Mean Scores and Mean Change Scores for Primary and Secondary Teachers for their Attitude Toward the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy Pre and Post Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pre Implementation</th>
<th>Post Implementation</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7.2 0.92</td>
<td>4.4 1.7</td>
<td>-2.8 1.84</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.2 1</td>
<td>3.6 1.6</td>
<td>-3.6 1.82</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores based on aggregated scores on two questions where 4 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 13 shows there was a non significant difference between the attitudes of primary ($M = 7.2, SD = .92$) and secondary teachers ($M = 7.2, SD = 1$) towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy before it was implemented. The common pre implementation mean score of 7.2 shows both primary and secondary teachers strongly supported the idea of financially rewarding teachers deemed to have advanced skills. In contrast however was the difference in attitude change having experienced policy implementation between primary ($M = -2.8$) and secondary teachers ($M = -3.6$). While both primary and secondary teachers declined in mean score post implementation
indicating commonality in lack of continued support for the policy, the decline in the mean score for secondary teachers was greater and significantly different to the decline in the mean score for primary teachers. This finding is congruent with the work of Nelson (1986); Hart (1987) and Dickson et al (1992) whose research found that secondary school teachers were less supportive of career ladder schemes than primary school teachers.

Interviews with primary and secondary teachers were instructive in accounting for the difference in the attitude change of the two groups. Secondary teachers described the culture within the two levels of schooling as different. As much as disillusionment with the policy itself, it was this culture which was expressing itself in secondary teachers' responses. One secondary teacher provided this view:

Secondary teachers are scathing of everything. All things considered to come from above are treated with immediate cynicism and disrespect. They are more aware of what's going on and what should be the case. Primary school teachers are of a different mind set... they are too busy writing programs that they don't get the chance to find out what's really going on. (Teacher No: 52)

The faculty structure of the secondary school was described as an impediment to the effective implementation of any educational policy and in particular the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. Faculties were described as representing 'schools within schools' where the achievement of consensus and a shared vision was difficult.

In secondary schools, faculty members stay in faculties so pockets get isolated. This encourages and supports dissidents who feed off one another. Primary schools, where teachers are teaching the same Key Learning Areas have to be more of a team; it is a lot easier to get a shared vision of what the school should be about and later what is happening in the school (Teacher No: 81)
Teachers described the faculty structure of the secondary school as having engendered a degree of competition between faculties to attract students. This has resulted in what one teacher described as a dysfunctional culture in secondary schools where teachers' perceptions of other Key Learning Areas and teachers in them became tainted:

Primary schools have more of a feeling of 'oneness', of 'us'. At a certain point in the secondary system it becomes very competitive; a rivalry across faculties because jobs depend on student choices of various subjects. At our school at the moment there is a big stink because we have an alternate Higher School Certificate pathway called the Work Studies Higher School Certificate, where students do subjects like Hospitality and Office Studies. They don't get a Tertiary Entrance Rank and there are more kids doing these subjects each year, which means there are less numbers doing the traditional Higher School Certificate subjects. This means there is a decreasing need for teachers in those subjects .... so teachers in areas like Humanities, (like History, Geography and Economics) don't have enough kids for their classes to run so their jobs are on the line leading to forced transfers. I think this is driving some of the cross faculty differences in schools which can manifest themselves when it comes to a view of the AST policy (for example). It can taint perceptions of colleagues and school leadership decisions. (Teacher No: 118)

School leaders in secondary schools faced particular difficulties implementing the Advanced Skills Teacher policy across the faculty structure. One result of this was the adoption of coping strategies, the utilisation of which was hypothesised by Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992). One of these strategies was the complete disbandment of merit in the selection process for the sake of 'keeping faculties happy'. In itself, this led to further teacher disillusionment.

One secondary teacher revealed that:

Good teachers aren't attracted to AST positions. The boss will say to a faculty,"You're faculty doesn't have any AST's, how about one of you nominating." The boss doesn't want to have an AST position empty and uses it to try and keep the peace. (Teacher No: 107)
Another secondary teacher reported similar behaviour from his principal resulting in policy implementation which like the practice described above, was also aimed at satisfying school interests rather than policy intent. This teacher described a situation where:

Our numbers are getting so low that House Patrons, (Year Advisers) won't be paid for the roles they perform. So what the boss has decided to do is distribute AST positions amongst these people who will automatically get AST status and money for being a House Patron. Yet some of them aren't even eligible because they have never been assessed as an AST, not even expressed interest in an AST position. The AST position is being used to solve school level problems instead of rewarding the better teachers. (Teacher No: 92)

Another problem which has contributed to the disillusionment of secondary teachers with the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was described as the difficulties faced by some secondary school leaders in communicating Advanced Skills Teacher roles and responsibilities across faculties.

In the secondary system, individual faculties are like schools on their own. Therefore it is much more difficult for teachers to track who is and who isn't an AST or what they are or should be doing. This can breed feelings of inequity and result in teachers interpreting in a very negative way what might be a perfectly legitimate situation. In primary schools, even the large ones, there is not the break down into faculties so communication is easier and more consistent. (Teacher No: 122)

Secondary teachers described the size of the teaching staff in secondary schools and the quota component of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as impacting on the attitudes of secondary teachers towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. While the quota component of the policy attempted to ensure relativity between schools regardless of size, the situation remained that in secondary schools there were many staff who were deemed to have satisfied the requirements for an Advanced Skills Teacher position, but still could not
attain one. A teacher from a secondary school reported that from a staff of fifty four, only three teachers were not eligible for consideration as Advanced Skills Teachers and believed:

It is a slap in the face to be deemed AST and not get the extra money. There is no status in it. They're giving people labels about superior performance and no extra compensation, I mean what other organisation does that. In our school we have all these teachers recognised as advanced yet without the accompanying reward or responsibilities. These teachers tend to be the harshest critics of the AST policy. (Teacher No: 124)
Research Question Four

This research question was generated from the research by Hart (1987) and Ebmeier and Hart (1992). These studies found that teachers of 'less experience' were more positive towards career ladder schemes, than 'highly experienced teachers'. Therefore, research question four investigated any differences in attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy between teachers with differing years of teaching experience. In order to answer this question attitude changes pre and post implementation of five groups according to years of experience were compared. While an analysis of the mean change scores for each group revealed differences in attitude change, the significance of these differences was tested by using an Analysis of Variance. Table 14 provides the mean scores for the pre and post implementation attitudes of each group, implementation change scores for each group and the statistical significance of any differences in attitude change.

Table 14
Mean Scores and Mean Change Scores for Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience for their Attitude Toward the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy Pre and Post Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Of Service</th>
<th>Pre Implementation</th>
<th>Post Implementation</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores based on aggregated scores on two questions where 4 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 14 shows there was a non significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with different years of service to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy pre implementation. Table 14 also shows no significant differences
between the implementation change scores having experienced policy implementation for each group. In descriptive terms, teachers with more years of experience were less positive toward the policy but a significant difference was not substantiated.

The analysis of the quantitative data therefore revealed no significant differences between groups on the pre implementation attitude, or any significant difference between the mean change scores having experienced policy implementation. A comparison of the implementation change scores for the different groups however did reveal some interesting differences in the changed attitudes of teachers. These differences were explored through an analysis of the qualitative data.

The smallest attitude change having experienced policy implementation as gauged by the implementation change scores, was held by teachers with zero to five years of experience, \((M = -2.0)\). Although not at a statistically significant level, implementation change scores then increased with years of experience. This indicated increasing disenchantment with the policy with increasing years of experience, viz; 6 - 10 years, \((M = -2.6)\), 11 - 15 years, \((M = -3.3)\), 16 - 20 years, \((M = -3.3)\) and 21 - 30 years, \((M = -3.5)\).

The finding that teachers of less experience had the smallest mean change score is consistent with the overseas literature, (Hart, 1987; Dickson, 1992; and Ebmeier and Hart, 1992) which indicated that teachers of less experience are more likely to be positive towards alternatives to a uniform salary schedule than their more experienced colleagues. This variation can be explained in a number of ways. Notably, the lack of involvement of teachers of less experience due to their ineligibility (service requirement) had left them more sanguine about the Advanced Skills Teacher process. Teachers of less experience also commented on the attainment of an Advanced Skills Teacher position as being one step onto the promotions ladder, a perception which would be increasingly lost on teachers with
increasing years of service. Significantly, this view also illustrated a lack of acceptance of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy as an alternate pathway from administration, one primary Advanced Skills Teacher suggesting:

It was meant to be a reward for classroom teachers,...another career path, but now if you go for an Executive Teachers job you have to be an AST. It's a step on the promotions ladder. (Teacher No: 85)

Increasing implementation change scores with years of experience was explained as being the product of a degree of disenfranchisement from the process being felt by more experienced teachers. These teachers were described as being from an era 'pre merit selection' with one teacher commenting:

It has been quite divisive on our staff. We have some very talented teachers on our staff who have become quite disillusioned and haven't decided to jump through the hoops to get an increase they really deserve. They tend to be the older teachers, the ones who have never wanted to be upwardly mobile. To their credit they are still doing all the things they have always done. They haven't deserted the kids because of this policy, but clearly they were the teachers the policy was aimed at and they haven't taken up positions. They are products of an era pre interviews and merit selection. These aspects of the present policy continue to disenfranchise them from the rewards possible through the AST position. There are a lot of them too. Why would they bother going through the process of interview for a role some have been doing for years anyway for a measly $1200 dollars. (Teacher No: 21)

This view was elaborated on by one secondary teacher who revealed:

I had List Two seventeen years ago but never attained a Head Teacher position. Now, the level of competence I demonstrated back then is not going to be gauged through an interview and for what, a miserable AST position. I couldn't be bothered. (Teacher No: 26)
In spite of these views, other teachers saw advantages for more experienced teachers in pursuing Advanced Skills Teacher positions. These teachers saw the potential of the role to flatten the hierarchy and provide experienced teachers with some input into the school. One secondary teacher suggested one of the advantages of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was that:

It gives more people a role. One of the problems in schools is that a lot of people are disenchanted in that they feel that their career path has disappeared. I feel that this is why some of our very talented teachers around their forties think, “I’m still a classroom teacher, therefore my chances of being a Head Teacher are not that great anymore and if you’re not a principal by the age of 42 you can kiss the lot goodbye”. (Teacher No: 94)

While some teachers of more experience had entered into the Advanced Skills Teacher selection process and been given Advanced Skills Teacher roles, many found their roles did not utilise their experience and were therefore unsatisfying. One primary teacher revealed:

It was the only carrot that people had; the only way that you thought that after, in my case 17 years, that maybe something I learnt was of some use to other people. But nothing I’ve ever done was ever used by anyone on our school staff. They didn’t want to know about it. (Teacher No: 100)

Teachers described the inclination of some school leaders to ‘give’ more experienced teachers Advanced Skills Teacher positions irrespective of their merit. Some teachers approved of the practice with one teacher remarking that teachers “.... should get it just for sticking around for ten or twenty years.” Other teachers while viewing this practice as inappropriate, conceded concerns with the effectiveness of relatively younger teachers becoming Advanced Skills Teachers when the selection process was not seen as legitimate and when staff were relatively experienced:
One of the problems we have here on the South Coast is that teachers tend to be very experienced. In the minds of some of these teachers, this limits the roles AST's can play in terms of a staff development function. It also makes it very difficult for some AST's. In other regions, if you are an AST with ten years of experience then you are also a senior member of staff as far as experience is concerned. In our region, ten years experience is like first year out. Younger AST's seem to get ignored. (Teacher No: 73)
Research Question Five

Research question five investigated whether teachers of different years of teacher training held different attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. It was based on the belief that the smaller financial incentive in achieving an Advanced Skills Teacher position for four year trained teachers would result in their attitudes towards the policy being different to that of three year trained teachers. For the purpose of collecting and analysing data for this study, two year trained teachers and three year trained teachers were treated as a single group. This decision was based on figures available at the time the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was finalised which revealed that there were only 375 two year trained teachers across the state. (Industrial Commission of New South Wales, 1991, p.18).

This question was answered by comparing the attitude change pre and post policy implementation for both groups and analysing the significance of any attitude change with a $t$ test applied to the implementation change scores. Table 15 provides the mean scores for the pre and post implementation attitudes of both groups, implementation change scores for both groups and the statistical significance of any difference in attitude change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Of Training</th>
<th>Pre Implementation</th>
<th>Post Implementation</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
<td>Mean S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YT</td>
<td>7.1 1.1</td>
<td>4.3 1.8</td>
<td>-2.8 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 YT</td>
<td>7 0.85</td>
<td>4 1.6</td>
<td>-3.0 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores based on aggregated scores on two questions where 4 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 15 shows there was a non significant difference between pre
implementation mean scores for three year trained teachers of \( (M = 7.1, SD = 1.1) \) and for four year trained teachers of \( (M = 7.0, SD = .85) \). Table 15 also reveals a non significant difference between the implementation change scores of three year trained \( (M = -2.8, SD = 1.9) \) and four year trained teachers \( (M = -3.0, SD = 1.8) \) having experienced the policy being implemented.

These findings did not support the belief that three year trained teachers would find both the idea and the implementation of the policy more attractive than four year trained teachers. A number of factors can be viewed as responsible for this uniformity. Specifically, the Enterprise Agreement of December 10, 1993 removed the incremental barrier for three year trained teachers effective from January 1, 1995. This put three year trained teachers on the same salary scale as four year trained teachers and acted to moderate the issue of Advanced Skills Teacher selection as a pathway to the four year trained scale. Alternatively, this finding can be viewed as supporting the work of Herzberg (1966) and specifically as it relates to teachers, Lortie (1975) and others, who described the importance of factors other than financial remuneration in motivating teachers. This view confirmed Dinham’s (1992) finding on teacher resignation that only a minority of teachers commented on salary and that after resigning, teachers in his study actually earned less than they did as teachers (based on average salaries pre and post resignation). It is captured in the following quote from a secondary teacher who exclaimed:

> Extra money won't ever help you get better teachers or teaching. You are either intrinsically into it or you are misplaced. (Teacher No 98)

Interviews provided a number of other factors described as responsible for this uniform response. One three year trained classroom teacher, linked it to the arbitrary nature of policy implementation described in the discussion of research question one:
What teachers don’t like is to be used as scapegoats; to be exploited and taken advantage of. Whether it is the implementation of AST policy or the implementation of syllabus, teachers expect it to be done with a certain degree of professionalism, of consistency. The arbitrariness of what’s happening to them will make them act as a group and react angrily and say “You can’t pay me enough for this job” and you get this general agreement on issues from all levels. (Teacher No: 88)

The roles given to Advanced Skills Teachers and the associated value placed on these roles was also described as responsible for some disillusionment from three year trained teachers. One three year trained Advanced Skills Teacher revealed:

Principals pick people who are nominally able to do a job and fit the criteria, but the catch is they might also be the type of person who rather stupidly like me thinks people actually want them to achieve something. Rather it is a case of them saying “You just go through the motions, we’ll tick the box, our performance appraisal is complete and everybody will be happy.” It took me two years to realise that’s all people really wanted. Nobody cared less about whether you did or didn’t achieve something useful. (Teacher No: 10)

The issue of roles seemed to have been particularly relevant to three year trained teachers disillusioned with policy implementation. These teachers had found that Advanced Skills Teacher roles were either executive responsibilities or of little educational value to the school. Another three year trained teacher commented:

I was quite prepared to be given a role which I could really get stuck in to. I saw it as an opportunity to gain a few extra dollars but showcase some of the skills that I thought I had acquired not at any university, but in front of kids, and colleagues had commented on in the past. When the principal told me he wanted me to create and maintain a detention book I couldn’t believe it. So much for my supposed advanced skills. (Teacher No: 112)
Teachers of three years training also described what they saw as a lack of interest demonstrated by the leadership of some schools in the outcomes of Advanced Skills Teacher positions. This view is captured in the following comment from a three year trained Advanced Skills Teacher who revealed:

There was some very significant work being done which wasn't being valued by the school leadership. I'm only three year trained so there was a lot in it for me in terms of pure financial reward and I wanted to do something in the student welfare area but when I saw the work that AST's had done which was completely devalued through the inaction of the school leadership I thought "What's the point?" (Teacher No: 126)

This data confirmed the findings of Smylie and Smart (1990) who found that teachers will oppose programs where they doubt the commitment of the administration to the program. In many schools, even where Advanced Skills Teacher roles were considered important by teachers, there was a perception held by teachers that the impact of Advanced Skills Teacher roles would be minimal because many were not taken seriously by the school leadership.

Some of our AST's have been given very definite roles including the implementation of new curriculum. The problem is nothing seemed to happen and nobody seemed to care. We had a school development day where the focus was on the new Personal Development/Health/Physical Education curriculum. I thought 'Here's an opportunity for our PD/H/PE AST to lead the way or at least contribute in some way. On the day the relevant consultant came out and did a fine job and left. There was no involvement by our AST, nor in fact expectation from the executive of later involvement by our AST. (Teacher No: 119)
Research Question Six

This research question was generated from two sources. The first of these was the finding of Hart (1987) that the attitudes of school leaders in relation to career ladder schemes varied widely. The second source was the author's belief that executive teachers would be less favourable toward the policy as (a) the policy was not targeting executives and (b) Advanced Skills Teacher allowances put Advanced Skills Teachers on a salary level commensurate with some executives.

