

THE CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP ROLE IN FACILITATING CURRICULUM DELIBERATION

LYNNE M. HANNAY, *Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education (Midwestern Centre)*

WAYNE SELLER, *Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education (Northwestern Centre)*

Deliberative theory has given the field of curriculum a rich conceptual dialogue ever since the publication of Schwab's first practical paper in 1969.¹ However, whether the benefits of this dialogue have affected school practice is questionable.² To translate the theoretical work on deliberation into the practical world of school-based curriculum development, we must consider ways of helping practitioners understand and practice the deliberative process.

Understanding the role of the curriculum development chair in leading the deliberative process might give practitioners one means of facilitating deliberation. This article, then, considers the role of two committee leaders, providing examples and suggesting strategies useful for those responsible for guiding the work of curriculum development committees.

Leading a curriculum development committee requires the same basic skills necessary for effective leadership in any aspect of school life. The purpose of such leadership is to manage a process for completing identified tasks. In this case, the task is producing a curriculum. The existing images of effective leadership limit an examination of the leadership required for a successful curriculum development project. These images originate in studies of administrative and managerial positions and are of limited value in examining curriculum leadership because they miss two important aspects of the curriculum development task. The first missing element is the identity of the person chairing the curriculum committee, in most instances, a classroom teacher or a department head. Therefore, the chair is not in an administrative or managerial position and so does not hold any power of position over the other committee members. Leadership forces, whether real or implied by

¹Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical. A Language for Curriculum," *School Review* 78 (November 1969): 1-23.

²Ilene B. Harris, "Communicating the Character of 'Deliberation,'" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18 (April-June 1986): 115-132.

position, are therefore not available to the curriculum leader. The second consideration for supplementing the traditional leadership image is the need for specialized curriculum knowledge. A curriculum committee's task is based on a process, deliberation, not commonly used by organizational functionaries.

Skills in communications, interpersonal relations, and group task and maintenance functions as presented in the work of Katz and Kahn, Bowers and Seashore, Fiedler, and Hoy and Miskel are important to the curriculum leader.³ Schwab, however, provides us with the additional abilities and knowledge that the curriculum leader needs.⁴ Schwab's basic concept of leadership in a curriculum committee is consistent with traditional leadership and theory.⁵ His accent on the committee's need to come together and work as a group implies that the skills related to team building and group task and maintenance functions are important aspects of the leadership role. Similarly, Schwab relates the role of the chair to task accomplishment:

It is the chairman's task to move the group to effectiveness. . . . The chairman's contributions to the effectiveness of the group are of two kinds: the performance of tasks which complement those of the group, activities with the group or with specific members of it designed to enhance their competence.⁶

Schwab's basic concept of curriculum development leadership is consistent with the behavioral approach to studying leadership: What a leader does is important. He does not allow for groups' contextual variations or for situational leadership.

A major contribution Schwab makes to the discussion of leading curriculum committees comes from his view of the process the group uses to accomplish its task. In his view, Schwab includes decision making based on serious reflection involving input from all stakeholders. This call for reflection (which does not occur unless motivated by an external stimulus) provides an argument for the leader's need for knowledge about, and skill in, deliberation. Schwab implies that deliberation is indeed a curriculum skill because, although he argues for the presence of a principal on the curriculum committee, he does not endow this role with the chair of the committee.⁷

³Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (New York: Wiley, 1978); David G. Bowers and Stanley E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 11 (September 1966): 238-263; Fred E. Fiedler, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967); Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel, *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice* (New York: Random House, 1982).

⁴Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4. Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 239-265.

⁵Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical. A Language for Curriculum," *School Review* 78 (November 1969): 1-23.

⁶Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4. Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 252.

⁷Ibid.

The use of the commonplaces of student, teacher, subject matter, and milieu as the basis for maintaining deliberation indicates a further refinement of the curriculum leader's knowledge and skill base. This person must maintain a balanced discussion within the group during deliberation. Applying this skill and knowledge goes beyond the normal group task and maintenance functions and focuses on the technical requirements of a skilled curriculum leader. Schwab calls these requirements the "arts of deliberation and eclectic" and the "arts of the problemation."⁸

Although Schwab says that "the chairman will need to evoke and maintain an appropriately deliberative mode of discussion," he acknowledges the difficulty of the task.⁹ Most people are inexperienced in using the deliberative mode because the debate format is more prevalent in our society. In the context of curriculum development, that lack of power of position and a clearly outlined process further complicate the leader's task.

