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ABSTRACT

June M. Alexis

A study of the extent to which the criteria of the TTA, Ofsted and the Academic Literature agree what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools

This research examines the extent to which the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree on the criteria on what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools. The role of subject leaders is an evolving one where they have to deal with the process of change. Many subject leaders were not prepared for the devolution of management and leadership tasks they had to undertake, especially as a result of the ERA (1988).

The three bodies, the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature, all have an input in developing the role and focusing on what makes subject leaders effective. Despite having some, although limited, convergence on the effectiveness of subject leaders, they do emphasise different aspects of the role to the exclusion of others areas. The aspects they emphasise tend to relate to their individual functions and purposes.

Lawton’s five level model of curriculum control was the framework used for structuring the literature review. One of the central themes of the review is that subject leaders are expected to translate government policies to their departmental members to ensure effective teaching and learning takes place in their subject areas. Thus, this emphasises the important aspects of management and leadership that are central to the work of subject leaders. Particularly, this research highlights four key functions as the main responsibilities of subject leaders: management and leadership, quality of teaching, management of the learning experience and students’ standard of achievement. These areas are common to the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature. The Ofsted reports, on the other hand, confirm the continuing weaknesses in subject leaders’ performance with respect to management and leadership functions.

Subject leaders play an increasing role in school improvement at the departmental level. This study outlines the varying and demanding functions that subject leaders have to undertake without being given extra consideration for the work in the area of management and leadership duties they have to perform. These are mainly in the area of management and leadership. It concludes by suggesting that subject leaders need training for this demanding role therefore training providers need to collaborate on the content of such programmes.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Education Reform Act (ERA), 1988, produced many changes in the control of the curriculum in England and Wales. Prior to the ERA, schools had greater autonomy in the design, content and strategies for delivering the curriculum. This prevailed during a climate of limited, central government interference in education and a period in which education was influenced to a certain extent by the local education authorities (LEA) and the teaching unions. The role of the then Department of Education and Science (DES) was mainly to deal with the number of schools within the LEAs, resources and the issues relating to the development of comprehensive education. The DES gave very little attention to curriculum matters as it was felt to be a professional concern and would, therefore, be better left to those teachers who were trained to develop and implement it (Pring, 1989). It was the eleven plus, and the examination syllabuses, which largely controlled the content of the curriculum.

The LEAs' task was to ensure that schools were working efficiently, oversee the maintenance of schools, appoint and pay teachers, coordinate the admissions policy and related duties. However, the responsibility for the quality and content of teaching, in practical terms, was given to headteachers and teachers in their individual schools. The governing bodies had very little to do with the running of the school or the curriculum although, technically, they were given this responsibility by the 1944 Education Act.
'For the first hundred years of national education in England and Wales, the schools themselves were virtually 'on their own' in terms of ethos, organisation and curriculum. In practically no other country and in no other system did the headteacher (and teachers) wield such power.'

(Fowler, 1988, p. 11)

Indeed, it was with a certain degree of pride that the idea of a National Curriculum was rejected by educationalists and academics as an undesirable and inappropriate concept. This was not considered to be the British way, dictating what should be taught in schools. The flexible and diverse system in Britain was much more preferred to the more uniform and rigid arrangement of the school curriculum in countries like France with a national timetable and Stalin’s Russia during the 1950s (Chitty, 1993).

When the 1944 Education Act was drafted, no direct reference was made 'to the content of the curriculum'.

'Those who drafted the 1944 Education Act saw no need to grapple with the issue of the curriculum; and the c-word makes no appearance in the act itself.'

(Chitty, 1993, page 1)

In fact there was no statutory requirement for the inclusion of any subject in the school timetable, except that of religious education (Chitty, 1993). Lawton (1980) referred to this period as 'the golden age of teacher control (or non-control) of the curriculum'.
A Change in Educational Thinking

Towards the end of the 1950s, the claim that children were born with a fixed amount of intelligence, which remained the same throughout their lives, could no longer be justified (Chitty, 1993). This brought about a change in educational thinking.

A prime concern for educational sociologists related to the ways in which educational opportunities were denied to children from working-class backgrounds. A different stance was taken by educationalists. Children’s abilities were no longer being blamed on their innate intelligence, but instead were regarded as a consequence of their environment. As a result, the cause of the underachievement of the working class was deemed to be the home background of such pupils. Nothing was considered in relation to the function of education in respect of the development of the children’s intellectual abilities. The tendency was to ‘blame the individual’ and to see the role of the school, as opposed to the family background, as peripheral to the success of the student (Reynolds, 1988). Subsequently, a new theory emerged that children are able to develop and improve in their attainment due to the influence of their schooling experience despite their home background (Edmonds, 1978; Rutter et al.1979; Hopkins, 1994; Reynolds, 1994).

The school effectiveness and school improvement movements developed during the 1970s and 1980s. School effectiveness research has the potential to inform about what makes ‘good’ schools. Research in this field has been primarily concerned with pupils’ academic and social outcomes (Reynolds et al., 1996). On the other hand, school
Improvement research attempts to show how schools can improve the performance of their pupils. These two paradigms have challenged the view that the home background of socially disadvantaged children is one of the main reasons why children fail at school and that nothing could be done to change the situation.

"...the movement (school effectiveness and school improvement)...

destroyed forever the alibi of teachers and others that it was the home background or social disadvantage which was the reason why children failed at school, and that consequently little could be done to change things.

Nowadays, it is the school which is held more accountable for whether its children can perform academically and socially, since it is the school which is seen as responsible for pupils' success and failure"  

(Reynolds, 1994, p. 23)

It must be pointed out however, that the home background of students is still a powerful influence on children's attainment. Furthermore, these two movements, school effectiveness and school improvement, stress the importance of the quality of education provided by the schools in the intellectual development of children. Lawton (1973) bemoaned the failure of educationalists to rethink the content of the curriculum and plan a suitable programme, which would be relevant for an international secondary education. The DES, as noted earlier, was far too busy analysing the reorganisation plans of comprehensive schools submitted by local authorities to consider any curriculum issues (Chitty, 1993). The Schools Council, at the time an important emissary for curriculum
planning, developed new exciting curriculum initiatives. As a result, pupils in the comprehensives were placed into different classes according to their ability. The pupils in the higher bands followed a grammar school type of curriculum with strong emphasis on the traditional academic subjects, while those pupils in the lower band had to accept either a diluted version of the academic curriculum or a programme influenced by the Newsom Report (1963), which concentrated on non-academic courses of an undemanding nature. This state of affairs could not continue and the dissatisfaction soon became evident (Chitty, 1993).

**Government Dissatisfaction with the Curriculum**

It was later on during the 1960s that it became noticeable that the government was dissatisfied with the content of the curriculum. As the government spent a substantial amount of money on education, through the rate support grant to LEAs, it had the right to monitor more carefully and to influence the school curriculum (Pring, 1989). In addition to this, there were growing concerns amongst parents, employers, politicians and the public at large about the content, relevance, quality and standard of the curriculum. Most of the blame for the apparent failure of the educational system tended to be attributed to secondary schools. It was accepted that students were taught to acquire knowledge of particular subjects, but it seemed as if they were not equipped to use what they had learned in different subject areas or to apply their knowledge in new and different situations. The general feeling was that the educational system should be producing young people with enhanced skills, abilities and qualities, which would enable them to be better contributors in serving the community in which they live.
'England is a complex urban society with a very elaborate political and social structure. However, most young people leave school almost entirely ignorant of the socio-political system. England is an industrial society, but education has failed to enable the young to live harmoniously within that society. They have an imperfect understanding of industrialisation; many are not educated in such a way as to gain employment. England is a democratic society with a high rate of social mobility, but schools tend to divide the young socially, academically and culturally, rather than to encourage cooperation, social harmony and the development of a common culture.' (Lawton, 1989, p.26)

Schools were blamed for the increased violence and vandalism in society because of the perceived lack of discipline associated with child-centred approaches to education, and for the apparent decline in responsible attitudes amongst the young. Connected to this criticism is the view that there should be a stronger emphasis on citizenship in the curriculum, to promote a sense of responsibility in young people.

These were among the main criticisms, which the government used to bring about the reform of the curriculum. It was noticed that education lacked input from parents, employers and the community. As a result, the Taylor Committee (1979) produced a report 'A New Partnership for our Schools'. The committee recommended that the governing bodies should carry out their duties as stated in the 1944 Education Act; have
equal representation on the governing bodies of parents, teachers, LEAs and members of
the community; and decide on the direction school policy should take. Many of these
ideas have been adopted in subsequent legislation (Pring, 1989).

Whether or not those criticisms of education are well founded, they did constitute both a
challenge and a threat to teachers and educationalists (Hewlett, 1986). The main reason
is that in Britain, more than any other industrial country, teachers have enjoyed a long
respected tradition of curricular freedom as to what they included in the school
curriculum. (Hewlett, 1986; Lawton, 1996)

‘... this early notion of government concerning itself with school
curricular matters provoked bitter hostility from the teaching profession
and the local education authorities.' (Fowler, 1988, page 11)

Despite this however, schools had been subjected to a certain amount of external
guidance from governing bodies and LEAs, although the involvement has been minimal
(Hewlett, 1986).

Teachers were not really expected to adhere to external guidance from LEAs, governing
bodies or central government as to the content of the curriculum. However, there has
always been the legal machinery available to put this into motion, but it has never
actually been exercised in an effective manner. The apparent failure of schools to
respond appropriately to the expectations from society to provide an education that would
equip their students for adult life and the world of work, made it difficult for them to explain about direct external involvement from the Secretary of State and national agencies (Hewlett, 1986). There was a strong argument for education being regarded as the direct concern not only of government, but also of trade and industry. As a result, there has been a shift in central government’s position in relation to the school curriculum, as it was accepted that education had a strong influence on public life (Hewlett, 1986; Pring, 1989; Lawton, 1989; Chitty, 1993).

The demand on schools has been created by central government’s determination since 1979 to make schools and other public services subject to the same pressures, which private companies have to undergo in order to sell their products in a market (Bennett, 1995). The point here is the belief that customers should have the freedom to choose between a variety of potential suppliers and, in turn, those suppliers are competing for the customers’ interest. This is seen to be the most efficient way to ensure that quality services are provided by government agencies by giving value for money to central government. Local government was encouraged to put many of its services out to tender and its own employees have to bid for the contract to deliver those services in competition with others. In this way, central government will be able to regulate the standards of service and monitor the quality of what has been provided, rather than having to provide the service directly (Bennett, 1995). The role of the government has shifted from providing services for schools to monitoring outcomes.
Numerous attempts were made to change the main features of education, not only in Britain, but also throughout the western world. There were two main reasons offered for this, which have been highlighted by Edwards and Kelly (1998). The first was the need to support the continued economic development of society through the school educational programme. The second was to do this while at the same time providing for equality of entitlement for all children to educational provision that would enhance and enrich their lives as individuals. These two aims were already expressed in the Crowther Committee (1959) when mention was made about ‘a national investment’ and about ‘the right of every boy and girl to be educated’. Ouston (1999) makes a clear distinction between ‘equality of opportunity’ and ‘equality of outcomes’. She states that ‘equality of opportunity’ requires that all students have access to the same educational experiences. While on the other hand ‘equality of outcomes’ refers to the different provision for students with differing educational needs, and that some children may well need additional help to access the curriculum in order for them to make progress.

A Common Approach to the Curriculum

Well before the passing of ERA, in fact from the 1970s, demands were being made for a common curriculum.

‘By the middle of the 1970s, it was becoming apparent, from both research and experience, from theory and practice that the attainment of these aims would require the establishment of a curriculum framed in terms of the common principles and processes which should underpin every child’s educational

There were two main reasons for wanting to adopt this common approach to the design of the curriculum. The first was to do with the content of education received by pupils. The second reason was related to a wish for external control over the work of teachers in an attempt to ensure that standards will improve.

HMI were advocates of a common curriculum. They put forward their views in three ‘Red Books’ published between 1977 and 1983. The DES’ concept of a limited subject-based core curriculum was rejected by the HMI, who argued instead for whole curriculum planning to be organised around eight areas of experience. These were: the aesthetic and creative, the ethical, the linguistic, the mathematical, the physical, the scientific, the social and political, and the spiritual. A ninth area, technological was added later. HMI felt that all pupils, regardless of their ability, should have access to an ‘entitlement curriculum’ which incorporated vocational and technical as well as the academic experience. The DES opposed this in 1985 in ‘Better Schools’ where they put forward their ideas based upon traditional school subjects, which were concerned with breadth, balance, relevance and differentiation. The DES contended that there needed to be coherence instead of focusing upon areas of experience (Ribbins, 1993). However, both of these proposals were rejected and through the 1988 Education Act, a content approach was adopted instead as there were concerns about the content and quality of the curriculum being offered to children (Chitty, 1993; Lawton, 1996).
'Teachers were handed down a curriculum that was planned in great haste, with no clear aims and values, and without a coherent design, and were expected to teach and assess it after minimal opportunities to prepare for it. A recipe for disaster! ' (Lawton, 1996, p.8)

However, the key event that triggered off the 'great debate' nationally in the United Kingdom was the seminal Ruskin College address by the then Prime Minister, James Callaghan. His first concern was that far too many sixth formers (Years 12 and 13) were choosing to study the arts and very few the sciences to the detriment of the advancement of technological studies for an industrial society. As a result of this observation, Callaghan felt that education was not preparing children for the economy. The second was the demand for greater control over the activities of teachers and a higher degree of public accountability than had previously been required of them. In addition to this, industry and political pressure groups raised questions about the quality of the curriculum being offered in schools.

'... The curriculum is no longer a secret place but a highly public arena in which a contest ebbs and flows, a contest for control of the curriculum.'

(Lofthouse et al., 1995, p.15)

The curriculum in England and Wales was considered to be too fragmented and this lack of cohesion adversely affected standards as it was not possible to compare like with like. The advocates of a common curriculum based some of their arguments around the need
to cater for the increased geographical mobility of children’s parents to ensure that if a child’s family moves from one part of the country to another the child will find the same topics being taught. In addition to this, five other points were identified by Lofthouse et al. (1995) as a justification for a common curriculum:

- children’s entitlement to a worthwhile curriculum embodying a consensus of aims;
- a common curriculum entitles children to participate in a shared culture;
- a National Curriculum promotes common standards;
- a National Curriculum increases accountability for the benefit of all;
- and equality to access as well as increased accountability.

However, Becher (1989) suggests that the imposition of the National Curriculum in England and Wales was a mark of the Conservative government’s dissatisfaction with teachers and the educational system. Becher (1989) goes on to surmise that the underlying rationale of the reform is to remind teachers and other professionals working in education that the major function of teaching and learning is to serve the national economy.

The Introduction of the National Curriculum

Some commentators looked upon the 1988 ERA as a belated product of Callaghan’s Great Debate. It was one of the most radical and far-reaching pieces of educational legislation for England and Wales since the 1944 Education Act as it shifted control over education from the LEAs to central government (Maclure, 1988). The then Secretary for Education, Kenneth Baker, drafted the 1988 ERA, which implemented the National
Curriculum. Lawton (1989) claims that a number of critics were deeply concerned by the bureaucratic style of the National Curriculum which appeared to be more concerned with control than with improving the quality of education, as it gave the Secretary of State so much more additional power over the curriculum. Another criticism, offered by Lawton (1989), was the emphasis on the publication of the test results of schools, which was connected with introducing the educational market place. A final criticism was that the National Curriculum was not truly national, as it did not apply to independent schools.

Once the National Curriculum was in operation there was a need to monitor its implementation in a systematic way. The Education (Schools) Act, 1992 established the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). Originally it was thought that the publication of results would lead to parents choosing 'good' schools and that 'poor' schools would close. That did not happen so Ofsted was introduced to increase governmental control over the content of the school curriculum. Ofsted's main function is to provide the government and the public with current information regarding the state of the nation's schools. Another of Ofsted's functions was to help schools improve by building on their strengths and tackling their identified weaknesses. It was also a way to monitor the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms.

'The introduction of a prescriptive National Curriculum was followed by a national inspection system regime, organised by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), to tighten governmental control over the purpose and content of schooling.' (Wise and Bush, 1999)
Hillman (1992), Bolam (1997) and Bush (1998) have discussed in detail the impact of the ERA on headteachers and Wallace and Hall (1994) show how it has affected the leadership team (LT). However, there is scant evidence about how the changes in content and delivery of the ERA have affected the working experience of subject leaders in their management and leadership role (Wise and Bush, 1999).

Although the National Curriculum is now well established, it has proved to be unsatisfactory in a number of ways, as some commentators predicted (Chitty, 1993; Lawton, 1996).

'It is not surprising, then, that it has already become plain that the National Curriculum has not achieved what it was claimed it would achieve. In particular, there is clear evidence that, as had been predicted, it has not provided that entitlement which was claimed to be a major part of its raison d’etre.'

(Edwards and Kelly, 1998, p.xii)

The 1993 Dearing Report accepted that the National Curriculum had become overloaded. This came about because the Working Groups of the various subjects were not able to judge the collective weight of the entire curriculum in teaching terms (Chitty, 1993). Teachers enjoyed the experience of having their expertise sought, along with their associations, on the content of the curriculum.
As a result, some of the curriculum deficiencies were removed. The Review did not extend beyond political concerns. It concentrated on slimming down the amount that had to be assimilated in the programmes of study with some of the content becoming optional. This diminished the level of prescription, so that the revision that followed was considered to be mainly cosmetic (Chitty, 1993). The copious reforms that teachers have had to deal with have not altered even though there has been a change in government.

At first the new Labour government gave no indication that there would be a significant revision of the school curriculum. They did express concern about the level of pupil achievement. However, a variety of new initiatives has been implemented such as the literacy and numeracy hours in primary schools, and pre vocational courses for 14 to 16 year olds in secondary school, the National Literacy Strategy (NLS) and National Numeracy Strategy (NNS) for Key Stage 3, to try and improve the quality of learning. Other revisions to the National Curriculum by the Secretary of State have been prescribed:

(1) programmes of study have been redesigned and restructured to be less prescriptive;

(2) stability to enable schools to focus on raising standards;

(3) making teaching requirements clearer and promote continuity;

(4) reduce requirements, for example scaling down the content of the foundation subjects;

(5) provide greater coherence within and between subjects;
(6) other national initiatives such as Education Action Zone (EAZ), learning mentors for disaffected students, work related learning.

The general feeling amongst educationalists is that any alteration to the National Curriculum will involve more people by being open, democratic and appropriate to equip students adequately for the world of work (Lawton, 1996).

Some teachers and educationalists hope that these changes to the curriculum will be carefully planned and suitable for a diverse school population. Being less prescriptive and concentrating on the kinds of educational experience to which all young people in a democratic society should be entitled will give more scope for raising educational achievement. Edwards and Kelly (1998) articulate that:

‘The concern must be to develop a form of curriculum which will genuinely prepare the young for entry, as full and competent participants, into the democratic society of the future, a curriculum which will offer personal entitlement and empowerment in addition to a preparation for productive economic role’ (Pages xiv and xv)

London Secondary Schools

The William Tyndale primary school affair was one high profile illustration of the concerns that many people had regarding the way schools were operating. The incident involved teachers in a North London junior school who were said to have refused to teach their pupils in a formal, structured manner. The ‘affair’ caused advocates of child-
centred education to be widely associated, in public opinion, with left wing extremists abandoning appropriate standards and discipline of pupils, and instead developing a laissez faire approach. As a result, there were demands for greater public control over educational practices in schools (Auld, 1976).

Rutter et al. (1979) was one of the earliest studies that came up with the comparatively new idea, which led on to 'the school can make a difference' movement of the 1970s and 1980s mentioned earlier. They demonstrated that schools have an important impact on pupils' achievement and as result it does matter which school a child attends. The findings of the research were received with some criticisms as they contradicted the widespread view among educationalists and academics that schools made little difference to pupils' educational achievement (Coleman, 1966; The Plowden Report, 1967; Jensen, 1969; Bernstein, 1970; Jencks, 1972).

In the Rutter study, the progress of students at twelve inner London secondary schools was analysed. Data were collected on the pupils throughout their secondary schooling on attendance, examination results, behaviour in school and delinquency outside. The pupils' aptitude in these schools were skewed mainly towards the middle and bottom of the ability range and their examination results, when compared with all schools in the Greater London area, were pleasing. All the schools served areas with chronic disadvantages and varied significantly in their academic attainment. The findings from the research indicated that some schools were more able than others to provide a positive influence on their pupils' development and educational achievement, while others were
less successful in doing so. This was largely dependent on the quality of education the pupils received in their schools.

In 1986 the National Council for Educational Standards (NCES) carried out research on the examination performance of secondary schools in Inner London. The report from the research was disturbing, showing underachievement and poor standards in the capital’s schools in comparison with those in the rest of the country. The blame could not be placed on the lack of resources or staffing levels, as these were very generous and far better than elsewhere in the country. Nor could social deprivation or pupils’ ethnic background be the cause for the poor standard of educational achievement as it is the opinion amongst educational researchers that all pupils can make progress in their learning if given good quality education. (Rutter et al., 1979; Manghan et al., 1990). Inner London schools had forty percent more to spend on resources than the national average. Yet after five years of generous funding standards were still thirty percent below the national average (NCES, 1986). NCES (ibid.) also confirmed that the schools, which were achieving the worst results, were the inner London secondary schools.

What was even more disturbing was the variation in achievement of schools with a similar pupil intake (NCES, 1986; Marks, 1994). The NCES (ibid.) also highlighted that:

‘...ILEA London comprehensive schools not only did less well than comprehensive schools elsewhere in the country, even in relatively socially deprived areas, but that they also do less well than secondary modern
schools-schools which, by definition, are deprived of those pupils who would normally be expected to take GCE.’ (Page, 10).

However, the NCES (op. cit.) pointed out that the ILEA had good schools with outstanding work being done in them. It noted that higher standards were achieved by voluntary aided schools, such as religious denominational ones, which consistently out performed the maintained schools for pupils of all ability. These schools achieved examination results, which were as good as anywhere else in this country. Ofsted (1993) supports this view and claims that not all schools in deprived areas perform badly. One of the reasons why these religious schools performed better could be due to the pupils having more support.

A five-year study on six inner London comprehensive schools was conducted by Maughan et al. (1990). This study was developed out of the previous research project of Rutter et al. (1979). Using a different research design, a longitudinal study instead of a cross-sectional one, Maughan et. al. (1990) were able to establish from the findings of the research that substantial improvements in terms of pupil outcomes could be achieved at individual schools over a period of years.

'They show that children, whatever their background, can achieve a great deal if they (children) are well taught and well motivated but they also show that, in schools with similar intakes of pupils achieve widely differing results. The differences are a measure of a school’s
effectiveness in teaching and motivating its pupils’ (DfEE, 1997, p. 25)

The House of Commons Education Committee Third Report (1995) also expressed disquiet about the quality of life and the impact on the educational prospects of children who live in city areas. The Report defines city schools as ‘... those serving communities with high levels of social deprivation - including but not confined to the inner cities.’ (page v). The children who attend these schools are usually disadvantaged as they experience:

‘... fragmented or disrupted home background, poverty and poor employment prospects for parents and children... cultural and language differences between home and school, poor housing stock, high mobility of families, poor local environment.’ (page, v)

The report recognises the socio-economic challenge secondary schools face in London. Ofsted (1993) acknowledges this and maintains that the achievement of these pupils is inextricably connected to their impoverished socio-economic background, as there is a difference between teaching pupils from supportive and educationally aware families who suffer none of the disadvantages mentioned above. Schools in the city, the House of Commons Report (1995) asserts, have to work hard to engender a reasonable level of achievement, and much harder still to match the performance of schools in more favourable parts of the country. The factors that affect the performance of city schools
are more likely to be the same ones, which affect the performance of other schools. However, the report highlights that city schools usually have more pupils from deprived backgrounds, which bring added pressure on schools:

‘... The difference in city schools is that they are more likely to have more disadvantaged pupils, who are affected by tensions of poverty, unemployment, poor housing, lack of interest on the part of the parents, unstable family background, and in many cases an inadequate diet. All bring additional tensions into the schools and these combine to distract both pupils and teachers from educational success.’ (page, xvii)

The DfEE (1999), in agreement, states that the performance in city secondary schools shows more needs to be done to raise standard of pupil achievement. Only 33% of city schools' students achieve five GCSE A* - C compared with 46% nationally. This shows quite clearly that the average performance in city schools lagged well behind those in other areas. The government sees it as crucial to raise the standard of achievement of these pupils to create a prosperous and inclusive society. However, these same pupils can do well in circumstances where they are able to receive a sound education in their early years, become more motivated, experience skilled teaching, better resources and have enhanced self esteem (House of Commons, 1995).
Subject Leaders

Subject leaders, for the purpose of this thesis are considered to be those subject specialists who have direct responsibility for an area of the academic curriculum in secondary schools. For schools to fulfil the expectations of the government with respect to raising educational standards, then the role of subject leaders becomes central in achieving the government's goal. The Ofsted framework, effective from 1 January 2000, states clearly that Ofsted team inspectors will have to take the performance of subject leaders into account when making their judgements on schools' results and achievements. The quality of the curriculum delivery is paramount and schools have to show that they are maintaining very high standards or improving as well as can be expected, for all pupils irrespective of their level of ability or whether they use English as an additional language.

The role of subject leaders has developed and changed over the past few years. It has now become a highly skilled role, which involves a heavy managerial component together with a heavy teaching load (Dunham, 1995). Although this role has evolved since the passing of the ERA, (1988) there needs to be a change in attitude to the position. As a result, it is important for senior leaders to understand this change in subject leaders' role and be clear about the expectations and range of responsibility they will have to undertake. Subject leaders too, need to be clear about the complexity of their function (Dunham, 1995) and the important working relationship between themselves and the leadership team.
Findings from the Ofsted Report (2000) argue that increased expectations are being placed on subject leaders. Many subject leaders, Ofsted claims, are effective in organisation and general administration rather than in strategic leadership. The main areas of weaknesses are: departmental development planning; monitoring and evaluation of the quality of teaching; and the standards of learning achieved by pupils. Thus, the role of subject leaders in London schools, where examination results are generally below the national average, requires further investigation.

It is the subject leader’s responsibility to ensure that the quality of teaching and learning is effective in the classroom in order to achieve the government’s targets for raising academic standards. The refining and developing of the curriculum has been a major task in schools over recent years (Garwood and Dowden, 1998) and subject leaders will continue to have an important role in implementing these changes.

Subject leaders are expected to ensure that the curriculum is organised; resourced well; provides relevant training to ensure that teachers are confident and competent in their subject knowledge; and finally, to monitor and evaluate the curriculum to ensure that good practice is effective, and consistent. Ofsted criteria provide a tool to enable the subject leaders to know how to organise, to advise, to promote, to plan and to set specific targets for improvement (Garwood and Dowden, 1998).
Planning is a central task for subject leaders especially in their role of managing change. How successful a subject leader is may be assessed by the specific increase in pupils’ performance in national tests and examinations.