Research question six investigated whether teachers holding executive positions in a school viewed the Advanced Skills Teacher policy differently to classroom teachers. The question was answered by comparing the attitude change pre and post policy implementation for both groups and analysing the significance of any attitude change with a $t$ test applied to the implementation change scores.

Table 16 provides the mean scores for the pre and post implementation attitudes of both groups, implementation change scores for both groups and the statistical significance of any difference in attitude change.

Table 16
**Mean Scores and Mean Change Scores for Teachers According to Position in School for their Attitude Toward the Advanced Skills Teacher Policy Pre and Post Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pre Implementation</th>
<th>Post Implementation</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores based on aggregated scores on two questions where 4 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 16 shows that there was a non significant difference between the
attitudes of teachers or executives before the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. The pre implementation mean scores for teachers ($M = 7.0, SD = 1.11$) and executives ($M = 7.4, SD = .79$) do show that executives were more positive toward the policy although not at a statistically significant level. Table 16 also provides implementation change scores for both groups having experienced policy implementation. This shows that there was a significant difference in attitude change between teachers ($M = -3.5, SD = 1.8$) and executives ($M = -2.7, SD = 1.9$) having experienced policy implementation. Teachers were less satisfied with what they had experienced from the policy than were executives.

Qualitative data suggested the issue which seemed to have made executives more supportive of the implementation had also been the issue which most teachers had objected to; the demarcation between Advanced Skills Teacher roles and executive roles. Interview data confirmed the view that many Advanced Skills Teacher roles tended to resemble executive roles. This is consistent with the findings of Edelfelt's study of career ladder schemes (1972, cited by Johnson, 1986) that teaching learning roles were "...shunted aside" (p.70) because it was easier for school administrators to find hierarchical roles. Executives and classroom teachers viewed this practice differently. One executive stated:

"There are advantages for AST's in taking on executive type roles. It gives them great experience in skills like handling people and taking responsibility for a certain area, ... it lets them demonstrate and refine certain skills, like talking to large groups. (Teacher No: 17)"

An Advanced Skills Teacher described his experience as:

"The workload makes the position a cheap executive member. All of my roles have been executive roles. I've handled all the discipline policy, the discipline and award system and liaising with the"
counsellor while others tell me they just get the money. I sit in on every parent interview the boss has. I'm doing 6-8 hours a week extra work and after tax I'd be better paid if I worked in a fish and chip shop. (Teacher No: 65)

Many Advanced Skills Teachers confirmed the practice of being asked to perform executive type roles and the resultant disillusionment which came with this practice:

I've been asked to be an AST for the last three years primarily because nobody else wants the thing but I'm the single income earner in our family and can't afford to knock it back. One of the reasons nobody else wants it is because it has basically become the dropping off point for all the jobs the assistant principal doesn't want. This year my AST role was running school assemblies and having done it for twelve months I now know why he dropped it and gave it to me. (Teacher No: 110)

What seemed to be the issue however, was not the fact that some Advanced Skills Teachers were carrying out roles traditionally seen as the responsibility of the executive, but the nature of those roles. Some Advanced Skills Teachers reported performing what could be termed executive roles with a clear learning and teaching focus linked to staff development. In contrast with the Advanced Skills Teachers who had been given administrative type roles like those described above, these Advanced Skills Teachers seemed satisfied with these responsibilities. One primary Advanced Skills Teacher revealed that:

The increase in workload for executives and principals since Schools Renewal has been monumental. There is a whole range of responsibilities that the executives should have picked up that they have not unreasonably passed onto the AST. I'm quite comfortable as an AST at having picked up executive roles where staff come to me for advice for classroom management and teaching assistance. (Teacher No: 71)
Another primary Advanced Skills Teacher reported favourably on a collaborative approach where executive members worked with the Advanced Skills Teacher in a shared role:

I work with the Executive Teacher and if I wasn’t there he would be doing it by himself so in that way it lightens their role a little but it also becomes a great development exercise for both the AST and the Executive member. (Name provided) told me that he got a lot out of doing the role with me and had learnt from me. (Teacher No: 6)

One primary executive reported on the potential for this model of policy implementation when she stated:

Some executive are truly sincere in their desire to implement collaborative leadership and the AST positions do provide an opportunity for that if it is managed well. The same executives see it as a great opportunity for some genuine leadership from the peers of classroom teachers who might not otherwise be able to do it because they weren’t wearing another stripe or hat so to speak. In schools, where the AST role has been put in place in an honourable way there is that sort of capacity. (Teacher No: 106)

Although the statistical conclusion that teachers were less satisfied with what they had experienced than executives was supported by the interview data, other responses from executive members reflected issues outside those supporting this conclusion. These issues highlighted the difficulties which are faced when work redesign occurs at one level. Quite clearly, when the work of teachers was reorganised, the work of the executive members who supervised them was also reorganised. This reorganisation not only impacted on the relationship the executive and the Advanced Skills Teacher shared, but also the relationship that executives shared with other members of staff. In redefining one person’s role, other roles were simultaneously redefined. While Advanced Skills Teachers preferred their roles to include a teaching and learning focus, some executives pointed disappointingly to the remnants
they were left with after Advanced Skills Teachers had been given these traditionally executive responsibilities. One primary executive expressed frustration with the roles she had seen Advanced Skills Teachers given:

What frustrates me is the roles AST's are given. We know they can't do playground duty rosters because they aren't allowed to do the administrative stuff. But they are allowed to do staff development and I think hang on that's what I enjoy doing. We know they can do staff development but they are not allowed to supervise people, that becomes my job again and that is where all the accountability and accompanying stress is. They seem to get the best of both worlds all the time. The role needs to be more clearly defined at a system level because principals seem to lack the guidance and support to specify creative and legitimate roles which won't upset Federation and yet don't undermine executive positions. (Teacher No: 128)
**Research Question Seven**

This research question was generated from the review of literature where Hart (1987); Dickson et al (1992) and Conley and Levinson (1993) found that teachers who competed for and obtained career ladder positions were more supportive of the opportunities for growth than teachers who did not.

Research question seven therefore investigated whether teachers who were holding or had previously held Advanced Skills Teacher roles viewed the Advanced Skills Teacher policy differently to classroom teachers who had not held Advanced Skills Teacher roles. The question was answered by comparing the attitude change pre and post implementation for both groups and analysing the significance of any attitude change with a $t$ test applied to the implementation change scores.

Table 17 provides the mean scores for the pre and post implementation attitudes for Advanced Skills Teachers and classroom teachers, implementation change scores for both groups and the statistical significance of any difference in attitude change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pre Implementation</th>
<th>Post Implementation</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Mean 7.2, S.D 0.91</td>
<td>Mean 4.3, S.D 1.7</td>
<td>Mean -2.9, S.D 1.8</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Mean$ scores based on aggregated scores on two questions where 4 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Table 17 shows a non significant difference between the pre implementation attitudes of Advanced Skills Teachers, ($M = 7.2, SD = .91$) and classroom
teachers, \((M = 7.0, SD = 1.11)\). Mean scores for both groups showed strong pre implementation support for the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. That the mean scores for both groups should be so similar is a reflection of the to be expected relative attractiveness of the policy pre implementation to both groups.

Table 17 also provides implementation change scores for both groups for the change in attitude having experienced policy implementation. This shows that there was a significant difference in attitude change having experienced policy implementation, between Advanced Skills Teachers \((M = -2.9, SD = 1.8)\) and classroom teachers \((M = -3.5, SD = 1.79)\). This finding reflected those of Hart (1992) in her study of career ladder schemes.

This result was not unexpected. School structures had traditionally been characterised by a lack of differentiation between classroom teachers other than those occupying executive positions. The introduction of a new policy, particularly one based around quotas was always going to threaten the professional commitment of those teachers deemed unsuitable, or in the case of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, suitable but without a position. Interview data shed light on the differences in attitude change between Advanced Skills Teachers and classroom teachers. This saw the reemergence of three of the dominant themes of the study; poor selection procedures, inappropriate roles and the imposition of quotas. Related to the problems associated with the quota was the concern expressed by a number of teachers that the nature of the teaching population and deficiencies in the selection process meant selection procedures were unable to distinguish between candidates, thus confirming the caveats placed on evaluation systems by the Contracts Literature. One secondary teacher suggested:

The basic problem in teaching is an economic one. You have a highly homogeneous work force with a very small ability range from which to differentiate. You have high levels of continuing
professional development which has meant a certain kind of uniform level of development. They have all been there 20 years, they have all got a BA Dip Ed and they are all churning out great kids, yet some are going to get extra rewards. (Teacher No:30)

As a result of the perceived inadequacies in selection procedures, many classroom teachers considered teachers holding Advanced Skills Teacher positions were not necessarily teachers with 'advanced skills'. Teachers described a flow on effect where teachers with advanced skills were discouraged from considering Advanced Skills Teacher selection, viewing the label and the position as meaningless:

I've known many situations on staffs where teachers who were truly advanced skills teachers were so disillusioned they wouldn't apply, preferring to maintain their professional integrity and reputation with the people that mattered rather than pursue and be seen to be part of a complete farce. It was not so much the AST position but rather the mismanagement of the concept behind the AST policy which has turned appropriate teachers away from it. (Teacher No: 62)

Other teachers, while stating that the Advanced Skills Teachers at their school were the better teachers expressed their dismay that the quota component of the policy prevented every worthy teacher being rewarded:

All the AST's at my school are worthy teachers, however all the teachers at my school are worthy of AST status and reward. The fact that a system imposed quota has forced our very well intended boss to make judgments between people he would never have made otherwise has led to a degree of resentment by staff, not between the boss and teachers but between teachers and teachers. (Teacher No: 70)

Interview data revealed Advanced Skills Teacher roles and a lack of communication of these roles contributed to teacher dissatisfaction. This led to suspicion and resentment on the part of many classroom teachers. While
data provided previously suggested this could be an issue confined to secondary schools via the difficulties encountered in the faculty system, many primary school classroom teachers reported a similar situation in existence. One teacher teaching at two primary schools photocopied the questionnaire and returned both copies. She justified this action on the grounds that she had seen policy being implemented differently in the two schools and therefore held opposing attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. This teacher stated that she:

Wouldn't have a clue what the AST does or is supposed to do. At the school where I like it, the AST is the English coordinator she has done all the work K-6 in implementing the new document which is now defunct of course. It was spelt out quite clearly that they were looking for someone to take charge of English. The other school I'm not sure what they do and I'm not sure what they are supposed to be doing. I'm sure if you asked they would tell you but they shouldn't have to should they because if it had any value it would be visible; people would know. (Teacher No: 38)

Many classroom teachers expressed resentment with some Advanced Skills Teacher roles. It seemed to be a common practice that Advanced Skills Teachers at both primary and secondary levels were given a role yet did nothing extra in that role. Classroom teachers found these roles inappropriate. At the primary level this was manifest in situations where the Release From Face To Face (RFF) teacher taught one Key Learning Area across the school and was made an Advanced Skills Teacher on the basis of this contribution alone. While teachers expressed concerns of equity about this practice, they were also concerned about the lack of value these roles held for other teachers. Typical of these concerns were the following comments from two classroom teachers:

Most of the roles are being done by teachers who like to do a certain subject with kids and they take the RFF job and just do it...they don't work with teachers. (Teacher No: 15)
Another primary teacher had found:

Most of the roles have been about improving teaching and learning but not the performance of teachers. For example, I don't agree with roles where someone might be given the AST role for Personal Development/Health/Physical Education and then just teach that throughout the school on an RFF basis. They are really only doing a normal teaching load but getting AST money and no other teachers are benefiting from their experience. (Teacher No: 46)

An implementation decision similar to the one described above which seemed to be common in primary schools was the practice of making the librarian an Advanced Skills Teacher but not giving the librarian any extra duties to go with the position. This had led to resentment, a number of teachers expressing their concern as:

Criteria seems to be based on not what you do in the classroom but on what you can do outside the classroom. Our librarian is an AST yet she rarely ever teaches. At the time other teachers joked that they had never seen the librarian teach not alone teach at an advanced level. But she has time to do all these other things to write submissions and look good. Now if I only taught that amount of time and didn't have to organise excursions and socials, report to parents or present assembly items etc then I could look that good. (Teacher No: 114)

The concern seemed to be not only the obvious equity concern but that by valuing the contribution that librarians and RFF teachers made to a school through making their positions Advanced Skills Teacher positions without extra responsibilities, there was a simultaneous devaluing of the work of classroom teachers. This was best expressed by one primary teacher who stated:

Our librarian got it and her area was library. Now she's a good librarian, but I'm a good classroom teacher so I wondered why I couldn't get it just for being a good classroom teacher. I think the
problem is that bosses have great difficulties thinking up AST roles, but they don't want to let the AST position leave the school. (Teacher No: 41)

A corollary to the practice described above at the secondary level was Advanced Skills Teachers being provided with release to perform their Advanced Skills Teacher duties. Some teachers were given the Advanced Skills Teacher role on the basis that they could use a lower period load to perform the duties:

Another way AST positions are designated (to give you an example), you might have a Social Science teacher who has a few floating periods in a certain area. That person might be directed, “You can do this and take that on as a role” So the teacher gets the AST money and time to perform the duties associated with the role. So teachers have picked up a position just by virtue of their teaching allocation in the first instance. (Teacher No: 75)
Research Question Eight

This research question was based on the belief held by the author and described through the Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) model of educational policy making, that the implementation of educational policy will vary across the school system. This variation will be a response to the personal interests of stakeholders and the organisational interests of each school. Specific to this study was the further belief that as well as being related to some personal and school characteristics, teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy would also be a function of their divergent experiences of school level policy implementation. This research question set out to identify those school level policy implementation decisions associated with positive teacher attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. To answer this question a stepwise multiple regression was carried out. The measure of each teachers post implementation attitude was regressed against the twelve sub scales representing school level implementation processes. Table 18 shows the results of this regression.

Table 18
Explained Variance, Root Mean Square Error, F Value and Significance Levels Obtained from Regression of School Level Implementation Decisions against Post Implementation Attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>% of explained variance</th>
<th>RMS residual</th>
<th>F test</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance of the Advanced Skills Teacher is assessed</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>82.494</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback provided to staff on selected Advanced Skills Teacher</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of criteria to teaching and learning</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>48.055</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of roles to improving classroom practice</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>38.979</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 reveals four of the twelve variables of policy implementation remained in the equation for a total $R^2$ of .605. In the first step of the
regression, the variable with the highest partial correlation, performance of the Advanced Skills Teacher is assessed was entered into the equation. Table 18 shows that this variable alone contributed 45.2% of the explained variance. At the second step, feedback provided to the staff on the selected Advanced Skills Teacher was entered. The addition of this variable to the equation added 10.3% to the explained variance and decreased the standard error of the estimate to 1.179. At the third step, relevance of criteria to teaching and learning was added to the equation. The addition of this variable added another 3.3% to the explained variance and decreased the standard error of the estimate to 1.134. The fourth and final step saw the addition of roles relevant to improving classroom practice to the equation. This added another 1.7% to the explained variance for a final explained variance of 60.5%. The addition of this variable also decreased the standard error of the estimate to 1.11.

While the statistical analysis identified these decisions as significant in explaining a positive attitude toward the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, interview data was again relied upon to describe the way these implementation decisions were implemented and provide a rationale for their association with a positive attitude toward the Advanced Skills Teacher policy.

Attempts by school leadership to evaluate the performance of Advanced Skills Teachers explained 45.2% of the variance of the post implementation attitude. The inclusion of this decision into the equation was consistent with the findings of Hart (1992).

Interviews with teachers revealed a wide range of practices being adopted by school leadership to (a) evaluate the performance of Advanced Skills Teachers and (b) to make this evaluation public knowledge within the school. Although a feedback component was a feature of early policy formulation, (Schools Council, 1989) these disparate practices can be traced to the limited policy
advice that principals received. The original policy faxed to principals, (Appendix E) under the subheading Review Of Advanced Skills Teachers advised principals that Advanced Skills Teachers could be reappointed if the position still existed, if their performance was appropriate and if the teacher had satisfactorily completed his/her annual performance review.

