

Entering No Man's Land: Transformative Curriculum for School Secretaries

Neill Ustick

Australian Catholic University

In contrast to the traditional field's rather exclusive emphasis on devising schemes for improving the procedures of curriculum development, much contemporary scholarship labours to *understand* how curriculum is developed, from the domain of policy, to planning and implementation, to teaching, and to evaluation and supervision.

(Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery & Taubman 1995, p. 791)

Tertiary teaching has changed. Universities no longer teach only undergraduates and higher degree students in long-established programs with readily identifiable students. This paper tells the story of my experience, as one of two academics, in developing a new course taught to a group of people new to a university setting. The students were female school secretaries in Catholic schools. The course was workplace related but not part of a university program. I begin with a discussion of the newness of the student group, followed by an account of the newness of the course. Since developing the course involved a range of different people across various institutions, I continue with an analysis of and reflections on some tensions and surprises that I experienced in the course design process. There are elements of retrospection in which I include some discussion of the actual teaching and learning that eventuated from the design stage. This analysis employs as a framework three notions from William Pinar, William Reynolds, Patrick Slattery and Peter Taubman's (1995) 'Understanding Curriculum': curriculum as political text, curriculum as autobiographical text and curriculum as institutionalised text. I conclude with a brief discussion of curriculum as transformative, offering empowerment for learners and shifts in my identity. (Another story - the experience of the school secretaries -deserves telling, but that is the focus of a current research project and will unfold in due course.)

Background

The vast bulk of my teaching, at a school level and in university teacher education, has involved established courses within existing programs. Thus, virtually all new courses have been revisions of old ones, comprising a different 'take' on previous ones, and within the context of the same existing program. At times, these have been challenging revisions, requiring a fresh conceptualisation and then articulation of goals. In team teaching settings, extra complexities associated with collaboration have been encountered. There have been various views and interests to negotiate, together with different working rates and styles, especially when it has come to producing drafts. Overall, with a long background of curriculum design in schools and at university, I thought I pretty much knew it all and had met all the permutations. I discovered two years ago that I was mistaken.

In early 1999, I began participating in designing a university course at Australian Catholic University (ACU) for school office secretaries from Catholic schools in the Canberra-Goulburn diocese. Fresh from completing my doctorate that included feminist theory, my initial response was one of excitement at the challenge of constructing a course for mature women. However, in approaching this enterprise, several difficulties soon loomed large. One was the lack of a model for such a course and also of any program within which it sat. There

was no such course at ACU, nor indeed (so far as I could ascertain) at any other university in the region. A second difficulty lay in the magnitude of the project. The early conversations with people from the Catholic Education Office (CEO) included the possibility of developing a full bachelor's degree program, if this introductory course was successful and interest was sufficient. My initial response of excitement was now combined with apprehension.

In what ways was I adequate? From a range of informal experiences with school secretaries and from my theoretical work in sociology, I thought I could develop some appropriate material for some aspects of their work. I felt excited at the possibilities of articulating and applying such themes as the person in the workplace, workplace politics and power, human growth and development, and the role of individual values in relation to institutional values. However, and this was a second major problem, much of their work was unknown to me. I also lacked detailed knowledge about what professional development they already had received. Later, I discovered that this professional development centred on the technical aspects of their work, such as data entry, general computing, maintaining rolls and general office tasks. What did they need in these and other areas and what could we as a pair of university teacher education lecturers provide in relation to them? More than that, what if my idea that an approach that tackled key themes and issues related to their work and relationships was thought to be unnecessarily complex, theoretical and perhaps irrelevant to their perceived needs? This question briefly stirred an inner voice about the often perceived irrelevance of 'theory' to 'practice', of academics working in an ivory tower and I felt challenged to link knowledge to action. In addition, here was I as a man entering women's territory: was this no man's land?

It was not long before some of these questions were answered. Several meetings were held between CEO representatives and the two ACU lecturers (a colleague and myself), followed by another meeting — essentially, a focus group — that included several school secretaries who were keen to attend the course. A common denominator of these meetings was that we were all tentative, not wanting to dominate discussion, and yet — supported by the informal and open atmosphere — everyone did share views and preferences. In the light of some of my fears, these were encouraging. Articulate and prepared to ask for what they wanted, the secretaries revealed that they did not seek a re-hash of the technical training that they already had received, namely, up-dating computer skills and first aid training. They agreed with our broad desire to theorise the workplace. They also sought advice concerning the legal aspects of their work. This feedback was reassuring. Both our broad idea for the course and also what we believed we had competence to offer were affirmed. However, partly because discussion thus far had been at the broad level, many questions remained.

One set of questions concerned the theoretical material: how much, what and at what level we would offer? Another concerned some personal tensions I felt across a range of issues. One of these was the task of producing a curriculum on demand by outsiders, as it were, with considerable control potentially in the hands of the CEO as the funding agency. This had not been my previous experience either in school or university settings. A second personal tension concerned developing and teaching the course with a colleague whose theoretical ideas and teaching approach differed significantly from mine. How would working together be and how complementary or contradictory would our material and approaches be, both for ourselves and for the participants?

Since these questions concern curriculum politics and the persons and institutions involved in curriculum, I have found Pinar et al.'s (1995) account helpful in thinking about the issues involved.

Curriculum as political text, curriculum as autobiographical text and curriculum as institutionalised text

Pinar et al. (1995) describe nine ways of thinking about curriculum. Without attempting to summarise or attend to all aspect of that encyclopaedic treatment, I choose – and make my own uses of - three of these as relevant to this account concerning tensions in curriculum design: curriculum as political text, curriculum as autobiographical text and curriculum as institutionalised text. As will become clear in the discussion, these three frames for analysing my experience of curriculum design are overlapping and interacting.

Curriculum As Political Text

There are multiple layers to the political aspects of the curriculum work involved in constructing and teaching the school secretaries inservice education course. These layers concern, firstly, the interests and positioning of those directly involved, most obviously those interests overtly expressed. One aspect of positioning, capable of influencing curriculum decision making, was the power relations, especially around decisions concerning what knowledge is to be taught. Focused more on content and goals, a second layer involves underlying structural interests connected to such matters as the hierarchical nature of school administration and particularly the nature, conditions and remuneration of the work done by school secretaries. These two layers are implicated in both curriculum content and process and the elements work interactively. The politics in the curriculum design process affect and are affected by the politics intended by it.

Much of my initial apprehension in commencing to think about an appropriate course for school office secretaries lay in being under the scrutiny of outsiders, primarily the CEO but also the small number of secretaries working as a focus group in the early stages. So far as I could tell from the various meetings held, each group — academics, CEO personnel, secretaries — had its own interests. It was not that any group or person entered into overt conflict concerning their interests, but simply that they were patently different and had to be taken into account. For example, the time frame for the course depended on the amount of CEO funding. It was to be three days, with little or no release time for the secretaries, so that the course had to run at weekends. Coming to the course without any tertiary education, the secretaries expressed disquiet at confronting complex theory, lots of reading and writing and any major assignment. (They had little awareness of how similar they were to many of the current generation of university students.) This diversity of interests presents both differences and similarities in experience from much conventional curriculum work. I suspect that much of this involves collaborative work at the formative stages — usually with people of similar, or at least known, interests — but thereafter is usually the responsibility of one person (perhaps two people). Similarity exists in cases where we work with colleagues of significantly different theoretical and other interests and thus where negotiation is either required or denied.

I suspect that the interests layer of the political character of this case of curriculum design parallels in an overt way equally political processes in other cases of curriculum design. In those cases, the voices of non-academic stakeholders (e.g. pre-service teachers, teacher

employing bodies, governments) were either not heard or not acknowledged by the lecturers involved in course design. What is possibly new here is not so much the political nature of curriculum design as its explicit character where the various parties sit face to face and hear from, and express intentions to, one another. There are also the more ambiguous power relations inherent in such sharing of the curriculum development task. Before, not always consciously, I was able to mute or play down the other voices and give heed largely or solely to my own. This time, I was unable to avoid the interests of others. I also question how well my notions of professionalism, and in particular, professional autonomy, have prepared me for robust curriculum dialogue with outsiders. Despite this discussion of the ambiguous, new form of the power relations involved, I think it remained the case that power of curriculum decision making, at least in terms of content, assessment and pedagogy, resided with the two academics.

I say 'outsiders' because I suspect that the political nature of the curriculum design work resided in more than working with other colleagues with different views. The fact that these others were non-academics, from non-academic organisations or institutions, introduced a dimension of uncertainty. Would we talk the same language and share the same values? Would I be able to make myself and my position – including my theoretical orientation – clear? Here, I was in part experiencing the uncomfortable phenomenon of 'othering', what Yeatman (1994, p. 49) calls the 'binary politics of inversion'. Conventionally, academics hold power over what gets taught and how. To have these matters contested by non-academics was initially unsettling. In hindsight, I wonder to what extent the others involved experienced 'othering'.

In the event, I had little time to mull over these misgivings, as the planning process got rapidly under way. This compressed time frame, so typical of much curriculum design work, particularly in schools, probably served to magnify the tensions and uncertainties involved. Perhaps paralleling the messiness of actual research compared with 'textbook' accounts, time pressure and the tyranny of deadlines are rarely, however, discussed or problematised in formal descriptions. In my case, I was hurried on and my pre-conceptions that had led to excitement and anxiety started interacting with experiences of effective collaboration. As mentioned earlier, I found pleasure and reassurance in discovering both considerable consistency between my conceptualisation of the course and that of others and also ease in my accepting and then embracing the differences. Perhaps here I was experiencing some disruptions of traditional dichotomies between 'competitive' and 'collaborative' and re-working my definition of professional autonomy.

I brought to the course design some understanding of the deeper underlying interests and structural positioning of the school secretaries, as I had earlier studied poststructuralist feminist perspectives on work and organisations. These included the challenge to dichotomies such as work/home or professional/private that separate work from other aspects of life and rational/emotional that limits emotional expression in the workplace. They also include work on the sexuality of organisations (Hearn, Sheppard, Tancred-Sheriff & Burrell 1989; Itzin & Newman 1995; Mills & Tancred 1992) and on masculinities in organisations (Brittan 1989; Cheng 1996; Connell 1995). Notable among these ideas was the notion of 'masculinist organisations' and challenges to promote equitable workplaces (Pringle 1993, pp. 137-138).

School secretaries, all women, work in subordinate positions within heavily feminised organisations that are nonetheless both hierarchical and masculinist. Underlying and contradicting the more collegial discourse of teacher professionalism (Blackmore 1999, p.

37), school hierarchies typically maintain sharp boundaries between executive, teachers and particularly non-teaching staff, with accompanying language for the last group, such as 'support staff'. In fact, both the professionalism discourse (from which secretaries are excluded) and this hierarchical status distance secretaries from decision making and status. Moreover, they experience ambiguity of being simultaneously highly valued ('the lynchpin of the school') and de-valued ('just secretaries').

As Blackmore notes (1999 p. 29) schools are also masculinist and they share with other masculinist organisations, although to a somewhat lesser degree, perhaps through the heavily feminised workforce, the privileging of rationality over emotionality. More seriously, however, was the lack of career structure for school secretaries and, until this course, high level, intellectually demanding professional development. This was exemplified by one teacher's surprised remark to a secretary when he heard that she was attending the course at ACU: 'Why are *you* going to university?'

The political nature of decisions about curriculum content is often related to what has been called by Basil Bernstein (1999, p. 246) 'Official Knowledge', that is, the educational knowledge constructed and distributed by the state. I wish to modify that meaning slightly and apply it to the current case to refer to the knowledge deemed by employers appropriate for the inservice education of school secretaries. Once that is said, it becomes apparent that there is no clarity about what that knowledge is. Since the course was a new course, what indications were there about what the CEO's 'official knowledge' is or indeed if they were applying any at all? On the first matter, current inservice education events for secretaries were a starting point. They suggested that the secretaries were conventionally seen to need further training in first aid, word processing and other ICT skills, along with 'customer relations' skills such as telephone use and conflict resolution skills. On the other hand, the CEO clearly wanted more than this or they would not have asked a university to offer the course. Perhaps in this case 'official knowledge' was not such a problem. This was confirmed in early course planning sessions. When I raised such views as the desirability of fostering secretaries' awareness of their school's hierarchical nature and the questioning of their ambiguous status in the school, the CEO staff raised no questions. In meetings characterised by considerable give-and-take, this may have been a sign of acceptance that curriculum for school secretaries is not politically neutral.

