

BOLD VISIONS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

# The Future of Educational Research

**Perspectives from beginning  
researchers**

Noleine Fitzallen, Robyn Reaburn and  
Si Fan (Eds.)

*SensePublishers*

## **The Future of Educational Research**

## Bold Visions in Educational Research

Volume 37

### *Series Editors:*

**Kenneth Tobin**, *The Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA*

**Carolyn Ali-Khan**, *College of Education & Human Services, University of North Florida, USA*

### *Co-founding Editor:*

**Joe Kincheloe**

### *Editorial Board:*

**Barry Down**, *School of Education, Murdoch University, Australia*

**Daniel L. Dinsmore**, *University of North Florida, USA*

**Gene Fellner**, *Lehman College, College of Staten Island, USA*

**L. Earle Reynbold**, *Qualitative Research Methods, George Mason University, USA*

**Stephen Ritchie**, *School of Education, Murdoch University, Australia*

### *Scope:*

*Bold Visions in Educational Research* is international in scope and includes books from two areas: *teaching and learning to teach* and *research methods in education*. Each area contains multi-authored handbooks of approximately 200,000 words and monographs (authored and edited collections) of approximately 130,000 words. All books are scholarly, written to engage specified readers and catalyze changes in policies and practices. Defining characteristics of books in the series are their explicit uses of theory and associated methodologies to address important problems. We invite books from across a theoretical and methodological spectrum from scholars employing quantitative, statistical, experimental, ethnographic, semiotic, hermeneutic, historical, ethnomethodological, phenomenological, case studies, action, cultural studies, content analysis, rhetorical, deconstructive, critical, literary, aesthetic and other research methods.

Books on *teaching and learning to teach* focus on any of the curriculum areas (e.g., literacy, science, mathematics, social science), in and out of school settings, and points along the age continuum (pre K to adult). The purpose of books on *research methods in education* is **not** to present generalized and abstract procedures but to show how research is undertaken, highlighting the particulars that pertain to a study. Each book brings to the foreground those details that must be considered at every step on the way to doing a good study. The goal is **not** to show how generalizable methods are but to present rich descriptions to show how research is enacted. The books focus on methodology, within a context of substantive results so that methods, theory, and the processes leading to empirical analyses and outcomes are juxtaposed. In this way method is not reified, but is explored within well-described contexts and the emergent research outcomes. Three illustrative examples of books are those that allow proponents of particular perspectives to interact and debate, comprehensive handbooks where leading scholars explore particular genres of inquiry in detail, and introductory texts to particular educational research methods/issues of interest to novice researchers.

# **The Future of Educational Research**

*Perspectives from Beginning Researchers*

*Edited by*

**Noleine Fitzallen**

*University of Tasmania, Australia*

**Robyn Reaburn**

*University of Tasmania, Australia*

and

**Si Fan**

*University of Tasmania, Australia*



SENSE PUBLISHERS  
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6209-510-6 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-94-6209-511-3 (hardback)

ISBN: 978-94-6209-512-0 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,  
P.O. Box 21858,  
3001 AW Rotterdam,  
The Netherlands  
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All Rights Reserved © 2014 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
<b>Section 1: Researching Policy and Curriculum</b>	
Policy and Curriculum Research in the Context of Change <i>Natalie Brown &amp; Kim Beswick</i>	3
Changes in Policy Related to Early Childhood Education and Care in Australia: The Journey Towards Pedagogical Leadership <i>Di Nailon &amp; Kim Beswick</i>	13
Parents' Evaluation of an Early Learning Support Program <i>Sally Giacon &amp; Ian Hay</i>	25
Factors Influencing an Individual's Decision to Donate to a State University: A Case Study of Two Universities <i>Rohayati Mohd Isa &amp; John Williamson</i>	35
Preparing Tasmanian English Teachers for Curriculum Implementation <i>Amanda Moran, Yoshi Budd, Jeanne Allen &amp; John Williamson</i>	53
Musical Engagement and Wellbeing in Young Garage Bands <i>Jane Baker</i>	67
<b>Section 2: Researching Teachers' Experiences</b>	
Investigating Teachers' Experiences <i>Sharon P. Fraser</i>	79
Challenges Faced by the Male Primary Teacher: A Literature Review <i>Vaughan Cruickshank</i>	87
The Art of Practice: Exploring the Interactions Between Artist Practice and Teacher Practice <i>Abbey MacDonald &amp; Tim Moss</i>	99
An Historical Exploration of Creativity Research <i>Robyn McCarthy &amp; Sharon Pittaway</i>	111
Beginning Teachers' Mathematical Teacher-Efficacy Confidence <i>Lynda Kidd</i>	121

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Just Give Me a Break, Will You? Effects of Uninterrupted Break Time on Teachers' Work Lives <i>Elkana Ngwenya</i>	135
<b>Section 3: Researching Educational Technologies</b>	
Engagement and Educational Technologies <i>Noleine Fitzallen &amp; Jillian Downing</i>	153
Web-Based Technologies: Indispensable Resources in an Australian University Context <i>Si Fan &amp; Thao Le</i>	165
Information Literacy: A Retrospective of the Literature <i>Emily Patterson &amp; Tracey Muir</i>	177
Progress in Video-Based Intervention for Individuals with Autism: Impacts of Imitation Skills and Model Types <i>Christopher Rayner</i>	189
The Use of Interactive Whiteboards in Education: Opportunities and Challenges <i>Marissa Saville, Kim Beswick &amp; Rosemary Callingham</i>	203
<b>Section 4: Researching the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics</b>	
Investigating the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics <i>Helen Chick</i>	219
Factors Influencing Mathematics Achievement Among Secondary School Students: A Review <i>Mini J. Chaman, Kim Beswick &amp; Rosemary Callingham</i>	227
Computational Strategies Used by Year 2 Students <i>Marlene Chesney &amp; Rosemary Callingham</i>	239
Students' Understanding of Variation on Entering Tertiary Education <i>Robyn Reaburn</i>	253
Developing a Sequence of Learning Experiences in Statistics <i>Noleine Fitzallen &amp; Jane Watson</i>	263
<b>Section 5: Researching Literacy Development</b>	
Literacy Development: An Interactive Perspective <i>Ian Hay</i>	281

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Literacy and Students' Transition Into Secondary School <i>Belinda Hopwood, Ian Hay &amp; Janet Dymont</i>	291
Engaged Young Writers: Dialogic Choices Beyond Naplan <i>Damon P. Thomas, Angela Thomas &amp; David Moltow</i>	301
Contributors	317
External Reviewers	325





## PREFACE

*The Future of Educational Research: Perspectives from Beginning Researchers* showcases the work of higher degree by research (HDR) students from the Faculty of Education at the University of Tasmania. It aims to provide an avenue for the students to contribute to research literature early on in their career and supports the notion of publication throughout one's study. The book provides a snapshot of the current state of research across a broad range of fields in education. Each chapter makes a genuine contribution to knowledge in the relevant area and so the book will be useful to a broad range of education researchers. For supervisors and HDR students the book is useful as a set of examples of student writing, suggesting to supervisors and their students the sorts of writing that research higher degree students in education can undertake and the contribution they can make as they progress their candidature.