The guidelines provided to principals in November, 1992 (effective 1993) added to this:

The principal is required to review the performance of each currently appointed Advanced Skills Teacher. The review is to be based on the agreed roles and responsibilities of the specific Advanced Skills Teacher position. The review should determine whether or not each Advanced Skills Teacher has satisfactorily performed the Advanced Skills Teacher duties. (Appendix G, p.5)

One practice in schools where the performance of the Advanced Skills Teacher was evaluated, was the Advanced Skills Teacher reporting to a staff meeting on what their role had been and what they believed they had achieved. On some occasions, this was tabled in the form of a one page statement, independent of the principal or school executive. A number of executives described this practice as the result of principals not having the time to examine the performance of Advanced Skills Teachers. It seemed that in some schools, the involvement of the principal in this aspect of the process was not essential for teachers to look favourably on the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. One secondary Advanced Skills Teacher described an evaluative process which had satisfied teachers as:

We're presenting the work we have done (student welfare) to the staff and evaluating it ourselves. The principal isn't evaluating our performance, we're getting feedback directly from the staff on our performance and if appropriate our products. (Teacher No: 105)

Practices like this seemed to be sufficient in maintaining the integrity of the
process in the eyes of other teachers. Interview data revealed that teachers did not expect the evaluation of an Advanced Skills Teacher role to be a unwieldy process, as long as some feedback was available. One secondary teacher commented:

These people are only getting an extra twenty dollars a week before tax so no body should expect their evaluation to be a big deal. What other teachers and for that matter, the AST themselves need to know however is that the AST position is taken seriously by principals. One way they can show this is by expressing some interest in the outcomes of the position. (Teacher No: 116)

For Advanced Skills Teachers the evaluation of their performance was an indicator that their work was valued. Teachers who were Advanced Skills Teachers highlighted a nexus between some form of evaluation and perceptions of the relative importance of their work. These teachers were describing what Herzberg (1966) would label a Motivation Factor and what Porter's (1961) reconstruction of Maslow's hierarchy would label Self Esteem and Autonomy. That many Advanced Skills Teachers required this feedback is captured in this comment from an Advanced Skills Teacher who felt:

Great professional trust...nobody ever asked me what I was doing but in my evaluation at the end of the year I said I would have liked to have been asked half way through the year how I thought I was going. (Teacher No: 50)

Where this evaluation was missing, Advanced Skills Teachers reported feelings of:

I got sick of doing all this work for no recognition. It wasn't the reward. I was getting the pittance that accompanies the label, but I was busting myself in half, coming up with some great stuff that wasn't being used. The Cluster Director asked us to look at building a bridge within the cluster for Years 6 and 7 in Science and Technology. We got the secondary teachers involved, the
University came down and got involved. We brought Years 6 and 7 together and we shared curriculum documents but there was no attempt to measure the usefulness of what I had done and the mapping exercise that I documented as one outcome of it was never used. I could have done nothing with the role and no one would have noticed or cared. (Teacher No: 44)

For classroom teachers and executives, some form of evaluation of Advanced Skills Teacher performance satisfied concerns of equity. It was further related to the perception that some Advanced Skills Teacher roles were not of significant value to the school. Where some form of evaluation was missing, teachers doubted the commitment of the school leadership to the Advanced Skills Teacher role. This had the consequence of further demeaning the role in the eyes of these teachers. One primary teacher said:

Since the early days the AST thing has lost all credibility. If you don't get it you will look like a dud. Initially it was a big deal. If someone became an AST you patted them on the back and said "Congratulations you are an AST". Now the baton is just passed on with no attempt to seriously look at what each AST has done. One principal said to one person here; "Sign this, you are now an AST", and didn't bother speaking to them again. It hasn't rewarded classroom teachers at all, in fact the lack of interest that some principals have demonstrated for it has flowed to teachers who don't care anymore either. The money available certainly isn't worth any extra so if no one cares about what extra you do as an AST there's no point in applying. (Teacher No: 24)

Teachers described the impact of other policy decisions on the ability of school leadership to respond to the performance of some Advanced Skills Teachers. In particular the review of the Eltis Committee in August, 1995 which brought a halt to the curriculum implementation timetable of the previous government removed the roles of some of the designated Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teachers, (English in the primary system and Profiles and Literacy in the secondary system). This left these Advanced Skills Teachers without a role and therefore nothing to evaluate. A number of
teachers commented on the implications this had for broader teacher perceptions of Advanced Skills Teacher effectiveness. One secondary executive revealed that in his school:

The Profiles situation this year hardly made it attractive for people. It's just all sitting there now isn't it. They haven't been able to do anything. I mean I guess people might consider AST now if they think half way through the year the Department was going to tell them the job they had been designated to do throughout the school was all up for review and then effectively stopped. It's just been a great year for cynics and that is a hard battle to fight for an executive. (Teacher No: 96)

The other three implementation practices identified in the stepwise regression (feedback provided to staff on selected Advanced Skills Teacher, relevance of criteria to teaching and learning and roles relevant to improving classroom practice) had a cumulative explained variance after performance of the Advanced Skills Teacher is evaluated of 15.3%. Interview data from teachers suggested that as policy implementation decisions, these three variables exhibit high degrees of reciprocity. In schools where Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation satisfied teachers, they were interrelated through a model of school management which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Policy advice indicating the necessity or even desirability of providing feedback to the staff on the selected Advanced Skills Teacher was not made. In spite of the fact that principals were not asked to provide feedback to staff on why certain teachers had been selected as Advanced Skills Teachers, many teachers described a belief that this information would be forthcoming if they requested it. This level of availability of feedback seemed to satisfy the equity concerns being felt by teachers, even unsuccessful candidates. Other teachers described principals who did provide feedback to staff members on why certain people were selected. One secondary teacher revealed:
The principal always explains to unsuccessful applicants first and then the rest of the staff why he chose who he chose and it is always based on information he already had - not from information you tell him. He is very observant and knows what the individual strengths and weaknesses of his staff are. (Teacher No: 117)

Lack of appropriate feedback on those teachers selected as Advanced Skills Teachers became an issue in schools where teachers perceived inappropriate candidates had been chosen. One secondary teacher saw the lack of feedback provision as a way for principals to rotate Advanced Skills Teacher positions to accommodate competing interests in some schools:

Although unsuccessful candidates have been told why they didn’t get the position, I think it has just been an excuse. The principal just wanted to give it to someone else who ended up making their own role. The principal just said, ‘This year our priority is student welfare.’ We knew he was struggling to justify his decision. Student welfare is always a priority. Instead he should have said, “This year the AST will have to be able to do ..., who is interested and how can you show that you could do it.” This has never been done. (Teacher No: 79)

Other respondents attributed less sanguine motives for the inaction of their principal in justifying Advanced Skills Teacher decisions. In describing principals who went to some lengths to avoid having to provide staff with feedback on selected Advanced Skills Teachers, these respondents were also describing principals who were attempting to satisfy the organisational interests of the school through the selective interpretation of policy mandates. One primary executive member revealed how:

Quite often when unsuitable candidates were going to be selected as AST’s a number of the executive would express their opposition. With no attempt being made to justify the decision, these concerns were usually put aside with the rider that this would provide the person with professional development. Now I don’t accept that now and I didn’t accept it then because that was not the original concept
of AST. To be labelled an AST meant that you were there already. I don't mind them being given an AST role as long as it is communicated clearly throughout the school that they have been granted AST status on the grounds of their role being played in the school before they undertake any extra duties. If they are prepared then to be used in the school over and above their classroom teaching duties then I regard that as professional development. (Teacher No: 19)

Another primary teacher revealed that:

One of our AST's has been what you would have to describe as a recalcitrant. This person has tried to impede any initiative which other staff members have tried to create. He/she has had stand up arguments with the principal during staff meetings and at one stage a process which was to bring into question his/her competence was commenced. This person was (although is no longer) an AST who had the trivial role of (role provided but omitted to ensure anonymity.) Now, whether the principal was trying to buy this persons cooperation, or whether the principal's action was a sincere attempt to professionally develop this person, perhaps even raise their self esteem is irrelevant. The principal made no attempt whatsoever to explain or justify his selection because what he did was in explainable. What mattered was that no one in the school considered this person to be in any way advanced. The result was, (and this was in the early days of AST's) the complete denigrating of the AST position in our school, a situation which has not been rectified and probably never will. (Teacher No: 95)

Policy advice in the area of selection criteria provided principals with eight 'abilities and characteristics' which formed the selection criteria against which the selection panel was to assess applicants. (Appendix E) Where there were more teachers who satisfied the selection criteria than there were Advanced Skills Teacher positions, the principal in the case of school based appointments and the Cluster Director in the case of cluster based appointments were to recommend the most suitable applicants. The Guidelines for Principals, November 1992 (effective 1993) emphasised the
need to establish the suitability of each applicant against the general criteria only and not on the basis of specific role statements for a particular Advanced Skills Teacher position. (Appendix G) In schools where there were more teachers considered suitable as Advanced Skills Teachers than there were Advanced Skills Teacher positions, this procedure created a suitability list. On the basis of established school needs, the principal then selected an applicant from the suitability list and negotiated specific roles and responsibilities with the selected applicant.

The inclusion of relevance of criteria to teaching and learning as contributing toward a positive attitude toward the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, reflected Elam's (1989) and Smylie and Smart's (1990) findings about teacher unwillingness to participate in programs where they believed their work could not be appropriately evaluated. It is clear that where the selection criteria provided in the policy guidelines alone was used to assess teacher suitability as an Advanced Skills Teacher, then teachers viewed the process as ineffective in gauging teacher competence. One of the difficulties principals faced was where they had a pool of candidates who had been granted suitability as an Advanced Skills Teacher. Policy advice dictated that selection of the successful candidate from this pool was to be done by the principal alone. This decision was at odds with the decisions preceding it as for the first time it took the Advanced Skills Teacher policy away from a collaborative base and into the principal's office and out of scrutiny. One teacher commented that:

I would like to know exactly what the principal considers to be advanced skills. As far as I am concerned, the criteria that the application form says AST's have to satisfy most teachers with some experience should walk in. If the boss must rank teachers which is what is required in this process, it must be done fairly and teachers should be told, "This is what I was looking for and this is what other teachers said or have done." (Teacher No: 64)
Where selection criteria remained generic and there was no attempt to provide staff with information on how the successful Advanced Skills Teacher measured up against specific requirements for each Advanced Skills Teacher position, concerns for equity and a certain level of cynicism were the result. (Equity Theory) This finding was consistent with those of Gaffney and Crowther (1993). One primary teacher described her belief that:

Criteria were never set down beforehand. Staff have never been told what AST's should be able to do or what the position should involve. He has just selected the ones that he wants to select and then fitted the roles to them. We wouldn't have a clue what their supposed advanced skills were. None of the roles have been about assisting other teachers. This is another of the things that irks me about AST roles. I have certain expertise in research. AST's were selected and then given a role. That role turned out to be research to assist our Disadvantaged Schools Program and equity program. I couldn't even be considered. These weren't designated AST roles but the AST's get to do these things as they come up ... ad hoc decision making. (Teacher No: 67)

In the area of Advanced Skills Teacher roles, original policy advice noted that Advanced Skills Teacher roles should place an emphasis on assisting beginning teachers and provided eight broad areas where Advanced Skills Teacher roles could be focussed. The final decision was determined by the principal following discussions with the Advanced Skills Teacher (Appendix E). The November 1992 Guidelines (effective 1993) suggested that Advanced Skills Teacher roles should be related to school needs identified through a process of collaboration (Appendix G). It was then recommended that specific roles within these broad areas be negotiated with the appointed Advanced Skills Teacher.

The inclusion of roles relevant to improving classroom practice reflected Needs Theory, the meaningfulness component of Hackman and Oldham's job enrichment model and the research findings of Smylie and Smart (1990) and
Ballou and Podgursky (1993). Inclusion in the regression equation supported the principal finding of research question two; that the attachment of a role to the Advanced Skills Teacher position in itself was not sufficient to negatively influence teachers’ attitudes towards the policy however, the *nature of the role* Advanced Skills Teachers were asked to perform did influence teachers’ attitudes. One secondary teacher who was an Advanced Skills Teacher revealed:

> I used advanced skills but they weren’t my teaching skills. That’s where my disagreement with the whole policy is. I don’t think it is such a bad thing to reward teachers who are willing to do things for the whole school community and that’s what a lot of the AST roles involve; school/community links and broader student welfare concerns. These parent participation and student welfare AST’s really are benefiting the school community however I think it’s a misnomer to say that they are the classroom teachers with advanced teaching skills. They are probably good organisers, they most certainly have the welfare of the school at heart and it’s nice that they are being rewarded in some way but it shouldn’t be put forward that these people are the people with advanced skills in the classroom. Surely if they had been recognised as such then the leadership of the school would be using them to better effect with other teachers. (Teacher No: 66)

Where teachers supported the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, they had witnessed Advanced Skills Teacher roles which supported the improvement of classroom practice. The data and discussion accompanying research question one detailed the kinds of roles teachers preferred to see Advanced Skills Teachers performing. These roles are characterised by the involvement of the Advanced Skills Teacher in a mentoring capacity where Advanced Skills Teachers can be viewed as a resource for the improvement of other teachers. This did not mean that the designated Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teacher positions implemented with the Enterprise Agreement signed in 1993 were universally successful. These positions were targeted at emerging curriculum emphases. Interview data suggested the assumption of a nexus
between these emerging curriculum and teacher needs was simplistic and the imposition of Advanced Skills Teacher roles along these lines did not ensure the effectiveness of these positions. Undermining the perceived utility of these targeted Advanced Skills Teachers were descriptions of some Advanced Skills Teachers restricting their role to ‘pinning flyers for in service courses on the notice board’ or ‘showing us new resources during staff meetings’, practices in themselves indicative of a lack of evaluation of the Advanced Skills Teacher role by school leadership. One primary teacher explained this as:

There is development and there is development. Some of these AST’s can point to all sorts of things they have ‘done’ for other teachers but most of it isn’t done in front of kids or in situations where the other teacher can really benefit. It may be just sticking things on notice boards, or writing things in the newsletter but it doesn’t help anybody really. (Teacher No: 86)

One teacher expressed concern that the introduction of the designated Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teacher positions had led to a situation where:

Some of these people are selecting themselves. At our school, the positions specified by the Department meant that there was only one person at our school with a background which allowed her to do the job. As a result of being AST she has attended all these courses but hasn’t helped anybody else improve themselves. (Teacher No: 76)

Primary teachers commented on the lack of support provided by the Department for the designated English Advanced Skills Teachers and the impact of forces outside the control of the principal, notably delays in curriculum implementation and the impact of the Eltis review.

The significance of each of these variables can be viewed in a holistic way.
Interviews with teachers who viewed Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation in their schools as successful revealed that each of these variables occurred with maximum staff involvement irrespective of policy mandates and resulted in roles and responsibilities which ensured a teaching and learning focus. These findings are consistent with those of Ebmeier and Hart (1992) whose research into career ladder plans considered successful by teachers highlighted the need to maximise staff input into the implementation of the plans and Hart (1992) who found ".... when teachers accrue more decision making authority over professional issues, their autonomy and the significance of their work for others increase. Professional autonomy and task significance are enhanced for those in the new authority roles" (p.375).

Staff involvement also provided a framework on which teachers could make judgments about the respective worth of certain candidates. Where these practices were a feature of Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation, they seemed to stem from a model of decision making already present in the school which transcended Advanced Skills Teacher implementation alone. It was a model of school organisation featuring flat management structures and incorporating participative decision making in every step of the process up to but excluding selection of the Advanced Skills Teacher. As well as being part of a process which identified school needs, staff in these schools described opportunities for input into the setting of specific criteria and the creation of roles. This was contrary to the policy which suggested these aspects of implementation be left to the principal.

One primary teacher described an Advanced Skills Teacher process at her school ".... which the whole school owned." While describing specific advantages in this process for school leadership in not being seen as the person who was selecting, (or rather not selecting) Advanced Skills Teachers, the teacher also described a school where staff involvement in decision making had increased perceived levels of equity and accountability within the
school and where the entire process from selection criteria through to role
description and evaluation linked the Advanced Skills Teacher position to the
educational needs of the school. In the case of the selection criteria, this had
the effect of augmenting the relevance of the initial general criteria by making
it site specific and apposite to school needs. It also allowed staff to have
input into the role description of each Advanced Skills Teacher. The teacher
described the process as:

We work out our needs for the following year and parents, teachers
and students are asked to contribute to that. Once we identify our
needs we categorise them and from those categories we form our
teams. People nominate for what team they would like to be on.
Then the team makes up a school plan for that area which will meet
the needs which have been identified. We get a budget and we
work to the plan, and we evaluate it. Part of that plan may be the
allocation of an AST to help us achieve our goals. The team decides
on the role an allocated AST will perform as part of our team and
from this role the team makes decisions about what that AST needs
to be able to do. This becomes the selection criteria for that
particular AST role. People who think they have those skills or
would like to do those things apply. This narrows the field down a
bit but at the same time opens it up because each team is actually
specifying certain skill requirements across a broad area rather
than just asking for the best teacher. Specifying skill requirements
at this level of detail makes it so much easier for teachers to gauge
their own worth and chances in the role. The team also sets the
role which then becomes the role description. The team then says,
"These are the qualities we want our AST to have." The executive
chooses the AST so that the team doesn't have to wear any flack.
When the role is evaluated the team invites the AST in and the AST
tells the team and the executive how they thought they have
managed the role, what problems they have had and what the
pluses were. It doesn't come down to saying "You have done a
good job or you haven't" but the person tells the story of their year
in the role. It has worked well. (Teacher No: 34)

In spite of the structural difficulties documented earlier in this chapter which
appeared to be faced by secondary school leadership in implementing
Advanced Skills Teacher policy, respondents provided examples from the secondary system where similar management of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy had been achieved. One secondary teacher described how:

At the end of each year the staff decide on possible areas for the AST positions to operate. Suggestions are called for and then everyone gets to vote on what could become the AST positions next year. This usually provides us with some tight role descriptions, not just priority areas. Results are printed out and discussed and then the executive discuss the priority areas. These are stated out front and a little job statement is provided for each position detailing what it is hoped will be achieved. People nominate for the jobs that are available in terms of the specific role statement for that position. This is followed by an interview procedure which is quite formal but not quite as stressful as it used to be for these positions. After a teacher is selected, a short blurb goes into the staff bulletin once again stating the specific role and the successful applicant. The duties the AST will perform are then spelt out in quite clear language. Even if an AST leaves midstream it is published in the Bulletin that that person is leaving and expressions of interest are invited. (Teacher No: 91)

One of the results of the inclusion of staff in the generation of selection criteria, was a teaching and learning focus. As a result of that focus and the consensus that it represented, principals seemed confident in stating the qualities that the successful applicant brought to the position. Teachers were able to make their own judgments as to the degree of symmetry between the successful applicant and the role requirements.