The observation above shows the changing role of the subject leaders and emphasises their important management and leadership role. The impact on the LT’s structure makes it more hierarchical and bureaucratic, but there needs to be a note of caution here. The reality of this scenario in many cases is that this type of hierarchical form is more complex than is generally recognised. For instance, whilst members of the LT would exercise line management authority over subject leaders, it is normal practice for senior leaders to teach as subject specialists. Therefore, they would themselves be line managed by subject leaders in charged of departments. This interchangeable role of senior leaders and subject leaders carries the possibility of the subject leaders’ theoretical authority being compromised or distorted. They may feel that they will have to tread carefully when dealing with senior leaders who line manage them in other areas.

**Purpose of the Thesis**

The purpose of this thesis is to establish to what extent the criteria of the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree on what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools. The ERA produced fundamental changes to the management role of subject leaders. Subject leaders are in a strategic position as they have the responsibility of translating policy intention into classroom practice. In addition to this, they may have
to ensure that they supervise and monitor the work of their subordinates in the department (Wise and Bush, 1999).

The author will be focusing on how the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree in what they consider to be the qualities that makes effective subject leaders. In addition to this, an investigation will be undertaken to compare the effectiveness of subject leaders in two contrasting LEAs in respect of pupil achievement.

**Research Questions**

- To what extent do the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree with each other’s criteria on what makes effective subject leaders?

The last decade has seen the introduction of the Ofsted inspection system and the establishment of the TTA. For the inspection process Ofsted has produced its handbook for guidance setting out the criteria for inspectors to follow when evaluating the quality of education in schools. The TTA, despite recent modification, is still responsible for determining the standards for teachers, subject leaders and headteachers. These standards stated in the TTA document are used to assess the effectiveness of subject leaders in their leadership roles. Therefore, these two agencies’ perspectives have influence on the role and responsibilities of subject leaders. In addition to this, the academic literature has its own perspective on what are the essentials that make effective subject leaders. The academic literature receives its information from research findings conducted in schools and other educational establishments. This question seeks to evaluate the extent to which all three bodies agree on the criteria, which make effective subject leaders.
• **Are there differences in what the documents consider to be the important role of subject leaders?**

While it could be assumed that all three bodies should be emphasising similar criteria on the important areas of subject leaders’ role, it maybe that because of the differences in their specific functions their criteria and priority would vary. Hence, this question is designed to probe and find out the extent to which they differ.

• **Are the differences, if any, linked to the respective roles of the bodies?**

Each of these bodies has its own roles and mandates, and as a result may well focus on different areas in respect of the subject leaders’ role. Therefore, this question is intended to establish the context of these bodies and the overall role they play in developing leadership and management in schools in respect of subject leaders.

• **What further reasons may explain the differences between the roles of the three bodies?**

Here, one needs to consider what other reasons could be behind their differences, if they are any. The purpose of this question is to ascertain whether or not the differences between the roles of the three bodies will send contradictory messages to subject leaders or will it depend on their function of enhancing subject leaders’ performance.
• Are there differences between expectations and practices from the research findings?

If these bodies have varying roles and functions their expectations and practices may also be different. The question is designed to compare the findings from the Ofsted reports, focusing on London schools, with the ideals espoused by the academic literature, TTA and Ofsted.

For the purpose of this thesis the terms ‘senior leaders’ and/or ‘the leadership team’ (LT) are used to denote headteachers, deputies, assistant headteachers and senior teachers. Subject leaders refer to academic middle managers, curriculum managers, curriculum coordinators, middle managers, subject co-ordinators, heads of department, heads of faculty and learning coordinators. ‘Pastoral heads’ refer to heads of year and heads of house. ‘Teachers’ refer to all those teachers not holding senior or middle management posts in schools.

Summary

The curriculum that was offered to pupils in England before 1988 was perceived to have failed to provide an adequate education to prepare pupils for adult life in a modern technological and industrial society. Central government saw the need to have a National Curriculum to ensure that pupils throughout the country experience continuity and progression in their schooling. The copious changes in education are attempts by the government to improve the quality of educational provision for all pupils. The present government has developed a number of new initiatives to help improve the academic
performance of pupils, so that Britain will have a more educated workforce to compete confidently with other industrial countries, and especially their European counterparts. In addition to this, the government is of the opinion that it must support the continued economic growth of the country through an educational system that provides young people who will advance the quality of society in the twenty first century.

The importance of the role of subject leaders in school improvement and curriculum management is well documented and emphasised by the academic literature. Thus, their value in the wider educational reform of government cannot be over stated irrespective of the curriculum management role exercised by senior leaders within the school and external control by government agencies such as QCA, Ofsted and TTA. Therefore, the next chapter reviews the literature on the five stages of curriculum management.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum management is a central activity for schools because it creates the framework for effective teaching and learning to take place (Preedy, 1989). It includes:

'...organising and coordinating curriculum planning; changing the curriculum in response to internal and external needs and demands, dealing with the issues that arise in implementing curriculum change and evaluating the work of the school...,' ‘negotiating the curriculum in practice with various groups and interests involved.'

(Preedy, 1989, p.viii)

As the curriculum is considered to be at the centre of every school, and is one of the most important features in education, it has received constant attention in the literature. This has been mainly due to the recognition that in a rapidly changing society, such as Britain, there is a need for continuous appraisal and adjustment regarding changes in the educational experience of pupils.

OFSTED offers its own definition of a good curriculum:

'A good curriculum is one which complies with legal requirements for pupils of statutory school age; is organised appropriately and effectively in terms of time allocation to subjects and with grouping arrangements which enable all pupils to achieve their full potential; provides access
to the full range of curricular experience for all pupils for whom the National Curriculum is not modified or disapplied; ensures continuity particularly by taking account of pupils' earlier experience; includes coherent provision for the major cross-curricular themes, dimensions and skills, including personal and social education and preparation for adult life; and makes suitable alternative provision for pupils for whom parts of the National Curriculum are disapplied, ensuring that this provision is balanced and broadly based. 

A programme of extra-curricular activities extends and complements the curriculum and is open to all pupils.' (OFSTED, 1994)

The school curriculum is the responsibility of a wide spectrum of people. These include central government, local education authorities, the governing bodies of schools, headteachers in conjunction with members of the leadership team, subject leaders and, in the classroom, by subject teachers. However, it has been well established within the research literature on education that subject leaders play an increasingly important role in maintaining and improving the quality of the curriculum and their departmental performance in secondary schools (Bucher and Harris, 1999). Harris (2000) contends that subject leaders within English secondary schools contribute to departmental performance in much the same way as headteachers contribute to the overall school performance. HMI (2002) confirms this with regard to school leadership and management:

'The leadership and management of our schools continue to improve, being good or better in some three quarters of primary, special and secondary schools . . .
At secondary level, the quality of leadership given by headteachers is often closely related to the quality of that of heads of department . . .

'In 2000/01 leadership and management of the headteacher and key staff were judged good or better in 77% of secondary schools.' (page 6)

Nevertheless, central government made a political move to take control of the school curriculum. This was because of the concern felt for many years that the curriculum programmes for schools were far too fragmented and lacked cohesion. There were also variations in the standard of education provided by schools across the country. In addition, there was the dissatisfaction with some local education authorities and schools in preparing students adequately for a technological age and school leavers leaving school with poor basic skills in literacy and numeracy. As a result, a number of government agencies, committees and councils, such as OFSTED and QCA, have been created so that central government can monitor the quality of education. This enables central government to keep the school curriculum under constant review. In this way, central government feels that it will be able to maintain high standards so that Britain can compete confidently and globally with its European counterparts.

EXTERNAL MANAGEMENT OF THE CURRICULUM

Central Government Management of the Curriculum

Until the passing of the ERA (1988), central government had limited control over the curriculum. Nevertheless, central government was able to influence and prescribe what a school curriculum should contain through control of examinations, various documents and committee reports (Pring, 1989). These include the Bullock Report: A Language for Life (1975); Warnock Report: Special Educational Needs (1978); The
Swann Report: Education For All (1975); and government consultation papers, for example 'A Framework for the School Curriculum (1980). These reports and other consultation documents became the basis of staff development for teachers, government policies and, at times, legislation (Pring, 1989).

The change in the basic power structure of the education system in England after 1988 was considered to be a political move as it restored to central government, control over the curriculum which had been relaxed between the war years. Maclure (1988) contends that central government's aim was to make it clear that national political power overrides local political power. To achieve this, the ERA set in motion the formal machinery for exercising and enforcing these powers and responsibilities by central government. The Secretary of State was given powers to prescribe and control the National Curriculum (Lawton, 1989). The Conservative Government highlighted what it saw as the failure of some local education authorities and schools to provide adequate curricula for a technological age. The previous Conservative government pointed out that the economically successful countries in Europe, such as Germany and France, had a centrally controlled curriculum (Lawton and Chitty, 1988).

The Role of Ofsted

A particular external influence on subject leaders in secondary school is the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). Ofsted was created to assess and evaluate the quality of teaching and learning in schools on a regular basis (Wood and Orlik, 1994). Ofsted is a non-ministerial government department responsible for the system of inspection, which came into force with the Education (Schools) Act, 1992. This Act sets out the ground rules for inspection and empowered Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) to
co-ordinate this initiative. The aim of this process of inspection is to use independent inspectors to inspect every state funded school in England on a six yearly cycle (previously on a four yearly cycle). This system started in September 1993 for secondary schools and September 1994 for primary, special and other schools (Earley et al., 1996).

Inspection is compulsory and it is intended to help schools to improve by building on their strengths and tackling their identified weaknesses, so that they may improve the quality of education offered and raise the standards achieved by their pupils. This systematic inspection is to provide the government and the public with current information about the state of the nation's schools through the inspection report. The report represents the public accountability of the education service and is based on very explicit criteria. An inspection report is a judgement on a school's effectiveness at a particular point in time. It will inform the Secretary of State for Education and Skills about:

- 'the quality of education provided by the schools;
- the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils at those schools;
- and the efficient management of schools

(Ofsted, 2002, p.8)

Ofsted works with LEAs and schools to improve educational standards by offering advice to them (Ofsted, 2002). It provides schools and LEAs with statistical analysis drawn from inspection and other data. Schools have been given Performance AND
Assessment (PANDA) reports on assessment and examination data, so that comparisons may be made with other schools nationally and schools with similar intakes. In addition, Ofsted has provided training for school managers in the area of self-evaluation. LEAs and other training providers have developed training programmes using the Ofsted framework and material as valuable development tools (Ofsted, 2002).

Reynolds et al. (1996) assert that Ofsted has been influenced by the school effectiveness research and therefore feel that schools can make a difference to the achievement of their pupils. It is from this premise that the Ofsted procedures for evaluating schools focus on the quality of teaching and learning, which takes place in the classroom.

However, it must be acknowledged that the Ofsted procedures alluded to above have their links with the school effectiveness research findings. These tend to be correlated in many facets. Thus, to illustrate this point, it will always be the case that positive school effectiveness factors will generally be found amongst schools that are performing well and correspondingly be absent in schools that are failing. Nevertheless, the Ofsted judgements are still unable to inform the schools (whether they be successful or failing) as to how they were able to succeed or what they may do to succeed. To further elaborate, the Ofsted judgements or findings do not communicate the specific strategies schools deploy in achieving successful and effective leadership. Neither in the case of schools judged to have weak leadership has Ofsted been able to clearly indicate what these schools are failing to do to achieve effectiveness.
A further point that needs to be emphasised here, is the fact that the school effectiveness researchers are today inclined to see effectiveness more in terms of the context in which schools are operating. They do not consider that the ‘one size, fits all’ approach to earlier school effectiveness debate is appropriate. The argument now is to see effectiveness as being determined by the particular ethos and culture of the school.

Although school effectiveness is judged at the whole school level the Ofsted handbook offers criteria, which, by implication, can be applied at the level of the department (Harris, Jamieson and Russ, 1997). Throughout the inspection process, Ofsted sets a series of demands about how subject departments should be run in order to deliver what is considered to be good quality teaching and learning.

Subject leaders, under the guidance of the Leadership Team, have to interpret and implement the demands made upon them. Busher and Harris (1999) state that the external influence has reinforced the hierarchical process and, as a result, evens out the imbalance of power between leaders and followers amongst staff at whatever level in a school organisation. Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) claim departments facing the prospect of an Ofsted inspection hanging over them may be nerve racking, but the effects seemed beneficial to the department. This is mainly because the departments were made to review their policies and practices, and to ensure that they were being adhered to consistently. Successful subject leaders are expected to have clear awareness and understanding of what the Ofsted process will expect from them and their team members. Subject leaders are expected to advise departmental colleagues on how to implement the required processes effectively. The way in which subject
leaders act in these circumstances will have a considerable effect on their departments’ culture and ethos (Busher and Harris, 1999).

Despite what has been said about the Ofsted expectations with reference to the role of subject leaders such as departments having clear policies, ensuring that policies are consistently implemented, there remains, however, concerns regarding the effectiveness of the Ofsted inspection judgements with respect to the role of subject leaders.

When Ofsted inspects schools it has very little time to observe middle managers managing their departments. Instead the inspectors make judgements on the effectiveness of middle managers by a process of deduction arrived at from the observations of teachers. For example, where an observation shows that certain whole school polices and subject polices are not being followed, inspectors will conclude that this is due to middle managers not monitoring the implementation of those policies in their department. This illustrates the concern that the Ofsted judgements lack security given that the evidence used tends to be of a second hand nature. Thus, observations by Ofsted are not of middle managers in their management role, but of subject teachers and the way they implement policies. Therefore, subject leaders are judged indirectly on the performance of their staff.

In addition to the argument above, subject leaders are also being assessed using the Ofsted handbook and its criteria for effective curriculum delivery. Nevertheless, the inspection follows no clearly laid out management principles designed specifically for subject leaders. On the other hand, inspectors in practice apply the leadership and
management criteria for headteachers and other senior leaders, set out in the Ofsted handbook, to evaluate the management and leadership effectiveness of subject leaders. In other words, subject leaders are not judged with reference to their role and responsibilities, but from those criteria applicable to senior school leaders, borrowed and used by inspectors to evaluate subject leaders. This is a serious weakness.

The Role of the Qualification and Curriculum Authority (QCA)

Another fairly new organisation, the Qualification and Curriculum Authority (QCA), was created to end the academic/vocational divide in education. The QCA came into being in October 1997. The Education Act (1997) gave the QCA a core remit to provide quality and coherence in education and training. The QCA’s task is to bring together the work of the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) and the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) with additional powers and duties which give the QCA a unique overview of the curriculum, assessment and qualifications across the whole of education and training, from pre-school to higher vocational levels.

'... QCA now has a profoundly strong hold over the school curriculum, adding inter alia values, morals and citizenship to its already content-heavy agenda.'

(Association of Teachers and Lecturers, 1998, p.20)

The QCA’s prime duty is to advise the Secretary of State for Education and Skills on all matters affecting the school curriculum, pupil assessment and publicly funded qualifications offered in schools, colleges and work places. The background to this is
the creation of a coherent national framework of qualifications, as recommended by
Sir Ron Dearing in his 1996 report on education and training for 16 to 19 year olds.
Sir Ron Dearing's committee was asked to consider four key issues: the scope for
slimming down the curriculum; the future of the ten level scales; how to simplify the
testing arrangement; and finally, how to improve the administration of the National
Curriculum and the tests. The message from the Dearing Report was that the National
Curriculum should not be seen as the whole curriculum, and that it should be the
responsibility of all the teachers in their school to plan a coherent curriculum in such a
way that it catered adequately for the needs of their school population (Lawton,
1996).

Over the last ten years the National Curriculum has been modified in detail. It has
now been subjected to a fundamental review by the QCA during 1999. The key
feature of the QCA's review has been the attention it has paid to the purpose of
education. Aldrich and White (1998) argue that the National Curriculum still lacks a
clear vision of what the parts are designed to achieve. The QCA's (1997) view is that
there needs to be a much clearer statement about the aims and priorities of the school
curriculum as a necessary preliminary to any review.

In conducting this review the QCA has taken on a consultative and collaborative
approach by seeking the opinions and views from an extensive range of partners, such
as teachers, educationalists and researchers, in developing the proposals. The main
purpose for this procedure is to ensure coherent and consistent approaches to bring
about greater effectiveness by working with others in pursuit of a world class system
of education and training for the twenty first century (QCA, 1997).
'The National Curriculum provides the legal framework for nearly every child's school education except for those educated privately. It helps to shape the educational experience and later lives of all future citizens of England and Wales, as such it is a powerful institution. If it gets things wrong, its potential for harm is massive. That is why great care should be taken to ensure that its aims and more specific curriculum objectives which derive from them are as well worked out as possible.'

(Aldrich and White, 1998 page 4)

The importance of working in partnership has been shown by the well received Dearing Report (1996), mentioned earlier. It is clear from the literature on education (Aldrich and White, 1998) that no one section of the population should have the power to decide what the school curriculum entails as this would enable that section to control the shape of future society. As the schools' curricula have such a great influence on the lives of pupils it is becoming increasingly necessary for every sector of society to be equally entitled to participate in contributing to its content.

'Given the great influence which schools' curricula are intended to have on the lives of their pupils and therefore on the shape of future society, why should teachers have power to set their broad contours, including their overall aims? . . . Why should a section of the population have the power to help shape what future society should be like, when this was - as was becoming increasingly plain through the 1970s
and 1980s a power in which every citizen was equally entitled to participate?

Just as generals were not entitled to decide on military policy,
or tax inspectors to lay down fiscal policy, so, it was felt, teachers
did not have the right to determine educational policy.'

(Aldrich and White, 1998, p.6)

However, given the role of the teachers, and especially subject leaders, there is every
good reason why they should have a considerable say about the curriculum in order to
deliver and manage it effectively at the school level for the benefit of the young people (Aldrich and White, 1998).

The Role of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA)

The ‘National Standards for Subject Leaders’ (NSSL) was set up by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) in 1998 '. . . to promote effective and efficient professional development for teachers and headteachers, targeted on improvements in the quality of teaching and leadership which will have the maximum impact on pupils’ learning.' (Page, 1) The TTA makes it clear that these standards are designed to guide the professional development of subject leaders, so that they can improve their effectiveness in their role or for those aspiring to take the responsibility for leading a subject.

With the publication of the NSSL the TTA formally acknowledges the importance of the subject leader’s role as being gatekeepers of their subject curriculum as well as the management of change and development. The TTA highlights that the subject leaders are in a unique position to influence the quality of teaching and learning in
their department, and can have powerful experience over classroom practices in their subject areas.

Gunter and Rutherford (2000) assert that the TTA’s programme for subject leadership is aimed at enabling course members to engage with the requirements of the National Standards in which the core purpose of the subject leader is described as:

'To provide professional leadership and management for a subject to secure high quality teaching, effective use of resources, and improved standards of learning and achievement for all pupils.' (p. 4)

In the National Standards for Subject Leaders the TTA sets out the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes that it feels will enable subject leaders to carry out their leadership role effectively in four key areas:

- 'Strategic direction and development of the subject;
- Teaching and learning;
- Leading and managing staff;
- Efficient and effective development of staff and resources.' (page, 9)

Adey (2000) postulates that each of the four key areas of the subject leadership identified in the TTA’s National Standards for Subject Leaders relate directly to teaching and learning. The reason for this is to secure and sustain effective teaching of the subject, evaluate the quality of teaching and standards of pupils’ achievements and set out targets for improvement. This cannot be fulfilled unless subject leaders play their part in leading and managing staff, providing strategic direction and
development of the subject, and ensure the efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources.

The term ‘subject leader’ does not only represent a change of terminology, but also a redefinition of the role for these middle managers leading a department. TTA (1998) emphasises the expectations and importance of the role of subject leaders in being able to secure high quality and improved standards of achievement for both pupils and teachers by being able to meet clearly defined organisational, curriculum and pedagogical goals (Harris, Busher and Wise, 2001). Furthermore, the TTA acknowledges the centrality of the subject leaders in contributing to whole school aims, policies, and practices:

‘While the headteacher and the governors carry overall responsibility for school improvement, a subject leader has responsibility for the subject curriculum and for establishing high standards of teaching and learning in their subject as well as playing a major role in development of school policy.’ (TTA, 1998), page 3)

As a result of the re-definition of the subject leaders’ role, as alluded to above, the expectation for those leading from the middle has changed dramatically. The leadership and management challenges they are expected to cope with are extensive and extremely demanding (Harris, Busher, Wise, 2001). There has been a heavy increase in the workload for subject leaders due to the demands of the National Curriculum, the pressures and preparation for Ofsted inspections (Metcalf and Russell, 1997), performance management, significant changes to the Key Stage Three
curriculum, the GCSE at Key Stage Four and the new AS and A2 level syllabuses for Key Stage Five. These have combined to place extra responsibilities on the subject leaders (Adey, 2000). At the same time, the Leadership Team (LT) also had to manage copious educational changes, which has resulted in some of the tasks usually carried out by the LT, being delegated to subject leaders (Brown and Rutherford, 1996). The TTA’s training programme is designed to ensure that subject leaders are prepared adequately for the changes and the continuous development they have to experience in leading their subject areas.

The TTA’s (1998) approach is to encourage subject leaders to work closely with the headteacher and other members of the leadership team, and will liaise with other colleagues as appropriate in order to bring about improvement in pupils’ performance.

The Role of the Local Education Authorities

The Education Reform Act, 1988 had a major impact on the role of the local education authorities (LEA). The Act altered the basic power structure of the education system by restoring to central government powers over the curriculum. In addition to this, many of the LEAs’ powers were transferred to other organisations and institutions. Maclure (1992) contends that the change in the power structure was highly controversial as it reversed a long tradition of local policy-making and administration to the DfES having greater executive role over the control of the curriculum.

Responsibility for finance, resources, staffing and pupil numbers was passed from LEAs to schools and their governing bodies (Earley et al., 1996). The stance adopted
was to strengthen even further central government’s control of the educational system and make schools more independent of local authorities’ control and direction (Bennett, 1995).

‘Not only did it (The Education Reform Act, 1988) strengthen the central government’s role in education, it introduced important limitations on the functions of the local education authorities, who were forced to give greater autonomy to schools and governing bodies.’ (Maclure, 1992, p.v)

However, the LEAs retained responsibility, given to them in the 1944 Education Act, for monitoring and evaluating the quality of education, and in particularly the content of the curriculum, provided by their schools. It appears that LEAs were giving different emphasis to this duty, as many seem to prefer to work in an advisory capacity with schools (Ranson, 1992, Maychell and Keys, 1993) Now, the LEAs’ role has shifted towards one of support rather than control (Ranson, 1992) where advisers and consultants would work with school staff such as subject leaders, literacy and numeracy coordinators.

To support schools and teachers in their role of managing the curriculum the government now requires from LEAs information about the curriculum on offer in schools. It also requires reassurance that the school policies, as they developed into documents, are being implemented. Pring (1989) contends that in many respect the power of the LEAs was diminishing before the ERA. Before the early 1980s, most LEAs would have had very little detailed knowledge of the curriculum content in their schools. The main reason for this was that the responsibility of the curriculum was felt to be best left to professionals in the schools. (Pring, 1989).
It can be seen that the role of the LEAs has been gradually changing to become a more supportive one for their schools. The LEAs were required from as early as 1977 to report on their curriculum arrangements for their schools. Subsequently, the 1986 Education Act stipulated that they had to have a curriculum policy for their schools, which culminated with the introduction of the National Curriculum. With the introduction of the National Curriculum, central government took a direct interest in in-service education and training of teachers.

The LEAs' advisory and inspection services were able to give guidance and support to schools with the National Curriculum core and foundation subjects. Wisher (1993) however, sees the LEAs supporting schools in terms of implementing changes and modifications to programmes of study and attainment targets, and in the implementation of that part of the Education Reform Act which relates to the moral, aesthetic and spiritual dimension of the curriculum and preparation for adult life.

The copious reforms in education over the last fifteen years have had a major impact on the role of the LEAs. At first central government attempted to make local authorities more efficient through strong financial control. However, central government changed its position and altered the way local authorities delivered their services.

‘Local authorities were to become contracting agents, buying from private organisations the services they had to provide, monitoring their provision and applying quality control and assurance inspections as necessary.’
DfEE (1997) outlines that role in detail and states that the LEA's task is to challenge schools to raise standards continuously and apply pressure where schools are not doing so. The present government expects the LEAs to work in active partnership with schools in order to raise the standard of pupil achievement (DfEE, 1997). Cornforth and Evans (1996) also highlight the importance of the LEAs’ key role in raising standards and spell out what this means: inspection and advisory service; setting targets; analysing and publishing information including examination results; and making sure progress is made. The LEAs are to help schools set and meet their targets as their main focus is raising standards, and ensuring quality curriculum provision, especially in city schools. To achieve this, LEAs have to submit their Education Development Plan (EDP) to the Secretary of State for approval, setting out how they intend to promote school improvement including the performance targets set by schools. The plans have to cover a three year period and will be subject to an annual review. If the Secretary of State does not approve the EDP, it may be referred back to the LEA for further amendment drawing on advice from Ofsted. If necessary, the Secretary of State will direct Ofsted to undertake an inspection of the LEA (DfEE, 1997).

The response of many LEAs was to reconstitute the service they offer around the principle of a partnership with schools, governors and the community (Ranson, 1992). Ranson (1992) asserts that the leading responsibility of LEAs is to ensure that school organisations and other agencies work together to ensure that pupils make progress in their education by providing the appropriate curriculum to suit the need of their pupil
intake. The cooperation in sharing resources and developing the curriculum to improve learning opportunities for all pupils will need a new climate of trust and confidence (Ranson, 1992).

LEAs have useful comparative data on their schools’ performance and play an important role in helping schools set their targets for improving pupil achievement and curricular experience (DfEE, 1997). Between Ofsted inspections, the performance of schools should be monitored by the LEA as follow:

- analyse recent test, examination and inspection data;
- compare results and progress with data from other schools;
- monitor parental and local concerns;
- agree annual targets;
- check that the school’s approach to improvement planning meets national standards set by the DfEE (now the DfES).’

(DfEE, 1997 p. 28)

The LEAs have always evaluated the achievement of pupils, but the purpose and form of the evaluation has changed radically. Evaluation in the past was ad hoc, but now evaluation of performance has become a more formal and systematic process (Ranson, 1992). Where schools are under performing, the LEA would contact the governing body setting out the reasons for concern and requesting an action plan (DfEE, 1997). If the LEAs are not satisfied with the improvement they can appoint additional governors or temporarily withdraw budgetary delegation, similar to the action, which can be taken, when a school has been found to be failing (Ranson, 1992).
The role of the LEAs has changed significantly. The new culture in which LEAs are operating at the present time directs them to focus on providing schools with advice, support and monitoring their progress. The present government sees one of the LEAs' roles as helping schools meet their targets and to challenge schools to raise educational standards continuously. Where schools are not achieving their targets LEAs have to intervene and provide focused assistance to improve the schools that are under performing. If an LEA is still unsatisfied with a school’s progress they have the authority to invite Ofsted to inspect the school. In addition to this, LEAs are expected to produce local comparative data, which will enable schools to examine their overall performance and to compare differences in gender and ethnic minority groups. Therefore, LEAs will be working in a new type of partnership with their schools to ensure that they are raising educational standards. At this point it will be necessary to concentrate on the internal management of the school curriculum.

INTERNAL MANAGEMENT OF THE CURRICULUM

The Role of the Leadership Team

The 1988 ERA gives considerable power to governors and headteachers over the management of the curriculum at the level of individual schools. Circular 7/88 gives the governing body, together with headteachers, the power and responsibilities for management of the curriculum. Bennett (1995) brings to our attention that governors are supposed to provide a lay input to professional activities taking place in schools and to monitor what is happening, thus giving forms of reporting which were not previously needed or required. The emphasis, however, seems to be focused more on the governors rather than on headteachers as the Circular states that:
'... governing bodies will be free to allocate resources to their own curriculum priorities from delegated budgets...' (DES, 1988, para. 35)

However, the above statement has to be seen in the context of the governing bodies having a statutory obligation to oversee the management of the full implementation of the National Curriculum in their schools. Nevertheless, subsequent circulars have confirmed the view that the detailed organisation, management and monitoring of the curriculum are the responsibility of headteachers and their leadership teams. Governors seem to have been reluctant to take a leading role in the curriculum, as they do not have the professional expertise to carry out the curriculum management of schools.

'The mainstream curriculum of the secondary school raises complex and difficult problems that even professional educators find taxing. For part-time, lay governors to achieve anything like a comprehensive grasp of the issues involved requires an enormous and continuing effort. Furthermore, everyday experience of lay governors, unlike teachers and headteachers, does not commonly throw up opportunities for them to pick-up such expertise as a matter of course. No wonder, then, that they are mostly content to leave the initiative to the professionals.

(Ribbins, 1993, p. 53)

In practice, therefore, it is the headteacher and the rest of the LT who assume the role of custodians of the curriculum, which in reality is an imposed curriculum. The role of the governors, headteachers and the rest of LT is to have a whole view of the
curriculum to ensure that it meets statutory requirements under Section 1 of the Education Reform Act and to manage effective teaching and learning at the classroom level.

Having a whole view of the curriculum includes not only the formal programme of lessons, but also the experiences that pupils encounter in their day-to-day interactions, which contributes to the school's ethos. Examples of these less formal parts of the curriculum are the quality of the interpersonal relationships, regard for equal opportunity, how the curriculum is organised, managed and taught together with the type of extra curricular activities available.

'For curriculum managers with an overview of the school's curriculum, this implies that their responsibility is to try to ensure that the whole curriculum experienced by students is a process itself which is enriching and part of a "journey" which will continue after school.'

(Coleman, Middlewood and Bush, 1995, p. 18)

Dimmock and Wildy (1995), in their study of an effective secondary school in Western Australian, support this view and confirm that:

'Only senior managers are in a position to adopt an overview of the whole school curriculum. Effective as individual departments may be, there is need for overseeing goals, programme consistency with the goals, appropriate resource allocation and assessment.' (p.321)
However, Bell (1991) contends that school management of the curriculum by both practitioners and academics tends to focus on the structure and process of managing rather than with demonstrating how effective management can directly facilitate the process of teaching and learning. From a different perspective, Dimmock (1993) expresses concern about the absence of evidence to show how management and organisation influence the curriculum provision in schools. Dimmock and Wildy (1995) comment that very little is actually known about how, and by whom, the curriculum is managed in schools. They claim that:

'Neither the principal nor the deputies, however, are seen to assume responsibility for curriculum management in practice. There is a discrepancy, therefore, between role perceptions and actual practice in relation to curriculum management.' (p. 307)

In spite of the above, the literature acknowledges the importance of the LTs in having a holistic view of the curriculum. In having an overview of the curriculum, school leaders are able to evaluate the quality of education the school provides for its pupils from what Duffy (1988) refers to as two distinct dimensions of the curriculum: lateral and longitudinal views. The lateral view looks across the curriculum to identify the entire learning that the curriculum offers a particular student at a specific stage in the child’s school career. On the other hand, the longitudinal view concentrates on the continuity and progression in the pupil's learning experience throughout the child’s schooling.
The managerial roles and tasks of the curriculum are usually delegated to senior leaders. In today's educational climate, the influence of research findings in educational management, combined with the expectations of the DfES and Ofsted, encourages senior leaders to work collaboratively through various structured consultation procedures involving the school governors. This approach is to some extent consistent with the principles of what Lortie (1964) defines as 'collegial authority' where professional equals conduct their curriculum responsibilities in a democratic manner to cope with the demands from external constraints on the curriculum.

'There is a world of difference between national policy and its delivery in school. The national curriculum points towards the need for . . . collegiality.' (Campbell, 1989, p.73)

It is worthwhile to note that in this area of curriculum delivery the process falls with in the managerial domain of the function of the LT. A distinction can be drawn between leadership and management. The headteacher's primary role is to set or establish the school's vision and to give a sense of direction. In addition, the headteacher is also expected to provide inspiration and motivation for colleagues as they work to fulfil the mission of the school. In this way headteachers are exercising their leadership role. However, when it comes to the delivery of their management functions this will be more effectively achieved out as a shared leadership endeavour with other members of the LT. Thus, in practice senior leaders carry the managerial duties in collaboration with subject leaders, who are at the forefront for specifically managing the curriculum (Wallace, 2001)
Wallace (1989) asserts that good curriculum management is seen as a process where all professional staff participates actively in negotiating an agreed curriculum and contribute jointly in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluating its delivery, including other's performance as managers and class/subject teachers. Writings on curriculum management show that where differentiation of roles is clear, good practice takes place. Each role carries specific curriculum responsibilities where individuals are engaged in certain activities and know how the activities should be carried out using particular skills (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989).

However, in many large secondary schools the head or a member of the LT would have overall responsibility for the management of the curriculum. It should also be noted that since the 1988 ERA the head is deemed to be the key interpreter and manager of change especially with respect to the series of educational reforms covering the last decade (Ribbins, 1993).

Wallace (1989) explains that this role of the head has three main functions. First of all, it is the head's task to provide leadership in clearly defining objectives for curriculum programmes. It is the head's responsibility to ensure that teachers know exactly what they should teach, and pupils know what they must learn. Secondly, headteachers along with other members of the LT should monitor the extent to which the curriculum programme is committed to meeting the objectives established for the schools. The objectives should be used to construct the curriculum, made clear and acted upon to guarantee effective learning takes place by pupils. Finally, the head should use various assessment techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of their
schools in producing high standards of pupil achievement in the curriculum objectives. It can be seen that the head's behaviour and attitude toward the management of the curriculum has an influence upon the way in which the other members of the LT perform their roles.

The educational literature reveals that headteachers frequently fail to delegate management responsibilities, set up procedures for curriculum planning or give colleagues sufficient time to carry out their delegated management tasks. Some of today's weaknesses in curriculum management can be traced back to earlier periods such as pre-National Curriculum introduction, when for example; deputy heads were often excluded from sharing overall curriculum management of the school (Wallace, 1989). Subject leaders were sometimes unclear about the support they could expect from the LT and the LT are rarely given the support to enable them to take the initiative in assisting their colleagues (Wallace, 1989; Bennett, 1995). Despite improvements in curriculum management brought about by the introduction of the National Curriculum, members of the LT still do not always engage in the process of communication and interaction implied by the collegiate model of curriculum management (Ofsted, 1998). Hargreaves (1994) postulates that:

'School improvement, curriculum reform, teacher development, and leadership development are all seen as being dependent, to some extent, on the building of positive collegial relationships for success.'

(Hargreaves, 1994, p. 187)
It is not clear from the literature how many headteachers, along with their members of LT, actually observe, monitor, evaluate, and give feedback to colleagues on their classroom curriculum delivery. Ofsted (1998) claims that the weakest aspect of senior leaders is still in monitoring standards, evaluating the quality of teaching and improving the effectiveness of the school.

The headteacher, other members of the LT and the governors are expected to foster various forms of curriculum development which include social, cultural, moral and spiritual aspects of pupil learning. The primary emphasis of the curriculum is on the acquisition of knowledge and development of cognitive skills and abilities (Brown, 1981). However, the goals of education also include the development of children who feel good about themselves, their capabilities and self-confidence, which is believed to facilitate later learning (Stevenson and Lee, 1990). Senior leaders should ensure that:

'The curriculum includes not only the formal programme of lessons but also those sections which produce the school's ethos, such as the quality of relationship, the concern for equality of opportunity, the values exemplified in how the curriculum is organised, managed and taught and the nature and support for extra-curricular activities.'

(Wood and Orlik, 1994, p. 86)

In addition to this, senior leaders have a statutory obligation under Section 1 of the Education Reform Act (1988) to provide a broad and balanced curriculum which promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of the pupils
and prepare them for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life. These are the tasks that senior leaders are obliged to carry out so that children experience a wide range of learning.

It is important for senior leaders to act as role models for subject leaders by demonstrating the qualities of good leadership (Lofthouse et al., 1995). Although senior leaders have responsibility for the delivery of the whole school curriculum they do not have direct control of it. The demands upon the senior leaders make it necessary for them to need assistants, at the middle management level, who can transmit and articulate the work of the individuals in the departments in a practical way (Bennett, 1995).

The role of the Leadership Team is to have an overall view of the curriculum, including extra curricular activities, offered in schools and to make sure that they meet the statutory requirements and the needs of their pupil intake. In addition to this, the Leadership Team manages the monitoring and evaluation of the quality of teaching and learning that takes place in the school by having a systematic programme. The Leadership Team will need support to carry out this task, because it has to rely on the expertise of the subject leaders.

**Academic Literature Perspectives on the Role of Subject Leaders**

It was the passing of the 1988 Education Reform Act, which gave considerable delegation of administration and management responsibilities to subject leaders. It has become more and more apparent that for schools to develop and improve their educational performance in a constantly changing climate issues of management
cannot be the exclusive responsibility of senior leaders (Harris, Busher and Wise, 2001). Research evidence relating to school improvement and school effectiveness has shown that improving schools focus change at all levels of the school organisation: whole school, department and the classroom. In addition to this, evidence from research has demonstrated the importance of organising change at the department level, which can be filtered down to the learning environment of the classroom. Harris claims that:

'The school improvement literature has consistently reinforced the importance of a clear focus on teaching and learning issues as a means of improving schools' (Harris, 1998, p. 274)

There is a growing recognition in research that subject leaders can make a real difference to school effectiveness and school improvement, but very little has been done so far to develop their management skills of this important group by the government (Harris, 2000). It has been repeated time and time again that subject leaders have just not received the high quality professional development training to prepare them adequately to undertake the complex tasks they will experience in their working life. David Reynolds, professor of education at Exeter University and DfES adviser, remarked that the emphasis should be more on subject leaders than on headteachers to allow headteachers to focus more on strategic planning.

'I would like the next government to move beyond our unhealthy national obsession with headteachers and focus on middle management. Most heads are now as good as they are going to get, whereas middle management is
usually inadequate. Making it better frees heads to be more strategic. It also creates an engine for school improvement that's much more powerful than one man or woman in the head's study.' (Reynolds, 2001, page 8)

Professor Reynolds might be harsh in voicing his opinion that middle management is 'usually inadequate'.

However, in support of subject leaders in their middle management role Hammond and Harris (2000) argue that although specialists courses do exist, the quality of them varies and to date there is no entitlement to training for these subject specialists leading from the middle. To attempt to improve the situation, the present government established a National College for School Leadership (NCSL) symbolising its commitment to improve leadership at all levels in schools. There is also concern about the enormous gap between the headteacher with overall responsibility for a school and the rest of the teaching staff. Recent developments in education have recognised the importance of narrowing that gap. The evidence for this comes from the DfEE paper 'Learning and teaching: A strategy for professional development' where the government states that it will be asking:

'... The National College for School Leadership, working with DfEE (now DfES), to develop a national programme of training for those with subject or specialist leadership responsibilities in schools outside the senior management team. This should include training in effective professional development, in particular training in lesson observation, feedback, coaching,'
mentoring, and training needs analysis. It will fit within
the national training and development framework for headteachers,
depuities and others in leadership positions in schools being
developed by NCSL'. (DfEE, 2001, p.16)

This is an encouraging statement, but one needs to consider the number and diversity of both the team and teacher leadership roles in secondary schools. In addition to leading a department, subject leaders have to teach a full timetable and the demands made on them are particularly daunting. At present, a substantial number of subject leaders take up the leadership post without any formal training and/or support. Those who are fortunate are given the opportunity to work with an able practitioner, visit successful departments and attend an accredited training programme.

Most of the recent research and writing on education have focused primarily on subject leaders in their leadership role and scant attention is given to those teachers who lead pastoral and cross-curricular teams (Hammond and Harris, 2000). One of the main reasons for this could be that schools depend more on their subject departments to bring about improvements in pupil academic achievement.

'Subject leaders have an important role to play in changing the internal conditions of the school. They are uniquely placed within the school organisation to bring about changes where it matters most, i.e. in the classroom. They are key agents to improve teaching and learning because they have a direct influence over the professional practice of others. They are also in a position to create a culture and a set
of values about teaching and learning within their subject area.

(Busher and Harris, 2000, p.186)

As a result, the role of subject leaders in partnership with the school's professional development policy and strategy is crucial in ensuring that the quality of curriculum delivery will produce good pupil attainment commensurate with their age and ability. Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989), one of the most notable study of effective heads of department, confirm this and go on to postulate that, although the management of the curriculum has been mainly focused on the headteacher and the Leadership Team (LT) for the formulation of the school philosophies, policies, aims and objectives, it is at the department level that these are actually implemented. Wise and Bush (1999) assert that it is the subject leaders who usually have this responsibility of translating policy intentions into actual classroom practice. Ball and Bowe (1992) emphasise that subject departments have become more important as the National Curriculum has been implemented. Therefore, subject leaders occupy a key role in ensuring that the school's curriculum policy is executed.

Bush and Harris (1999) argue that it is the subject leaders who provide the structures and channel for managing the teaching and learning of teachers and students in their team. Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) assert that the real success of outstanding departments is located in their ability to organise key elements of the teaching and learning process in an effective way. Where departments are successful their leaders are in an influential position to shape the professional interactions and perceptions of the team members. The subject leader can achieved this by fostering a collegiate climate
within the departmental team and establishing a shared vision (Harris, Jamieson and Russ, 1997; Harris, 2000)

Subject leaders serve a pivotal role in communication both within their department and in the wider school context. At the department level, subject leaders have a dual role as they act as intermediaries between senior leaders and the class teachers. They have to interpret and then explain the policies to their department members and also present their departments' views to the leadership team (Coleman, Middlewood and Bush, 1995). This puts the subject leaders in a very sensitive position as they experience pressure from their super ordinates and subordinates. In addition to this, they require good subject knowledge, teaching expertise and the ability to manage and lead a team to guarantee the effective functioning of their departments (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989). This was emphasised aptly some years earlier by John (1980):

'Middle managers . . . have a dual role. They are both members of a higher-echelon management body and leaders of their own sub-systems. As members of a general management team they contribute their particular skills and expertise to questions concerning the whole institution (such as the general aims of the school). As managers of their own subsystem they provide the members of their groups with the leadership required for effective internal organisation of the sub-system concerned. '

(John, 1980, p.52)

Bennett (1995) is also aware of the importance of the subject leaders' role in the secondary sector of education. Senior leaders need assistants to transmit the vision of
the school organisation, articulate it in practical every day terms, and work with their colleagues to turn the vision into reality. Bennett (1995) sees this as the key role of subject leaders. He is in agreement with John (1980) as they are not only concerned with passing ideas and information from leaders to classroom teachers, but they also need to inform senior leaders about what is happening in the daily work of their department and about any issues or problems which may arise. However, he (Bennett) is concerned that senior leaders do not recognise the significance of the role of subject leaders:

'B... secondary schools are more likely to be places of dispute and argument than places of consensus, and individuals are needed who can undertake the responsibility of trying to weld together the often disparate and disputing sub-units into a coherent whole. This function makes it important that senior management should recognise the integrative function of the middle management role and provide opportunities for it to be exercised. In particular, a two-way management of information is important... there is little reason to believe that senior staff adequately recognise this function.'

(Bennett, 1995, p. 104)

It has been acknowledged by HMI (1984), and to a similar degree by secondary headteachers who took part in a National Foundation For Educational Research (NFER) project, that schools depend more on their subject leaders for their success and the management of change than on any other role as these lie at the centre of the educational process (Weindling and Earley, 1987). Wise and Bush (1999) also echoes this concept:
'The National Curriculum emphasised subject knowledge and prescribed content in detail so the specialist understanding of team leaders and department heads placed them at the centre of its implementation. The short time-scale allowed for had significant implications for the workload of middle managers and they had to reconcile their teams’ curriculum philosophy with the new requirement, as well as organising training opportunities.' (Wise and Bush, 1999, p.185)

Furthermore, little research has been undertaken to determine the qualities needed for those aspiring to head a department successfully and the training required for them to become more competent leaders. What has been confirmed in the literature on successful schools is that effective leadership at all levels in schools is important but:

'...departments and faculty heads were seen as the driving force behind any school and...the key to improving the quality of the learning process.' (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989, p. 102)

Glatter (1988) postulates that a department is more likely to achieve success where there is an able and efficient person giving the appropriate leadership. This good quality leadership depends upon the head of department/faculty having a sound understanding of the curriculum area for which s/he has responsibility together with good people management skills and management of resources. The literature on education also emphasises that subject leaders are usually at the forefront of
knowledge in the study, teaching, evaluation and planning for learning about their particular subject areas (Gold, 1998).

From an overview of the HMI (DES, 1987) report on LEA provision it can be gleaned that this area of subject leadership is considered to be one of the most important areas for improving pupil academic achievement in schools. However, there was concern expressed by HMI (DES, 1988) when its appraisal of secondary schools was undertaken. HMI found that there was inadequate training in leadership, especially subject leaders, and as a result they were found to be ineffective. The OFSTED report (1998) also acknowledges that subject leaders have a key role in raising standards but this was not fully developed in many of the schools inspected. In the report (OFSTED, 1998), inspectors criticised subject leaders as they felt that too many of them held the narrow view that their role is for managing resources only and not people. Lofthouse et al. (1995) assert that there is a definite distinction between what a subject leader's role should be about and what research evidence highlights as the considerable constraints, which may prevent many subject leaders from undertaking an extended subject leadership role. Dunham (1995) acknowledges this and states that subject leaders' role have a large managerial component together with a heavy teaching load.

The literature on curriculum management frequently refers to the constraint on subject leaders due to the lack of time they are given to carry out their leadership role effectively (Bennett, 1995; Ofsted, 1997; Wise and Bush, 1999). Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989) found that department/faculty heads were given insufficient non-contact time to carry out their many administrative and management responsibilities. The DES (1985), in 'Better Schools', made a poignant point that subject leaders had
too little time for planning and development of the curriculum. This shortage of time meant that essential activities such as curriculum evaluation, department reviews and staff development were not always carried out as efficiently or given the importance they merited. They were overloaded with administrative duties and found it difficult to delegate straightforward administrative tasks to other members of the teaching team (Lofthouse et al., 1995) as subject leaders were aware of the increased demands on the pedagogical skills of their departmental colleagues (Lofthouse, 1994). This mitigated against effective curriculum leadership and could have an adverse effect on pupil achievement.

The ERA (1988) produced fundamental changes to the role of subject leaders especially in their responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the teachers in their departments.

'A good head of department is aware that review and evaluation are crucial for improving the department's delivery of the curriculum.'

(Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989, page 107)

As a result, department/faculty heads have to be effective managers of their own time and find better and creative ways to use their time (e.g. by combining classes for an introductory lesson or watching film to support a novel). This would not affect their performance as practitioners in the classrooms and should help to ensure that standards are maintained to help continued improvement in pupil achievement in the curriculum area for which they hold responsibility. The Cockcroft Report (1982) pointed out that this lack of time was a major constraint on heads of
departments/faculties, as some of their duties and activities could not be achieved outside normal school hours. For example, classroom observation could only be carried out while teaching is in progress, therefore, time would need to be put aside during the school day for this type of assessment and monitoring (Ofsted, 1997).

Subject leaders need to know the strengths and weaknesses of their staff, and the content and quality of the education being delivered by members of their department, especially now that there is increased external pressure demanding competent teaching in lessons (Wise and Bush, 1999).

'... the basic activity of a manager in a school is to enable other teachers to work as effectively as possible to plan and deliver that learning and teaching. Management is a neutral activity – it is about making things happen.' (Gold, 1998, p.4)

However, Bennett (1995) claims that there was reluctance by subject leaders to observe their colleagues teaching. They prefer to use other indirect methods such as checking exercise books for marking, lesson plans and assessment to monitor their department members. Monitoring is one of the heads of departments'faculties' main functions as leaders, so that they are able to appraise the quality of teaching in their subject areas to ensure effective departmental performance in pupil achievement. Opportunities should be given for staff to share good practice and strategies employed to eliminate weaknesses. Lofthouse et al. (1995) remark that the key objective of subject leaders is to establish an agenda for teaching and learning, as they are best
placed to influence these areas. Ofsted (1998) reported, however, that the role of subject leaders in monitoring the quality of teaching is often ill defined.

The Ofsted (1997) report declares that the ways in which schools are organised, and the heavy demands placed on senior leaders, make the role of subject leaders crucial in raising standards across the school, especially in monitoring and evaluating of pupil attainment and the quality of teaching. In order for this to be effective it is important that the roles undertaken by senior leaders and subject leaders are clearly defined and complementary to each other (Ofsted, 1997).

To develop a wider leadership role, subject leaders need the support of senior leaders to evaluate the performance of their department and set targets for improvement (Ofsted, 1997) In spite of this, Bennett (1995) asserts that subject leaders are in a position where they can work against the senior leaders as easily as they can work to create a cohesive organisation. The Ofsted Report (1998) points out that, where subject leaders are most effective, there are good links with the leadership team, departmental plans are well co-ordinated and middle managers are held accountable for their implementation. The inspectors found that where links are unclear, departments set vague or unrealistic targets and as a result progress towards raising achievement is poorly co-ordinated. However, given that the inspectors’ judgements on subject leaders are based on interviews there could be question as to the validity of the Ofsted judgements in these areas. Clearly, this is not based on direct observation, which is a more reliable way of doing research.
Senior leaders need to provide adequate time and resources and create an environment where high expectations are set for subject leaders to achieve their full potential (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989). In addition to this, subject leaders are expected to adapt a collaborative approach in leading their department, so that a positive team ethos may be promoted which establishes effective curriculum management (Day et al., 1993). Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989) support this view:

'...more effective departmental heads were able to foster a collegial climate which, in turn, enabled the team to monitor itself and from which observation and appraisal seemed to arise naturally.' (p. 106)

Gold (1998) asserts that the very nature of the subject leaders’ role is not always defined, particularly in very small departments. Gold goes on to contend that there is tension between having the ultimate responsibility for planning and delivering a particular subject and having to place it into a whole school ethos, whilst at the same time contributing to the development of that ethos. In well-managed subject departments where subject leaders encourage all their staff, including newly qualified teachers, to take some responsibilities, it helps in building effective teams (Ofsted, 1997). This enables departmental team members to contribute to the work of the department and as a result gain in professional development at the same time. This will take some of the pressure from the subject leaders’ role and free them to spend more time on their leadership function (Ofsted, 1997).

Subject leaders are very much in the front line in making decision in respect of providing a curriculum that matches the need of all the pupils. To be even more
effective they will need to become more involved in strategic planning for the whole school organisation (Harris, 2000). The reality of this varies according to the management approach of the senior leaders, culture and ethos of the school organisation (Harris, 2000).

The recent Ofsted report (2002) confirms yet again that 'good management of subjects and aspects is a crucial factor in schools' success' (p.39). The report states that where leadership and management are of high quality the common factors that bring about success in the subject areas are 'astute planning of teaching, good involvement and motivation of staff, and effective monitoring and evaluation.' (p.39). Furthermore, the report highlights that delegation to, and contribution of, middle managers continue to make improvement and there were fewer instances of poor practice being carried on in these schools. The report also comments that where schools are making good progress subject leaders take collective responsibility for applying school policies such as homework and assessment consistently. Earley et al. (2002), one of the latest researches on the current state of school leadership in England confirms some of these points. They assert that headteachers felt that:

'Middle managers within their schools were regarded by heads as 'the experts', and enjoy considerable professional efficacy as a result.' (Earley et al., 2002, p.10)
They also go on to recommend that leadership development for middle managers should become as automatic as other professional development, and part of a whole career plan. In addition to this, training programmes should take account of aspects of the 'National Standards for Subject Leaders' presented by the TTA. One half of the sample of middle managers that took part in Earley et al. (2002) research, indicated that they would welcome further or new training and development opportunities in all of the four key areas of management tasks, that is: strategic direction and development of the subject; teaching and learning; leading and managing staff; and efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources. Added to this, are the key skills and attributes of leadership and self-management in which subject leaders feel they need more training to be effective in their role.

Training and development opportunities are only two ways in which subject leaders can use to improve their performance. However, the TTA (1998) postulates that the effectiveness of subject leaders will also depend on three things. The first is, the acknowledgement by the headteacher and governing body about their responsibilities of meeting the needs of all pupils and to operate effectively in relation to the standards. Secondly, they should concentrate on the way decisions; policies and practices are communicated and implemented in the school. Finally, how subject leaders contribute to the assessment procedures and the system of monitoring and evaluation.

The leadership role of subject leaders in secondary schools is one of paramount importance if the quality of teaching is to be of a high standard to enable pupils of all abilities to make good progress across the curriculum. The function of the subject
leaders is at the heart of raising educational standards. They have to bring together school policies and classroom practices into a cohesive programme resulting in improved pupil achievement. Subject leaders are faced with considerable challenge as they support their classroom colleagues to develop a new and enhanced range of skills as leaders of learning.

It is clear from the literature that the contemporary role of subject leaders is a very demanding and challenging one. They are held accountable to the Leadership Team for the performance of their team. It is their responsibility to monitor the quality of teaching and learning in their individual departments. They have to ensure that the curriculum offered in their departments caters for the individual needs of the pupils they serve in a diverse school population. The next section will consider the processes and practices of the management of teaching and learning in the classroom.

Managing Teaching and Learning at the Classroom Level

Despite the fact that the literature on education acknowledges that subject leaders are key agents in influencing teaching and learning (Lofthouse et al. 1995; Aldrich and White, 1998; TTA, 1998; Busher and Harris, 2000; Gunter and Rutherford, 2000), it is the individual classroom teacher who has direct control over the management of the learning environment. Therefore, every teacher is a manager of learning, and teaching and learning are at the very heart of the classroom. What becomes significant is the degree to which teachers are willing to define and own their management areas (Lofthouse, 1994). Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1996) explain that ‘management refers to everything teachers do to organise their classroom in order to make teaching possible.’ (p. 55) It is the teacher's task, then to provide all the pupils with quality
learning experiences. In order to accomplish this, the teacher has to manage the classroom effectively as it is vital if pupils are to make progress.

'A teacher is a classroom manager managing the development of knowledge and understanding, skills and abilities of pupils.' (Beanford 1997, p.3)

The progress that pupils make will depend on such things as intelligence, motivation, previous attainment and skills, and the judgements that teachers have of their pupils. However, equally important are the kinds of relationship the teacher develops with the pupils, the approach the teacher takes to classroom control and the kind of atmosphere that is established in the learning environment of the classroom (Downey and Kelly, 1979).

Lofthouse et al. (1995) assert that delivery of the curriculum is the responsibility of the individual teachers in their classroom. The effectiveness of the teaching and learning depend primarily on the quality, knowledge and skills of the teachers.

'...the quality of the children's education depends on the quality of the people teaching them.' (Elliott, 1994 p.50)

Lofthouse (1994) contends that, in order to achieve quality in learning, there has to be quality in management. Teachers are expected to have an understanding of the type of activities, which will interest their pupils and be able to match appropriate work to their pupils' ability. The teacher has to ensure that the lesson is well planned, managed, organised and can maintain the pupils' interest. It must be remembered, that
at any one time in a class of approximately thirty pupils, a teacher may be teaching pupils whose ability range spans many levels or GCSE grades. The effective management of learning and teaching depends on systematic and continuous planning by teachers (Mortimore, 1993; Hopkins, West and Ainscow, 1996). Therefore, the teacher must be skilful at recognising pupils' individual differences and take account of the appropriate teaching and differentiated strategies needed for them to achieve the desired learning outcome.

'For the teacher to be an effective deliver of the curriculum she must understand what the pupil currently knows, have a capacity to devise appropriate learning situations in the light of the knowledge, and skill in managing them so their potential for promoting learning is realised.'

(Wilson, 1988, p.67)

Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1996), when discussing the management of effective teaching and learning, state that responses from pupils are found to be more favourable when there is a combination of firm leadership from the teacher, and where pupils feel that their views are represented. Kyriacou (1986) found that effective teachers are very skilful when managing pupils, command their trust and confidence, and have high expectations of their pupils' potential and achievement. Research on pupil achievement confirms that, in classrooms where teachers consult pupils about their learning and teachers are receptive to pupils' ideas, pupils achieve far better. Furthermore, the effective teachers are good managers of learning as they are able to motive, inspire and challenge pupils. They take full responsibility for the
planning, organisation and management of their pupils’ learning (Harris, Jamieson and Russ, 1996)

Kyriacou (1997) distinguishes between two managerial activities involved in effective teaching: classroom teaching quality and classroom teaching tasks. The qualities refer to such things as 'good rapport with pupils or pitching the work at the appropriate level of difficulty for the pupils' (Kyriacou, 1997, p. 77). The tasks on the other hand, relate to the 'activities and practices such as planning a lesson or assessing pupils’ progress' (Kyriacou, 1997, p. 77).

Much of the work on teacher quality is indebted to Kounin's (1970) seminal study on classroom management. He attempted to identify the effective techniques used by successful teachers as opposed to unsuccessful teachers when dealing with pupil misbehaviour. Kounin found little difference, but what he noticed was that the successful teachers were more effective in their classroom delivery especially in regard to their instructional management and keeping pupils actively engaged on the learning task.

Ramsay and Oliver (1995) point out that attempts have been made over the past forty years to establish what are the successful teaching methods, which bring about high pupil achievement. Copious research findings found that schools in which students perform well have similar characteristics. Three aspects of teaching quality have been highlighted: teaching skills, teaching strategies and reflective teaching. Studies on classroom learning have shown that a well managed, direct and structured approach for the lesson delivery brings about high pupil achievement.
'... students achieve highly when their teachers emphasise academic goals, make them explicit, and have high expectations for their students to master the curriculum. More, students will generally achieve more when their teachers carefully organise and sequence their curriculum experiences: when they frequently ask direct and specific questions to monitor their students' progress and check on their understanding; when they provide students with ample feedback which allows students to practise a skill until it becomes second nature; and when teachers regularly review and hold students accountable for their work.' (Ramsay and Oliver, 1995, p.335)

In relation to teaching strategies, it was found by Joyce et al. (1987) that students' achievement is enhanced when teachers use cooperative learning approaches such as peer teaching, ability grouping and democratic grouping. Joyce et al. (1992) point out that, as there are models of teaching to help pupils become more effective learners, there are also models of learning. They claim that effective learners are able to draw information and ideas from their teachers and use learning resources in an effective manner.

Finally, reflective teaching is considered to be a necessary exercise for quality teaching, for two main reasons. First, to consider whether the lesson has been successful and to act on any implications for future practice. Secondly, to assess and to record the educational progress of pupils (Kyriacou, 1997). This is where effective teachers are able to harmonise, integrate and transcend the necessary classroom management skills (Ramsay and Oliver, 1995)
A study undertaken by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (1994) provided five dimensions of teaching quality: knowledge, pedagogic skills, reflection, empathy and managerial competence. Out of the five, the teacher's knowledge of the subject is emphasised as an essential requirement for competency in the classroom by both government agencies and academic writers on education. However, good subject knowledge, teaching quality and teaching tasks do not guarantee that effective teaching and learning will necessarily take place. A teacher has to be able to manage control of a class to ensure sound learning outcomes. It does not matter how knowledgeable or skilful a teacher is; if a teacher cannot control a class effective learning will not take place in the classroom.

'The ability to manage a class underpins many other professional skills which teachers may have. The most knowledgeable people in the world with the most brilliant ability to explain, phrase exactly the right sort of question, prepare interesting-looking lessons, and assess pupils' work, would be lost if they did not exercise control when the need arose, avoid or know how to deal with misbehaviour, organise effectively activities for groups and individuals, and establish good personal relationship and mutual respect.' (Wragg, 1987, p.31)

The classroom management styles of individual teachers play an important part in creating the atmosphere in a school, as the classroom milieu is where the relationship between pupils and teachers develop during their daily interaction. It is important for
teachers to establish good relationships with pupils and encourage them to learn and behave in a manner that is conducive to an effective learning environment:

'...good classroom management makes personal teaching possible,

frees the individual from constant conflict, and only then can the teacher

be truly personal' (Marland, 1975, p.31)

The most important element of classroom management is ensuring that all pupils have a chance to learn (Harris, Jamieson and Ross, 1996). The aim of the teacher, then, is to allow the pupils to gain some autonomy over their learning and develop the self-discipline and motivation to want to achieve their full potential. However, educational research has shown that the expectations teachers hold of their pupils can have a profound effect on the pupils' standard of academic achievement (Coard 1971; Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968; Hargreaves 1967; Lacey 1970; Rist 1970; Keddie 1971; Nash 1973; Mortimore et al. 1988). These studies reveal that, where teachers have high expectations of their pupils, the pupils tend to do well in their scholastic performance and, where the expectations were low, because of race, class, gender or ability, these pupils did less well. Ofsted (1998) confirms similar findings that low expectations by teachers lead them to give pupils undemanding tasks and limit opportunities for them to think critically and to take responsibility for organising and extending their work.

The HMI (DES, 1987) report on LEA provision states that there are two issues, which are important to improving educational standards in schools. The first is the effective leadership of subject leaders mentioned in the previous section and the second is the
high expectations of pupils by their teachers. Therefore, teachers must be sensitive in
the way that they interact and communicate, both verbally and non verbally, with their
pupils so that learning will not be impeded in the classroom. In Mortimer’s (1993)
opinion:

'Effective teachers, in my judgement, bind together skills and knowledge
through the use of their imagination, creativity and sensitivity in order
to stimulate, support and encourage learning, using such means as high
expectations and modelling behaviour.' (page, 296)

Hopkins, West and Ainscow (1996) postulate that there is a strong body of research,
which suggest that pupil achievement can be further enhanced by consistent and
strategic use of teaching models. Successful teachers have a repertoire of strategies
that they employ at different times, with different pupils, with different curriculum
content to achieve a range of learning outcomes. These teachers are able to transfer
cognitive and social skills to their students and teach them how to make productive
use of these in future learning contexts. Hopkins, West and Ainscow (1996) also
highlight how a teacher is able to promote pupil learning:

'... by being active in planning and organising his or her teaching
explaining to students what they are to learn, arranging occasions
for guided practice, monitoring progress, providing feedback and
otherwise helping students understand and accomplish work.'

(page, 17)
The evaluation of these successful teaching strategies by subject leaders is important to ensure that good practices are shared amongst colleagues in school.

**Integrating the Five Levels**

The five-level model of curriculum control: national, regional, institutional, department and the individual classroom teacher shows that not one level has complete control over the school curriculum. Lawton (1983) goes further and explains that, in assessing the five-level model, three specific aspects need to be taken into consideration. These aspects are the curriculum content; pedagogy, which relates to the pupil-teacher relationship and teaching methods; and evaluation, where assessment, examinations and testing are used to find how effective the curriculum is in bring about high standards of pupil achievement.

The Lawton (1983) five-level model of curriculum control, which can be adapted for any level of control, illustrates in a clear and concise way the overall pattern in a centrally influenced curriculum. Lawton (1983) postulates that with this framework the curriculum would be prescribed nationally, the pedagogy at the discretion of the classroom teacher, and the evaluation of the curriculum being the school's responsibility, but moderated regionally by the LEAs. An example of the model would be as follows:
Fig. 2.1 Lawton’s model of a national curriculum in a non-totalitarian society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level</th>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>pedagogy</th>
<th>evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. national</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model above (figure 2.1), is an over simplification, of any national curriculum and is expected to be modified by LEAs, the local schools and individual teachers. It is a model that allows for flexibility locally and gives discretion to schools and individual teachers. In light of the National Curriculum introduced in 1988, the model reflecting this can be represented as in figure 2.2 below:

2.2 Contrasting model of the present National Curriculum for England and Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level</th>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>pedagogy</th>
<th>evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. national</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. department</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While pedagogy, in theory, is still expected to be the responsibility of the individual teachers, increasingly, central government (through the DfES) is becoming more
prescriptive with respect to curriculum content and teaching methodology. Examples of this are the literacy and numeracy initiatives.

With regard to evaluation, while schools and departments are required to conduct assessment procedures and also to record and use assessment data, nevertheless, the national testing regime has much greater dominance than the local evaluation methods. Thus, increasingly there is danger that Lawton’s argument that where the curriculum is centrally controlled in respect of pedagogy and evaluation this could lead to what he terms a totalitarian regime.

This direction could have implication for subject leaders as increasing government interference could undermine their autonomy and leadership role, in that their scope for flexibility, creativity and local discretion would be strongly weakened. The ideal would be to have a curriculum that has a national framework that allows for local discretion and teacher flexibility.

However, Lawton (1983) claims that the five levels of curriculum management are rarely simple or straightforward, as there might be disputes between the different levels about the control of the curriculum. It must be borne in mind that in the two figures showing a difference emphasise are only examples: one represents the ideal (Lawton’s model in figure 2.1 above) whilst the other (figure 2.2 above) seeks to interpret what is actually prevailing at the present time in respect of curriculum management.
Summary

The management of the curriculum is the responsibility of central government, local education authorities, schools, departments and individual teachers in the classroom. However, with the passing of the Education Reform Act, 1988, which introduced the National Curriculum central government became directly involved with influencing and shaping the school curriculum. The reason behind the government’s intervention was due to the concerns expressed by industry, parents and politicians that the standards of achievement of students leaving school were far behind other European countries.

In order to improve the quality of education being delivered in school central government created a number of agencies such as Ofsted, QCA and the TTA. Ofsted’s role is to assess and evaluate the quality of education schools provide for their students; the QCA has an overview of the entire curriculum, assessment and qualification to ensure consistency; and the TTA was established to develop the standards for teachers, subject leaders and headteachers together with providing training for newly qualified teachers (NQT).

As a result of central government’s increased power over the curriculum the LEAs’ role have changed to become more of a supportive one for their schools to ensure that they have a curriculum policy that would continuously challenge schools to raise educational standards.

Headteachers, other leadership team members and governors are expected to provide leadership and direction in respect of the curriculum to bring about improvement in
educational standards in their schools. However, with the copious changes in education over the last fifteen years schools' leadership teams need the support of subject leaders to translate their policies, practices and government initiatives at the departmental level. As a result of this, subject leaders' roles have been redefined. The academic literature confirms that effective subject departments can make significant difference to school improvement. However, research shows that academic middle managers are ill prepared for the role and not given sufficient time to carry out their management and leadership functions adequately. Despite this, they are expected to monitor the quality of education being delivered by the teachers within their department to ensure that it caters for the individual needs of all the students.

Under the guidance of the subject leaders, teachers have to plan and prepare appropriately differentiated lessons that are interesting and will motivate the students to gain in understanding, knowledge and skills. Classroom teachers are expected to use a range of teaching styles and methods in order to achieve improvement in pupils' performance.

The chapter ends with an outline of Lawton's five level model of curriculum management and gives an analysis of the implications for subject leaders regarding increasing government interference of the curriculum. The next chapter will be a discussion on the methodology used for conducting the research relating to the role of subject leaders in the management of the curriculum.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the research methodology used to gather the data for this research. The purpose of this research is to determine the extent to which the TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted and academic researchers agree on their criteria on what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools. Although the three bodies fulfil different functions with respect to the issue of curriculum management, they nevertheless have a common interest in advancing the effectiveness of the subject leaders. Thus, the research attempts to compare the different emphases these bodies place on different aspects of the subject leaders’ role. To achieve this, the research uses documentary analysis for compiling quantitative data linked to a qualitative approach. The characteristic and important elements of documentary analysis methodology are discussed as well as incorporating validity and reliability. The final section concentrates on the data analysis.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Both positivist and anti-positivist research approaches are used in this research design. Although the terms positivist and anti-positivist appear in the research literature, they are more commonly referred to as quantitative research and qualitative respectively. These two types of research differ in the manner in which data is collected. Quantitative research explores traits and situations from which numerical data can be obtained. The approach makes greater use of measurement and statistics (Charles, 1988) such as the
data used in this research to collect numerical information. Qualitative research, on the other hand, investigates characteristics of individuals and their settings, which cannot be easily described numerically (Gall et al., 1996). The information is mainly verbal and is collected through recording the frequency in which it occurs. These techniques are used to carry out investigations in education, singly as well as jointly. The main reason for combining both quantitative and qualitative methods in this investigation was to develop the analysis, thus providing richer detail. This enabled the author/researcher to gather data from different perspectives to strengthen the research methodology and techniques. The literature reveals that it is beneficial to combine both qualitative and quantitative research methods in a research design (Sieber, 1973; Howe, 1988; Rossman and Wilson, 1991; and Miles and Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman (1994) maintain that '. . . we have to face the facts that numbers and words are both needed if we are to understand the world.' (p. 40). Rossman and Wilson (1991) contend that linking quantitative and qualitative data enables confirmation of each approach by triangulation.

In keeping with the advantages to be gained from the application of a dual approach, this study used the structured content-analysis approach that yields quantitative data, but extracted from documents with data collected using a qualitative method. By combining the two techniques one is able to achieve triangulation as the qualitative data can help with the quantitative side of the study during design by assisting with conceptual development and instrumentation (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Despite the fact that advocates of both methods criticise each other, some educational researchers claim that the two perspectives have complementary purposes (Miles and Huberman, 1994).
RESEARCH METHODS

Although classification of educational research is a difficult task, Best and Kahn (1989) have divided educational research into three types: historical, descriptive and experimental, or a combination of the three. Historical research involves analysing, interpreting, investigating and recording events of the past in order to discover generalisations that are helpful in understanding both the past and the present, and to a certain extent anticipating the future. Descriptive research describes conditions that exist at present. It involves comparison or contrast and attempts to find relationships between them. Experimental research describes what will be when certain variables are controlled or manipulated. The focus of this type of research is on variable relationships. Drawing on Best and Kahn’s (1989) definition of types of research, this research can be said to have employed a combination of historical and descriptive approaches. Primarily, it is descriptive as it attempted to analyse, describe and interpret the position of subject leaders in London secondary schools and how they carried out their leadership role. There is also an historical dimension to the study as it interprets events of the past by analysing the original documents of a selection of Ofsted reports from two LEAs secondary schools as part of its data source.

Charles (1995) gives different terms to his distinction in categorising educational research. He suggests that practicality, methodology and the type of research questions asked can differentiate research. Where the types of research are defined by methodology, it falls under two dichotomous headings: experimental versus non experimental and qualitative versus quantitative. Experimental research reveals cause
and effects that enable researchers to predict and control events. This type of research is often difficult to conduct in school settings. Non-experimental research, on the other hand, is more prevalent in educational research than experimental research. The research describes, explain events and situations as they exist or once existed; it evaluates products or processes; and finally develops innovations. This is similar to Best and Kahn's (1989) descriptive research and this research contain similar features of it.

The other methodological distinction, mentioned earlier, was qualitative versus quantitative research. This research used a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research approaches to analyse verbal and non-quantitative documents. From this quantitative data were derived using qualitative documents (Bailey, 1978; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Cohen et al., 2000). The final means offered by Charles (1995) of categorizing research involves the nature of the questions that prompted the research. These types of research are identified as ethnographic, historical, descriptive, correlation, action and evaluation, casual-comparative and experimental. In the context of this research, the research questions raised mean that the study’s methodology contained elements that are descriptive, correlative and evaluative following Charles’ (1995) categories.

Validity and Reliability

This section considers the issues of validity and reliability with regard to the documents used in this research. The validity issues relevant to this research involve the following: the appropriateness of the research method; the suitability of the research instrument and
categories; the representativeness of the sample of twenty maintained London secondary schools; and the degree of external validity. The appropriateness of the methodology for answering the research questions could only be achieved by a scrutiny of the authentic documents used by the three agencies for their work with subject leaders. As documents are usually first-person accounts of events and/or feelings they tend to have face validity. The content of the documents tend to be more rigorously checked on face validity than other data gathering methods used in social research (Bailey, 1982). The suitability of the research instrument for gathering the data was achieved. This is because the categories for the documentary analysis for the research questions were appropriate and provided valuable data for answering the research questions. To reiterate, the key issues from the questions were: the degree to which the various bodies agree; what they consider to be the important roles of subject leaders; the extent to which the specific roles reflect the differences; and whether there is a dichotomy between expectations and practices.

With respect to the representativeness of the sample of schools drawn from two authorities in the study, for LEA A there were eight schools out of a total of eleven in the authority. Thus, this represents a very high percentage of the schools in LEA A and would clearly give great accuracy in terms of the data reflected in the work of the authority. On the other hand, LEA B had twelve Ofsted school reports analysed from a total of twenty-one schools in the London borough. In the opinion of the researcher this high degree of sampling would ensure greater confidence in the validity of the data for this authority.
Finally, on the issue of external validity, which means to what extent can one generalise the results to a wider population, it was restricted specifically to the two London Education Authorities in this research. Furthermore, it could be reasonable to argue that what pertains in these two authorities with respect to subject leaders in their management role might be found in other London schools to some measure.

However, a major drawback to validity can be where documents are written for other purposes other than for social research. This can be said to be the case for the Ofsted reports. Nevertheless, the information contained in the reports with respect to the issue of subject leaders would not be compromised, because such inspection reports are generally intended for monitoring standards in education. As a result, there is confidence in the Ofsted reports and the comments on subject leaders in their leadership role because they were written for educational purposes. There is creditability in the method used for gathering the data as a set of criteria were used.

These criteria were tested in the pilot study using six Ofsted reports, two from the less successful LEA (LEA A) and four from the other LEA (LEA B), which was more successful in terms of pupil achievement. The categories were replicated by a number of subject leaders, on the author's/researcher's behalf, both within the author's own institution and in other schools in LEA A. The process of analysing the data form the Ofsted reports was to record whether a category was mentioned as having a serious cause for concern, a cause for concern, needs improving or was mentioned favourably. The combined scores for the two LEAs were multiplied by a weighting formula of three (3).
where the category was judged to be a cause of serious concern in the Ofsted reports: two (2) when category was stated to be a cause for concern; one (1) where the category needed improving; and zero (0) when the category was mentioned favourably. These weightings were arbitrarily chosen, but applied consistently across all the categories with respect to the Ofsted reports. The weighted score system allowed one to judge the extent to which the category was reported positively or negatively in the Ofsted reports, that is, higher scores tended to be areas for greater concerns in the reports, whereas a lower score indicates favourable judgement.

There is often a substantial time lapse between the actual event and the writing of the document. Again, this is not the case with regard to the Ofsted reports, as inspectors have to complete the inspection reports and formulate judgements within prescribed hours of the observations being completed. Furthermore, in relation to the validity of the instruments used for the research, the categories for the documentary analysis of the TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted handbook and the academic literature clearly established the focus each of these agencies gives to the role of subject leaders. Bailey (1982) asserts that despite the shortcomings of documentary study it is able to have a more detailed check on face validity than do other data gathering methods in social investigation.

With regard to reliability, there are three kinds, which are relevant to content analysis: stability, reproducibility and accuracy (Krippendorff, 1980). Stability can be confirmed when the same content is coded more than once by the same coder and achieving similar
results. The documents, TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted handbook and the academic literature were analysed twice by the author of this study. In addition to this, the author interviewed subject leaders within her own school institution, other subject department leaders external to the school and her own experience as a subject leader to confirm the categories to be used in this research. The pilot study was also used to fine-tune the categories and some categories were excluded. The thirty categories, which were finally selected for the research, set out clearly areas relevant to the subject leaders’ role. All the documents used can be replicated. Reproducibility was achieved by an experienced researcher selecting sections of the documents used in this research and coding them to confirm reliability. The accuracy was achieved by recording the categories according to the content and context they were used in the documents. The Ofsted reports meet the accuracy test for consistency of measurement in that inspectors follow a set of criteria based on the Inspection Framework for making judgements on subject leaders’ leadership in the inspection documents analysed. Consistency was further achieved by analysing the same sections of the Ofsted school reports for the period 1996 to 2000. These criteria are offered in the Ofsted handbook, which, by implication, can be applied at the department level (Harris, Jamieson and Russ, 1997). In addition, reliability was reinforced as Ofsted inspectors are trained to use a standardised methodology for conducting inspections. Reliability was further achieved by the pilot study of six Ofsted London secondary school reports, from the two authorities under investigation. This contributed to a refinement of the categories to ensure their relevance and appropriateness for this study.
Commentary on documents used in the research

The research analyses TTA's Standard for Subject Leaders, Ofsted handbook, Ofsted London secondary school reports and the academic literature. The TTA focuses on the professional knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes, which are necessary for subject leaders to carry out their key tasks and roles efficiently and effectively. The Ofsted handbook sets out the criteria by which subject leaders are to be judged on the extent to which leadership and management create an effective and improving environment where pupils are keen and able to learn. With regard to the Ofsted school reports, the Ofsted team inspectors concentrate on what is happening in practice. They consider how effective subject leaders are in carrying out their leadership role and promoting high standards of achievement in their department.

The TTA document sets out the professional standards for subject leaders. The importance of the subject teacher's management role has been formally acknowledged by the TTA with the publication of the 'National Standards for Subject Leaders'. This was intended for accreditation, like the National Professional Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH)). Its central purpose was to set out the required skills of good subject leaders. The subject leaders' standards represent a major re-definition of the role and expectations of their performance. The standards highlight the importance of the subject leader in securing high quality teaching and improved standards of achievement (TTA, 1998). The TTA acknowledged the centrality of the subject leader in contributing to whole school
policy. In regards to professional knowledge and understanding, subject leaders are expected to have knowledge of the subject and remain up to date in their subject area.

Subject leaders have to ensure that the aims and values of the school are transmitted through the curriculum and now have to take part in the national performance management scheme. They will also be assessed on how well they manage the department's budget, delegate and develop the staff in the department. They have to manage the induction programme for newly qualified teachers, induct new staff into the procedures of the department and assist in ensuring high educational standards.

Ofsted covers similar areas as the TTA in respect of subject leaders. The Ofsted handbook has the criteria set out for inspectors to evaluate subject leaders in their management role. These are the same criteria, which apply to headteachers in their leadership role. This is found in the section of the handbook 'How well is the school led and managed?' (pp.86-98). According to Ofsted, subject leaders should ensure that there is equality of access and opportunities for all pupils, in other words to provide inclusiveness in educational provision. They have to monitor the department's effectiveness in helping pupils to develop initiatives and responsibilities. Their ability to delegate tasks and develop colleagues; existing, newly qualified and staff new to the school, and how they manage the financial budget of the department will be evaluated. Subject leaders are expected to be involved in the monitoring, evaluating and development of teaching. They have to identify strengths and weaknesses in their team members, set standards and targets for improvement and ensure that the policies for the
school and department, are carried out. The national performance management scheme should assess this process.

The planning role of subject leaders is assessed by Ofsted to ensure that there is effective planning and organisation of the subject. They are required to be able to identify the needs of students and cater for the varying ability range in the student population. Ofsted expects subject leaders to have good subject knowledge, and keep abreast with changes and new developments in their subject area. Subject leaders are expected to give clear direction for the work of the department and to promote high educational standards. They need to ensure that the aims and the values of the school are transmitted through the curriculum. It is important that subject leaders are able to develop a relationship with the community and other educational establishments.

Although not succinct, the Ofsted criteria are used more widely possibly by schools than the TTA’s criteria for subject leaders. This is because Ofsted is considered to be ‘high status’ and therefore powerful by subject leaders. It will make judgements using the Ofsted handbook and framework on subject leaders when inspecting schools. In preparing for inspections school are most likely to use the Ofsted framework for guidance and for self-evaluation. However, the TTA criteria will feature more strongly when schools are dealing with staff induction, INSET and formulating job descriptions.

The Ofsted reports on schools evaluate what is happening in practice in secondary schools in respect of how departments are led and managed in their various curriculum
areas. Usually a group of subject specialists undertake a series of classroom observations; analyse the department’s documentation; interview key staff in the department; scrutinise samples of students work; and interview these students about their work in the curriculum areas. From this process the team inspectors, under the leadership of a registered inspector, form their judgements on how well the department’s practices and procedures are able to provide good quality education.

Finally, the fourth set of documents, the academic literature, provides information from research findings about the qualities that makes good curriculum leaders. It offers ideas on what makes an effective department. Some of the studies have considered the way in which different departmental cultures and structures help to affect the quality of the leadership style and departmental academic performance. The academic literature emphasises the importance of the subject leaders’ role in contributing to the management of change both at the departmental and whole school level in secondary schools. In addition to this, the academic literature also discusses some of the tensions and dilemmas facing subject leaders in their middle management role. In total, the number of documents studied for this purpose was twenty three of the leading writers, educationalists and authorities in this area.

**SAMPLING**

Six Ofsted school reports were sampled initially to confirm the categories, which relate to subject teachers in their management role. Two from the LEA with a smaller number of secondary schools and four from the LEA which has a larger number of secondary
schools. The Ofsted school reports of the two LEAs span the period from 1996 to 2000. For the full study a total of twenty schools were selected from two Outer London Boroughs: eight from one borough and twelve from the other. The sample size is in keeping with small-scale social research (Cohen et al., 2000). The sample strategy selected is a non-probability sample of all Ofsted reports, more commonly known as purposive sample, where a particular section of the wider population has been included in the study and others excluded (Cohen et al., 2000). These LEAs were selected because the two boroughs stand in direct contrast to each other in terms of pupil achievement and their pupils' socio-economic background. The LEAs can be identified as LEA A and LEA B. LEA A refers to the borough with marked educational underachievement and LEA B for the borough whose educational performance is above the national average. Having these two contrasting LEA schools, information has been gathered from the inspection reports on the effectiveness (or lack of effectiveness) of subject leaders in managing their curriculum areas.

LEA A has 9,964 families receiving free school meals (the borough was unable to provide the total number of individual pupils and students actually receiving free school meals). The proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals is well above the national average and there are high levels of mobility within the pupil population. The families entitled to free school meals are those who are on income support, job seekers allowance (income based) and asylum seekers. The population of secondary school aged students is approximately 11,000 and for primary pupils it is 21,000. It must be noted that a
considerable amount of secondary aged students are schooled out side the borough, enough for at least another secondary school.

In contrast to LEA A, the proportion of pupils entitled to free school meals in LEA B is close to the national average. The total number of pupils receiving free school meals is also close to the national average. In primary school there are 2,533 pupils and for secondary schools it is 3,289. LEA B has approximately one third of the secondary school aged pupils residing outside the borough. A number of these students reside in LEA A.

The Ofsted school reports were able to provide information on subject leaders who work in contrasting situations due to the differing socio-economic background of their pupil intake. The data was collected using the quantitative method approach, and the analysis technique was the structured content analysis using Bailey’s (1982) model. This, Bailey (1982) and Robson (1993) agree, is similar to a structured analysis applied to documents rather than to observation of non-verbal behaviour. In other words, it is a structured document-analysis technique in that the researcher first constructs a set of mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories, which can be used to analyse the documents for the research, and then records the frequency with which each of these categories is mentioned in the documents studied.
DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

The analysis of documentary sources is a major method of social research (Mason, 1996). Educational research usually involves the analysis of documents as part of the data gathering process. In some cases the documentary evidence will be used to supplement information obtained by other methods of research thus contributing to triangulation. In others, it will be the main or exclusive method of research (Miles and Huberman, 1994). For this research study this was the case in that the documentary evidence technique was the only method used. The evidence was gleaned from documents related to subject leaders, which involved documents published by TTA, Ofsted handbook, Ofsted reports and the academic literature. Johnson (1994) asserts that:

'The essence of a document or record is that it already exists in a definitive form. Unlike a questionnaire or interview schedule, it cannot be individually designed to suit a particular research purpose, but must be drawn on as a source of data in the form in which it stands.' (pp. 58-59)

Documentary analysis is an example of unobtrusive or non-reactive research. It is not affected by the fact that it is being used for the investigation. Using documentary analysis of educational records can provide valuable source of data (Duffy, 1987). This also applies to the research as information has been gathered about the performance of subject leaders in maintained London secondary schools. The inspection reports provide
valuable insight into the practice of subject leaders in two LEAs selected for study and the Ofsted inspectors’ interpretation of the inspection framework.

Documents may be divided into two types: primary and secondary. Primary sources are original documents. Secondary sources are interpretations of primary sources, in other words secondary documents are written about primary documents. It needs to be mentioned that some documents may be primary from one point of view and secondary from another depending on the focus of the research (Duffy, 1987). For this study the Ofsted reports can be viewed as primary source as they are records of actual observations and judgements made by inspection teams on subject leaders in London secondary schools. The other documents, TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders and the Ofsted handbook are also primary documents. The academic review literature is usually considered as a secondary source, but for the purpose of this research it will be treated as if it is a primary source. This was because interpretations had to be made with respect to academic literature’s treatment of the subject leaders’ role in London secondary maintained schools.

Generally, documents have a definite purpose and the purpose will be important in understanding and interpreting the result of the analysis. As result, there is a distinction made in documentary analysis between ‘witting’ and ‘unwitting’ evidence. According to Duffy (1987) ‘witting’ evidence is information that the original author of the document wanted to impart. ‘Unwitting’ documentary evidence is everything else that can be learned from studying the document, both the intentional and unintentional meanings.
This research used both witting and unwitting documentary evidences. The witting evidence is in respect of the twenty Ofsted reports on London secondary schools as the study looks at the Ofsted reports to see what the inspections focus on in respect of how subject leaders lead and manage their departments. Unwitting documentary evidence was employed as the research concentrates on the role of subject leaders from the perspective of the TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted handbook and the academic literature.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of Documentary Evidence**

Documents can be of enormous benefit to the researcher in his/her investigation. Bailey (1982) cites a number of advantages related to document studies. However, the ones which are pertinent to this study are firstly, what documentary analysis offers is the relatively low cost compared to the option of a large-scale survey defining subject leadership. Secondly, these documents are written by people who are skilled writers and may be of more value than responses from questionnaires. A third is that the data are in permanent form and therefore, can be subject to re analysis, allowing for reliability checks and replication studies (Robson, 1993). Finally, they also demonstrate how policymakers and policy shapers think about subject leadership in secondary schools.

One of Bailey’s (1982) principal disadvantages is the coding of a document, as it is one of the most difficult tasks facing the researcher. This is mainly because documents are usually written in words and are more difficult to quantify than numbers. To overcome this problem, as part of the methodology a sample of the documents was subjected to
external coding by an experienced researcher in the educational field to explore validity and reliability. Another disadvantage is that, the documents chosen for the research have been written for some other purpose other than for the research. Therefore, it is difficult or impossible to allow for biases or distortions that this introduces in the Ofsted secondary school reports, but there are no other similar documents that can be used to compare the information needed for this research. As a result, the Ofsted reports have to be taken as authentic judgements, despite the fact that these judgements exist within an interpretative frame.

Content Analysis

Bailey (1982) states that documentary analysis may be limited to two types: unstructured and nonquantitative case study approaches, and the structured content analysis approach. This study adopts the structured content analysis approach. Various definitions have been offered on content analysis. Krippendroff (1980) defines content analysis as ‘a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context.’ Berelon (1952), in an earlier definition states that content analysis is ‘a research technique for the objective, systematic and qualitative description of the manifest content of communication.’ Stone et al. (1966) claim that ‘content analysis is a research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics within a text.’ Cohen et al. (2000) on the other hand, defines content analysis as a multipurpose research method developed specifically for investigating a broad spectrum of problems in which the content of the communication serves as a basis of inference, from word counts (Travers, 1969) to categorization (Cohen et al., 2000).
Finally, Weber (1990) refers to content analysis as 'a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text.' These inferences, he claims, are about the sender(s) of the messages, the message and the audience for which the message was intended. The audiences for the documents used in this research tend to be people in the educational field. The audiences for the Ofsted handbook are mainly Ofsted inspectors, teachers, educationalists and LEA officers. The Ofsted reports are intended for headteachers and teachers, parents, the LEA, educationalists, researchers, the community and the wider public. Mainly leadership teams in schools, subject leaders and those aspiring to become subject leaders use the TTA’s document. In respect of the academic literature, the audiences are mainly educationalists, teachers and educational researchers.

The central goal of content analysis is to take a verbal, non-quantitative document and transform it into quantitative data by just counting the words, the content of the sentence or the theme of a paragraph. The result can be presented in table form containing either frequencies or percentages. The Ofsted reports, TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders and the academic literature are considered professional documents. All the three types of documents are available for professional use.

Bailey (1982) comments that content analysis is roughly the same process as for structured observation, as it is a structured documentary analysis technique in which the researcher is able to construct a set of categories that can be applied when analysing documents, and then record the frequency with which each of the categories is observed in the documents studied. This technique offered by Bailey is the exclusive methodology
of this research. According to Bailey's (1982) model after the categories have been constructed, the next step is to analyse the documents. Bailey (1982) suggests five key tasks that a content analyst would have to employ when researching documents:

1. Draw the sample of documents
2. Define the content of categories
   
   The actual content depends upon the purpose of the study.
3. Define the recording unit
4. Define the context unit
5. Define the system of enumeration’ (Page 314)

Categories need to reflect the purpose of the research. They should be exhaustive, mutually exclusive and independent so that the value of one category does not have any bearing on the value of another category. The best way to construct categories is to examine the documents and establish what common elements they contain. The important point is that categories must be considered adequate for the purposes of the study being undertaken. The categories for this research were constructed by analysing the documents mentioned in the previous paragraph and finding out what common elements they contained in relation to subject leaders in secondary schools. It is only by letting the categories emerge from the documents to be examined that the aim of mutual exclusiveness and exhaustiveness can be achieved. Selection of the categories was constructed by an examination of sections from all four documents studied to ascertain what common themes they contained (Weber, 1990), which related to the role of subject
leaders. The author also drew on her own experience as a subject leader, the views of other subject leaders and school leaders in the author's present school and other London secondary maintained schools and what they considered relevant to the role of subject leaders. In addition to this, the categories were also drawn up with reference to the research questions. The categories are as follows:

- Setting Aims and Objectives
- Assessment Management
- Attainment and Progress
- Behaviour/Discipline
- Classroom Management
- Curriculum Management
- Curriculum Planning
- Differentiation
- Equal Opportunities
- Ethnic Differences
- Examination Results
- Expectation (teachers' expectations)
- Gender Differences
- Gifted and Talented
- Homework Management
- Induction of New Staff (both newly qualified and new staff to the school)
- Learning Support
• Management of the Learning Experience

• Management of Monitoring and Evaluation

• Management and Leadership (It is necessary to mention here that management and leadership are combined as one category in many educational texts and literature. However, it is important to note that management relates to orchestrating the day to day running of the department and leadership is about setting the direction for the department)

• Motivation of Staff

• Provision for Staff Development

• Quality of Teaching (subject leaders’ teaching)

• Resources Management

• Special Educational Needs (SEN)/English as an Additional Language (EAL)

• Strategic Planning

• Students’ Standard of Achievement

• Subject Knowledge

• Target Setting

• Team Building

The recording unit used in this study was on the management and leadership role of subject leaders. This is justified on the grounds that the theme as a form of coding/recording unit is labour-intensive, but has provided a more detailed and sophisticated comparisons for the purpose of this study (Weber, 1990). The context unit relates to the subject leaders and their role in secondary schools.
Bailey (1982) gives four main ways to enumerate the data in content analysis. Two of the four methods were used in this study. One of these was a simply binary coding of ‘1’ used when the category appeared or ‘0’ to indicate when it did not. This method was applied to the Ofsted reports of the two LEAs used for comparison in the study. The other was the frequency with which the category appeared in the documents. This was used when analysing the following documents: TTA’s Standards for Subject Teachers, Ofsted handbook and the academic literature.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

The study took non-quantitative documents and converted them into quantitative data (Bailey, 1982; Robson, 1993; and Miles and Huberman, 1994). These were then analysed using a computer spreadsheet. The categories were listed down the left hand side for all of the documents analysed and the frequency for each document recorded horizontally on the spreadsheet. With regard to the TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted Handbook and the academic literature, the results were presented in table form (Appendices 4, 5, and 6) by recording the total frequency each category appeared in the documents that related to subject leaders’ role. Next, a percentage of each of these categories was calculated, so that a comparison could be made between the documents mentioned above.

In respect of the inspection reports on the London secondary schools, the categories were similarly recorded on a spreadsheet. The schools are numbered 1 to 20. The LEA, which
could be described as having Inner London characteristics in respect of the schools’
take, can be identified numerically as 1 to 8. The other LEA, which is successful in
terms of examination results and does not have the socio economic disadvantages, is
numbered 9 to 20. In order to quantify these reports a simply binary coding was used of
‘1’ and ‘0’ to indicate whether or not the category appeared in the Ofsted school reports.
In addition to this, each category is further sub-divided into a, b, c, and d. Where the
number 1 was recorded by the letter ‘a’ this means, that the category, in the inspector’s
judgement, was a serious cause for concern. The letter ‘b’ means that the category was a
cause for concern, but not a serious one. With respect to the letter ‘c’, this means that the
category was not a cause for concern, but some improvement was necessary. The last,
letter ‘d’, means that the category was mentioned favourably. Where a ‘0’ appeared by a,
b, c or d this means that the category was not mentioned at all. Next, all the columns were
added up and a percentage given for each letter. After this, letters ‘a’ and ‘b’, and letters
‘c’ and ‘d’ percentages were added together.

Following on from this, the total for each rank under the individual category for all the
schools was calculated. Each of these ranks were multiplied in the following manner:
letter ‘a’ by 3, letter ‘b’ by 2, letter ‘c’ by 1 and letter ‘d’ by 0. Finally, the total of each
rank under each category was added up, so that a comparison of key emphasis can be
made of the three documents, that is, TTA’s Standards for Subject Leaders, Ofsted
handbook and the academic literature against, the findings from the Ofsted inspections
reports of schools in the two LEAs.
Summary

The educational research undertaken used documentary evidence as its exclusive method of research. The main type of documentary study, which was used in this research, is the structured content-analysis approach that yields quantitative data from written documents (Bailey, 1982). Using the content analysis approach the study was able to concentrate on the issues related to subject leaders in their leadership role. A number of advantages and disadvantages of documentary evidence pertinent to this research was discussed. Finally, the chapter concluded with an explanation on how the data was analysed. At this point it is now necessary to consider in detail the findings from the documentary evidence and what can be learned about subject leaders, and the main areas of their work.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The data for the research were collected from the study of four key documents on subject leaders in their management role. These four documentary sources are the academic literature, TTA's Standards for Subject Leaders, the Ofsted handbook and twenty Ofsted reports from two contrasting LEAs in respect of student achievement. In analysing these documents thirty categories were used for this purpose. The frequency with which these categories appeared in the above documents were recorded and analysed statistically to produce the findings for this research reported later in this chapter.

The documents reviewed for the academic literature were drawn from the research findings. Practitioners in education have authored many of these with close links to training institutions. The TTA is a government agency that defines the standards and supervises the various training providers for subject leaders and teachers. The Ofsted handbook sets out the standards for inspection. Inspectors, when inspecting schools, will use these standards for subject leaders in their curriculum management roles. On the other hand, the findings of the Ofsted reports provide the results of the inspectors' judgements from the evaluation of the work of subject leaders in schools. The first three documents look at the ideals and the expectations, although they look at them from different standpoints because of their different functions. The twenty Ofsted reports on the other hand, inform how subject leaders perform in reality.
A review of the TTA and Ofsted Handbook on their main emphasis of the subject leaders' role

The TTA concentrates on the ideal, in other words: What should be happening in the leadership and management role of subject leaders? The TTA's task is to shape the role of the subject leaders and set out the expectations. In the document the standards are presented in a structured and concise way. The subject standards focus on the quality of teaching and learning, and the effect they have on pupils' learning. The TTA's main aims for national standards are: to set clear targets for subject leaders; help teachers plan and monitor their professional development; focus on improving achievement; recognition of teachers' expertise and achievement; and to help providers of professional development to arrange high quality relevant training. It is claimed by TTA that the Subject Standards for Subject Leaders came about as a result of 'intensive consultation' with a whole spectrum of people, associations, and agencies both local and national, inside and outside of the educational field such as teachers, LEAs, Ofsted and the QCA.

These standards are divided into five main areas:

- 'Core purpose of the subject leaders
- Key outcomes of subject leadership
- Professional knowledge and understanding
- Skills and attributes
- Key areas of subject leadership'

(TTA, 1998, p.3)

The first defines the core purpose of the subject leaders as being the professional leader who provides overall management of the subject framework. Secondly, the
key outcomes of the subject leaders will be measured in terms of pupil and teacher performance; good information and feedback to parents; ensures that the headteacher and other members of the Leadership Team (LT) are aware of the needs and achievements of the subject; and in turn keep the LT informed about changes needed to deliver the curriculum effectively and training requirements for department members. Thirdly, the subject leaders must have good knowledge of the subject and keep up to date with new developments and initiatives in the subject areas, and in education generally. Fourthly, the skills that subject leaders need to carry out their roles effectively are leadership, decision-making, communication and self-management. In addition, there are the attributes such as personal presence, self-confidence, enthusiasm, commitment, intellectual ability and integrity. The final section of subject leadership centres around four key areas, which are: strategic direction and development of the subject; teaching and learning; leading and managing staff; and efficient deployment of staff and resources (TTA, 1998).

The TTA is more input driven while Ofsted focuses on outcomes. Ofsted concentrates on what has happened and as a result monitors the outcome. Another element of Ofsted's work is to deal with accountability, strengths and weaknesses of the subject leaders' performance. Ofsted does not have a specific document for subject leaders. Information about what is to be expected of subject leaders are found in various sections of the Ofsted framework and the handbook for 'Inspecting Secondary Schools'.

The two key sections are 'How good are the curricula and other opportunities offered to pupils and students? And 'How well is the school led and managed? Including
further guidance in ‘Inspecting Subjects and Aspect 11 –18’, and specific information for subject areas such as ‘Inspecting English 11-16 with guidance on self-evaluation’ and ‘Inspecting post -16 English with guidance and self-evaluation’. However, there is relevant information for subject leaders littered throughout the texts. The main areas of focus on subject leaders in the Ofsted literature are:

- Ensure (equality of access and opportunities for all pupils) inclusiveness in educational provision.
- Effective strategies for teaching and learning.
- Need to monitor departments effectiveness (in helping pupils to develop initiatives and responsibilities) and in terms of identifying strengths and weaknesses.
- Monitoring standards, targets and subject policies to ensure that they are in line with the whole school’s policies.
- Ensures good effective planning and organisation of the subject.
- Identify pupils’ needs.
- Have good subject knowledge and keep up to date with development in the subject.
- The way in which subject leaders access information external to the school i.e. Internet, effective use of ICT in the subject areas.
- The delivery of SMSC (social, moral, spiritual and cultural).
- Ensure that aims and values of the school are transmitted through the curriculum.
- Take part as a leader and a teacher in the national Performance Management (PM) scheme.
• Clear direction for the work of the department and the promotion of high standards
• How well they delegate and develop colleagues.
• Management of the school induction programme for new members of staff and newly qualified teachers.
• How subject leaders assist in ensuring high quality education.
• Resource deployment and management.
• Managing relationship with the community and other educational institutions.

It can be seen by analysing these two government agencies' documents that the criteria for subject leaders in some areas are the same, such as teaching and learning, having good subject knowledge, effective development of departmental members and the monitoring performance of both teachers and pupils. However, their focus differs. The TTA is more of a training guide while the Ofsted handbook concentrates more heavily on pupil performance, standards of achievement, and the part that the subject leaders and teachers play in these areas.

Comparison of Main Characteristics/Features of Subject Leaders

The data are given in table form below as these tables display the present statistical results more clearly and therefore reduce the need to write copious prose explanations. Following on from this, there will be a commentary on each table, which will highlight the key points from the findings. After the commentary, it will be explained how the findings answer the research questions. Finally, the results will be linked to the purpose of the research.
Table 4.1 The rank order of the top ten categories for the role of subject leaders emphasised by the academic literature compared with TTA, Ofsted handbook and Ofsted reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature Rank</th>
<th>TTA Standards Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Reports Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 has five columns. The first gives the top ten categories emphasised by the academic literature in rank order. Columns three to five show the comparison of the ranking for the TTA, Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports with reference to the academic literature. For example, the category of management and leadership was ranked first in the academic literature, that is, it collected the highest number of frequencies from the documentary analysis. In respect of the TTA it was ranked fifth, third for the Ofsted handbook and tenth for the Ofsted reports.
Table 4.2 The percentage (%) of top ten categories for the role of subject leaders emphasised by the academic literature compared with the TTA, Ofsted handbook and Ofsted report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature</th>
<th>TTA Standards</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook</th>
<th>Ofsted Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category with the highest percentage was management and leadership with 21.04% occurrence in the academic literature when compared with the TTA and the Ofsted handbook. Students' standard of achievement was second with 15.85% in the Ofsted handbook. The third most recorded category was the quality of teaching, which featured in first place in the TTA with 14.35%, second place in the academic literature with 12.12% and third place in the Ofsted handbook with 10.67%. All the aforementioned categories were mentioned just over 4% to just below 3.50% in the Ofsted reports. Subject knowledge was mentioned the most in the TTA in almost 10% (9.72%) of the document and the least in the Ofsted handbook of less than 1% at 0.61%

The following three tables, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, list the expectations and values of the ten most important categories in respect of subject leaders in their management role in the academic literature, TTA document and the Ofsted handbook.
Table 4.3 The Academic Literature first ten recorded categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>21.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the table above show that management and leadership had almost doubled (21.04%) the percentage for the next three categories of teaching (12.12%), learning experience (11.90%) and curriculum management (10.86%). In addition, there was a strong emphasis on the first four areas as they were referred to between just over 21% and almost 11% of the documents. The first four categories were more significant as they appeared over one hundred times with management and leadership recorded nearly three hundred times in the total documents studied. The middle four categories, monitoring and evaluation, staff development, standard of achievement and resources, were not as significant as the first four categories. They appeared just below eighty nine times (6.54%) to fifty six times (2.45%). The final two categories, strategic planning and subject knowledge, were less significant as they appeared in less than 3% of the academic literature.
Table 4.4 TTA first ten recorded categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above reveals that there was significant emphasis on teaching at 14.35% of the document compared with 9.72% for learning experience and subject knowledge.

Table 4.5 OFSTED Handbook first ten recorded categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of SEN/EAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ standard of achievement and quality of subject leaders’ teaching were both rated highly at 15.85% and 15.24% respectively. The next important category was management and leadership, which appeared in 10.67% of the document. There was less variation amongst the other categories.
Table 4.6 Ofsted Reports first ten recorded categories that are highlighted as areas subject leaders were least effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/ Discipline</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the categories scored between 48 and 42 responses, which in percentage term worked out to be between 4.69% and 4.11% of the reports analysed.

Comparison of the Intermediate Categories

Table 4.7 The intermediate ten categories for the role of subject leaders emphasised by the academic literature compared with the TTA, Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature Rank</th>
<th>TTA Standards Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Report Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the intermediate categories with ranking from 11 to 20 for the academic literature and a comparison of where those categories are positioned for the TTA, Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports. It also shows that the category of
attainment and progress was fourth for both the Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports, expectations was ranked thirteenth for both the TTA and the academic literature and fifteenth for the Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports. In the intermediate categories group there is convergence between the academic literature and the Ofsted handbook and divergence between the TTA and the Ofsted reports when compared with the academic literature.

Table 4.8 The percentage (%) of ten intermediate categories for the role of subject leaders emphasised by the academic literature compared with the TTA, Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature</th>
<th>TTA Standards</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook</th>
<th>Ofsted Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attainment and progress appeared in 8.54% of the Ofsted handbook, but appeared in just less than half of that amount in the Ofsted report with 4.40%. Target setting came in 8.80% of the TTA document compared to the nearest percentage of 3.42% in the Ofsted reports as an area of concern.
Comparison of the Ten Final Categories

Table 4.9 The final ten categories recorded for the role of subject leaders emphasised by each of the four documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature</th>
<th>TTA Standards</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook</th>
<th>Ofsted Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academic literature and the Ofsted reports were the only two documents out of the four, which have all the categories mentioned. TTA has twenty-two categories, which were mentioned and eight that did not appear in the document: equal opportunities, learning support, homework, classroom management, differentiation, examination, ethnic differences and gender differences. In the Ofsted handbook classroom management, differentiation, homework and learning support were not mentioned in respect of the subject leaders’ role. Differentiation was given the same ranking for both the academic literature and the Ofsted reports. SEN/EAL appeared the least in the academic literature (0.30%) and most in the Ofsted handbook (3.96%). Learning support was ranked in twenty-fifth position in the academic literature and just one place behind in twenty-sixth position in the Ofsted reports where it was considered favourably. Gifted and talented, and induction of new staff were ranked in similar positions for the academic literature and the Ofsted reports. The TTA and the Ofsted handbook had similar ranking for the same two categories mentioned above.
The academic literature and the Ofsted reports showed more convergence than the other two documents.

Table 4.10 The percentage (%) of the final ten categories recorded for the role of subject leaders emphasised by each of the four documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature</th>
<th>TTA Standards</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook</th>
<th>Ofsted Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender differences only occurred in 0.15% of the academic literature, did not appear in the TTA, referred to 0.91% in the Ofsted handbook, but featured in the Ofsted reports 4.11% as an area where subject leaders needed to make improvements. All the categories were mentioned less than 1% in the academic literature, only one category, SEN/EAL, appeared in over 1% of the TTA document and the Ofsted handbook. Motivation and gifted and talented were the least mentioned in the Ofsted reports. The majority of the other categories were areas for concern or serious concern where subject leaders were least effective in carrying out their management role.
Table 4.11 Comparison of the findings of the first ten categories in alphabetical order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Literature %</th>
<th>TTA %</th>
<th>Handbook %</th>
<th>Reports %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aims and objectives were mentioned in all the documents, but mentioned the most under the TTA (4.63%) and the least in the Ofsted reports. These were mentioned almost twice as much in the Ofsted handbook (2.13%) than in the Ofsted reports (1.37%). Assessment was also mentioned almost two times more in the Ofsted reports (4.40%) than the Ofsted handbook (2.74%). It was mentioned the most in the Ofsted reports and the least in the TTA document (1.39%). The TTA and the Ofsted reports gave similar attention to the category of attainment and progress, but it was mentioned most in the Ofsted handbook and the least in the academic literature.

Behaviour/Discipline was referred to almost seven more times in the Ofsted reports (4.20%) than in the Ofsted handbook (0.61%) and therefore considered a serious concern by the inspectors. While attainment and progress were mentioned nearly twice as much in the Ofsted handbook (8.54%) than in the Ofsted reports (4.40%) as an area where subject leaders showed weaknesses. Classroom management did not seem to be an issue for the TTA or the Ofsted handbook, but it was an area where subject leaders were weak in the Ofsted reports (4.20%).
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Curriculum management was mentioned in all the documents analysed, with the academic literature scoring the highest references of 10.86% and the TTA the least with 2.31%. In fact, it occurred five times more in the academic literature than in the TTA. It was addressed approximately one and a half times more in the Ofsted handbook (6.40%) than in the Ofsted reports (4.20%). In the Ofsted reports the curriculum management was considered roughly the same as assessment, attainment and progress, and behaviour/discipline as cause for concern where subject leaders were least effect.

Differentiation was not mentioned in the TTA or the Ofsted handbook. It was mentioned more in the Ofsted reports (2.74%), as an area where subject leaders need to improve, than in the academic literature. The category of equal opportunities was not addressed in the TTA document. It was mentioned the most in the Ofsted reports and the least in the academic literature (0.30%). It occurred four more times in the Ofsted reports (2.35%) than in the Ofsted handbook (0.60%).

Table 4.12 Comparison of the findings of the second ten categories in alphabetical order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Literature %</th>
<th>TTA %</th>
<th>Handbook %</th>
<th>Report %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Experience</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination was addressed more in the Ofsted reports (4.20%) nearly five more times than in the Ofsted handbook (0.61%). The category of Expectations was addressed in all the documentations. It was addressed in the Ofsted reports (3.81%) the most as an area where subject teachers have weaknesses and emphasised the least in the Ofsted handbook (1.22%). The category of Gender differences was addressed the most in the Ofsted reports (4.11%) and the least in the academic literature (0.15%). It was mentioned four times more in the Ofsted reports than in the Ofsted handbook (0.91%) and considered an area where subject leaders were not paying sufficient attention in their leadership role.

Gifted and talented occurred in all the documents. It was mentioned the most in the Ofsted reports (4.11%) and the least in academic literature (0.07%). However, it was mentioned less than 1% in the other two documents. The main reason for this is because Gifted and Talented/Excellence in the City (EiC) programmes were not introduced until 1997/1998. Homework was not addressed in the Ofsted handbook or the TTA document. It was mentioned in 3.81% of the Ofsted reports as an area of concern and referred to less than 1% (0.89%) in the academic literature. Induction for new staff came in each document. It appeared the most in the Ofsted reports (1.56%) and the least in the academic literature (0.07%). In fact it appeared 5.2 times more in the Ofsted reports than in the Ofsted handbook.

Learning experience was mentioned in all four documents. It was recorded the most in the academic literature (11.90%) and the least in the Ofsted reports (4.01%). However, it was an area of concern in respect of subject leaders management of it in the Ofsted reports. Learning Support was mentioned more in the Ofsted reports
(2.83%) and the least in the academic literature (0.22%), but did not feature in the Ofsted handbook or the TTA.

Management and leadership appeared in 21.04% of the academic literature compared to 10.77% in the Ofsted handbook and 8.33% in the TTA document. The Ofsted reports had it as an area of serious concern in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role. In both the Ofsted reports and the Ofsted handbook, management and leadership was linked in with the management and leadership of the whole school, with just brief statements on it under each subject of the curriculum for each curriculum subject report.

Monitoring and evaluation was addressed quite highly in the academic literature, Ofsted handbook and the Ofsted reports and to a lesser extent in the TTA. It occurred twice as much in the Ofsted handbook than in the Ofsted reports. It appeared the most in the Ofsted handbook (7.93%) and the least in the TTA document (4.17%). In the Ofsted reports, monitoring and evaluation was highlighted as an area of serious concern where subject leaders were ineffective in their departmental role.

The remaining ten categories were mentioned in all the documentations.

Table 4.13 Comparison of the findings of the third ten categories in alphabetical order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Literature %</th>
<th>TTA %</th>
<th>Handbook %</th>
<th>Report %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation was mentioned under 1% in all the documents. It occurred the most in the TTA (0.93%) and least in the Ofsted handbook (0.30%). It occurred two times more in the Ofsted reports (0.68%) than in the Ofsted handbook (0.30%). Strategic planning was addressed the most in the Ofsted reports (4.01%) and least in the Ofsted handbook (0.3%). In fact it was mentioned thirteen more times in the Ofsted reports than the handbook, and occurred four times more in the Ofsted reports than the TTA.

Quality of teaching was mentioned four times more in the Ofsted handbook (15.84%) than the Ofsted reports (3.81%). Resources management was mentioned the most in the Ofsted handbook (6.71%). Staff development appeared most frequently in the academic literature (6.02%) and the least in the Ofsted handbook. It was referred to four times more in the Ofsted reports (3.81%) than in the Ofsted handbook (0.91%).

Students’ standard of achievement was mentioned five times more in the Ofsted handbook (15.85%) than in the Ofsted reports (3.81%). Subject knowledge occurred the most in the TTA (9.72%), but it was addressed five times more in the Ofsted reports (3.32%) than the Ofsted handbook (0.61%).

Target setting was addressed most in TTA (8.80%) and the least in the academic literature (1.41%). Target setting occurred one and a half time more in the Ofsted reports (3.42%) than in the Ofsted handbook (2.44%), and four times more in the
TTA than the Ofsted reports or Ofsted handbook. Team building appeared less than 2% in all the documents.

The academic literature main emphasis was on curriculum, learning experience, management and leadership, and teaching. Less than five percent (5%) of the material written within the academic literature related to class management, differentiation, equal opportunities, ethnic differences, examinations, gender differences, gifted and talented, homework, induction for new staff, learning support, motivation and SEN/EAL.

With regard to the TTA, the main focus was on the quality of teaching, subject knowledge, target setting, learning experience and management and leadership. Classroom management, differentiation, equal opportunities, ethnic differences, examination, gender differences, homework and learning support are not mentioned at all. Twenty-six percent (26%) of the material written dealt with aims and objectives, assessment, attainment and progress, curriculum planning, expectation, monitoring and evaluation, resources and SEN/EAL. Less than five percent (5%) of the document dealt with behaviour/discipline, strategic planning, gifted and talented, induction for new staff, motivation and team building.

In the Ofsted handbook the main priority was on management and leadership, standards of achievement, quality of teaching and, attainment and progress. Issues related to classroom management, differentiation, homework and learning support in respect of subject leaders and their role were not mentioned in the Ofsted handbook. One reason for this could be that these areas are seen as the individual teacher's
responsibility. Less than six percent (6%) of the document referred to behaviour/discipline; equal opportunities; gender differences; strategic planning; examinations; gifted and talented; new staff induction; motivation; staff development; and subject knowledge. Approximately seventeen percent (17%) of the Ofsted handbook coded items related to aims and objectives, assessment, expectations, curriculum planning, SEN/EAL, target setting and team building.

The Ofsted reports covered all the thirty categories relatively evenly with aims and objectives, gifted and talented, new staff induction, motivation and team building being the areas mentioned the least as a concern in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role.

Data linked to the Research Questions

In order to demonstrate how the research findings were able to provide answers for the research questions, each question will be discussed using the information drawn from the findings.

Review of Research Questions

To what extent do the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree with their criteria on what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools?

The evidence from the research findings shows that the documents: TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature do not always agree on what they emphasise as the important criteria that make effective subject leaders. The main reason for this is that each document is fulfilling a different function. As a result, no two documents had the categories in the same rank order. Therefore, the priority varied amongst them. The
main emphasis in respect of the TTA is how to manage the curriculum, while the Ofsted reports report on how subject leaders were actually managing and leading their department in practice. The Ofsted handbook is a guideline for inspectors to follow in order to ascertain whether or not subject leaders are carrying out their functions efficiently and effectively. This is to evaluate the degree to which they give clear direction for the work and development of the departments they lead and promote high standards. The academic literature provides information on what is good practice in order to achieve effective leadership of subject departments.

**Are there differences in what the documents consider to be the important role of subject leaders?**

While there were not many differences between the top ten categories of the academic literature, TTA and the Ofsted handbook, nevertheless there were significant omissions. Curriculum management, monitoring and evaluation, resources management and strategic planning did not appear in the TTA’s top ten categories. In the Ofsted handbook provision for staff development, strategic planning and subject knowledge were also not mentioned in the ten top categories. When the Ofsted reports top ten categories were compared with the academic literature five of them did not feature in the first ten categories: quality of teaching, management of the learning experience, provision for staff development, students’ standard of achievement and subject knowledge. These areas were not judged as having serious concerns by the Ofsted inspectors. It is important to reinforce here that the Ofsted reports provide a different function in comparison to the academic literature, TTA and the Ofsted handbook. These three documentary sources (academic literature, TTA and the Ofsted handbook) emphasise the expectations required of subject leaders, while on the
other hand the Ofsted reports identify the practice or lack of practice of these expectations in schools by subject leaders.

**Are the differences, if any, linked to the respective roles of the bodies?**

The differences in the documents appear to be linked to their respective roles and functions. The TTA centres on developing the role of subject leaders in ensuring the pedagogical competence of subject teachers. This makes them accountable for the quality of their departments' performance. Hence, the reasons for its first three leading categories being quality of teaching, management of the learning experience and subject knowledge.

The Ofsted handbook evaluates what should be happening when subject leaders lead and manage a department, while the Ofsted reports describe and give judgements on strengths and weaknesses of the subject leaders in managing the curriculum and their department. In other words, Ofsted team inspectors concentrate on standards in evaluating subject leaders in their leadership role. Thus, a contrast can be seen between the two where the handbook highlights quality of teaching and students' standard of achievement, the former being an input factor and the latter being the outcome. While the Ofsted reports raise concerns about subject leaders' effectiveness in the management of resources and managing the implementation and evaluation of policies and practices.

The academic literature, on the other hand, is theoretical as it is based on research findings of what might be good practice in managing a subject area. Hence, the findings show that it pays more attention to management and leadership, quality of
teaching, the development of the learning experience and management of the curriculum as its four leading criteria for subject leadership.

Another important observation is that, these three documents all strongly emphasise management and leadership, teaching, standard of achievement and learning experience. However, they do vary according to the degree of importance they attached to each category. With regard to the Ofsted reports, management and leadership featured as an area where subject leaders have weaknesses as it was ranked tenth place out of the total thirty categories. The academic literature, the TTA and the Ofsted handbook also focused heavily on management and leadership in their first ten categories. In addition to this, they concentrate on standards of achievement and learning experience, but they do not rank them in the same order of their first ten categories. None of these three categories appears in the Ofsted reports as an area of serious concern in respect of subject leaders in their management role.

What further reasons may explain the differences between the roles of the three bodies?

There are two other possible reasons, which may be able to explain the differences between the roles of the three bodies. The first is the historical background of the bodies and the second is the relationship they have with schools. It can be seen from the literature review that the TTA and Ofsted came about due to government policies in order to improve the quality and delivery of teaching, and secondly, monitor the standards of education in our schools. The academic literature is the product of independent educational research conducted in the form of basic research. It is not affected by government policies; therefore, it follows logically that one of the areas
for basic research would deal with the issue of management and leadership in education, covering relevant levels of managing the curriculum, including subject leaders.

With regard to the relationship with schools, although the TTA concentrates heavily on teaching it does not interact directly with schools on issues related to subject leaders in their leadership role. As a result, it could be less aware of many of the functions subject leaders have to play in running their departments. The areas emphasised by Ofsted are standards, teaching and management. These are issues relating to subject leaders in their departmental role, and hence, the Ofsted priority appears to be in harmony with areas of departmental functions. However, subject leaders may not always utilise and implement the management principles of the Ofsted handbook to support their development in their leadership role.

Are there differences between expectations and practices from the research findings?

The three documents, the academic literature, the TTA and the Ofsted handbook, give views and opinions of the expectations of subject leaders in their leadership role. These documents also provide differentiation with respect to the emphasis they place on the criteria developed by them. However, the Ofsted reports provide information about how subject leaders are performing in their leadership role in schools.

The academic literature's expectations focused strongly on management and leadership, the quality of teaching, learning experience, and curriculum management. The TTA strongly emphasise the quality of teaching, subject knowledge, learning
experience and target setting. The third document, the Ofsted handbook, focuses on students’ standard of achievement, the quality of teaching, management and leadership and, attainment and progress. These three documentary sources set out the standards expected of subject leaders, while the Ofsted reports identifies the areas of concern with respect to subject leaders’ performance in managing their departments.

There tends to be general convergence between the leading categories in the academic literature, TTA and the Ofsted handbook. Of all the major categories identified by the academic literature, the TTA and the Ofsted handbook only management and leadership, quality of teaching, learning experience and standards of achievement appeared as areas of significant importance in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role. However, the issue of leadership and management has been identified as an area where subject leaders are considered relatively weak in the Ofsted reports.

It appears that practitioners in schools are not matching up to the expectations and standards that are generally expected of subject leaders. To support this finding, there are evidences from data collected by Ofsted inspectors, together with findings from HMI surveys carried out on secondary schools in England.

Summary

The findings show that the three bodies aim to encourage, support and set clear standards for subject leaders. This is illustrated by the fact that there is a general convergence among the three bodies with respect to the categories they consider to be essential to the role of subject leaders. They do, however, vary in the position that
each category is ranked. A reason for the variation could be because they each fulfil
different roles and function and therefore, this may not be surprising. However, the
Ofsted reports give the judgements from the Ofsted inspectors on how subject leaders
are performing in their department and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses.

A detailed analysis of the findings will be undertaken in chapter five to ascertain what
further information can be gleaned from the research on how the three bodies agree on
what makes effective subject leaders.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The main focus of this educational management research has been to establish the extent to which the criteria offered by TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree on what makes effective subject leaders in London secondary schools. This is specifically relevant in today's educational climate as subject leaders in their middle management role are recognised as being able to make a real difference to school effectiveness and school improvement (Harris, 2000). The literature confirms that for school to develop and improve their educational performance in a constantly changing educational climate management of the curriculum cannot be the exclusive province of senior leaders (Coleman, Middlewood and Bush 1995; Bennett, 1995; Harris, Busher and Wise, 2001). Schools need managers to translate policies into practice. This is where subject leaders serve a dual role as they act as intermediaries between senior leaders and the classroom teachers. Subject leaders have to interpret policies for their team members and present their subordinates view to senior leaders (Bennett, 1995).

This research analysed each of the four key documents: the academic literature, TTA, the Ofsted handbook and the management role of subject leaders in twenty Ofsted reports drawn from two LEAs with contrasting student achievement in public examinations. This chapter concentrates on interpreting the data and examines the implications of the research findings. In addition, the chapter will consider key questions as follows:
• What is important from the findings?
• Can the findings explain the existing theories in the context of the research?
• What other observations can be drawn from the findings?
• Which of the above observations are considered to be important?
• What form should the further investigation take?

ANALYSIS of the FINDINGS

The documents, along with the thirty categories selected for use in this research, provide useful insight into the perception of subject leaders’ role. In analysing the findings the author will set out in diagrammatic form the areas, from the documents studied, where these agencies agree or disagree with what they consider to be important functions relating to the role of subject leaders. The expectations of each of the documents and their main areas of focus reveal some differences. The first significant point from analysing the first ten categories, found in Table 4.1, is that four of them were found to be common to all three documents. These four categories are: management and leadership, quality of teaching, management of the learning experience and students’ standard of achievement. It could be that these four occupy pre-eminent positions in the top ten categories of the three agencies because they are considered by academics, researchers and practitioners as having a strong impact on teaching and learning, which is at the heart of school improvement.
A second important observation is that, whereas all three agencies agree on the four common categories as illustrated above (fig. 5.1), nevertheless, they give different priorities to each of them. However, quality of teaching is fairly constant in all the three documents more than any other category.

The Academic Literature

The academic literature tends to concentrate strongly on management and leadership. This area dominates the academic literature, as it is the most frequently mentioned in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role. Educational research during the period covered by the literature review has shown that management and leadership is the most important role of subject leaders. One reason for this could be that research studies may have focused on this area of research to the neglect of other aspects of the subject leaders’ role. The second and third categories highlighted under the academic
literature, where there was very little difference between the numbers of times they were recorded, are the quality of teaching and the management of the learning experience with standard of achievement being the least mentioned in the four common categories.

When focusing on the academic literature's first ten categories (see figure 5.2) the same emphasis can be noted, which is that management related duties were recorded more frequently than the other aspects. On the other hand, subject knowledge was ranked tenth. It maybe that researchers assumed that subject leaders will have good subject knowledge. Hence they may not have seen the necessity to highlight subject knowledge as important to the work of subject leaders, in comparison to other categories in the top ten.

Figure 5.2 - Academic Literature
First Ten Categories

Key
a - Management and Leadership
b - Quality of Teaching
c - Management of the Learning Experience
d - Curriculum Management
e - Management of Monitoring and Evaluation
f - Provision for Staff Development
g - Students’ Standard of Achievement
h - Resources Management
i - Strategic Planning
j - Subject Knowledge
In addition to this, during the period covered by the academic literature current issues in education such as staff development and continuing professional development (CPD) appear not to have been given high priority. Therefore, the academic literature would also, understandably, not have been giving such great attention to professional development, as the strength of teaching was not linked in any significant way to students’ standard of achievement. There was no great emphasis on public accountability, which is now an issue associated with performance management. Performance management and inspections have contributed to the importance now given to subject knowledge with respect to pedagogy and the functions of subject leaders.

However, it must be pointed out that the observations in the findings, relating to what the academic literature considers to be the primary duties of subject leaders, maybe thought of by some educationalists to be theoretically based. Nevertheless, it can be reasoned justly that they are good practices, which have been identified through research into school effectiveness.

The TTA

The TTA, on the other hand, strongly emphasises the subject leaders’ role in managing the quality of teaching and give lesser emphasis to the other three common categories (see fig.5.1). Next is management of the learning experience, with management and leadership and students’ standard of achievement fairly close together. The TTA is responsible for setting the standards for the development of the role of subject leaders, who can be said to be at the heart of any school’s effort in
raising students’ achievement. The reason for this emphasis on the quality of teaching may be because the TTA had also developed the standards for teaching. Thus, it appears to have transferred many of the features linked to teaching into the framework it has formulated for subject leaders.

In contrast to the teaching, the management aspects are referred to less frequently in the TTA’s document (see fig. 5.3 below). It would be reasonable to assume that they would have been in a higher position in respect of the top ten categories given the central position that management and leadership would play in subject leaders’ role. In fact the quality of teaching is the only category that appears in over ten percent of the document (see figure 5.3 below).

![Figure 5.3 - TTA First Ten Categories](image)

**Key**

- a - Quality of Teaching
- c - Subject Knowledge
- e - Management and Leadership
- g - Curriculum Planning
- i - Aims and Objectives
- b - Management of the Learning Experience
- d - Target Setting
- f - Students’ Standard of Achievement
- h - Provision for Staff Development
- j – Attainment and Progress
The Ofsted Handbook

The third document, the Ofsted handbook, is strong on standards of achievement and the quality of teaching (see figure 5.4 below), as these two areas are given much greater emphasis than the other categories. It also gives significant emphasis to management and leadership and to a lesser extent the management of the learning experience. An explanation for this is that the purpose of the handbook is to direct inspectors on where they need to focus when evaluating subject departments in order to determine the quality of education schools are providing for their clients. Hence, this could be the reason why the handbook concentrates more on teaching and standard of achievement. Furthermore, it should be noted that sixty percent of the inspection time is spent in the classroom observing the quality of teaching and learning.

In addition to this, the Ofsted inspection process sees management and leadership as vital to the achievement of high standard in education. Therefore, this provides an explanation for the handbook also giving attention to issues of management and leadership, although they are not given as high a profile as students’ standard of achievement and quality of teaching.
The quality of teaching features strongly in all three documents, but is given higher priority both by the Ofsted handbook and the TTA. These two came into existence in a period of numerous government educational reforms that concentrated heavily on raising educational standards, which would inevitably involve the quality of teaching and learning.

Another important observation worth mentioning, although one might consider it self-evident, is that the three highest recorded departmental functions highlighted by the Ofsted handbook are standard of achievement, quality of teaching and management and leadership, which appears to mirror the key areas of the inspection procedure. Therefore, one can see the logical of the handbook’s guidance in adopting this structure.
A further point needs noting here. Management of the learning experience was emphasised strongly in the academic literature and less significantly in the TTA and to a lesser degree still in the Ofsted handbook. Again, it is confirmed here that academic research seems to focus more on the area of management as part of the important role of the subject leaders, while the Ofsted handbook pays more attention to the process and outcome of the subject leaders’ role. The TTA, however, concentrates on how subject leaders will work in their department to bring about effective teaching and learning.

It can be argued that these three documents set out their own expectations of what is required of subject leaders in their leadership role. In summary, these three bodies have common agreement on the essentials for effective subject leadership, as there is strong consensus on management and leadership and quality of teaching, but vary in the relative strength they attach to each category (see figure 5.1 above).

The Ofsted Reports
The third significant aspect is regarding the findings from the Ofsted reports. The reports have emphasised management issues as areas of serious concern in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role. Examples of some of these management issues are resources management, monitoring and evaluation, assessment and curriculum planning. In addition to this, it is important to note that assessment and pupils’ attainment and progress are ranked in the same position of third place as these two categories are linked to the achievement of higher educational standards. Gender differences came in ninth place as an area subject leaders need to give far more
attention. This is not surprising as the underachievement of boys, especially black African Caribbean boys, has been of great concern to educators and governments.

![Figure 5.5 - Ofsted Reports - First Ten Categories](image)

**Key**

a - Resources Management  
 b - Management of Monitoring and Evaluation  
 c - Assessment Management  
 d - Attainment and Progress  
 e - Curriculum Planning  
 f - Behaviour/Discipline  
 g - Curriculum Management  
 h - Examination Results  
 i - Gender Differences  
 j - Management and Leadership

Another significant point of the findings in relations to the first ten categories of the Ofsted reports is shown in figure 5.5 above. This shows that when one looks at what is happening in practice in schools, as opposed to the ideals and expectations promoted by the other three documents, there is for the Ofsted reports a uniform group of categories identified as areas which are major concerns to inspectors regarding the role of subject leaders. However, what is important to notice is that from these ten areas of concern there is no single issue, which stood out more than the others.
Although the categories identified as areas of serious concern in the Ofsted reports these categories are fairly evenly balanced. They are resources management, management of monitoring and evaluation and assessment are areas with relatively greater concerns where subject leaders need to improve. Management and leadership while still the area of least concern in the top ten categories, nonetheless, the findings are still suggesting that it is an area where subject leaders need to develop more effectiveness. Research on subject leaders reveals that they need more training in management and leadership (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989; Bennett, 1995; Harris, 2000).

The category of monitoring and evaluation is another aspect that the Ofsted reports consider to be a cause for serious concern and a high priority for improvement. It is ranked in second place in the top ten categories of the Ofsted reports and also appears in all the other documents. Both the academic literature and the Ofsted handbook ranked it in fifth place as an area of great importance with respect to the functions of subject leaders as it needs to be managed effectively. The TTA ranked it in eleventh place, giving it less priority for subject leaders in their departmental role. It appears that subject leaders are still struggling to develop the skills and competencies for a number of these management tasks.

From the evidence gathered on the Ofsted reports quality of teaching is not a cause for concern. However, behaviour/discipline and examination results are serious cause for concerns as they feature in sixth and eighth places respectively in the top ten categories where subject leaders are not performing well. Although teachers are generally meeting the criteria for satisfactory and above in their teaching, yet they are
coming up against challenging behaviour which also affect examination results. Part of the research was conducted in city schools with inner city characteristic where the pupil intake may have experienced adverse socio economic conditions. Thus, this has been impacted on the examination results. It is not surprising that many London schools are performing below the national standards.

The areas of curriculum planning and curriculum management are also serious cause for concern. They are fifth and seventh places respectively. They are consistently in the top ten categories of the expectation for the academic literature, TTA and the Ofsted handbook. Therefore, the fact that they are highlighted as areas of concerns make them key issues for consideration in respect of subject leaders' departmental role. They are also at the centre of the work of subject leaders.

With regard to the Ofsted reports intermediate categories (see figure 5.7 below) they are also heavily weighted to management and leadership issues, apart from expectations and homework. All the others are identified by the Ofsted reports as areas of concerns or need improving in respect of subject leaders in their leadership role: strategic planning, management of the learning experience, SEN/EAL, provision for staff development, students' standards of achievement, quality of teaching, target setting and subject knowledge.
It is quite clear that management issues dominate this middle group of the Ofsted reports. However, it should be pointed out that the categories addressed above show that subject leaders are more or less better in managing areas on the periphery of the curriculum. Subject leaders are however, weaker on direct management of the curriculum (see figure 5.6 above).

The final ten categories affect students' standards of achievement (see figure 5.8 below), but they are not a cause for concern. However, some do need improving. These relate to aspect of teaching quality and to a certain extent subject knowledge. A number of these teaching issues will not be of concern such as: classroom management, learning support, differentiation, ethnic differences and equal opportunities as they are linked to the teaching aspects of teaching which Ofsted considers to be sound. Furthermore, some of the other categories, such as team

---

**Figure 5.6 - Ofsted Reports Second Ten Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a - Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b - Management of the Learning Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c - SEN/EAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d - Provision for Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e - Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f - Homework Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g - Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h - Quality of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i - Target Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j - Subject Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Key

a - Strategic Planning  
b - Management of the Learning Experience  
c - SEN/EAL  
d - Provision for Staff Development  
e - Expectations  
f - Homework Management  
g - Students' Standard of Achievement  
h - Quality of Teaching  
i - Target Setting  
j - Subject Knowledge
building and motivation, inspectors would not automatically identify while carrying out a departmental inspection.

Figure 5.7 - Ofsted Reports Ten Final Categories

Key
a - Classroom Management
b - Learning Support
c - Differentiation
d - Ethnic Differences
e - Equal Opportunities
e - Ethnic Differences
f - Team Building
h - Aims and Objectives
j - Motivation of Staff

The areas that were mentioned the least were aims and objectives, gifted and talented, new staff induction, motivation and team building. Again it can be seen in figure 5.7 that half of the categories still relate to management issues of the subject leaders' roles. Some of these might be categories that inspectors may not have spent sufficient time investigating during an inspection. For example, ethnic differences and equal opportunities, which could be a reason why education inclusion is now a priority when schools are being inspected to see if subject leaders cater adequately for their students whatever their ability, class, race or background. Gifted and talented is a
fairly new initiate, however, inspectors are now asked to comment on this category to ensure that the needs of these students are catered for appropriately in schools.

It must be borne in mind that the TTA and Ofsted came into being as a result of government initiatives as education came high up on the government’s agenda. They have a shorter history, which has been affected by current reforms in education and as a result they tend to echo the government’s priorities especially in the area of management and leadership.

Summary of the four documents
The quality of teaching excludes some very important aspects of teaching that cannot be found from just observing lessons. In conducting classroom observations inspectors are unable to measure accurately such areas as attainment and progress and assessment. These areas need information to be gathered and evidence (in addition to classroom observations) such as the scrutiny of children’s work, teachers’ assessment profile of students’ work and interviews with students about their progress or lack of progress.

Subject knowledge is another category where the score is quite low, with the exception of the TTA, where it is ranked third. It is significant to note that both the Ofsted reports and the Ofsted handbook have subject knowledge in twentieth place and twenty-first place respectively. It can be reasoned that it is not an area given high priority by the inspection guidance. Neither is it an area of concern when it comes to inspection with Ofsted. The reason for this could be that subject leaders’ subject knowledge is quite sound, as they are usually subject specialists.
The analysis of the Ofsted reports in comparison to the academic literature reveal that the quality of teaching, standards of achievement and subject knowledge are areas causing less concern. These areas would have impact on the students’ standards of achievement, and this can be seen in the trend in GCSE results as they continue improving year on year.

Strategic planning is a fairly new development in school leadership. It is usually left to senior leaders to formulate and therefore not really fashionable for subject leaders to become involved in this area of their school’s work. However, strategic planning is now an area where subject leaders are expected to contribute in developing the work of their schools. It featured ninth in the academic literature and the Ofsted reports place it in eleventh place as an area where subject leaders need to develop in their departmental role. The TTA and the Ofsted handbook see strategic planning as less significant for subject leaders.

RELEVANT THEORIES TO THE FINDINGS
There are a number of relevant theories that support the findings from this research. From the analysis of the data collected four leading categories are common to all three bodies: management and leadership, quality of teaching, management of the learning experience and standard of achievement.

Management and Leadership
Research findings from the literature review support the observation that management and leadership as being one of the primary functions of the subject leader’s role,
emerging from the devolution and sharing of responsibilities with senior leaders. Bennett (1995) confirms from his research that the demands on senior leaders make it necessary for them to require the help of assistants at the middle management level who are able to translate and explain the work of individual departments in a practical way. Gunter and Rutherford (2000) agree with the concept of subject leaders being the guardians of professionalism for their departments. They argue that subject leaders should be able to manage their staff and resources to achieve high quality teaching. Busher and Harris (1999) comment on the subject leaders’ management role in respect of the curriculum by suggesting that they should play an increasing role in maintaining and improving the quality of curriculum provision and departmental performance. Bush and Wise (1999) establish from their study that schools today depend much more on subject leaders for their success and for effectively managing the process of change. This is irrespective of all the entire important roles subject leaders perform. Harris, Bucher and Wise (2001) reinforce this view. Subject leaders they found ‘... are important gate keepers to (the management of) change and development within the subject’ (page 84).

Another finding in support of subject leaders’ management and leadership role is keeping their subject departments under constant review (Ofsted (1997). Ofsted (1997) found that subject leaders are expected to support senior leaders in evaluating the performances of their departments as well as setting targets for improvement. Ofsted (1997) also found that departmental leaders who managed their departments well, delegated tasks to their team members, which helped to develop them professionally and unite the department. Ofsted (2002) suggests that good management of subject areas is a crucial factor for achieving school success. In
addition to this, the report highlights that where leadership and management are of a good standard one of the main factors that brings about success in subject areas is effective planning of teaching.

Theories and authorities referred to in the literature review that are relevant to the finding on management and leadership acknowledge the importance of this area in the role of subject leaders. Busher and Harris (1999) contend that the external influence has reinforced the hierarchical process of management of the curriculum, but has also evened out the imbalance of power between leaders and subordinates amongst staff in school organisations. Thus, it explains the growing recognition of the importance of subject leaders in today's school management process. Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) also agree on the importance of the management and leadership functions regarding subject leaders. Furthermore, as an example, they suggest the need for subject leaders to be able to know the Ofsted inspection criteria and to use that knowledge to support and guide colleagues on how to implement these requirements themselves when delivering lessons in the classroom.

Harris, Busher and Wise (2001) claim that the expectations of subject leaders have changed considerably because the leadership and management challenges they face are very demanding and wide-ranging. The TTA (1998) acknowledges that subject leaders have responsibility for the management of the subject curriculum, ensuring high quality teaching and taking part in the development of whole school policies. Therefore, management and leadership tasks are no longer the exclusive duties of senior leaders. Harris (2000) states that there is growing recognition that subject leaders contribution to and can make a difference in school effectiveness and
improvement if they manage their departments effectively. Busher and Harris (1999) assert that subject leaders provide the structures and organisation for managing teaching and learning, so that they can be monitored and evaluated systematically.

Earley et al. (2002) found that one of the main themes from their research showed that in exceptionally well-led schools headteachers consider subject leaders to be 'the experts’ in their subject areas. This was because these subject leaders were able to produce good results. Ofsted (2002) establishes that where leadership and management of a subject area are of a high quality astute planning of teaching is one of the common factors. Thus, the finding that leadership and management are crucial in respect of the subject leaders’ role endorses the principles behind these theories identified in the literature review.

Quality of Teaching

Quality of teaching is another of the four leading categories. For this area there are a number of research findings, which have been identified in the literature. Busher and Harris (1999) emphasise the significance of subject leaders monitoring the quality of teaching and learning, as they are held accountable for their curriculum areas’ performance. Although every teacher is a manager of learning, it is important that subject leaders know what is happening in the classroom of their departmental members (Bennett, 1995). In order to achieve this there needs to be a well planned monitoring and evaluation programme where time is given for classroom observations and feedback to teachers on their strengths and areas for improvement (Earley and Fletcher- Campbell, 1989).
Ofsted (1998) reports that monitoring standards and evaluating the quality of teaching are still weak aspects of the subject leaders’ role. However, one of the major constraints on subject leaders is lack of time to perform their management and leadership functions. The Cockcroft Report (1982), Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989) and Wise and Bush (1999) mention that this lack of time poses problems for subject leaders, as some of their duties such as classroom observation could not be achieved outside the normal school day.

Adey (2000) makes a salient point that all the four key areas of the TTA’s standards for subject leadership (strategic direction and development; teaching and learning; leading and managing staff; and efficient and effective development of staff and resources) are related directly to teaching and learning which are at the heart of the educational process. Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) affirm that outstanding departments have the ability to organise key elements of teaching and learning in an effective way, which matches the capacities and interest of the pupils. These departments took time and effort in selecting what to teach the students and ways of teaching them to enhance the students’ learning. Good teachers, Hopkins, West and Ainscow (1996) glean from research findings, explain to students what they are to learn, monitor their progress and provide valuable feedback to help them improve the quality of their work. Harris (1998) reiterates that the school improvement literature has consistently reinforced the importance of the quality of teaching and learning as means of improving schools.

There are a number of theories and authorities in the literature review on the aspect of quality of teaching that is supported by the findings of this research. Gunter and
Rutherford (2000) assert that subject leaders are expected to provide professional leadership and management to achieve high quality teaching. Wood and Orlik (1994) contend that Ofsted was created to assess and evaluate the quality of teaching and learning on a regularly basis to inform the government and the public on the quality of education being offered to pupils in schools. Lofthouse et al. (1995) are aware that subject leaders are in the best position to set the programme for teaching and learning, as they are able to influence the learning experience of the students. Bell (1991) is concerned that school management of the curriculum concentrates on the structure and process rather than focussing on how management can assist the process of teaching and learning. The educational literature stresses that subject leaders are usually knowledgeable about teaching in their particular subject specification. Thus, the findings, which place teaching amongst the core of the subject leaders' key responsibilities, affirm the above views.

Management of the Learning Experience

Management of the learning experience is the third category that the TTA, the academic literature and Ofsted have in common. The findings from the research show that subject leaders are expected to take an active part in the way they manage the learning experience in their individual departments. As an example, one area where the management of the learning experience is crucial is in respect of subject leaders preparing their department for an impending Ofsted inspection. Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) claim that effective departments were able to use the preparation for an Ofsted inspection to their advantage as it made them think about their policies and strategies. The subject leader's task is to support the team members and to commit their policies into practice within the department. This had a beneficial effect on the
department and, subject leaders were able to advise their departmental colleagues to ensure consistency in carrying out the process effectively. Another area that Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1997) highlighted was in respect of the National Curriculum where good subject leaders were managing the learning experience effectively, as they are expected to ensure that pupils experience an educational diet that is broad, balance and relevant.

The ERA (1988) transformed the role of subject leaders especially in their responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the learning experience in their department. Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989) postulate that a good subject leader will be aware that review and evaluation of the learning experience in subject departments are essential for improving the quality and delivery of the curriculum. DES (1985) identifies the fact that subject leaders have insufficient time for planning and development of the curriculum. As a result, important tasks such as evaluating the curriculum, department reviews and staff development could not be carried out effectively and efficiently. Hence, it demonstrates the important role of subject leaders for planning and evaluating the learning experience.

Bennett (1995) detects in his research that subject leaders were reluctant to carry out classroom observation on their departmental colleagues. Instead, they chose indirect method such as lesson plans and pupil assessment to monitor the quality of the learning experience. This underlines the crucial need for subject leaders' perception to be brought in line with the new demands required for their role.
The theories and leading opinions that relate to the management of the learning experience focus mainly on keeping the subject departments under constant review to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Coleman, Middlewood and Bush (1995) maintain that subject leaders have a responsibility to ensure that the whole curriculum experienced by pupils should be enriching so that they continue learning beyond school.

Good quality leadership depends upon subject leaders having a sound understanding of the curriculum area for which they hold responsibility. They also have to be good at people management skills and be able to management the resources effectively and efficiently (Glatter, 1988). Gold (1998) confirms that in the educational literature subject leaders are expected to take the lead in evaluation and planning the learning for their subject area. In managing the learning experience subject leaders ought to know the individual strengths and weaknesses of their departmental members and the quality of the education being delivered by them (Wise and Bush, 1999). Classroom observation is one way in which subject leaders can assess the learning experience in their department, but they need time, within the normal school day, to carry out this type of activity (Ofsted, 1997). Hence, it can be seen that subject leaders are now taking on some of the management roles, which were usually discharged by senior leaders (Brown and Rutherford, 1996).

Students' Standard of Achievement

The final area in the four leading categories is students' standard of achievement. The effective management of a subject department should lead to the raising of students' standard achievement. This is why this category is an important one as the whole
purpose of education is to improve student achievement. Adey (2000) comments that the TTA's standards relate to teaching and learning and, therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the quality of teaching and students' standard of achievement, in order to set targets for improvement. Earley and Fletcher-Campbell (1989) confirm that subject leaders are the key to improving the quality of the learning process in any school. Two years earlier the DES (1987), established that subject leadership is one of the most important posts in a school to bring about improvement in students' academic achievement. Ramsey and Oliver (1995) emphasise that students achieve more when their teachers are carefully organise, through the subject department, and so that their curriculum experience are sequenced appropriately. Joyce et al. (1992) claim that students' achievement is also enhanced when teachers in the department encourage cooperative learning approaches such as peer teaching, peer marking or pupils working in a group sharing experiences.

Theories and authorities, which relate to improving students' standard of achievement, tend to highlight the importance of the subject leaders' role in managing the curriculum. The TTA (1998) acknowledges the role of subject leaders in securing improved standards of achievement for pupils. Gunter and Rutherford (2000) confirm this as they state that subject leaders are to provide professional leadership and management to achieve improved standards of learning. Ofsted is committed to working with LEAs and schools at the department level to improve educational standards (Ofsted, 2002). Harris, Jamieson and Russ (1996) assert that effective teachers are good managers of learning as they motivate, inspire and challenge pupils to achieve their full potential. In support of this, Lofthouse et al. (1995) postulate that the curriculum delivery is the responsibility of the individual
teacher and the quality of the learning depends upon the skill of the teacher. Therefore, it can be seen that the importance of standard of achievement as one of the dominant aspects of subject leaders' role has been supported by a number of research findings linked to this theme. Furthermore, the findings also provide confirmation to certain theories and authorities in this specific area of educational standards.

Before moving on to the findings relating to the Ofsted reports it should be noted (as already discussed) that although the three bodies, the TTA, the academic literature and the Ofsted handbook agree on four leading areas of the subject leaders' role, their order of ranking them do differ. For example, management and leadership has first ranking for the academic literature while the TTA places quality of teaching at the top of its categories and the Ofsted handbook emphasis both standard of achievement and quality of teaching. Having already discussed these with reference to supporting findings, relevant theories and authorities, there will be no further need to continue to analyse them.

Discussion of Findings on the Ofsted Reports

The findings of the Ofsted reports used in this research relate to two London boroughs with contrasting examination results and other factors such as socio-economic differences. The findings of the study relating to the Ofsted reports demonstrate that subject leaders were not as effective in a number of key areas relating to their management role. These are as follows (see Figure: 5.5): resources management, management of monitoring and evaluation, assessment, attainment and progress, curriculum planning, behaviour/discipline, curriculum management, examination results, gender differences and management and leadership. As mentioned earlier, all
these categories are management related issues. In the context of the leadership role of subject leaders this result has far reaching implications, as it has to be implied from the findings that subject leaders are failing on one of their most important functions. Thus, in relation to this study the observation merits further explanation.

Reforming the area of curriculum leadership has been a relatively new feature coming out of the ERA, 1988. Prior to that, the equivalent function in this area was that of the head of department concept, but it has to be recognised that heads of department in those days carried very little strategic and management responsibilities. However, the ERA, 1988 in effect brought about a redefinition of the heads of departments’ role. Hence, the new description of subject leaders, which has replaced the term ‘heads of department’. The Act, in setting up the National Curriculum programme, made it necessary for schools to have a more structured middle management system that would provide accountability to headteachers, governors, LEAs and the government for the implementation of its curriculum reform programme. However, the change in the role of subject leaders was not accompanied by adequate provisions to prepare them for the new challenges they now had to face. This deficiency has found the attention of key writers in this field. Some of their observations are expressed below as part of the discussion of the findings.

Harris (2000) claims that very little was done to develop these curriculum leaders’ management and leadership skills by schools, LEA and the government. Harris, Busher and Wise (2001) claim that the area of management and leadership poses a test for subject leaders, as it is extensive and demanding. One reason for this could be that subject leaders are unclear about the support they could expect from the school’s
Leadership Team (LT) (Wallace, 1989; Bennett, 1995), but in all fairness the LT was rarely given support to enable it to take initiatives in assisting subject leaders in their management tasks (Bennett, 1995). Another area was the difficulty subject leaders face in planning and delivering a subject and then having the task to place their work appropriately in the whole school context (Gold, 1998). A third point, which affected the way subject leaders function, is the lack of time given to them to carry out their management and leadership duties such as the tasks of planning and development of the curriculum (Bennett, 1995; Wise and Bush, 1999; Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989; DES, 1985). Bennett (1995) is concerned that senior leaders do not recognise the significant role of subject leaders in assisting the LT in transmitting the vision of the school in a practical way. This may have contributed to the weaknesses highlighted by the Ofsted reports.

There is no doubt that the lack of training opportunities available to subject leaders has affected their performance in key management and leadership tasks. The DfES (2001) acknowledges the weaknesses in the performance of subject leaders and inadequate training for their role. As a result, the government has mandated the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) to provide training programmes for subject leaders in respect of management and leadership. In addition to this, the shift in the subject leaders' role means that it is essential to keep their subject area under review by having a systematic programme of monitoring and evaluation (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989), especially with the introduction of performance management (Hammond and Harris, 2000).
The theories and leading opinions, which support the findings in this study on the role of subject leaders, confirm that they had inadequate training in leadership and were therefore found ineffective. Lofthouse et al. (1995) argue that there needs to be a distinction between what the role of subject leaders should be and what research highlights as constraints which may well prevent them undertaking challenging and extensive duties. Harris (2000) comments that subject leaders need to contribute to strategic planning. A further point that needs to be mentioned is that the literature reveals that subject leaders have a dual role. They have to interpret policies for their team members and present the department views to the LT. However, the Ofsted reports do not confirm these expectations. Nevertheless, Harris, Busher and Wise (2001) highlight that management cannot be the exclusive right of the LT. They, the subject leaders, have the responsibility to translate policy into practice such as gender issues, curriculum planning and curriculum management. Thus, the weaknesses highlighted by the Ofsted reports have found a measure of support amongst the opinions of a substantial number of writers in the literature on education.

**IMPLICATIONS**

**Management and Leadership**

The implications from this study on what criteria make effective subject leaders can be established from the research findings. Firstly, the study makes it clear that subject leaders need training and skill development in management and leadership within their curriculum area. This area is of paramount importance if they are to be held accountable for the management of the curriculum planning for the subject area and its implementation and monitoring. They are also accountable for the professional development of their team members. It follows from this that subject leaders should
delegate some core tasks to other members and establish lines of communication for reviewing the work of the department. As leaders, the subject specialists should be clear of the direction they want to steer their department in terms of having the ability to share their vision with their colleagues and further develop their departments' performance. Subject leaders are in the best position to play a key role in ensuring that their departmental members provide the best learning opportunities for all students whatever their ability. As a result, they need to have good interpersonal relationship to try and develop working arrangements in order to achieve school and departmental goals, which will bring about improved students' performance. A final area of accountability is in respect of implementing school policies at the department level to ensure that they are followed consistently.

Being the leading professional in their department implies that subject leaders will have to work closer with the LT. Their role has changed from being head of a department to one where they are expected to contribute to the formulation of the school’s vision/mission direction as well as take an active part in whole school planning and development. This will give them a sense of ownership and as a result they will be able to direct staff in the effective execution of these duties.

The appointment and recruitment of subject leaders have implications for schools today. When appointing subject leaders schools need to look for people who have the quality to lead and manage a subject area effectively. Added to this, they must be able to contribute to strategic matters and the organisation’s decision-making process. In addition to this, schools should consider their potential to become school leaders in the future and invest in their development and create further opportunities for
extending their experiences. An example could be to have subject leaders taking turns to serve on the LT for about a half term. Another initiative, which may be considered, is to have subject leaders join the LT for whole school development planning.

Quality of Teaching

The second area in respect of the implication of the findings is in respect of the quality of teaching. Due to the nature of the subject leaders' role members of their department view them as expert practitioners in the subject area. Good subject leaders will encourage other teachers to observe them teach and promote the idea of team members observing each other. They are expected to have a good track record in terms of teaching by being effective in their own classroom work, good role models and having good subject knowledge. They have to keep abreast of the development in the curriculum area in which they hold responsibility, as they are to be at the forefront of managing change.

Subject leaders need to be good motivators to inspire their staff in raising the standard of teaching. Time should be set aside for working collaboratively, planning and developing the work of the department, and the sharing of ideas to enhance the potential of the departmental members. These will provide the opportunities for pedagogic partnership amongst the department to extend and develop good practice in the teaching team.

In order to monitor the quality of teaching in departments subject leaders have to be competent in doing lesson observations, which should inform the teacher observee about both the strengths demonstrated in the lesson, and the areas that need
improvement in the quality of teaching. It is important for subject leaders to appraise the quality of teaching in their subject area, so that they have a clear understanding of the level of uniformity and consistency in implementing the departmental policies and practices in the classroom. Furthermore, subject leaders are able to judge the quality of teaching experienced by the students.

Successful subject leaders are expected to have a sound knowledge of the Ofsted process and criteria for judging departments, so that they are able to advise their team members on how to interpret and implement the required demands effectively. Knowing what to expect in undergoing an Ofsted inspection can alleviate some of the stress teachers will experience. In preparing for the inspection, subject leaders need to involve the whole department. The department should undergo a complete departmental review where every team member is involved through the process. This will enable all members to have a good understanding of the department's practices and policies. High quality management and leadership at the middle management level of school organisations must raise the quality of subject teaching.

Management of the Learning Experience
The third area relating to the implications of this research is the management of the learning experience. Subject leaders are expected to allocate and utilise the resources in the school to support the learning experience of students. Good subject leaders will manage the resources for the advantage of the whole department and also for the benefit of the students, so that it enhances their learning. One area where subject leaders have been criticised is in the use of information and communication technology (ICT). Ofsted inspectors have criticised them for not using ICT to
complement students' learning. Many departments are still not using ICT to support and aid learning or incorporating tasks so that ICT can be used in their schemes of work. Therefore, subject leaders will need to implement and manage ICT in students' learning programmes. As well as ICT, subject leaders will have to find new and creative ways in managing other resources such as the library.

Target setting has become important in managing and monitoring students' progress. Having systematic reviews will help subject leaders manage the learning experience in a structured and organised fashion. At any one time the department should know at what grade or level the students are achieving in their curriculum area. There are three ways of achieving this. The first is keeping records of the students' work. The subject leader should require records from each subject teacher with detailed assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the individual pupils they teach. The second is having regular learning reviews, where students are involved with reviewing their own work and setting targets for improvement. Subject leaders are able to monitor the pupils' learning outcome and improvements in the pupils' quality of work. The test for subject leaders is to see how they use the data collected from the learning review to improve students' performance in their subject area. A third is having detailed schemes of work that the departmental members have worked on collaboratively to produce or revise them either as a whole team or in smaller groups. This will give the staff members a feeling of ownership of these important documents.

Classroom observation is another method subject leaders should use to track students' progress in their learning when managing the learning experience. In this way subject leaders are able to help teachers to be effective with their teaching and pedagogic
Subject leaders have an essential part to play in making sure that their colleagues provide good quality learning experience for students. From another angle, subject leaders will need to ensure that they motivate the students in their department to become effective learners. One way to achieve this is in involving the students in special ways of working to bring about successful examination results. Another means to accomplish this is by the celebration of achievement through the giving of certificates and creating a portfolio of a record of achievement in the subject area. A third is to encourage team members to offer students regular feedback on their progress and achievement.

Forging links with the local community and other outside bodies such as other schools and community groups is another way to promote learning and extend the students’ experience beyond the school. All this adds to the ethos of a department where learning is valued and managed well. This is why good resource allocation, having agreed schemes of work, informative record keeping of students’ work and systematic review of students progress are all important in managing the learning experience of students.

**Students’ Standard of Achievement**

The final category in regard to the implication of this study is students’ standard of achievement. Subject leaders have the responsibility and are held accountable for the quality of student learning in their department. First and foremost they have to ensure that they are implementing the National Curriculum such as the national literacy and numeracy strategies. Subject leaders have to monitor the attainment and progress of
students to calculate whether or not the department is adding value to their students' performance.

Target setting, although mentioned above, is also an important area in managing students' achievement. It is important here because students need to be actively involved in reviewing and reflecting on their achievement whether good or poor. Subject leaders have to enforce that students take part in self-evaluation and are given the opportunity to action plan and set targets to improve their achievement in their subject areas.

Linked with target setting is comparing the data with other departments within the school, locally and nationally, so that subject leaders can monitor how well (or poorly) their departments are achieving in respect of the type of school, locality and students' standard of achievement. Furthermore, it is essential that subject leaders advocate working collaboratively with other departments in the school on school improvement strategies for the benefit of the students such as ICT, the special needs and Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) departments.

Finally, another way in which subject leaders can encourage teachers in their department to improve students' achievement is for them to undertake pilot studies/research in their own classrooms using new and creative methods of teaching to ascertain if they can bring about improvement in learning. This gives teachers the opportunity to become engage in developing themselves professionally using different means of investigating how they perform in the classroom and what they can do to
enhance their curriculum delivery to achieve better standard of achievement for their students.

Subject leaders do have powerful influence over classroom practices within their individual subject departments and they are held accountable for the performance of their department that is why they must be knowledgeable about what is happening in their subject areas. If good practices are being carried out they should be shared, but where there needs to be improvement every effort should be made to eradicate poor practices.

**TTA and Ofsted**

These two agencies came out of government initiatives to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools in England. There are important implications in respect of these two bodies.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter and in the findings chapter, the quality of teaching is accentuated more than any other category in the TTA document. The TTA needs to broaden its emphasis by enhancing the other three leading categories to widen the perspective and highlight the significant features of the subject leaders’ leadership role.

The findings from the Ofsted reports reveal that the TTA may have to consider taking on board the observation that management and leadership is an area of deficiency in respect of subject leaders and therefore, need special treatment and focus. To achieve this, the TTA would have to revise the subject leaders’ standards making sure that
they are more in keeping with the expectations of the subject leaders’ role as brought about by the ERA (1988) and the concept of devolved leadership.

Earlier, reference was made to the DfES willingness to work with the NCSL ‘to develop a national programme of training for those with subject leadership responsibilities in school outside the senior management team.’ The TTA may want to introduce a formalised training programme for subject leaders in collaboration with the NCSL focussing on areas to help improve subject leadership.

The implications from the findings for Ofsted are mainly to do with the subject leaders and their role in managing the curriculum. It is necessary to reiterate an important one here, and that is at present the Ofsted handbook does not have a specific section that deals exclusively with subject leaders. Instead, reference is made to the overall school leadership, but, by implication, it can be applied to subject leadership. Maybe in revising the Ofsted handbook for the future, Ofsted needs to consider including a section (or sections) that deal specifically with the subject leaders’ leadership role.

The Ofsted handbook mentions a number of management related issues, but it needs to emphasise those other crucial management functions into the guidelines especially at the departmental level. This will, therefore, make them more prominent for Ofsted inspectors to focus on when evaluating subject leaders’ work and how they manage their department. Therefore inspectors will not need to concentrate so heavily on resources management. At present there is very little on the strategic role of the subject leaders and how they manage and lead their departments. In addition to this,
there should be at least a full paragraph in the handbook about the leadership and management aspect of subject leaders in the section on ‘How the school is managed and led?’

Furthermore, the Ofsted handbook may need to give more guidance to inspectors on how to evaluate subject leaders’ role more effectively, so that it is in line with the new functions they have to undertake. This is to remove the current reliance by inspectors on the interviews they have with subject leaders. It will also be appropriate to interview the line managers about the roles and duties of subject leaders and how they carry out their responsibilities. Furthermore, subject leaders will need to be more focused on other departmental colleagues especially those with management responsibilities to ascertain a more accurate judgement on how the departments are led and managed.

CRITIQUE of the RESEARCH METHOD

The research design used in this study was a structured content analysis using Bailey’s (1982) model. The three agencies’ documents that were analysed focused on subject leaders in their leadership role either directly or by implication. Although it was the only method used it employed both qualitative and quantitative research techniques to achieve triangulation. This research also used a combination of historical and descriptive approaches. From an historical perspective, this study interpreted events from the past as it analysed twenty original Ofsted reports from two London LEAs. The descriptive element of the research analysed, described and interpreted the position of subject leaders in their leadership role.
There were several advantages in using the structured content analysis approach for this study. Firstly, this method is suitable and effective for a small-scale research. Using the structured content analysis method enabled the researcher to produce good quality data on the role of the subject leaders as perceived by the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature. A second advantage is to do with the rich data collected. Apart from producing the results implied from the research, that is, it provided data showing the extent to which there is agreement on what are the essentials of the role of subject leaders, the research also provided additional data on the extensive range of responsibilities subject leaders are expected to perform. Thirdly, documentary analysis is relatively efficient to manage, as the time needed to collect the data was not over excessive. A fourth advantage is that access to the data was fairly easy as they are available for use by the public from the TTA and Ofsted, and libraries in the case of the academic literature. The final advantage is related to time and cost. The methodology proved an inexpensive way of collecting the data. It did not involve interviewing of key personal in the schools and it did not involve the cost of posting questionnaires.