Contributions to this book cover the spectrum of education from the early years through to tertiary education. In terms of researching teachers, they cover topics as diverse as teachers' time allocation, how teachers manage the introduction of new technology, how the creative endeavour can be affected by the process of teaching and how teachers manage the introduction of new curricula. In relation to students, they cover topics such as mathematics anxiety, the effect of membership of garage bands, and the effects of the transition from primary to secondary school on literacy. From a parents' point of view there is a contribution about the effects of an early learning intervention. There are also chapters on diverse topics such as techniques to assist learning for children with autism, why males find it difficult to become primary teachers, and the role of philanthropy in university funding.

Apparent in the chapters is that research in education can involve a wide variety of methods of data collection and analysis. Some writers have used questionnaires, others interviews, and others a mixture of both. Some have used their own classroom experiences, classroom observations or students' work samples. Yet another has used narrative research. There is also a diverse range of quantitative and qualitative analyses. Evident in all the chapters is the passion the researchers have for their area of interest and their desire to contribute to a better understanding of educational practices and issues.

All but one of the beginning researchers in this book presented aspects of their research at a Post Graduate Research Conference hosted by the Faculty of Education at the University of Tasmania. Following the conference the students used the feedback received at their presentations to expand upon their initial ideas and write the chapters presented in this book. In some cases the students collaborated with their supervisors to write the chapters. All the beginning researcher chapters in the book are first-authored by an HDR student. The introductory chapters for each of the sections in the book are authored by established, and in some cases eminent,

## PREFACE

researchers in the relevant fields from the University of Tasmania, with an interest in Education.

The chapters in the book underwent a double blind peer-review process. First the students' chapters were reviewed by the researchers responsible for writing the introductory chapter for the section within which the individual chapters were positioned. Feedback was incorporated into the chapters before undergoing an external peer review process. The external reviews were conducted by established researchers in the relevant fields, in most cases external to the University of Tasmania. A list of external reviewers is provided after the chapters.

## STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

The book is divided into five sections each of which is introduced by a chapter written by an established researcher/s in the field. The sections are: Researching Policy and Curriculum, Researching Teachers' Experience, Researching Educational Technologies, Researching the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics, and Researching Literacy Development.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To publish requires a publisher who can be convinced to support the underlying proposal and conceptualisation of the book. We acknowledge Sense Publishers for their support to publish this book, and assistance in managing the publishing process. In particular, the advice and communications of Michel Lokhorst assisted in bringing the book to publication.

We acknowledge the support from the Faculty of Education, the Centre for Pathways and Partnerships, The Institute of Learning and Teaching, and colleagues at the University of Tasmania, who provided support throughout the process of compiling the book. Especially, we thank Associate Professor Kim Beswick who got us started on this endeavour and Nick Walkem who provided invaluable administrative support and facilitated the external review process.

We thank Abbey McDonald for allowing us to use her painting on the cover of this book. Abbey is one of the chapter authors and we are excited that this book provides her with the opportunity to showcase her work as an artist as well as a researcher. The image is representative of all the beginning researchers who contributed to this book. In the same way that the bird takes flight, through the publication of this book, the students take flight as researchers.

We express our sincere appreciation to the beginning researchers who so willingly shared their research stories. Finally, we acknowledge the supervisors who supported their students in the writing process by either contributing as co-authors or by providing feedback on early versions of the chapters.

The Editors  
Noleine Fitzallen, Robyn Reaburn, and Si Fan.

SECTION 1

**RESEARCHING POLICY AND CURRICULUM**

NATALIE BROWN & KIM BESWICK

## **POLICY AND CURRICULUM RESEARCH IN THE CONTEXT OF CHANGE**

There is continual change in the education landscape in response to both public and political agendas. In the early 1990s, Simon Marginson noted that “the politics of education are changing and volatile, with little consensus on some issues” (1993, p. 3). This remains the case, with education policy highly politicised, and the results of this playing out in inevitable cycles for state-funded education systems, and other education stakeholders. In Australia, the past 20 years have seen major changes in curriculum for the compulsory years of schooling. These have encompassed development of outcomes based curricula (Donnelly, 2007), Essential Learnings curricula (Luke, Matters, Herschell, Grace, Barratt, & Land, 2000; Department of Education, Tasmania, 2002; Townsend & Bates, 2007), and a recent return to national curriculum prescribed for disciplinary areas (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2012a). This latest curriculum development is part of a broader move to a national policy environment that, in addition to a national curriculum, features a national assessment program in literacy and numeracy (NAPLAN), national standards for teachers (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership [AITSL], 2011a), and national accreditation of teacher education programs (AITSL, 2011b). There has also been increasing attention given to the early years of schooling, including pre-school provision (Press, 2008). In the tertiary sector, a move to demand driven university places, and an emphasis on social inclusion reflected through a changed funding model, has had implications for university entrance and pathways into and out of tertiary study (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales, 2008; Commonwealth of Australia, 2009). Public universities are increasingly seeking alternative sources of revenue to supplement and enhance state-based funding (Johnstone, 2004; Chung-Hoon, Hite, & Hite, 2005). In addition, university rankings have assumed increased importance in the context of a global market in higher education (Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007).