In schools where these practices were a component of policy implementation, the suitability of the selected Advanced Skills Teacher could be described relative to clear role statements which were the product of staff collaboration and which aimed to satisfy some identified school need. This practice satisfied some of the deficiencies identified by Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1994) in the original policy, particularly that the selection criteria were generic. These schools achieved an appropriate mix of policy implementation.
Teachers had input into Advanced Skills Teacher roles to feel comfortable with the selection criteria, without implementing a full blown peer assessment approach, a process seen by some (Scriven, 1989) as ineffective in cases of teacher assessment.

While the inclusion of these practices as a product of staff involvement seems to be associated with positive teacher attitudes, it seems the converse is also true. In describing what they believed needed to be done in schools to make the policy a success, a number of respondents were actually describing the situations which existed in schools where the policy was seen as a success. One primary teacher stated:

Some principals haven't had enough education on pure management issues. They haven't made it clear to the staff what they hope to achieve by organising their school in a certain way. Where schools are organised along flatter management patterns the AST policy seems to have been more successful because every aspect of the process is open to individual scrutiny and input.' (Teacher No: 93)

Another teacher (support) extending this potential for Advanced Skills Teacher implementation being a reflection of total school management practice based the following comment on her experiences in both primary and secondary schools:

I've noticed that the schools where the AST policy is seen in a poor light by staff are the same schools where every policy or new initiative is seen in a poor light. There must be a common denominator there mustn't there. Some principals have been slow to catch onto the fact that involving staff in school decisions is good sense, not just politically appropriate. The good principals are saying; "Let's see what we can do with this, any ideas?" In schools where this approach is taken staff involvement is at a maximum. Particularly in terms of AST roles, principals need to be more creative because the policy left them with very little support and who could give it to them,... the Cluster Director had never had to do it either. Good principals realised that in their schools were
practitioners who were probably bursting with ideas for AST roles and the good principals tapped into these ideas. The pay off for the principal was that in empowering teachers they were letting the people who the policy was intended for develop it for themselves. (Teacher No: 49)

Another secondary teacher suggested that while the theory behind the position implied the existence of a certain management culture in schools, the formulation and implementation, had not been consistent with this culture:

The problem is that the school staff isn’t being involved in the whole process. The staff has to be able to see that this is something they want. They have to have input into the role. Original policy intent saw AST’s working with other teachers and yet the same policy then put in place implementation procedures which depowered teachers, completely froze them out of the process both in terms of selection criteria and then roles. (Teacher No: 31)

As a result of this, where there is no staff input into roles, Advanced Skills Teachers reported the potential for unrealistic expectations being placed on them. A secondary teacher revealed that:

We are selected first of all, then we go and negotiate extra duties. We are asked what we would like to do. I like being able to negotiate the role but you don’t always get what you want. The principal becomes the sole arbiter and it is very unclear in our school on what basis he gives his approval. For example, some teachers have come up with some very imaginative ideas and have been told it either wouldn’t work, would cost too much or would upset someone else, while other teachers have been allowed to complete fairly meaningless roles. One was even allowed to take pictures of the school which are now hanging in the foyer as a means of promoting the school. I wouldn’t put in for it again. (Teacher No: 14)

One secondary executive who had been an Advanced Skills Teacher revealed:
What principals need to do is involve staff and say "How do you want these people to be used". This would have then given me permission to come in more openly with strategies that I would have used to perform the role. When that didn't happen there was this overwhelming workload. (Teacher No: 104)
Chapter Eight

Summary and Conclusions

An Overview of the Chapter

This chapter recaps the intentions of the study and the major findings. On the basis of these findings, it identifies implications for future policy development and implementation.

Recap of the Study

This study was based on the belief that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was implemented arbitrarily across the New South Wales state school system. The Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) model of educational policy implementation was used to illustrate how arbitrary policy implementation could occur as implementation became a response to school and organisational interests as well as policy mandates.

A review of the relevant literature provided a theoretical framework for the study. This review covered three main areas:

1. theoretical perspectives on teacher compensation and motivation;
2. career ladders schemes, a corollary to the Advanced Skills Teacher policy implemented in the United States and,
3. the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy in various states in Australia.

Data from these three areas were combined with anecdotal evidence from the
The author's experience in the state school system to identify two sets of factors which could influence teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy (a) teacher and school characteristics and (b) policy implementation decisions. These factors were ascertained in the questionnaire. To gauge the impact of policy implementation, teachers' attitudes towards the policy pre implementation and teachers' attitudes towards the policy post implementation were also measured in the questionnaire. Data gained from the questionnaire was used to compare the attitudes of teachers from selected cohort groups both pre and post policy implementation and later regress teachers' experiences of policy implementation against their attitude towards the policy.

A stratified random sample which reflected teacher and school characteristics was utilised. Questionnaires were posted directly to teachers across one administrative region of the New South Wales Department of School Education. Questionnaires were both confidential and anonymous. A return rate for the survey of 56% without follow up reflected the topicality of the research in the teaching community. Statistical analysis of the data revealed certain trends and these were pursued through interviews.

**The Main Issues Revisited**

*Policy Formulation*

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy can be viewed from both an industrial context and an educational context.

From an industrial context, it was an attempt to change the way teachers worked at a time when workplace restructuring was perceived as essential for national economic well being. This perceived necessity to alter Australia's workplace practices had been identified earlier through falling international
competitiveness and a resultant deterioration in terms of trade. The development of skills based career paths became a priority. Workplace changes along these lines also became a precursor to industrial agreements acceptable to industrial commissions at both a state and national level. At the same time, the perceived contribution of the education system to the national economic interest was emerging.

From an educational context, the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was a response to identified levels of teacher disillusionment and a career structure which was not seen as placing sufficient emphasis on the quality of teaching. It was based on a belief that classroom teaching had to be made more attractive for both potential teachers and the committed teachers already in the system. The Advanced Skills Teacher policy recognised the fundamental importance of the teacher and good teachers in the school system. For the first time, the work of teachers as opposed to curriculum change or systemic reorganisation, became the focus for increasing the outcomes from the educational system.

After being outlined in an educational context through the involvement of the Schools Commission, policy formulation occurred through industrial activity in the Industrial Commission of New South Wales between the Teachers Federation and the Department of School Education. The resultant policy contained important gaps. Missing was consensus on issues of importance particularly those that related to the nature of advanced skills in teaching, teacher evaluation and selection processes. The Teachers Federation, and the Department of School Education had difficulty separating their traditional industrial predilections from the necessity to establish the necessary standards frameworks and procedures for teacher evaluation. Compounding this was the nature of industrial relations commissions in Australia, and in particular their exclusive reliance on evidence from industrial protagonists. This meant that the logical development of the policy by teachers and researchers could not occur (Chadbourne and Ingvarson, 1994). Unlike other
policy initiatives of the time including the Scott Report (1990) teachers were not encouraged to provide input into the policy.

*Policy Implementation*

The rhetoric accompanying the restructure of the Department of School Education during the early 1990's placed an increased emphasis on decisions made at the school level. Principals were provided with greater autonomy and were encouraged to act within broad frameworks while responding to local and school needs. Although the potential of implementing agencies to subvert policy mandates in even the most stable of times has been well documented (Rein and Rabinovitz, 1978; Lipsky, 1980) the discursive environment of public school education at this time further encouraged the interpretation and reinterpretation of policy documents at a school level.

The Advanced Skills Teacher policy entered the state school system at a time of industrial upheaval. Policy mandates were incomplete and changed incrementally as policy implementation in schools continued. The restructuring of state education along corporate lines was being met with disapproval from the Teachers Federation and teachers. Teachers were wary of any new policy initiative that entered a culture increasingly characterised by suspicion and mistrust.

Compounding the task of principals in implementing the policy was a culture in teaching firmly based around a uniform salary schedule and a history of external evaluations of teaching practice via the inspectorial system. For the first time the Advanced Skills Teacher policy brought decisions about differential remuneration and more importantly what constituted good teaching practice to the level of the individual school. School leaders were asked to select advanced teachers and rank them via a merit process which many teachers saw as illegitimate and on the basis of incomplete policy advice.
Although the educational literature (DEET, 1988) described the need for a ".... consistency of approach across the nation to key elements of the selection process and a national approach to the identification and acknowledgement of advanced teaching skills" (p. 57), the teacher appraisal and evaluation component of the policy was not detailed by educationalists. In the New South Wales state school system, the issue of teacher appraisal is one which historically, industrial contexts have been unable to solve. One example of this was the Teacher Efficiency Review Scheme of 1986. Consistent with this, eventual policy came up with broad guidelines which in effect left it up to a selection panel headed by the principal to make subjective judgments on suitability.

Another issue on which policy implementors were provided with minimal guidance was the issue of the roles of Advanced Skills Teachers. While the educational literature discussed the need for the classification not to be considered in terms of another duty statement, it also provided a broad outline of responsibilities, not only open to interpretation but incongruent with earlier assertions from the educational literature, (Schools Council, 1989) vis; ".... a major role in the supervision of trainee and beginning teachers and should make their capacities, experience and maturity available to the school in a role such as team leadership" (p. 120).

Recap of the Major Findings

The review of the literature suggested that while the differentiation of teachers' salaries and responsibilities on the basis of performance judgments makes easy rhetoric, the acceptance of these programs in schools was problematic.

Teachers overwhelmingly approved of the idea underpinning the Advanced Skills Teacher policy (pre implementation) and were generally of the belief that
superior teaching performance should be rewarded and recognised. This study found that the teachers most supportive of the policy pre implementation were the more experienced teachers. This was an important finding as it was the experienced, yet unpromoted teachers that the policy was targeting.

Just as teachers uniformly approved of the policy pre implementation, they also uniformly disapproved of the policy post implementation. This disapproval was a function of their expectations of the policy not being fulfilled. While teachers expressed most resentment towards selection procedures and the nature of Advanced Skills Teacher roles, underpinning teacher concerns was an arbitrariness of implementation leading to school and system level equity concerns. Teachers identified this equity issue as leading to school level divisiveness. Compounding the potential for this divisiveness was the imposition of quotas on the number of teachers who could be granted Advanced Skills Teacher positions and therefore resultant salary increases.

Teachers also experienced a range of processes to evaluate them and their peers for Advanced Skills Teacher suitability. Most of these were seen as inadequate. The documentation and interview process mandated in the policy statements was not seen as capable of determining advanced skills. While the educational literature primordial to the policy recommended means of defining advanced teaching skills (DEET, 1988) when this did not occur school leaders were left in a vacuum and adopted coping strategies like the rotation of positions around the staff and across faculties. While some principals had managed to include a merit consideration into Advanced Skills Teacher selection, the inability of policy makers to develop a standards framework for teacher competence meant principals did so at the cost of alienating other staff members. Some teachers described attempts by school leaders to maintain a system of selection based on teacher merit. Other teachers had seen the concept of merit completely ignored and witnessed
either inappropriate teachers being granted Advanced Skills Teacher status and positions or Advanced Skills Teacher positions rotated around eligible teachers or between faculties. The arbitrariness of selection procedures and in some cases the complete disbandment of merit from selection procedures was based on a lack of objectivity about what constituted advanced skills and the inability of school leadership to define advanced skills.

One of the underlying problems driving much of the teacher disillusionment with the policy was the imposition of quotas, a characteristic of national policy implementation unique to New South Wales and Queensland despite the evidence which suggested quotas were a poor way of regulating the differentiation of teachers' responsibilities and salaries (Smylie and Smart, 1990; Poston and Frase, 1991). While in the early days of policy implementation the Commonwealth Government had maintained the need for quotas in an attempt to ensure that only suitable teachers were granted Advanced Skills Teacher positions, as a regulatory tool quotas proved themselves to be ineffective. Quotas forced principals into an unfortunate dichotomy. On the one hand the imposition of quotas forced principals to select staff for positions that they were not suitable to fill. The inclusion of Advanced Skills Teacher positions in Enterprise Agreements reached between the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation left principals with little choice. Indeed, it would be a very brave principal who refused to utilise the quota of Advanced Skills Teacher positions in their school while ever the quota of positions was seen as a component of a salary increase. This led to some teachers being designated as Advanced Skills Teacher who were not seen as having advanced skills by their colleagues. This seemed to further denigrate the policy in the eyes of teachers. At the same time, quotas also restricted the number of teachers who could gain Advanced Skills Teacher positions. As a result, in schools where the number of Advanced Skills Teacher positions was not commensurate with the number of teachers considered advanced, the policy was again denigrated in the eyes of teachers. Quotas lead to competitiveness, rivalry and for some dislocation.
This from a policy which was predicated on norms of collegiality, professional sharing and mutual growth.

The study found that teachers who approved of the policy post implementation had witnessed significantly different implementation practices than teachers who did not approve of the policy post implementation. This finding supported two of the major contentions of the study (a) that the policy was implemented in an arbitrary manner and (b) that teachers' attitudes towards the policy would be a function of their experiences of policy implementation. The only implementation decision measured by the questionnaire which teachers who had approved of policy implementation had in common with teachers who disapproved of policy implementation was the reward relative to task variable. Both groups agreed that Advanced Skills Teachers had been expected to do too much and therefore a significant finding of this study was that the imposition of a role as such was not sufficient to deter teachers from approving of the policy. The study revealed however that the nature of the roles which Advanced Skills Teachers were required to perform did affect teachers' attitudes. Where teachers approved of policy implementation, the nature of the role had a clear and important link to classroom practice.

The nature of roles as an implementation issue can be traced to the formulation stages of the policy. The formulation of the policy in an industrial context meant that the productivity and efficiency guidelines were attached via an industrial paradigm. These guidelines were not empathetic with the organisation of schools nor the work of teachers. Implicit in the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was the belief that increases in teacher productivity and efficiency could only be obtained by Advanced Skills Teachers doing extra duties. This mind set was probably justifiable in most industrial contexts where efficiency and productivity are quantifiable and can be measured in terms of increased output. Unfortunately the same mind set misunderstands the nature of teaching and the professional development models available in
professional vocations. When Advanced Skills Teachers were found an 'extra job' there was an explicit suggestion being made to teachers that (a) student outcomes would be improved if the better teachers were given extra jobs to do outside the classroom and therefore away from students and (b) that the development of advanced teaching skills in themselves was not important. Interviews with teachers confirmed that the dubious logic that resided in these propositions was lost on teachers and became a factor in teacher disillusionment with the policy. This was not to suggest that teachers did not want Advanced Skills Teachers to make a contribution to the school over and above their classroom teaching contribution. What teachers did object to however, were roles for the sake of roles. They did not want principals searching for something for the Advanced Skills Teacher to do, just because that teacher was going to get an extra $1200 per year before tax. They did not want roles which represented the normal contribution of each Advanced Skills Teacher such as sports organiser, librarian or release from face to face specialist. Teachers wanted roles which related to improving the classroom practice of other teachers through a contagion type model of professional growth. Teachers wanted roles which were targeted to teaching and learning and the improvement of other teachers through the activity of the Advanced Skills Teacher at the classroom level. Some teachers even suggested a mentoring type of model. This model for workplace growth and improved productivity is more in keeping with the workplace of teachers. Some principals recognised this and developed roles or allowed their staff to develop roles which approximated this model. In other schools where principals were seen to have tacked on an extra job teachers resented it. Principals who failed to attach a role of some significance to an Advanced Skills Teacher position further undermined teacher confidence in the policy.

Related to the issue of roles was the finding that the designated Teaching and Learning positions, a feature of Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation after the 1993 Enterprise Agreement, were not successful in creating and maintaining a link between Advanced Skills Teacher roles and
teaching and learning. While based on the credible notion that emerging curriculum will necessarily become school priorities, the effect of this imposition was to narrow the opportunities for teachers to become Advanced Skills Teachers. In some schools, because of prior experiences or qualifications, the mandating of curriculum areas for Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teachers led to the automatic selection of some applicants and the automatic deselection of others. Although these Enterprise Agreements mandated that Teaching and Learning Advanced Skills Teachers were to have a teaching and learning focus, in schools which had not developed appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of Advanced Skills Teachers, designated Teaching and Learning positions had little impact on the improvement of classroom practice. This demonstrated that while an Enterprise Agreement can mandate the broad curriculum areas to be the focus of Advanced Skills Teacher activity, only school level policy implementation processes can determine the perceived effectiveness of the Advanced Skills Teacher within these curriculum areas. In schools where the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was being implemented poorly, the mandating of Advanced Skills Teachers to certain curriculum areas did little to improve the perceived effectiveness of these positions.

Primary teachers were more positive about the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy than secondary teachers. While some secondary teachers described a culture operating in many secondary schools which was potentially dismissive of any policy initiative, there appeared to be specific organisational difficulties faced by secondary school leaders implementing this policy in their schools. Foremost among these was the faculty structure, a characteristic of secondary schools. What one secondary teacher described as a lack of 'oneness' in secondary schools resulted in the creation of equity issues between faculties when Advanced Skills Teacher positions were not evenly distributed across the school. In some secondary schools, this resulted in coping strategies like the rotation of positions between faculties irrespective of merit. The faculty structure also created
communication issues in some secondary schools, where teachers became unfamiliar with those who were given Advanced Skills Teacher positions and the roles they were asked to perform.