To understand the nature of effective curriculum leadership, we need a different framework for conceptualizing leadership. This framework must help combine the theoretical and research bases of the managerial approach and the specialized requirements of the curriculum process. Sergiovanni provides one framework.¹⁰ He presents various aspects of leadership metaphorically as forces available to the leader. He defines force as "the strength or energy brought to bear on a situation to start or stop motion or change."¹¹ Through this approach, Sergiovanni extends the locus of leadership from the traditional managerial roles to others, including teachers. The basis for leadership in this setting, therefore, is not limited to those in power roles but includes anyone interested in improving a situation. Sergiovanni presents five leadership forces—technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural—that can serve as lenses to examine the behavior of a leader in action.

Technical leadership includes activities like planning, time management, organization, and coordination. In the curriculum process, technical skills might also include facilitating continual movement from design decisions to an examination of the philosophy of the curriculum and back to design. Deliberation is the process that allows this activity to occur.

The human leadership force incorporates the leader's human relations actions and particular approaches to such activities as decision making. The curricularist extends this force to include establishing an environment that supports reflection without the pressure and stress of having to produce a concrete product too quickly.

⁸Ibid., pp. 243, 257.

⁹Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁰Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

¹¹Ibid., p. 6.

Educational leadership constitutes Sergiovanni's third force.¹² At the general managerial level, this aspect of leadership involves diagnosing problems, counseling teachers, and providing supervision. In the curriculum process, the educational force also includes knowledge of commonplaces and an ability to maintain a balance between them during deliberations.

The fourth force is symbolic leadership. Sergiovanni describes this aspect as the "role of chief" and explains that the leader helps others identify what is important and valuable.¹³ Through the leader's actions, the group receives clarification of its basic purposes and goals. This leader helps the others explore what is beneath the surface of the task and understand the established vision. Symbolic leadership is the essence of the curriculum deliberation process.

Cultural leadership constitutes the last force. The purpose of this force is to establish the organization as a distinct entity in which all members feel they are an integral part. In the curriculum process, cultural leadership includes two important aspects: identifying what constitutes problematic practice in the light of the purpose of the curriculum activity and establishing the group identity in terms of both the product and the process.

Examining the leadership of a curriculum development committee involves both traditional views of effective leadership and the specific requirements of the curriculum process. The concept of a range of forces available to a leader helps to combine the two aspects into a coherent whole.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of curriculum decision making as it occurred in school-based curriculum development committees. The research design was embedded in the naturalistic paradigm because of the complex and context-dependent nature of the curriculum decision-making process. This article focuses on the curriculum leadership evidenced in two of the studied committees.

Contextual Description of Research Sites

This article reports on the deliberative process experienced by two curriculum development committees, a high school geography committee and a school district-based process-oriented thinking (POT) committee. Both committees were located in the same school district, but differing contextual factors influenced the committees and resulted in different experiences. Both committees were developing a curriculum for use in their own practice.

¹²Ibid., pp. 4-13.

¹³Ibid., p. 7.

The geography committee was developing a grade 11 geography curriculum to be implemented at their school. Committee membership included five practicing teachers and a faculty member from the Northwestern Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). The teacher members of the committee were selected by the school administration because they were teaching geography, not because they had either a major interest or expertise in developing curriculum. While one teacher was officially named the committee chair, OISE faculty member Lynne Hannay acted as the curriculum leader.¹⁴

The purpose of the POT committee was to develop a professional development curriculum for the teachers in the school district. The goal was to implement process-oriented thinking into the instructional practices of the school district by first educating teachers. The committee included the consulting staff of the school district and one principal volunteer. Mick, the curriculum coordinator, led the committee.

Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

Because the intention of the study was to document the development process as it emerged, we employed several naturalistic techniques. The principal investigators were participant researchers in the curriculum development process. The form of the participation varied for the two researchers. One researcher was almost a pure observer and rarely entered into the committee's dialogue. The second researcher, however, acted as a participant-as-observer. In this role, "an observer develops relationships with informants through time, and . . . is apt to spend more time and energy participating than observing."¹⁵ The decision to assume a more active participant role was based on our conscious attempt to implement Schwab's curriculum leadership role alongside the field development responsibilities.¹⁶ In addition, this form of participant observation gave greater insight into the curriculum development process.¹⁷ The researchers' interventions became another focus of the emerging design.