Curriculum as Autobiographical Text

Clandinin and Connelly (1988) draw attention to the central role of experience in curriculum work. We can go further: people's lives enter powerfully into the teaching – both content and pedagogy -and the learning associated with a course. The biographies of both teachers and students play a role in constructing curriculum. Less obviously perhaps, the process is interactive: people's lives and identities are changed in the process. I begin with the former aspect, first with the learners.

There is an odd sense in which I, as an academic, can still recall the experience of feeling strange and uncertain in confronting the physical and intellectual aspects of a university. Both its physical size and the level of cognitive demand, including the mysteries of academic writing, can be intimidating. Starting my first undergraduate degree yielded a host of such feelings and thoughts, as has (although less each time) commencing subsequent degrees in new universities. In designing the school secretaries course, I have found it valuable to retrieve some of these memories. What does it feel like to start at university, never having

been there before? Here, I found myself connecting my biography as teacher with that of the learners.

In thinking of curriculum as shaped by learners' autobiography, I note that both the accessibility of the course and the content of the course are implicated. Course reading materials and also course assessment were designed to be sensitive to the academic inexperience of participants. For example, we decided to construct a relatively small readings book of about eight short readings for the three days of the course. At first, we began to choose easy-to-read items. For me, this, however, is where another tension entered, as I noticed that, with the first selection, some central ideas were being omitted in the simplifications involved. I found myself adding some items that were conceptually challenging but still — I hoped — would be accessible once scaffolding was offered.

In terms of content, autobiography took three forms. First, I noted from the moment I heard of the possibility of the course a rising excitement. I found myself relishing the prospect of designing a course for women who were school secretaries. Closely linked to my identity and in particular to my core values, that personal desire served as a key motivator throughout the design process. The same dynamic is identified by Andy Hargreaves (1995) as an omission in most accounts of teacher development. Second, there was the strong and deliberate use of participants' experience. As examples, the first session focused on personal metaphors for their work and all other sessions centred on participants' stories of particular events illustrating or raising relevant issues. Third, I noted the value of speaking about my own life experience, to illustrate and at times to develop the meaning of theory being discussed. This occurred in all sessions that I led, ranging from personal metaphors to human growth and development.

These two aspects of curriculum work — curriculum as political text and curriculum as autobiographical text — are effectively brought together by Ivor Goodson (1998, p. 3): 'The current changes in the economy and superstructure associated with postmodernity pose particular perils and promises for the world of education.' Looking ahead to the next epoch, Goodson (1998, pp. 3-4) proposes two major changes to the forms of workplace knowledge that will be promoted. One change amounts to an intensification of an existing movement, namely, the continuing struggle concerning proper ways to develop knowledge within institutional and other social sites. A second, and for Goodson more important, change is a strengthening debate about life politics, the politics of identity construction and ongoing identity maintenance.

The first of these changes is clearly political in that it relates to the different interests of those involved in different sites and institutions. How is knowledge to be developed? In this school secretaries course project, is it sufficient to train school secretaries to be more efficient in their current work (essentially a process of socialisation), or is it important to provide theoretical perspectives that might prove empowering by assisting them to re-think their work (essentially emancipation)? I found it encouraging that the CEO representatives were happy to accommodate, perhaps support, a theoretical approach that provided scope for secretaries to think deeply about their work. I was uncertain that my colleague saw this issue in the way that I did but she did not oppose the approach.

Goodson's second change corresponded with my own theoretical attention to identity formation, particularly in respect of work, and to the role in curriculum work of integrating teacher and student identity issues into pedagogy. As a result of my belief, I pressed for

content and pedagogy in this new course to centre on participants' lived experience. My colleague enthusiastically supported this emphasis, although from more general adult learning principles rather than from an emphasis on life story, life history or identity formation.

The autobiography of myself as teacher was mentioned earlier in informing my awareness of learner anxiety in approaching the academy. However, one other area merits attention, namely, the teacher's experience of teaching and views about 'good' teaching. For myself as an ex-school teacher turned academic, much of my learning about tertiary teaching over ten or so years has centred on developing appropriate teaching strategies for tertiary students, most of whom are school leavers, with up to a quarter somewhat older. The university traditions of teaching have focused on transmission of content and even recent information and communications technology innovations such as 'PowerPoint' focus on information transmission. Paul Ramsden (1992, pp. 111-119) offers an account of three theories of teaching employed by teachers in higher education, before proposing his own model which focuses on lecturers' seeking to make learning possible. His first theory is 'teaching as telling or transmission' (1992, p. 111): 'Many teachers in higher education implicitly or explicitly define the task of teaching undergraduates as the transmission of authoritative content or the demonstration of procedures ... Much of the folklore of university teaching follows a similar line.' As experienced school teachers, neither my colleague nor I was lured strongly by this bait, although I detected signs that participants expected such teaching, as they expressed surprise at how much lecturers took notice of their views and worked with their ideas.

Curriculum as Institutionalised Text

In many ways, designing this school secretaries course lacked many of the usual institutional features. Planning involved a relatively small and free-wheeling group of two academics — no supervisor exerted control over the process —, two CEO personnel and four secretaries. Moreover, the product was susceptible to change since, as a stand-alone course, it was not part of any formal, institutional framework. In addition, just as the participants undertook the course at weekends on top of their workload, the two academics shouldered the teaching as an extra commitment and thus were 'left alone' by their supervisors. These weakly institutional features derived from the course lacking articulation into any larger diploma or degree. In the long term, this initially positive point will need addressing, so that participants can indeed take their study further by linking the course into other courses, such as a diploma or bachelors degree.

In another sense, the curriculum was heavily affected institutionally. Firstly, at least until the course becomes self-sufficient, the existence of the course depended on the CEO's funding and organisational support. There were several consequences of this. For example, it was unclear whether we could offer the course to other secretaries — in Catholic schools or in other schools — independent of the CEO. Second, we as lecturers work within an academic environment which has for some time shaped our theoretical understandings and our understandings of teaching. I noted, for example, how readily I as a sociologist approached course themes from a sociological perspective, whereas my psychology colleague took a more individualistic approach to issues.

How Curriculum Constructs Pedagogic Identity

Bernstein (1999, p. 246) argues that curriculum reform constructs different pedagogic identities. Reminiscent of my earlier discussion of curriculum as autobiography and

curriculum as institutional text, he distinguishes (p. 259) two forms of pedagogy: *institutional pedagogy* and *segmental pedagogy*. The school secretaries course clearly has elements of the former since, according to Bernstein, this involves official sites, accredited providers and acquirers gathered as a distinct social category. Through my commitment to design a course that addresses the women's experience and allows them to speak and reflect on that experience, I believe it also has — at least indirectly — elements of segmental pedagogy, which Bernstein describes (p. 259) as 'carried out usually in the face-to-face relations of everyday experience and practice by informal providers'. For Bernstein, the competences developed in segmental pedagogy (e.g. a child learning to tie her/his shoe laces) are pieces of whole actions and that is why the pedagogy is segmented. I suggest a modification of Bernstein's framework, namely the extension to include cases where pedagogy concerns everyday experiences but where the learnings are consciously integrated. This amounts to an intentional overlap between institutional and segmental pedagogies. In the school secretaries course, we endeavoured, within an institutional context, to forge links between the women's experiences, usually initially discussed in a segmented way, and broad theoretical concepts, so as to construct chains of meaning. Such chains of meaning, we believe, are more likely to prove transformative and empowering as they increase learners' ability to think for themselves in applying broad principles and perspectives to new situations and problems.