Although teacher support for the policy pre implementation increased with years of service, teacher disillusionment with the policy post implementation also increased with years of service. More experienced teachers, many of whom had been deemed suitable for promotion by the former inspection system were seen as particularly disadvantaged by the selection process. There was a belief amongst this group in particular that abilities which came with years of experience were not best ascertained through the interview process. Whether this finding can be put down to a cynicism which may be connected to years of service in any vocation this study could not ascertain. The concern remains however that it was these more experienced teachers who had chosen not to pursue the conventional career path in teaching for whom the policy was trying to cater. These teachers were not motivated by the policy, did not engage with the process and opportunities to utilise their experience were lost.

Teachers of three years of training and four years of training did not differ significantly in their attitudes towards the policy pre or post implementation. Interviews suggested that the level of dissatisfaction described in the findings of research question one led to this uniform response. Alternatively, interview data revealed that this uniform response was due to policy changes effective from January 1, 1995 which saw the establishment of a common incremental salary scale regardless of years of initial training and which made the attainment of an Advanced Skills Teacher position of commensurate financial value to both three and four year trained teachers.

Executive members of a school were more supportive of the policy as implemented than were classroom teachers. Interview data suggested that this was due to the nature of many Advanced Skills Teacher roles which
tended to resemble executive responsibilities particularly those with an administrative purpose. The impact of this had been to lessen the workload of executives in some schools. While this seems to have resulted in executives being more supportive of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, it had a corresponding but opposite effect on teachers and some Advanced Skills Teachers. Most classroom teachers and Advanced Skills Teachers expressed resentment when Advanced Skills Teacher roles were restricted to administrative type functions but were supportive of roles which included a staff development component.

Classroom teachers who obtained an Advanced Skills Teacher position were more positive toward the policy post implementation than classroom teachers who had not obtained an Advanced Skills Teacher position. Interview data pertaining to this question saw the reemergence of three of the dominant themes of the study which had tended to polarise the views of these two groups (a) poor selection procedures, (b) inappropriate roles and (c) the imposition of quotas. It also shed some light on the nature of the divisiveness that the policy caused in some schools, particularly where Advanced Skills Teachers were not required to perform a role supplementary to their usual contribution to the school.

The study identified the importance of four policy implementation decisions with a positive attitude towards the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. In order of decreasing partial correlations these were:

1. The performance of each Advanced Skills Teacher was evaluated.
2. Feedback was provided to staff on why Advanced Skills Teachers were selected.
3. Relevance of criteria to teaching and learning.
4. Relevance of roles to improving classroom practice.
Interview data revealed a degree of synergy between these decisions. It became clear that in schools where these practices were a feature of Advanced Skills Teacher policy implementation, they reflected a style of school management which included high levels of staff participation in decision making. Through staff participation in the implementation process and the resultant shared vision on selection criteria and in particular roles, many of the issues which stemmed from concerns of equity were diminished or absolved.

A Concluding Note

On August 29, 1996, after more than twelve months of negotiations, the New South Wales Teachers Federation and the Department of School Education came to an agreement on salaries. As part of this agreement, Advanced Skills Teacher positions were to be gradually phased out culminating in the creation of a new category in January, 1999 titled 'senior teacher'. This new classification will be funded by using the annual value of 10,481 Advanced Skills Teacher and curriculum allowances which will be abolished on December 31, 1998 (Enterprise Agreement, 1996). Access to the senior teacher category will be open to every teacher and in effect will become a defacto step on the already existent salary ladder. New South Wales had begun to remove the Advanced Skills Teacher classification from its salary structure.

Although the Teachers Federation had previously been prepared to negotiate the demise of Advanced Skills Teacher positions in schools, (New South Wales Teachers Federation Salaries Bulletin 1, 1995), the Department of School Education, as late as March 1996, had signalled its desire to maintain the place of Advanced Skills Teacher positions with the proposal to create Advanced Skills Teacher positions in primary schools to support the Computers in Schools Policy. (Memorandum To Teachers 96/025, 1996)
While it is outside the confines of this study to confirm this, it appears that many of the school level implementation difficulties described in this study affirmed the Teachers Federation view of the policy and made the Advanced Skills Teacher policy highly negotiable, and an alternative which did not require selection procedures, role statements or quotas more desirable.

With the demise of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy has come the failure of an attempt to reward better teachers while simultaneously utilising their skills for the improvement of other teachers. One respondent who was interviewed for this study in December, 1995 argued that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy could not be salvaged as it had been abused by too many people. The course of events which has since transpired in New South Wales would suggest she was correct. However the need which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy aimed to satisfy still exists in schools in New South Wales and other states. Seven months after the Department of School Education and the Teachers Federation negotiated the demise of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, the advertisement which appears as Appendix M was published in Saturday morning newspapers across the country. The Senate Inquiry Into the Status of Teachers and the Development of the Profession During the Next Five Years due to report on or before the last sitting day of the Autumn session of the Federal Parliament 1998, has a frame of reference which includes:

Examine the expectations of teachers regarding their careers and identify those issues which bear most significantly upon job satisfaction, stress and their ability to carry out their work efficiently and effectively. Possible issues might include new patterns of work organisation and the relationships between teaching and non-teaching staff in schools and systems organisation and its impact on work practices and career development (Senate Employment, Education and Training Committee, Current Inquiries (http://www.senate.aph.gov.au/committee/eet p. 6).
Clearly, this most recent inquiry has much in common with the inquiries conducted by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (1988) and the Schools Council (1989, 1990) referred to in Chapter Two of this study and which resulted in the development of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. As this study has revealed however, a theoretically sound and popular proposition can in practice become a policy which fails to deliver what it sets out to as ".... the delivery of services shapes policy outcomes more than the design of policy" (Palumbo and Calista, 1990, p. xiii). The results of this study would suggest however, that educationalists and politicians desirous of rewarding teachers with advanced skills and extending their enthusiasm and skills throughout the school system should take heart. Models of policy implementation which are attractive to teachers are available. Capable teachers want to share their skills and their colleagues are equally anxious to discover them. The United States experience of revisiting alternatives to the uniform salary schedule for teachers notably career ladders, (Guernsey, 1986; Hart, 1987) also suggests that the Advanced Skills Teacher policy will not be the last attempt to identify and reward superior teaching. The results of this study also suggest that future policy development requires a reconsideration of some fundamental issues at both a formulation and implementation level and these will now be discussed.

At a policy formulation level, the success of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was predicated on the synergistic achievement of two aims:

1. The identification and reward of teachers deemed to be advanced.
2. The use of these teachers in professional development roles across the school.

While these aims seemed plausible and indeed likely in theory, in implementation the incongruence between the two aims became apparent as a process of teacher competition, selection, promotion and increased
responsibility was subsequent to the expected development of collegial relationships, mentoring and mutual professional development. In retrospect, it is now clear that the incongruence between these two aims hampered the total success of the policy. In schools where the policy was deemed a success, school leaders put in place implementation practices which encouraged the coalescence of these two divergent processes. Some of these practices have been identified in this study and discussed in Chapter Seven.

On reflection, it seems that the broader educational environment in which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was implemented in New South Wales was not conducive to its acceptance by teachers. The early nineties were a period of rapid change in New South Wales state schools. Many of these changes, some of which were described in Chapter Three were resisted by the Teachers Federation and teachers themselves. This resulted in an environment characterised by confrontation and mistrust. The implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, a policy not part of these state mandated changes was affected by this atmosphere and became subject to the same kind of confrontation as state mandated policies like selection of teachers on merit and the dezonning of school boundaries. On top of this, the policy was introduced during a period of decline in the relative value of teachers salaries (illustrated in Chapter One). This lead to the Teachers Federation pursuing the attainment of an Advanced Skills Teacher position and the accompanying salary increase as something all of its members should attain. Yanow (1990) suggested that the gap between policy intentions and policy outcomes, is often a result of this 'culture' of the policy and is characterised by competing values and norms. To illustrate the influence of the policy culture, Yanow stated:

We could put a man on the moon because there was little clash of values to impede the mission. We have not been able to win the war on poverty because of the clash of values, and the varying beliefs concerning what is poverty, who are the poor, whether
government should help them - to name but a few points of contention. Competing values coexist, even after policy is legislated, and influence implementors and implementation. This cannot be understood ontologically: values are not subjective facts. They can only be interpreted (p.226).

Bearing this in mind, future policy implementation in this area should be cognizant of the role that the educational environment of the day can have on policy outcomes. Future policy success will depend on shared understandings by all stakeholders and a congruence where possible, of policy process and policy intent. This implies the need for some preliminary ground work prior to policy formulation, perhaps in the form of a Green Paper which canvasses potential issues and seeks solutions.

The formulation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy occurred in an industrial context. While the link with workplace restructuring made an industrial agreement the appropriate vehicle for highlighting the need for a policy like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, an industrial context was not the appropriate place to develop educational policy. The formulation of the policy within an industrial context and therefore a concomitant reliance on the views of industrial protagonists led to the exclusion of teachers and educationalists from the process. This resulted in a lack of any clear conceptualisation of what constituted advanced teaching skills or any attempt to implement the mechanism through which these may have been ascertained and promoted. One of the fundamental understandings behind any policy development is that the implementing institutions or individuals must have the capacity to implement the policy. When the industrial context within which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was developed failed to deliver the support which school leaders required to confidently assess teacher competencies when selecting advanced skills teachers, principals no longer had the capacity to implement the policy. An irony of contemporary education in this country remains, that while education systems have had little difficulty devising frameworks for viewing student progress through the various key
learning areas (outcomes and profiles) they are reluctant to view the progression of teaching ability in the same way or devise anything resembling a profile of teacher competencies. Future policy development must consider the nature of advanced teaching skills and clearly articulate them. Other countries have already started to develop the means by which this can occur. In the United States, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) is an independent professional body whose main functions are to ".... develop rigorous standards for what highly accomplished teachers should know and be able to do in specific subject areas (eg science) or levels (eg early childhood) and to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards" (Ingvarson, 1997, p. 4).

Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1991) advanced the argument that selection criteria for Advanced Skills Teachers should be specific to the curriculum area in which the Advanced Skills Teacher is to be based. Certainly this type of change would reflect the knowledge needs of most subjects, particularly at the secondary level. With this being the case, teacher associations and networks should provide the leadership in the area of teacher standards and certification. Ingvarson (1997) cited the Australian Science Teachers Association as initiating a project to develop standards which represent high quality science teaching and the Mathematics and English teaching associations as pursuing a similar goal.

Advanced skills in teaching need to be viewed in a more generic way as well. Curriculum emphases embodied in syllabus documents released in New South Wales since 1991 all require certain pedagogy to be in place; student outcomes driving teaching and learning being one example of this, a degree of student centredness and control being others. By implication advanced teaching skills, as well as having a particular knowledge component of the kind alluded to by Chadbourne and Ingvarson, (1991) simultaneously have definite process components. While the establishment of the Centre for Teaching Excellence as part of the Leading Schools Program in Queensland.
(Education Queensland, Leading Schools Program, 1997) suggests the plausibility of state wide consensus on what constitutes highly developed teaching skills, the development of such a document should occur with the participation of teachers. The *Good Practice Frameworks* developed by the Quality Assurance Directorate of the New South Wales Department of School Education between 1991 and 1995, utilising extensive teacher collaboration and input offer an appropriate starting point for assembling a framework for this purpose both in terms of a process and a product.

The appropriateness of an industrial context as a venue for policy formation is undeniably linked to the issue of quotas. In the early days of policy formulation and implementation, the Commonwealth Government argued for quotas to ensure that only advanced teachers were rewarded. In later years, the State Government continued to impose quotas to ensure that Advanced Skills Teacher positions were allocated proportional to the number of teachers in a school. The imposition of quotas was not compatible with a policy which was presumably based on merit. Quotas were a divisive force in schools. Quotas, and the competition they engender, would not be a feature of future policy implementation in this area if future policy was founded on the clear articulation of advanced teaching skills. Ingvarson (1997) stated ".... a career structure based on valid standards and rigorous assessments is non-competitive. It promotes collaboration and professional community, essential elements of successful schools" (p.14).

This study focussed on school level policy implementation. Policy implementation research cited earlier in this study revealed that in both general policy terms, (Rein and Rabinovitz, 1978; Lipsky, 1980; Palumbo and Calista, 1990; Yanow, 1982) and indeed, policies specific to education (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992; Crump 1993) even the best considered policies have the potential to be implemented disparately. The first major finding of this study was that this disparate implementation had occurred resulting in inequitable practices. These inequitable practices had occurred at both an inter and
intra school level and had resulted in teacher disillusionment with the policy. Much of this inequity and resulting disillusionment revolved around two implementation components (a) selection procedures and (b) roles.

Many schools who attempted to adopt rigorous selection procedures utilised the selection panel approach mandated in the policy. Not only were these panels untrained but their judgments were based on evidence restricted to self reported abilities, referees nominated by the applicant and an interview. As a process in itself, this reflected what Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1997) described as a ".... traditional public service method", an inefficient way of gauging advanced skills resulting in " ....floods of letters of complaint from teachers and principals who were trying to do the right thing" (p.18).

The issue of selection procedures encompasses the broader issue of teacher evaluation or appraisal, an in depth discussion of which is beyond the scope of this study. Scriven (1989) gave some indication of the breadth of this issue in suggesting that no one method of teacher evaluation is sufficiently valid enough to be used alone and that reliability demands that multiple methods be used. This study has already identified the need for system wide consensus and articulation of advanced teaching skills at both a content and process level as a precursor to the future school level implementation of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy. It has also suggested the involvement of professional associations in the development of subject specific standards and the system wide development of generic pedagogical standards as two means through which this might be developed. However the results of this study suggest that where the implementation of these standards frameworks involves positions like Advanced Skills Teacher positions, selection procedures should also (a) include criteria which reflects the role each Advanced Skills Teacher is required to perform and (b) include staff input into this criteria. This implies a three stage model of teacher effectiveness where content knowledge of the type proposed by Chadbourne and Ingvarson, process or pedagogy of the type ordained in syllabus
requirements and finally criteria specific to the role of the future Advanced Skills Teacher are combined in a model of teacher evaluation. Although Scriven (1994) described peer assistance as valuable in the improvement of teaching, he described the suggestion that peers make decisions about merit as ".... lacking validity and credibility mainly because of the massive conflict of interest, ..... fear of reprisal for negative comments and the hope of reciprocation for positive ones" (p.85). While remaining cognizant of Scriven's concerns, models of peer involvement in the Advanced Skills Teacher selection process particularly in relation to criteria have been identified as effective and have been described in Chapter Seven of this study. Indeed, they are also cited in the literature (Henning, Taylor and Blackman, 1994). The consideration of staff input into selection processes for future policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy would seem to have some merit.

In relation to the roles of Advanced Skills Teachers, this study found that the vast majority of teachers holding Advanced Skills Teacher positions wanted to have significant responsibilities attached to their positions in spite of the relatively small remuneration which came with the position. Future policy development must give consideration to two factors; the nature of the roles Advanced Skills Teachers are designated and the appropriate remuneration of these teachers.

This study revealed that the attachment of a role to the Advanced Skills Teacher position in itself was not sufficient to negatively influence teachers' attitudes towards the policy. The nature of the role Advanced Skills Teachers were asked to perform however was. If advanced teaching skills are going to be the touchstone against which teachers are judged for positions, then the roles of Advanced Skills Teachers must give the incumbents the opportunity to demonstrate these skills, preferably with a view towards the development of other staff. This will go some way to solving some of the equity concerns shared by many teachers about the relative level of advancement of their Advanced Skills Teacher colleagues while simultaneously sending a clear
message that advanced skills are recognised and valued. Roles uncovered in
this study such as 'leading assemblies for twelve months', 'promoting the
school' or 'handling discipline' should not be considered. The cumulative
effect of these changes would be roles with a learning and teaching focus and
which increase the educational outcomes for students. This was one of the
major aims upon which the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was based, yet
one which became increasingly lost during policy development and later
implementation. This study revealed that this aim was not only theoretically
plausible but was also desired by teachers.

In schools where teachers were supportive of Advanced Skills Teacher policy
implementation, roles were linked to the improvement of classroom practice.
While this study could not confirm that these types of roles were necessarily
a product of collaboration and consensus at a whole school level, anecdotal
and interview evidence would suggest this was usually the case. The trend in
schools where supervision tends to be less about collecting teaching
programs on a five weekly cycle and more about collaboration, mentoring and
joint program development in the first instance, lends itself to the utilisation
of Advanced Skills Teacher roles in this way. Advanced Skills Teachers with
a teaching and learning function could be invited into these teams on a needs
basis. If the staff had previously determined the needs and selection criteria
these factors would be congruent. Teachers with Advanced Skills Teacher
responsibilities could then serve a consultants type role without the pejorative
meaning attached to an expert-novice type of model. When implemented
through the model of collegial planning and team work already described in
this study, it would also ensure that these roles do not become onerous for
the Advanced Skills Teacher concerned.