Audiotapes of each committee meeting supplemented the researchers' presence. The tapes were transcribed verbatim onto diskettes to facilitate data analysis. The audiotape data consist of 710 pages of single-spaced transcripts for the geography committee and 239 pages of single-spaced transcripts for the POT committee. Also, the researchers interviewed the committee members

¹⁴All names, except that of the researcher, have been changed.

¹⁵Raymond L. Gold, "Roles in Sociological Field Observations," in *Issues in Participant Observation*, ed. George J. McCall and J. Simmons (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969), p. 35.

¹⁶Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4. Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 239-265.

¹⁷William H. Schubert, "Curriculum Research Controversy: A Special Case of a General Problem," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 1 (Winter 1986): 132-147.

about their reflections on the development process and their curriculum orientations. These taped interviews were conversational and open-ended. The tapes were then transcribed and entered onto computer diskettes.

The data analysis consisted of reviewing the transcripts to determine whether a framework based on Sergiovanni would be a useful tool for analyzing the leadership role. The transcripts were coded for instances of the five leadership forces and for instances when the Sergiovanni framework would not apply. Sergiovanni's five leadership forces provide the conceptual framework for analyzing the forms and styles of leadership that facilitate deliberative curriculum development.

FINDINGS

Technical

Technical leadership, according to Sergiovanni, concerns planning, time management, organization, and coordination.¹⁸ These factors are important considerations for the curriculum development process. In both committees, the leaders frequently guided the organization of the development process. The leaders dealt with both simplistic organizational matters such as arranging the next meeting or typing the draft copies; they also helped organize more substantive issues pertinent to the development process. They often summarized what the committee had accomplished to date and what still had to be tackled. For instance, Lynne, the leader of the geography committee, asked:

Are we bogging down? . . . trying to get ahead of ourselves? If we can figure out themes or whatever. . . . We have already identified concepts, we've already identified skills. If we could identify some themes, then let's go and start to see how we could organize them. You know, how would you put a curriculum together that would reflect those themes? (Meeting 2, p. 32)

Mick, the POT committee leader, frequently evidenced a similar style:

Okay, we entered into this round of discussion by talking about the ways a student learns, how a student learns. We have it listed there. . . . Now we entered into the whole aspect of styles, okay? So are we ready to add, to the process-oriented thinking model, a [learning] styles step? (Meeting 1, p. 9)

One technical skill necessary is an understanding of the deliberative process. Evocation and maintenance, as described by Schwab, were used throughout the curriculum development process by both leaders.¹⁹ The teacher members of the geography committee felt pressured to produce a curriculum document quickly to meet external requirements:

¹⁸Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

¹⁹Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 239-265.

I mean [the department head] is just pushing the pressure down the ladder. He's getting pressure from the [assistant principal], and he'll [assistant principal] claim he's getting pressure from whomever. . . . I believe it's the Ministry [of Education] that says you have to have all these nice, concise little documents in your office when we [Ministry of Education] come around. (Meeting 1, p. 8)

By constantly reinforcing the dynamic ends-means nature of curriculum deliberation, Lynne was able to decrease their anxiety about an immediate product, which, in turn, permitted the committee members the luxury of reflection. The following comment typically occurs throughout the transcripts.

It's the nature of curriculum. Because it's not easy, there's no right answer. . . . I think we're building because it's a circular process. We've down time, too, but we're constantly going forward. (Meeting 2, p. 39)

Human

Sergiovanni includes human relations and the method of decision making in his description of the human leadership force.²⁰ Unless we establish a climate that supports reflection and risk taking, deliberation is highly unlikely. In the studied committees, the recognition of the worth of the individual's opinions, support for risk taking, and a participatory decision making mode all contributed to this climate. The geography and POT committee leaders employed similar techniques to build the climate. Typically, they expressed themselves in tentative terms that created a questioning rather than a dogmatic climate. For example, the chair of the POT committee, Mick, frequently introduced a new dimension in this manner. "Let me throw something else out for consideration, okay? Let's take intuition as an example . . ." Lynne also used tentative phrases—"I'm wondering . . .," "I think . . .," "Maybe . . ."—to facilitate a questioning climate that supported deliberation.

Both leaders supported committee members' ideas. An extract from the geography committee transcripts provides a typical example:

Certainly, in the way you set up your assignments, the teaching strategies could hit most skills we're talking about. Hey, I think we're moving, guys. We're humming here. (Meeting 4, p. 8)

The acceptance of the differing perspectives evident in the committee membership led naturally to the participatory decision-making style practiced by both leaders. Curricular decisions were made by consensus, with the leaders encouraging all members to participate equally.

Although the human leadership force was evident in both committees, the nature of the committees resulted in differing emphasis placed on the

²⁰Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

human relations. The POT committee had previous experience working both in a participatory mode and together as a consultative group. The geography committee had not experienced, either through curriculum development or as a department, working together in a deliberative or participatory manner. Therefore, this committee required much more attention to group building and human relations. They became a group through their curriculum development work.

The leader of the geography committee employed a "gentling" process to help committee members gain the confidence to take risks and share their professional expertise. Lynne initially introduced issues that reflected the current beliefs of the members on curriculum development and teaching geography. Gradually, as the process unfolded, she raised more complex concepts that encouraged the teachers to question their past curriculum development and teaching practice. Her understanding of the group members and constant encouragement allowed the participants to take the risks necessary to question their practice. The following comment represents how she displayed respect for the committee members' opinions and teaching expertise: "You're teaching it, not me. . . . If you don't think it is a good idea, say so" (Meeting 2, p. 25). Multiple examples of Lynne's encouragement occur throughout the transcripts:

I'm really impressed by the objectives you've written. I mean, you look at the kind of stuff you're asking kids to do, look at the thinking skills. . . . You're asking them to define and apply. You're asking them to categorize. You're asking them to identify and understand. (Meeting 2, p. 9)

Educational

Sergiovanni's definition of the educational force includes diagnosing problems, counseling teachers, and providing supervision.²¹ In deliberative curriculum development, the educational force is particularly important in facilitating a discussion of and a balance between Schwab's four commonplaces. Further, the educational force raises the question of educational worth, an essential component of the deliberative process.

The transcripts from both the geography and the POT committees provide rich examples of how the two leaders incorporated the educational force into the deliberations. The transcripts document how the leaders helped generate alternatives, introduced a questioning of past practice, and displayed a knowledge of both educational research and provincial educational policy. Schwab notes the importance of the two latter categories in his description of a deliberative curriculum chair.²²

²¹Ibid.

²²Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4. Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 239-265.

Both leaders were adept at interjecting alternatives into the deliberations either by introducing an alternative themselves or by soliciting ones from the committee members. The POT committee leader provided two examples:

Let's take a look at our options. The other option is to do the input when we bring people [in], we guide them to what the changes are and what is meant by those changes, some of the knowns and unknowns that we talked about earlier (Meeting 3, p. 9)

Okay, we've talked about that. . . . Now, what are the alternatives to doing that? (Meeting 4, p. 32)

The geography committee leader also encouraged her committee to investigate alternatives in both the nature of the curriculum and the curriculum development process:

I think the next issue is how you go about organizing it. I mean, do you write a curriculum that has a section on these themes, or do you go with some major topics and figure out how you integrate the themes? I think it's an organizational question for the curriculum. (Meeting 2, p. 35)

The other thing is, in looking at this, have we added in at all the affective domain? We've got skills, and we've got knowledge objectives, but do we have [the] affective? (Meeting 5, p. 8)

By facilitating a consideration of alternatives and establishing a supportive climate, the leaders encouraged Schwab's deliberative process, where "all pool their ingenuities, insights, and perceptions in the interest of discovering the most promising possibilities for trial, rather than forming sides, each of which looks only to the strengths of a selected one alternative."²³

The leaders also performed Schwab's maintenance function in their attempts to balance the focus between the commonplaces.²⁴ When one commonplace dominated—subject matter for the geography committee—the leader asked questions introducing another commonplace into the deliberations. Especially with this committee, Lynne was constantly inserting the student commonplace because the teacher members typically neglected it. Through this process, she was able to help the committee members reflectively address what they should be teaching and for what reason:

I think we can come back to Nick's question, too: What's best for the kids? Which way is going to be easier for the kids to learn the concepts? Maybe that's something we're going to have to think about this afternoon. (Meeting 2, p. 36)

By evoking questions about the student commonplace, Lynne helped the geography committee members move from a traditional content to a more

²³Ibid., p. 255.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 239–265.

process orientation. She began the gentling process early on in the first meeting:

Is there a set of concepts or ideas that would run across both [physical and human geography], regardless of the content? Are there some geography skills that you could focus on in the curriculum? (Meeting 1, p. 8)

The geography committee leader employed her knowledge of existing provincial educational trends and policy to support the direction she was urging the committee to take:

The way it seems to be coming down with all the Ministry documents is integration. That's the way I hear you talking right now is integrating these different things, instead of having them as separate [courses]. (Meeting 1, p. 12)