Changes of this kind are global phenomena. International trends towards refreshing curriculum and pedagogy have been motivated by the perceived changing needs of society in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Le Métias, 2003; Luke, Freebody, Shun, & Gopinathan, 2005; Watson, Beswick, & Brown, 2012). This has included the development of values-based curricula in countries such as New Zealand, South Africa, United States (Rodwell, 2011), Portugal (Carvalho, & Solomon, 2012) as well as a focus

on pedagogical reform based on research findings in specific disciplinary areas (e.g., De Jong, 2004; Carvalho & Solomon, 2012). Educational change can be prompted by numerous factors. At least in Australia, significant educational change, including curriculum change has resulted from changes of government (Baker, Trotter, & Holt, 2003). There has also been change as a result of public, or media scrutiny. An excellent example of this has been documented in Tasmania by Mulford and Edmunds (2010) who analysed 141 articles concerning a curriculum reform in a daily newspaper – stemming from initial support to a decidedly negative stance in concert with the demise of the initiative. Support for change is often provided through presentation of data, however, the sources and validity of these data as a rationale for the changes proposed may be open to question or critique. This is particularly the case where narrow sources of data are used to drive reform.

Perhaps the best illustration of this is the current debate about the use of standardised testing to drive reform – particularly in curriculum and pedagogy. Assessment for raising standards of education has,

Become a globalized educational policy discourse; the evaluation message system (manifest as high-stakes national census testing) has taken the upper hand in many schooling systems around the world with England as the best (or worst?) case in point. (Lingard, 2010, p. 131)

As Stobart (2008) notes,

A key purpose of assessment, particularly in education, has been to establish and raise standards of learning. This is now a virtually universal belief – it is hard to find a country that is not using the rhetoric of needing assessment to raise standards in response to the challenges of globalisation. (p. 24)

The results of the most recent Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) that show declines in Australia's standing (Thomson, Hillman, Wernert, Schmid, Buckley & Munene, 2012) will almost certainly provoke further calls for change.

The accountability agenda that accompanies increasing emphasis on standardised testing is consistent with a global trend, particularly through the UK and US. In the US, accountability and testing reforms have been broadly criticised (Hursh, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2010). In Australia increased accountability is focussed on teacher education and the teaching profession, as evidenced by the AITSL developments alluded to above, as well as the school sector. In regard to the latter, the 'My School' website has been introduced giving ready access to statistical information of all Australian schools. Among the key pieces of information available through this site are NAPLAN results. Supporters of NAPLAN testing, point to the ready availability of time series data to assist with diagnosis of learning outcomes and ability to monitor progress. From the *Using My School to support school and student improvement* fact sheet (ACARA, 2012b),

Effective schools collect quality information from student assessment to evaluate themselves and examine where they need to improve and how they can use experiences of success and failure to generate that improvement.

Allan Luke is a vocal critic of such narrowly focussed high stakes testing, contending that using this as a measure of educational outcome can fail students from low socio-economic or culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (2010). He suggests that this type of testing can lead to “scripted standardized pedagogy” that results in “an enacted curriculum of basic skills, rule recognition and compliance” (p. 180). A critique of the NAPLAN tests for a specific group, Indigenous children from remote communities, has been written by Wigglesworth, Simpson and Loakes (2011). They call into question, through the use of specific examples, the use of this as a diagnostic tool for second language learners and children from remote communities. This is through not only the specific language used, but also the assumed cultural knowledge. A further concern with the current popularity of outcome measures is that there is a danger of “measuring what is easy to measure, rather than what is significant in terms of public sector organisations such as schooling systems” (Lingard, 2010, p. 135).

David Berliner and colleagues have researched and documented similar concerns about high stakes testing and their detrimental and unintended outcomes for disadvantaged student groups in the US for some time, as well as negative impacts on curriculum and teaching (e.g., Amrein & Berliner, 2002; Nichols & Berliner, 2005; 2008). Lessons to be learned from the US experience, however, appear not to have been heeded elsewhere. Rather the Australian trend towards standardised testing can be seen as part of a global movement towards ‘policy borrowing’ (Steiner-Khamsi, 2004). Adopting policy and practice that is being used elsewhere can be seen as avoiding reinvention of the wheel, particularly when the policy in question has been based on quality and relevant research and the limits of transferability arising from contextual differences have been well understood. The practice, however, needs to be regarded with caution. Lingard (2010) notes that,

To be effective, policy borrowing must be accompanied by policy learning, which takes account of research on the effects of the policy that will be borrowed in the source system, learning from that and then applying that knowledge to the borrowing system through careful consideration of national and local histories, cultures and so on. (p. 132)

In the context of global policy borrowing, educational researchers need to be vigilant and active.

We contend that for change to bring about positive outcomes for students, it needs not only to be based on quality research but also that evidence is drawn from multiple sources. Importantly, there is a need for cognisance of context. As well as providing a rigorous research basis for future policy, educational researchers have

an important role to play in evaluating strategic change and initiatives that spring from policy changes or innovation. Because education is of public interest, ensuring that initiatives, especially those that have input of resources, receive ongoing and rigorous evaluation is necessary not only for accountability, but to enhance the quality of the education and the educational outcomes of students. Researchers also have a responsibility to publish their findings in a timely fashion and in ways that maximise access to them by policy makers and stakeholders.

#### THE CHAPTERS

The chapters in this section represent research that has sprung from new initiatives, or systemic change. The projects presented are diverse but reflect a global acceptance of the concept of lifelong learning and informal learning (Morgan-Klein & Osborne, 2007). They cover the full spectrum of formal learning – early childhood and care and ‘prior to’ learning programs (Nailon & Beswick, and Giacon & Hay) through to Higher Education (Mohd Isa & Williamson). Both in-school curriculum (Moran, Budd, Allen, & Williamson) and extra-curricular learning (Baker) are also given attention. Two of the studies reported allowed sometimes neglected voices in educational research to be heard: parents in the case of Giacon and Hay’s work, and adolescent boys in Baker’s study.