The vast majority of teachers interviewed for this study believed Advanced
Skills Teacher roles should involve significant responsibilities. This was in
spite of what most teachers viewed as the small remuneration attached to the
position. This confirmed earlier research which highlighted the role of
intrinsic motivators (Lortie, 1975; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978) and hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1966) in the work satisfaction of teachers. It would appear however, that both the base salary of teachers and the salary supplement which came with being an Advanced Skills Teacher was too low, certainly compared to those achieved by teachers in other countries. Hargreaves (1997) described salary increases as “....exceptionally important”, revealing that a classroom teacher in Ontario with a first degree earns A$60,000 per year (p.11). By way of example, this compares with the maximum A$50,000 per annum which teachers at the senior teacher level in New South Wales will earn in the year 1999 (Enterprise Agreement, 1996, p. 35). Although the issue of financing salary increases for teachers and the inherent systemic difficulties of doing this were identified in Chapter One, future policy implementation needs to send a clear message that teaching skills are valued and attach a significant remuneration to their demonstration. There is even the potential for the effective implementation of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy, to represent a total cost saving, not just in terms of efficacy in increasing student learning outcomes but, bearing in mind the costs of high teacher turnover and teacher training, ensuring the place of efficient teachers in the system. This implies extending and narrowing the salary scale rather than continuing to provide flat rate increases to all teachers (Ingvarson and Chadbourne, 1997). It also implies the need to view the professional lives of teachers as occurring in stages (Huberman, 1989) and therefore taking into account what Huberman calls both “.... psychological and sociological perspectives” (p.32) of teachers work through the tailoring of opportunities and rewards to certain career stages. This is preferable to rewarding every teacher who has managed to remain in teaching after a specified period of time as the present salary ladder tends to do and as the senior teacher category will continue to do. This policy change along with the model of mentoring described earlier, would refocus attention on the fundamental importance of the teacher to school effectiveness.

The potential for policies to be implemented disparately appears to be a
feature of policy making. The studies cited earlier confirm this. Accepting this as a reality of policy development, two axioms of school organisation offer some guidance in the future development of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy.

The first axiom is that educational policy is not implemented in a social vacuum. Schools are characterised by prevailing patterns of relationships, work practices, responsibilities and beliefs. Over many years and after a number of restructures, these characteristics of schools continue to endure. Many teachers interviewed for this study referred to the attainment of an Advanced Skills Teacher position as a step on the promotions path; that in spite of the rhetoric and the transparent importance of good teaching to most teachers and non teachers, the teaching community still viewed increasing managerial responsibility as an indicator of progression in the profession. For policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy to be effective, other policy initiatives must be directed to changing this view of teaching and alter the expectations of career minded teachers so that increasing skills and abilities in teaching carry the same status as the attainment of administrative posts. A nationally endorsed profile of teacher competencies, exhibiting the skills and knowledge based shared by competent teachers would go some way to assist in this aim.

Analogous to the first axiom is the second which also relates to school organisation. It is captured in the description of schools as ‘technologically bottom heavy’. This description refers to the fact that in many schools, expertise in matters pertaining to learning and teaching is usually shared by the numerous classroom teachers at the bottom of the hierarchy, not necessarily by the lesser number at the top of the hierarchy whose increased responsibilities for administration have increasingly removed them from the evolving knowledge of curriculum and learning and teaching. The resultant image of school knowledge resembles an isosceles triangle and suggests that for the future implementation of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher
policy, school decision making should tap into the bottom of the triangle, in effect flattening the hierarchy as far as decision making is concerned. In schools where the Advanced Skills Teacher policy was seen as successful, implementation decisions seemed symmetrical with these features. Where principals relied on the underlying beliefs of the whole school through the involvement of teachers in the process to determine selection criteria and roles for example, policy implementation was seen as successful. Examples of these practices are included in Chapter Seven. The inclusion of teachers in each step of the process was more than just political correctness. It engendered ownership of the process amongst staff and resulted in selection criteria specific to roles which the staff deemed important. Involvement in the process appeared to satisfy some of the communication difficulties leading to equity concerns particularly at the secondary level. The following comment was instructive in this area:

It needed a mixture of top down and bottom up implementation. It needed the top down because you needed the gatekeepers approval for the deployment of staff in certain ways, but at the same time you needed the bottom up engagement, acceptance of the ownership of what's taking place. That means a staff has to have input, they have to say ..."This is what we want and in this area." (Primary AST No 2)

Finally, school leadership must maintain an active interest in Advanced Skills Teacher positions. This implies some sort of evaluation of performance. In schools where the model of implementation featured collaboration and mentoring, this evaluation would be an automatic feature of school level implementation. This would negate the need for formal evaluations by school leaders and add weight to the appropriateness of peer appraisal as an effective and appropriate means of gauging teacher competence.

The results of this study should not be seen as an attempt to denigrate the role of school leadership in the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher
policy. Hindsight tends to have a '20/20' quality encouraging us in retrospect, to be dismissive of poor implementation practices. This study has detailed the inadequacies of the policy and the compromises within policy formulation which led to these inadequacies. In hindsight, these policy inadequacies made implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher policy difficult for school leaders. Left to their own devices, the attempts by some school leaders as identified by this study to make the Advanced Skills Teacher policy more symmetrical with the organisational features of a school and the needs of teachers and students, have provided some guidance for the future implementation of policies like the Advanced Skills Teacher policy.
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Appendix C

Administrative Organisation of Typical Primary School, 1991

Principal

Assistant Principal (Primary) (Teaching)

Executive Teacher (Primary)

Classroom Teachers (CRT)

Assistant Principal (Infants) (Teaching)

CRT  CRT  CRT  CRT  CRT  CRT
NSW Department of Education.
*Head Teacher: Appointed when periods allocated to faculty exceed 81 per week.
*Head Teacher (Admin): When enrolments exceed 700.
*Head Teacher (Girls): When girls enrolments exceed 500.
*Faculties without Head Teachers are supervised by Head Teachers of a different faculty or by the Deputy Principal.

Appendix D
Administrative Organisation of Typical Secondary School, 1991
Appendix E
Advanced Skills Teacher Policy

ADVANCED SKILLS TEACHER - LEVEL 1

POLICY

The introduction of the Advanced Skills Teacher is to permit the retention in the classroom of highly skilled teachers. The Advanced Skills Teacher category is a way of recognising and rewarding outstanding teachers who have a commitment to classroom teaching and are willing to provide such things as educational leadership, professional support and provide guidance to beginning and less experienced teachers.

Advanced Skills Teachers Level 1 will be progressively introduced from the commencement of Term 1, 1992.

From the beginning of the first term, 1992, with a view to be completed by July 1992, the Department will appoint a first group of Advanced Skills Teachers up to a maximum of 15% of the number of full-time 3YT and 4YT permanent and temporary teachers who are on Step 9 and Step 13 of the Common Incremental Salary Scale respectively.

During 1992 the Department will commence action to appoint a second group of Advanced Skills Teachers from the beginning of Term 1, 1993. This second group of Advanced Skills Teachers will be up to a maximum of 15% of the number of full-time 3YT and 4YT permanent and temporary teachers who are on Step 9 and Step 13 of the Common Incremental Salary Scale respectively.

Once established Advanced Skills Teacher positions will be retained where the performance of tasks are at Advanced Skills Teacher level and:

* In the case of two thirds of the positions in accordance with the number of full time unpromoted teachers in the school, and
* In the case of the one third of the positions the allocation to individual schools by the Cluster Director taking into account the needs and priorities of the schools’ and the cluster.

Access to Advanced Skills Teacher positions will not be automatic but be based on an assessment of eligible teachers in terms of the assessment criteria set out in the application form.

Teachers and School Counsellors who are three, four or five year trained and are of the opinion that they are highly skilled and believe they meet the eligibility and selection criteria may apply for assessment as Advanced Skills Teachers.
Teachers eligible for appointment as Advanced Skills Teacher will be assessed by a panel. (See 4.2 below.)

The Department will allocate AST positions in the manner prescribed in the Award, attached guidelines, and taking into account the educational needs of the cluster and the individual school.

Teachers who are successfully assessed may then be selected for appointment to vacant Advanced Skills Teacher positions.

By the end of School Term 3 1992 a joint review of the Advanced Skills Teacher process will be completed by the Department and the Teachers Federation of New South Wales, with a view to monitoring:

- The gender mix of applicants
- The gender mix of successful applicants
- The number of successful primary and secondary applicants
- The efficiency of the panel assessment process
- The appropriateness of the selection criteria
- The needs based allocation of AST's to schools and clusters
- The impact of the introduction of permanent part-time work

**GUIDELINES 1991/92**

1. **Allocation of Advanced Skills Teachers**

1.1 **Allocation to Clusters**

In 1992 the number of Advanced Skills Teachers to be appointed will be up to a maximum of 15% of the total number of full-time 3YT and 4YT permanent and temporary teachers (determined at the end of School Term 3 1991) who are on Step 9 and Step 13 of the Common Incremental Salary Scale respectively.

The 15% referred to above will be appointed to each cluster in two groups in the following manner:

i) Two thirds (ie. 10% of the eligible pool) will be allocated to clusters on the basis of the number of full time unpromoted teachers within the cluster.
ii) One third (ie. 5% of the eligible pool) will be allocated to clusters on the basis of the number of beginning teachers in their first two years of service within the cluster.

1.2 Allocation to Schools

The allocation of Advanced Skills Teacher positions to schools will be undertaken by the Cluster Director as follows:

i) Two thirds of Advanced Skills Teacher positions to schools within each cluster will be on the basis of the size of each school determined by the number of unpromoted teachers in the school. Provided that the Cluster Director can only nominate whole positions to an individual school, but must ensure that a full complement of positions is allocated to schools within the cluster.

ii) One third of Advanced Skills Teacher positions to individual schools within each cluster will be determined by a panel having regard to the school's particular needs and identifiable disadvantage. The panel will comprise of the Cluster Director, as convener, one Secondary and one Primary Principal from within the cluster.

The Cluster Director can allocate the Advanced Skills Teacher positions to another school in the cluster if there is no successfully assessed teacher to apply from within the school or the vacancy is not filled through transfer of a teacher from another school who has successfully satisfied the assessment criteria.

2. Roles and Responsibilities of Advanced Skills Teachers

The specific additional duties for the Advanced Skills Teachers in school positions will be determined by the School Principal following discussion with the AST. The specific duties for an Advanced Skills Teachers position with cluster duties will be decided by the Cluster Director and the teacher's Principal following discussion with the AST.

In determining such additional roles and responsibilities within the school/cluster the Cluster Director and/or Principal will need to take into account the following:

i) Specific educational needs of the school/cluster;

ii) School based support and the requirement for Advanced Skills Teachers to perform normal teaching loads as determined for primary and secondary classroom teachers.

Noting the emphasis on the AST's role in assisting beginning teachers the additional roles and responsibilities of Advanced Skills Teachers may relate to the following areas:
a) Assisting classroom teachers, in particular beginning teachers.

b) Providing professional support to other officers employed in the school or cluster of schools, including:

. Supporting members of the school executive across faculties and departments in the maintenance and development of school-based welfare programs.

. Providing professional support and guidance for less experienced teachers relating to classroom performance, resource development and curriculum implementation.

. Assisting in the provision of in-school service.

. Assisting teachers in adapting to the NSW school system.

. Participating in or leading school welfare terms.

Taking demonstration lessons and supervising student teachers.

c) Undertaking tasks relating to specific educational needs identified in the school/cluster directed towards improving the educational outcomes of students including:

. Participating in or leading school welfare teams.

. Other professional support in areas identified by the Cluster Director/Principal for the implementation and maintenance of whole school programs.

3. **Teachers Eligible to Apply For Assessment**

Only permanent or temporary teachers and School Counsellors are eligible to apply for appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher.

i) In the case of 3YT teachers, the teacher must have completed one year on Level 9 of the Common Incremental Salary Scale and have completed nine years of service, such service including service for which incremental credit has been given; or

In the case of 4YT teachers, the teacher must have completed one year on Level 13 of the Common Incremental Salary Scale; and

ii) The teacher must be a highly skilled and can demonstrate, in terms of the assessment criteria set out in the application form, ability above the normal experience and competence of a teacher at the top of the incremental scale.
4. Selection Procedure

4.1 Application

It will be the responsibility of an eligible teacher to apply for assessment as an Advanced Skills Teacher.

Teachers must apply for assessment through their Principal to the Cluster Director using the application form attached.

In addition to the application form, the teacher is to provide the following:

- Statement of professional experience containing supportive detail and references from the teacher's supervisor and other relevant officers in the following areas:
  - Participation in professional development programs, especially related to classroom practice, over a significant period.
  - Expertise in and contribution to, the school’s in service program and curriculum development.
  - Participation in the professional development of other teachers.
  - Contribution to student progress as related to the learning objectives derived from the school's programs and established in the teacher's programming.

- References including one from the teacher's immediate supervisor.

4.2 Selection Panel

The Cluster Director will establish an assessment panel which will be responsible for identifying those eligible applicants who satisfy the assessment criteria for appointment to vacant positions as Advanced Skills Teachers.

The panel will consist of the following:

i) Cluster Director or nominee as convener;

ii) Principal of the school; and

iii) Teacher in a promotion position from another school in the Cluster.

Consistent with the Department's policy about the involvement of parent/school community members in decisions of this kind, a parent or school community representative should be included if possible.
4.3 Selection Process and Criteria

In assessing teachers who have applied for appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher, the panel will determine, on the basis of the assessment criteria, whether the skills of the teacher have been developed to a level appropriate to warrant appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher.

The skills that will form part of the assessment criteria will include the following abilities and characteristics:

- Generation of positive attitudes to learning.
- Achievement of positive and professional relationships with students, parents and colleagues.
- Use of a breadth of classroom strategies and learning strategies.
- Contribution to the organisation, planning and development of curriculum.
- Contribution to the professional support and development of teachers in the immediate faculty/learning areas.
- Creation and maintenance of positive classroom dynamics.
- Contribution to professional and curriculum decision-making processes.
- Innovation in planning and teaching.
- Contribution to specialised learning/welfare areas.

The assessment panel will interview the teacher to give the teacher the opportunity to bring evidence in the areas of the selection criteria as the teacher considers appropriate. The interview may be dispensed with by agreement between the panel and the teacher.

4.4 Recommendations

Where there are more teachers in a school who have satisfied the selection criteria than the number of available Advanced Skills Teacher positions, then:

- The Principal, in the case of school appointments, or
- The Cluster Director in the case of cluster based appointments

will recommend the most suitable teacher(s) who have been successfully assessed for appointment to the available position(s).
Teachers who are not recommended for appointment but satisfy the selection criteria will normally be placed on an eligibility list which will remain current for 12 months. However, teachers successfully assessed in 1991 or 1992 will remain eligible until the appointment of the second group of 15% has been completed in 1993.

If an individual school has been allocated an Advanced Skills Teacher position(s) and there is:

- Insufficient or no eligible teacher(s) or
- The eligible teacher(s) have not been successful in satisfying the assessment criteria

the position(s) can be filled by eligible teachers from other schools (who have successfully satisfied the assessment criteria), who may apply for transfer to the school provided a suitable teaching vacancy exists in the school.

If the position still remains vacant, the Advanced Skills Teacher position can be allocated to another school in the cluster by the Cluster Director.

5. Appointment and Conditions

5.1 Appointment

Appointments will only be made to vacant AST positions.

Teachers who have been considered by a panel to have satisfied the assessment criteria and warranting appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher may:

i) Be appointed to a vacant position as an Advanced Skills Teacher in his/her school/cluster;

ii) Will remain entitled for consideration for appointment in any cluster or school to whom he/she is transferred as an Advanced Skills Teacher where an appropriate vacancy is available, subject to satisfactory outcome of the teacher’s annual performance review of their duties.

Teachers appointed as Advanced Skills Teachers will be appointed for a period of 1 year but may be re-appointed subject to:

i) The Cluster Director and/or the Principal as appropriate, is of the opinion that the performance of tasks at Advanced Skills Teacher level are appropriate and necessary in the school/cluster;

ii) Continued availability of the Advanced Skills Teacher position at the school/cluster;
iii) Satisfactory completion of the teacher's annual performance review; and

5.2 Transfer

A teacher appointed as an Advanced Skills Teacher will retain such an appointment notwithstanding that he/she has been transferred to or appointed to another school within the cluster subject to:

i) Satisfactory completion of the teacher's annual performance review; and

ii) Continued availability of the Advanced Skills Teacher position at the school/cluster.

5.3 Allowance and Incremental Progression

On appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher, in addition to any other award entitlements, the successful teacher will be paid an allowance of $1,230 pa in addition to their salary while they continue to occupy the position and satisfactorily perform the role and responsibilities of the Advanced Skills Teacher. Appropriate advice is to be forwarded to the Region of the appointment of an Advanced Skills Teacher for payment of the allowance to be processed.

The allowance will be taken into account for superannuation purposes.

In the event of an AST being absent from duty, another teacher will not be paid a relieving allowance to the AST level.

3YT teachers who are successfully assessed and appointed to a vacant Advanced Skills Teacher position will be deemed to have 4YT trained status and will progress along the salary scale applicable to 4YT teachers. They remain eligible for progression along the common incremental salary scale to the 13th level even if he/she does not, following completion of the first appointment as an Advanced Skills Teacher, continue to occupy an Advanced Skills Teacher position.

6. Review of Advanced Skills Teachers

After a period of 1 year as an Advanced Skills Teacher, the teacher may be reappointed provided the following is satisfied:

i) Advanced Skills Teacher position continues to be available at the school/cluster.

ii) The Principal/Cluster Director is of the opinion that the performance of tasks at the Advanced Skills Teacher level are appropriate and necessary in the school/cluster respectively, and

iii) The teacher has satisfactorily completed his/her annual performance review.
**Appendix F**

Application Form for Assessment as an Advanced Skills Teacher

---

**NSW Department of School Education**

APPLICATION FOR ADVANCED SKILLS TEACHER

This Application should be submitted to your Principal.