One criticism of the study is that it only applied one method to carry out the research. The research could have included questionnaires to subject leaders and other key figures within their school organisation such as the headteacher and subject leaders’ line managers. This could have again provided different perspectives on the subject leaders’ role. Furthermore, interviews with subject leaders and other significant post holders could have given additional insight into how they perceive their new role and compare it with how other people view their performance.
Another criticism is that the twenty Ofsted reports were drawn from only two London LEAs for this study. The sample could have been extended to four LEAs to widen the representation of it and to strengthen the validity and reliability of the data collected. The number of schools could have also been increased from twenty to thirty. This would have also provided the research instrument with a wider pool and given more consistency in the data collection process. Doing this may have strengthened the reliability of the data collected.

A final criticism has to do with coding the categories used in the research. Despite the use of an experienced researcher in designing and sampling the categories the author feels that there may be some degree of subjectivity in judging where to place these items. For example, some of the categories could overlap and what they mean could also be subject to different interpretations.

One point that needs to be made which emerged by analysing the documents is that although the two contrasting LEAs were chosen in terms of pupils’ academic achievement and socio-economic backgrounds the findings reveal that subject leaders were weak on a substantial amount of managerial issues. However, this provides another justification to the idea of having a larger number of LEAs in the sample.

**Summary**

The analysis of the findings shows that TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature do have some leading categories in common with respect to subject leaders in their management role. However, they do vary according to the emphasis they place on each one. The academic literature tends to focus strongly on management and
leadership, the TTA on the quality of teaching and the Ofsted handbook on the standards of pupil achievement and to a slightly lesser degree the quality of teaching. As each of the agencies emphasise different items this could be disconcerting for educational policy makers, governors and headteachers who, in appropriate ways are responsible for formulating job descriptions, duties and responsibilities for subject leaders. In respect of the Ofsted reports, the emphasis usually relate to management issues, in which subject leaders appear to be weak. However, the categories when applied to the Ofsted reports tend to be fairly uniform in what they judged to be the ten significant areas of concerns to inspectors.

Although these documents set out their individual expectations for subject leaders in their management role the quality of teaching is fairly constant in them. Furthermore, from the analysis of the findings the area of management and leadership stands out strongly as one of the key functions of subject leaders. This is in keeping with the redefinition of their role, as subject leaders have to take on some of the management tasks, which were under the domain of the LT. The devolving of management related duties from LT to middle management is due mainly to the external pressures on schools to raise the standards in both teaching and learning.

It is clear from the three agencies that effective management and leadership of a department is a challenging and demanding one in the present educational climate. There is growing recognition of the importance of subject leaders in the process of school management and leadership. The academic literature reiterates over and over again that it has been recognised in the educational field that schools depend more on their subject leaders to bring about school improvement. Therefore, schools will need
to work on improving the management of subject departments and by implication the effectiveness of subject leaders in their curriculum role.

After analysing the research findings consideration will be given in the conclusion and recommendations of the study in order to offer ideas together with solutions for improving the leadership role of subject leaders.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The study was undertaken to identify and evaluate the extent to which the criteria of the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature agree on what are the essential functions for effective subject leadership in London secondary schools. The writer is interested in the new emphasis placed on subject leaders in raising educational standards. Analysing the documents of the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature gave some understanding about the criteria, which make effective subject leadership in London secondary schools. By using these three documents the writer was able to gain insight about the challenging and extensive duties now expected from subject leaders with inappropriate preparation and inadequate training. The lack of support given to subject leaders is highlighted by the academic literature and borne out by the findings of this research. In examining the documents it is clear that subject leaders were ill prepared for the complexity of this management role. Many of the areas the Ofsted reports found subject leaders weak or ineffective in were mainly management functions.

In this chapter a brief review will be undertaken of the previous five chapters. Next, it will concentrate on the general conclusions drawn from the research. Following on from this it will be highlighted how this research can contribute to the field of education and then go on to offer some recommendations for improving the situation for subject leaders. Finally, ideas for further research will be presented.
Chapter one discusses the historical perspective regarding the concerns about the type of curriculum experience that was being offered to students in England. At first it was the children’s home background that was being blamed for their poor performance. The idea was dismissed when during the 1970s and 1980s educational researchers found that schools can make a difference to the academic performance of students (Rutter et al., 1979; Mortimore et al., 1988). Emerging out of this view was the concept of school improvement and school effectiveness movements. Later on, other studies such as Mangan et al. (1990) and Reynolds et al. (1996) confirmed that socially disadvantage children could improve their academic performance despite the circumstances of their home background.

As a result of this, the government, industry and the general public felt that schools were not providing an education that would equip students adequately for a technological age and many of them were leaving school not being competent in the basic skills. There was also disquiet about the low performance of children in England compared to their European counterparts.

Central government decided to take control of the school curriculum and as a result the ERA (1988) was passed. Every since then governments have tried to improve the quality of education offered in schools to redress the poor performance of pupils. As a consequence, they introduced copious initiatives and agencies such as Ofsted and the TTA to monitor the performance of schools and establish standards for teachers. Subject leaders in secondary schools found themselves at the forefront of these changes and in addition to this there was a redefinition of their role, which distributed management responsibilities to them. These subject leaders found themselves being
held accountable for the performance of the students in their department and having to manage and lead their departmental members in order to bring about improved teaching and learning.

The second chapter reviews the literature on curriculum management and is structured using Lawton's (1983) five level model of curriculum control from central government down to the individual classroom teacher. However, a substantial amount of the literature focused on subject leaders in their management and leadership role. It is at the middle management level that the subject leaders have to translate government policies into practice. The educational literature acknowledges the importance of the subject leaders' role in raising students' achievement (Harris, 2000). However, they need time to carry out their management functions efficiently and effectively (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989; Bennett, 1995; Wise and Bush, 1999). Furthermore, subject leaders are seen as intermediaries between the LT and the teachers in their department (Bennett, 1995).

Chapter three concentrates on the research methodology of documentary analysis using the structured content analysis approach that gave quantitative data from written documents. Triangulation was achieved by combining quantitative and qualitative research method in this study. The work centred around the TTA, Ofsted and the academic literature documents to find out if all the agencies were concentrating on the same criteria to guide and support subject leaders in their demanding role of managing the curriculum at the department level. Reliability and validity were both achieved, for example, the documents had face validity and the research used a pilot study, which is one way of checking for reliability. The chapter further discussed the
advantages and disadvantages of the method and concluded that structured content analysis was the best research method to use in analysing the data and in extracting the information. At the end of the chapter an explanation was given on how the data was analysed.

Following on from that, chapter four, dealt with the findings from the research. The findings established that there was some agreement amongst the agencies about what they considered to be important qualities for effective subject leaders. Despite the fact that there was general accordance of the three documents, they do however vary in the categories they give most emphasis. The Ofsted reports, on the other hand, evaluated the performance of subject leaders in their management role to highlight where they were effective and what areas of their work needed improvement.

In chapter five the findings were analysed to see what further information could be gleaned from the documents. Four leading categories emerged which were common to the three bodies. In addition, the analysis drew attention to the categories that were strongly emphasised by each agency to the exclusion of the others, with the exception of the Ofsted handbook, where students' standard of achievement and the quality of teaching were recorded almost the same amount of times. The quality of teaching was the only category that was fairly constant throughout the three documents. In the case of the Ofsted report, the categories were fairly uniform as none featured more strongly than the rest.
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The government is determined to raise educational standards in Britain. Therefore, it is evident that it is searching for more effective ways of achieving higher academic performance for all pupils (Bushe and Harris, 1999). As a result, it is inevitable that schools will continue to face a variety of changes in the future, so that students’ achievement improve and are maintained at a high level. This is especially so for secondary schools in London where there is great mobility in admission and as subject leaders have to cater for a diverse student population where they have to manage and support a curriculum that needs to cater for a cultural and a diverse population. To accomplish this aim many government initiatives and schemes have aimed at improving the quality of leadership and management at the whole school level. However, the LTs need the assistance of middle managers/subject leaders within the school organisation to support them in implementing government initiatives and policies to bring about improved standards of achievement as the increase in management tasks have been considerable.

Subject leaders are uniquely placed in the school organisation to support the LT, as they are the leading professionals in their department and considered to be the expert practitioners. The demands brought about by the National Curriculum made it of paramount importance that subject leaders having specialist knowledge, would have to take a major role in managing its implementation (Wise and Bush, 1999). However, it is clear from the academic literature and research that to be effective subject leaders need training and time, sometimes within the school day to carry out their management tasks (Earley and Fletcher-Campbell, 1989; Bennett, 1995; Wise and Bush, 1999). The shift to a more managerial stance involves the systematic
monitoring of teaching and learning in the subject area. This management function will become more important as a result of performance management.

There are a number of salient points that can be drawn from this research. Firstly, from the findings of this study, it has been established that the functions of subject leaders are quite varied and wide-ranging. This has been substantiated from the thirty categories developed for the purpose of this research. On examination of the categories it is possible to classify them further under four main headings: management and leadership, curriculum, teaching and learning and professional development. It can be seen that these four areas give a clear indication of the key responsibilities subject leaders will have to undertake in their leadership role.

The second is, connected to the three agencies and their role in curriculum management. The agencies, the TTA, Ofsted, and the academic literature, are not only distinct bodies in their own right, but have different functions and priorities. The TTA is concern about standards in respect of subject leaders’ in their leadership role; Ofsted gives guidelines on how to evaluate subject leaders’ performance during an inspection; and the academic literature tends to concentrate on research findings on post holders at the middle management level. Hence, the different emphasis they give would reflect the precedence they have on their own work. The research established, however, that despite the variation there is still convergence amongst the three of them. For example, they have four leading functions of the subject leaders’ role in common: students’ standard of achievement, management of the learning experience, quality of teaching and management and leadership (see figure 5.1).
The above categories are influenced by the input and output factors. Management of the learning experience and management and leadership are both about managing the input factor. Students' standard of achievement and the quality of teaching are output factors. They are both central to the learning process and thereby responsible for standards of teaching and learning. To be effective, subject leaders must broadly influence both the input and output factors. In this way they are able to influence the process of learning and the outcome from that process. Therefore, subject leaders cannot escape their responsibilities for shaping the learning process of their department, as their role is intrinsically linked to both the input and output factors of the learning process.

Another important point arises, from the Ofsted reports' perspective on how subject leaders perform in practice. There is a discrepancy between the theory and practice in respect of the subject leaders' roles and responsibilities as illustrated by the Ofsted reports. The theory is quite different from what is actually happening in schools. From the Ofsted reports it appears that middle managers are not coping as well as they are expected to in the present educationally climate. The Ofsted reports reflect the general practice in middle management role for those who have responsibility for managing a department. The reports clearly single out the weaknesses in subject leaders performance of their management roles.

From the reports analysed in this research it seems as if subject leaders are not yet managers in the true sense of the function. They need development in a range of managerial areas and skills. They appear to be struggling with the heavy teaching workload coupled with the lack of time to carry out their management responsibilities.
The Ofsted reports inform about subject leaders strengths and weaknesses, but offer no support in helping to eradicate the weaknesses subject leaders demonstrate during the inspection. In addition to this, subject leaders are in a leadership position with little, if any, training and without any adequate preparation for the management duties they have to be engaged in.

The final salient point has to do with the transitional problems subject leaders have to face. Subject leaders are having difficulties making the change from what was once the resource coordinator of heads of department to the more management and leadership role they now have to assume. This is because of the copious initiatives and heavy management and leadership tasks school have to grapple with. Subject leaders now have to manage their implementation in the current educational climate of continuous changes.

CONTRIBUTION to the FIELD of EDUCATION

There are five main contributions this study will make to the field of education in respect of secondary schools in London. The first is by giving more clarity and help in shaping the new evolving role of subject leaders in their management and leadership functions. In this thesis it emphasises strongly the nature of leadership and management as being significant to the role of subject leaders. The study will also promote the management and leadership angle of the role of subject leaders. No other study has tried to define the subject leaders role in terms of the four key areas of responsibilities: management and leadership, curriculum, teaching (in terms of delivery) and learning, and professional development. These four key functions of the subject specialists are identified through the categories selected for this research.
What will now be needed are the specific tasks, which clarify the functions of the new role as discussed in this research.

Secondly, this study is unique, as no other study has tried to capture the essential of the job descriptions of the subject leaders based on the information from the academic literature. Using the categories and the findings from the research can help to clarify the content of a job description in specific terms for subject leaders.

Another contribution concerns the Ofsted reports. When Ofsted inspectors are evaluating the performance of subject leaders in their subject areas, they refer to their strengths and weaknesses in terms of how they manage and lead their departments. This study is able to pinpoint some of the reasons behind the weaknesses of subject leaders in their role. It is able to give insight into the observation made by the Ofsted inspectors as it focuses on why there are weaknesses. Some of the weaknesses are out of the subject leaders’ control, such as not having formal training for their management and leadership role and insufficient time to carry out these tasks together with their heavy teaching load. Other factors are to do with the professional knowledge and skills subject leaders are expected to have in managing and leading their departments, such as good interpersonal skills and team building.

Fourthly, the information from the study may provide valuable insight, in some modest way, for bodies such as the TTA and the NCSL who will be preparing subject leaders for this important role. Using the materials in this study these training bodies will be able to identify and refine essential areas for subject leaders’ professional development. The need for adequate training for subject leaders in management and
leadership is paramount. They need to ensure that they can interpret the perspectives and policies of the LT into the practices of the individual teachers at the classroom level (Bush and Harris, 1999). In other words, they will be held accountable for their departments’ performance. Undergoing good quality training as envisaged by the present government will enable subject leaders to understand the different and wide-ranging functions of their role. This study highlights the diverse functions that subject leaders have to discharge in their capacity as curriculum leaders.

The final contribution to the field of education is connected to the fourth point mentioned above in an indirect manner. It concerns the area of distributive leadership as the training programmes will have to take this concept on board when preparing for other leadership positions in schools, especially the role of subject leaders. Therefore, this study is broadening the understanding of management and leadership in education as it suggests that school leadership should be more broadly embraced to include leadership at middle management level (Bush and Harris, 1999). Here, the emphasis is on shared devolved leadership where there is a clear distinction between the leadership functions of the LT and middle managers. Having this clarity is a necessary prerequisite, so that subject leaders know what is expected of them in the area of leadership.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The prime purpose of the five recommendations that will be put forward is to develop subject leaders to become more effective in their management and leadership roles. The first is regarding the different agencies that have direct responsibilities in developing the role of subject leaders and the proposal for training providers to
establish the government’s national programmes for subject leaders. These bodies, such as the TTA, NCSL, Ofsted and research institutions will need to collaborate in the key areas to be incorporated into the courses. This cross fertilisation amongst the agencies and providers is imperative as a framework is necessary in establishing consistency in content and appropriateness for the training programmes. The agencies and providers may have to take into account the need to concentrate more fervently on the areas of leadership and management for subject leaders as the academic literature makes it plain that leadership extends beyond the LT and encompasses other levels of leadership within the school organisation (Harris et al., 2001). The government envisages training providers networking to deliver coherent and relevant programmes to benefit subject leaders in their leadership and management functions. Therefore, the aims of this recommendation is to bring more cohesion and perspectives into the design and implementation of these new initiatives, which are expected to develop the skills and attributes of subject leaders. Ultimately, this is intended to secure higher student achievement by meeting specific organisational, curriculum and pedagogical objectives (Harris et al., 2001).

At present there is no section within the Ofsted handbook that provides guidance for Ofsted inspectors in evaluating subject leaders. The assessment of their role is done by implication using the framework for the LT. Therefore, the second recommendation would be to have the Ofsted handbook revised and incorporate a section for evaluating subject leaders and how they are leading and managing their departments. In the light of the findings from this research, especially in respect of the Ofsted reports, subject leaders are weak in management areas. However, on closer examination of the findings from the Ofsted reports, schools do not give
sufficient priority to the management and leadership duties for subject leaders, that would ensure that the reports present a more balanced account of the work of subject leaders. Therefore, a revised Ofsted handbook should give emphasis and priority to leadership and management aspects of subject leaders’ performance.

A third recommendation refers to the actual evaluation of subject leaders by Ofsted inspectors. The Ofsted guidance to inspectors should give more attention to the collection of evidence on the extent to which subject leaders display effectiveness in managing issues such as the implementation of policies and evaluating the performance of colleagues. Added to this, reference should also be made on how professional development is managed, how good are the team building strategies employed and the way in which target setting deals with the learning situation. At present Ofsted inspectors focus on issues related to subject leaders centres on the periphery of management and leadership issues such as: How adequate are the resources in the department? Are they used efficiently? How accessible are they for the other departmental members?

The fourth recommendation concerns the headteachers’ expectations of subject leaders. The headteachers’ perceptions tend to acknowledge more the leadership role and requirements of other senior leaders than subject leaders. As a consequence, more development opportunities are made available to senior leaders in schools. Headteachers see subject leaders more in terms of being the specialist in the curriculum area in which they hold responsibility. As a result, headteachers need to pay more attention to developing their subject leaders’ management and leadership skills. This should be part of the headteachers’ functions, if not it will remain a
neglected area in developing the leadership skills of subject leaders. Therefore, headteachers need to concentrate on the duties and functions of their curriculum managers. Headteachers need to see the importance of the work by the NCSL, so that they can cater for this within the school institution.

The fifth and final recommendation relates to the NCSL. With the development of the NCSL and the increasing role in leadership, the DfES may need to redefine the purpose of the TTA, so that its contribution to the subject leaders’ roles can be more clearly understood by practitioners in education.

**FURTHER RESEARCH**

There are six suggestions for further research on subject leaders in London secondary schools. Firstly, given the findings of this study it is still necessary for further research to provide a broader examination of the issues relating to the role of subject leaders. This will give more authority to the data if future research confirm and or support the findings. Secondly, further research could be in analysing induction policies in schools for subject leaders to determine the focus that they give to management and leadership functions. Thirdly, further research in this field could concentrate on the subject leaders themselves to ascertain their perception of their role.

The fourth area is finding out how subject leaders are selected and recruited for the post. Here, the focus will be on what interview panels look for in candidates in fulfilling the criteria. Another aspect would be in finding out how Ofsted reports influence subject leaders’ working practices after the evaluation and judgements on their performance in their leadership role. The literature review on subject leaders did
not give sufficient information on research on the impact Ofsted inspections have had on subject leaders’ performance to establish whether they have changed or altered their procedures and practices. A sixth area to be considered for further research is regarding the TTA standards on subject leaders. Research is required to see how well the TTA standards are used in school and formed part of the subject leaders’ practices. The final area for the suggestion for further research concerns the QCA’s roles and functions in influencing the work and development of subject leaders.

Summary

The argument put forward in this concluding chapter is that the role of the subject leader is an evolving one where they have to deal with management and leadership tasks. Contemporary government policies have created a climate where the emphasis is on raising students’ standard of achievement. A number of new initiatives have developed and agencies created such as QCA, Ofsted and TTA to support schools and key leadership roles to enable the government to achieve its goal in raising educational standards.

Subject leaders have a demanding role to play especially in London secondary schools. They also have one of the key roles in bringing about school improvement as subject leaders have to turn government policies into practices and many of the functions that were once carried out by senior leaders have been distributed down to curriculum leaders. This devolution of leadership has put a tremendous strain on subject leaders as they were inadequately prepared for their post and had no formal training. In addition, subject leaders have had an increase in workload and heavy teaching commitment, which they have found difficult to manage.
Thus, it is the expectation of the writer that this study and its findings will highlight the contribution well trained and developed subject leaders can make to the national agenda for improving educational standard for all students regardless of their ability, socio economic background or ethnic origin.
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Appendix 1
The LEAs Context and Performance

LEA A

LEA A is one of the most deprived in England. The authority is predominantly residential and contains several housing estates. The proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals are well above the national average and there are high levels of mobility within the pupil population. This is due mainly to the high proportion of refugees and asylum seekers in the borough. At present almost half of the population is from minority ethnic backgrounds. Nine percent is made up of refugees and asylum seekers, mainly of Turkish and Somali heritage. It has enormous disparities in income, wealth, housing condition and unemployment. Unemployment is concentrated in particular housing estates and neighbourhoods, and it is highest amongst black and other minority ethnic communities. These circumstances have added significantly to the challenges facing LEA A in working with schools to raise educational standards. The Ofsted report, 1999 on LEA A makes it quite plain that this educational authority has had too little success, despite the fact that overall attainment in schools has risen. However, it is not sufficient to bridge the gap with national standard as the LEA weaknesses outweigh its strengths.

LEA A has 9,964 families receiving free school meals (the borough was unable to provide the total number of individual pupils and students actually receiving free school meals). The families entitled to free school meals are those who are on income support, job seekers allowance (income based) and asylum seekers. The population of secondary school aged students is 11,000 and for primary pupils it is 21,000. It must be noted that a considerable amount of secondary aged students are schooled out side the borough, enough for at least another secondary school.

In respect of secondary schools the gap is widening, especially at the higher levels of GCSE at Key Stage Four. Attainment is below or well below national levels, but it is in line with similar schools and LEAs. Attainment is also below or well below national averages at all stages of compulsory education, and generally below that of similar LEAs. For example, in 1998 LEA A was ranked 135 out of 150 LEAs for the performance of its schools in the Key Stage 2 English test, and 137 in the mathematics tests. With regard to the performance of its schools in GCSE for 5+ A*-C grades A ranked 145 out of 149 LEAs and 5+ A*-G its position was 142. Despite the fact that the rate of improvement for key stage tests and GCSEs have increased in line with the rate of improvement nationally it has been less consistent.

Data collected from the Ofsted inspections confirms that attainment and progress in LEA A’s schools are below that of similar LEAs, and nationally. Fewer primary and secondary schools provide good or very good quality of education when compared nationally, and there are fewer good or very good secondary schools than in similar LEAs or nationally. However, the quality of teaching in primary and secondary schools is similar to those in comparable LEAs and nationally.

The LEA has been criticised for failing to communicate its commitment to raise educational standards in its schools. Many of the LEA’s schools are highly critical about consultation and guidance given to them. Strategies are now being put in place to ensure greater focus on strategic leadership and raising standards in the LEA’s school. This is hoped to be achieved by improve monitoring arrangements, collected
and analysed information on standards, quality and management in the LEA's school by the School Effectiveness Branch (SEB.)

LEA B
In contrast to LEA A, LEA B schools generally perform well according to its Ofsted report, 2000. Unemployment is relatively low, but it does have areas of social deprivation. The proportion of pupils entitled to free school meals is close to the national average. Almost thirty percent of the pupil population are of ethnic heritage and there is a wide diversity of languages and different cultures in schools. Around on third of the pupils speak English as an additional language. It is important to note that approximately one third of the secondary pupils reside outside of the borough.

LEA B has twenty-one secondary, eighty-seven primary schools, four nursery schools, five special school and two pupil referral units. Four of the primary and ten secondary schools were formerly grant maintained (GM) schools. The students’ population in maintained secondary schools is 22187 and 24,304 in primary schools. There are seven single sex schools of which three are selective. The authority has an unusually high number of denominational and religious schools. Pupils receiving free school meals in primary schools total to 2,533 and 3,289 for secondary schools. It can be seen that LEA B keeps more detailed records on its pupils and students.

The data collected by Ofsted found that the proportion of schools providing good or very good quality education is higher than found nationally. The test and examination results reflect this as they are well above the national figures and in line with, or slightly above those of authorities with similar socio-economic characteristics. Attainment in test at Key Stage 2 and Key stage 3 in English and mathematics is well above national averages, but in line with statistical neighbours. The proportion of pupils achieving five or more GCSE passes at grades A*-C is well above the national average and above statistical neighbours. The proportion of students achieving A*-G pass and five A* -G passes are similar to national figures. Rates of improvement in key stage tests and GCSE have generally been the same as or above national standards. Unauthorised absences and exclusions are well below the national figures.

LEA B has more strengths than weaknesses, though the weaknesses are considerable. It has contributed more effectively to improvement in primary and special school than in secondary schools where the working relation are less well established. Expenditure on education has been consistently above the standard spending assessment and most aspect of the service is well resourced. Support for school improvement; partnership with other agencies; support for senior managers in school, newly qualified teachers, attendance; the planning of school places are satisfactory or better.
Appendix 2

Table 4.14 The rank order of the thirty categories for the role of subject leaders emphasised by the academic literature compared with TTA, Ofsted handbook and Ofsted reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic Literature Rank</th>
<th>TTA Standards Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Handbook Rank</th>
<th>Ofsted Reports Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations Results</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3

### Analysis of Academic Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

The total number of documents read as part of the analysis of the academic literature was twenty three. These included a collection of papers on academic middle management by Alma Harris, which could be considered to an expert's 'state of the art' review.
### Appendix 4

Analysis of TTA Standards for Subject Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.81%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.81%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.98%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.26%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.38%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL                                            106  100.00%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.85%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 328 100.00%
### Appendix 6

**20 OFSTED Inspection Reports**

Two North London LEAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Difference</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Planning</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Experience</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Difference</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homework Management

**SEN/EAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>LEA A</th>
<th>LEA B</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>total - all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8</td>
<td>x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 6</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 1</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two North London LEAs*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Experience</th>
<th>Resources Management</th>
<th>Management &amp; Leadership</th>
<th>Motivation of Staff</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
<th>Quality of Teaching</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>Standard of Achievement</th>
<th>Aims and Objectives</th>
<th>Examination Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 6</td>
<td>b 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 12.5%</td>
<td>c 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12.5%</td>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>b 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>c 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>a 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12.5%</td>
<td>b 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 25.0%</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 58.3%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 25.0%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 58.3%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 25.0%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 16.7%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 83.3%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 16.7%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 83.3%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 16.7%</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table above represents various educational metrics and performance indicators such as Learning Experience, Resources Management, Management & Leadership, Motivation of Staff, Expectations, Classroom Management, Quality of Teaching, Differentiation, Standard of Achievement, Aims and Objectives, and Examination Results.
- Each metric is further broken down into specific categories and subcategories with corresponding percentages and scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 1 0 1 1 1 1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>75.00%</th>
<th>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</th>
<th>1 8.3%</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>b 0 1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>7 58.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c 1 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>4 33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>TTA</th>
<th>Handbook</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Results</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the Learning Experience</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Staff Development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Numerical Rank Order on Findings for Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Lit (rank)</th>
<th>TTA</th>
<th>TTA (rank)</th>
<th>Handbook</th>
<th>H'book (rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Experience</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Achievement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment and Progress</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Setting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN/EAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of New Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Reports (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>