The chapters are also diverse in research methodology and underscore the varieties of methodologies that can and, we argue, should be used to drive and evaluate changes in educational policy and practice. The need to embrace broad research perspectives and diverse methodologies to predict the need for, evaluate success of, and suggest new directions for educational policy has been picked up by a number of researchers. For example, Luke et al. (2005) critiqued: “An overreliance on test and examination scores as a principal indicator of system efficacy and classical experimental design models as the sole model for the selection and implementation of [educational] reform” (p. 12). They proposed that,

An alternative is to build a rich, multidisciplinary and interpretive social science as the evidence base; and to disseminate the findings of a range of studies broadly across the educational community to prompt debate and discussion, and to focus innovation. (p. 12)

In his work on educational leadership and education outcomes, Mulford (2007) also commented on research methodologies. He pointed out that both qualitative and quantitative methodologies can result in significant data reduction – and in the analysis phase that researchers must ensure that evidence presented for, in this case linking leadership to student outcomes, is sufficiently complex “to come close to the reality faced by schools” (p. 20) and therefore to assist in both understanding and predicting “appropriate outcomes and practice” (p. 22). Multiple methodologies allow issues to be understood at differing but equally important levels of analysis from systemic to individual with studies focussed on particular cases or contexts



providing insights into broad phenomena. Case studies are commonly employed in education research (Tight, 2003). When well-constructed, well defined and acknowledging of limitations, they can offer broad applicability through both the methodology employed and the findings. This is particularly true when the researchers critically confirm or challenge previous findings from the literature, with respect to the context of the specific case. Four of the five studies presented in this section have utilised a case study approach with cases ranging from individuals involved in a garage band (Baker) to two universities located in different countries (Mohd Isa & Williamson).

Using a narrative inquiry, Baker has explored the music, musical practices, well-being and identity of young musicians who are members of garage bands. The findings of this study have much to offer teachers working with young people. There is also a broader message here for education policy makers whose decisions impact young people such as those in Baker's study: research that gives voice to young people, allowing them to explain the world from their own perspective, is crucial to the effectiveness of initiatives designed to improve their attainment and opportunities.

The critical role of the early years in creating conditions for successful education has been well documented around the world (Attanasio, 2012; National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2008; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). This perspective underpinned Giacon and Hay's study investigating a specific initiative of the Tasmanian Government, the *Launching into Learning (LiL)* program. The chapter by Nailon and Beswick describes the broader policy context in which studies such as Giacon and Hay's are situated. They present an overview of policy changes in early childhood education and care (ECEC) in Australia from the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Nailon and Beswick consider the key national influences on the development of policy in the suite of formal (non-parental) programs for education and care of children prior to formal school entry. The use of a methodology where historical policy developments have been summarised and reviewed, with reference to research and evaluation of policy developments has allowed them to highlight the complexity of the ECEC sector. Moran, Budd, Allen and Williamson are working in a school-based setting, to explore professional learning needs of teachers implementing *The Australian Curriculum: English* (ACARA, 2012c), and using multiple sources of data to build a deep understanding of their research questions. The prevalence of major curriculum reform has been alluded to in the introduction to this chapter. The consequent professional learning needs of teachers are therefore an important research focus. Moran et al. are analysing the new Australian curriculum in secondary English (ACARA, 2012c) in a number of interesting ways.

One interesting element of Moran et al.'s work is the underpinning theoretical model that is being used to inform the study. The researchers have adopted Harris and Marsh's Authority model (Harris & Marsh, 2005), to reflect the way in which the curriculum change is being implemented in schools. This model, viewing change as an authoritative top-down process, is guiding the choice of methodological

approaches. The chapter by Mohd Isa and Williamson offers a different perspective on implications of educational policy. They have used a qualitative survey as their main data instrument. The choice of this methodology is consistent with the research being conducted in two different and culturally diverse countries: Malaysia and Australia. The issue that is the subject of the research, philanthropy, has been the subject of some previous studies conducted in Australian higher education institutions, but Mohd Isa and Williamson have broadened the lens to look at two contexts through two qualitative case studies that entailed collecting evidence through documentary analysis, surveys and interviews in the two purposively selected universities. Their work highlights the general importance of attending to context as well as identifying specific contextual differences that impact on philanthropic fund raising by universities in Malaysia and Australia. It exemplifies how a one size fits all approach is often not appropriate, and localised research can be essential for quality outcomes.

## CONCLUSION

We began this chapter by acknowledging that change is a constant part of the context in which educational research is conducted and education policy is enacted. The researchers whose work is presented in the chapters of this section are working and will continue to work in a politicised environment whether in Australia or elsewhere. This is at least in part due to the importance of education to individuals in terms of their life outcomes and opportunities, and to governments for which education represents both a major expenditure and the means of improving economic and social outcomes at a national level (Considine, Marginson, Sheehan, & Kumnick, 2001; Wyn, 2006)).

The research studies in this section are diverse in scope, subject and methodology but together illustrate some key features of the kind of research that is needed to inform policy and curriculum debates into the future. These are:

- the value in attending to the voices of education stakeholders that can easily be neglected in a focus on student outcomes and teacher competence (Baker and Giacon & Hay);
- the importance to attending to differences between contexts and the need to adapt policy settings and expectations accordingly (Mohd Isa & Williamson);
- the need to consider and adequately provide for the implications of change for those charged with its implementation (Moran et al.); and
- the importance of understanding the historical context in which current developments are occurring with a view to learning from that (Nailon & Beswick).

We encourage these and other educational researchers to remain vigilant and active in: their examination and critique of educational policy, their contributions to the research base that will inform developments into the future, and the communication of their findings to the broad education community including policy makers.