---

### Section 1 - Applicant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given Names

### Section 2 - Home Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town/Suburb</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phone

### Section 3 - School Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4 - Superannuation and Incremental Status

If appointed as an AST, I wish my allowance to be superable (YES/NO)

Current Incremental Status

- 3YT Step
- or
- 4YT Step

### Section 5 - Statement and Signature of Applicant

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct. (Note: Any statement found to be deliberately misleading may result in rejection of this application.)

Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Section 6 - Supporting Information

Applicants should refer to the AST Application and Information for Teachers booklet for details regarding the skills to be addressed.

a) Participation in professional development programs, especially related to classroom practice, over a significant period.

b) Expertise in and contribution to, the school’s programs and professional development of other teachers.
c) Contribution to curriculum development.


d) Contribution to student progress as related to the learning objectives derived from the school's programs and established in the teacher's programming.
Appendix G
Advanced Skills Teacher Guidelines for Principals, 1992

Advanced Skills Teachers

Guidelines for Principals

November, 1992
This document replaces the "AST Guidelines to Principals and Cluster Directors" document published in February, 1992.

The document includes guidelines on the selection and appointment of ASTs for 1993, sample letters to AST applicants, summary charts of the selection and appointment process, and a copy of the document AST Application Form and Information for Teachers which includes a revised application form to be used for this round of appointments.

The following terms are used in this document:

- **Eligible AST**: Teachers meeting the AST service requirement are considered *eligible* to apply for AST appointment. *See page 1.*

- **Suitable AST**: Teachers are deemed *suitable* ASTs if they meet the AST service requirement and satisfy the school based AST panel that they also meet the general AST criteria. *See page 3.*

- **Suitability List**: Teachers deemed suitable ASTs are placed on a *suitability list*. *See page 3 and 6.*

- **Appointed AST**: Teachers placed on the suitability list may be *appointed* as ASTs if their skills and experiences best meet the roles and responsibilities defined for specific AST positions. *See page 6.*

A summary of the process of selection and appointment as described in this document follows:
Summary of Process

STEP 1
Principal reviews each current AST and AST position. The principal may,
   a) re-appoint the AST; or
   b) declare the position vacant and place the AST on the 1993 suitability list, unless the decision to declare the position vacant related to the failure to perform AST duties satisfactorily.

STEP 2
Principal announces to school any re-appointments made and the remaining number of vacant AST positions and invites applications.

STEP 3
Principal informs all teachers placed on the suitability list in 1992 that they will be placed on the 1993 suitability list without the need for application or interview and invites applications from other eligible teachers.

STEP 4
The school based AST panel determines the suitability of each applicant.

STEP 5
Panel places suitable applicants on suitability list.

STEP 6
Applicant Listing form is completed and forwarded to the cluster director by the school principal for approval. If the cluster director is a member of the panel, the form is forwarded to Director, Human Resources for approval.

STEP 7
Principal, together with staff and community, determine new areas of need to be addressed by ASTs in 1993.

STEP 8
From the approved suitability list, the principal appoints ASTs subject to confirmation of the service requirement by regional officers.

STEP 9
With each appointed AST, the principal negotiates specific roles and responsibilities aimed at meeting the defined needs of the school.
The Advanced Skills Teacher position was created to encourage the retention in the classroom of highly skilled teachers.

The Advanced Skills Teacher position recognises and rewards experienced teachers who have a commitment to classroom teaching and who provide educational leadership, professional support and guidance to other classroom teachers.

The AST category allows AST positions allocated to schools to be used, in addition to the ordinary teaching load, for specific roles and responsibilities relating to the school's needs. These roles and responsibilities include:

- Assisting classroom teachers and in particular beginning teachers including:
  - Provision of professional support to other officers employed in the school or cluster of schools.
  - Support for members of a school executive across faculties and departments in the maintenance of school based welfare programs.
  - Providing professional support and guidance for less experienced teachers, relating to classroom performance, resource development and curriculum implementation.
  - Assistance in the provision of in-school in-service.
  - Assistance to teachers in adapting to the NSW school system.
  - Participating in or leading curriculum development teams.

- Taking demonstration lessons and the supervision of student teachers.

- Specific educational needs identified by the cluster or school directed towards improving the educational outcome of students including:
  - Participating in or leading school welfare teams.
  - Other professional support in areas identified by school principal and/or the cluster director for the implementation and maintenance of whole school programs.

Eligibility to Apply for AST Position

Unpromoted teachers, including specialist teachers such as school counsellors and home school liaison officers, permanent part-time teachers as well as seconded and deployed teachers are eligible to apply if they meet the following service requirement as at February 1, 1993:

1. 3 Year Trained teachers who have completed one year on level 9 of the common salary scale.

2. 4 Year Trained teachers who have completed one year on level 13 of the common salary scale.

See page 26 (Appendix 3 - AST Application Form and Information for Teachers) for more details about the eligibility of teachers other than full-time classroom teachers.

Allocation of ASTs to Schools and Clusters

In September, 1992 additional AST positions were created up to a maximum of 15% of the statewide total number of full-time permanent and temporary teachers on Step 9 (3YT) and Step 13 (4YT) of the common salary scale. This Statewide total has been determined on the basis of the number of teachers
Allocation to clusters and schools

(a) Two thirds of the positions will be distributed across clusters on the basis of the number of full-time unpromoted teachers in each cluster.

This allocation will be distributed across schools within the cluster on the basis of the number of full-time unpromoted teachers in each school.

(b) One third of the positions will be distributed across clusters on the basis on the number of beginning teachers in each cluster in their first two years of service.

This allocation will be distributed across schools within the cluster on the basis of identified needs, as determined by a cluster panel. The cluster panel will consist of the Cluster Director as convener, one secondary and one primary principal from within the cluster.

In allocating positions the cluster panel is to ensure as far as possible that:

- all available AST positions are allocated;
- only whole positions are allocated to schools;
- positions are re-allocated from one school to another within the same cluster or region only after every effort has been made to fill the positions within the school.

Positions already allocated to schools in February will also remain with the same schools in 1993. This makes the number of ASTs to be appointed in 1993 up to 30% of the statewide total number of full-time permanent and temporary teachers who are on Step 9 (3YT) and Step 13 (4YT) of the common salary scale.

Extension of suitability lists

Teachers found suitable in the first round of AST appointments early in 1992 will be automatically placed by the principal on the school’s 1993 suitability list without the need for application or interview.

Review of current AST positions

The principal is required to review the performance of each currently appointed AST. The review is to be based on the agreed roles and responsibilities of the specific AST position. The review should determine whether or not each AST has satisfactorily performed the AST duties.

The principal, in consultation with staff and the school community, should then determine if the school needs addressed by each AST position currently filled will continue to exist in 1993.

In the event that the principal determines that a current AST position should continue to address the same specific need, then the appointed AST is to be automatically re-appointed for 1993 provided that the principal also determines that the AST has satisfactorily performed the AST duties.
In the event that the principal determines that a current AST position should not continue to address the same specific need, then the AST position is to be declared vacant. The AST appointed in 1992 is to be automatically placed on the school’s suitability list for 1993, provided that the principal also determines that the AST has satisfactorily performed the AST duties.

An AST not automatically placed on a suitability list for 1993 may still submit an application form for consideration for suitability in 1993.

At the conclusion of this exercise, the principal should announce to the school staff any re-appointments made and the remaining number of AST positions available to be filled in 1993. The principal should then invite applications from eligible teachers and must clearly indicate a closing date for the receipt of applications.

Application for AST

Principals should ensure that classroom teachers have access to the AST Application Form and Information for Teachers, which informs teachers of the AST eligibility criteria and includes a revised AST application form.

Teachers may apply for assessment as an AST by completing the Application for Advanced Skills Teacher form. This form requires applicants to address general AST criteria by focusing on some or all of the following skills:

- Generation of positive attitudes to learning.
- Use of a breadth of classroom strategies and learning strategies.
- Creation and maintenance of positive classroom dynamics.
- Contribution to specialised learning/welfare areas.
- Contribution to the organisation, planning and development of curriculum.
- Contribution to professional and curriculum decision-making processes.
- Innovation in planning and teaching.
- Contribution to the professional support and development of teachers in the immediate faculty/learning areas.
- Achievement of positive and professional relationships with students, parents and colleagues.

It is not necessary for applicants to submit additional attachments/material with their application forms.

Completed application forms must be lodged with the principal of the applicant’s school.

Teachers who are seconded, deployed or on leave and who have right of return to their school, should submit their applications to their school principal.

Those teachers without right of return may arrange to submit their application to an appropriate school which they last worked.
Consideration of applicants

A school-based AST panel must be established to consider the suitability of applicants. The panel must consist of:

- the principal of the school as convener;
- the cluster director or nominee (from another school);
- a teacher in a promotion position from another school in the cluster;

The panel must include at least one female and one male member.

The convener must ensure that the panel implement EEO principles which ensure that people with equal probability of job success have an equal chance of being appointed. That is, their sex, sexual preference, marital status, race or physical disability should not be barriers to appointment.

The panel will be responsible for the formulation of a list of applicants considered suitable for AST status.

The convener must ensure that it is clearly understood by the panel that their role is to establish the suitability of each applicant against the general AST criteria as outlined in section 6 of the application form and not on the basis of the specific role required for a particular AST position.

In cases where the number of applicants in a school is less than or equal to the number of available AST positions and the panel feels that, on the strength of the applications, all applicants are deemed suitable, the selection panel may, with the agreement of the applicants, dispense with the interviews. In all other cases all applicants must be interviewed.

Placement on the AST suitability list

At the conclusion of the selection process, the panel must complete the Applicant Listing 1993 return (attached), listing all applicants and indicating those deemed suitable.

Unsuccessful applicants may be deemed ineligible if they do not meet the service requirement or unsuitable if they meet the service requirement but do not satisfy the panel that their skills and experience within the context of the AST general criteria are of an AST standard.

The Applicant Listing 1993 return should be forwarded to the cluster director for approval. In cases where the cluster director is a panel member, the return should be forwarded to the regional director, Human Resources for approval.

Determining school needs to be addressed by ASTs

The principal, using the school's management plan and in consultation with school staff and community, should determine areas of need that will be addressed by ASTs appointed in the following year.

In identifying areas of need to be addressed, the principal may focus for example on the needs of professional development of classroom teachers, provision of leadership and support for school welfare programs or co-ordination of student teachers programs.
The principal will define a broad set of roles and responsibilities for each available AST position based on the identified areas of need.

**Appointment of ASTs**

From the approved suitability list, the principal will select for appointment the most appropriate suitable teacher for each available AST position using the defined roles and responsibilities.

The principal will complete the *Appointments for 1993* return (attached) and forward it to the cluster director who will arrange for confirmation of the service requirement to be undertaken by regional officers. Upon confirmation, the principal will announce the appointment of ASTs. Generally, all applicants should be informed of the result of their application within two weeks of interview.

Following the appointment of ASTs, the principal must negotiate the specific roles and responsibilities to be undertaken to meet the school needs identified by the principal, staff and community with each appointed AST.

In cases where an AST is requested to undertake cluster wide responsibilities, similar negotiations should take place between the appointed AST, the cluster director and the school principal.

Only permanent part-time teachers may be appointed to AST positions on a part-time basis. In most cases, a school will appoint two permanent part-time teachers as ASTs where between them, one full-time position can be allocated.

Seconded and deployed teachers and other teachers not appointed to a school-based position may not be appointed as ASTs. Such teachers may be placed on suitability lists pending their return to a school-based position.

Teachers not deemed suitable or not appointed to AST positions may request the Regional Director, Human Resources to review the selection process if they believe they have grounds to justify such a review.

**Letters to applicants**

Principals are responsible for providing all applicants with feedback during the selection and appointment process. Sample letters are provided in this document for use by principals.

**Conditions of Service of ASTs**

A teacher appointed to an AST position remains in that position for the current school year.

At the end of each school year the AST’s performance will be reviewed by the principal.

The principal may re-appoint a teacher as an AST for the following year provided:

- the AST position continues to be available at the school,
- the principal is of the opinion that the tasks of the AST position remain appropriate and
the teacher's annual review relating to the performance of the role of AST has been satisfactory.

A teacher placed on an AST suitability list remains on that list for one school year. The principal may determine that a teacher on the AST suitability list remains on that list for the next year without the need for an interview. Teachers deemed suitable in 1992, remain on the suitability list until the end of the 1993 school year.

Teachers appointed as ASTs or placed on a school's AST suitability list who are transferred to a school where a vacant AST position exist may be considered for appointment to that position.

Dealing with vacant AST positions

Where insufficient applicants are available for selection from within the school, the following procedures are offered to assist in filling AST positions:

(a) Classroom teacher vacancies which are advertised may have a preamble in the advertisement declaring the availability of one or more AST positions for which successful applicants may be considered.

If there are no vacant classroom teacher positions, then

(b) The cluster director may arrange for an exchange, for a specific period of time, of classroom teachers between two schools within the cluster, with the agreement of the classroom teachers and principals concerned.

(c) The cluster director may reallocate the unfilled AST position to another school within the cluster for the remainder of the school year.

Such a reallocation may similarly be effected within the Region for the remainder of the school year if the position cannot be filled by either advertisement or reallocation within the cluster.

A flow diagram describing these procedures follows.
FILLING OF AN ADVANCED SKILLS TEACHER VACANCY IN A SCHOOL WITH INSUFFICIENT ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Current staffing process

- CRT vacancy remains
- AST vacancy remains

Advertise CRT position with AST as incentive.

- CRT position filled by teacher assessed as eligible for appointment as an AST
  - Recommend and appoint teacher as AST

- AST position not filled through responses to advertisement

- Negotiate exchange of CRTs within Cluster to provide a teacher suitable for appointment as an AST
  - Suitable exchange negotiated
  - NO
  - YES
  - Reallocate across cluster or region
  - Recommend and appoint teacher as AST
Appendices

1. **AST - Sample letters**
   - Applicants not placed on the suitability list following interview
   - Applicants placed on the suitability list following interview
   - Applicants on suitability list who are not appointed as Advanced Skills Teachers
   - Applicants who have been appointed as an AST

2. **AST School Return**
   - Applicant Listing 1993
   - Appointments for 1993

3. **AST Application form and Information for Teachers**
Dear

I refer to your application for the position of Advanced Skills Teacher at _________ School.

After careful consideration of your application the AST Panel has not recommended your placement on the suitability list for the _____________ school year.

Whilst you were not successful on this occasion I would like to thank you for your application and wish you well in the future. If you wish to discuss any aspect of your application please contact me at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Convener
(Position)
Dear

I refer to your application to become an Advanced Skills Teacher at __________ School.

I am pleased to inform you that your name has been included in this school's AST suitability list.

I shall commence the process of selecting the Advanced Skills Teachers for specific positions at this school during the 20__ school year. I will advise you of my decision at the earliest possible opportunity.

On behalf of the AST Panel I wish to congratulate you on this recognition of your outstanding teaching skills.

Your sincerely,

Convener
(Position)
Dear,

Following consideration of the needs of _______________ School during the ________ school year I have appointed _______________ , _______________ (etc) as Advanced Skills Teacher(s).

Unfortunately you have not been appointed, however you should be aware that your status of suitability as an Advanced Skills Teacher will remain valid until the end of 1993.

Thank you for your outstanding service to the New South Wales Department of School Education.

Your sincerely,

Convener
(Position)

/ / /
TO: APPLICANTS WHO HAVE BEEN APPOINTED AS AN AST.

Dear

I am pleased to inform you that you have been appointed as an Advanced Skills Teacher at _________ School for the _______ school year.

I would like to congratulate you on this recognition of your achievements as a classroom practitioner.

Yours sincerely,

Convener
(Position)
Advanced Skills Teacher School Return
Applicant Listing 1993

This Return should also include teachers deemed suitable in the first round of AST appointments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Applicants deemed suitable, prior to appointments being made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsuitable/Ineligible Applicants
(please place U or I for each applicant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Unsuitable or Ineligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Panel

Convener
Name
Signature
Date

Cluster Director/Nominee
Name
Signature
Date

Member
Name
Signature
Date

Number of Males on Panel
Number of Females on Panel

Approval
Advanced Skills Teacher School Return Appointments for 1993

This Return should also include any AST appointed in 1992 who is reappointed for 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following applicant(s) have been appointed from the AST-suitability list to Advanced Skills Teacher position(s), subject to regional confirmation of status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>New Appointment or Re-appointment (N/R)</th>
<th>3YT or 4YT</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Superannuation (Y/N)</th>
<th>Status Confirmed (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal's Signature _____________________________ Date ____________

School AST total allocation for 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4YT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

- A - Appointed
- S - Suitable but not appointed
- U - Unsuitable/ ineligible
- P - Permanent
Advanced Skills Teacher Application Form and Information for Teachers, 1992

November, 1992

Application form and Information for Teachers
This document replaces the AST Information Bulletin published in February, 1992. The document answers more questions and includes an AST application form.

For detailed information on this initiative, interested teachers should refer to the appropriate section of the Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award. Details of this award were reprinted in School Education News - Volume 1 No. 13, 30 October, 1991.

The following terms are used in this document:

- **Eligible AST**: Teachers meeting the AST service requirement are considered *eligible* to apply for AST appointment.

- **Suitable AST**: Teachers are deemed *suitable* ASTs if they meet the AST service requirement and satisfy the school based AST panel that they also meet the general AST criteria.

- **Suitability List**: Teachers deemed suitable ASTs are placed on a *suitability list*.