The geography committee leader did not overtly introduce educational research and knowledge into the deliberations. Perhaps because of the committee composition, however, the POT committee leader frequently introduced such information into the discussions. For instance, when the committee was considering a more interactive approach to their teacher inservice program, Mick introduced the change literature:

I guess the change that we're trying to bring about could be an innovation of sorts. At the top of this page I just gave you, it's from Fullan's book called *The Meaning of Educational Change*, there are 10 points that he says that are essential when you look at bringing change. (Meeting 3, p. 8)

Symbolic

According to Sergiovanni, a leader employing the symbolic force helps group members develop a vision or mission by identifying what is important and valuable.²⁵ Through this process and the actions of the leader, then, the group clarifies its basic purpose and goals. The implicit *should* component of the symbolic force represents the essence of deliberation. Walker classifies the philosophy of the committee as its platform.²⁶ As Kennedy, Sabar, and Shafrii suggest:

It is the platform that guides subsequent development, acting as the reference point for all decisions that have to be made. In particular, the platform suggests the kind of educational activities and experiences that are important for students.²⁷

²⁵Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

²⁶Decker F. Walker, "A Naturalistic Model for Curriculum Development," in *Curriculum: An Introduction to the Field*, ed. James R. Gress and David E. Purpel (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1978), pp. 468-507.

²⁷Kerry J. Kennedy, Naama Sabar, and Nitzza Shafrii, "Knowledge Utilization and the Process of Curriculum Development. A Report," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 17 (January-March 1985): 104.

Both leaders employed the symbolic force to facilitate the deliberative process. Because the geography committee entered into the development process without a common platform, Lynne evoked questions and raised alternatives that helped them develop a common vision or platform. The POT leader was primarily concerned with maintaining the previously established platform centering on process-oriented thinking skills. Typically, he used the symbolic force to reaffirm this philosophy or to question alternatives and decisions in the light of the philosophy. Mick frequently restated the philosophy:

Would it be helpful if I just read the philosophy again? It is not on the page here. We articulated a philosophy. We had "some natural qualities of the child, to develop to their fullest potential as a full being, intellectually, spiritually, morally, physically, and socially." That's the philosophy right here. (Meeting 2, p. 31)

Because the POT committee had a clearly identified end from the beginning of their deliberations, Mick was primarily concerned with ensuring that the means they selected matched their articulated goal. Therefore, his interventions involved maintaining a consistency between the means and the desired end product:

Something that we haven't talked about that's inherent in our philosophy is that we are becoming, now, learner-centered as opposed to teacher-centered. We've never consciously addressed that, but everything we do focuses on the learner as opposed to the teacher. (Meeting 2, p. 35)

The common philosophy and vision led to the committee's missionary zeal. Through the shared goal, the leader was able to create a sense of commitment and excitement:

Now what we're doing here is that we're infusing global change into the [school] system. Like the system is not going to look the same anymore if some of these things are done. We're talking about some pretty nitty-gritty things. (Meeting 4, p. 23)

The geography committee had a different experience related to a common philosophy or platform. Initially, this committee was far more concerned with the end paper product than the means of achieving that end. The leader helped the committee members form and articulate a philosophy for the committee. Lynne employed a process curriculum orientation and the student commonplace as the means of facilitating a reflective discussion on their philosophy. Early in the first committee meeting, she introduced the importance of the committee members rationalizing and supporting their curriculum decisions. "I think you should be starting with why you did that and the rationale for doing it" (Meeting 1, p. 10). She also questioned a content orientation by using the student commonplace in the first meeting:

I often wondered at physical geography. . . . Why is that important for kids to learn? That is sacrilege, I know. But maybe that is a question that should be on the floor. Is it in relation to human [geography]? Because that is what you're saying, that's what kids are going to be interested in. (Meeting 1, p. 14)

A little later in the same meeting, Lynne employed the authority of the Ministry of Education to formally introduce the concept of a process-oriented thinking curriculum orientation:

But is there in the new geography document [Ministry of Education guideline], like there is in every other new document that comes out, a real emphasis on problem-solving skills rather than content? (Meeting 1, p. 21)

The geography committee leader continually, throughout the life of the committee, returned the discussion to a problem-solving or process curriculum orientation. Typically, she raised the issue by discussing a design decision of the committee. As Schwab suggests, she used the committee's words and actions to evoke deliberation.²⁸ In the following comment, she reacted to a draft section prepared by a committee member:

I'm wondering, Mark. . . . As an overall reaction to this, it's gone very much back to content, and the process skills aren't emphasized very much in the whole unit (Meeting 6, p. 25)

The continual emphasis on process learning and the established reflective climate described earlier in the Human section created an environment where committee members felt comfortable enough to question their existing practice and to explore alternative ways of teaching and learning. The following transcript provides an instance where the committee reflectively explored such issues:

Lynne: You could set up some really neat role-playing situations in any of these categories. . . .