## REFERENCES

- Amrein, A. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). *An analysis of some unintended and negative consequences of high-stakes testing*. Education Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, College of Education, Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Arizona State University.
- Attanasio, O. (2012, May). Review of evidence and research gaps. Presentation given during panel 6. *Early childhood education: Directions for future research*, at *Evidence-based education: Policy-making and reform in Africa*. Accra, Ghana.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012a). *The shape of the Australian Curriculum, Version 3*. Sydney: Author.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012b). *Using my school to support school and student improvement*. Retrieved from [http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/\\_resources/Using\\_My\\_School\\_to\\_support\\_school\\_and\\_student\\_improvement.pdf](http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Using_My_School_to_support_school_and_student_improvement.pdf)
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012c). *The Australian Curriculum: English, Version 4.0*. Sydney: Author.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (2011a). *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and procedures*. Melbourne, VIC: Education Services Australia.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (2011b). *National professional standards for teachers*. Melbourne, VIC: Education Services Australia.
- Baker, R., Trotter, H., & Holt, J. (2003). *Research report for Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs*. Sydney: Curriculum Corporation.
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian higher education: Final report*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Carvalho, C., & Solomon, Y. (2012). Supporting statistical literacy: What do culturally relevant/realistic tasks show us about the nature of pupil engagement with statistics? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 57–65.
- Chung-Hoon, T. L., Hite, J. M., & Hite, S. J. (2005). Searching for enduring donor relationships: Evidence for factors and strategies in a donor/organization integration model for fund raising. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(1), 34–53.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2009). *Transforming Australia's higher education system*. Canberra: Author.
- Considine, M., Marginson, S., Sheehan, P., & Kumnick, M. (2001). *The comparative performance of Australia as a knowledge nation: Report to the Chifley Research Centre*. Retrieved from <http://vuir.vu.edu.au/15895/1/15895.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- De Jong, O. (2004). Curriculum reform and new practices in classrooms and teacher courses. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 2, 431–434.
- Department of Education, Tasmania. (2002). *Essential Learnings framework 1*. Hobart: Author.
- Donnelly, K. (2007). Australia's adoption of outcomes-based education: A critique. *Issues in Educational Research*, 17(2), 183–206.
- Edgar, D., & Edgar, P. (2008). *The new child. In search of smarter grown-ups*. Melbourne, VIC: Wilkinson Publishing Pty Ltd.
- Harris, C., & Marsh, C. J. (2005). *Curriculum developments in Australia: Promising initiatives, impasses and dead-ends*. New York: Open Book Publishers.
- Hursh, D. (2008). *High-stakes testing and the decline of teaching and learning*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Johnstone, D. B. (2004). *A political culture of giving and the philanthropic support of higher education in international perspective*. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York.
- Le Métias, J. (2003). International trends in curriculum frameworks. *The Educational Forum*, 67(3), 235–247.

- Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: Testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(2), 129–147.
- Luke, A. (2010). Documenting reproduction and inequality: Revisiting Jean Anyon's 'social class and school knowledge'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 40(1), 167–182.
- Luke, A., Freebody, P., Shun, S., & Gopinathan, S. (2005). Towards research-based innovation and reform: Singapore schooling in transition. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5–28.
- Luke, A., Matters, G., Herschell, P., Grace, N., Barratt, R., & Land, R. (2000). *Draft New Basics Project Technical Paper, Version 3 April 2000*. Brisbane, QLD: Education Queensland.
- Marginson, S. (1993). *Education and public policy in Australia*. Melbourne, VIC: Cambridge University Press.
- Marginson, S., & Van der Wende, M. (2007). To rank or to be ranked: The impact of global rankings in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 306–329.
- Morgan-Klein, B., & Osborne, M. (2007). *The concepts and practices of lifelong learning*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Mulford, B. (2007). *Quality Australian evidence on leadership for improved learning – The leadership challenge – Improving learning in schools*. Retrieved from [http://research.acer.edu.au/research\\_conference\\_2007/8](http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2007/8)
- Mulford, B., & Edmunds, B. (2010). *Educational measurement in Australian schooling: Serving public purposes in Tasmanian primary schools*. Launceston, TAS: Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania.
- National Scientific Council on the Developing Child (2008). *The timing and quality of early experiences combine to shape brain architecture* (Working paper #5). Cambridge, MA: Centre on the Developing Child, Harvard University. Retrieved from [http://www.developingchild.net/pubs/wp/Timing\\_Quality\\_Early\\_Experiences.pdf](http://www.developingchild.net/pubs/wp/Timing_Quality_Early_Experiences.pdf)
- Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2005). *The inevitable corruption of indicators and educators through high-stakes testing*. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University.
- Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2008). Why has high-stakes testing so easily slipped into contemporary American life? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 672–676.
- Press, F. (2008). Trends and debates in ECEC policy: A literature review canvassing policy developments in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom. In D. Brennan (Ed.). *Building an international research collaboration in early childhood education and care*. Background Materials for a Workshop funded by the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY), February 18–19th, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales.
- Rodwell, G. (2011). One newspaper's role in the demise of the Tasmanian Essential Learnings curriculum: Adding new understandings to Cohen's moral panic theory in analysing curriculum change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12, 441–456.
- Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *From neurons to neighbourhoods: The science of early childhood development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stobart, G. (2008). *Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Thomson, S., Hillman, K., Wernert, N., Schmid, M., Buckley, S., & Munene, A. (2012). *Highlights from TIMSS & PIRLS 2011 from Australia's perspective*. Camberwell, VIC: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Tight, M. (2003). *Researching Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Townsend, T., & Bates, R. (2007). *Handbook of teacher education: Globalization, standards and professionalism in times of change*. Springer: Dordrecht.
- Watson, J., Beswick, K., & Brown, N. (2012). *Educational research and professional learning in changing times*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

#### POLICY AND CURRICULUM RESEARCH IN THE CONTEXT OF CHANGE

- Wigglesworth, G., Simpson, J., & Loakes, D. (2011). NAPLAN language assessments for indigenous children in remote communities: Issues and problems. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34(3), 320–343.
- Wyn, J. (2006). Youth transitions to work and further education in Australia. In J. Chapman, P. Cartwright, & E. J. McGilp (Eds.). *Lifelong learning, participation and equity* (pp. 217–242). Dordrecht: Springer.

DI NAILON & KIM BESWICK

## **CHANGES IN POLICY RELATED TO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE IN AUSTRALIA: THE JOURNEY TOWARDS PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP**

This chapter provides an overview and commentary on two decades of policy changes in early childhood education and care (ECEC) in Australia that led to a National Quality Framework (NQF) for ECEC services for children from birth to five years (Council of Australian Governments [COAG], 2009a). It can be argued that the direction of the policy changes has meant that educators in these services have been increasingly asked to adopt pedagogical leadership skills and practices. Highlighting the recent shifts and influences on ECEC policy in Australia provides a context for future research into the development of pedagogical leadership by educators working in ECEC services. For the purposes of this chapter ECEC relates to formal, non-parental, education and care arrangements available to children before they commence formal schooling. While the nomenclature may be different in the various States and Territories the term ECEC broadly includes services such as long day care (centre based and home-based), and pre-school (Brennan, 2008), offered in a range of locations.

The provision of education and care for young children in Australia is big business for governments and providers. A 5 year snapshot to 2009 outlined in a Report by the Office of Early Childhood Education and Child Care (OECECC) “State of Child Care in Australia” highlighted the growth of investment, accessibility and utilisation rates in the sector (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR], 2010b). The OECECC Report, based on administrative and survey data from DEEWR, the Productivity Commission and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), noted that early childhood education and care funding had more than doubled during those years, up from \$1.7b in 2004/5 to \$3.7b in 2008/9 (DEEWR, 2010b). Much of this funding was used to offset service fees for eligible families. By the September quarter of 2009 around 500,000 children from birth to 5 years were in approved care across Australia with families paying on average \$60.80 per day and \$287.00 per week for long day care (DEEWR, 2010b). The magnitude of the overall investment by individual families and governments keeps ECEC service provision high on the nation’s economic, social and political agendas. Some might say that recent policy changes which have resulted in a coherent national approach to funding and service provision could have been forecast on economic

grounds alone. There is, however, more to the story of the direction of ECEC policy changes that have occurred in recent times. While the changes have responded to the need for accountability in government spending, they have also been informed by policy outcomes from previous decades and from research that has centred on young children's development and learning. It is these influences that have impacted most on educators' practice as pedagogical leaders. The remainder of this chapter describes policy influences and changes in Australia leading up to the introduction of the NQF, and the resultant press for educators to see themselves as pedagogical leaders who adopt an active role in promoting their practice "especially those aspects that involve building and nurturing relationships, curriculum decision-making, teaching and learning" (DEEWR, 2010a, p. 6).

#### ECEC POLICY IN AUSTRALIA: LANDMARKS OF CHANGE

All three levels of government in Australia, federal, state/territory and local, have been involved in the provision of ECEC services for almost half a century - providing funding and regulating sites and practice. Over time, administrative responsibilities of each of the levels of government have been re-arranged, or changed, as policies were developed and agreements reached. Periods of policy change and influence on these changes have been highlighted elsewhere using lenses such as 'the rise of quality' (Logan, Press & Sumsion, 2012, p. 4), or 'the mixed economy of child care' (Brennan, 2007, p. 214). Our tracing of ECEC policy agendas that, in part, led to a focus on pedagogical leadership reflects intentions similar to those outlined in Logan et al., and McLachlan (2011) who noted the importance of reflecting on history to address current concerns. Such reflection also provides a necessary basis for future research in the area.

##### *Policies for Parent Workforce Participation*

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the Australian federal and state governments developed parallel ECEC systems and responsibilities (MacDonald, 2002). During that time operational grants were provided by the Federal Government to child care centres to cover staffing costs according to prescribed formulas, and linked funding to priority of access to children of working parents. The decision by the conservative Liberal/National Coalition in 1996 to change funding arrangements marked the beginning of a new era of assisting families rather than funding ECEC services directly (Harris, 2007). Much of the Federal ECEC funding focus was on increasing parents' workforce participation. By undertaking this move, Cass and Brennan (2003) note that operational subsidies for services were significantly reduced, and eligibility for fee assistance through Child Care Assistance and the Child Care Rebate was tightened and combined with a Family Tax Initiative. In 2000, the Child Care Benefit was introduced, replacing Child Care Assistance and the Child Care Rebate (Brennan, 2008). According to Brennan, the Child Care Benefit provided a



higher level of support to more families and increased the hours of care that could be claimed. The Child Care Benefit, Brennan added, targeted parents who were employed, studying or seeking employment.

*Australia's Quality Agenda: Moving Toward a Focus on ECEC Practice*

From 1993 the Federal Government required that long day care centres operating under the Child Care Program participate in a quality assurance process if families using the centre were to be eligible for fee assistance (Press & Hayes, 2000 p. 30). Press and Hayes noted that licensing, and health and safety continued to be the province of state and local jurisdictions, while the following structures were established to enact federal quality related policy directions:

- The National Childcare Accreditation Council (NCAC) was charged with overseeing the quality improvement and accreditation process for long day care.
- Support staff were employed by the Commonwealth to provide advice to long day care centres on accreditation matters and to coordinate the accreditation system.

Brennan (2008) confirmed the growing influence of the federal government at that time. The NCAC was an incorporated association, however, its chairperson and members were appointed by the Federal minister responsible for children's services (Brennan, 2008). The child care quality assurance system introduced as a "standard of quality beyond the minimum requirements described by licensing regulations" (NCAC, 2006, p. 4). Having a "beyond minimum" standard of care meant that for the first time the significant role of educators as curriculum decision-makers was alluded to in policy. Under the quality agenda the need for upgrading educator skills and knowledge became a priority for services attempting to meet the 52 high quality standards established under the Quality Improvement and Assurance System (QIAS). Australia was described in a report to the Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD) by Press and Hayes (2000) as "unique in having a national, government supported, accreditation system for its long day care centres that is directly tied to the provision of funding, with over 98% of centres participating" (p. 39). The QIAS focused primarily upon the determining components of quality, and at the time of writing their report, Press and Hayes commented that the QIAS was under review. They noted that although the QIAS process had been widely supported there had been a number of concerns raised by service providers and the community. The concerns described by Press and Hayes focused on the consistency of the application of QIAS processes and the lack of penalties applied to services failing to achieve accreditation or failing to participate in the system.

The Child Care Advisory Council [CCAC] was charged with the task of conducting the review. Solutions were to "be within current funding arrangements where possible and be supported by a cost effectiveness analysis, exploring the impact on small business and on the Commonwealth" (Press & Hayes, 2000 p. 40) According to Press and Hayes, the Council consulted extensively during the course



of the review with the consultations showing strong support for the QIAS, and a widespread desire to maintain a high level of quality in child care centres, but also the need to make the process less complex, less time consuming and better coordinated with state licensing provisions. The Council's final recommendations, according to Press and Hayes aimed at streamlining and simplifying QIAS administrative requirements and ensuring greater validity and consistency in the accreditation process.

Press and Hayes (2000) noted that from 1 July 2000 early childhood policy would be broadened to fund eligible families in a wider range of family support services. The Family Assistance Act 1999 partially replaced the Child Care Act and through its Child Care Program was concerned with policy and funding in relation to long day care services (including family day care); multifunctional services and multifunctional Aboriginal services; some occasional care centres; and outside school hours care. This change in policy and funding was described by Press and Hayes as having other than workforce ideals by tagging funding to quality of care provided to children. In addition, there was a shift towards upgrading child care practice. Federal funding was made available for the provision of support, advice and training to the staff and management of services under the Child Care Program (Press & Hayes, 2000).

The new decade saw the responsibilities of the NCAC expanded to include family day care (2001) and outside school hours' care (2003) (NCAC, 2006, pp. 3-4), and in turn focus on the practices of educators working in these services. Based on educator feedback from the review of the accreditation system, the QIAS was streamlined in January 2002 to 10 overarching Quality Areas and 35 Principles. A standard 2.5 year accreditation was introduced at that time. While these changes made some differences it became evident that the quality process required further streamlining and educators required more assistance balancing their educational and care roles and complying with the QIAS system. A QIAS Source Book, and Quality Practices Guide were introduced in 2005 to provide additional information about practices that would inform the QIAS process. The quality standards were reduced from 10 to 7 standards. The first accreditation decisions were made under the 7 re-classified standards in July 2006. Further changes to the Child Care Quality Accreditation System (CCQAS) in 2006 included the introduction of unannounced validation visits, spot check visits between self-study reports, the employment of non-peer validators by NCAC, and the intended development of a more integrated CCQAS to promote consistency and equity across child care sectors. It could be argued that lessons learned from the introduction and revisions to the QIAS informed the development of the 2010 National Quality Standard (NQS) and legislation pertaining to the Standard.

#### *The Birth of Australia's Unified Children's Agenda*

Brennan (2008) outlined a range of political and policy activity from 2000 that steered the course of ECEC policy and practice over the years from 2001 to 2010. The appointment of the CCAC in 1998 was pivotal not only to reviewing and

#### CHANGES IN POLICY RELATED TO EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

initiating the changes to the quality assurance program, but according to Brennan, the future of ECEC in Australia. She noted that the CCAC was required by the Federal Government to investigate the likely child care needs of Australia after 2001 and to identify action which might need to be taken to ensure appropriate child care would be available (p. 39). The CCAC Report titled “Child Care: Beyond 2001”, advocated the reconceptualisation of child care to incorporate both care and education (CCAC, 2001). It recommended the creation of a National Children’s Agenda aimed at;

- recognising the importance of children’s early years,
- helping to retain and attract ECEC workers with skills,
- better ensuring equity of access to children’s services, and
- enhancing collaboration between levels of government and children’s services.

In 2003, the Federal Government released a consultation paper “Towards a National Agenda for Early Childhood.” A draft agenda was released in 2004 and the final agenda in May 2007 (Brennan, 2008). The Agenda established four action platforms: healthy families with young children; early learning and care; supporting families and parenting; and creating child-friendly communities (Australian Government, 2007, pp. 19-26). The early learning and care platform promoted parent involvement in early learning for children, consistency of ECEC systems across Australia, access to ECEC among the most disadvantaged children and the need for a skilled ECEC workforce (Australian Government, 2007, p. 21). Highlighting early learning was a landmark in Australian ECEC policy, and one that elevated informed pedagogical decision-making in debates that followed.

The federal election of November 2007 brought to power a Labor Government and into the new ministry a dedicated Parliamentary Secretary for Early Childhood Education and Childcare (Brennan, 2008). Brennan pointed out that prior to the election, the Australian Labor Party emphasised the need for education in children’s services policy at a federal level, declaring that “Federal Labor will put learning and development at the centre of Australia’s approach to early childhood education and care” (p. 30). Labor, she said, was committed to:

- developing universal pre-school for all four year old children for 15 hours per week;
- the creation of new long day care centres on the grounds of educational institutions (schools, universities and technical colleges);
- establishing new standards for ECEC quality; and
- increasing the number of qualified early childhood educators.

After the 2007 election, the scene was set for the Federal Government, under Labor, to work with the states to refine and create policies, agreements and a National Law to advance the national quality agenda beginning with the development of the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF). The EYLF was and continues to be the catalyst for developing ECEC educators’ skills, practices and knowledge and taking up pedagogical leadership roles in their services.

On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 the National Quality Framework (NQF) for early childhood services in Australia became fully operational. It formed part of a suite of policies that responded to social and educational imperatives that informed the discourses, and agreements driving the National ECEC Reform Agenda agreed to by Federal and State governments between 2008 and 2011. During these years, a comprehensive set of policies and strategies were developed and agreed to by the Council of Australian Governments (see COAG, 2009b). They included:

- The Council of Australian Governments’ Early Childhood Commitment
- National Quality Framework for Early Childhood Education and Care (NQF) including the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF), and Framework for School Age Care
- Indigenous Children including Providing a Solid Start in School, Indigenous Preschools and Indigenous Early Childhood Development National Partnership
- Australian Early Development Index (AEDI)
- Early Learning and Care Centres
- Early Childhood Education – Universal Access including National Partnership Agreement on Early Childhood Education and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Universal Access Strategy
- Early Years Workforce Strategy (EYWS)
- Home Interaction Program for Parents and Youngsters (HIPPY)

Overall, the policies, agreements and strategies listed above focus on much more than the nation’s economic business of ECEC related to parent workforce participation of earlier policies, or the later funding-associated links to quality care provision. The aims, guiding principles and rhetoric contained in the documents promote the need for ensuring that the nation’s children are well served. There appears to be some intent on the part of the Federal and State Governments to prioritise “learning” in ECEC services in order to meet the vision of the *Early Childhood Development Strategy* (ECDS) endorsed by COAG in July 2009. That is, “by 2020 all children have the best start in life to create a better future for themselves, and for the nation” (COAG, 2009a, p. 4). The delivery of this lofty vision falls on ECEC services and the educators responsible for creating the relationships and the environments where young children can get their “best start”. To this end a plethora of professional development strategies have been created to support educators in their pedagogical leadership roles. The content and processes of the professional development initiatives introduced across the sector are based on the research that informed the policies themselves. Several key research influences are discussed in the following section.

#### RESEARCH INFLUENCES ON CURRENT ECEC POLICIES AND PRACTICE

Australian ECEC policy and practice has been heavily influenced by the internationalisation of the ECCE agenda based on the results of brain research (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2008; Schonkoff & Phillips,

2000), and early childhood economic investment research that has highlighted later pay-offs for money spent on children's health, well-being and learning in their early years (Galinsky, 2006). The 2001 CCAC Report made significant use of international studies to inform their recommendations to the Federal Government. Arguments have been made, however, for caution in the direct application of findings from elsewhere to ECEC in Australia. For example, Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence (1999) have raised several points about the need to examine in a critical way the perspectives used to evaluate quality and child outcomes in other countries. These authors prevail upon us to question results and problematise findings by relating our analyses to local social, political and philosophical contexts.

Significant research and evaluation has been conducted in Australia and elsewhere over the past decade specifically to advance the ECEC sector and inform policy. A meta-analysis by Gilliam and Zigler (2001) of ECEC evaluations conducted during the period 1990 to 2000 was used to inform a later social policy report by Brauner, Gordic, and Zigler (2004) for ECEC in the United States of America. These authors argued that an infrastructure that combines care and education must be built, either by placing educational components in the child care system, or by locating care into the educational system thereby achieving a more enduring approach. Brauner et al. also noted the need for reframing the relationship between care and education by changing the current terminology and constituency of child care and increasing parental and societal awareness of the components and benefits of quality care. They claimed that only when this happens, will the state of child care begin to improve. It would seem that Australian ECEC policy has attempted in part to reflect Brauner et al.'s recommendations. For example, the term "educators" is now used as a role descriptor for all staff working with children of all ages in ECEC services.

ECEC policies, practices, and research from elsewhere have played a major role in informing Australia's shift towards prioritising children's "best start". In its report to the Australian Federal Government, Boston Consulting Group's (2008) executive summary stated;

There is good evidence from trials and long term studies around the world that investment in basic early childhood services more than pays for itself ... Furthermore, evidence from other countries suggests that a more intensive integrated 'recipe' of services significantly enhances long-term prospects of more vulnerable children.

The Boston Consulting Group's report highlighted several strategies that other countries had adopted which have now been incorporated into Australian policy. Importantly, each of the strategies noted by the Boston Group had been informed by trials and long term studies. Strategies reported by the Group and adopted by the Federal Government include:

- Seeking greater integration of services (that is, from 2010 onwards, 39 integrated child and family centres will be built across Australia) (DEEWR, 2012)

- Expanding early childhood services (note the target of 15 hours additional preschool for Australia’s children) (DEEWR, 2012)
- Developing national early childhood strategies (note the 2009 emergence of the NQF/EYLF in Australia)
- Consolidating early childhood services under one government department’s jurisdiction (note the COAG agreements that aim to consolidate arrangements between jurisdictions including the passing of legislation supporting the National Quality Agenda) (COAG, 2009b)

A number of debates about ECEC policy and practice in Australia have drawn upon successive reviews of OECD countries, where recommendations have been made for greater coherence in early childhood policies and services (Bennett, 2003; OECD, 2001, 2006). Press and Hayes (2000) wrote a summary of ECEC policy in Australia. Their “Report to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development” contributed to the OECD agenda so that when comparisons were made Australia’s performance (or lack thereof) could be highlighted by ECEC advocacy groups. The use of recommendations from OECD Reports was evident in the development of the NQF (see for example, Victorian Curriculum Assessment Authority, 2008).

One consequence of regional variations in the delivery of early childhood education and care, according to Moore (2008), is that there is no guarantee of consistent outcomes for children across Australia. Moore argued for more consistent and coherent policies across early childhood sectors and greater cohesiveness and integration within and between services in order to achieve better quality programs and better outcomes for children. His argument is echoed by others (see also The Boston Consulting Group, 2008; Bennett, 2007; Doctors, Gebhard, Jones & Wat, 2008; Elliott, 2006; Press, 2008), and has had some impact on ECEC policy decision-making. What this has meant for ECEC educators across Australia is a commitment by governments at all levels to support, as well as measure through the NQF quality assurance process, their capacity to advocate for and to build nurturing relationships, curriculum decision-making, teaching and learning – that is their pedagogical leadership skills and knowledge (DEEWR, 2010a).

#### IN CONCLUSION: ECEC POLICY SHIFTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP

The impact of greater attention to the early years is evident in policy and practice. International research on the importance of the early childhood years to children’s future well-being and development has resulted in a children’s agenda. In Australia, information from such research has contributed to a number of reforms in areas concerned with the early years, and to a greater degree of interdepartmental collaboration and exchange. However, ECEC settings are complex. ECEC policy directions in Australia have aimed to provide increasingly comprehensive approaches to the provision of education and care (DEEWR, 2010b). Each of the state and federal agreements, the legislated quality requirements and the national curriculum

framework has taken pains to profile the complexity of children's lives. Initiatives in the ECEC reform agenda introduced in 2009 and fully operationalised on January 1, 2012, are intended to promote consistent early childhood practice in all ECEC settings. They are also aimed at breaking down the division between education and care by promoting the understanding that children's learning and development occurs in all contexts (DEEWR, 2010b).

The success of ECEC policy depends on how well ECEC services can enact and meet the intended policy outcomes. At the service level it requires pedagogical leadership. Current ECEC policies and practices in Australia have been based on a series of integrated reforms from past decades briefly described in this chapter. Tracing the history of policies and influences on ECEC policy-making and highlighting them here has provided some evidence of the need to understand the complexities underpinning the national reform agenda. Insights gained can provide a starting point for educators coming to terms with the National ECEC Reform Agenda, and for determining its success. In brief, ECEC policy informs pedagogical leadership in ECEC settings. Within the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF) pedagogical leadership is related to educator's professional judgments based on their:

- professional knowledge and skills;
- knowledge of children, families and communities;
- awareness of how their beliefs and values impact on children's learning; and
- personal styles and past experiences (DEEWR, 2009, p. 11).

The EYLF is intended to guide professional conversations and embody the activity of pedagogical leadership. Well informed, reflective, and rigorous pedagogical leadership has the potential to fulfil much of the intended ECEC policy outcomes for Australia's children. How, and how well, this occurs will need to be the focus of future research, especially given the on-going debates (Edwards, 2007; Harcourt & Keen, 2012; Nutall & Edwards, 2007) about theories and evidence-based practices that contribute to individual and collective understandings about preferred pedagogies in ECEC.

Our position is that it is important to examine the progression of ECEC policies, research, debates and discourses that have led to, and informed, the current policy agenda. Insights gained provide a necessary a-priori step to developing pedagogical leadership in ECEC in response to the current National Quality Agenda for ECEC in Australia. This chapter has attempted to summarise two decades of ECEC policy changes and the rising focus on what educators do to make a difference in children's lives.

## REFERENCES

- Australian Government. (2007). *National agenda for early childhood*, Canberra: Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.
- Bennett, J. (2003). Starting Strong: The persistent division between care and education. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 1(1), 21–48.