Earlier, I noted the two-way interaction between autobiography and curriculum. Bernstein's terminology of 'pedagogic identity' proves provocative in this connection. It raises for me the possibility that teaching a new course fosters new ways of seeing myself as teacher and academic. One of these ways proved both appealing and uncomfortable. As mentioned earlier, I found the exercise of re-thinking curriculum to meet what I thought were the needs of school secretaries quite stimulating and challenging. For one thing, it meant I had to learn lots about what secretaries do and what they need, although it was not altogether clear how to do that, particularly in a relatively short time frame. (In later courses, having spoken with and listened to many secretaries, I found myself on surer ground and I suspect the secretaries in those later courses recognised my better grasp of their situation.) It also meant I had to identify appropriate theory and readings about that work and those needs. This was complicated by noticing some significant differences in theoretical perspective and pedagogy between myself and my academic colleague. That meant I had to consider options such as (a) teaching my way and allowing her to teach hers, hoping the participants wouldn't be troubled or confused by the differences, (b) entering into discussion about our respective approaches and seeking to find a common or reasonably common approach. For several reasons, a major one being sheer busyness, the former option eventuated and it meant I had for the first time the experience of team teaching without an explicitly shared course philosophy. My pedagogic identity had altered: no longer in control of course philosophy, I contributed to a potentially discordant 'song'. This left me feeling uncertain.

In addition, my identity also changed as the range of my curriculum work broadened out into new fields beyond the academy and its typical undergraduate and postgraduate student population. This, too, as indicated earlier, brought feelings of both uncertainty and excitement but, as time progressed, it strengthened my confidence in my ability to design effective and transformative curriculum for non-school and non-university settings.

Transformative Curriculum

Several times already, I have alluded to my hopes for this new course to prove transformative for the secretaries. Such hopes related to several factors. Informed by critical theory, one was

my broad understanding of education as a combination of socialisation and transformation, aimed at both enabling competent functioning in the world and also empowerment and emancipation. Here lies a significant tension in curriculum design in that a course framed for fitting secretaries into the existing workplace relations would look different to one constructed to develop critical awareness and the possibilities of acting to challenge and change unhealthy practices and structures. As alluded to earlier, I was heartened that the CEO personnel, while not requesting it, accepted a more-than-socialising, indeed a critical, multiple perspectives approach. Recently, in reading Ira Shor's (1980) 'Critical Teaching and Everyday Life', I found an articulation of what I had striven for. He expresses my hopes and my background when he speaks (1980, p. xxv) of being influenced by Paulo Freire, of developing a commitment to teaching by dialogue as a foundational learning process as he and students co-investigated reality and attempted to systematise daily knowledge, aiming for 'a conceptual inquiry into reality'. For some years, my understanding and practice of university teaching have matched this description and this philosophy strongly informed and energised my approach to the school secretaries course.

A second and related factor – referred to earlier – was my belief, based on meeting many secretaries in visits to schools when I supervised students on field experience, that the women were ambiguously positioned. They were simultaneously highly valued ('the hub of the wheel') and accorded a low position on the pecking order ('only secretaries') (Casanova 1991, pp. 131-133). This ambiguity, coupled with the history of such secretarial positions, which often arose from a mother with secretarial skills being employed part-time to do some office work, seems to have led most school secretaries to feel unconfident about their intellectual abilities and relatively powerless in their workplaces. Seen by many others as 'just secretaries', they seemed to have internalised this perception. My own encounters with many school secretaries, however, had led me to see them, not only as key personnel in schools, but as highly competent and committed workers. Confronted by the request to construct this inservice course, this informal analysis led me to think of facilitating these people to identify their abilities across a range of dimensions, including the intellectual skills of critical thinking that draws upon multiple perspectives. I found the movie 'Educating Rita' frequently coming to mind, stirring my imagination about the transformation possible as mature women tackled powerful ideas and perspectives.

While it will be the focus of later papers, I think it is appropriate to say here that this hope for emancipation/transformation bore considerable fruit in the two courses offered in 1999 and 2000. In written evaluations, in interviews and in a follow up 'advanced' course in 2001, virtually all secretaries reported a range of outcomes related to emancipation. Most common was a strong growth in confidence that showed itself in such ways as negotiating significant job changes, taking on new responsibilities, analysing likely changes in their work situation associated with the arrival of a new Principal and making recommendations to smooth the transition. A second major outcome was the loss of a sense of isolation. Most secretaries work alone or as one among two or three and lack an appreciation of how similar and different their work is to that of their peers. Given the chance to reflect on their stories and their personal metaphors (a major teaching concept in the first course, informed for example by Cortazzi and Lixian (1999) and Knowles, Cole and Presswood (1994, pp. 35-37)), they valued listening to and sharing of stories and came to perceive themselves as more connected to their counterparts in other places. Some later initiated some networking and more is likely.

Conclusion

I have offered an account of a project in curriculum design that is set within three frames, but goes beyond them. In ways that involved tension and uncertainty and centred on both design and content, the process can be seen to have involved political factors of interests and positioning. As second and third frames, the story reveals the role of the autobiographies of both learners and lecturer, and institutional factors that proved both constraining and enabling. There were also other factors. This story of curriculum design reveals, among other things, a remarkable synchrony. A request from the CEO to develop a university inservice education course for Catholic school secretaries met a group of ready-to-learn secretaries and an academic keen to construct an emancipatory and critical curriculum and a colleague keen to contribute in other ways. For myself as lecturer and for the course participants, the outcomes were transformative, as the brief outline given here indicates. So significant for me were these transformations that I have developed an ongoing research project, across sites in Australia and the U.S., that centres on shifts in identity for the school secretaries involved. The CEO has committed itself to further introductory courses and an advanced course (held in August-September 2001) and to a conference in 2002. Many of the secretaries have participated in these events and seek more. In subsequent papers, I will discuss the outcomes of teaching two introductory courses in 1999-2000, followed by an advanced course in 2001.

References

- Bernstein, Basil. (1999). 'Official knowledge and pedagogic identities'. In Frances Christie. (Ed.). *Pedagogy and The Shaping of Consciousness: Linguistic and Social Processes*. London: Cassell, pp. 246-261.
- Blackmore, Jill. (1999). *Troubling Women: Feminism, Leadership and Educational Change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Brittan, Arthur. (1989). *Masculinity and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Casanova, Ursula. (1991). *Elementary School Secretaries: The Women in the Principal's Office*. Newbury Park, California: Corwin Press.
- Cheng, Cliff. (Ed.). (1996). *Masculinities in Organisations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connelly, F. Michael & D. Jean Clandinin. (1988). *Teachers as Curriculum Planners: Narratives of Experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cortazzi, Martin & Jin Lixian. (1999). 'Bridges to Learning: Metaphors of Teaching, Learning and Language.' In Lynne Cameron & Graham Low. (Eds). *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 149-176.
- Goodson, Ivor F. (1998). 'Storying the Self: Life Politics and the Study of the Teacher's Life and Work'. In William F. Pinar. (Ed.). *Curriculum: Toward New Identities*. New York: Garland Publications, pp. 3-20.
- Hargreaves, Andy. (1995). 'Development and Desire.' In Thomas R. Guskey & Michael Huberman. (Eds). *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hearn, Jeff; Deborah L. Sheppard; Peta Tancred-Sheriff & Gibson Burrell. (Eds). (1989). *The Sexuality of Organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Itzin, Catherine & Janet Newman. (Eds). (1995). *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting theory into practice*. London: Routledge.
- Knowles, J. Gary; Ardra L. Cole & Colleen S. Presswood. (1994). *Through Preservice Teachers' Eyes: Exploring Field Experience Through Narrative and Enquiry*. Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada.
- Mills, Albert J. & Peta Tancred. (Eds.). (1992). *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

- Pinar, William; Reynolds, William; Slattery, Patrick & Taubman, Peter. (1995). *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pringle, Ruth. (1993). 'Feminism and Management.' In Alexander Kouzmin, Leonie Still & Paul Clarke. (Eds). *New Directions in Management*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill, pp.127-142.
- Ramsden, Paul. (1992). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Shor, Ira. (1980). *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*. Boston: South End Press.
- Yeatman, Anna. (1994). *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*. New York: Routledge.

saveSave Secondary Curricula For Later. 18 views. 00 upvotes00 downvotes.Â This subject was recently discussed at a radio programme and after heated debate, a partially accepted conclusion regarding the subjects which should be included in secondary schools curricula was reached. I will try to pus forward some of the most relevant arguments expressed. To begin with, research recently carried out revealed the fact that, although 80% of the children of the middle class posses a computer, there is still some unknown information about the proper use of computers, and the situation tends to be even worse among adults.