Mark: Do you ever do role-playing?

Archie: Pardon me?

Mark: Do you ever do role-playing in geography or anywhere?

Archie: I have maybe once.

Mark: I never have. Well, I've sort of toyed with the idea. . . . How do you do it?

Lynne: [provides examples]

Mark: Have you got an example of any of that? Could you dig out something?

Lynne: [more examples]

Mark: I'd like to see that, quite frankly, because I don't really know that much about role-playing. I mean, I know the general drift of it, but I stop and think to myself, "Mmhm, I can't. . . ." Maybe I don't give enough thought to it.

Archie: I think role-playing and most of those types of strategies demand a heck of a pile of preparation because the better they're prepared, in my mind, the more successful they'll be in the classroom. I find I just don't have that kind of time most times. I've never seen an example in my teaching career, you know, say, in teachers college or something like that. . . . I think that is why I tend to stay away from it.

²⁸Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 239-265.

[several comments]

Mark. See, the thing I always wondered is, how do you motivate them? How do you get them to care that much [about the role-playing]? I mean you do it, I do it, for fun, but some of the kids, they don't want to spend the effort.

[several more comments from Lynn]

Archie. Just sitting here talking about it [role-playing], I think I'm going to try it with my five 13s coming in next semester.

Mark. How often do you do all of these things . . . ? Like you know how to do them and so forth, you don't do them mainly on the account of it's easier to do it the other way. I mean the old Socratic style is easy. I mean you could walk in and say, "Well here we go." There's no preparation really. I mean you know the course and so forth. You just go there. There's not a lot that is absolutely necessary, and I think that so often you might do it not because this doesn't work or anything like that but just because it's so much more work.

[more comments]

Archie. I think one of my greatest, I can't say it's a fear, but I think it's one of the greatest reasons for not doing this kind of stuff in the past was I never felt comfortable when it came to an evaluation. How do you evaluate? (Meeting 4, pp. 48-58)

Cultural

For Sergiovanni, the cultural leadership force involves establishing the organization as a distinct entity whose members all consider themselves an integral part.²⁹ Schwab also notes the "need for regular members of our curriculum group to discover one another and to create from the diversity of members a coherent and effective group."³⁰ In curriculum deliberation, this force is crucial for establishing a group identity in terms of both the deliberative product and the process used to create the product. A sharing and open climate facilitates the sense of togetherness or groupness required for deliberation to proceed.

The POT committee had a strong sense of individual and group commitment to its goal of implementing process-oriented thinking skills in the schools. This committee also had a past history of working collaboratively as the consultant staff for the school district. Therefore, Mick did not have to establish a distinct group identity, and his role became one of maintaining the group sense of purpose throughout the deliberative process. He accomplished the maintenance function by frequently referring to the group's mission and the group's role as a change agent in the school system. These comments are typical:

²⁹Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Education Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

³⁰Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do," *Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (Fall 1983): 251.

So what we're trying to do is be the leading edge. We want to have a long-range plan to keep building on this kind of thing. (Meeting 2, p. 35)

That future is largely dependent upon what's happening in this committee. (Meeting 3, p. 22)

The geography committee, conversely, lacked a past history of collaboration or a sense of mission. In the past, the members had worked individually, in isolation from other department members. The leader of this committee had to help the group members establish a sense of entity in both the product they were developing and in the process employed. She used the educational force to facilitate a group discussion of whether their curriculum should have a content or a process orientation.

Schwab notes that the chair must remove or reduce the barriers to collaboration among the curriculum committee members.³¹ Lynne faced this issue because the geography committee initially intended to follow their past practice of working independently:

I think the best bet is you gentlemen prepare your physical geography [course], I'll prepare the human for the general [grade] 11s, and Archie can prepare his for the advanced [level]. . . . You can have copies of ours; we'd like a copy of your physical. (Meeting 1, p. 3)

Starting in the first meeting, the leader stressed the importance of working collaboratively:

Lynne: My only problem is that if you work individually . . . once it is on paper, it'll become law. You're going to lose your collectiveness, which I guess is what I was trying to encourage.

Mark: It's hard to get things done because you sit down and try to outline a course with four guys and so forth . . . a lot of heat generated and not a lot of light.

Lynne: But I think the heat is important, too. (Meeting 1, p. 18)

Lynne not only had to introduce the notion of collaborative curriculum development but had to help individuals overcome their bias toward specific geography subject matter. The strong subject bias was evident from the beginning of the project, according to one committee member:

I hope you don't try to do one [curriculum document] that mixes physical [geography] with human [geography] because I wouldn't do it, and I know damn well that you guys wouldn't do it, would you? (Meeting 1, p. 18)

When the teacher members of the committee decided in their second meeting to develop a common curriculum integrating human and physical geography, Lynne emphasized a circular rather than a linear process for curriculum development:

³¹Ibid., pp. 239–265.

I'm sensing that you guys are talking now about trying to work on one curriculum [Yeah]. Then I would suggest that you start working on that today, not with the anticipation that it be finished. (Meeting 2, p. 3)

The vision referred to in the previous section on symbolic leadership also contributed to the sense of groupness that the geography committee gradually developed. The leader's frequent interjection of the student commonplace into the discussion played a major role in the emerging vision. This comment is typical:

Take the idea of enjoyment as one of the rationales for going to an integrated and concept approach . . . because I think that is underlying the kind of decisions you guys are making, because you want kids to enjoy what they are doing (Meeting 2, p. 12)

The geography committee's development process not only produced a written curriculum document that reflected the vision they developed, but the committee members also perceived the process as valuable. Their comments at the end of the last session indicate their perceptions:

Jack. We learned a lot from [the process], so I think that's the important thing

Archie. By doing it yourself, Lynne, you're going to write a document that you can use. By doing it collectively, we're going to use the document. All of us can use it

Ralph. You have sources of interest that we all have. Like I have my little stash of goodies, okay? And then all of a sudden it comes out, "Geez, I never thought of using that." You get a whole different perspective than you get doing it on an individual basis or two guys that are teaching the course. . . . And you get a pride of ownership, too (Meeting 8, p. 114)

The group identity evident in the geography and POT committees was essential to both committees' successful deliberations. Partially because of the stress both leaders placed on human relations and participatory decision making, the created group culture facilitated the risk taking and reflection necessary in a deliberative process.

DISCUSSION

This article has examined the curriculum leadership practiced by two individuals. Although generalizing from such a small sample is impossible, the evidence suggests some possible implications that could provide the basis for further case-study analysis and that might guide those facilitating school-based deliberation.

Sergiovanni maintains that while the presence of the three lower-level leadership forces—technical, human, and educational—will facilitate a competent school, excellence requires the presence of the two higher-level forces—symbolic and cultural.³² We can make a similar assertion about curriculum

³²Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," *Educational Leadership* 41 (February 1984): 4-13.

deliberation. The technical, human, and educational forces are necessary but not sufficient for deliberation, the symbolic and cultural forces must be present.

The presence of the three lower leadership forces provided the basis for practicing the symbolic and cultural forces. In both committees, the leaders understood the nature of deliberative curriculum development and so could guide the committee through the process. The technical knowledge was especially important to the geography committee because they initially intended to produce a document immediately, without any prolonged consideration of what it should include. This committee perceived a need to produce the curriculum quickly to meet external requirements. Lynne was able to dissipate some of their concerns about the external pressures and to portray development as a circular process.

The human force provided the foundation for deliberation. By understanding the context and the people, as Fieldler advocates, both leaders were able to build the reflective, supportive climate essential for deliberation.³³ The geography committee leader employed a gentling process to gradually encourage a questioning climate. Initially, Lynne asked questions that were not too far removed from the committee members' existing practice and educational beliefs. However, as the deliberative process unfolded and the supportive climate was established, she more critically challenged those practices and beliefs. The gentling process, in conjunction with the supportive atmosphere, helped create a reflective climate.

Both leaders typically guided the deliberations by asking questions and expressing themselves tentatively. When individual committee members addressed the questions asked, they frequently moved into a reflective mode. By guiding the process with questions and tentative suggestions, the leaders helped develop a questioning climate that accepted and encouraged reflection.

The educational leadership force was also a necessary component of the deliberative process. Both leaders adeptly introduced alternatives for their committees to consider. When the discussion neglected a commonplace, the leader typically asked a question bringing that commonplace back into the discussion.

By using the three lower-level leadership forces—technical, human, and educational—the leaders facilitated deliberation. The technical force guided the process, and the human force supported the reflective climate necessary for deliberation. Further, the presence of the educational force evoked a consideration of the four commonplaces and an investigation of alternatives.

Without the presence of the symbolic and the cultural forces, however, successful curriculum deliberation would have been impossible. The symbolic

³³Fred E. Fieldler, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967)

force deals with the establishment of a vision or a platform from which the deliberations may proceed. The symbolic force represents, then, the essence of deliberation. Establishing a vision or platform requires a consideration of what the curriculum should include and why. The leaders of the geography committee and the POT committee were both actively involved in facilitating reflection on the vision or the platform guiding their committees' decisions. By asking questions and phrasing issues in tentative terms, both leaders invited reflection on a common platform. The geography committee leader was more involved in evoking deliberation on the vision, and the POT committee leader was primarily involved in maintaining a consistency between the committee's vision and their projected actions.

Because the geography committee did not have a common platform when they began the development process, the leader helped the members establish a common vision. The gentling process was a key factor in achieving deliberation on the committee's platform. Lynne asked questions about the student commonplace and process skills to accomplish her goal. Only by gradually introducing questions pertinent to these issues, when they arose from the committee's design decisions, was she able to evoke discussion of why certain content and skills were important for students to learn. As the geography committee developed a platform, they began to perceive certain elements of their existing practice as problematic.

The POT committee leader was more actively involved in maintaining than creating the platform. Mick's major function was to ensure that the committee deliberated on whether their planned action was consistent with the goals included in the platform. Frequently, he reminded the committee that their means of delivering the inservice curriculum must also reflect a process-oriented approach.

Ideally, deliberation is a group process in which all members participate equally and freely. One role for the leader, then, is to help establish and maintain a sense of group identity. Both leaders here actively performed this role associated with the cultural force. Again, the POT committee leader primarily served a maintenance function because the committee had a previously established sense of group identity. Mick constantly referred to the committee's change-agent role in implementing process-oriented thinking throughout the school system. The geography committee leader not only had to help the committee establish a shared platform but also had to stress the importance of working collaboratively. Committee members lacked a history of collaborative work, yet by the end of the project they had established a strong collaborative group identity. The role of the leader in establishing the group identity and collaborative decision making was crucial. Lynne's practice of asking questions and providing tentative suggestions encouraged a shared decision-making model rather than an authoritarian approach. As one committee member stated, "You've manipulated us into a real good committee, Lynne" (Meeting 8, p. 12). The reflective, supportive climate established

through the human force was essential in creating the group identity evident by the end of the project.

CONCLUSION

All five of Sergiovanni's leadership forces intertwined to support the two committees' successful curriculum deliberation. This study suggests that the technical, human, and cultural forces are especially germane in facilitating the deliberative process. By technically understanding deliberation, the leaders were able to guide their committees. The reflective, supportive climate that comes from a concern with human relations provides the foundation for building the group identity. Perpetuated with the cultural force, the group identity is essential for deliberation because it provides the arena for shared decision making and collaborative action. Together, the leadership emanating from the technical, human, and cultural forces becomes the means for examining the desired ends. Without a consideration of these elements, the group climate might not be conducive to deliberation.

The educational and symbolic forces more directly concern the substantive issues involved in deliberation. These forces encourage an examination of what should be taught and why. The educational and symbolic forces encourage reflection on the nature of the desired end product.

Curriculum leadership requires a consideration of both the means and the ends. Sergiovanni's five forces provide a way of conceptualizing a curricular leadership role. The technical, human, and cultural forces pertain to the means through which a leader can facilitate the process of creating a curriculum. Curriculum decision making, however, involves choices on what is worthwhile to include in the curriculum offered to students. Sergiovanni's educational and symbolic forces suggest ways a curricular leader can help a committee address the substantive issues or the ends of a curriculum. All five forces, therefore, provide a useful framework for describing curricular leadership appropriate for a deliberative process.³⁴

LYNNE M. HANNAY is Associate Professor of Education and Head, Midwestern Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Margaret Avenue School, 235 Louisa Street, Kitchener, Ontario N2H 5N1, Canada.

WAYNE SELLER is Head, Northwestern Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 235 Gibson Avenue, Thunder Bay, Ontario P7A 2J6, Canada.

³⁴This study was funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Grant 410-85-0531.

Copyright © 1991 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.