- **Appointed AST**: Teachers placed on the suitability list may be *appointed* as ASTs if their skills and experiences best meet the roles and responsibilities defined for specific AST positions.

A summary of the process of selection and appointment as described in this document follows:
ADVANCED SKILLS TEACHERS FOR 1993

Summary of Process

STEP 1
Principal reviews each current AST and AST position. The principal may,
a) re-appoint the AST; or
b) declare the position vacant and place the AST on the 1993 suitability list, unless the decision to declare the position vacant related to the failure to perform AST duties satisfactorily.

STEP 2
Principal announces to school any re-appointments made and the remaining number of vacant AST positions and invites applications.

STEP 3
Principal informs all teachers placed on the suitability list in 1992 that they will be placed on the 1993 suitability list without the need for application or interview and invites applications from other eligible teachers.

STEP 4
The school based AST panel determines the suitability of each applicant.
Panel places suitable applicants on suitability list.

STEP 5
Applicant Listing form is completed and forwarded to the cluster director by the school principal for approval. If the cluster director is a member of the panel, the form is forwarded to Director, Human Resources for approval.

STEP 6
Principal, together with staff and community, determine new areas of need to be addressed by ASTs in 1993.

From the approved suitability list, the principal appoints ASTs subject to confirmation of the service requirement by regional officers.

With each appointed AST, the principal negotiates specific roles and responsibilities aimed at meeting the defined needs of the school.
What is the allowance for an Advanced Skills Teacher (AST)?

ASTs will be paid an annual allowance of $1230. ASTs have the option for the allowance to be superable.

What are the responsibilities of an AST?

An AST is a classroom teacher who provides educational leadership, and guidance to classroom teachers.

The specific role of an AST will differ from one school to another and from one position to another within the same school. The role is negotiated between the principal and each AST. Examples of roles and responsibilities can be found in Section 11.7.1 of the Teachers and Related Employees Salaries and Conditions Award.

Who is eligible to apply to be an AST?

All permanent and temporary unpromoted teachers are eligible for consideration if they satisfy the following service requirement as at February 1, 1993.

3YT - have completed one year on Level 9 of the Common Salary Scale
4YT - have completed one year on Level 13 of the Common Salary Scale

Page 8 provides additional information for teachers other than full-time classroom teachers.

How have the number of AST positions for schools been determined?

An allocation of AST positions was distributed to schools and clusters in February, 1992. Allocations made to schools in February will remain with the same schools. A further allocation of AST positions has now been made to schools on the same basis as the previous allocation. This brings the number of ASTs to be appointed up to 30% of the statewide total number of full-time permanent and temporary teachers.

How many vacant positions will I be considered for in my school?

First, your principal will review the performance of appointed ASTs on the basis of the agreed roles and responsibilities of the specific AST position. The review will determine whether or not each AST has satisfactorily performed the AST duties.

Second, your principal, in consultation with the school staff and community will determine if the area of need addressed by each filled AST position requires further attention in 1993.

In cases where the need requires further attention and the AST addressing this need has performed the AST duties satisfactorily, the current AST will be automatically re-appointed for 1993.
In cases where the school need has been fully addressed, or where the principal determines that an AST has not performed the AST duties satisfactorily, the AST position will be declared vacant for 1993.

The total number of vacant positions to be filled in 1993 will therefore include positions declared vacant as described above, positions allocated for 1992 to your school but which remained unfilled and the additional positions allocated to your school for 1993.

Applicants deemed suitable will be considered for each of these positions.

What happens if I was appointed AST and the Principal declares my position vacant?

If your principal determines that you performed your AST duties satisfactorily, then you will be automatically placed on the 1993 suitability list without having to re-apply or be interviewed.

If your principal determines that you did not perform your AST duties satisfactorily, then you are eligible to re-apply for placement on the 1993 suitability list by submitting an application form.

Do I have to re-apply if I was not appointed as an AST but was placed on the 1992 suitability list?

No. All teachers who were deemed suitable but were not appointed to AST positions in 1992 will be automatically placed on the 1993 suitability list without the need for application or interview.

In future years, teachers placed on suitability lists will remain on the list for the remainder of the current year and may be placed, without having to re-apply or be interviewed, on the suitability list for the following year subject to a satisfactory review.

How do I apply to be an AST?

An Advanced Skills Teacher Application form is included in this document. The form must be completed and submitted to your Principal.

Who will determine the closing date for application and how will I know?

The Principal will determine a closing date for applications and will inform all school staff.

What are the skills I should address in completing the application form?

Teachers are advised to focus on some or all of the following skills when addressing the general AST criteria in section 6 of the application form.

- Generation of positive attitudes to learning.
- Use of a breadth of classroom strategies and learning strategies.
- Creation and maintenance of positive classroom dynamics.
- Contribution to specialised learning/welfare areas.
- Contribution to the organisation, planning and development of curriculum.
• Contribution to professional and curriculum decision-making processes.
• Innovation in planning and teaching.
• Contribution to the professional support and development of teachers in the immediate faculty/learning areas.
• Achievement of positive and professional relationships with students, parents and colleagues.

Who will be on the panel?

The panel will consist of:

• The principal of the school (convener);
• The cluster director or nominee who must be from another school and;
• A teacher in a promotion position from another school in the cluster.

The panel will consist of at least one male and one female and will adhere to EEO principles.

What are the panel’s responsibilities?

The Panel will consider all applicants and place those applicants who meet the AST service requirement and the AST general criteria on a suitability list.

Who will be deemed suitable?

Teachers who meet the AST service requirement and who through their application and performance at the interview demonstrate that they possess exceptional ability as a teacher will be deemed suitable ASTs.

Refer to the application form for more specific details.

How will the ASTs be appointed?

The Principal will consider all applicants placed on the suitability list for appointment as ASTs and will appoint the most suitable applicants to available positions. The selection for appointment will be based on the particular responsibilities required of each position as determined by the Principal in consultation with the staff and school community.

When will the result of my application be known?

The Principal, in normal circumstances will inform all applicants of the result of their application within two weeks of interview.
What if I wish to complain about the selection and appointment process?

Teachers not deemed suitable or not appointed to AST positions should first discuss their position with their principal. If teachers believe that there are still grounds for complaint, they should write to the regional Director, Human Resources who may conduct a review of the selection and appointment process.

Can two full-time teachers share one AST position?

No. A full-time teacher can only be appointed to a full-time position.

If I am placed on the AST suitability list how long will my suitability remain current?

Teachers will remain on the suitability list until the end of the 1993 school year and may remain on the list subject to a satisfactory yearly review.

However, teachers deemed suitable in 1992 will remain suitable until the end of 1993.

Can I transfer as an AST?

All appointed ASTs, and those placed on the suitability list, who are transferred to a school where a vacant AST position exist may be considered for appointment to that position. Transferred ASTs should inform their principal of their AST suitability.

When will further applications for ASTs be considered?

Further applications for assessment to determine suitability for an Advanced Skills Teacher appointment in 1994 will be considered during Term 3, 1993.
Information for Teachers Other than Full-time Classroom Teachers

☐ Seconded and deployed teachers

Am I eligible to apply?
Yes, provided you meet the service requirement.

To whom should I apply?
If you have right of return to your school you may submit your application to your school principal. If you do not have right of return you may submit your application to an appropriate school near your place of employment or where appropriate you may elect to submit your application to your last school. Please check the closing date for AST applications with the school principal.

Can I be appointed as an AST, if I am not in a school based position?
No. The nature of the AST position and its responsibilities makes it imperative that the positions are only allocated to school based staff. You may however, be placed on a suitability list which may result in a future appointment as an AST upon your return to a school.

☐ Specialist teachers

Am I eligible to apply?
If you are a school counsellor, home school liaison officer, teacher librarian, itinerant teacher or other specialist teacher and you meet the service requirement then you are eligible to apply.

To whom should I apply, if I am based in more than one school?
You should submit your application in the school where you spend most of your time.

Can I be appointed as an AST?
Yes, provided that you are deemed suitable and your principal determines that you are best able to address a particular need of the school which is to be assigned to an AST.

☐ Permanent Part time teachers (including part time leave without pay)

Am I eligible to apply?
Yes.

Can I be appointed as an AST?
Yes, provided that you are deemed suitable and the principal determines that you are best able to address a particular need of the school which is to be assigned to an AST.

In most cases, to ensure that a full set of responsibilities is assigned to an AST position, a principal may appoint two permanent part time teachers to one AST position on a job share arrangement.

Job sharing arrangements are not available for full time teachers, i.e. a full time teacher may only be considered for appointment to an AST position on a full time basis.

The above also applies for teachers granted part-time leave without pay for the full school year.
☐ Tear off and complete the application form.

☐ Applications should be submitted to your Principal
Personnel and Employee Relations Directorate - 1992

NSW Department of School Education
Dear Colleague,

Through a process of random selection from the list of teachers currently teaching in the South Coast Region, you have been selected to participate in a research project which aims to examine teachers' attitudes towards and experiences of, the Advanced Skills Teacher classification.

Information for this research will be collected through both questionnaire and interviews. Please complete the questionnaire by circling the appropriate responses and returning it in the reply paid envelope provided. The questionnaire takes approximately ten minutes to complete.

On the final page of the questionnaire there is a space available for you to indicate your willingness to be interviewed. Interviews will be conducted at a time of your convenience, most likely over the telephone. While participation in the questionnaire and interviews is voluntary, your decision to participate in the research will mean the results more accurately reflect the situation that exists in schools.

Please note that there is no way that individuals or schools can be identified with the information collected. Information collected from the administration of the survey will be anonymous. Information collected through interviews will be confidential.

For the purpose of this research it is neither necessary nor desirable to connect individuals or schools with specific information and there will be no attempt made to do this. There will be no reference to particular schools or individuals in the final report.

This research project is being conducted with the assistance of the Faculty Of Education at the University Of Wollongong. If you have any enquiries regarding the conduct of the research please contact the Secretary of the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee on (042) 213079.

This research has the approval of the New South Wales Department Of School Education.

Thanking you in anticipation of your involvement,
John MacDonald
Classroom Teacher
Department Of School Education
South Coast Region.

Postal Address: Northfields Avenue Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
Telephone: (042) 21 3555 (University). Facsimile: (042) 21 4657
Teachers' Attitudes Towards The Advanced Skills Teacher Classification

Teacher Questionnaire

Dear Colleague,

This questionnaire is part of a study designed to describe teachers' attitudes towards the Advanced Skills Teacher classification, first introduced into New South Wales state schools in 1991.

Directions:

Part A of the questionnaire asks you to provide some personal information. Please circle the appropriate number.

Part B of the questionnaire asks for your experience of AST policy implementation.

Please indicate your response to each question by circling the appropriate number. Your responses will be either:

4. Nearly Always .......... Over 75% of the time
3. Often ...................... About 50 - 75% of the time
2. Sometimes .................. Around 25 - 50% of the time
1. Rarely ........................ Less than 25% of the time
0. No Idea

Part C of the questionnaire asks for your opinion on a scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, with the option of No Comment. Please circle the appropriate number.

The information you can provide is highly valued, so please return the completed questionnaire in the reply paid envelope provided by Friday, 20 October, 1995.

Be assured that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. There is no purpose in, nor intention to, identify individuals or schools in the final report.

A second method for collecting data for this study will be follow up interviews. If you are prepared to take part in these interviews, please indicate this by returning the notice attached as the last sheet to this questionnaire. Each interview will take approximately fifteen minutes.

The questionnaire takes approximately 10 minutes to complete.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
This information is CONFIDENTIAL and will be used for statistical purposes only.

*Please circle the number against your answer.*

**PART A: ABOUT YOU**

1. Level of students taught.
   - Primary: 1
   - Secondary: 2

2. Years Of Service.
   - 0 - 5 years: 1
   - 6 - 10 years: 2
   - 11 - 15 years: 3
   - 16 - 20 years: 4
   - 21 - 30 years +: 5

3. Years Of Teacher Training.
   - 2/3 years trained: 1
   - 4 + years trained: 2

4. Are you in an Executive position at your school.
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 2

   *If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 4, please commence Part B on the next page. If you answered ‘No’ please answer Question 5.*

5. Have you nominated yourself for assessment for AST suitability.
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 2

   *If you answered ‘No’ to Question 5, please commence Part B on the next page. If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 5 please answer Question 6.*

6. Have you held an AST position.
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 2

   **Part B commences on the following page.**
Part B of the survey relates to *your experience of AST policy implementation.*

*(Please circle the appropriate response)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nearly Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>No Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my experience, teachers have been made aware of the selection criteria before applying for AST assessment.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the schools where I have taught, staff have been told what an AST will do before that AST is selected.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have found that the supervision process has provided teachers with assistance in preparing for AST assessment.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my experience, the roles required of AST's have directly related to improving the performance of other teachers.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It has been my experience that feedback on why teachers are selected as AST's has been provided to the rest of the staff.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the schools where I have taught, the extra duties given to AST's have been communicated clearly to all staff.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In my experience, AST's have been selected only on the basis of their teaching skills and abilities.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. From my experience, given their salary increase, AST's should be expected to do more within their AST role.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In my experience, AST roles have been important to the functioning of the school.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In the schools where I have taught, the only criteria used to assess teachers for AST suitability has been classroom teaching skills.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In the schools where I have taught, other teachers have been made aware of the roles of the AST's at the school.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It has been my experience that the staff have known what the role of a future AST is to be prior to the selection process.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In schools where I've taught, the performance of each AST has been evaluated.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It has been my experience that, relative to their salary increase, AST's have been expected to do too much.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B of the survey relates to your experience of AST policy implementation. (Please circle the appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Nearly Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>No Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. In my experience, AST's have been provided with feedback on their performance from the school leadership.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have found that the extra responsibilities of AST's have been significant and of some consequence in the school.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I have found that the effectiveness of AST's has been taken seriously by school leadership.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. In schools where I have taught, professional development for teachers has helped to prepare candidates for AST selection.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In my experience, AST's have been aware of the perceived level of their performance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In my experience, the AST selection process has provided candidates with valuable feedback.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. In the schools where I have taught, the reasons for selecting certain candidates have been communicated to staff.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. In my experience the roles required of AST's have directly related to improving classroom practice.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It has been my experience that the unsuccessful candidates for AST positions have been told why they didn't get the position.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In the schools where I have taught, criteria for selection as an AST was made clear to all staff prior to the selection process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part C commences on the following page.
Part C
To further gauge your attitudes towards the AST policy and classification, please consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From my experience, the AST policy has been implemented effectively.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highly skilled teachers should be rewarded, and encouraged to share their skills with other teachers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As it has occurred in schools, the AST classification has been a positive initiative.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The idea behind the creation of AST positions was a good idea.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the trials of this survey, I found many teachers who were interested in discussing the study and in particular, their experiences/views on AST implementation. A second method for gathering data for this study will be through interviews. If you are prepared to be interviewed, either by telephone or in person, (your choice) please provide the contact details required below.

Like the survey information, interview information will remain confidential.

Name: __________________________
Telephone Number: ___________________
Best time to contact you at this number: ___________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX J
Validating Committee

Associate Professor John Patterson
Dean
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong

Gregg Rowlands
Lecturer
Faculty of Education
University of Wollongong

Fiona Whiting
Assistant Principal
Fairy Meadow Demonstration School

Julie Knott
Teacher
Como West Public School
Dear John

I refer to your application to conduct a project in Departmental schools entitled:

*Teachers' attitudes towards AST classification and the impact of school level policy implementation on these attitudes.*

I am pleased to inform you that I have approved your application to conduct this research. I ask that you now contact the principals of the nominated schools to seek their participation. This approval remains valid until: 1/6/96.

In conducting research, you should be aware of the following requirements:

- the principal must approve the methods of gathering information in the school and has the right to withdraw the school from the study at any time;

- the privacy of the school and the students is to be protected.

You are reminded that the participation of teachers and students must be voluntary and must be at the school's convenience. Note that in advising principals that approval has been given for you to seek their support in your study, you should include a copy of this letter with the documents you send to schools.

When your study is completed, please forward your report marked to the Attention of (Dr) Don Gordon, Executive Officer, Research Applications, Quality Assurance Directorate, Department of School Education, Private Bag 3, Ryde NSW 2112. I wish you every success with your project.

Yours sincerely

Neville Hightett
Director
Program Evaluation
1/6/95
The South Coast Region, covering an area of 53,678 square kilometres, is a region of diverse economic activity supporting a population of approximately 448,329.

Encompassing coastal plains, tablelands and the Snowy Mountains, the Region has developed tourism as one of its major growth industries.

Traditionally linked to coal mining, the production of iron and steel and their associated industrial enterprises, the South Coast also supports the primary industries of cattle, wheat and sheep farming. Forestry and timber milling are significant activities, particularly along the coastal strip, as is fishing.
Appendix M
The Senate Inquiry into the Status of Teachers and the Development of the Profession During the Next Five Years

Inquiry into the Status of Teachers

On the 20 June 1996 the following matter was referred to the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee for inquiry and report on or before the last sitting day of the Autumn session 1998:

The status of teachers and the development of the profession during the next five years. Issues include community perception of, and teacher attitudes towards, the teaching profession, and matters of teacher training and supply.

The Committee seeks the views of members of the public on the above issue. Submissions must reach the Committee by 9 May 1997. Full terms of Reference are available on the Internet at: http://senate.aph.gov.au/committee/commfp.html Information is also available by phoning (06) 277 8521, TTY No: (06) 277 7799 or fax (06) 277 5706.

PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA