

© Copyright by  
BRIAN JAMES FRANKCOMBE  
1977

COMPARATIVE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ELEMENTARY  
SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE IN  
ALBERTA AND IN TASMANIA

By

Brian James Frankcombe

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1977

## ABSTRACT

### COMPARATIVE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES/SOCIAL SCIENCE IN ALBERTA AND IN TASMANIA

By

Brian James Frankcombe

#### The Problem

The study was about ways in which curriculum development in elementary social studies/social science is perceived by teachers, parents, university faculty, principals, Department staff, curriculum committee members, school-system administrators, and teacher organization representatives in Alberta and Tasmania. Education in Alberta is partially decentralized through locally elected school boards. In Tasmania, there is a centralized, State-run education system.

#### Design and Conduct of the Study

A questionnaire with forty questions about the curriculum guide, about the curriculum (with subsections on curriculum sources, texts/references, roles in curriculum development, and planning for program implementation) and about curriculum dissemination (with subsections on understanding the guide, use of the guide, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas) was administered to a random sample in the respondent groups. In Tasmania, the researcher

conducted an interview with most respondents, using the questionnaire as the basis for the interview. Individuals who could not be reached for an interview were surveyed by mail. In Alberta, the survey was conducted by mail. Responses were organized to get descriptive and comparative data for use in dealing with the two geographical areas.

### Major Findings

It is perceived by the respondents that:

1. Teachers should be given a greater role in the development of curriculum guides and of curriculum generally in both regions.
2. Pilot teachers were used in Tasmania with good effect.
3. Existing curriculum guides had limited prescription.
4. Greater prescription than existed would be useful.
5. Set texts had limited value.
6. Texts and reference materials for new curriculum ideas should be made available earlier than in the past.
7. The teacher organization gave very limited leadership in curriculum development in both areas.
8. Principals and superintendents gave limited encouragement to teachers to develop curriculum.
9. Principals gave very limited supervision of teaching and monitoring of teacher planning.
10. Planning for the implementation of a new program was limited.



11. Planning for the implementation of a new program was chiefly the responsibility of curriculum committees, Departments of Education, and teachers.

12. Time was identified as an important need for teachers in improving planning, in reaching an understanding of the curriculum guide, and in training for use of the guide.

13. Reading the curriculum guide was ranked as the best way to understand it.

14. Ambiguity of language in curriculum guides posed a problem to understanding of it.

15. The curriculum guides were generally used extensively by teachers.

16. A lack of materials hindered teacher use of the curriculum guides.

17. Teacher training to use the guides was limited.

18. Workshops were seen as a major way to train teachers in service.

19. Curriculum committees should have a greater role in the diffusion of new curriculum ideas.

20. Subject meetings and staff meetings were ranked as the most important ways to diffuse new curriculum ideas in the school.

21. The perceptions of teachers and principals were more alike than were those of these two groups and parents.

22. Parents perceived a greater role in curriculum development for the Department than did teachers.

23. School-based educators and teacher representatives agreed with each other's perceptions more than did the other non-school-based educators and teacher representatives.

24. There were similarities and differences in the perceptions of their own and others' roles in curriculum development among and between educators and others concerned with elementary social studies/social science in Alberta and in Tasmania.

25. Perceptions of Tasmanian respondents tended to reflect the continued centralization of control of education by the State.

**Dedicated to Bev  
for her patience and support.**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are offered to Dr. Cole Brembeck of Michigan State University for his guidance and assistance throughout. Committee members Drs. Charles Blackman, David Heenan, and Gordon Stewart; volunteer typists Debbi Kuran, Theresa Awes, Kathy Miller, and Joyce McFarland; and M.S.U. personnel Ruth Hefflebower and Virginia Wiseman are also thanked for their extra effort and help. Many others contributed suggestions, ideas, time, and co-operation. All are acknowledged with appreciation. All of the above added to the study; any errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Need . . . . .	1
Purpose . . . . .	4
Contexts of the Study . . . . .	4
Introduction . . . . .	4
General Factors . . . . .	8
Organizational Structure of Education . . . . .	14
Education Facts . . . . .	15
Educational History . . . . .	16
Educational Philosophy . . . . .	22
Curriculum Processes for Elementary Social Studies/Social Science . . . . .	27
Teacher Organization . . . . .	31
Terms Used . . . . .	32
Summary . . . . .	37
Overview . . . . .	39
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	40
Introduction . . . . .	40
Research Literature on Role Perceptions . . . . .	40
Curriculum Sources . . . . .	40
Roles in Curriculum Development . . . . .	42
Planning for Program Implementation . . . . .	43
Teacher Training . . . . .	43
Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas . . . . .	44
Curriculum Defined . . . . .	46
Curriculum Development . . . . .	50
Summary . . . . .	52
3. DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY . . . . .	56
Introduction . . . . .	56
Design of the Study . . . . .	58
Sample . . . . .	58
Measures . . . . .	60
Design . . . . .	62
Method of Analysis . . . . .	62

Chapter	Page
Conduct of the Study . . . . .	63
Sources of Information . . . . .	63
Responses . . . . .	65
Geographical Factors . . . . .	70
Summary . . . . .	73
4. SURVEY RESULTS . . . . .	75
Introduction . . . . .	75
Questions Related to the Curriculum Guide . . . . .	76
Questions Related to Curriculum . . . . .	92
Curriculum Sources . . . . .	92
Texts/References . . . . .	95
Roles in Curriculum Development . . . . .	104
Planning for Program Implementation . . . . .	113
Questions Related to Curriculum Dissemination . . . . .	119
Understanding the Guide . . . . .	119
Use of the Guide . . . . .	127
Teacher Training . . . . .	131
Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas . . . . .	135
Summary . . . . .	143
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	145
Introduction . . . . .	145
Summary . . . . .	145
The Curriculum Guide . . . . .	145
The Curriculum . . . . .	148
Curriculum Dissemination . . . . .	154
Findings and Related Research . . . . .	160
Conclusions . . . . .	165
General . . . . .	165
Answers to Key Questions . . . . .	167
Suggestions on Use of Findings . . . . .	175
Matters Needing Further Study . . . . .	177
APPENDICES	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ALBERTA/TASMANIA . . . . .	178
B. SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS . . . . .	185
C. SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DATA . . . . .	186
LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .	264

## CHAPTER 1

### THE PROBLEM

#### Need

Individuals whose duties involve curriculum development face many problems, and it is through their efforts in solving these problems that curriculum is made more effective. When curriculum is defined as all the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school, as it is in this study, there is evident need for knowledge and understanding about curriculum, the ways it is developed, and the ways it is disseminated to teachers. The focus in curriculum development is upon the teacher, since learning experiences flow through the teacher to children. Those who work with teachers in curriculum development, then, require advice and information about many aspects of it. The following are some of them.<sup>1</sup>

Those interested in curriculum development need information on teacher response to externally or internally developed curricula. It is important to know how teachers react when they have been involved in the development of curricula, compared with reactions when they have not been involved. The place of texts and reference

---

<sup>1</sup>The reader is referred to Chapter 2 for an overview of research that relates to the aspects of curriculum development given in this section.

materials in curriculum development is another area needing an information base. It is valuable to know whether set texts are favored and how references should be timed in relation to a new curriculum.

Leadership in curriculum development is an area that is important to those responsible for curricula. The roles of traditional leaders, such as the school principal, should be known so that these leaders may be used when it is possible. Since effectiveness of any work involving more than one person usually depends upon cooperation and teamwork, knowledge of who is or should be taking leadership roles helps the curriculum planner to use all available resources.

Teachers have to be well informed about new curriculum ideas before they can use those ideas effectively. It is important to know who should diffuse new ideas to teachers and whether there are some ways that are the best to train teachers to use new curricula. Information about whether teachers receive specific training or are given general training on the job is also of value, as it assists in planning for teacher training.

Planning for the introduction of a new curriculum is a detailed process which calls for knowledge and understanding by the planner. Information about the extent of planning, who does it, and how, is needed by those responsible for introducing changes in existing curricula or the establishment of new ones.

Besides the areas of curriculum development noted above, those who are responsible for curriculum development require knowledge



and understanding of other matters. They need to decide whether a curriculum guide is desirable as an articulation of the program, or whether it is better to have teachers operate without a written guide.

Knowledge of the ways in which educators and the "consumers" of education, such as parents, perceive their own roles and the roles of others in curriculum development is of value. This knowledge can be used to plan curriculum work so that key groups are involved, accenting cooperation from the start, and preventing possible conflicts that could develop later.

The impact of social, political, cultural, linguistic, and economic factors upon curriculum development is important. Responsibility for curriculum development means that individuals have to seek to meet local needs. In doing so, the individuals should give due attention to the contexts of the region for which the curriculum is being planned. One factor that can change from place to place is the organizational structure of education. In some areas of the world, education is centrally controlled by the national or state government. In other areas, there has been partial decentralization of control so that locally elected school boards have much authority and responsibility for education. It is important for curriculum planners to know whether the organizational structure of education has any significant effect(s) upon curriculum development.

### Purpose

This study is intended to provide additional knowledge and information about a number of aspects of curriculum development for those who are responsible for curriculum development. Key questions that are pursued through the study are:

To what extent are there similarities and differences in the perspectives of various groups about their roles and the roles of others in curriculum development?

Do responses from a region with a partially decentralized organization of education reflect that organization?

Do responses from a region with a centralized organization of education reflect that organization?

Who are the key personnel in curriculum development?

What are the major ways in which curriculum development can be made most effective?

These basic questions are examined in this study, so that there will be added data available for use in curriculum development, along with some insights into the effects of factors such as the organization of education.

### Contexts of the Study

#### Introduction

In order to study these basic questions and to gather information on the various areas of curriculum development noted under "Need," a questionnaire was used in Alberta, Canada, and Tasmania, Australia. The Province of Alberta has a partly decentralized

organization of education with much authority and responsibility given to locally elected school boards. The State of Tasmania has a centralized organization of education, with authority and responsibility retained by the State, and all staff are civil servants. A new social studies curriculum was introduced in the elementary schools of Alberta during the early 1970s. A new social science curriculum was introduced in the elementary schools of Tasmania during the early 1970s. For these reasons, the questionnaire was administered to groups of educators and parents interested or involved in elementary social studies/social science in Alberta and in Tasmania.

The questions that are used in the questionnaire are shown below. They are grouped according to the themes or categories used throughout the study. The complete questionnaire is given in Appendix A.

The Curriculum Guide:

2. Whose thinking does the guide reflect?
3. Whose thinking should the guide reflect?
4. Why should this be so?
5. Were you involved in the development of the guide?  
If so, how?
6. Should you have been involved in the development of the guide? If so, how?
7. Do you think that it is a "good" guide?
- 8. Do you have any criticisms of the guide?
9. Check how the curriculum guide sets course content, texts/references, teaching methods, time on topics.  
(List of choices provided in questionnaire.)

10. How is any obligation by the teacher to follow the guide enforced?
11. To what extent should the guide prescribe social studies/social science for the Province/State?

The Curriculum:

a. Curriculum Sources

12. Who actually sets curriculum?
13. Who should plan the curriculum for social studies/social science?

b. Texts/References

14. Should there be set texts for social studies/social science?
15. Why should there be set texts? (Why not?)
16. Are the available text/reference books satisfactory?
17. Why? (Why not?)
18. Who writes/publishes books used in teaching social studies/social science?
19. Do books lead, accompany, or follow new curriculum ideas?
20. Which should they do?

c. Roles in Curriculum Development

21. To what extent does the teacher organization encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?
22. To what extent do principals encourage curriculum development?
23. To what extent do school-system administrators (superintendent, supervisor) encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?
24. To what extent do principals actually supervise teaching of classroom teachers?
25. To what extent do principals monitor daily/weekly plans of classroom teachers?

d. Planning for Program Implementation

26. How much is there integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas?
27. Who should provide integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany any new curriculum ideas?
28. In what ways could present planning be improved?

Curriculum Dissemination:

a. Understanding the Guide

29. Do teachers understand the guide provided by the Province/State?
30. Rank the ways in which teachers came to understand the guide. (List of choices provided in questionnaire.)
31. What things hinder(ed) teachers from understanding the guide?
32. What ways would be best for teachers to come to understand the curriculum guide?

b. Use of the Guide

33. To what extent is the program given in the guide used in the classroom?
34. What are the things that hinder teachers most in using the program?

c. Teacher Training

35. Were teachers specifically trained to use the program?
36. Rank according to relative importance in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program. (List of choices provided in questionnaire.)

c. Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas

- 37. Who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas?
38. To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

39. To what extent do principals give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?
40. Rank according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas within a school. (List of choices provided in questionnaire.)
41. Rank according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas by the teacher organization. (List of choices provided in questionnaire.)

### General Factors

As a further step in providing contexts for the study, selected information about Alberta and Tasmania is given. The first section of this information deals with general factors, including physical environment, demography, history, economy, and politics, each with an introductory statement that relates it to this study. Following these are short descriptions of educational structure, facts, history, philosophy, curriculum processes, and the teacher organization in each area.

Physical environment: Curriculum development involves planning by and among people; curriculum ideas derive from many sources. The interaction of people within Alberta and Tasmania and between Alberta and Tasmania and neighboring countries/States/Provinces is affected to a great extent by the physical environment, with size, proximity to neighbors, climate, and terrain as important considerations.

Alberta<sup>2</sup> is a Province in Canada; Tasmania<sup>3</sup> is a State in Australia. The land area of Alberta is 248,800 square miles, plus 6,485 square miles of lakes. The total area of Tasmania is 26,215 square miles. Alberta extends from 49° to 60° north latitude and from 110° to 120° west longitude; Tasmania lies from 40°38' to 43°39' south latitude and from 144°35' to 148°23' east longitude. Alberta is surrounded by land--the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan to the west and east, respectively, the Canadian North-West Territories on the north, and the United States of America to the south. Tasmania is an island, bounded on the west and south by the Indian Ocean, on the east by the Tasman Sea, and on the north, separating it from the mainland of Australia, by Bass Strait.

The western part of Alberta is mountainous, but most of its terrain is grassland or grainland--flat or undulating. Tasmania is known as the Isle of Mountains from the high proportion of its area that is elevated. The highest point in Tasmania, Mt. Ossa, is 1,617 metres high (5,305 feet). Alberta has many peaks over 10,000 feet in height. Rainfall in Tasmania varies from 26 inches per annum on the East Coast to over 140 inches on the West Coast. Precipitation in Northern Alberta and in the South East is below fifteen inches per year and consists mainly of snow; average annual precipitation elsewhere is up to about thirty inches per year, much of it snow.

---

<sup>2</sup>Data on Alberta from Margot J. Fawcett, ed., The 1974 Corpus Almanac of Canada (Toronto: Corpus Publishers Services Ltd., 1974); and from Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1971, pp. 525-27.

<sup>3</sup>Data on Tasmania are from Tasmanian Year Book No. 8: 1974, Tasmanian Office, Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Thus, Alberta is larger in area than Tasmania, tending to impose greater difficulties for overall interaction, for widespread participation in curriculum development, and for curriculum dissemination. Alberta's climate is more severe than that of Tasmania, further accentuating problems. The relative physical isolation of Tasmania, surrounded as it is by oceans and seas, tends to reduce the impact of neighbors, unless their ideas are sought after. By contrast, Albertans receive much United States culture, the common boundary leading to direct reception of many radio and television programs. The nature of the terrain in Tasmania is inclined to interfere with travel in the same way that distance does in Alberta, although the roads and highways of Alberta are so good that all-year travel is feasible, enabling people to interact quite well. The high country of Alberta is very sparsely populated and most travelers can avoid the area; so the extreme heights do not impose extra problems for Albertans.

Demography: Curriculum development should involve the sharing of ideas by concerned people; curriculum dissemination involves conveying curriculum ideas to others. Both depend upon communications between and among people and effective communications are greatly affected by population. In such cases, population totals, the distribution of population, and whether the population is urban or rural are all important.

Alberta's population at the 1971 Census was 1,627,874; Tasmania's population in the same year was 390,000. Alberta's population is distributed at the rate of 6.54 per square mile;



Tasmania's at 6 per square mile. In Alberta, two large cities--Edmonton (the capital) and Calgary--contain a high proportion of the population and there is an overall urban population that is 76.75 percent of the total. In Tasmania, the capital city, Hobart, has 33.29 percent of the population, with the urban total overall at 73.4 percent. Both Alberta and Tasmania have significant immigrant groups in the population.

The greater population in Alberta makes direct participation in the development of a curriculum guide more difficult and accentuates problems in spreading new curriculum ideas. Concentrations of population help in reaching more teachers more quickly and should provide for more sharing of ideas by teachers. The two regions have similar percentages in urban areas, so little advantage should accrue to either. Their population density overall is also similar, giving neither a particular advantage.

History: Language is a vital tool for planning curriculum and for spreading curriculum ideas. Ethnic origin is also important, particularly if the curriculum has to accommodate widely disparate cultures.

Alberta was the original home of groups of Northern American Indians, Tasmania of Tasmanian Aborigines. The Indians still remain as a factor of Albertan life, while the Aborigines are gone from Tasmania, the last one dying in 1876.

Alberta was settled as part of British North America and English is the chief language used. However, the evolution of Canada as a nation since 1867 has meant two languages in the country and

there are parts of Alberta where French is prominent. Tasmania began as a penal colony of Britain in 1803 and became part of the Commonwealth of Australia when it was formed in 1901. The official language is English and it is used for business, government, and education, and by the media.

Curriculum planning in Alberta must take into account the Indian people, who are a continuing fact affecting both the content of teaching and how teaching is done. Although English is the chief language of instruction in Alberta, the Alberta Social Studies Curriculum Committee had two French-Canadians in its membership in 1970. The French fact in Canada adds an extra dimension to curriculum development in social studies in Alberta. The provision of French language resources for French-speaking students accentuates the usual problem of providing resources for a new curriculum. Although French-speaking students are a small percentage of the total Albertan school population, provision of opportunities for these students, equal to the opportunities for English-speaking students, is an important political consideration.

Economy: The sections given above on physical environment, demography, and history point out some factors that influence curriculum development and curriculum dissemination. The fiscal resources available to an area can provide a means to overcome some of the problems associated with environment, demography, and history; or they can add to those problems by being too few to meet the needs of education.

Alberta's economy is enriched by extensive energy resources of oil, gas, and coal. These provide a sound fiscal base for the Province along with the agricultural, manufacturing, and other mineral products. Tasmania has had a limited population growth in recent years, has suffered from transportation difficulties in getting products to market, has a greater distance to send products to world markets, and is generally stable but not rich economically. Alberta has had rapid expansion since 1960; the growth in Tasmania has been much less.

The relative wealth of Alberta has led to a superior network of roads. Funding for education has permitted the purchase of many resources, the development of much audio-visual material, and the release of teachers for curriculum work. It is not possible to judge whether the extra money available in Alberta compared with that available in Tasmania has been enough to offset the extra problems of greater area, harsher climate, greater population, and greater ethnic and linguistic diversity.

Politics: The nature of the government of a region has a marked effect upon curriculum development and dissemination. An autocratic system usually decrees and prescribes according to the wishes of one or a few, while a democratic system encourages widespread participation.

Both Alberta and Tasmania function under a British parliamentary system with regular election of representatives. Canada and Australia, of which Alberta and Tasmania are respectively a

part, both have a similar style of government and are regarded as democracies.

In each, there is a desire to maintain a broad involvement in curriculum development and dissemination. The success of these efforts, as perceived by some groups, is indicated by the responses to the questionnaire.

### Organizational Structure of Education

While there are similarities in the structures of the Provincial/State systems, with elected politicians as Ministers of Education and senior civil servants acting as their advisors and as administrators of the systems, there are also contrasts. The most notable difference occurs where local government bodies assume much responsibility for education, as in Alberta. By contrast, in Tasmania there is no locally elected body to assume responsibility. Local government receives its authority in Alberta through the School Act.<sup>4</sup> This form of decentralization and delegation of responsibility and authority is common in North America. In Tasmania, however, the State Department retains control, so that all professional educators in the public schools are employees of the State.

---

<sup>4</sup>The School Act, 1970 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, n.d.).

### Education Facts<sup>5</sup>

Alberta: In 1972-73,<sup>6,7</sup> Alberta schools enrolled 422,333 pupils, 347,728 in the public system and 74,605 in the separate system.<sup>8</sup> Included were 103,905 pupils in Edmonton and 102,601 pupils in Calgary.

Tasmania: In 1972, Tasmanian schools enrolled 94,055 pupils, 79,957 in government schools and 14,098 in nongovernment schools.

### Teaching staff:

Alberta: During 1972-73, Alberta schools employed a total of 22,272 teachers. Included were 5,430 teachers in Edmonton and 5,342 teachers in Calgary. The average pupil/teacher ratio in Alberta was 18.9:1.

Tasmania: During 1972, Tasmanian government schools employed 3,946 full-time and 559 part-time teachers. The average teacher/pupil ratio, allotting part-time teachers as half time, was 18.9:1.

---

<sup>5</sup>The Annual Review, 1973 (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1974).

<sup>6</sup>The Department of Education in Alberta operates with a fiscal year that runs from April 1 of one year to March 31 of the next and with a school year that runs September 1 of one year to August 31 of the next year.

<sup>7</sup>1972 and 1972/73 were selected as the years for these figures because they were the latest figures available during the time of the study, in 1974.

<sup>8</sup>Under the School Act in Alberta, any group of electors who belong to a minority religious group may operate a "separate" school system within the area where a "public" school system operates. Most separate school jurisdictions are Catholic; at least one is Protestant.

Education costs:

Alberta: The average annual cost of educating each pupil was \$950.22.

In the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1973, \$333,721,334 was paid by the Province for the education of Albertan children, approximately 58.5 percent coming from general revenues of the Province. The remainder came from the provincial levy on property, at the rate of 28 mills.

The average teacher salary in 1972-73 was \$11,522, being set according to years of training and years of experience. Most teachers were university trained.

Tasmania: The average annual cost of educating each pupil, from government funds, was \$A390.00 (approximately \$ Canadian 468.00).

Teacher salaries varied according to years of experience and many teachers were trained in teacher-training colleges.

Schools:

Alberta: There were 1,394 schools in operation in Alberta during 1972-73 in 30 Divisions, 30 Counties, and 89 Districts.

Tasmania: In 1972, Tasmania operated 282 schools, in a single system.

Educational History

Alberta: The educational history of Alberta parallels its social, economic, and political history. Most of the following

information is gleaned from the work of Chalmers.<sup>9</sup> Settlement of western Canada was followed quite closely by clergymen, who erected churches. These churches often served as schools as well, with the pastors as teachers. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant schools were set up by the early 1800's. The Hudson Bay Company (united with the North West Company in 1821) was overseer of the whole area until 1869, when the government assumed control of many facets of the Hudson Bay Company's functions, including control of education. In so doing, the government inherited Company policies on education, namely:

- (1) Support of education is a legitimate function of government,
- (2) education is best administered by religious, not secular authorities,
- (3) educational segregation by sexes is regarded as normal, especially at upper levels, although local circumstances may permit coeducation,
- (4) although children should be encouraged to attend school regularly, attendance need not be compulsory,
- (5) any person with a moderately good education is qualified to teach school.<sup>10</sup>

The first territorial support for schools in what is now Alberta occurred in 1880, with the first public school starting in 1882. After the elected assembly gained control from the Lieutenant Governor of the area, the education system became more Ontario-based than Quebec-based, in the 1890's. There were both separate and public schools, each type being paid for by its supporters through a system of taxation.

When Alberta was formed in 1905, there were 560 school districts in the Province. This number grew to 1505 by 1910 and 3700 to

---

<sup>9</sup> John W. Chalmers, Schools of the Foothills Province (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

4000 by the late 1930's. Girls attended in greater numbers than had done so previously and their presence in especially small rural schools led to coeducation as the norm. In 1907, the first kindergarten in Alberta was started. Recession, depression, and the fact of fewer school-age children all tended to keep children in school longer, through the 1920's and 1930's.

The Alberta Teachers' Alliance, formed in 1918, received a government charter as the Alberta Teachers' Association in 1935 and was made subject to compulsory membership in 1936. Educational historians have related this fact to the election to office of a new government in 1935, referring to the successful lobbying of members of the Teachers' Alliance.

Teacher shortages characterized Albertan education through several decades. By 1955, centralization of the many school districts led to the existence of 176 consolidated school districts, with a few remaining rural districts. The move towards centralization commenced with the creation of 11 divisions from 774 rural districts in 1937; by 1966, there were 59 divisions and counties, plus 16 rural public school districts in Alberta.

In 1929, the present system of 6-3-3 organization for elementary-junior-senior high was established. The present "credit"<sup>11</sup> program for senior high school subjects started in the late 1930's.

---

<sup>11</sup>Albertan students are required to complete twenty-five hours of schooling for each credit they receive in each subject throughout the senior high school (grades 10, 11, and 12).



The Cameron Commission report of 1959 included recommendations on the establishment of Community Colleges for Alberta and on vocational education, both later receiving attention. In mid-1973, the Worth Report arose from concerns about the long-range plans needed for Albertan education facing the 21st century.

In teacher training, there was a normal school set up in Calgary in 1906. Others followed, to prepare teachers for the schools and to improve on the meager training of early teachers. In 1930, the first graduates from the University of Alberta's new School of Education came to the schools; and from 1945 all teacher education became a function of the University of Alberta.

Throughout a period of over thirty years from the mid-1930's, Alberta had a single party in power in the Provincial government. This provided relative political stability for the development of education. A similar political situation existed in Tasmania. In other respects, however, Tasmania and Alberta were less alike.

Tasmania: As noted earlier, Tasmania became a State in 1856. In 1869, compulsory education was prescribed. Over the years, this was extended: in 1898, the ages of compulsory attendance were from 7 to 13 years; in 1912, it became 6 to 14 years; and in 1946, it became 6 to 16 years.<sup>12</sup>

The first state high schools in Tasmania were opened in 1913, based on "an academic tradition made possible by a selective

---

<sup>12</sup>Tasmanian Year Book, 1974, op. cit.

intake of students and staff."<sup>13</sup> In 1944, the Schools Board of Tasmania was established to govern systems of awarding school certificates. A Schools Board Certificate, awarded at the fourth year level of secondary education, was introduced in 1946. That year there was a reorganization of the education system to provide for graduation after three, four, or five years of secondary education. There was progressive abolition of the classification test used to select primary pupils for admission to secondary schools through the period 1956 to 1962, with English-type comprehensive high schools commencing in 1957. In 1969, two certificates were set up for secondary students "graduating"--the School Certificate, after four years, and the Higher School Certificate, after five or six years of secondary education. Both certificates consisted of a report on the student showing his/her results and listing all subjects taken.<sup>14</sup>

In 1962 matriculation colleges started in Tasmania, and the concept was extended to other larger population areas in subsequent years. In 1973 there was a new college opened near Hobart, "the first college in Australia specifically designed for fifth and sixth-year secondary students."<sup>15</sup> One important purpose of these matriculation colleges was to help bridge the gap between secondary and tertiary education.

---

<sup>13</sup>Tasmanian Matriculation Colleges (Hobart: Education Department, n.d.).

<sup>14</sup>"Education in Tasmania, 1973," Tasmanian Year Book, No. 7, 1973 (Tasmanian Office, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1973).

<sup>15</sup>Tasmanian Matriculation Colleges, op. cit.

The population of Tasmania was largely rural in earlier times and, in an attempt to meet the needs of local areas, "area schools" were established. Commencing in 1935, these area schools numbered 35 in 1973.<sup>16</sup> A characteristic of the schools was their concentration upon practical subjects at the secondary level. Most had a farm-type operation as part of the school, used for study by the local students. In 1973, "district school" replaced the title "area school."

Teacher education in Tasmania has been undertaken primarily by Provincially-run teacher colleges. These colleges were run by the Department to provide trained teachers as needed. A Faculty of Education was established at the University of Tasmania after World War II and provided a one-year program leading to a Diploma of Education for graduates from the faculties of Arts and Science.<sup>17</sup> In 1973, plans were being made to provide training for a Bachelor of Education degree at the University of Tasmania.

Adult education was organized in Tasmania in 1914 and has been a part of Tasmanian education since that time. In 1969, pre-schools were established as a part of the education system.

There has been considerable federal funding of education in Australia, despite the fact that States control education. A Commonwealth Office of Education was established in 1945. There was a change in the Federal Government early in the 1970's, leading to a

---

<sup>16</sup>The Educational Needs of Rural Areas (Hobart: Education Department of Tasmania, 1971).

<sup>17</sup>Education in Tasmania, 1973, op. cit.

review of federal funding. A study was undertaken and it led to the Karmel Report. As a result of the Karmel Report, considerable federal money was put into education, beginning in 1974.

From the brief historical sketch of education in each area, it can be seen that Alberta and Tasmania have some common features along with some quite different characteristics. The strength of the professional association of teachers in Alberta is not matched in Tasmania, where membership is voluntary. The organizational structure of schools through the school board system/State civil service system also constitutes notable differences.

#### Educational Philosophy

Alberta is part of a country that has been Canada for over 100 years. The United States of America, its southern neighbor, is very large and very influential. Many Albertan university staff train in or come from the United States. As well, texts in universities and in schools, the general literature of education, and educational philosophies largely originate in the United States. Printed materials and the products of other media from that country have a profound influence on education throughout Alberta. Overall, educational philosophy in Alberta reflects the educational philosophy of the United States of America.

Tasmania is part of a country that has been the Commonwealth of Australia for over seventy years. While its own publishing industry is growing, it imports books and other printed resources

extensively from Britain. Immigrants from Britain maintain early ties with that area, continuing the British influence.

The United States has had more influence in Tasmania since the Second World War but the greatest influence in education continues to come from Britain. This influence is reflected in such practices as the use of school uniforms for students and in the development of kindergarten.

Both regions have compulsory school attendance to age sixteen. Tasmania was the first colony in the British Empire to make education compulsory, in 1869.

The Worth Report<sup>18</sup> provides some insight into the thinking about education in Alberta in the early 1970's. Included in the report are recommendations stressing decentralization, defining some areas where centralization is the best approach, proposing life-long and early childhood education, and dealing with certification of teachers. These recommendations, which contribute to the educational philosophy of Alberta, arose from the input of many sources within Alberta. They will have varying effects upon future educational practice in Alberta. Some of the recommendations worthy of note are:

On decentralization:

The provincial educational structure must foster development of relatively independent local units of government and institutions highly responsive to the needs of their clients.

---

<sup>18</sup>A Choice of Futures, Report of the Commission on Educational Planning (Edmonton: Government Printer, 1972).

Activities in governance to be performed at the provincial level must be limited to those that cannot be effectively performed at the local or institutional level.

Boards of trustees must help to ensure that decentralization of authority also occurs within their jurisdictions.

Consistent with the move toward more local control, it is only appropriate that decisions about designs of schools be made at the local level.

Existing legislation will have to be extended so that boards of trustees can establish a school council for each school or group of schools within its jurisdiction.

The Department of Education should continue to issue a diploma on a school's recommendation.

There should be increased autonomy of the learner, reduced dominance of the teacher, and less pre-ordained structure for the learning transaction.

On centralization and standardization:

Priority will be given to providing the student with involvement in experiences which result in the student achieving mastery of basic skills and strategies, being excited with learning, and becoming imbued with a desire to continue learning, rather than with giving the student a core of factual information.

The provincial authority should specify a basic length or minimum range for the school year and school day to safeguard the public interest and to provide a baseline for funding.

More time must be allocated to physical education, fine arts, and outdoor education to enhance creative capacity and personal autonomy.

Environmental education must dominate future horizons.

Educational planning should be correlated with general social and economic planning.

The provincial government should assume fiscal responsibility for early and basic education, but with some opportunity for financial enrichment at the local level.

On life-long learning:

Educational planning must take life-long learning as a basic assumption.

Employers and labor unions must be encouraged to negotiate day release periods so that schooling can become a part of regular work schedules.

Boards of trustees and school councils should concern themselves with both basic education and further education programs in community schools.

On early childhood education:

Schooling should begin at the earliest age at which a child can derive benefit and should have three major functions: stimulation, identification, socialization.

Provision for and public funding of selective experiences for three and four year olds is advocated.

Provision for and public funding of universal opportunity programs for five year olds is advocated.

Early education must be to help each child develop an image of himself which he finds satisfying and attractive.

On certification of staff:

School authorities should be granted the freedom to employ for special tasks whomever they wish, when no suitably qualified professional, trainee, or volunteer is available. Present regulations bar uncertified personnel from instructional roles in schools.

Teaching certificates ought to be issued for a fixed time, ten years being the proposed period.

In identifying specifics of educational philosophy in Tasmania, it is best to cite the statements of the Education Department.

A statement on the primary schools follows:

In recent years the objectives of the primary school program have changed from what seemed to be the conventional expectations of schools that "train" children in academic learnings and which see as successful only those children who reach prescribed goals. They wish to foster social, artistic and moral, as well as intellectual development in children through their own activity and discovery. They want to help their personal growth, teach them that they are competent to learn, to grow, to trust themselves as well as others. Underlying this is an emphasis on differences in children's temperaments, interests, abilities and modes of learning. One of the objectives is to have children get to know everyday phenomena through first-hand experience.

Another aim of the curriculum is to have the child question thoughtfully and think for himself, making his own generalizations and abstractions.

In addition the learning of new skills and the solving of problems is emphasized.

We encourage a child to express his feelings and sense of self through dramatic play, dance, graphic art, literature. At the same time, recognizing the increased complexity of the demands on teachers there is growing willingness for teachers to work cooperatively using individual talents and interests to the advantage of more than one class and providing a situation where pupils can readily be regrouped in small or large groups, always with intensive or general supervision and assistance as the occasion demands. There will be a need for space



to store books, materials, equipment, teaching aids and many objects including the product of pupils' efforts: these will relate to art, craft, science and mathematical experiment.

Within teaching areas flexibility is sought, not only to allow varied use at any given time, but to allow adaptation to different approaches and policies over the years.

Accepting that classes do not need to work exclusively in their own defined areas there can be shared use of some facilities such as wet areas.

As cooperative teaching and space sharing have gained acceptance, open-space design has increasingly been adopted as in harmony with changing statement and school organization.<sup>19</sup>

A further statement of philosophy appeared in Edington's report:

It is recognized by the Department of Education that "education from early childhood to adulthood is a continuous process with a continuously changing demand. It is the task of an education system to assess itself, and where necessary, adapt itself to meet this demand at every level of learning."<sup>20</sup>

#### Curriculum Processes for Elementary Social Studies/Social Science

In Alberta, there is a curriculum committee<sup>21</sup> which develops a curriculum guide for elementary social studies. Membership of this committee includes Department staff, university staff, and teachers nominated by the Alberta Teachers' Association. Members of the Alberta Teachers' Association who offer to serve on the committee include classroom teachers, school administrators, and system consultants in social studies. Membership of the committee is for a

---

<sup>19</sup>Primary Schools Statement of Philosophy (Roneod sheet received in 1973 from the Director of Primary Education).

<sup>20</sup>A Case Study of the Teaching Aids Centre, Tasmania, Australia, prepared by Mr. A. B. Edington, Director of Information and Research for the Centre for Educational Development Overseas, London, for presentation to the Commonwealth Ministers for Education, Jamaica, June 1974, p. 3.

<sup>21</sup>The writer was a member of the committee from 1968 to 1971.

three-year term. The most recent work of the committee culminated in the publication of a curriculum guide in 1971.<sup>22</sup> The guide was published by the Department of Education after being approved by the necessary curriculum advisory bodies.

Tasmanian educators undertook considerable thought and debate en route to the decision to designate social studies as social science. Swifte<sup>23</sup> and Rodwell<sup>24</sup> have provided written evidence of this process. The new curriculum guides in Tasmania were arrived at via an extended practical involvement by coopted teachers who spent a week in Hobart working as a team with Department staff in developing a draft. Teachers were then seconded from schools to spend time to develop the draft into a detailed guide. The guide was then tested in selected schools, using varying geographic and economic bases to give a diversity of trial situations. After the trial, the guide was revised and there were seminars held in centres throughout the State to provide other teachers with the background for its use. Constant revision was provided for and high local interest and relevance was sought by having Tasmanian teachers write stories for inclusion in the guide.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Experiences in Decision Making, Elementary Social Studies Handbook (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, January 1971).

<sup>23</sup>H. L. Swifte, "Aims and Means in Social Sciences," Tasmanian Journal of Education 6 (April 1972): 32-33.

<sup>24</sup>Grant Rodwell, "Putting Science Into Social Sciences," Tasmanian Journal of Education 7 (July-August 1973): 39-43.

<sup>25</sup>Interview with George Holden, past chairman of Working Committee, July 1974.

In Tasmania, the program was first introduced into kindergarten. After that, Grades 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5 and 6 used the program, in pairs of grades each time. The sequence for a new guide was as follows: in the first year there were limited trials in selected schools; in the second year the guide was available to all teachers but in tentative form; and in the third year the guide was published as an official course to be offered in all schools.<sup>26</sup> A similar progressive introduction occurred at the secondary level in Tasmania. Evaluation commenced with the publication of the first guide and stressed the effects of the program rather than evaluation of students. A report on First Year High School exemplifies this approach of stressing the effects of the program on students and teachers by concentrating on the attitudes and interests of pupils rather than on their knowledge of course content.<sup>27</sup> The Curriculum Branch published a series of Banks of Items for Primary Social Sciences in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 to assist and to guide teachers in the evaluation of the program.

Implementation of the new curriculum guide for elementary social studies in Alberta was for Grades 1 to 6, with a heavy stress upon teacher inservice by Department staff. Seminars were held extensively throughout Alberta. Besides the work of the Department, there were Social Studies Council workshops and seminars in many

---

<sup>26</sup>Interview with Don Palmer, July 1974.

<sup>27</sup>D. G. Palmer, The Attitudes and Interests of First Year High School Pupils and Their Teachers (With Particular Reference to the New Social Sciences Courses) (Hobart: Education Department of Tasmania, March 1973).

areas. The subject councils of the Alberta Teachers' Association provide opportunities for teachers to work cooperatively in areas of common interest.

A member of the Committee planning the program in Tasmania was from the Australian Broadcasting Commission. This national radio-television network had personnel of its own staff working with a seconded Department staff member so that programs would be better able to meet the needs of schools.<sup>28</sup> In addition, the Department, through its Teaching Aids Branch, provided multi-media packages and printed many of the texts and other references used with the program.<sup>29</sup>

In Alberta, software such as audio and videotapes that were needed for the program were provided for teachers through the Audio Visual Services Branch. Educational radio and television programs were also provided through educational agencies but most references and texts were commercially produced.

An important component in the planning of the curriculum guide in Tasmania was the spiral curriculum proposed by Hilda Taba.<sup>30</sup> The same concept was used in planning the curriculum guide in Alberta.<sup>31</sup> The spiral curriculum, as proposed by Taba, consists of visualizing concepts that are going to be developed in social

---

<sup>28</sup>Interview with Hugh McIndow and Mr. Gleeson, July 1974.

<sup>29</sup>Interview with Graeme Foster, July 1974.

<sup>30</sup>Interview with Hugh Campbell, July 1974.

<sup>31</sup>Experiences in Decision Making, op. cit., p. 14.

studies as being "threads which appear over and over again in a spiral fashion but which always are moving to a higher level."<sup>32</sup>

### Teacher Organization

In Alberta, the Alberta Teachers' Association had a 1974 budget of \$3,315,983.00. Its budget for Professional Development activities was \$258,320.00.<sup>33</sup>

The Tasmanian Teachers' Federation budget for 1974 totalled \$163,200.00, of which the sum of \$8,000.00 was identified for "In-Service Education and Research."<sup>34</sup>

Teachers in Alberta are required by legislation to be members of the Alberta Teachers' Association. This compulsory membership through the School Act and the Teaching Profession Act,<sup>35</sup> gives the organization a very considerable status. In addition to its role in negotiating contracts for teachers, the Association gives much attention to Professional Development, largely through a network of Specialist Councils.<sup>36</sup> A Specialist Council is an organization of educators having a common interest in a subject or program area. Funds for the operation of the organization are available from the

---

<sup>32</sup>Hilda Taba, Teachers' Handbook for Elementary Social Studies (Don Mills: Ontario: Addison-Wesley (Canada) Ltd., 1967), p. 14.

<sup>33</sup>1976 Handbook, The Alberta Teachers' Association 59th Annual Representative Assembly, Part 2, p. 4.

<sup>34</sup>Budget for 1974, Tasmanian Teachers' Federation.

<sup>35</sup>The School Act, op. cit.; The Teaching Profession Act (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1955).

<sup>36</sup>There were nineteen Councils in 1974.

Provincial Association as well as from fees paid by members of each council. Throughout the period following the introduction of the new Social Studies program in Alberta, the Social Studies Council had a membership of over 1,000 and was active in workshops/seminars to assist teachers with the program.<sup>37</sup>

Teachers in Tasmania also belong to internal subject organizations. Thus, a meeting of the Tasmanian Geography Teachers Association Northern Branch was scheduled to discuss the new Social Science Syllabus in April, 1971, in Launceston.<sup>38</sup> Members of the Tasmanian Teachers' Federation may be in one or more of the fourteen or fifteen specialist groups that exist and must be in one of the thirty-four geographical subunits of the Federation.<sup>39</sup>

#### Terms Used

Throughout this study, a number of names or terms are used that have particular meanings in Alberta and Tasmania. A brief description of these is given below to assist the reader who may not be familiar with these regions.

The curriculum committee is made up of educators who are charged with the development of a program of studies for the region. In Alberta, the curriculum committee is comprised of representatives from the Department of Education and from universities, along with a

---

<sup>37</sup>The writer was president in 1971 and 1972.

<sup>38</sup>The Tasmanian Teacher (Hobart: Education Department, March 1971), p. 3.

<sup>39</sup>Interview with Harry Leitch and May Backhouse, July 1974.

majority of members who are teachers or administrators chosen from a selected list of members of the Alberta Teachers' Association. In Tasmania, members are teachers or administrators, officials of the Department, or staff of the university or teacher training college. School-based personnel are usually seconded<sup>40</sup> from school duties for curriculum committee work in Tasmania; in Alberta, their duties are performed on an ad hoc basis.

The curriculum guide is the product of the curriculum committee's work. The guide includes a written outline of the program of studies--content--along with advice about methods of teaching and evaluation--process. In an introduction to the guide in Alberta, the Department of Education indicates that the guide is suggestive only; the Tasmanian guide takes a similar approach. This means that teachers are not obliged to follow the guide slavishly, but may plan their own curriculum to develop the concepts, skills, and attitudes called for at each level. However, any teacher who is unable to plan an effective program or who appears unsuccessful in teaching the subject is referred to the guide. In such cases, administrators make the guide more than suggestive for a teacher.

Within each guide there are parts that are required in a general sense in order to avoid undue repetition of topics and to provide a logical sequence. Thus, the Grade 5 child will study Canada or Australia but not necessarily through the content described

---

<sup>40</sup>A member of staff is seconded when working in another department or area for a fixed term or task, while being officially listed in his/her original position.

in the guide. Both regions produce the curriculum guide as an official publication of the Department. As a result, many educators disbelieve the injunction that the guide is suggestive and treat it as prescriptive.

Curriculum dissemination refers to the spreading of information about the references, the content, and the processes that are advocated/suggested/prescribed by the curriculum guide. The section on curriculum dissemination deals with questions that relate to teacher understanding of the guide, to the use of the guide by teachers, to the training of teachers for use of the programs contained in the guide, and to ways in which curriculum ideas can or should be diffused to reach teachers.

The Department is the Department of Education in Alberta and the Education Department in Tasmania. Each is responsible for education within the Province/State, under the federal division of powers. In Alberta, the School Act delegates much control of education to a locally elected board, council, or committee. The latter hires staff to serve as teachers and administrators for the jurisdiction, operates an annual budget, has powers over curriculum, within the general guidelines and under the general direction of the Department, and is able to determine the course of local education while remaining accountable to the Department, through the Act, for good fiscal and educational management. In Alberta, the Department operates a central office which has branches for various facets of education, to monitor the accountability of school jurisdictions. In 1971, it established Regional Offices in six centres throughout



the Province. Besides providing consultative services to jurisdictions, the staff of these offices serve as monitors of local education, checking that the Act and other provincially mandated educational decisions are followed.

In Tasmania, the Department includes every employee of the public school system, including teachers, principals, and superintendents. Besides the central office in the capital, there is a cadre of superintendents located in four regional offices. The role of superintendents in Tasmania is described as being supervisory rather than evaluative under this structure, but the hierarchical framework tends to make them evaluators.

The professional organization in Alberta is the Alberta Teachers' Association. In Tasmania, the organization is the Tasmanian Teachers' Federation. Membership in the Alberta organization is compulsory; in Tasmania, membership is voluntary.

Teacher organization representatives include the elected officials of the Alberta Teachers' Association and executive officers of the Alberta Teachers' Association and of the Tasmanian Teachers' Federation.

School-system administrators, as a group, are limited to Alberta, where School Board appointed superintendents of schools fall in this category, along with assistant superintendents and any other central office educational personnel. Whether called "superintendents" or "school system administrators" in this report of the study, they are unique to Alberta. However, Tasmanians confused

departmental superintendents with "school-system administrators" or superintendents in one place in the study.

Principals include personnel variously designated as principal, headmaster, headteacher, and the deputies or assistants of these offices. "Principal" is the chief term used throughout the study.

School-based educators include the teachers and principals who responded to the questionnaire.

Non-school-based educators are the Department, university, school-system administrator, teacher organization, and curriculum committee respondents. Bridging both groups, the curriculum committee has a membership that is both school-based and non-school-based. For the purposes of the study, the curriculum committee group is included with non-school-based educators because of the number of university and Department members, the secondment to curriculum duties for Tasmanian teachers, and the presence of school-system personnel as teacher representatives in Alberta.

Parents are members of the Parents' and Friends' Association in Tasmania or of the Home and School Association in Alberta. The organizations are established to provide for improved liaison between the school and the home and do their grassroots work at the level of the local school. There is also a Provincial/State body, which serves as a forum for common concerns and as a vehicle for political pressure or action. Those surveyed are officers in the Provincial/State body of their organization, being elected from among the general membership.

Groups are the various categories of people who are surveyed.

The sample is made up as follows:

Group	Number Surveyed	
	Alberta	Tasmania
Teachers	40	40
Parents	8	6
University	7	4
Principals	20	20
Department	7	8
Curriculum Committee	8	1
School-System Admin.	20	--
Teacher Rep.	3	2

### Summary

The need for information and knowledge about curriculum development is noted, as is the need for data on the different situations where curriculum development will occur. The purpose of the study is to address a list of basic questions on curriculum development to generate information and knowledge about it.

Following the statements of need and of purpose is a section on contexts of the study. Representing centralized organization and partly decentralized organizations, respectively, and having recently introduced curriculum in elementary social studies, Tasmania and Alberta are used for the study. Following a list of the specific questions of the questionnaire, a context is set for the reader by the inclusion of some background information on both Alberta and Tasmania.

Alberta has a larger area than Tasmania and its winter climate is more severe than that of Tasmania. There are many more people in Alberta than in Tasmania and Alberta has both Indian and

French-speaking people, as well as English-speaking residents, in a country that uses two languages extensively. All these factors tend to make the interaction and communication processes that are basic to curriculum development and curriculum dissemination more difficult in Alberta than in Tasmania.

The relative isolation of Tasmania does not apply to Alberta, where there is influence from all its neighbors, and especially from the United States to the south. Traditional ties for Tasmania are more with Britain and British immigrants have tended to maintain them.

Both areas have a high proportion of the population in urban settings and there is a similar density of population in each. Both operate under a democratic system of government.

Although the mountains of Alberta reach greater heights than those in Tasmania, the latter has mountainous areas throughout, making travel in Tasmania more difficult than travel in Alberta. Alberta is a rich area and it provides communications systems and opportunities in education that are not available in Tasmania.

Both regions have control of education delegated to them from their national governments. Alberta has further delegated much responsibility to local government authorities, while Tasmania retains centralized control. In education Alberta has a larger student body, more schools, a more numerous teaching force, a greater budget, and more per capita cost than does Tasmania. In addition, Alberta's teacher organization has more members, more strength, and more funds than its Tasmanian counterpart.

The next section contains terms that could be new to readers, with an explanation and a description. Included are: curriculum committee, curriculum guide, curriculum dissemination, the Department, professional organization, teacher organization representatives, school-system administrators, principals, school-based educators, non-school-based educators, parents, and groups.

### Overview

A review of the literature is presented in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3 there are details about the sample, the measure used, the design of the study, and the method of analysis used. Chapter 4 is devoted to a description, analysis, and comparison of responses to the questionnaire on curriculum development and on dissemination of curriculum ideas in the two regions. A summary and conclusions from the survey are given in Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Included in this review of literature are studies that are germane to the inquiry of the thesis, namely, curriculum sources, roles in curriculum development, planning for program implementation, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas.

Since the focus throughout the study is on curriculum, a brief review of literature on the meaning of curriculum is included, and it leads to the definition of curriculum as "all of the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school." A short section referring to literature that defines curriculum development concludes the chapter.

#### Research Literature on Role Perceptions

##### Curriculum Sources

The studies by Christoff, Flåtten, Harris, and Sloan refer to the topics covered by questionnaire items 12 and 13,<sup>1</sup> under the section on curriculum sources, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>Anton Edward Christoff, "A Study to Determine How Teachers in the Sheboygan Public Schools, Sheboygan, Wisconsin, Perceive the Freedom They Have and the Freedom They Feel They Should Have to Make Instructional Decisions" (Ed.D. thesis, University of Northern Colorado, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 7-8; Wayne Richard Flåtten, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal, Teachers, and Parents in the Area of Curriculum Improvement" (Ed.D. thesis, Brigham

12. Rank according to who actually sets curriculum now. (List given in questionnaire.)
13. Rank according to who should plan the curriculum for social studies/social science. (List given in questionnaire.)

Anton Edward Christoff<sup>2</sup> found that teachers in the Sheboygan Public Schools in Wisconsin felt that they had considerable freedom to make instructional decisions and also that they felt that they should have the freedom. Some teachers wanted more freedom than they had, with the younger teachers generally wanting the most freedom.

Wayne Richard Flåtten<sup>3</sup> found that a jury of experts and a group of elementary school principals both felt that the experts and the principals should have more involvement, to enhance the curriculum of the elementary school.

Juanita Edwards Harris<sup>4</sup> found that the teachers selected for her study stressed aspects of curriculum development generally the same as did curriculum specialists. In doing so, the teachers

---

Young University, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts 1972, 5-6; Juanita Edwards Harris, "A Study of the Opinions of Selected Teachers Concerning Curriculum Planning at the Regional Level in a Decentralized School System" (Ed.D. thesis, Wayne State University, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts 1972, 5-6; Harold Richard Sloan, "Innovation and Change in Iowa Elementary Schools: Principals and Teachers' Perceptions" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Iowa, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 11-12.

<sup>2</sup>Christoff, op. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Flåtten, op. cit.

<sup>4</sup>Harris, op. cit.

showed that they and curriculum specialists had similar perceptions of curriculum sources.

Harold Richard Sloan<sup>5</sup> found that both principals and teachers in Iowa Elementary Schools saw themselves and each other as being most important program proposers.

These findings can be compared with the perceptions of principals, teachers, and curriculum committee members who responded to the questionnaire items on who actually sets and who should plan curriculum for social studies/social science. Comparisons are made as part of the summary and conclusions of the study in Chapter 5.

#### Roles in Curriculum Development

Studies that relate to this topic generally fall into the area covered by question 21, which is:

21. To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in curriculum development?

A study by William Douglas Ward<sup>6</sup> is in this category.

Ward<sup>7</sup> found that teacher organizations place high priority on involvement in instructional policy development with school boards. He also found that the teacher organizations place low priority on teacher organization development and/or enforcement of

---

<sup>5</sup>Sloan, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup>William Douglas Ward, "The Role of Teacher Organizations in Professional Development and Instructional Improvement as Perceived by Selected Teacher Organization Leaders" (Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1973).

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.



performance standards by teachers. His findings would indicate perceptions of teacher organization leadership in the policy sense but not through a monitoring of members.

Respondents to question 21 give their perceptions of the role of the teacher organization in curriculum development, permitting comparisons between Ward's findings and findings in this study. These comparisons are made in Chapter 5.

#### Planning for Program Implementation

Charles Nathan Dempsey<sup>8</sup> found that teachers in Virginia expected effective instructional leadership from elementary school principals. This finding relates to question 27, which states:

27. Who should provide integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany new curriculum ideas?

The extent to which respondents to question 27 state that principals are key planners in ensuring that resources accompany new curriculum ideas can be compared with Dempsey's finding. This comparison is presented in Chapter 5.

#### Teacher Training

Reference to teacher training occurs in the study by Ward.<sup>9</sup> He found that teacher organizations place high priority on local initiative and planning of in-service activities, with in-service to

---

<sup>8</sup>Charles Nathan Dempsey, "Patterns of Effectiveness and Ineffective Behavior of Elementary School Principals as Perceived by a Selected Group of Class-Room Teachers in Virginia" (Ed.D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 7-8.

<sup>9</sup>Ward, op. cit.

be funded by the public and not by dues. Ward's work on this theme is relevant to item 36, as follows:

36. Rank according to relative importance in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program. (List included in questionnaire.)

A comparison between Ward's finding and the finding in this study on the matter of teacher training is given in Chapter 5.

### Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas

Research literature on diffusion of curriculum ideas includes work by Ward, Dempsey, Sloan, Easton, and Gourley<sup>10</sup> and relates to questions 37, 38, 39, and 40, as follows:

37. Who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas?
38. To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?
39. To what extent do principals give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?
40. Rank the following according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas. (List included in questionnaire.)

Ward<sup>11</sup> found that teacher organizations give low priority to instructional improvement through the teacher organization. Since instructional leadership would logically include spreading new

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.; Dempsey, op. cit.; Sloan, op. cit.; Donald Louis Easton, "The Supervisory Role of the Elementary School Principal in Montana" (Ed.D. thesis, Montana State University, 1971), Dissertation Abstracts Vol. 32 9-10, p. 4870-A; Harold Eugene Gourley, "Issues at the Building Level as Perceived by Elementary Principals" (Ed.D. thesis, Indiana University, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 11-12.

<sup>11</sup>Ward, op. cit.

curriculum ideas, his findings relate to questions 37 and 38, on responsibility for spreading new curriculum ideas and on teacher organization leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas.

Dempsey<sup>12</sup> reports a study that relates to question 37, on responsibility for spreading new curriculum ideas, when he found that teachers in Virginia expected effective instructional leadership from elementary school principals. Instructional leadership is taken to mean that there would be leadership given to teachers by principals so that the instruction of pupils would be most effective. In this sense, instructional leadership would logically have to include curriculum diffusion.

Sloan<sup>13</sup> reports that principals and teachers in Iowa saw themselves and each other as being most important program adopters, as well as program proposers. This finding is relevant to questions 37 and 39 on responsibility for spreading new curriculum ideas and on the extent of principals' leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas.

Harold Eugene Gourley<sup>14</sup> found that the three most significant issues confronting building principals include curriculum innovation. This point relates most closely to question 39, which asks about the extent of leadership shown by principals in spreading new curriculum ideas.

---

<sup>12</sup>Dempsey, op. cit.

<sup>13</sup>Sloan, op. cit.

<sup>14</sup>Gourley, op. cit.

Donald Louis Easton<sup>15</sup> found that teachers stress the importance of administrative visits less than the visits are stressed by administrators themselves. His finding is most pertinent to question 40 on what is the best way to spread new curriculum ideas.

The research on diffusion of curriculum ideas can be compared with findings in this study. The comparisons are made in Chapter 5.

### Curriculum Defined

There are many descriptions of curriculum. Morris says, "Stemming from the Latin, curriculum literally means a 'race course' or a course of studies through which one 'runs' to reach the end, an end presumably of full knowledge, keen insight and mature citizenship."<sup>16</sup> Beauchamp expects that "the curriculum for the elementary school be a planned document, and that it be planned by the adult membership of the school community it is intended to serve."<sup>17</sup>

He adds:

Curriculum has been defined as the design of a social group for the educational experiences of their children in school. It has been suggested that this curriculum consists of four parts: a statement of document interest, a statement of goal direction, an instructional guide, and provisions for evaluation.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Easton, op. cit.

<sup>16</sup>Van Cleve Morris, Philosophy and the American School (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 88.

<sup>17</sup>George A. Beauchamp, Planning the Elementary School Curriculum (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1956), p. 275.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

Ragan presents much the same view in stating, "Traditionally curriculum has meant the subjects taught in school or the course of study,"<sup>19</sup> and Hurley agrees: "Some think of the curriculum as the course of study and follow it slavishly. Others consider it synonymous with the basic textbook. Still others consider curriculum to be definitive outlines for teaching separate subjects day by day."<sup>20</sup>

Doll differentiates between the traditional and the modern view of curriculum in the statement: "The commonly-accepted definition of curriculum has changed from content of courses of study and lists of subjects and courses to all the experiences which are offered to learners under the auspices or direction of the school."<sup>21</sup> Similar distinctions between curriculum as the course of study, as courses offered, as subject matter content, and as planned experiences are made by Anderson.<sup>22</sup> Crosby differentiates between subject-centred curricula ("founded upon the belief that the curriculum is composed of separate and distinct subjects, each of which embraces a body of content and skills which will enable the learner to acquire knowledge

---

<sup>19</sup>W. B. Ragan, Modern Elementary Curriculum, rev. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

<sup>20</sup>B. D. Hurley, Curriculum for Elementary School Children (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957), p. 79.

<sup>21</sup>R. C. Doll, Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), p. 21.

<sup>22</sup>V. E. Anderson, Practices and Procedures of Curriculum Improvement (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956), pp. 4-5.

of himself and his world"),<sup>23</sup> child-centred curricula ("the premise that the child is the center of the educational process and the curriculum should be built upon his interests, needs, abilities and purposes"),<sup>24</sup> and problem-centred curricula ("conceived as the framework in which the child is guided toward maturity within the context of the social group").<sup>25</sup>

The definition of curriculum given by Doll, above, includes "all the experiences which are offered to learners under the auspices or direction of the school." Grobman agrees when he states, ". . . curriculum encompasses all school-oriented learning experiences of the child, including some unplanned ones that produce results diametrically opposed to the aims of the curriculum planners."<sup>26</sup> This all-encompassing definition is limited by Hicks, Houston, Cheney and Marquard when they state that the curriculum of the school includes those experiences "for which the school accepts responsibility."<sup>27</sup> Burdin and McAuley also limit the definition but fail to clarify the extent of that limit. They state, "Curriculum

---

<sup>23</sup>Muriel Crosby, Curriculum Development for Elementary Schools in a Changing Society (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1964), p. 10.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>26</sup>Halda Grobman, Evaluation Activities of Curriculum Projects: A Starting Point (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1968), p. 5.

<sup>27</sup>William Vernon Hicks, W. Robert Houston, Bruce D. Cheney, and Richard L. Marquard, The New Elementary School Curriculum (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1970), p. 26.

to a large degree is what the teacher and pupils do in the classroom."<sup>28</sup> In this definition, they stress process rather than content, as do others noted below.

A number of writers emphasize student experience, like Doll cited above. Cay, for example, says curriculum is "the educational design of learning experiences for children, youth and adults in school."<sup>29</sup> Beck, Cook and Kearney note that curriculum is often defined as "the educational experiences that children have in school."<sup>30</sup>

Beauchamp states that "the most common way about thinking about curriculum is to define it as all of the experiences of children under the jurisdiction of the school" and ". . . curriculum . . . the sum of the experiences--the learnings, skills, habits, and attitudes that the child has made a part of himself, and that govern his behavior, as a result of the environment provided by the school."<sup>31</sup> Dittman includes a definition of curriculum as "what happens in an

---

<sup>28</sup>J. L. Burdin and J. D. McAuley, Elementary School Curriculum and Instruction: The Teacher's Role (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1971).

<sup>29</sup>D. F. Cay, Curriculum: Design for Learning (New York: The Bobbs Merrill Company, 1966), p. 1.

<sup>30</sup>R. H. Beck, W. W. Cook, and N. C. Kearney, Curriculum in the Modern Elementary School, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 1.

<sup>31</sup>G. A. Beauchamp, The Curriculum of the Elementary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1964), pp. 5-6.

educational environment."<sup>32</sup> Crary says that "curriculum is the program of intended learning devised by the school."<sup>33</sup> Inslow describes the curriculum as "the planned composite effort of any school to guide pupil learning toward predetermined learning outcomes."<sup>34</sup>

For the purposes of this study, the general definition of Doll, with the limitation of planning suggested by such writers as Hicks, Houston, Cheney, and Marquard, Cay, and Crary is used. Thus, the curriculum is "all of the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school."

#### Curriculum Development

Perceptions about curriculum development are introduced by Frost and Rowland, Wright, Camp, Stosberg and Fleming, Pritzkau, Miel, and Richmond.

Frost and Rowland state, "The effective curriculum, however, means planning from advance organizers and the executing of these plans by a specific teacher for a unique group of students in an educational encounter."<sup>35</sup> They define advance organizers as including publishers, State Education Commissions, or major curriculum

---

<sup>32</sup>Laura L. Dittman, ed., Curriculum Is What Happens (Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1970), p. 4.

<sup>33</sup>Ryland W. Crary, Humanizing the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), p. 13.

<sup>34</sup>Gail M. Inslow, The Emergent in Curriculum (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 7.

<sup>35</sup>Joe L. Grost and G. Thomas Rowland, Curriculum for the Seventies (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1969), p. 5.



development projects. They add that curriculum development is not complete until applied in the educational encounter. Wright, Camp, Stosberg, and Fleming say, "No curriculum has any meaning at all until teachers and students together, with new technology, and information bring it to life."<sup>36</sup> Pritzkau stresses that curriculum improvement is an integral and integrated factor with teaching itself, indicating that use of the classroom context for curriculum improvement is vital.<sup>37</sup> Miel is as definite about the process being more important than the content:

If it is true that the curriculum is composed of the experiences children undergo, it follows as a corollary that the curriculum is the result of interaction of a complex of factors, including the physical environment and the desires, beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and skills of the persons served by and serving the school.<sup>38</sup>

A change of curriculum, according to Miel, would be a change of interactions not a change on paper. Richmond deals specifically with curriculum development when he contends that it is a deliberate, managed process rather than automatic change brought about by various forces.<sup>39</sup> The planning dimension that has received considerable attention above is also called for by Nerbovig, who indicates that

---

<sup>36</sup>Betty Atwell Wright, Lorrie T. Camp, William K. Stosberg, and Babette L. Fleming, Elementary School Curriculum (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), p. v.

<sup>37</sup>Philo T. Pritzkau, Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959).

<sup>38</sup>Alice Miel, Changing the Curriculum (New York: Century Company, Inc., 1946), p. 10.

<sup>39</sup>W. Kenneth Richmond, The School Curriculum (London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1971), pp. 11-12.

planning involves selection of topic, selection of instructional goals and activities, including evaluation, and logistics, in which he includes, such as groups, space, time, movement, and materials.<sup>47</sup>

The planning element underlies curriculum development as it is referred to throughout the study.

### Summary

The content of Chapter 2 is a review of the literature that relates to the study. Research reports dealing with role perceptions are reviewed in the section, Research Literature on Role Perceptions. There is research relating to curriculum sources, roles in curriculum development, planning for curriculum implementation, teacher training, and dissemination of curriculum ideas through role perceptions of superintendents, principals, teachers, curriculum directors, "experts," and teacher organization leaders. Selected reports relevant to this study are related to particular questions of the questionnaire.

The next section gives a review of the differing definitions of curriculum in the literature. A wide range of definitions is noted and the writer arrives at the one that is used throughout the study.

The final section deals with curriculum development, leading to the conclusion that planning is the necessary facet for development to take place.

---

<sup>40</sup>Marcell H. Nerbovig, Unit Planning: A Model for Curriculum Development (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970).

The content of the section entitled Research Literature on Role Perceptions, about literature reported from research relating to this study, is quite limited. The writer was surprised at the paucity of research in this area and made extra attempts to find more, but to no avail. During the first writing of the report, he searched library resources for research reports, concentrating on the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Review of Educational Research, Research in Education, the Educational Index, The Handbook of Research on Teaching, and on Dissertation Abstracts. A wide range of key words, including administrators, courses of study, curriculum, curriculum development, curriculum guide, curriculum planning, dissemination, elementary, in-service, perceptions, principals, professional organization, role perceptions, roles, social studies, and teachers, were used in the search with limited results. Journals were searched with no results, there being a rare article on the subject but no research. The dissertations produced at Michigan State University were also searched, with very limited success.

When in Tasmania, the writer visited the library at the University of Tasmania and searched indices and files. The Australian Educational Index was searched without success.

For concentrated effort to complete the report with the availability of library facilities and the guidance of his advisor, the writer returned to the campus at Michigan State University. A further search of research was undertaken, concentrating on the ERIC system and reports from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development. Using the descriptors curriculum, curriculum development, perceptions, and role perceptions, the writer searched ERIC sources. Some titles were sufficiently appropriate to warrant reference to the document résumé; some résumés appeared relevant enough to warrant reference to the documents. All such leads were unproductive when the thrust of this study was considered.

As a result, it is concluded that the research dealing with role perceptions of educators and others in the area of curriculum development was quite limited up to the end of 1974, the period of this study.

Despite the general dearth of other research, however, it is pleasing to note that what is available is highly relevant.

The relevance of the reported research to this study lies in the fact that both deal with topics and questions that are either the same or quite similar. Details of comparisons between responses in this study and findings in the reported research are given in Chapter 5. The summary given below is limited to brief statements of the research findings and to a reference to the particular questions yielding comparable data in this study.

Christoff found that teachers have and want freedom to make instructional decisions. Responses to questions 12 and 13 in this survey can be matched against that finding.<sup>41</sup> Flååten found that principals want more involvement in curriculum. Albertan and Tasmanian respondents have perceptions of the wishes of principals

---

<sup>41</sup>See Chapters 4 and 5.

for involvement.<sup>42</sup> Harris found that teachers stressed curriculum and Sloan found that teachers and principals saw themselves as important program proposers. Responses to questions 12 and 13 show how the respondents in the study feel.<sup>43</sup>

Ward found that the teacher organization gave low priority to teacher standards and to instructional improvement through teacher organization channels, but high priority to local involvement and leadership in in-service. Dempsey found that teachers expect good leadership from principals, Sloan that teachers and principals saw themselves as program adopters, and Gourley that principals had problems in curriculum innovation. Responses to questions 21, 37, 39, and 40 all bear on these findings.<sup>44</sup> Easton's findings that administrators stress the administrative visit more so than do teachers will be further explored in considering responses to question 40.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER 3

### DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

Planning the study was complicated by several factors. Initial planning took place at Michigan State University, away from both of the geographical areas to be studied. The writer had recent acquaintance with education in Alberta but had been absent from Tasmania for ten years. This absence presented more difficulty in designing the questionnaire than in such activities as scheduling visits to schools and offices.

The geographical distribution of the three regions involved-- Alberta and Tasmania as the places to be studied, Michigan as the location of library, advisor, and courses--called for special plans. Costs involved in travelling to Tasmania and limitations on time available meant that only one visit could be scheduled. Considerable attention was given when planning the study to ensure that all factors likely to relate to the study were included, so that a single visit would maximize findings. Work in Tasmania was conducted with the realization that omissions probably could not be remedied, since letters and telephone calls would be slow and would be difficult to co-ordinate, the appropriate people would be hard to reach, and a second visit was not possible. Work on the design of the study and on related research was undertaken in Michigan while the writer was

in residence at the University and had access to the library and his advisor. Neither was readily available during the research phase of the study, in Tasmania and in Alberta.

The research in Alberta was made easier by several factors, including the fact that the writer resided there and could pursue any omissions; there was greater familiarity by the writer with education there; and the writer had already used the questionnaire in Tasmania, so felt more confidence in it. On the other hand, the use of random sampling meant that there could be no substitution if a selected person failed to respond; so there was pressure to have specific respondents reply. And, the use of the mail in conducting the survey was a new experience.

The design of the study was affected by its subject, as well as by the geographical regions involved. Curriculum development involves planning of the experiences that students will have under the auspices of the school. Aspects of that planning include the present curriculum guide, curriculum sources, texts/references, roles in curriculum development, planning for program implementation, understanding the guide, use of the guide, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas. These elements were all incorporated in the questionnaire.

Since no one person or group of people associated with curriculum development could provide final, definitive answers to questions in the above categories, a survey was considered, to gather the perceptions of various groups of interested respondents. By grouping respondents and by considering their region of origin, comparisons

of perceptions could be made, these comparisons being between and among the different groups in any one region, as well as between and among the different groups of the two regions.

The factors of subject and geography noted above had a major effect on the design and on the conduct of the study, as is indicated in the sections that follow.

### Design of the Study

#### Sample

Albertans and Tasmanians involved or interested in elementary social studies in the following groups were surveyed: classroom teachers, school principals and head teachers, school system administrators, Department of Education staff, teacher organization representatives, parents, personnel of curriculum committees, publishers, elected representatives, university and teacher-training college faculty, and "others." The number of people working with elementary social studies as Department of Education staff, teacher organization representatives, personnel of curriculum committees, and university and college faculty in Alberta and in Tasmania was so small that virtually all individuals in these groups were surveyed. It should be noted that colleges referred to here are teacher-training colleges only. Parents were surveyed through the Provincial/State organization that represents parents on education matters. Publishers were surveyed by taking a random sample of 25 percent of the publishers whose books are listed for use in elementary social studies in each region.



In Tasmania, the elected representative is the government member who is Minister of Education. There are no school-system administrators in Tasmania. In Alberta, elected representatives include all of the locally elected members of the various boards and school committees responsible for the running of school divisions, school districts, and counties, while school-system administrators consist of central office personnel of the various local jurisdictions. To get responses from elected representatives and school-system administrators in Alberta, the writer surveyed the Board Chairman and the superintendent of schools (or his designate) from a random sampling of twenty school jurisdictions operating in the Province.

Classroom teachers in Tasmania were sampled by making a random sample of forty schools from the list of elementary schools in the State, using a table of random numbers (as listed by Walker and Lev).<sup>1</sup> A classroom teacher from each of the forty schools was surveyed, alternating through the grades. Thus, the survey began with a teacher of grade one, followed by a teacher of grade two, and so on, for the forty schools. Another random sample of twenty schools was taken and the questionnaire was administered to the head teacher or principal of each.

In Alberta, local jurisdictions were listed and a random sample of twenty taken. Schools having elementary classes in these twenty jurisdictions were listed in twenty lists, from each of which

---

<sup>1</sup>Helen Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), pp. 484-85.

a random sampling of two schools was taken. One teacher from each of the schools was surveyed, beginning with a teacher of grade one in the first school and proceeding through to grade six, for the forty schools. In any school where there was more than one teacher at a grade level, the questionnaire was completed either by an individual or by more than one, with a composite response. A further random sampling of one school from each of the twenty jurisdictions was used to determine the school principals to be surveyed in Alberta.

In addition to the groups noted above, the questionnaires were completed by "other" individuals with an interest in elementary social studies. These other respondents were the President of the Alberta Social Studies Council, the Executive Director of the Alberta School Trustees Association, and a Tasmanian media employee seconded to work with educators in preparing audio-visual materials for social studies.

All random sampling made use of a table of random numbers.<sup>2</sup>

### Measures

The survey was conducted through an interview and/or through a written questionnaire. The interview consisted of completion of the questionnaire with the interviewer present, which was the procedure used with most of the seventy-one respondents in Tasmania. Eighty-nine questionnaires were completed in Alberta without the interviewer present. A covering letter served as an introduction

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

to the questionnaire, especially in Alberta where simultaneous personal contact was absent.

The full questionnaire appears in Appendix A and a list of the actual questions, grouped according to the themes or categories used throughout the study and numbered as in the questionnaire, is given in Chapter 1.

Babbie was used as a reference and guide in the construction and administration of the questionnaire.<sup>3</sup> A first draft of the questionnaire was field-tested in Michigan through the help of two local classroom teachers, during the spring of 1974. A second draft was field-tested in Alberta later that spring by a group of teachers and administrators in a small school jurisdiction. The writer spent some time analyzing each question with the teachers and administrators after they had responded, to check whether the questions were accurate and clear. The final content of the questionnaire was then determined.

The organization and lay-out of the questionnaire was planned with a research analyst who is a member of the faculty of the University of Lethbridge.<sup>4</sup> This was done so that responses could be coded and transferred to a computer for analysis.

Despite the preparation, there were some problems in using the questionnaire. Thus, for Question 23, Tasmanians categorized the superintendents as school-system administrators, although the latter

---

<sup>3</sup>Earl Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973).

<sup>4</sup>Dr. Vern Dravland.

group was defined for the study as being the locally appointed school jurisdiction central office personnel found only in Alberta. Question 41, dealing with ways in which the teacher organization could spread new curriculum ideas, was administered in Tasmania but, when it was found that some of the possible answers did not apply there, this question was eliminated from the survey report. When the writer originally left Tasmania in 1963, the chief administrator in each school was called Head Teacher or Head Master/Head Mistress and the questionnaire was constructed with these titles in mind. However, on arriving in Tasmania in 1974, the writer found that the term "principal" had gained wide acceptance.

### Design

The approach in the study is descriptive and comparative in nature. There is a general description of education in the two areas, followed by an analysis of curriculum development practices and of procedures for the dissemination of curriculum ideas in elementary social studies through the perceptions of individuals who are involved or interested.

### Method of Analysis

The perceptions of respondents of their roles and of the roles of others in curriculum development and in the dissemination of curriculum ideas are analyzed by considering percentages of people having the different views. Thus, it is possible to determine the extent of overall agreement on answers to certain questions; of agreement according to groups of respondents on answers to certain

questions; and of agreement according to groups of respondents according to location in Alberta or in Tasmania on answers to certain questions.

The questionnaire was planned so that responses could be coded, then analyzed on a computer according to answers, groups, and regions. This was done at the University of Lethbridge in Alberta, with the analysis providing percentages of responses by answer, by answer by group, and by answer by group by region.

The analysis, and all the percentages given throughout this report of the study, is based upon the first answer by each respondent. For example, in Question 30, respondents are asked to rank the ways in which teachers came to understand the guide. There are thirteen possible answers to be ranked but only the one ranked first by each respondent is included in the analysis and in the percentages of responses.

### Conduct of the Study

#### Sources of Information

It was possible to take random samples from lists of jurisdictions, schools, and teachers only through the co-operation and assistance of many people who provided the lists. Others helped in a variety of other ways.

In Tasmania, the researcher received a list of the primary schools operating in the State through the curriculum branch of the Department. Contact with the curriculum branch was facilitated by meetings of the writer with the Tasmanian official who had been

seconded to spearhead the development of the Social Science curriculum, while that official was visiting Alberta. The random sample was taken from the list as it was received from the Education Department.

The Albertan Department of Education produces a list of the operating school jurisdictions in the Province. The writer received the list and took random samples from it to determine which superintendents and board chairmen would be surveyed and which areas would provide teachers and principals to be surveyed. Superintendents co-operated and assisted greatly. There was a very good response to the questionnaire from this group, who often feel that they receive too many questionnaires. When the twenty school jurisdictions that would provide the teachers and principals to be surveyed were selected at random, the superintendents provided a list of the schools in each jurisdiction and a list of the staff members in each school. In so doing, they authorized the writer to survey the staff members who were finally selected at random, increasing the likelihood that there would be positive response to the questionnaire by these people.

Parent groups in both areas responded readily with names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the elected officials when asked for them. This made it possible for questionnaires to be sent to officials in Alberta and for either mail contact or personal interviews in Tasmania. Those who were interviewed gave much time and thought to the interview.

The staff of the various branches of the Education Department in Tasmania made time available for interviews and suggested other people who were knowledgeable about elementary social science. It was through such advice that the writer learned of the integral part played by the Australian Broadcasting Commission in curriculum development and the consequent availability of audio-visual materials through that agency. As a result of this information, there were interviews with the people directly involved.

The Executive Secretary of the Tasmanian Teachers' Federation and his assistant spent half a day providing the writer with up-to-date perceptions of education in Tasmania, as well as in responding to the questionnaire.

The above examples serve to indicate the dependence that this researcher had upon the good will and co-operation of many people in both Alberta and Tasmania. The writer acknowledges that assistance with gratitude.

### Responses

The use of random sampling meant that there was no flexibility in the event that the planned sample was unavailable to respond. The inclusion of a substitute respondent for anyone selected at random who could not respond could have negated the randomness of selection, so the questionnaire was administered only to those chosen by the initial random sampling. As a result, some groups did not contain as many members as was originally planned. For example, potential responses of teachers fell below the forty

sampled in Alberta when one questionnaire was returned unanswered, since there was no class at the level indicated and when another questionnaire was directed by postal authorities to another province and a more accurate address for the appropriate Albertan teacher could not be found. One sample in Tasmania was eliminated when there was no teacher at the appropriate grade level.

The Minister of Education in Tasmania was not available for an interview. As the only elected representative in that region, he was the sole member of a group. His secretary was very courteous and promised that the questionnaire would be completed and returned. It was not.

One Tasmanian principal was too busy for an interview. He graciously accepted a show of slides for his pupils and promised to complete and return the questionnaire within a week. Despite a reminder, he did not.

The pattern of universal courtesy and/or cooperation that was offered in both areas was only broken once, an indication of the generally positive reception given to the researcher.

Some Tasmanians who could not be interviewed personally or whose schedule precluded completion of the questionnaire in time for the writer to take it with him failed to follow through with promises to forward it later, so responses were not 100 percent there, as is shown below.

Of the groups originally included, three have been dropped, two before percentages were calculated and one after that. Publishers were dropped as a group when it was found that responses



were limited, that both government and private publishers were active in Tasmania, and that salesmen, rather than publishers themselves, were the visible group having contact with elementary social studies in each area.

Elected representatives were dropped due to the very limited response from this group in Alberta. Only 30 percent returned questionnaires that were completed, while another 15 percent indicated that they could/would not respond. There was only one potential respondent in this group in Tasmania, a very poor sample.

A miscellaneous group, titled "other," was also dropped, since the group represented such a small and diverse sample that comparison with responses by other groups had no real significance. However, the decision to drop this group came after computer analysis; so it ranks in the percentages and totals but is not reported as a separate group.

The groups identified as respondents are not entirely discrete categories, since some randomly sampled teachers were also principals of their schools; some principals were also full- or part-time classroom teachers; curriculum committee members may have been from teacher, university, principal, Department, or school-system administrator groups; and teacher organization elected representatives were also either teachers or principals. In addition, samples in all other categories included parents, although that group is comprised, for this survey, of elected representatives of parent organizations.

A complete list of the various groups surveyed and of the extent of responses is given in Appendix B. From that Appendix, it can be seen that all seventeen groups<sup>5</sup> included in the analysis responded at least at the rate of 62.5 percent. Of the total of seventeen groups in the two regions, the response rates were as follows:

60-69 percent--4 groups

Albertan Parents	(5 respondents)
"Other"	(2 respondents)
Teacher Representatives	(2 respondents)
Tasmanian Parents	(4 respondents)

70-79 percent--3 groups

Albertan University	(5 respondents)
Department	(5 respondents)
Teachers	(29 respondents)

80-89 percent--4 groups

Albertan School System	(16 respondents)
Administrators	(7 respondents)
Curriculum Committee	(7 respondents)
Tasmanian Teachers	(34 respondents)
Department	(7 respondents)

90-99 percent--2 groups

Albertan Principals	(18 respondents)
Tasmanian Principals	(18 respondents)

100 percent--4 groups

Tasmanian University	(4 respondents)
Curriculum Committee	(1 respondent)
Teacher Representatives	(2 respondents)
"Other"	(1 respondent)

---

<sup>5</sup>Including the "other" respondents from each region.

The overall response rate was 80.4 percent. In Alberta, it was 76.6 percent and in Tasmania it was 85.5 percent.

Besides the rate of response, the nature of responses is important. The questions listed in the questionnaire have various characteristics which often determine the nature of responses. Some questions are closed questions, where the possible answers are listed. Included in this category are questions numbered 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 33, 35, 38, and 39. However, some respondents replied to Question 29 by indicating that some teachers do and some do not understand the guide. These closed questions present no problem for coding, analysis, or reporting.

Another group has questions that are almost closed, but the open "other" category is included, leaving scope for a variety of answers. Included in this category are Questions 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 27, 30, 32, 36, 37, and 40. In this study, these questions present no problem for coding, analysis, or reporting.

One question, number 9, is closed in that it lists all possible answers. However, the variety of possible answers is extensive and resulted in a total of twenty-three different combinations being given by respondents. No major problem for coding, analysis, or reporting was experienced.

The balance of the questions are "open" questions, where the respondents supply the answers. Included in this category are Questions 4, 5(a), 6(a), 8, 15, 17, 18, 28, 31, and 34. Answers to Questions 5(a) and 15 were limited in scope and could be grouped quite easily, at least for most responses. However, the balance of

these questions provided such a variety of answers that the writer experienced difficulty in discerning categories. The coding process involved the recording of these responses and their grouping into like meanings, with some risk that the respondent's meaning would be changed. The nature of the survey and factors of distance precluded any check with respondents to elaborate on their response in such cases. In the study, the questions presenting the greatest problems are numbers 4, 6(a), 8, 17, 18, 28, 31, and 34 because of the wide variety of answers that were given.

The curriculum committee is a unique group in each area. In Tasmania, teachers are seconded to work on the curriculum committee. Following the development of a guide, they return to regular teaching duties. Thus, in 1974, there was only one respondent from Tasmania who was identified as being a curriculum committee member for elementary social science. In Alberta, the committee that developed the 1971 curriculum guide had changed membership, through the three-year rotation of members, by late 1974. This fact could underlie the unexpected responses received from Albertan curriculum committee members to some questions.

### Geographical Factors

The fact that Alberta and Tasmania are widely separated geographically caused some problems in conducting a survey in both of them. For the survey in Tasmania, the writer paid a visit during the summer of 1974. A schedule was worked out so that almost all of the randomly selected teachers and principals could be visited at

their schools. In the course of the personal interview, the items on the questionnaire were dealt with. The most common practice was for the respondent to read and to discuss each question, then indicate his/her response. The sample included one respondent who lived in a community on an island in Bass Strait. For this individual the questionnaire was mailed. Another teacher lived in an isolated mining community in the northeast. A telephone interview was conducted from the nearest point of access on a good gravel road.

An introductory letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a tentative "appointment" time was sent to each respondent ahead of the meeting. Despite their busy schedules, teachers and principals proved to be very accommodating, showing almost universal courtesy and desire to help. In the introductory letter, the writer offered to show color slides that had been taken in Europe and North America to the teacher's class as appreciation for the teacher's co-operation. Many teachers accepted the offer.

Besides written communications, there was extensive telephone communication with teachers and principals. All teachers and principals, especially in smaller schools where the principal was also a teacher, had classes to work with. The interviews took place before school, at recess or lunch times, after school, during preparation periods, or in class time, with pupils either set to work or under the supervision of a colleague. The interviews took place in staff-rooms, offices, classrooms, corridors, and homes.

Dovetailed with interviews of the teachers and principals were interviews with parents, Department staff, university personnel,

teacher organization representatives, and curriculum committee members. From his years as a student and teacher in Tasmania, the writer had many contacts from whom to get the names of people holding positions and offices in the various groups. All the other respondent groups besides teachers and principals tended to be located in the four largest centres, with a heavy concentration in the capital city. Excellent co-operation was again received. In one or two cases, individuals could not be reached at their places of work because of commitments elsewhere. These people were reached by telephone.

Despite the fact that it was mid-winter in Tasmania, the researcher was able to visit most areas quite readily. With an automobile borrowed from relatives, he circled the State during the five weeks at his disposal and was able to contact all the people he wanted to contact. Most responded to the questionnaire and many gave added insights into Tasmanian education through such activities as tours of the school and wide-ranging discussions.

During the fall and winter of 1974-75, the survey was conducted in Alberta. The considerable distances involved and much more harsh climate in winter led the writer to use the mails as the chief means of conducting the survey. Many of the individuals who were university staff, Department personnel, curriculum committee members, school-system administrators, and teacher organization representatives were personally known to the writer. This likely helped in bringing a high level of response. The teachers and principals were contacted by name, thanks to the assistance of superintendents as noted above.

The use of this more personal approach likely helped in bringing a high level of response from these groups.

A letter of introduction and the questionnaire, together with a stamped, return addressed envelope, was sent to each of the people being surveyed. Each questionnaire assured anonymity, with the researcher using a key to check where the responses were from. A follow-up letter with a copy of the questionnaire and another stamped envelope was sent to those not replying, on the assumption that the first letter had been lost in the mail.

The letters stressed the importance of the response to the researcher and noted that random sampling made that individual's response the only one of value. There was a good response by all concerned, making use of the telephone as a follow-up a rare occurrence and obviating the need for a protracted tour of Alberta to conduct personal interviews with each person.

### Summary

The survey covered classroom teachers, school principals and head teachers, other administrators (school-system central office personnel in Alberta), Department of Education staff, teacher organization representatives, parents, personnel of curriculum committees, publishers, elected representatives (member of Parliament in Tasmania and school trustees in Alberta), university and teacher-training college staff, and "others."

Teachers and school and school-system administrators were selected by random sampling from the official lists of the Department or of the school jurisdiction.

The survey was conducted through a questionnaire, which was completed in most instances in Tasmania with the writer present. In Alberta, the questionnaires were mailed to potential respondents with a covering letter. The questionnaire was field tested in Michigan and in Alberta as it was being developed and was organized to facilitate coding of responses for analysis.

Findings are descriptive and comparative. Through analysis of responses, percentages responding to each group from each region can be described and compared.

The researcher found almost universal courtesy and met with ready co-operation and assistance in most places. The response rate to the survey is quite good, reflecting this co-operation.

Following administration of the questionnaire, the groups made up of publishers and elected representatives were eliminated from the study. The "other" group was dropped after the analysis was done. There is an overall average response rate of 80.4 percent for the study analysis.<sup>6</sup> Some open-ended questions brought a wide variety of answers, making it difficult to code, analyze, and report on responses. Grouping of like answers was used in such cases.

---

<sup>6</sup>All percentages were computed with "other" included.



## CHAPTER 4

### SURVEY RESULTS

#### Introduction

This chapter reports on the responses to the questionnaire, minus question number 41 and the category of "other." Question number 41 was dropped because there was no Tasmanian equivalent of some of the options listed. The category "other" was dropped from the report since there were only three persons in the group and they do not belong to an identifiable classification. However, all figures were put through the computer and all calculations of percentages were made with the three "other" respondents of the survey included, prior to the decision to eliminate the group. The ratios and percentages given throughout the report of the study thus include these three, who represent 1.9 percent of all respondents.

This chapter is limited to a report of the responses to the survey. Interpretations of the findings and conclusions drawn by the author appear in Chapter 5. The chapter is organized around the headings given in Chapter 1, with each part introduced by a very brief overview of central tendencies, followed by a more detailed report on each question. The report on responses to each question includes information about notable ratios of respondents giving

various answers, along with the ratios of responses by group, by region, and by group in each region.

The first part deals with questions related to the curriculum guide. The second part stresses questions related to curriculum and is further divided into sections on curriculum sources, texts/ references, roles in curriculum development, and planning for program implementation. The third part deals with questions related to curriculum dissemination. It, too, is further divided into four parts, on understanding the guide, use of the guide, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas.

#### Questions Related to the Curriculum Guide

The written "curriculum guide" that is available to teachers in Alberta and in Tasmania is the focus of questions two through eleven. While there is a wide range of views on most questions, there are some evident central tendencies in the responses.

Generally, the curriculum committee in each region is perceived as having set the existing curriculum guide and both teachers and curriculum committees are preferred as the source of the guide, with preferences for teachers in setting the guide less strong among parents, Department and university personnel. Chief reasons supporting the choice of who should decide the guide are that teachers know pupils, that a practical, applicable, and suitable curriculum is needed, that curriculum should reflect society, and that there should be more teacher voice.

About three-quarters of the respondents were not involved in setting the present guide. Involvement was higher for university and

Department groups than for others and for Tasmanians more than for Albertans. University and Department personnel were involved on curriculum committees, Tasmanian teachers as pilot teachers.<sup>1</sup> About half of the respondents want to be involved, especially teachers. This involvement is sought through consultation, representation, or directly. University and Department personnel and parents are most anxious for direct involvement.

Most respondents feel that it is a "good" guide. However, Albertan teachers and principals say that it is not a "good" guide at a ratio that is higher than the average.<sup>2</sup> Many respondents have no criticisms of the guide. Criticism that the guide is too general or vague, and that it is hard to understand are the chief complaints, both being much more frequent among Albertans than among Tasmanians.

The degree of prescription in the guide is variously perceived. Most people perceive little specific prescription. A majority of these people believe that there is only general prescription and some people believe that there is little or no prescription. There is more prescription seen in Alberta than in Tasmania. There is also more perception of enforcement of prescription in Alberta than in Tasmania, chiefly through inspection by other than Department

---

<sup>1</sup>Pilot teachers are classroom teachers who are selected to "pilot" or to test a proposed curriculum, then to provide reactions and suggestions to the curriculum committee.

<sup>2</sup>Reference to "average ratio" is governed by two factors. For example: (a) if Albertans reply in a "higher than average ratio," Albertans as a group reply at a higher ratio than do all respondents as a single group; (b) if Tasmanian teachers respond at a "higher than average ratio," Tasmanian teachers respond at a higher ratio than do all Tasmanian respondents as a single group.

staff. Departmental inspection is felt to be more prevalent in Tasmania than in Alberta. However, many respondents see no enforcement, including about half the teachers.

There is a tendency to want more prescription than exists, either moderate or extensive, with Albertans seeking extensive prescription more frequently than do Tasmanians.

A more detailed report on responses to questions two through eleven follows:

Question 2: Whose thinking does the guide reflect? Rank:

1( ) teacher	5( ) principal	9( ) school-sys. adm.
2( ) parent	6( ) department	10( ) teacher organ.
3( ) university	7( ) elected rep.	11( ) other(_____)
4( ) publisher	8( ) curric. comm.	

Almost two respondents in each three indicate that they perceive the guide as reflecting the thinking of the curriculum committee. About two respondents in thirteen feel that the thinking of the Department of Education is reflected in the guide, while about one in sixteen sees teacher ideas there.

The curriculum committee as the source of the ideas of the guide is ranked first by eight university staff in nine, and by over four principals in five. Other groups are in general accord with the average except parents (four in nine) and teacher representatives (nil). One teacher representative in two, one parent in three, one curriculum committee member in four, and one teacher and principal in nine cite the Department of Education as the source of ideas. One teacher in nine ranks teachers first when saying who set the guide.

Three Albertans in five and almost three Tasmanians in four rank the curriculum committee first when indicating whose thinking is reflected in the curriculum guide. Notable responses in this vein from groups are three Albertan parents in five (one Tasmanian parent in four); all Albertan university staff (three Tasmanians in four); two Albertan principals in three (all in Tasmania); two Albertan Department staff in five (almost three Tasmanians in four); and five Albertan curriculum committee members in nine (all in Tasmania). Almost one Albertan in four ranks the Department of Education first as contributing the thinking reflected in the curriculum guide, to one Tasmanian in eighteen. All Albertan teacher representatives agree that the guide comes from the Department along with two Albertan Department staff in five and over one Albertan curriculum committee in four. As well, one Tasmanian teacher in seventeen sees the Department as the origin of the guide. One Tasmanian in nine and one Albertan in forty-five say that the guide reflects the thinking of teachers. Major responses to this effect are from teachers (one Tasmanian in seven, one Albertan in fourteen), teacher representatives (one Tasmanian in two), parents (one Tasmanian in four), and Department staff (one Tasmanian in seven).

Question 3: Whose thinking should the guide reflect? Rank:

- |                 |                    |                         |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1( ) teacher    | 5( ) principal     | 9( ) school-sys. admin. |
| 2( ) parent     | 6( ) department    | 10( ) teacher organ.    |
| 3( ) university | 7( ) elected rep.  | 11( ) other(_____)      |
| 4( ) publisher  | 8( ) curric. comm. |                         |

Over one respondent in three feels that the guide should reflect the thinking of teachers and one in three says that the

guide should come from the curriculum committee. One in eighteen cites parents as the desired source of the curriculum guide.

Ranking teachers first are over one teacher and curriculum committee member in three, one teacher representative in two, five principals in nine--but just one Department staff in twelve, two university personnel in nine, and one parent in nine. Most groups approach the average response in ranking of the curriculum committee, greatest variations coming from one Department staff in two, four university staff in nine, and one teacher representative in four. Parental determination of the guide is preferred especially by two parents in nine and by almost one school-system administrator in five.

Question 4: Why should this be so?

Giving reasons for the source of curriculum ideas shown in answer to the previous question, respondents stress the following: Teachers know pupil needs (one respondent in six); practicality, applicability, and suitability of curriculum (over one respondent in seven); curriculum should reflect all society, especially educational society (less than one respondent in seven); and there should be more teacher voice in curriculum (one respondent in twelve). In addition, one in four gives no reply. There are sixteen different responses given to this open-ended question.

Significant group responses in the various categories are: One principal in four and two teachers in nine feel that teachers know pupil needs. Four parents in nine, one school-system

administrator in four and one teacher in nine regard practicality, applicability, and suitability of curriculum as of paramount importance in determining who should set the curriculum guide. Three curriculum committee members in eight, one principal in six, and one teacher in eight cite societal concerns as the reason for their choice of who should decide the curriculum guide. One principal in nine, one school-system administrator in eight, and one teacher in nine want more teacher voice in setting the curriculum guide.

Almost three Albertan responses in ten are "nil" on question 4, to about one in five in Tasmania. Teacher knowledge of pupil needs is ranked first by one Albertan in twelve and by one Tasmanian in four, chiefly by teachers (one Albertan in six and over one Tasmanian in four) and principals (one Albertan in nine and almost two Tasmanians in five). Practical, applicable, and suitable curriculum is stressed by almost one Albertan in four and one Tasmanian in twenty-four, mainly by teachers (one Albertan in five, one Tasmanian in five) and curriculum committee members (almost three Albertans in ten, nil in Tasmania). Society being reflected in curriculum is ranked first by almost one Albertan in twelve to over one Tasmanian in five. Chief responses here are from principals (two Albertans in nine, one Tasmanian in nine), curriculum committee members (almost three Albertans in ten, all Tasmanians), and teachers (nil in Alberta, almost one Tasmanian in four). Greater teacher voice is called for by one Albertan in eleven and one Tasmanian in twelve, chiefly by teachers (about one Albertan in seven, one Tasmanian in

twelve), principals (one Albertan in nine, one Tasmanian in six), and school-system administrators (one Albertan in eight).

Question 5: Were you involved in the development of the guide?    Yes    No

Over three respondents in four indicate that they were not involved, while almost one in four replies that he/she was involved in the development of the guide.

Involvement by the various groups was as follows (with the balance not involved in each case): teachers--one in eight; parents--nil; university staff--two in three; curriculum committee members--five in eight; school-system administrators--one in sixteen; and teacher representatives--one in four.

Over four Albertans in five were not involved, to two in three in Tasmania. All Albertan groups except Department staff, university staff, and curriculum committee members were involved in a lower ratio than one in two. No parents were involved and fewer than one in ten Albertan teachers, principals, and school-system administrators were involved. In Tasmania, one teacher in five and one principal in three was involved. Both regions had higher involvement of university staff (three Albertans in five, three Tasmanians in four) and Department staff (three Albertans in five and almost three Tasmanians in four).

Question 5A: If so, how?

To the question asking how they were involved, over four respondents in five do not answer. One in nine says that he/she



had been a curriculum committee member and about one in thirty had been a pilot teacher.

Those responding as having been a curriculum committee member include Department staff (almost three in five), university staff (four in nine), and curriculum committee members (one in two). The pilot teacher role is noted by one teacher in thirty, one principal in thirty-six, and one Department staff in twelve.

One Albertan in eleven had been a curriculum committee member, notably Department staff (three in five), curriculum committee member (over two in five), and university staff (one in five). Tasmanians cited membership on the curriculum committee in the ratio of one in seven, chiefly university staff (three in four), curriculum committee member (all), Department staff (over five in nine), principal (one in nine). All pilot teachers were Tasmanians (one Tasmanian in fourteen). These pilot teachers in Tasmania were Department staff (one in seven), teachers and principals (about one in eighteen).

Question 6: Should you have been involved?    Yes    No

One respondent in two feels there should have been involvement for them in development of the guide, while almost two in five feel that they should not have been involved. The remainder omit an answer.

All except teachers and school-system administrators reply in at least the ratio of one in two that they should have been involved. Teachers reply this way in the ratio of four in nine and

school-system administrators in the ratio of about one in three. Five school-system administrators in nine and four teachers in nine reply that they should not have been involved, as does one teacher representative in two.

Fewer than one Albertan in two and just over one Tasmanian in two shares the view that he/she should have been involved. About four teachers in nine in each region feel this way. One Albertan principal in three (nearly three in four in Tasmania), high ratios of Albertan parents, university staff, and Department staff (but just under four in nine in Tasmania) and one school-system administrator in three also feel that they should have been involved. No Tasmanian teacher representative or curriculum committee members want involvement. Four teachers in nine in each region feel that they should not have been involved.

Question 6A: If so, how?

Almost three respondents in five give no response as to how they should have been involved. About one respondent in twelve feels that a questionnaire/consultant approach would have been best to give involvement; one in thirteen says that some form of representation is best for involvement; and one in nineteen wants to represent his/her own group by direct involvement. A total of fourteen different responses are given to this question.

Consultation is suggested by teachers (one in nine) and by principals (almost one in five). Representation is preferred by one principal in nine and by some in all other groups except

Department staff and teacher representatives. Direct involvement is sought by one Department staff and university staff in three and by one parent in nine.

One Tasmanian in seven endorses consultation (one teacher in nine and one principal in three), to one Albertan in twenty-two (one teacher in ten and one principal in eighteen). Representation is suggested by one Albertan in ten, including two university staff in five and one principal in six, and by one Tasmanian in twenty-four. Direct involvement is proposed by about one Albertan in thirty, the main ones being one parent, university staff, and Department staff in five, and by one Tasmanian in twelve, including three Department staff in five and one university staff in two.

Question 7: Do you think that it is a "good" guide?    Yes    No

Seven respondents in ten indicate that they think it is a "good" guide, while about two in nine say that it is not. The balance do not reply.

Groups responding that it is a "good" guide in a ratio less than the average are teachers (almost two in three) and school-system administrators (five in eight). Almost three Albertans in five think that it is a "good" guide along with over four Tasmanians in five. The only group in either region with less than half the respondents saying it is a "good" guide are Albertan teachers (almost one in two). One Tasmanian teacher representative in two feels that it is a "good" guide. The next least positive response comes from Albertan principals, with five in nine saying that it is a "good" guide.

Conversely, almost one Albertan in three says it is not good, to one Tasmanian in twelve. Two Albertan teachers, parents, and university staff in five are of this view.

Question 8: Do you have any criticisms of the guide?

Three respondents in eight give no answer when asked if they have any criticisms of the guide. Two in eleven say that the guide is too general or vague, one in nine says that teachers find it hard to understand, about one in eighteen registers "no criticism," one in twenty says that teachers need more direction than is given, and one in twenty-two says that content dates very quickly. There are eighteen different answers given for this question.

Almost one Albertan in four says that the guide is too general or vague, the chief group being teachers (almost two in five). One Tasmanian in nine agrees, consisting of over one principal in four and one teacher in twelve. About one Albertan in five finds the guide hard to understand, to one Tasmanian in seventy. Those saying that the guide is hard to understand include almost three Albertan curriculum committee members in four, and one Albertan school-system administrator in two. One Albertan in eleven proposes more direction for teachers (nil in Tasmania). This response comes from six different groups. Concern about the content dating is expressed by about one Albertan in thirty and one Tasmanian in eighteen. The most common response in this vein comes from over one Tasmanian Department staff in four.

"No criticism" is the specific response of about two Tasmanian teachers in eleven. No response is given by over one Albertan in three (including four teachers and principals in nine) and by two Tasmanians in five (including over two teachers in five and one principal in three).

Question 9: Check how the curriculum guide sets the following:

- |                      |  |                       |  |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| a. course content:   | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all | b. texts/ references: | <input type="checkbox"/> suggested<br><input type="checkbox"/> required<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all   |
| c. teaching methods: | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all | d. time on topics:    | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all |

Course content, texts/references, teaching methods, and time on topics are all perceived to be set in general terms only by about two respondents in five. This response is given about two and a half times as often as the next most common response. Perceptions that only general directions come from the guide are expressed by proportionately few teachers (just over a quarter of them), parents (one in three), and Department personnel (one in four). All Albertan groups include some who give the response that only general directions are given, this answer coming from over half of the respondents in that region. In Tasmania, only about one in five agree. Only one in five Albertan parents responds that the guide gives general direction, and teacher responses in this vein fall below the overall ratio. Notable variations from the general proportion in Tasmania come from principals (just over one in four--and less than half the proportion of their Albertan counterparts), teachers (less than one

in six--and about one-third of the proportion of their Albertan counterparts), and parents (one in each two--and over twice the proportion of their Albertan counterparts).

The next most common response to the question is to the effect that the guide is perceived to set course content, texts/references, and teaching methods in general terms only but that time on topics receives no guidance.

Most respondents in this category are school personnel, over half being teachers. About one teacher in four gives this answer. Answers vary according to region, however, as only one Albertan teacher in about fifteen gives this response, compared with over one in three in Tasmania, and principals in Tasmania give this reply twice as often as do those in Alberta.

Of the twenty-one different combinations given in response to this question, the two most common account for over half of all responses.

Question 10: How is any obligation by the teacher to follow the guide enforced?

- |                            |                                       |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1( ) through set texts     | 3( ) by inspection (department staff) |
| 2( ) by inspection (other) | 4( ) other (_____)                    |

Enforcement of the guide is variously perceived by respondents. Almost one in three feels that there is no enforcement. This response was written in as an alternative to the choices listed on the questionnaire, so it must be felt strongly. The most notable proportion citing no enforcement is in the teacher group, where almost one in two does so. Overall, Tasmanian respondents perceive

absence of enforcement about twice as frequently as do Albertan respondents. Over half the Tasmanian principals agree, to one in six in Alberta, and half of the Tasmanian university respondents feel the same way, to one in five in Alberta. Parents agree with this perception in a proportion of one in four, or less, in each region.

One respondent in five says that enforcement of the guide comes through inspection by department staff. Overall, Tasmanian respondents give this answer almost three times as frequently as do the Albertans. In so doing, the Tasmanian respondents reduce the significance of their perceptions of freedom which is indicated by their perception of absence of enforcement noted above.

Department inspection is perceived by only about one Albertan teacher in seven compared with over one in four in Tasmania. Except for the teachers, no Albertan group has more than a single respondent indicating that there is Department inspection. Perceptions of inspection by the Department are noted by almost half of the principals in Tasmania and by a slightly lower ratio of Department staff there. A half of the small sample of teacher representatives in each region also respond that the guide is enforced through departmental inspection.

About one in seven of all respondents refers to other inspection. When this response is linked with inspection by central office in Alberta and by principals in Tasmania, the frequency of response is about one in four. Ratio of response Albertans:Tasmanians is about five:one, reflecting the implications of decentralization:

centralization in organizational structure. Enforcement by other school authorities besides the Department is perceived by about one Albertan teacher in four, to about one in seventeen in Tasmania; by over half of the Albertan principals, to none in Tasmania; and by over half of the school-system administrators.

Question 11: To what extent should the guide prescribe social studies/social science<sup>3</sup> for the Province/State?

1( ) not at all	3( ) somewhat	5( ) fully
2( ) little	4( ) extensively	

Almost half of all respondents indicate that they favor prescription by the guide in moderate measure ("somewhat"). There is a high degree of support for this answer, with over three in every four university staff and over one in each two Department staff responding for moderate prescription. Slightly more Tasmanians than Albertans, proportionately, give this response.

About one in fifteen calls for no prescription. Higher than average ratios of this view come from teachers and Department staff (about one in each twelve) and from curriculum committee members and teacher representatives (one in each four). Overall, Albertans call for no prescription in the ratio of about one in twelve respondents, to about one in sixteen from Tasmanians. However, the sole curriculum committee member in Tasmania gives this response, as do about one in twelve of the teachers. Albertan teachers respond in the same way

---

<sup>3</sup>The term "social studies" applies in Alberta; "social science" is used in Tasmania.



in the ratio of about one in fifteen and teacher representatives, one in two.

The next least restrictive, "little prescription," is called for by about one respondent in eight, including principals in the ratio of about one in six and Department staff in the ratio of about one in five. Among Tasmanian respondents, almost one in five favors this response to about one in fifteen among Albertans. Only about one in ten of the Tasmanian teachers perceives little prescription (nil in Alberta), but principals perceive this in the ratio of over one in five (half that rate in Alberta), and Department staff by over two in five (nil in Alberta). Two Albertan parents in five give this response.

A call for extensive prescription comes from almost one respondent in three. A ratio higher than this average comes from principals (over two in five). Albertans favor extensive prescription almost twice as frequently as do Tasmanians. In the groups, Albertan teachers prefer extensive prescription in the ratio of over two in five (Tasmanians are fewer than one in four), principals by over one in two (Tasmanians by one in three), and parents by one in four (one in two in Tasmania). In addition, one Albertan teacher representative in two gives this response.

Full prescription is preferred by no Tasmanians, but is called for by about one Albertan in twenty, including one parent in five.

### Questions Related to Curriculum

Curriculum is defined as all of the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school. In this section, there are four areas of inquiry:

Curriculum Sources (questions 12 and 13),

Texts/References (questions 14 through 20),

Roles in Curriculum Development (questions 21 through 25),

Planning for Program Implementation (questions 26 through 28).

### Curriculum Sources

The sources of the curriculum are the subject of questions twelve and thirteen. The most common responses to these questions are summarized below.

In indicating their perceptions of "what is" and "what should be," respondents rate teachers, the curriculum committee, and the Department of Education as their top three curriculum sources. However, teachers and the curriculum committee are ranked as being almost equal in the existing situation, while teachers are placed much higher than the curriculum committee in the desired situation. The Department is ranked less highly in response to the question on "what should be" than it is in response to the question on "what is" as sources of curriculum. So far as the existing situation is concerned, Tasmanian teachers believe teachers are more the source of curriculum than do Albertan teachers, and Albertan teachers rank the Department more highly than do Tasmanian teachers. When indicating who should plan curriculum, no Tasmanians rank the Department

of Education first and more Albertans than Tasmanians rank the curriculum committee first.

Question 12: Rank according to who actually sets curriculum now:

- |                 |                    |                       |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1( ) teacher    | 5( ) principal     | 9( ) school-sys. adm. |
| 2( ) parent     | 6( ) department    | 10( ) teacher organ.  |
| 3( ) university | 7( ) elected rep.  | 11( ) other (_____)   |
| 4( ) publisher  | 8( ) curric. comm. |                       |

Perceptions of who actually sets curriculum now were sought in question 12. Over one in each three respondents rank teachers first, with almost as many stating that it is curriculum committee members. Of the remainder, about one in six ranks the Department of Education first.

Of those ranking teachers first, notable variations from the average ratio occur with the Department staff and curriculum committee members (each with one in two), and with parents (just one in nine). Two and a half times as many Tasmanian teachers as Albertan teachers rank teachers first--over one in two to about one in five. The ratio of principals ranking teachers first is slightly higher in Tasmania than in Alberta. In Alberta, teachers are ranked first by three university staff in five, by three Department staff in five, and by just over two curriculum committee members in five. The same view is held by over two Department staff in five in Tasmania and by one teacher representative in two there.

Notable variations from the average ratio of one respondent in three giving the curriculum committee first ranking come from principals (over two in five), parents (over one in two), Department personnel (one in six), and curriculum committee members (one in

four). Between regions, a higher ratio of teachers in Alberta than in Tasmania ranks the curriculum committee first; the same applies for Department staff; but the opposite is the case for principals and for parents.

While the ratio ranking the curriculum committee first is similar in Alberta and in Tasmania, the ratios of those ranking the Department of Education first differ widely between regions. In Alberta, almost one in four ranks the Department first, to less than one in eleven in Tasmania. Albertan school personnel reply at about the average ratio but those in Tasmania vary, there being about one in nine of teacher responses and one in seventeen of principal responses in this category.

Question 13: Rank according to who should plan the curriculum for social studies/social science:

- |                 |                    |                         |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1( ) teacher    | 5( ) principal     | 9( ) school-sys. admin. |
| 2( ) parent     | 6( ) department    | 10( ) teacher organ.    |
| 3( ) university | 7( ) elected rep.  | 11( ) other(_____)      |
| 4( ) publisher  | 8( ) curric. comm. |                         |

Over half of all respondents rank teachers first when stating who should set the curriculum. About one in four ranks the curriculum committee first and one in seventeen prefers the Department of Education.

Groups ranking teachers first include all the teacher representatives, three in eight school-system administrators, and slightly over one in two of the teachers, principals, and Department staff. A similar ratio ranks teachers first in each region. Teachers and principals in Tasmania, when grouped together, are more strongly of

this view than are their Albertan counterparts, in the ratio of about three to two. Department staff in each region rank teachers first in the ratio of about three in five, a similar ratio to the responses of school-system administrators. However, teachers are ranked first by three Albertan parents in five and by four Albertan university staff in five, to nil in Tasmania.

The curriculum committee is ranked first by a higher ratio of Albertans than Tasmanians: about three to two. Over twice the ratio of Albertan teachers (just over one in three) give this ranking when compared with their Tasmanian counterparts. Principals in Alberta are also above average in ranking the curriculum committee first, almost two in five being of this view. Tasmanian parents agree in the ratio of three in four, to one in five in Alberta. Tasmanian university staff also rank the curriculum committee first in the ratio of three in four, to one in five in Alberta. Department staff responses ranking the curriculum committee first are one in five in Alberta (nil in Tasmania) and Albertan curriculum committee members agree in the ratio of about one in seven (nil in Tasmania).

No Tasmanians give the Department of Education first ranking, all responses in this category coming from Albertans. The most prominent group giving this response is curriculum committee members, who favor it in the ratio of over two in five respondents.

### Texts/References

The subject referred to in questions fourteen through twenty is texts/references in curriculum development. The answers to the

questions show the perceptions of respondents about texts/references used in social studies/social science. The general direction of the answers is given below.

A majority of respondents oppose set texts, more so in Tasmania than in Alberta. The most common reason given to justify views on whether there should not be set texts is that texts limit the scope of work, a point of view more strongly endorsed in Alberta than in Tasmania. Over half the respondents feel that existing texts are not satisfactory, with similar overall ratios having this view in each region. However, greater dissatisfaction, proportionately, comes from Albertan teachers, parents, and university personnel than from their Tasmanian counterparts. There are many comments about why the texts are satisfactory or not, chief being that there are too few texts available (by more Albertans than Tasmanians) and that texts are too difficult (by more Tasmanians than Albertans).

Asked what are the sources of materials, respondents cite "various sources" (this answer is more common from Tasmanians than from Albertans), "publishing houses" (more Albertans than Tasmanians give this response), and "the Department of Education" (this answer comes from Tasmanians only). Nearly half the respondents feel that materials accompany new curriculum ideas; some think that materials follow new curriculum ideas; and a few, chiefly Albertans, think that the materials lead the ideas. Compared with answers to the previous question about whether materials accompany, follow, or lead new curriculum ideas, respondents to the question on what should occur

are more strongly in favor of having materials accompany the ideas. A similar ratio in each area gives this answer. There are also more people in favor of having materials leading ideas in the ideal, with more Albertans than Tasmanians having this view. Few people want materials to follow the ideas.

Question 14: Should there be set texts for social studies/social science?      Yes      No

Almost two respondents in three state that there should not be set texts. Groups differing from this ratio to a notable extent, in opposing set texts, are teachers (almost three in four), Department staff (over nine in ten), university staff (over three in four), school-system administrators (three in eight), teacher representatives (three in four), and parents (two in nine).

Opposition to set texts comes from over four in five respondents in Tasmania to just over a half of all respondents in Alberta. Of the Tasmanian groups, teachers, principals, and Department staff oppose set texts with ratios slightly above the average, while one parent and teacher representative in two is in agreement. Albertan groups respond with school-system administrators and principals below the average ratio, and no parent responses oppose set texts. Teacher and curriculum committee groups reply with ratios slightly above the average and there is total commitment to this concept by all members of Department and teacher representative groups.

Question 15: Why should there be set texts? (Why not?)

Various reasons are given favoring or opposing set texts. The most common response, in opposition, by over one in two

respondents, is that set texts limit the scope of work in school. Next common answer, in favor, by about one in six, is that texts set the course more clearly.

A particularly high ratio of Department and university personnel (about three in four) answers against set texts by saying that such texts limit the scope of work in school. The same response comes from one parent in nine. Tasmanians perceive texts as limiting the scope of work in school almost twice as frequently as do Albertans. Only parents as a group in Tasmania respond in a ratio of less than one in two, being just one in four saying that set texts would limit the scope of school work. An average ratio of three Tasmanians in four has this perception, with teachers and Department staff responding at ratios above the average. Albertans average about two in five with this reply and include just university staff (four in five), Department staff (three in five), curriculum committee members (under three in five), and teacher representatives (all respondents in the group), with a majority feeling that texts would limit the scope of school work. Albertan school-based personnel (teachers and principals) agree in the ratio of about one in three.

One teacher in nine, about one principal in five, over two school-system administrators in five, and one parent in three favor set texts to set the course more clearly. About twice as many Albertans as Tasmanians give this answer, although over twice as many Tasmanian teachers as Albertan teachers do so. Notable groups (and ratios) favoring set texts to set the course more clearly are Albertan parents (three in five), principals (over one in four), and



school-system administrators (over two in five). Tasmanian teachers give this response in the ratio of about one in seven.

Texts are also favored because of the availability of suitable and relevant materials, by about one respondent in sixteen. This response is given by four times as many Albertans as Tasmanians, chiefly by one Albertan teacher in five.

Question 16: Are the available text/reference books satisfactory?  
Yes    No

Just over half the respondents say that texts/references that are available are not satisfactory, compared with about two in five saying that available texts/references are satisfactory. Principals state that texts are not satisfactory in the ratio of over three in five, at the same time as one in three of this group find them satisfactory. Other groups are more in agreement with the average responses.

There is a similar ratio of Albertans and Tasmanians perceiving text/reference books as being satisfactory and a similar ratio in each area perceives them as being unsatisfactory. However, about three Albertan teachers in five feel that materials are unsatisfactory, compared with less than one in two Tasmanian teachers; four Albertan parents in five agree, to none in Tasmania; four Albertan university personnel in five think the same, to one in four in Tasmania; and just over two in five Albertan principals perceive materials as being unsatisfactory, to over four out of five in Tasmania.

The opinion that materials are satisfactory comes from almost twice as many Tasmanian teachers, proportionately, as Albertan

teachers, being held by over one in two Tasmanian teachers. Three in four Tasmanian parents perceive materials as being satisfactory, while none in Alberta do so. One Albertan principal in two is of this opinion, to one in six in Tasmania. More than one in two school-system administrators in Alberta feels that materials are satisfactory.

Question 17: Why? (Why not?)

There are twelve different answers to the question of why? (Why not?) on available materials being satisfactory.

Almost one respondent in five indicates that there are not enough materials available. About one in five says that materials are too difficult. About one in six expresses general satisfaction with materials. About one in twelve notes that materials are not appropriate. Just over one in five of those surveyed does not respond to this question.

About twice as many teachers as the overall Albertan ratio indicate that there are not sufficient materials available, while about one-third of the teachers compared with the overall Tasmanian ratio do so. On the other hand, about one principal in eighteen in Alberta says that there are not enough materials, to one principal in two in Tasmania giving this response.

The excessive difficulty of materials is cited two and a half times as frequently by Tasmanian respondents as by Albertans. Respondents in Tasmania who are teachers, principals, Department staff, and curriculum committee members say that materials are too difficult two and a half times as frequently, or more, as do Albertans in these groups.

Satisfaction with materials is expressed by about one Albertan in five, to about one in eight from Tasmania. One teacher in ten and one principal in three is of this view in Alberta. Over one teacher in four feels this way in Tasmania.

Question 18: Who writes/publishes books used in teaching social studies/social science?

There are fourteen different responses to this question. About one reply in three indicates that there are various writers/publishers of texts; about one respondent in fourteen says that publishing houses produce texts; and a further one in fifteen points to the Department of Education as the source of books used in teaching social studies/social science.

About one Albertan in four feels that there are various writers/publishers, while about nine Tasmanians in twenty indicate this answer. Overall, those replying that there are various writers/publishers, in the ratio of one in three or higher, are teachers, principals, school-system administrators, Department staff, and curriculum committee members. Almost twice as many Tasmanian as Albertan teachers are of this view; over three times the ratio of Tasmanian to Albertan principals agree; and almost four times the Tasmanian to the Albertan Department staff give the same response. All curriculum committee members and school-system administrators noting various publishers/writers are Albertans.

Publishing houses as writers/publishers of books used in teaching social studies/social science is the response given by one principal in six. Overall responses with this answer are from one

Albertans in ten, about four times the ratio of Tasmanians saying that publishing houses are the writers/publishers of books used. Twice the ratio of Albertan principals as those in Tasmania give this reply, in the ratio of two in each nine.

The Department of Education is listed as the writer/publisher of books used in social studies/social science by Tasmanians only, in the ratio of about one Tasmanian in each seven. Among Tasmanian respondents, one teacher in five gives this reply, as does one parent in four and one university staff member in two.

Question 19: Books may introduce new ideas; may be published simultaneously with new ideas; or may be produced to reflect ideas being used. How do books used at present in social studies/social science relate to the curriculum ideas of the program?

1( ) lead

2( ) accompany

3( ) follow

In the views of about four respondents in nine, the books used at present in social studies/social science accompany curriculum ideas of the program. About three respondents in ten see the books as following the ideas, while about one in thirteen says that the books lead the ideas.

The highest ratio saying that books used at present in social studies/social science accompany curriculum ideas are teachers, in the ratio of three in five. Slightly under half of all Albertans and Tasmanians share this view. Teachers in each area reply that the ideas and the books go together, in the ratio of about three in five. The next highest ratio with this answer comes from school-system administrators (Albertans), in the ratio of one in two.

One principal in two, one Department staff member in two, four university personnel in nine, and about one school-system administrator in three endorse the idea that the books used in social studies/social science follow new curriculum ideas. Principals respond in a similar ratio in both areas; there are over twice as many Albertan Department staff as Tasmanian giving this answer; and three university staff in five in Alberta agree, to none in Tasmania.

The books used in social studies/social science lead curriculum ideas, in the view of almost twice as many Albertans as Tasmanians. Albertan parents (two in five) and Albertan principals (about one in six) give this reply.

Question 20: Which should they do?

1( ) lead

2( ) accompany

3( ) follow

Just over three respondents in five feel that books used in the program should accompany curriculum ideas. About one in seven prefers that books lead curriculum ideas and about one in twelve feels that books should follow curriculum ideas.

Chief groups favoring books accompanying ideas are principals (almost three in four), parents and Department personnel (two in three), curriculum committee members (five in eight), teachers (about three in five), and university staff (five in nine). Responses that books should accompany curriculum ideas are fairly evenly balanced between Albertans and Tasmanians. In Alberta, only school-system administrators are less than one in two in favor of this

response; in Tasmania, only curriculum committee members are less than one in two in agreement with this response.

One parent in three and almost one school-system administrator in five prefers that books lead curriculum ideas. About half as many again more Albertans than Tasmanians are in agreement with this view. One Tasmanian parent in two feels this way, as does one Albertan teacher in five.

### Roles in Curriculum Development

Perceptions of roles in curriculum development are the subject of questions twenty-one through twenty-five. Responses to the questions point to the general summary of perceptions given below.

Curriculum development leadership by the teacher organization is ranked quite similarly in each area, with the perception being that there is "little" rather than "extensive" curriculum development leadership by the teacher organization. Principals tend to give more extensive encouragement of curriculum development than does the teacher organization. Teachers and principals agree on this point. Much more encouragement of curriculum development by principals is seen in Tasmania than in Alberta. School-system administrators are seen as giving moderate encouragement of curriculum development by classroom teachers. There are more Tasmanians than Albertans with this point of view.<sup>4</sup> Principals are perceived by the total respondent group as doing very little actual supervision

---

<sup>4</sup>Tasmania has no local school-systems. Tasmanian respondents generally meant their superintendents, from the wording of the question.

of teachers or monitoring of teacher plans. Principals themselves, in both areas, feel that there is more extensive supervision than do their teachers. Monitoring of teacher plans by principals is viewed as occurring more in Tasmania than in Alberta.

Question 21: To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in curriculum development?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

Over two respondents in five feel that the teacher organizations' leadership in curriculum development is moderate. About one in eighty sees full leadership, one in six sees extensive leadership, about one in three sees little, and one in twenty sees none. The ratio checking extensive or full leadership, compared with little or none, is less than one to two.

Moderate<sup>5</sup> leadership in curriculum development by the teacher organization is noted by all curriculum committee members, by just over one principal in two, by one school-system administrator in two, and by just over two teachers in five. Over one Albertan in two checks this response, to just under one Tasmanian in three. Besides all curriculum committee members in both areas and one school-system administrator in two in Alberta, the answer that the teacher organization gives moderate leadership in curriculum development comes from over three Albertan principals in four (to just over one in four

---

<sup>5</sup>The category "somewhat" is interchanged with "moderate" throughout the report.

in Tasmania), and by about four Albertan teachers in nine (to under two in five in Tasmania).

Significant<sup>6</sup> leadership by the teacher organization in providing curriculum development is seen by one Department staff member in two and by one teacher organization representative in two. Apart from these groups, the highest ratio of respondents checking this response comes from Tasmanian principals (over one in four--to about one in eighteen in Alberta).

A ratio of one in two of school-system administrators and of Department staff perceive little or no teacher organization leadership in curriculum development. Agreement with this point of view comes from four parents in nine, one university staff member in three, two teachers in five, and about three principals in ten. The extreme answer, that the teacher organization gives no leadership in curriculum development, is checked by one Albertan teacher in fourteen (the only Albertan respondents to check this) and by about one Tasmanian teacher in seven. One Albertan in three sees little or no leadership, as do about four Tasmanians in nine. One teacher representative in two in Tasmania gives this answer; one Albertan school-system administrator in two does so; and parents in the ratio of two in five (Alberta) and one in two (Tasmania) agree. So do four Tasmanian principals in nine (to less than one in three in Alberta). About two teachers in five in each area also indicate that they perceive little or no leadership in curriculum development by the teacher organization.

---

<sup>6</sup>The categories "extensively" and "fully," when combined, are summarized as "significant" throughout the report.



Question 22: To what extent do principals encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

Just over two respondents in five feel that principals encourage curriculum development by teachers to a moderate extent. One in forty says there is no encouragement; just under one in four says there is little encouragement; just over one in four says that encouragement is extensive; and one in twenty says that encouragement is full. One in four says there is little or no encouragement; three in ten say that principals give extensive or full encouragement for curriculum development by classroom teachers.

Moderate encouragement of curriculum development by classroom teachers from the principal is indicated by about a similar proportion of respondents in Alberta and in Tasmania. Overall, only one teacher and principal in three gives this response, compared with about four school-system administrators in nine; five parents and university personnel in nine; five curriculum committee members in eight; and two Department staff in three.

One teacher in four, three school-system administrators and curriculum members in eight, and about one principal in five feel that there is little or no encouragement by principals for classroom teachers to develop curriculum.

Extensive or full encouragement by principals is perceived by almost one principal in two and by almost two teachers in five.

Teachers and principals in both Alberta and Tasmania check moderate encouragement in the ratio of about one in three. All other groups in Alberta and in Tasmania perceive moderate encouragement in the ratio of about one in two, or higher.

One Albertan in three sees little or no encouragement of curriculum development by principals, to about one in seven in Tasmania. Albertan teachers give this response in the ratio of over two in five (to one in seven in Tasmania) and all other Albertan groups make this a far more frequent response than do Tasmanians.

The reverse is true for extensive or full encouragement, with Tasmanians overall citing significant principal leadership in over two cases in five, to only one in five in Alberta. About twice as many Tasmanian teachers as the overall ratio in Tasmania have this perception. One Tasmanian teacher in two feels this way. Principals give the answer of extensive or full leadership more uniformly. One Tasmanian principal in two to over two Albertan principals in five give this answer.

Question 23: To what extent do school-system administrators (superintendent, supervisor) encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

Just over two respondents in five indicate that school-system administrators encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers to a moderate extent. Fewer than one in twenty feels there is no encouragement; one in five says that there is little encouragement;

over one in four indicates that encouragement is extensive; and about one in eight sees the encouragement as full. The highest proportion of respondents indicating that there is moderate encouragement of curriculum development by school-system administrators are parents, with over three in four giving this response. Significant encouragement of curriculum development by school-system administrators is indicated by about one in three of principals, school-system administrators, Department staff, university personnel, curriculum committee members, and teachers. "Little or no encouragement" is the response by about one in three teachers and principals and by one in four school-system administrators.

Over one of every two Tasmanians responds that there is moderate encouragement of curriculum development by superintendents, compared with about two Albertans in each five giving this answer. Generally, Albertan respondents perceive less encouragement by school-system administrators than do Tasmanian respondents. Both responses that there is full encouragement come from Albertans. Extensive encouragement of curriculum development by superintendents is perceived by almost 50 percent more Tasmanian teachers, proportionately, than Albertan teachers. Most perceptions of no encouragement of curriculum development come from Alberta with almost one teacher in five giving this answer. The ratio of teachers perceiving little encouragement is similar in Alberta and in Tasmania. Little encouragement is also perceived by two Albertan principals in five (to just over one in four in Tasmania) and by one school-system administrator in four.

Question 24: To what extent do principals actually supervise teaching of classroom teachers?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

Just under one respondent in three perceives moderate supervision of classroom teaching by principals. About one in twelve indicates that there is no supervision; over two in five say there is little supervision; about one in seven sees extensive supervision; and only one in 160 perceives full supervision.

Moderate supervision is the response by one Department staff in two and by about two in five of principals and school-system administrators--to just over one teacher in five. Principals and curriculum committee members see significant supervision in the ratio of about one in four. Over three teachers in five perceive little or no supervision, as do two parents in three, five university personnel in nine, two school-system administrators in five, and almost one principal in three.

Moderate supervision of classroom teaching by principals is perceived by a similar ratio overall in Alberta as in Tasmania, with variations between groups. Thus, almost two principals in five from Alberta give this response, to almost three in five from Tasmania, and four Albertan Department staff in five do so, to just over one in four in Tasmania.

Full supervision of classroom teachers by principals is perceived by no one in Alberta and by only one (a teacher, one in about thirty-five) in Tasmania. Almost one principal in four in each area

feels that there is extensive supervision of classroom teachers by principals but only one Tasmanian teacher in six and one Albertan teacher in twenty-eight agrees.

All Albertan respondents indicating no supervision of classroom teachers by principals are teachers (over one in four), to about one in twelve from Tasmania. Little supervision is perceived by some respondents in almost all groups, including two Albertan parents in five (one in two in Tasmania); by almost two Albertan principals in five (just over one in five in Tasmania); and by one teacher representative in two in Alberta (all in Tasmania).

Question 25: To what extent do principals monitor daily/weekly plans of classroom teachers?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

About one respondent in four says that principals monitor the weekly/daily plans of classroom teachers to a moderate extent. One respondent in six perceives no monitoring of weekly/daily plans by principals and two respondents in five see little monitoring of plans. About one respondent in seven feels that there is extensive monitoring and only one in twenty perceives full monitoring of the plans of classroom teachers by principals.

Those responding that there is little or no monitoring of plans by principals include more than one teacher in two, four school-system administrators in five, two parents in three, over half of the university staff, and all teacher organization representatives, but only two principals in five and one Department staff member in three.

Perceptions of significant monitoring of daily/weekly plans of classroom teachers come from about one in five of the teachers, principals, Department staff, and parents.

Moderate monitoring of teacher plans by principals is perceived by one Tasmanian respondent in three, to one Albertan in six. No Albertans respond that there is full monitoring of plans, compared with one Tasmanian in ten, including one Tasmanian teacher in seven. About one Albertan in thirty, including one principal in nine, perceives extensive monitoring of plans. Tasmanians see extensive monitoring of plans by principals in the ratio of almost three in ten. Notable responses from groups in Tasmania, indicating extensive monitoring, are over one teacher in four, one parent in two, one principal in three, and almost three Department staff in ten.

At the other extreme, perceiving no monitoring of teacher plans, is about one Albertan in four and one Tasmanian in eighteen. Over two Albertan teachers in five, one school-system administrator in five, and one principal in five share this view. In Tasmania, about one teacher in sixteen agrees that there is no monitoring of plans by principals, as does about one principal in thirty.

Little monitoring of the daily/weekly plans is perceived by more than one Albertan in two, to about one in five in Tasmania. This response comes from about two Albertan teachers in five, from all parents, from one principal in two, and from five school-system administrators in eight. By comparison, about one Tasmanian teacher in four, one parent in four, and one principal in nine agrees.

### Planning for Program Implementation

The planning that goes into program implementation is the subject of questions twenty-six through twenty-eight. This planning involves the provision of the necessary physical resources to accompany the introduction of a new program. A short survey of central tendencies in responses is given before each question is dealt with in more detail.

The weight of opinion about the extent of integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas is slightly towards "little" rather than "extensive." Albertans are more prominent than are Tasmanians with a perception of little planning and Albertans contribute all the responses that there is no planning.

Responses place responsibility for planning on, in order of priority, the curriculum committee (this answer comes from more Tasmanians than Albertans), the Department (this answer comes from more Tasmanians than Albertans), teachers (this answer comes from more Albertans than Tasmanians), and principals (this answer comes from more Albertans than Tasmanians).

Present planning could be improved, according to respondents, by providing more time for planning and testing of the proposed program (this response comes from more Albertans than Tasmanians); by allowing more teacher involvement in planning (this answer comes from more Albertans than Tasmanians); by providing better facilities/more materials for the program (this answer comes from more Tasmanians than Albertans); and by improving communications so that teachers

become better informed about the program (this reply comes from more Tasmanians than Albertans).

Question 26: How much is there integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

One respondent in three replies that there is moderate integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas. One in fourteen says there is no planning; almost one in three says that there is little planning; almost one in four feels that it is extensive; and less than one in fifty perceives full planning.

About one in three teachers, principals, and school-system administrators sees moderate planning in this area. "Little" or "no" planning of facilities and resources to accompany new curriculum ideas is the response by one teacher in three, by two principals in five, and by five each of school-system administrators and parents in nine. The extreme position of no planning is most strongly perceived by school-system administrators in the ratio of one in four.

Significant integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas is noted by about one teacher in three, by one Department staff member in two, and by one university respondent in three.

Moderate planning to provide integration of facilities, resources, and curriculum ideas is seen by about two Albertans in



five, to almost one Tasmanian in three. These responses include one Albertan teacher in three (to one in four in Tasmania), about two Albertan principals in five (to one in three in Tasmania), and one school-system administrator in three.

No planning for integration is the response of one Albertan in eight, to none in Tasmania. One school-system administrator in four gives the response that there is no planning. Little integrated planning is perceived by one Albertan in three, compared with about three Tasmanians in ten. In Alberta, little planning is the answer of one teacher in five, three parents and university staff in five, two principals, curriculum committee members, and Department staff in five, and one school-system administrator in five. Tasmanian respondents citing little integrated planning of facilities, resources, and curriculum ideas include one teacher and principal in three, one parent in two, and one Department staff in seven, but no curriculum committee members or university staff.

Question 27: Who should provide integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany any new curriculum ideas? Rank:

- |                 |                    |                         |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1( ) teacher    | 5( ) principal     | 9( ) school sys. admin. |
| 2( ) parent     | 6( ) department    | 10( ) teacher organ.    |
| 3( ) university | 7( ) elected rep.  | 11( ) other (_____)     |
| 4( ) publisher  | 8( ) curric. comm. |                         |

Integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany new curriculum ideas is perceived as being the first responsibility of the curriculum committee by over one respondent in four. The Department of Education has first responsibility for this planning placed

on it by over one respondent in five, teachers by one respondent in five, and principals by about one respondent in seven.

Those ranking the curriculum committee as having first responsibility for integrated planning include three teachers in ten, two Department personnel in five, over one principal in four, one university staff in three, and almost two curriculum members in five.

The Department of Education is ranked first for undertaking this planning by four parents in nine, three school-system administrators in eight, and one curriculum committee member in four, as well as by one Department staff in six.

Those ranking teachers as being primarily responsible are one parent and school-system administrator in three, almost one teacher in four, and one principal in six.

Principals receive first ranking for the role of planner from one curriculum member in four, one principal in five, and one teacher in nine.

The curriculum committee is ranked as being chiefly responsible for the integration of resources and curriculum ideas by almost two respondents in five in Tasmania and by about one in five in Alberta. About one Tasmanian in four ranks the Department of Education as being responsible, to one in five in Alberta. Those ranking the Department as having chief responsibility include three Tasmanian parents in four and two Albertan school-system administrators in five.

Teachers are ranked as having first responsibility for planning by about one Albertan in four, to one Tasmanian in six. Over one Albertan teacher in four, three Albertan parents in five, and

one school-system administrator in three give this response, along with one Tasmanian teacher in five and one Tasmanian principal in five.

One Albertan in five places principals first when considering who should be responsible for integrated planning of resources and curriculum ideas, to just one Tasmanian in sixteen. Albertan groups giving this ranking include principals in the ratio of more than one in four and teachers in the ratio of one in five.

Question 28: In what ways could present planning be improved?

Ways perceived as best for the improvement of present planning total eighteen. The most frequent responses to this question include calls for more time (by one respondent in six); for more teacher involvement (by a similar ratio); for better facilities/more materials (by a similar ratio); and for improved communications (by one respondent in sixteen). Those seeking more time for planning and testing of new curriculum ideas include three curriculum committee members in four, one school-system administrator in five, two parents in nine, and less than one teacher in ten. More teacher involvement is viewed as the best way to improve present planning for integration of resources and curriculum ideas by one principal in five, one Department staff in three, one school-system administrator in four, and one teacher in seven. The provision of better facilities is the chief way to improve planning for integration, in the opinions of two teachers and parents in nine. A call for improved communications as the best way to improve planning comes from one teacher in thirteen.

The matter of more time to effect improved planning is the response of almost one Albertan in four, to one Tasmanian in fourteen. Groups giving this answer include two Albertan parents in five, almost three Albertan curriculum committee members in four, and all teacher representatives. Teachers respond in this way in the ratio of one in seven in Alberta and one in sixteen in Tasmania.

Teacher involvement is proposed as the first need in improving planning by one Albertan in seven, to two Tasmanians in eleven. Teachers in Alberta respond in a ratio like that of the general group of Albertans, namely one in seven, while Tasmanian teachers also respond in the ratio of about one in seven. The answer that greater teacher involvement is needed to bring about improved planning to integrate resources and curriculum ideas comes from one school-system administrator in four, one Albertan Department staff in five, and one Albertan principal in six. In Tasmania, this response comes from over two Department staff in five and from two principals in nine.

Improved facilities/more materials are listed as being the chief need to effect improved planning by about one Tasmanian in three, to one Albertan in thirty. One Albertan teacher in fourteen gives this answer, as does one Tasmanian parent in two and about three Tasmanian teachers and principals in ten.

The need for improved communications to improve planning is ranked first by one Tasmanian in nine, to one Albertan in forty. Of the Albertans, one teacher in thirty and one Department staff in five give this response. In Tasmania, this answer comes from one

teacher representative in two, one university staff in four, and one teacher and principal in nine.

### Questions Related to Curriculum Dissemination

In this section, there are four areas of inquiry:  
 Understanding the Guide (Questions 29 through 32),  
 Use of the Guide (Questions 33 and 34),  
 Teacher Training (Questions 35 and 36),  
 Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas (Questions 37 through 40).

### Understanding the Guide

Questions twenty-nine through thirty-two focus on teacher understanding of the guide. This area of inquiry is important because the effect of the guide upon pupils in the classroom is determined largely by the extent to which classroom teachers understand the guide. Some central tendencies from responses are given, followed by a more detailed report on answers to each question.

There are perceptions of a higher level of understanding of the guide in Tasmania than in Alberta. In the two areas combined, more than half the respondents feel that there is understanding, with high teacher understanding perceived by parents and the Department and much lower teacher understanding perceived by university staff, curriculum committee members, and school-system administrators.

Respondents feel that teachers came to understand the present guide mainly through reading the guide, through Department workshops, and through teacher organization workshops. The best ways to come to understand the guide are also ranked as being through reading the

guide, through Department workshops, and through teacher organization workshops. Both Albertans and Tasmanians rank reading the guide as of top priority in the existing situation and in what would be best for coming to understand the guide. Departmental workshops are ranked much more highly as helping understanding the guide in Tasmania than in Alberta. In the existing situation, understanding of the guide is perceived as stemming from departmental workshops about fifteen times as frequently in Tasmania as in Alberta. In the ideal situation, the ratio ranking Department workshops first by Albertans: Tasmanians is about two:one. For the existing situations, teacher organization workshops are ranked first in helping teachers to come to understand the guide about seven times as frequently in Alberta as in Tasmania. In the answers giving perceptions of the ideal way for teachers to come to understand the guide, there is almost equal distribution of Albertans/Tasmanians seeing teacher organization workshops as of first importance.

Hindrances to teacher understanding of the guide include the lack of necessary time and the ambiguity of the guide (with Albertans giving these answers more frequently than do Tasmanians); the lack of help or training (with Tasmanians giving this answer more frequently than do Albertans); and the lack of training for teaching social studies (with this answer coming from both areas). Many respondents do not answer the question and some Tasmanians note that there is no hindrance to understanding the guide.

Question 29: Do teachers understand the guide provided by the  
Province/State?    Yes    No

Five respondents in eight state that teachers understand the existing guide. Two in nine state that teachers do not understand the guide, while one in thirteen feels that some do and some do not understand the guide.

Understanding of the guide is perceived by all respondent groups, chiefly by seven parents in nine and three Department staff in four. Teachers give this answer in the ratio of about seven in ten. One university staff in three, three curriculum committee members in eight, and four school-system administrators in nine share this view.

Lack of understanding of the guide is cited by university staff in the ratio of four in nine, by three school-system administrators in eight, by over one principal in four, and by one teacher in eight.

Albertans perceive that there is understanding of the guide in the ratio of four in nine, Tasmanians in the ratio of over four in five. No Albertan university staff have this view. Groups having low ratios perceiving teacher understanding of the guide are Albertan curriculum committee members (one in four), and principals and school-system administrators (four in nine). In Tasmania, the minimum ratio perceiving understanding of the guide comes from university staff, with three in four having this view.

Over one Albertan in three perceives lack of teacher understanding of the guide, to one Tasmanian in eighteen. Albertan

groups with this view include three university staff in five, four curriculum members and principals in nine, three school-system administrators in eight, and just over one teacher in four. In Tasmania, one university staff in four and one principal in nine also perceives an absence of teacher understanding of the guide.

Respondents who perceive some understanding of the guide by teachers are one Albertan in ten and one Tasmanian in twenty-four. This reply comes mainly from two Albertan university staff in five, two school-system administrators in eleven, and one Tasmanian principal in nine.

Question 30: Rank the ways in which teachers came to understand the guide:

- |                         |                                  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1( ) colleague(s)       | 8( ) department publication      |
| 2( ) principal          | 9( ) university course           |
| 3( ) department staff   | 10( ) department workshop        |
| 4( ) reading the guide  | 11( ) teacher organ. workshop    |
| 5( ) other reading      | 12( ) teacher organ. publication |
| 6( ) school-sys. admin. | 13( ) other (_____)              |
| 7( ) texts              |                                  |

Teachers come to understand the guide first by reading it, according to four respondents in each nine. One respondent in seven says that understanding comes through a Department workshop and one in sixteen perceives understanding as coming through a teacher organization workshop.

Reading the guide is cited as the first way in which teachers came to understand the guide by almost three teachers in five, by two parents in three, by one curriculum committee member in two, by three teacher representatives in four, by three school-system administrators in eight, and by two principals in nine. Department workshops



are listed as the chief way to teacher understanding by over one principal in four, by one Department staff member in four, and by one teacher in ten. Teacher organization workshops have first ranking in providing understanding with two university staff in nine, one principal in seven, and one teacher in thirty-one.

Just over two in five Albertan and Tasmanian respondents rank reading the guide as the most important way in which teachers came to understand the guide. Just over one Albertan teacher in two, four Albertan parents in five, five curriculum committee members in nine, and all Albertan teacher representatives feel this way. Over three Tasmanian teachers in five and one parent and teacher representative in two also place reading the guide first. Departmental workshops are ranked first as the way in which teachers came to understand the guide by almost one Tasmanian in three and by one Albertan in forty-four. Three Tasmanian Department staff in five place the department workshop first, as do five Tasmanian principals in nine and two Tasmanian teachers in eleven. Teacher organization workshops are ranked first as giving teacher understanding of the guide by one Albertan in ten and by one Tasmanian in seventy. Two Albertan parents in five, two Albertan principals in nine, and one Albertan teacher in fifteen place teacher organization workshops first.

Question 31: What things hinder(ed) teachers from understanding the guide?

There are fourteen different answers given as things that hinder(ed) teachers from understanding the guide. One respondent in

five sees lack of time as the first hindrance; almost one in five sees ambiguity and difficulty in understanding the guide as the chief deterrent to understanding; almost one in ten feels that the lack of understanding comes from lack of help/training for teachers; about one in fourteen cites lack of training in social studies as a hindrance to understanding; and another one in fourteen says that there is no hindrance to understanding. In addition, one respondent in four does not answer the question.

The absence of enough time to read the guide, to follow the necessary approach to come to understand the guide, and to orient teachers to the program is noted by one teacher in five, by one principal in four, and by one school-system administrator in three. One Department staff member in three, one curriculum committee member in four, two university staff and parents in nine, and one teacher in five perceive ambiguity in the guide and general lack of understanding of the guide by teachers as the chief hindrance. Lack of help/training for teachers is given as the chief hindrance to teacher understanding of the guide by one teacher representative in two, by one principal in nine, and by one teacher in ten. Lack of training in social studies is listed as the hindrance to understanding by one Department staff in four, by two university personnel in nine, by one school-system administrator in eighty, and by one teacher in thirty-two.

One Albertan in four cites lack of time as the chief hindrance to understanding of the guide, as does one Tasmanian in eight. Albertans giving this answer first place are chiefly one school-system

administrator in three, over one teacher in four, and almost one principal in four. Tasmanians noting lack of time as a hindrance to understanding of the guide are mainly one teacher in seven and one principal in eighteen. Ambiguity of the guide and general lack of understanding of it is noted by almost one Albertan in four and by one Tasmanian in nine. Four Albertan Department staff in five, two Albertan university staff and parents in five, almost three Albertan curriculum committee members in ten, and about one Albertan teacher in four perceive problems of ambiguity, as does one Tasmanian teacher in seven. Absence of help/training for teachers as the main hindrance to teacher understanding of the guide is noted by one Albertan in thirteen and by one Tasmanian in nine. One teacher representative in two in each region holds the view that an absence of help/training is the problem. About one in fourteen respondents in each area gives lack of training in social studies as the chief hindrance. Over two in five Tasmanian Department staff give this response.

The "nil" responses indicating that there is no hindrance to teacher understanding of the guide come from no Albertans and from two Tasmanians in thirteen, including over one teacher in four.

Question 32: Which ways would be best for teachers to understand the curriculum guide?

- |                           |                                  |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1( ) colleague(s)         | 8( ) department publication      |
| 2( ) principal            | 9( ) university course           |
| 3( ) department staff     | 10( ) department workshop        |
| 4( ) reading the guide    | 11( ) teacher organ. workshop    |
| 5( ) other reading        | 12( ) teacher organ. publication |
| 6( ) school-system admin. | 13( ) other ( _____ )            |
| 7( ) texts                |                                  |

The best ways for teachers to come to understand the guide are given as "reading the guide" (by over one respondent in four), "Department workshop" (by over one respondent in five), and "teacher organization workshop" (by about one respondent in eight).

Reading the guide is ranked first by four parents in nine, by three curriculum committee members and school-system administrators in eight, and by one teacher in three. First ranking is given to Department workshop as the best way to get teacher understanding of the guide by one curriculum committee member in two, by one parent, principal, and university staff member in three, and by one teacher in eight. Teacher organization workshops are ranked first for effecting understanding of the guide, by three Department staff in eight, by almost one school-system administrator in five, by one principal in six, and by one teacher in eight. No teacher representatives list teacher organization workshops first.

Over one in four respondents from each region cites reading the guide as the best way to bring about teacher understanding of the guide. Those expressing this view include two Albertan curriculum committee members in five, three school-system administrators in eight, and just over one Albertan teacher in four, together with three Tasmanian parents in four and almost two Tasmanian teachers in five. Understanding of the guide through a Department workshop is ranked first by about one Tasmanian in three and by about one Albertan in seven. Two Albertan parents and curriculum committee members in five, one Albertan university and Department staff in five, and one Albertan teacher in fourteen have this view, as do all Tasmanian

curriculum committee members, over one Tasmanian principal in two, one Tasmanian university staff in two, one Tasmanian parent in four, and less than one Tasmanian teacher in five.

Teacher organization workshops are favored for bringing teacher understanding of the guide by one Albertan in seven and by one Tasmanian in nine. Albertan teachers rank teacher organization workshops first in the ratio of one in five, as do Albertan principals (one in six) and school-system administrators (two in eleven). In Tasmania, over two Department staff in five respond this way, along with one principal in six and one teacher in eighteen.

#### Use of the Guide

Questions thirty-three and thirty-four deal with use of the present curriculum guide in classrooms. General points that are indicated by responses are given first, followed by a more detailed report of answers.

On balance, the guide is perceived as being more used than not. Slightly more Tasmanians than Albertans note "little" use of the guide but Tasmanian perceptions of usage of the guide are higher than are Albertan perceptions of usage overall.

Chief problems hindering use of the guide are cited as being, in order of priority, a lack of materials, inappropriateness of the program, lack of understanding of the concepts, lack of knowledge of appropriate teaching methods, and lack of detail in the program. Each of these answers is ranked somewhat the same in both areas except that there is more stress on the lack of knowledge of appropriate teaching methods in Alberta than in Tasmania.

Question 33: To what extent is the program given in the guide used in the classroom?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

Use of the program given in the existing guide in the classroom varies. About two respondents in five say that it is used "somewhat"; less than one in fifty sees it as not used at all; about one in ten says that the existing guide is little used; over two in five perceive it as being used extensively; and about one in seventy-five says that it is fully used.

Those replying that the program is used moderately include almost one teacher in two, over one school-system administrator in two, one Department staff in two, four university staff in nine, and one principal in four. Little or no use of the program in the guide is perceived chiefly by one curriculum committee member in four and one teacher in five. Extensive or full use of the program is perceived by two principals in three, by five curriculum committee members in eight, by five parents in nine, and by three teachers in ten.

Almost one in two Albertans mark "somewhat" as usage of the program, while just over one in four Tasmanians do so. All Albertan Department staff say that there is moderate usage, as do more than one in two Albertan teachers and school-system administrators. Almost two Tasmanian teachers in five agree with this answer.

No usage of the program is cited by one Albertan principal in nine and by one Tasmanian teacher in thirty-three. Little usage

of the program is the response of one Albertan in eleven and of one Tasmanian in eight. Responses that there is little usage are scattered through groups in Alberta. In Tasmania, all of those giving this answer are from one group, being over one teacher in four.

No Albertans check that usage of the program is full. One Tasmanian in thirty-six gives this answer, notably one parent in four. Extensive usage of the program given in the guide is listed by over one Albertan in three, to almost one Tasmanian in two. In Tasmania, over four Department staff in five, three parents and principals in four, and about three teachers in ten give this response. In Alberta, five principals and curriculum committee members in nine say that there is extensive usage of the program, as do less than one school-system administrator and teacher in three.

Question 34: What are things that hinder teachers most in using the program?

There are sixteen answers to the question, indicating things that hinder teachers in using the program. Hindrances include a lack of resource materials (cited by over one respondent in four); inappropriateness of the program (cited by one respondent in nine); a lack of understanding of concepts (cited by one respondent in twelve); and a lack of time and a lack of detail in the program (each cited by one respondent in fourteen).

Lack of resource materials is ranked as the chief hindrance to teachers in using the program by over two principals in five and by about one Department staff and teacher in four. Inappropriateness of the program is the main hindrance to teachers, in the

perceptions of two university staff in nine and one teacher in five. One parent in three, one principal in nine, and one teacher in ten cites a lack of understanding of concepts as the chief hindrance to teacher use of the program given in the guide. A lack of knowledge of appropriate teaching methods is given as the chief hindrance by one Department staff in four, one school-system administrator in eight, and one teacher in sixteen. A lack of time is given as the chief hindrance by one principal in nine and one teacher in thirteen. A lack of detail in the program is cited first as a hindrance to use of the program by two school-system administrators in eleven and one teacher in sixteen.

About one Albertan in four and one Tasmanian in three sees a lack of resource material as the chief hindrance to teachers in using the program. This view is shared by four Tasmanian principals in nine (to about two in five in Alberta), by almost one Tasmanian teacher in three (to about one in four in Alberta), and by over two Tasmanian Department staff in five (to nil in Alberta).

Inappropriateness of the program is ranked as the main hindrance to its use by teachers by one Albertan in ten and by one Tasmanian in eight. Of these, two Albertan teachers in eleven and one Tasmanian teacher in five make up the major groups.

Lack of understanding of concepts is given as the reason why the program is not easily used by one Albertan in nine and by one Tasmanian in twelve. Over two Albertan curriculum committee members in five feel this way, as do two Albertan parents in five and one school-system administrator in eight. No Albertan teachers agree.



One Tasmanian principal in nine is in agreement, as is one Tasmanian teacher in twelve.

About one Albertan in seven and one Tasmanian in thirty-three feels that teaching methods to use the program are not known. This answer is given by many groups in both Alberta and Tasmania, none being at a high ratio. Lack of time is cited as the main hindrance to use of the program by one Albertan in nine and by one Tasmanian in seventy. Two Albertan principals in nine, one Albertan Department staff in five, and one Albertan teacher in seven make up the chief groups referring to lack of time as a hindrance.

Deficiencies in detail in the program is listed as the first hindrance to teacher use of the program by one Albertan in thirteen and by one Tasmanian in eighteen. This response comes from two Albertan school-system administrators in eleven.

### Teacher Training

Questions thirty-five and thirty-six relate to the training of teachers to offer the program. A more detailed report of responses follows a short summary of the central tendencies of answers to these questions.

A majority of respondents feel that there is little or no specific training of teachers to use the guide, with the ratio giving this answer being about the same from each area. Perceptions of extensive training of teachers to use the program are higher in Tasmania, especially with university and Department personnel.

Commitment by the teacher is ranked first as the way to have teachers trained for the program. Teachers themselves give this response less frequently than do the other groups. Organized workshops are the next most important way to train teachers for understanding and use of a new program, with a slightly higher preference for this response in Tasmania than in Alberta. Time from work ranks next in importance as the best way to train teachers, being about equally listed in both areas.

Question 35: Were teachers specifically trained to use the program?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

About three respondents in ten say that teachers had some specific training to use the program. One in five says that there was no training; almost two in five say there was little training; one in sixteen says the training was extensive; and one in 160 says that the training was full.

Moderate training of teachers to use the program is ranked first by one school-system administrator and Department staff in two, by three teachers in ten, and by one principal in five. Significant training of teachers is indicated by one Department staff in four, two university staff in nine, one parent in nine, and by less than one teacher in twenty. Little or no specific training of teachers is cited by three teacher representatives and principals in four, by five curriculum committee members in eight, and by three teachers in five, as well as by one university staff in three and one Department

staff in four. Over one teacher in four says that there was no specific training of teachers.

One Albertan in three and one Tasmanian in four feels that there was moderate specific training of teachers to use the program. Of the Albertan respondents, one teacher in three, four Department staff in five, one school-system administrator in two, and two curriculum committee members in five share this view. Similar views of moderate training are held by over one Tasmanian teacher and Department staff in four.

No training of teachers is indicated by about one respondent in five from each region. All Albertan teacher representatives give this answer, as do two curriculum committee members in five and one teacher in five. In Tasmania, one teacher in three says that there is no training. Little specific training of teachers is perceived by about two respondents in five from each region. Five Albertan principals in nine hold this view, along with one teacher in three. Two Tasmanian principals in three see little specific training and so does one Tasmanian teacher in three.

Full training of teachers is checked by one Albertan in ninety and by one Albertan teacher in thirty. Extensive training of teachers is checked by one Albertan in ninety and by one Tasmanian in eight. The Tasmanians checking extensive training of teachers include one university staff in two and two Department staff in five.

Question 36: Rank according to relative importance in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program:

- |                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1( ) commitment by teacher   | 4( ) time from work  |
| 2( ) subsidy of direct costs | 5( ) articles, books |
| 3( ) organized workshops     | 6( ) other (_____)   |

More than one respondent in two says that the most important need in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program is commitment by the teacher. Over one in four gives organized workshops as of first importance in training teachers, and one in nine says that the first need in training teachers is time from work.

All groups give prominence to teacher commitment as the chief factor in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program, the lowest being teachers themselves, in the ratio of almost two in five. First ranking of organized workshops for training teachers comes from over one teacher in three, from one university staff in three, and from more than one principal in four. Time from work is favored as the best way to train teachers for a new program by two principals in nine and by one teacher and school-system administrator in eight.

Albertan respondents rank teacher commitment as the most important factor in training teachers for a new program in the ratio of three in five. Tasmanians give this answer in the ratio of about four in nine. All Albertan teacher representatives, Department staff, and university staff give this response, as do four parents in five and seven curriculum committee members in eight. One Albertan teacher in three agrees, while four in nine Tasmanian teachers do so.

Organized workshops are favored for training teachers by almost one Albertan in four and by over one Tasmanian in three. Two Albertan teachers in five feel this way but there are no Department staff, university staff, or parents with this view. In Tasmania, three university staff in four, one parent in two, and almost two principals in five give this response, as do fewer than three teachers and Department staff in ten.

Just over one in nine Albertans lists time from work as the main factor in training teachers for a new program, as does one Tasmanian in eight. Albertans with this response include two principals in nine and one school-system administrator and teacher in eight. Chief Tasmanians answering this way are two principals in nine and one teacher in nine.

#### Diffusion of Curriculum Ideas

Questions thirty-seven through forty focus on ways in which new curriculum ideas are, or should be, diffused. Detailed reporting of responses to each question is given following a short section that indicates central tendencies of answers to the questions.

Respondents rank the curriculum committee, the Department, teachers, and principals, in that order, as being the group or organization that should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas. Tasmanians place greater stress on the curriculum committee than do Albertans but Albertans rank the Department more highly than do Tasmanians. Teachers are ranked first by Department staff and principals.

Teacher organization leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas is seen as tending toward the "little" or "no" categories, especially by Tasmanians. More Albertans than Tasmanians perceive extensive leadership in this area.

Leadership by principals in spreading new curriculum ideas is generally in the "somewhat" range, tending towards "little." Tasmanians perceive more leadership in this area than do Albertans.

For the spreading of new curriculum ideas within a school, the following are ranked as best: subject meetings, staff meetings, informal discussion, and administrative visits. Albertans stress subject meetings as the best way to spread new curriculum ideas within a school more so than do Tasmanians; and there are more frequent responses from Tasmanians than from Albertans ranking informal discussion as of first importance in curriculum diffusion in a school. The ratios of responses from Albertans and Tasmanians favoring staff meetings and administrative visits for curriculum diffusion are similar in each area.

Question 37: Who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas?

- |                 |                    |                         |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1( ) teacher    | 5( ) principal     | 9( ) school-sys. admin. |
| 2( ) parent     | 6( ) department    | 10( ) teacher organ.    |
| 3( ) university | 7( ) elected rep.  | 11( ) other (_____)     |
| 4( ) publisher  | 8( ) curric. comm. |                         |

Over one respondent in four ranks the curriculum committee as having first responsibility for spreading new curriculum ideas. A further two in eleven rank the Department of Education first; over one in six cites teachers first; and one in nine makes principals

the first choice as being responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas.

Responsibility of the curriculum committee to spread new curriculum ideas is ranked first by two principals in five, by just over one teacher in four, and by one Department staff and curriculum committee member in four. First ranking of the Department of Education for curriculum diffusion comes chiefly from five parents in nine, four school-system administrators in nine, three curriculum committee members in eight, one Department staff and teacher representative in four, and one teacher in nine. No university staff place the Department first. The chief group saying that teachers should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas are teachers, in the ratio of over one in four. Principals are ranked as having chief responsibility for curriculum diffusion by one principal and Department staff in six and by almost one teacher in ten.

That the curriculum committee should be responsible is the response of twice as many Tasmanians as Albertans, being given by almost two Tasmanians in five to nearly one Albertan in five. Albertan groups responding in this way include teachers (just over one in five), principals (one in three), and school-system administrators (one in eight). No Department staff give this answer. Tasmanian responses saying that the curriculum committee should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas come from teachers (one in three), principals (one in two), and Department staff (over two in five).

The Department of Education is ranked first in desired responsibility for curriculum diffusion by about one Albertan in

four and by one Tasmanian in ten. Included in the Albertans giving this answer are three parents and Department staff in five, over two curriculum committee members and school-system administrators in five, and about two teachers in eleven. Tasmanians citing the Department first include one parent and teacher representative in two and one principal in nine.

Ranking teachers first as the group that should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas are about one in six Albertans and two in eleven Tasmanians. One Albertan teacher in four and one Albertan principal in three gives this answer, as does one Tasmanian teacher in three. One Tasmanian teacher representative in two agrees with this answer, while no Albertan teacher representatives do.

One Albertan in eight and one Tasmanian in ten ranks principals as having responsibility for curriculum diffusion. Chief groups responding in this way are teachers (one Albertan in six), principals (one Albertan in nine and two Tasmanians in nine), and Department staff (two Tasmanians in five).

Question 38: To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

1( ) not at all	4( ) extensively
2( ) little	5( ) fully
3( ) somewhat	

Over one respondent in three feels that the teacher organization gives leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas to a moderate degree ("somewhat"). About one in ten indicates no leadership; over one in three says "little"; one in six feels the leadership



to be extensive; and one in 167 sees full leadership by the teacher organization.

Moderate leadership by the teacher organization in spreading new curriculum ideas is perceived by two parents in three, by one curriculum committee member in two, and by about one teacher, principal, and school-system administrator in three. Little or no leadership is indicated by almost one teacher in two, two Department staff and principals in five, five university staff in nine, and one school-system administrator in two. "No leadership" by the teacher organization is the response of one teacher representative in two. Significant leadership by the teacher organization in curriculum diffusion is perceived by one Department staff and curriculum committee member in four, two principals in nine, and one teacher in seven.

Perceptions of moderate leadership in curriculum diffusion by the teacher organization are held by over two Albertans in five and by one Tasmanian in four. All groups except Tasmanian teacher representatives and Tasmanian curriculum committee members are included with this response. The response "not at all" is checked by one Albertan in thirty and by one Tasmanian in six. One Albertan teacher in sixteen answers this way, as does one Tasmanian teacher in five, almost three Tasmanian Department staff in ten, and all Tasmanian teacher representatives. About three Albertans in ten and two Tasmanians in five check "little" as the leadership by the teacher organization. The ratio of Albertans:Tasmanians giving the answer "little leadership" is about three:four, and it is made up of

responses from teachers, principals, and university staff in each area. One school-system administrator in two also gives this response. Full leadership in curriculum diffusion by the teacher organization is perceived by one Albertan parent in five. Extensive teacher organization leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas is indicated by one Albertan in five and by one Tasmanian in eight. In Alberta, notable respondents citing extensive leadership are one teacher in five, two principals in nine, two Department staff in five, and one teacher representative in two. In Tasmania, responses noting extensive leadership are from two principals in nine, one Department staff in seven, and one teacher in twelve.

Question 39: To what extent do principals give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 1( ) not at all | 4( ) extensively |
| 2( ) little     | 5( ) fully       |
| 3( ) somewhat   |                  |

The extent of the leadership of principals in spreading new curriculum ideas is perceived as moderate by over two respondents in five. One in twenty checks "not at all"; over one in four, "little"; two in nine, "extensively"; and about one in seventy-seven, "fully" as the response to the question on the extent of leadership given by principals in spreading new curriculum ideas.

Moderate leadership by principals is perceived by two parents in three, five university staff in nine, over one principal in two, one curriculum committee member in two, and under two teachers and school-system administrators in five.

Little or no leadership in curriculum diffusion by principals is the response of over one teacher in three, one school-system administrator in two, one Department staff in three, four university personnel in nine, and by one principal in seven.

Significant leadership by principals is indicated by one teacher representative in two, one Department staff, parent, and principal in three, and one teacher in five.

Over two respondents in five in each region check moderate as the extent of principals' leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas. Notable variations come from parents (all Albertans and one Tasmanian in four) and university staff (two Albertans in five and just over one Tasmanian in four). No leadership by principals is seen by one Albertan in eighteen and by one Tasmanian in twenty-four. One Albertan teacher in ten and one Tasmanian teacher in sixteen help make up this response. "Little leadership" by principals in curriculum diffusion is the answer of over one Albertan in three to two Tasmanians in fifteen. Major variations from the norm, in Alberta, come from teacher representatives (one in two), principals (two in nine), and parents (nil); and variations in Tasmania come from teachers (one in five), Department staff (nearly three in ten), and principals (one in sixteen). All responses of full leadership by principals come from Tasmanians (one in thirty-five), being from one parent in four and one principal in sixteen. Extensive leadership by principals is checked by one Albertan in seven and by almost one Tasmanian in three. Chief responses citing extensive principal leadership in curriculum diffusion come from

teachers (one Albertan in fourteen, one Tasmanian in three), principals (over one Albertan in four, one Tasmanian in three), Department staff (one Albertan in five, over two Tasmanians in five), and teacher representatives (one in two in each region).

Question 40: Rank the following according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas within a school:

- |                       |                    |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1( ) staff meetings   | 4( ) admin. visits | 7( ) informal disc.      |
| 2( ) subject meetings | 5( ) magazines     | 8( ) lesson plan to adm. |
| 3( ) school library   | 6( ) new resources | 9( ) other(_____)        |

Ranked first as the best way to spread new curriculum ideas within a school are subject meetings (by three respondents in eight), staff meetings (by over one in four), informal discussion (by about one in six), and administrative visits (by one in eighteen).

Subject meetings are ranked as the best way for in-school curriculum diffusion by three teacher representatives and school-system administrators in four, by one curriculum committee member in two, and by about one teacher and principal in three. One teacher in four ranks staff meetings first for spreading new curriculum ideas in a school, as do two principals in five, five Department staff in nine, and one parent in three. Informal discussion is preferred for curriculum diffusion by one curriculum committee member in four, one parent and teacher in eleven, and about one principal in five. There are scattered responses favoring administrative visits, with one teacher in sixteen selecting this response as the best way to spread new curriculum ideas in a school.

Subject meetings are preferred as the way to effect curriculum diffusion by almost one Albertan in two and by two Tasmanians

in nine. All Albertan teacher representatives and three school-system administrators in four endorse this idea. In Tasmania, one teacher representative in two and over one teacher and Department staff in four agrees. Over one Tasmanian in three and two Albertans in nine cite staff meetings as of first importance in spreading new curriculum ideas within a school. Albertans giving this answer include Department staff (two in five), principals (five in nine), parents (one in two), and teachers (almost one in four). Over one Tasmanian in four and one Albertan in eleven select informal discussion as the best way to spread ideas. Chief responses that informal discussion is best to spread curriculum ideas are from teachers (one Albertan in sixteen, nearly two Tasmanians in five), parents (two Albertans in five, nil in Tasmania), and principals (one Albertan in six, two Tasmanians in nine). Administrative visits are ranked first for curriculum diffusion within a school by one Albertan in sixteen and one Tasmanian in twenty-four. One Albertan teacher in ten feels this way, as does one Albertan school-system administrator in sixteen and one Tasmanian principal in eighteen.

### Summary

This report deals with a great diversity of responses. With forty questions, each having more than one possible answer and eight groups of respondents in each region, there is a mass of information on responses. The information is presented as ratios of respondents. More details, with overall percentages giving the most common answers, percentages by groups giving the most common answers, and percentages

by groups by regions giving the most common answers, appear in Appendix C.

The diversity of responses is addressed further in Chapter 5, where the main themes of the questionnaire are used as a basis for the organization of the summary of the findings of the survey. In Chapter 4, the sections on the present curriculum guide, on curriculum, with subsections on curriculum sources, texts/references, roles in curriculum development, and planning for program implementation, and on curriculum dissemination, with subsections on understanding the guide, use of the guide, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas, are used as a means to organize the information available. Responses are dealt with in ratios. There are short summaries given at the beginning of each section, telling the central tendencies that are evident in the more detailed report of responses to each question. The questions themselves are listed to assist the reader in identifying the context of replies.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Introduction

The summary portion of the chapter includes sections on each of the themes explored in the study, as well as a section relating the research reported in Chapter 2. The approach in each section is to focus on a broad summary of central tendencies that are evident in responses. A detailed summary of all responses is provided in Appendix C. For purposes of reporting, groups surveyed are combined to form school-based, non-school-based, and parent groups, in order to point out trends towards common points of view.

In addition to summarizing, the writer adds comments about the findings where these seem appropriate.

Following the summary, in the section on conclusions, the writer draws some general conclusions, relates conclusions to the five key questions cited in Chapter 1, and lists seven suggestions on how to use the findings to improve curriculum development. The final section includes questions that have been raised and that deserve further attention.

#### Summary

##### The Curriculum Guide

The present guide receives focus in Questions 2 through 11.

Replies to the questionnaire indicate that the curriculum guide is perceived as coming chiefly from the curriculum committees. The ideal sources of the guide, according to respondents, are the curriculum committees and teachers. During the interviews with respondents in Tasmania, the writer found that parents regard the curriculum committee as representing the Department of Education. At the same time, school-based personnel see the curriculum committee as representing them in the development of curriculum. It is not clear how the other respondent groups in Tasmania identify the curriculum committees. Perceptions of Albertan respondents on this point are also unknown.

There are also problems in knowing the precise perceptions of principals who strongly endorse teachers as the ideal source of the curriculum guide. It is not clear whether these principals regard themselves as teachers first and principals second, to be included in the curriculum development process, or whether they prefer others to prepare the guide. Since replies to Question 6, on whether they should have been involved in the development of the guide, include a majority of principals saying "yes," it must be concluded that principals include themselves as teachers when calling for teachers to set the curriculum guide.

The people responsible for the development of the curriculum guides in Alberta and in Tasmania should note the importance given to teachers by respondents.

Overall, there is very limited involvement in development of curriculum guides in each area. Ratios of people who were involved



are higher in Tasmania than in Alberta. There was much less actual involvement in the past than is desired for the future.

Pilot teachers are part of the curriculum development process for guides in Tasmania in sufficient numbers to show on the random sample. This process of involvement could well receive attention in Alberta. If it were used there, it could meet the expressed wish for more involvement than applies at present and the expressed wish for a greater teacher voice in preparation of the guide. Increased involvement by teachers could also be expected to increase perceptions of teachers and principals that the guide is a "good" guide and to reduce the criticisms of the guide by these groups.

There is a general perception of quite limited prescription in the existing guide, with higher prescription being perceived by more Albertan than Tasmanian respondents. This is an unexpected response, since the centralized nature of education in Tasmania should point to greater prescription there. Also unexpected is the weight of response favoring more prescription as a desirable direction. Twice the proportion of Albertans to Tasmanians call for more prescription, pointing to a reaction against the move to give more and more freedom to teachers in deciding curriculum. Teachers have found that practical considerations of curriculum development for their own classes have caused problems. In particular, there are always demands on teachers' time for detailed class preparation, making the time-consuming preparation of guides an onerous task. The time used in preparing guides tends to increase when the teachers are not trained in curriculum development.

In general, respondents to questions relating to the existing curriculum guides in Alberta and in Tasmania in elementary social studies have provided comments that should cause the appropriate officials in each area to consider alternative ways to develop and to apply these guides.

### The Curriculum

There are four parts in the section on the curriculum: curriculum sources, texts and references, roles in curriculum development, and planning for program implementation.

Curriculum sources: Respondents are guided by a definition of curriculum as "all of the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school." Replies to Questions 12 and 13 indicate perceptions of the sources of curriculum.

As noted in the previous section, Tasmanians who were interviewed tend to regard the curriculum committee in different ways according to their own group. Thus, parents see the curriculum committee as representing the Department (and, ultimately, themselves), while school-based personnel regard the curriculum committee as representing them. These variations make interpretation of responses more difficult.

Sources of the present curriculum are seen as being teachers and the curriculum committees, with the Department of Education ranked third. When considering who should set curriculum, respondents rank teachers first and place the Department of Education as a relatively low third choice, after the curriculum committees.

These responses point to a wish that teachers should be able to make more decisions about what is happening in the classrooms. The apparent contradiction of the earlier response that there should be more prescription through the curriculum guide can be explained by recognition of the fact that the guide places emphasis on content but does not provide much detail of teaching process. In addition, it should be noted that Albertans call most strongly for more prescription--and that more Albertans than Tasmanians would prefer that the curriculum committee set the curriculum.

Texts/references: The questions stressing texts/references are numbered 14 through 20 on the questionnaire.

Respondents are generally opposed to set texts, another apparent contradiction of the call for more prescription in the guide. However, this need not represent a contradiction since there could well be a set guide to show course content--and obviate the need for much teacher time in building a sequential, planned outline of content--without a prescription of the text book(s) to be used in teaching the content. There is less opposition to set texts in Alberta than in Tasmania; so responses to this question parallel those calling for more prescription through a guide. Opposition to set texts could well be based chiefly upon dissatisfaction with available texts rather than upon philosophy about prescription generally.

The timing of books and references in relation to the introduction of new curriculum ideas represents a problem in curriculum development. About a half of the respondents feel that, at present,

materials are available at the same time as the new curriculum ideas. Over half want the materials to be available at the same time as the new ideas. In addition, many respondents want the materials to be available before they have to implement the new curriculum ideas. Ideally, then, there is a wish for materials to be available earlier than is the case now. It is also felt that these materials should be more numerous and more easily read by students.

These points are important for the curriculum development leaders in each area. In Tasmania, many materials are produced by the Department of Education. Attempts should be made to direct the resources of the Department to early production of materials for new or changed courses. In Alberta, commercial publishers produce most of the materials. By the time committees decide upon curriculum changes, there is scarcely time for publishers to produce related materials. It would not seem feasible to delay implementation of decisions until materials are available, since the committee process itself is so slow that decisions seem to reach the stage of implementation long after the arrival of the philosophy on which they are based. In fact, revisions usually seem in order before teachers become familiar with the new curriculum ideas. Given the constraints of time in the implementation of new curriculum ideas in Alberta and the need for having materials lead or accompany the new curriculum ideas, it seems that changes are needed in the provision of resources in Alberta. Possible answers to the dilemma could come from initiatives of the Department of Education in having materials produced as part of or as a parallel to the development of a new curriculum

guide. There could be authors hired to produce materials that would be published by the Department itself; or the Department could apprise commercial publishers of needs in time for the latter to produce relevant and appropriate materials. As noted above, difficulty with this latter course of action is one of time, since the committee process means that no clear decisions are reached until just prior to implementation. As a result, existing texts/references are usually adopted for use but they are not always suitable. In social studies, the recent use of multiple references rather than texts seems to have made the problem of texts/references more noticeable because teachers have searched for materials but have had limited success.

Roles in curriculum development: Questions 21 through 25 are concerned with various roles in the development of curriculum.

The teacher organization provides very limited leadership in curriculum development in both Alberta and Tasmania, according to respondents. This is not surprising in Tasmania, where the budget of the teacher organization is quite small, its structure is relatively simple, and all educators are civil servants. In Alberta, however, the teacher organization has a considerable budget for professional development and has an extensive network of agencies that are active in curriculum work throughout the Province. The responses indicate that the focus of the Alberta Teachers' Association is upon union-type work rather than on activities of a professional association. From the responses, there is possible need for the specialist subject council in Social Studies to review its

purposes and its effectiveness. At the same time, the matter of identity arises again. The writer is doubtful whether effective leadership by the Social Studies Council in Alberta would be identified with the teacher organization, since it is likely that many teachers and others in education perceive the teacher organization as being limited to the formal structure of its executive members and its hired staff officers. It would be interesting to have answers to the question of teacher organization leadership in curriculum development after a period when activities by the specialist council were linked directly to the teacher organization.

Principals give more attention to curriculum development than does the teacher organization, but not to an outstanding extent. School authorities in the Department of Education in Tasmania and in school systems in Alberta could review their expectations of principals in this respect.

A review of the role of the principal in supervision of teaching and in monitoring of teacher planning would also seem in order from the findings of the study that neither occurs very much. With only moderate encouragement of teachers to develop curriculum by superintendents and other school-system administrators, the general absence of teacher organization leadership, some leadership by principals but very limited principal supervision of teaching and monitoring of plans, it appears that teachers are seen as being highly independent and self-motivated. This is in keeping with the more highly trained staff in schools in recent years and the trend towards a greater degree of professionalism. At the same time, the

present situation brings out the question of accountability in education that has been heard from the public during the past few years.

Planning for program implementation: The subject of Questions 26 through 28 is the planning that goes into program implementation.

In considering existing planning, respondents feel that it is generally "little" rather than "extensive." Like the curriculum guide, planning is perceived as being chiefly the responsibility of the curriculum committees, the Department, and teachers. Stress for planning, however, is more on the formal structure of curriculum committees and the Department than is the development of the curriculum guide.

Improvement of present planning could best be effected by more time, more teacher involvement, the provision of better facilities/ more materials, and improved communications, in that order. Of the four, more teacher involvement and improved communications would both involve teacher time, adding to the first ranking of "more time" as a means to improve planning.

The writer regards time as a vital component in education, a priority borne out by this and other responses in the study. There is no clear conclusion known to the writer about the ideal length of time of a school year, since there are so many variables involved. The traditional years of schooling in Alberta and in Tasmania are subject to constant pressure for reduction as the time that the teacher and the student are in interaction is cut back to provide the teacher with the time needed for learning about new curriculum

ideas, participating in curriculum development, receiving information about plans, and so on. It seems that there is no money for extra pay for a longer school year, even if teachers agreed with it; and reductions in the teacher's class time with his/her students leads to public reaction, calls for accountability, and questions about whether the student is being treated fairly. At the same time, there are increasing pressures upon teachers that indicate the need for a greater amount of nonteaching time in order to be effective in the classroom.

In curriculum development in general and planning for program implementation in particular, there is an urgent need for all interested and involved parties to sit down and to work at finding realistic solutions to the problem of time.

### Curriculum Dissemination

There are four parts in the section on curriculum dissemination: understanding the guide, use of the guide, teacher training, and diffusion of curriculum ideas.

Understanding the guide: Questions 29 through 32 stress understanding the guide.

While there is a general perception that the guide is understood by teachers, there is a higher perception of understanding in Tasmania than in Alberta. The level of understanding is likely based upon involvement in development of the guide. This would present a further justification to Albertan authorities to seek to increase teacher involvement in the preparation of the curriculum guide.



Responses to questions about the best way in which teachers came to understand the existing guide and perceptions about what is the ideal way to reach understanding of a guide place reading the guide first. On the basis of this ranking, principals, school-system administrators, Department personnel, and university staff who have responsibility to ensure that teachers understand curriculum guides should focus on strategies and activities which ensure that the guide is read by teachers. In a school system, discussions at staff meetings, with pre-reading of the guide acting as a basis for participation by teachers, would appear to be a highly valuable and worthwhile exercise.

Other routes to understanding are cited as being via workshops run by the Department or by the teacher organization, with responses generally reflecting the teacher organization role in Alberta and the Department role in Tasmania.

Hindrances to understanding are relatively numerous, with lack of time, ambiguity of the guide, and lack of help or training the major ones given.

Comments are made above in the section on planning for program implementation on the question of time and the concerns expressed there apply in this situation.

Ambiguity of the curriculum guide is an area of difficulty. Those persons who serve on a curriculum committee have a special interest in the particular subject and often have extra training in it. When Department personnel and university staff provide major direction for the guide, their expertise and academic training lead

towards a sophisticated document. Rank and file members of the curriculum committee must read extensively on the subject and thereby tend to raise their levels of expertise and to become immersed in current literature, with its unique terminology. Add to the foregoing a consciousness that the curriculum committee will produce a document that represents educational thinking in the Province/State on the particular subject and there is a tendency to have curriculum guides that are difficult for nonspecialists to understand. In practice, the elementary teacher is most often a generalist.

Given that the communication of ideas to teachers is the prime purpose of a curriculum guide and that there are problems of ambiguity as noted by respondents, the writer urges producers of curriculum guides in Tasmania and in Alberta to concentrate on more straightforward language and better explanation of terms in future curriculum guides.

The criticism of training points to the need for an examination by universities/teacher training colleges of the adequacy of their programs for elementary teachers. There is also need for those hiring staff to ensure that the required qualifications are present in new teachers and that appropriate in-service training is planned for up-dating and/or upgrading of staff.

Use of the guide: Questions 33 and 34 deal with use of the existing curriculum guide in classrooms.

There is quite high usage of the guide, with a generally higher usage in Tasmania than in Alberta. At the same time, it is of interest to note that there are more respondents citing "little" usage

in Tasmania than would be expected in a centralized system. The extent to which the guide is used or not could be studied by education authorities in each area in relation to the authorities' perceptions of the purposes of the guide and their expectations that it would be used.

Given the perceptions of quite limited prescription in the guide, teachers use it more extensively than would be expected. Increased usage likely arises from the dearth of time to develop programs and/or the lack of training in social studies that teachers have noted.

Difficulties in using the guide centre around the lack of materials, inappropriateness of the program, and general lack of teacher understanding of and/or preparation for the program. The question of resources to accompany the program received comment in the section on texts/references. The perceptions noted in this section underscore the importance of materials and point to a need for well-considered action to remedy difficulties and deficiencies.

Those responding that the program in the guide is inappropriate could be rejecting the underlying philosophy of the program, preferring the "old" approach and content, or commenting on the specific content of the guide. Whatever the reason, their responses are sufficiently numerous to suggest that education authorities in Alberta and in Tasmania should investigate further to decide whether there is a need for positive action to improve perceptions of the appropriateness of the program that is outlined in the guide.

The topic of teacher preparation is dealt with below and that of teacher understanding of the guide was discussed in the previous section. These topics will not be repeated here.

Teacher training: Questions 35 and 36 refer to the training of teachers to offer the program that is contained in the curriculum guide.

There is a general absence of training of teachers to use the guide, despite higher perceptions of university and department personnel that there is such training. This would indicate that university and Department staff believe that they are preparing teachers to use the program, but that others, including teachers, do not agree. A review of existing programs and activities designed to lead teachers to knowledge of how to use the program is thus needed.

While reviewing the training, university and Department staff should note the major response on the most important factors in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program, namely, commitment by the teacher. Less favored by teachers than by other groups, this answer points to the fact that training programs should be planned to meet teacher needs rather than being prescribed. Commitment by the teacher calls for the right timing of training programs. Efforts that precede the release of a new curriculum guide by too wide a margin will fail to get maximum response because teachers are not yet concerned about the use of the guide in the classroom. Training that is tardy will have a backlog of teacher anxiety and frustration to overcome.

Other major elements in training teachers are cited as being organized workshops and time from work. Since most teachers are not new to staff each year, so cannot train for changes in pre-service, there is constant need for updating work. Replies to this questionnaire rank workshops as a major avenue for training for changes, pointing the way for individuals charged with responsibility for training teachers to meet changes in curriculum guides.

The matter of teacher time has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

Diffusion of curriculum ideas: Questions 37 through 40 focus on ways in which new curriculum ideas are, or should be disseminated.

The curriculum committee, the Department, teachers, and principals, in that order, are ranked as being the ideal ones to spread new curriculum ideas. Teachers tend to rank themselves as being responsible for spreading new ideas. The teacher organization does not rank highly as being responsible in the ideal for diffusing curriculum ideas and responses to questions on whether it actually gives leadership in this way point to a very limited role. The more active Albertan organization plays a larger part than does the teacher organization in Tasmania. Principals have more of a role than does the teacher organization, with more leadership by principals in Tasmania than in Alberta.

The prominence of the curriculum committee as an ideal in the diffusion of curriculum ideas would suggest that the Departments in Alberta and in Tasmania should examine ways by which the curriculum committee can be more involved in this process. Appropriate

funding would be needed to release members and to permit their travel to workshops.

In the school setting, preferred ways to spread new curriculum ideas are subject meetings, staff meetings, informal discussion, and administrative visits, in that order. The writer suggests that principals examine ways in which the generalist teachers of an elementary school setting can be provided with opportunities to learn about new curriculum ideas in a combination of the two most preferred ways. Thus, a portion of regularly scheduled staff meetings, at which all other business is kept to a minimum, could be devoted to a particular subject area. By using discussion guides that focus on having teachers read the curriculum guide with clear objectives in view and by using a rotation of subjects throughout the year, the principal could well respond to a number of the priorities and preferences that have been identified in this part of the study.

### Findings and Related Research

In Chapter 3, it was reported that Christoff found that teachers feel that they have and that they want to have freedom to make instructional decisions; Flåtten found that "experts" and elementary principals want more involvement in curriculum; Harris found that specialists and teachers stressed curriculum equally; and Sloan found that teachers and principals both saw that they had an important role as program proposers. These findings relate to Questions 12 and 13 of this survey and a comparison will be made to find whether the respondents in this study feel the same as did the respondents

in the times, places, and groups studied by Christoff, Flååten, Harris, and Sloan.

Responses to Question 12 show that teachers feel that they have a very strong voice in setting curriculum, particularly when these teachers see teachers as a major force on the curriculum committee. In Tasmania, over half of the teachers have the perception that teachers themselves have the freedom to make curriculum decisions, without going through a curriculum committee. When curriculum is defined as it has been for this study, it can be equated with Christoff's "instructional decisions," and his first finding is confirmed. From the answers given to Question 12, it can be shown that teachers and curriculum committee members, the latter regarded here as the "specialists" of elementary social studies curriculum development and the equivalent of the "specialists" in the research by Harris, are viewed almost equally by all responses on who actually sets curriculum. This finding confirms that of Harris. From the answers given to Question 12, it can be shown that teachers are viewed as being very important program proposers by both teachers and principals, a finding similar to that of Sloan. However, unlike Sloan, this study finds that principals are not ranked highly as program proposers by either teachers or principals.

Responses to Question 13, dealing with who should plan the curriculum, place teachers to the fore. Over half of the teacher respondents identify teachers as the ideal planners of curriculum, concurring with the findings of Christoff that teachers want freedom to make instructional decisions. However, in viewing the curriculum

committee members as the "experts" of elementary social studies curriculum development and equating them to the "experts" in the study of Fläåten, we find that the curriculum committee is not highly rated as the ideal initiator of curriculum, especially by curriculum committee members themselves. Principals are not ranked highly, either, so the findings of Fläåten are not confirmed by this study.

Responses to Question 21 show that three teacher representatives in four perceive extensive teacher organization encouragement of curriculum development by classroom teachers, to one in four saying that there is little encouragement. In this finding, the survey relates to the research of Ward but lacks discrete classification of some of the categories he used. Thus, his finding that the teacher organization places high priority on involvement in instructional policy development with school boards could equate to the finding of this study, but this study did not refer to how the curriculum development was going to be encouraged. On the other hand, his finding that the teacher organizations place low priority on teacher organization development of performance standards by teachers is not endorsed by this study, if performance standards by teachers are equated to curriculum development by teachers.

In responding to Question 27, one teacher in nine ranks principals as the ones who should integrate planning for new curriculum ideas. Albertan teachers rank principals first in the ratio of one in five; Tasmanian teachers rank principals first in the ratio of about one in thirty-four. As reported in Chapter 3, Dempsey found that teachers expect good leadership from principals. On the basis



that planning to ensure that resources accompany new curriculum ideas is part of good leadership at the school level, the writer concludes that the teachers responding to this study do not strongly endorse Dempsey's finding.

Replies to Question 36 show that three teacher representatives in four rank commitment by the teacher as the most important factor in training of teachers for understanding and use of a new program. The research by Ward that found teacher organizations placing a high priority on local in-service is not strongly endorsed by teacher representatives in this study.

In Chapter 3, Sloan is reported as having found that teachers and principals regard themselves and each other as being very important program adopters. The responses to Question 37 show that, in this study, teachers rank themselves first more frequently than they rank any other single group as those responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas. The ratio of this response is just over one teacher in four. Teachers rank principals first in the ratio of about one in ten. In a ratio of one in six respondents, principals rank both teachers and themselves first as the ones who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas. The conclusion that is reached is that teachers and principals do not rank themselves and each other as being very important program adopters, as Sloan found.

The ratio of teachers citing principals as responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas is about one in ten, as noted above. If spreading new curriculum ideas is good leadership, then the

response in this study does not strongly agree with the findings of Dempsey that teachers expect good leadership from principals.

One teacher representative in four replies to Question 37 by indicating that the professional organization should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas. In this case, there is quite strong endorsement of the finding by Ward that teacher organizations place a low priority on instructional improvement through the teacher organization.

To Question 38, one teacher representative in four says that teacher organization leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas is extensive; one in four says that it is medium; and two in four say that it is nil. This again gives quite strong endorsement of the finding by Ward noted above. However, the endorsement is different according to region. All Tasmanian teacher representatives place no priority on this activity, to agree with Ward in an extreme manner. The Albertan responses show moderate and extensive teacher organization leadership, so there is disagreement with the findings of Ward in this case.

Responses to Question 39 show that teachers see principals as giving considerable leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas. One teacher in five perceives extensive or full leadership and almost two in five perceive moderate leadership. This response does not agree strongly with the finding of Gourley that principals have problems in curriculum innovation, although the presence of considerable success as is indicated by this study does not preclude the

presence of difficulties in making curriculum innovations, as indicated by Gourley.

The ratio of teachers perceiving high leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas is more than matched by principals with similar views. In fact, over four principals in five perceive moderate, extensive, or full leadership. The finding by Sloan that teachers and principals regard themselves and each other highly as program adopters is not strongly endorsed by the variety of responses by the two groups in this study.

Easton found that administrators regard administrative visits as being more effective than do teachers. The respondents to Question 40 did not rank administrative visits highly. Principals ranked administrative visits first in the ratio of about one in thirty-four; school-system administrators in the ratio of one in sixteen; and teachers in a similar ratio of one in sixteen. This means that respondents to this study show quite strong disagreement with the finding of Easton.

## Conclusions

### General

This study uses the responses of a sample of teachers, parents, university staff, principals, Department personnel, curriculum committee members, school-system administrators, and teacher organization representatives in Alberta and in Tasmania to explore perceptions on a variety of questions relating to curriculum development.

The subject area is social studies/social science and the level is the elementary school.

The focus of the study is primarily on curriculum development, with the centralized system in Tasmania and the partly decentralized organization of education in Alberta as a secondary focus. It is concluded that much data on curriculum development has been generated and some worthwhile conclusions reached, within the limits of the study. Much of the data provides opportunities for searching comparisons on particular questions, permitting comparisons of responses within each geographical area (for example, between Tasmanian teachers and Tasmanian parents), between similar groups (for example, between Tasmanian teachers and Albertan teachers), and between different groups in each geographical area (for example, between Tasmanian teachers and Albertan parents). In most cases, these comparisons have been limited, with data on central tendencies of responses receiving most attention. In this sense, the comparisons between Alberta and Tasmania have been a vehicle by which to explore curriculum development.

The study of the effects of centralization/partial decentralization has not brought a satisfying conclusion. While it is possible to identify some of the effects of continuing centralization on curriculum development in Tasmania, the study can draw no conclusions on the effects of partial decentralization in Alberta. This may be due to the unexpected influence of the Alberta Teachers' Association. Responses to a number of questions by Albertans could be explained by the existence of school boards, with school-based

personnel having the boards as their employers rather than being civil servants as in Tasmania. On the other hand, it seems more reasonable to believe that the greater role played by teachers and principals in Alberta than in Tasmania is due more to the relative position of the teacher organization in education in each area than to the organizational structure of education. The writer cannot resolve the matter of the impact of the teacher organization on responses on curriculum development and notes that this is an area needing further study.

#### Answers to Key Questions

There are five key questions that are identified in Chapter 1. The summary of the questionnaire categories covers the same general topics but with a different emphasis; so the findings of the study will now be related directly to the key questions.

Question 1: To what extent are there similarities and differences in the perceptions of various groups of their roles and the roles of others in curriculum development?

Teachers and principals show similar perceptions in a number of areas. Responses to Question 4, that teachers know pupils best and that greater teacher voice is needed in the development of a curriculum guide; to Question 6, that consultation is best in providing involvement in the development of a curriculum guide; to Question 10, on the lack of enforcement of the guide; to Question 19, that present text/reference books accompany new curriculum ideas; to Question 26, citing an absence of planning to ensure that resources

accompany new curriculum ideas; to Question 31, where more time is called for so teachers can come to understand the guide; to Question 34, that resource materials are a concern in using the program; to Question 35, on the limited amount of training of teachers to use the program; to Question 36, on the need for more time for training teachers to understand and to use the program; to Question 37, on the importance of professional educators in spreading new curriculum ideas; and to Question 40, that subject meetings are best for spreading new curriculum ideas within a school--all these responses tend to indicate similarity of perceptions by teachers and principals.

There are examples of agreement between parents and teachers in responses to Question 24, on supervision of classroom teaching by principals, and to Question 30, on reading the guide as the best way for teachers to come to understand it, but these are limited. Parents, teachers, and principals are notably in accord on the matter of resource books accompanying ideas, in replying to Question 20.

Replying to Question 2, a majority of parents cite the curriculum committee and the Department, together, as setting the guide. Teachers rank the curriculum committee and the Department slightly lower than do parents and rank the Department itself much lower than do parents when stating who sets the guide. Similar proportions of parents and teachers rank the curriculum committee first in answer to Question 3, but teachers rank teachers first by over three times the ratio of parents doing so. In the answers to Question 12, there is a higher ratio of parents than of teachers listing the curriculum committee first. On the same question, more teachers than parents

rank the Department as actually setting the guide. The ratios saying that the Department sets the guide are about one teacher in five to one parent in nine. In response to Question 13, on who should set the curriculum, parents rank the curriculum committee first almost twice as often as do teachers, in the ratio of four parents in nine. On the same question, the Department is ranked first by about one teacher in thirty but by no parents. In responding to Question 27 about planning, four parents in nine rank the Department first, compared with about one teacher in six. On the same question, the curriculum committee is ranked first by almost one teacher in three and by one parent in nine. One parent in three and about one teacher in eight ranks Department workshop as the answer to Question 32, on the best way for teachers to understand the guide. Question 37, on responsibility for spreading new curriculum ideas, is responded to so that parents cite the Department first in five times the ratio that teachers do. Over half of the parents give this response. The curriculum committee is given almost equal status by the two groups.

On the questions relating to involvement in the development of the present guide (Questions 2 through 11), there are similar perceptions by university and Department respondents about present involvement, desirable involvement, and methods of involvement. On the same questions there is agreement by university personnel and parents on desirable involvement and methods of involvement. On Question 10, university responses most closely endorse those of school-based personnel on perceptions of the absence of enforcement of the guide. On Question 16, parents and university respondents

tend to share views on texts; on Question 18, especially school-based educators and the Department share the perception that there are various publishers; and Question 20 finds greatest agreement by respondents wanting books to accompany ideas.

Although there are times when the university and the Department respondents are in agreement, this is not so clear for the other groups. In fact, there is more agreement between university staff and parents than there is between university personnel and school-system administrators.

The writer has found a very much more diverse expression of views from the teacher representatives than was expected, reflecting some of the differences between teacher organizations in Alberta and in Tasmania. But going beyond those differences it is very surprising to find, for example, that no teacher representatives list teacher organization workshops as the ideal way for teachers to come to understand the guide, especially in Alberta. In fact, there is more agreement between teachers and teacher representatives in Tasmania than in Alberta on some points. One example is in the replies to Question 37, on who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas, where the teachers are ranked first more often by Tasmanian teachers and teacher representatives than by Albertans in these two groups.

University, Department, teacher representative, curriculum committee, and superintendent respondents have proved to be widely disparate in their views, especially when broken into Albertan and Tasmanian respondents.



The examples of similarities and differences in the perceptions of various groups of their roles and the roles of others in curriculum development indicate that there are many areas of agreement in perceptions and many areas of differences in perceptions.

Question 2: Do responses from an area with a partially decentralized organization of education reflect that organization?

Albertan respondents perceive very limited enforcement of the guide by either the Department or the local jurisdiction (Question 10); they tend to seek more prescription rather than less, to a surprising extent (Question 11); and there is notable Albertan response that seeks professional leadership rather than Departmental leadership, in answer to Questions 27, 30, 37, and 40. Since there is no indication as to the source of the prescription in Question 11, neither the Department nor the local jurisdiction is preferred. On the basis of the above, it is evident that neither the central nor the local authority stands out significantly in the perceptions of Albertans. Indications are that the professional organization has a significantly higher role than does the provincial Department, insofar as the questions listed above are concerned.

On the basis of replies to questions, it appears that many perceptions in the partly decentralized area are different from those in the centralized area. However, this study fails to determine whether the differences are due to the partial decentralization or to other factors. It is suspected that the teacher organization is a major "other factor" that could, in fact, account for all or most of the differences.

Question 3: Do responses from an area with a centralized organization of education reflect that organization?

By virtue of the responses by Tasmanians to Questions 27, 30, 37, and 40, with the evident wish and expectation that the Department should and does give leadership, this question can be answered in the affirmative. The generally favorable reaction of Tasmanians to the guide, their greater involvement in its development, and their perceptions of the Education Department as the author/publisher of many books are further signs of centralized organization and a tendency for respondents to look to the central organization for leadership and/or direction.

While the general trend of responses reflects the centralized organization, there are examples to show that this reflection is not universal. When a higher ratio of Tasmanians than Albertans, especially teachers and principals, propose that the curriculum guide should reflect the thinking of teachers, they do not reflect the centralized organization in Tasmania. The strong Tasmanian response that there is no enforcement of the curriculum guide is a further example that does not reflect centralized organization.

Question 4: Who are the key personnel in curriculum development?

According to respondents, teachers and curriculum committee members have the greatest role in the formulation of curriculum guides and in determining what is planned for the classroom. Answers to Questions 2 through 11 suggest that university and Department personnel are highly represented on curriculum committees, although

the use of ratios inflates the impression when there are so many teachers to be represented and so few university and Department staff.

Teachers stand out as key personnel in curriculum development in many ways. Teacher commitment is the most important element in training teachers for understanding and using a new program, according to responses to Question 36. Teacher reading of the guide is cited as the best way for reaching understanding of the guide, in answers to Questions 30 and 32. Teachers are highly ranked for spreading new curriculum ideas (especially by teachers), in responses to Question 37 and by Albertans for planning for new curriculum ideas, in answers to Question 27.

Principals have a key role, according to responses to Questions 22, 24, 25, 37, 39, and 40. In some aspects, such as supervision and monitoring of teacher plans, principals are said to be giving very limited leadership, but their efforts in encouraging curriculum development are rated as being higher.

School-system administrators are ranked as giving some encouragement of curriculum development, so they have an important role.

Members of curriculum committees have a key role in curriculum development through the formulation of guides, as noted above. They are also looked to by especially Albertan respondents to Question 38 as the major group responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas. Along with the Department, the curriculum committee is seen as having an important part in providing for appropriate, sufficient,

and timely resources and references, teacher-training workshops, and integrated planning for new curriculum.

The teacher organization is not a significant force in curriculum development, according to the study.

Question 5: What are the major ways in which curriculum development can be made most effective?

From the study, it is indicated that there are a number of important factors that should be included in planning to make curriculum development most effective.

Teacher involvement in the formulation of curriculum guides and teacher determination of much of what happens in classrooms is strongly endorsed and should be given maximum opportunity. This involvement could lead to a more positive attitude to the guide.

Early reference materials, suitable for the pupils to read and in greater numbers than at present, are urgently needed with new or changed curricula.

Teachers would then have more of the tools to use in utilizing the curricula in their classes.

There is a need for better planning for the introduction of new or changed curricula. The curriculum committee, the Department, and teachers are regarded as being the chief agents of this planning. One need in planning is to get new curriculum guides to teachers in time for them to read the guides carefully before having to teach the curriculum in class. Since reading the guide is a major way for teachers to come to understand it, the guide should be available early enough to permit this reading.

Subject or staff meetings and workshops organized by the Department or by the teacher organization are ranked as the best way to help teachers train for use of a new curriculum. Given that teacher commitment is ranked as the first need in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program, there should be care given to the timing of these activities. Some effective motivation of teachers is needed if the timing is not such that the teacher will participate with a high level of commitment.

Teachers will be assisted in understanding the outline of a new program if there is little ambiguity or vagueness in the way it is written. They will also have need of time to study the program. Time is needed in many other ways, so that teachers may undertake curriculum development in a variety of contexts for the benefit of the students.

The next section, suggestions on use of findings, gives a list that will have relevance to this question.

#### Suggestions on Use of Findings

As a result of the study the writer has some suggestions to offer to educators in order to effect improvements in curriculum development. These suggestions arise, it should be noted, from the responses of a limited sample of people in only two geographical areas. Given those limitations, the following suggestions are offered:

1. There should be Provincial/State funds made available to increase the participation of teachers in curriculum development, particularly in the preparation of curriculum guides.

2. Ways must be found to get suitable and sufficient resources and materials to teachers who are to teach a new program.

3. Teacher organizations should review the public image of their role as professional organizations (as distinct from unions), including their image with teachers.

4. Administrators at all levels should consider their place in curriculum development, to ensure that teachers are not left to "go it alone."

5. Teacher time needs to be reviewed in an attempt to provide for planning, reading, and training to use the guide, without depriving students of their due.

6. Workshops continue to be an important way to help teachers to understand a new curriculum. Timing of workshops to meet the needs of teachers is vital.

7. A strategy to help teachers' understanding and use of a new program is indicated by responses:

Use a part of each staff or subject meeting or schedule special meetings to discuss each curriculum guide.

Use of a set of pre-set questions for the discussion would provide teachers a reading guide to use when reading the program prior to the meeting. Familiarity with the contents and philosophy of each guide, developed progressively throughout the year, will lead to important curriculum development in elementary classes.

### Matters Needing Further Study

As a result of this study, the following are suggested as matters on which further study would be worthwhile:

1. Whether relationships exist between types of teacher organizations and the organizational structure of education in various countries or states.

2. Because of the importance of role perceptions in relationships within education and the absence of research on this topic, there is a need for many studies that will provide insights into role perceptions in education. These studies should each concentrate on a limited number of groups, with a wide range of groups being covered by a series of studies. More detailed analysis of findings than is feasible in the present study would be possible through an approach that provides perceptions of a limited number of groups on specific questions.

## APPENDICES



## **APPENDIX A**

**QUESTIONNAIRE: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ALBERTA/TASMANIA**

## APPENDIX A

### QUESTIONNAIRE: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ALBERTA/TASMANIA

#### GENERAL DIRECTIONS:

Please answer all questions.

If you are not a teacher, answer questions that seem to be directed at teachers according to your perception of the position of teachers. (For example, you would respond to question 30 by indicating how you perceive that teachers came to understand the guide.)

Refer specifically to social studies/social science in the elementary school.

Answers should provide your own perception of each situation.

Rank by placing numbers in the spaces provided, beginning with the most important as number 1, next important as 2, etc.

Ranking should include as many of the alternatives as you feel appropriate. (For example, Tasmania does not have school system administrators (local superintendents, supervisors) or elected representatives as trustees.

Check, circle or write in numbers as appropriate; otherwise, write in answers. Definitions of groups in questions 2, 3, 12, 13, 27 and 37 are given in question 1. Differentiating between curriculum guide and curriculum and between what is and what should be is important.

#### 1. You are (or identify with):

- 1 (    ) teacher (classroom teacher)
- 2 (    ) parent (in local or area organization)
- 3 (    ) university (or teacher-college faculty)
- 4 (    ) publisher
- 5 (    ) principal (or head teacher)
- 6 (    ) department (of education)
- 7 (    ) elected rep. (trustee, parliamentarian)
- 8 (    ) curriculum comm. (member representing \_\_\_\_\_)
- 9 (    ) school-sys. admin. (local superintendent, supervisor)
- 10 (    ) teacher organ. (elected or employed)
- 11 (    ) other (\_\_\_\_\_)

The Province/State has a written curriculum guide that states the program for social studies/social science at the elementary level.

Questions 2 through 11 refer to that guide.

2. Whose thinking does the guide reflect? Rank:

- |                  |                     |                        |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 ( ) teacher    | 5 ( ) principal     | 9 ( ) school-sys. adm. |
| 2 ( ) parent     | 6 ( ) department    | 10 ( ) teacher organ.  |
| 3 ( ) university | 7 ( ) elected rep.  | 11 ( ) other(_____)    |
| 4 ( ) publisher  | 8 ( ) curric. comm. |                        |

3. Whose thinking should the guide reflect? Rank:

- |                  |                     |                        |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 ( ) teacher    | 5 ( ) principal     | 9 ( ) school-sys. adm. |
| 2 ( ) parent     | 6 ( ) department    | 10 ( ) teacher organ.  |
| 3 ( ) university | 7 ( ) elected rep.  | 11 ( ) other(_____)    |
| 4 ( ) publisher  | 8 ( ) curric. comm. |                        |

4. Why should this be so?

5. Were you involved in the development of the guide? Yes No  
If so, how?

6. Should you have been involved in the development of the guide? Yes No  
If so, how?

7. Do you think that it is a "good" guide? Yes No

8. Do you have any criticisms of the guide? (Please list them.)

9. Check how the curriculum guide sets the following:

- |                      |  |                          |  |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| a. course content:   | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all | b. texts/<br>references: | <input type="checkbox"/> suggested<br><input type="checkbox"/> required<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all   |
| c. teaching methods: | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all | d. time on topics:       | <input type="checkbox"/> in general<br><input type="checkbox"/> in detail<br><input type="checkbox"/> not at all |

10. How is any obligation by the teacher to follow the guide enforced?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> through set texts     | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> by inspection (department staff) |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> by inspection (other) | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> other (_____)                    |

11. To what extent should the guide prescribe social studies/social science for the Province/State?

- |                                       |  |                                  |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> not at all | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> somewhat    | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> fully |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> little     | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> extensively |                                  |

CURRICULUM can be defined as all of the planned experiences that are offered to learners under the auspices of the school.

Questions 12 and 13 refer to curriculum with that meaning.

12. Rank according to who actually sets curriculum now:

- |                                       |  |   |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> teacher    | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> principal     | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> school-sys. adm. |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> parent     | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> department    | 10 <input type="checkbox"/> teacher organ.  |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> university | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> elected rep.  | 11 <input type="checkbox"/> other (_____)   |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> publisher  | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> curric. comm. |   |

13. Rank according to who should plan the curriculum for social studies/social science?

- |                                       |  |   |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> teacher    | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> principal     | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> school-sys. adm. |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> parent     | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> department    | 10 <input type="checkbox"/> teacher organ.  |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> university | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> elected rep.  | 11 <input type="checkbox"/> other (_____)   |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> publisher  | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> curric. comm. |   |

Questions 14 through 20 refer to text or reference books used in teaching social studies/social science.

14. Should there be set texts for social studies/  
social science? Yes    No

15. Why should there be set texts? (Why not?)
16. Are the available text/reference books satisfactory? Yes No
17. Why? (Why not?)
18. Who writes/publishes books used in teaching social studies/  
social science?
19. Books may introduce new ideas; may be published simultaneously  
with new ideas; or may be produced to reflect ideas being used.  
How do books used at present in social studies/social science  
relate to the curriculum ideas of the program?  
1 ( ) lead                      2 ( ) accompany                      3 ( ) follow
20. Which should they do?  
1 ( ) lead                      2 ( ) accompany                      3 ( ) follow

Questions 21 through 25 refer to various roles in the development of curriculum (defined as the planned experiences offered to learners).

21. To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in curriculum development?
- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |
22. To what extent do principals encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?
- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |

23. To what extent do school-system administrators (superintendent, supervisor) encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

1 ( ) not at all	4 ( ) extensively
2 ( ) little	5 ( ) fully
3 ( ) somewhat	

24. To what extent do principals actually supervise teaching of classroom teachers?

1 ( ) not at all	4 ( ) extensively
2 ( ) little	5 ( ) fully
3 ( ) somewhat	

25. To what extent do principals monitor daily/weekly plans of classroom teachers?

1 ( ) not at all	4 ( ) extensively
2 ( ) little	5 ( ) fully
3 ( ) somewhat	

Questions 26 through 28 refer to planning for physical resources to accompany the introduction of a new program.

26. To what extent is there integrated planning to ensure that facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas?

1 ( ) not at all	4 ( ) extensively
2 ( ) little	5 ( ) fully
3 ( ) somewhat	

27. Who should provide integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany any new curriculum ideas? Rank:

1 ( ) teacher	5 ( ) principal	9 ( ) school sys. adm.
2 ( ) parent	6 ( ) department	10 ( ) teacher organ.
3 ( ) university	7 ( ) elected rep.	11 ( ) other (_____)
4 ( ) publisher	8 ( ) curric. comm.	

28. In what ways could present planning be improved?

Questions 29 through 32 refer to teacher understanding of the written curriculum guide for social studies/social science.

29. Do teachers understand the guide provided by the Province/State?

Yes No

30. Rank the ways in which teachers came to understand the guide:

- |                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 ( ) colleague(s)       | 8 ( ) department publication      |
| 2 ( ) principal          | 9 ( ) university course           |
| 3 ( ) department staff   | 10 ( ) department workshop        |
| 4 ( ) reading the guide  | 11 ( ) teacher organ. workshop    |
| 5 ( ) other reading      | 12 ( ) teacher organ. publication |
| 6 ( ) school-sys. admin. | 13 ( ) other (_____)              |
| 7 ( ) texts              |                                   |

31. What things hinder(ed) teachers from understanding the guide?

32. Which ways would be best for teachers to understand the curriculum guide?

- |                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 ( ) colleague(s)       | 8 ( ) department publication      |
| 2 ( ) principal          | 9 ( ) university course           |
| 3 ( ) department staff   | 10 ( ) department workshop        |
| 4 ( ) reading the guide  | 11 ( ) teacher organ. workshop    |
| 5 ( ) other reading      | 12 ( ) teacher organ. publication |
| 6 ( ) school-sys. admin. | 13 ( ) other (_____)              |
| 7 ( ) texts              |                                   |

Questions 33 and 34 refer to use of the program given in the curriculum guide.

33. To what extent is the program given in the guide used in the classroom?

- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |

34. What are the things that hinder teachers most in using the program?

Questions 35 and 36 refer to the training of teachers to use the program given in the curriculum guide.

35. Were teachers specifically trained to use the program?

- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |

36. Rank according to relative importance in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program:

- |                               |                       |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 ( ) commitment by teacher   | 4 ( ) time from work  |
| 2 ( ) subsidy of direct costs | 5 ( ) articles, books |
| 3 ( ) organized workshops     | 6 ( ) other (_____)   |

Questions 37 through 41 refer to the diffusion of curriculum ideas--curriculum being the planned experiences offered to learners by the school.

37. Who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum ideas?

- |                  |                     |                        |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 ( ) teacher    | 5 ( ) principal     | 9 ( ) school-sys. adm. |
| 2 ( ) parent     | 6 ( ) department    | 10 ( ) teacher organ.  |
| 3 ( ) university | 7 ( ) elected rep.  | 11 ( ) other (_____)   |
| 4 ( ) publisher  | 8 ( ) curric. comm. |                        |

38. To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |

39. To what extent do principals give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 ( ) not at all | 4 ( ) extensively |
| 2 ( ) little     | 5 ( ) fully       |
| 3 ( ) somewhat   |                   |

40. Rank the following according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas within a school:

- |                        |                     |                             |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 ( ) staff meetings   | 4 ( ) admin. visits | 7 ( ) informal dis.         |
| 2 ( ) subject meetings | 5 ( ) magazines     | 8 ( ) lesson plan to admin. |
| 3 ( ) school library   | 6 ( ) new resources | 9 ( ) other (_____)         |

41. Rank the following according to which is best for spreading new curriculum ideas by the teacher organization?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1 ( ) annual convention                | 5 ( ) prof. development--local           |
| 2 ( ) specialist council--<br>province | 6 ( ) prof. development--<br>consultants |
| 3 ( ) specialist council--<br>region   | 7 ( ) publication                        |
| 4 ( ) library                          | 8 ( ) other (_____)                      |



## **APPENDIX B**

### **SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS**

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS

Group	Alberta			Tasmania		
	No. in Survey	No. Reply	Percent Reply	No. in Survey	No. Reply	Percent Reply
Teachers	40	29	72.5	40	34	85.0
Parents	8	5	62.5	6	4	66.7
University	7	5	71.4	4	4	100.0
Publisher	11	6 <sup>a</sup>	54.5	-	-	--
Principals	20	18	90.0	20	18	90.0
Department	7	5	71.4	8	7	87.5
Elected rep.	20	6(9) <sup>a, b</sup>	30(45)	1	0	0.0
Curriculum committee	8	7	87.5	1	1	100.0
School system administrators	20	16	80.0	-	-	--
Teacher organ.	3	2	66.7	2	2	100.0
Other	3	2 <sup>c</sup>	66.7	1	1 <sup>c</sup>	100.0
		101(104) <sup>a</sup>			71	

<sup>a</sup>Not included in this study, making response for this survey total 89.

<sup>b</sup>Includes replies that the questionnaire could/would not be completed.

<sup>c</sup>Dropped after calculation of percentages. Included in percentages and totals but not included as a group in the survey report.

## APPENDIX C

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DATA

## APPENDIX C

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSE DATA

The data, presented for each question, are given below with the following organization: (A) each response to each question, with percentages of the total group; (B) each response listed with the number responding in each of the categories/groups used in the questionnaire, such as teacher, parent, university; and (C) responses listed with numbers responding on a geographical basis, separating Albertan and Tasmanian replies by group and by answer.

The data that are given include all the respondents listed in Appendix B, except publishers and elected representatives. Percentages and total responses include the "other" group but that group has not been included as a separate group or category in the reporting of responses by group. Responses that make up most answers or are the most significant are given; so subtotals do not always match totals. Each percentage given refers to the group preceding it. Thus, under A, a percentage after an answer is a percentage of all respondents; under B, a percentage after teachers is a percentage of all teachers in the group; and under C, a percentage after Albertans is a percentage of all Albertan respondents, while a percentage after teachers under the subheading Albertans is a percentage of all Albertan teacher respondents.

**Question 2: Whose thinking does the guide reflect:**

A. Curriculum Committee : 105 respondents (65.6 percent)

Department of Education : 24 respondents (15.0 percent)

Teachers : 10 respondents ( 6.3 percent)

University : 5 respondents ( 3.1 percent)

No Answer : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)

B. Curriculum Committee : 39 teachers (61.9 percent),  
4 parents (44.4 percent), 8 university (88.9 percent), 30 principals  
(83.3 percent), 7 department (58.3 percent), 5 curriculum committee  
(62.5 percent), 10 school-system administrators (62.5 percent).

Department of Education : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
3 parents (33.3 percent), 4 principals (11.1 percent), 2 department  
(16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 3 school-system  
administrators (18.8 percent), 2 teacher organization (50 percent).

Teachers : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 teacher organization (25 percent).

C. Curriculum Committee : 54 Albertans (60.7 percent)--  
17 teachers (58.6 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 5 university  
(100 percent), 12 principals (66.7 percent), 2 department (40 per-  
cent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 10 school-system  
administrators (62.5 percent).

: 51 Tasmanians (71.8 percent)--  
22 teachers (64.7 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 18 principals  
(100 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 5 department (71.4 per-  
cent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Department of Education : 20 Albertans (22.5 percent)--  
 2 department (40 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 5 teachers (17.2 percent),  
 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8  
 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.7 percent)--  
 2 teachers (5.9 percent), 2 parents (50 percent).

Teachers : 2 Albertans (2.2 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.9 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
 5 teachers (14.7 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 department  
 (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Question 3: Whose thinking should the guide reflect?

A. Teachers : 58 respondents (36.3 percent)

Curriculum Committee : 54 respondents (33.8 percent)

Parents : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)

Blank Replies : 13 respondents ( 8.1 percent)

B. Teachers : 23 teachers (36.5 percent),  
 1 parent (11.1 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 21 principals  
 (58.3 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee  
 (37.5 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent),  
 2 teacher organization (50 percent).

Curriculum Committee : 21 teachers (33 percent),  
 3 parents (33.3 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 10 principals

(27.8 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 1 teacher organization (25 percent).

Parents : 2 teachers (3.2 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 1 principal (2.8 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent).

C. Teachers : 29 Albertans (32.6 percent)-- 9 principals (50 percent), 9 teachers (31 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent).

: 29 Tasmanians (40.6 percent)-- 12 principals (66.7 percent), 14 teachers (41.2 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), no parent, no university.

Curriculum Committee : 30 Albertans (33.7 percent)-- 9 teachers (31 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 2 parents (40 percent).

: 24 Tasmanians (33.8 percent)-- 12 teachers (35.3 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), no teacher representative.

In addition, 7 Albertans and 2 Tasmanians listed parents as first. These were: Albertans--2 teachers (6.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), and no parents.

Tasmanians--2 parents (50 percent).

Question 4: Why should this be so?

A. Teachers know pupil needs: 26 respondents (16.3 percent)

Practicality, applicability and suitability of curriculum:

24 respondents (15 percent)

Reflect all society : 22 respondents (13.8 percent)

More teacher voice in curriculum: 14 respondents (8.8 percent)

Nil response : 40 respondents (25 percent)

B. Teachers know pupil needs: 14 teachers (22 percent), 9 principals (25 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

Practical, applicable, suitable curriculum: 7 teachers (11.1 percent), 4 parents (44.4 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Societal concerns : 8 teachers (12.7 percent), 6 principals (16.7 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent).



More teacher voice : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
5 principals (13.9 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

C. Nil Returns : 26 Albertans (29.2 percent)  
: 14 Tasmanians (19.7 percent)

Teachers know pupils best: 8 Albertans (8.9 percent)--  
5 teachers (17.2 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum  
committee (14.3 percent).

: 18 Tasmanians (25.3 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 1 depart-  
ment (14.3 percent).

Practical, applicable, suitable: 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)  
--6 teachers (20.6 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 per-  
cent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100  
percent), 1 university (20 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 2 cur-  
riculum committee (28.6 percent).

: 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 department (14.3  
percent), no curriculum committee.

Societal concerns : 7 Albertans (7.9 percent)--  
1 parent (20 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent),  
4 principals (22.2 percent).

: 15 Tasmanians (21.1 percent)--  
8 teachers (23.5 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum

committee (100 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 2 university (50 percent).

More teacher voice : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

: 6 Tasmanians (8.5 percent)--  
3 teachers (8.8 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent).

Question 5: Were you involved in the development of the guide?

A. No : 123 respondents (76.9 percent)

Yes : 37 respondents (23.1 percent)

B. No : 55 teachers (87.3 percent),  
9 parents (100 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 29 principals (80.6 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 15 school-system administrators (93.8 percent),  
3 teacher representatives (75 percent).

Yes : 8 teachers (12.7 percent),  
6 university (66.7 percent), 7 principals (19.4 percent), 8 department (66.7 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. No : 75 Albertans (84.3 percent)--  
5 parents (100 percent), 28 teachers (96.6 percent), 17 principals (94.4 percent), 15 school-system administrators (93.8 percent),

2 department (40 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 48 Tasmanians (67.6 percent)--

27 teachers (79.4 percent), 4 parents (100 percent), 12 principals (66.7 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent).

Yes

: 14 Albertans (15.7 percent)--

1 teacher (3.5 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 23 Tasmanians (32.4 percent)--

7 teachers (20.6 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 5 department (71.4 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Question 5A: If so, how?

A. No Answer : 130 respondents (81.2 percent)

Curriculum Committee member: 18 respondents (11.3 percent)

Pilot teacher : 5 respondents (3.1 percent)

B. Curriculum Committee : 7 department (58.3 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 4 curriculum (50 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

Pilot Teachers : 2 teachers (3.2 percent),

1 principal (2.8 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. Curriculum Committee : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
 1 university (20 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 3 curriculum  
 committee (42.9 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
 3 university (75 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 curriculum  
 committee (100 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent).

Pilot Teachers : 5 Tasmanians (7 percent)--  
 2 teachers (5.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department  
 (14.3 percent).

Question 6: Should you have been involved?

A. Yes : 80 respondents (50 percent)  
No : 62 respondents (38.8 percent)  
No Reply : 17 respondents (10.6 percent)

B. Yes : 28 teachers (44.4 percent),  
 19 principals (52.8 percent), 7 parents (77.8 percent), 7 university  
 (77.8 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 5 school-system adminis-  
 trators (31.3 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

No : 28 teachers (44.4 percent),  
 12 principals (33.3 percent), 9 school-system administrators  
 (56.3 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 2 curriculum committee  
 (25 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 2 parents  
 (22.2 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent).

C. Yes : 42 Albertans (47.2 percent)--  
 13 teachers (44.8 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 4 parents  
 (80 percent), 4 university (80 percent), 3 department (60 percent),  
 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives  
 (100 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent).

: 38 Tasmanians (53.5 percent)--  
 15 teachers (44.1 percent), 13 principals (72.2 percent), 3 parents  
 (75 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 3 department (42.9 per-  
 cent), no curriculum committee or teacher representatives.

No : 39 Albertans (43.8 percent)--  
 13 teachers (44.8 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 10 princi-  
 pals (55.6 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 9 school-system adminis-  
 trators (56.3 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 2 curriculum  
 committee (28.6 percent).

: 23 Tasmanians (32.4 percent)--  
 15 teachers (44.4 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent),  
 2 department (28.6 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 parent  
 (25 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Question 6A: If so, how?

A. No reply : 93 respondents (58.1 percent)  
By questionnaire/consultation: 14 respondents (8.8 percent)  
By representation : 12 respondents (7.5 percent)  
Directly : 9 respondents (5.6 percent)

B. By consultation : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
7 principals (19.4 percent).

By representation : 4 principals (11.1 percent),  
2 university (22.2 percent), 1 teacher (1.6 percent), 1 parent  
(11.1 percent).

Directly : 4 department (33.3 percent),  
3 university (33.3 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 principal  
(2.8 percent).

C. By consultation : 4 Albertans (4.5 percent)--  
3 teachers (10.3 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
4 teachers (11.8 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent).

By representation : 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
1 teacher (3.4 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 2 university  
(40 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 school-system  
administrator (6.3 percent).

: 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 principal (5.6  
percent).

Directly : 3 Albertans (3.3 percent)--  
1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent).

: 6 Tasmanians (8.5 percent)--  
2 university (50 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 3 department  
(60 percent).

Question 7: Do you think that it is a good guide?

- A. Yes : 112 respondents (70 percent)  
No : 36 respondents (22.5 percent)  
No reply : 9 respondents (5.6 percent)
- B. Yes : 41 teachers (65.1 percent),  
26 principals (72.2 percent), 10 school-system administrators  
(62.5 percent), 9 department (75 percent), 7 parents (77.8 percent),  
7 university (77.8 percent), 7 curriculum committee (87.5 percent),  
3 teacher representatives (75 percent).
- No : 17 teachers (27 percent),  
8 principals (22.2 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8  
percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent),  
2 department (16.7 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).
- C. Yes : 53 Albertans (59.6 percent)--  
14 teachers (48.3 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 3 parents  
(60 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 4 department (80 percent),  
2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 10 school-system adminis-  
trators (62.5 percent), 6 curriculum committee (85.7 percent).
- : 59 Tasmanians (83.1 percent)--  
27 teachers (79.4 percent), 16 principals (88.9 percent), 4 parents  
(100 percent), 4 university (100 percent), 5 department (71.4 per-  
cent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee  
(100 percent).
- No : 27 Albertans (30.3 percent)--  
12 teachers (41.4 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 2 parents

(40 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent).

Question 8: Do you have any criticisms of the guide?

A. No Answer : 60 respondents (37.5 percent)  
Too vague/general : 29 respondents (18.1 percent)  
Hard to understand : 18 respondents (11.3 percent)  
No criticism : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)  
More direction needed : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)  
Content dates quickly : 7 respondents ( 4.4 percent)

B. Too vague/general : 13 teachers (20.6 percent),  
9 principals (25 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

Hard to understand : 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 1 teacher (1.6 percent), no principals.

No criticism : 7 teachers (11.1 percent).  
More direction needed : 2 teachers ( 3.2 percent),  
2 principals (5.6 percent).

Content dates quickly : 2 teachers ( 3.2 percent),  
2 principals (5.6 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).



C. Too vague/general : 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)--  
 10 teachers (38 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 2 university  
 (40 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department (20 percent),  
 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 school-system administra-  
 tor (6.3 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
 3 teachers (8.8 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent).

Hard to understand : 17 Albertans (19.1 percent)--  
 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 5 curriculum committee  
 (71.4 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent),  
 1 parent (20 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--  
 1 teacher (2.9 percent).

More direction needed : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 univer-  
 sity (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee  
 (14.3 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), no  
 parents.

Content dates quickly : 3 Albertans (3.4 percent)--  
 1 teacher (3.4 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 teacher  
 representative (50 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 principal  
 (5.6 percent).

No criticism : 1 Albertan (1.1 percent)--  
 1 teacher (3.4 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.1 percent)--  
6 teachers (17.6 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 principal  
(5.6 percent).

No response : 32 Albertans (36 percent)--  
13 teachers (44.8 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 6 school-  
system administrators (37.6 percent), 2 parents (40 percent),  
1 university (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 teacher  
representative (50 percent).

: 28 Tasmanians (39.4 percent)--  
14 teachers (41.2 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 4 parents  
(100 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 2 teacher representa-  
tives (100 percent).

Question 9: Check how the curriculum guide sets course content,  
texts/references, teaching methods and time on topics.

- A. In general in all areas : 62 respondents (38.8 percent)  
Nil on time and in general in other areas: 24 respondents  
(15.0 percent)  
Nil on time, texts/references and in general in other two:  
14 respondents ( 8.8 percent)  
Content in detail, general in other areas:  
12 respondents ( 7.5 percent)  
No answer : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)

Twenty-one different combinations were given altogether.

B. In general in all areas : 17 teachers (27 percent), 17 principals (47.2 percent), 12 school-system administrators (75 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 3 department (25 percent).

Nil on time and in general in other areas: 15 teachers (23.8 percent), 6 principals (16.7 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent).

Nil on time and texts, general in other two: 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 teachers (3.2 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 3 principals (8.4 percent).

Content in detail, general in other areas: 6 teachers (9.5 percent), 5 principals (15.9 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. In general in all areas : 48 Albertans (53.9 percent)-- 12 teachers (41.3 percent), 12 principals (66.7 percent), 12 school-system administrators (75 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent).

: 14 Tasmanians (19.7 percent)-- 5 teachers (14.7 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Nil on time and in general in other areas: 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 18 Tasmanians (25.3 percent)--  
13 teachers (38.3 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Nil on time and texts, general in other two: 4 Albertans (4.5 percent)--2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.8 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Content in detail, general in other areas: 2 Albertans (2.2 percent)--2 teachers (6.8 percent).

: 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
4 teachers (11.8 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

Question 10: How is any obligation to follow the guide enforced?

A. No enforcement : 49 respondents (30.6 percent)

Inspection by department : 32 respondents (20 percent)

Other inspection : 24 respondents (15 percent)

Peer pressure : 12 respondents (7.5 percent)

Central office : 12 respondents (7.5 percent)

No answer : 11 respondents (6.9 percent)

B. No enforcement : 28 teachers (44.4 percent),  
8 principals (22.2 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 3 department

(25 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

Department inspection : 13 teachers (20.6 percent), 9 principals (25 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Other inspection : 8 principals (22.2 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 5 teachers (7.9 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Peer pressure : 5 principals (13.9 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 2 teachers (3.2 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent).

C. No enforcement : 19 Albertans (21 percent)-- 8 teachers (27.6 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 30 Tasmanians (42.2 percent)-- 20 teachers (58.8 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Department inspection : 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)-- 1 parent (20 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 4 teachers

(13.8 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (30.4 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent),  
1 parent (25 percent).

Other inspection and central office: 31 Albertans (35 percent)--7 teachers (24.1 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent),  
9 school-system administrators (56.3 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 5 Tasmanians (7 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.8 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), no principals.

Peer pressure : 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
1 teacher (3.4 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

: 6 Tasmanians (8.4 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent).

**Question 11:** To what extent should the guide prescribe social studies/social science for the Province/State?

- A. Nil : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)  
Little : 19 respondents (11.9 percent)  
Somewhat : 71 respondents (44.4 percent)  
Extensively : 51 respondents (31.9 percent)  
Fully : 4 respondents ( 2.5 percent)

B. Somewhat : 28 teachers (44.4 percent),  
 13 principals (36.1 percent), 7 university (77.8 percent), 7 department (58.3 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent),  
 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Extensively and fully : 23 teachers (36.5 percent),  
 16 principals (44.4 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent),  
 4 parents (44.4 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent),  
 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Little and nil : 9 teachers (14.3 percent),  
 7 principals (19.4 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (25 percent),  
 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent),  
 2 parents (22.2 percent).

C. Somewhat : 36 Albertans (40.4 percent)--  
 11 teachers (37.9 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 4 university (80 percent),  
 5 principals (27.8 percent), 3 department (60 percent),

4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 7 school-system administrators (58.3 percent).

: 35 Tasmanians (49.3 percent)--

17 teachers (50 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Fully

: 4 Albertans (4.5 percent)--

1 parent (20 percent), 2 teachers (6.9 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 0 Tasmanians

Extensively

: 35 Albertans (39.3 percent)--

13 teachers (44.8 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 16 Tasmanians (22.5 percent)--

8 teachers (23.5 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 2 parents (50 percent).

Little

: 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--

2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), no teachers or department.

: 13 Tasmanians (18.3 percent)--

4 teachers (11.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 university (25 percent).



Nil : 7 Albertans (7.9 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department  
 (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher  
 representative (50 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3  
 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
 3 teachers (8.8 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Question 12: Who actually sets curriculum now?

A. Teachers : 60 respondents (37.5 percent)  
Curriculum Committee : 57 respondents (35.6 percent)  
Department : 27 respondents (16.9 percent)  
Principals : 3 respondents ( 1.9 percent)  
Publishers : 2 respondents ( 1.3 percent)  
No answer : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)

B. Teachers : 24 teachers (38.1 percent),  
 14 principals (38.9 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 4 curric-  
 ulum committee (50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5  
 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Curriculum Committee : 22 teachers (34.9 percent),  
 16 principals (44.4 percent), 5 parents (55.5 percent), 5 school-  
 system administrators (31.3 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent),  
 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent).

Department : 12 teachers (19 percent),  
5 principals (13.9 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

Principals : 2 department (16.7 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Publishers : 1 parent (11.1 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. Teachers : 29 Albertans (32.6 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), no teacher representative.

: 31 Tasmanians (43.7 percent)--  
18 teachers (52.9 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Curriculum Committee : 31 Albertans (34.9 percent)--  
12 teachers (41.4 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent).

: 26 Tasmanians (36.6 percent)--  
10 teachers (29.4 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 3 parents (75 percent), 2 university (50 percent).

Department : 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)--  
 8 teachers (27.6 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 4 school-  
 system administrators (25 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6  
 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 6 Tasmanians (8.5 percent)--  
 4 teachers (11.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 parent  
 (25 percent).

Principals : 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Publishers : 2 Albertans (2.2 percent)--  
 1 parent (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Question 13: Who should plan the curriculum for social studies/  
 social science?

A. Teachers : 85 respondents (53.1 percent)

Curriculum Committee : 41 respondents (25.6 percent)

Department : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)

B. Teachers : 34 teachers (54 percent),  
 19 principals (54.8 percent), 10 school-system administrators  
 (62.5 percent), 7 department (58.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee  
 (37.5 percent), 4 teacher representatives (100 percent), 4 univer-  
 sity (44.4 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent).

Curriculum Committee : 15 teachers (23.8 percent),  
 11 principals (30.6 percent), 4 school-system administrators

(25 percent), 4 parents (44.4 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent),  
1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

Department : 2 teachers (3.2 percent),  
3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent),  
1 principal (2.8 percent).

C. Teachers : 44 Albertans (49.4 percent)--  
12 teachers (41.3 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 3 depart-  
ment (60 percent), 10 school-system administrators (62.5 percent),  
3 parents (60 percent), 4 university (80 percent), 2 curriculum  
committee (28.6 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent).

: 41 Tasmanians (57.7 percent)--  
22 teachers (64.7 percent), 11 principals (61.1 percent), 4 depart-  
ment (57.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent),  
1 curriculum committee (100 percent), no parents or university.

Curriculum Committee : 26 Albertans (30 percent)--  
10 teachers (34.4 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 4 school-  
system administrators (25 percent), 1 parent (20 percent),  
1 department (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent),  
1 university (20 percent).

: 15 Tasmanians (21.1 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 parents  
(75 percent), 3 university (75 percent), no department or curriculum  
committee.

Department : 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 3 curriculum committee (43.9 percent),

1 department (20 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

**Question 14: Should there be set texts for social studies/  
social science?**

- A. No : 105 respondents (65.6 percent)  
Yes : 49 respondents (30.6 percent)

B. No : 46 teachers (73 percent),  
 22 principals (61.1 percent), 11 department (91.7 percent), 7 uni-  
 versity (77.8 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent),  
 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 3 teacher repre-  
 sentatives (75 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent).

Yes : 16 teachers (25.4 percent),  
 12 principals (33.3 percent), 9 school-system administrators (56.3  
 percent), 7 parents (77.8 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent),  
 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. No : 47 Albertans (52.8 percent)--  
 17 teachers (58.6 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 6 school-  
 system administrators (37.5 percent), 5 department (100 percent),  
 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 4 university (80 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), no parents.

: 58 Tasmanians (81.7 percent)--  
 29 teachers (85.3 percent), 15 principals (83.3 percent), 6 depart-  
 ment (85.7 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 3 university

(75 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Yes : 37 Albertans (41.6 percent)--  
11 teachers (37.9 percent), 5 parents (100 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 9 school-system administrators (50 percent),  
2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 12 Tasmanians (16.9 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Question 15: Why should there be set texts? (Why not?)

- A. Limit the scope of work : 87 respondents (54.4 percent)  
Set course more clearly : 25 respondents (15.6 percent)  
Materials suitable and relevant: 10 respondents (6.3 percent)  
No reply : 14 respondents (8.8 percent)

B. Limit the scope of work : 37 teachers (58.7 percent),  
17 principals (47.2 percent), 9 department (75 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 7 university (77.8 percent),  
5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent),  
3 teacher representatives (75 percent).

Set course more clearly : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
7 principals (19.4 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Materials suitable and relevant: 6 teachers (9.5 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 1 principal (2.8 percent).

C. Limit the scope of work : 35 Albertans (39.3 percent)--  
4 university (80 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 10 teachers (34.4 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent).

: 52 Tasmanians (73.2 percent)--  
27 teachers (79.4 percent), 12 principals (66.7 percent), 6 department (85.7 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Set course more clearly : 18 Albertans (20.2 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 7 Tasmanians (9.9 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), no parents.

Materials suitable and relevant: 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.6 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 2 Tasmanians (2.7 percent)--  
1 parent (25 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), no teachers.

Texts lack necessary content: 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

Texts reduce costs : 4 Albertans (4.5 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 school-  
system administrator (6.3 percent).

Question 16: Are the available texts/reference books satisfactory?

A. No : 84 respondents (52.5 percent)  
Yes : 63 respondents (39.4 percent)  
No answer : 12 respondents ( 7.5 percent)

B. No : 33 teachers (52.4 percent),  
23 principals (63.9 percent), 6 school-system administrators  
(37.5 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent), 5 department (41.7  
percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 4 parents (44.4  
percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Yes : 26 teachers (41.3 percent),  
12 principals (33.3 percent), 9 school system administrators  
(56.3 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 3 curriculum committee  
(37.5 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 1 university (11.1 per-  
cent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. No : 45 Albertans (50.6 percent)--  
17 teachers (58.6 percent), 4 parents (80 percent), 4 university  
(80 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 1 department (20 percent),  
4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 1 teacher representative  
(50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent).

: 39 Tasmanians (54.9 percent)--  
16 teachers (47.1 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 15 principals



(83.3 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), no parents.

Yes : 35 Albertans (39.3 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.6 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 9 school-system administrators (56.3 percent), no parents.

: 28 Tasmanians (39.4 percent)--  
18 teachers (52.9 percent), 3 parents (75 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 university (25 percent), no teacher representatives.

Question 17: Why? (Why Not?)

A. Not enough materials : 30 respondents (18.8 percent)

Materials too difficult : 29 respondents (18.1 percent)

Good references available: 27 respondents (16.9 percent)

Materials not appropriate: 13 respondents ( 8.1 percent)

No response : 35 respondents (21.9 percent)

B. Not enough materials : 12 teachers (19 percent),  
10 principals (27.8 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent).

Materials too difficult : 12 teachers (19 percent), 6 principals (16.7 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

Good references available: 12 teachers (19 percent), 6 principals (16.7 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Materials not appropriate: 5 teachers (7.9 percent), 4 principals (11.1 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

C. Not enough materials : 14 Albertans (15.7 percent)-- 9 teachers (31 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent).

: 16 Tasmanians (22.5 percent)-- 3 teachers (8.8 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Materials too difficult : 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)-- 2 teachers (6.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

: 19 Tasmanians (26.8 percent)-- 10 teachers (29.4 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Good references available: 18 Albertans (20.2 percent)-- 3 teachers (10.3 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent).

Materials not appropriate: 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
2 university (40 percent), 1 teacher (3.4 percent), 2 principals  
(11.1 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 7 Tasmanians (9.9 percent)--  
4 teachers (11.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 depart-  
ment (14.3 percent).

Question 18: Who writes/publishes books used in teaching social  
studies/social science?

A. Various writers/publishers: 54 respondents (38.8 percent)

Publishing Houses : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)

Department : 10 respondents ( 6.3 percent)

No answer : 47 respondents (29.4 percent)

B. Various writers/publishers: 23 teachers (36.5 percent),  
13 principals (36.1 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5  
percent), 6 department (60 percent), 4 curriculum committee  
(50 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Publishing Houses : 6 principals (16.7 percent),  
2 teachers (3.2 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 depart-  
ment (8.3 percent).

Department : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
2 university (22.2 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

C. Various writers/publishers: 22 Albertans (24.7 percent)--  
7 teachers (24.1 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 6 school-system  
administrators (37.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 32 Tasmanians (45.1 percent)--  
16 teachers (47.1 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 5 depart-  
ment (71.4 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Publishing Houses : 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 teachers (6.9 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 2 Tasmanians (2.8 percent)--  
2 principals (11.1 percent).

Department : 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
7 teachers (20.6 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 parent  
(25 percent).

Question 19: Do books lead, accompany or follow new curriculum  
ideas?

A. Accompany : 72 respondents (42 percent)  
Follow : 52 respondents (32 percent)  
Lead : 12 respondents (7.5 percent)  
No answer : 16 respondents (10 percent)

B. Accompany : 38 teachers (60.3 percent),  
12 principals (33.3 percent), 8 school-system administrators  
(50 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 4 department (33.3 per-  
cent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent).

Follow : 12 teachers (19 percent),  
18 principals (50 percent), 5 department (50 percent), 5 school-  
system administrators (31.3 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent),  
2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 teacher representatives  
(50 percent).

Lead : 2 teachers (3.2 percent),  
4 principals (11.1 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 2 department  
(16.7 percent).

C. Accompany : 38 Albertans (42.7 percent)--  
18 teachers (62.1 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 8 school-  
system administrators (50 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9  
percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 depart-  
ment (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 34 Tasmanians (47.9 percent)--  
20 teachers (58.8 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 3 univer-  
sity (75 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Follow : 30 Albertans (33.7 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 9 principals  
(50 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 5 school-system administra-  
tors (31.3 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 teacher  
representative (50 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)--  
8 teachers (23.5 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 department  
(28.6 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 teacher representative  
(50 percent).

Lead : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
 2 parents (40 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 teacher  
 (3.4 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 school-system adminis-  
 trator (6.3 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
 1 parent (25 percent), 1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6  
 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Question 20: Which should they do?

A. Accompany : 97 respondents (60.6 percent)

Lead : 23 respondents (14.4 percent)

Follow : 14 respondents ( 8.8 percent)

B. Accompany : 37 teachers (58.7 percent),  
 26 principals (72.2 percent), 8 department (66.7 percent), 6 school-  
 system administrators (37.5 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent),  
 5 university (55.5 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Lead : 8 teachers (12.9 percent),  
 3 principals (8.3 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 3 school-  
 system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Follow : 5 teachers (8.1 percent),  
 4 principals (11.1 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8  
 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. Accompany : 55 Albertans (61.8 percent)--  
 19 teachers (65.5 percent), 12 principals (66.7 percent), 6 school-  
 system administrators (37.5 percent), 4 parents (80 percent),  
 3 university (60 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 5 curriculum  
 committee (71.4 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 42 Tasmanians (60 percent)--  
 18 teachers (52.9 percent), 14 principals (77.8 percent), 2 parents  
 (50 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 5 department (71.4 per-  
 cent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Lead : 15 Albertans (16.9 percent)--  
 6 teachers (20.7 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8  
 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 teacher representative  
 (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 department  
 (20 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.4 percent)--  
 2 teachers (5.9 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 principal  
 (5.6 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative  
 (50 percent).

Follow : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
 3 principals (16.7 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8  
 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent),  
 no teachers.

: 6 Tasmanians (8.6 percent)--  
 5 teachers (14.7 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

**Question 21:** To what extent does the teacher organization encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

- A. Nil : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)  
Little : 53 respondents (33.1 percent)  
Somewhat : 69 respondents (43.1 percent)  
Extensively : 26 respondents (16.3 percent)  
Fully : 2 respondents ( 1.3 percent)

B. Somewhat : 26 teachers (41.3 percent),  
 19 principals (52.8 percent), 8 curriculum committee (100 percent),  
 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 3 parents (33.3 per-  
 cent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 1 teacher representative  
 (25 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 11 teachers (17.4 percent),  
 6 principals (16.7 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 2 teacher  
 representatives (50 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 1 univer-  
 sity (11.1 percent).

Little or Nil : 25 teachers (39.7 percent),  
 11 principals (30.6 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 8 school-  
 system administrators (50 percent), 4 parents (44.4 percent),  
 3 university (33.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. Somewhat : 47 Albertans (52.8 percent)--  
 13 teachers (44.4 percent), 14 principals (77.8 percent), 7 curric-  
 ulum committee (100 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50  
 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 3 university (60 percent).



: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)--  
 13 teachers (38.2 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Fully : 2 Albertans (2.2 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.9 percent).

Extensively : 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)--  
 3 teachers (10.3 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 16 Tasmanians (22.6 percent)--  
 6 teachers (17.7 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent).

Little : 28 Albertans (31.5 percent)--  
 9 teachers (31 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 3 department (60 percent).

: 25 Tasmanians (35.2 percent)--  
 9 teachers (26.5 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 2 university (50 percent).

Nil : 2 Albertans (2.3 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.9 percent).

: 6 Tasmanians (8.5 percent)--  
 5 teachers (14.7 percent).

**Question 22:** To what extent do principals encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

- A. Nil : 4 respondents ( 2.5 percent)  
Little : 36 respondents (22.5 percent)  
Somewhat : 66 respondents (41.3 percent)  
Extensively : 41 respondents (25.6 percent)  
Fully : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)

B. Somewhat : 21 teachers (33.3 percent),  
 12 principals (33.3 percent), 8 department (66.7 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 5 parents (55.6 percent),  
 5 university (55.6 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 24 teachers (38.1 percent),  
 17 principals (47.2 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

Little or Nil : 17 teachers (27 percent),  
 7 principals (19.4 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent).

C. Somewhat : 38 Albertans (42.7 percent)--  
 3 department (60 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent),  
 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 10 teachers (34.5 percent),  
 6 principals (33.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 28 Tasmanians (39.4 percent)--  
 5 department (71.4 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 2 university  
 (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 11 teachers  
 (32.3 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 1 teacher representa-  
 tive (50 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 18 Albertans (20.2 percent)--  
 7 teachers (24.1 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 1 teacher  
 representative (50 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5  
 percent), no parents or department (includes 3 noting "full"--  
 all teachers).

: 31 Tasmanians (43.7 percent)--  
 17 teachers (50 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 parents  
 (50 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 teacher representative  
 (50 percent) (includes 5 noting "full"--3 teachers, 1 principal,  
 1 teacher representative).

Little or Nil : 30 Albertans (33.7 percent)--  
 12 teachers (41.4 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 4 principals  
 (22.2 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 3 curriculum committee  
 (42.9 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent)  
 (includes 3 noting "none"--2 teachers, 1 school-system administra-  
 tor).

: 10 Tasmanians (14.1 percent)--  
 5 teachers (14.7 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 university  
 (25 percent), no parents or department (includes 1 noting "none"--  
 1 teacher).

**Question 23:** To what extent do school-system administrators (superintendent, supervisor) encourage curriculum development by classroom teachers?

A. <u>Nil</u>	:	7 respondents ( 4.4 percent)
<u>Little</u>	:	32 respondents (20.0 percent)
<u>Somewhat</u>	:	71 respondents (44.4 percent)
<u>Extensively</u>	:	45 respondents (28.1 percent)
<u>Fully</u>	:	2 respondents ( 1.3 percent)

B. Somewhat : 27 teachers (42.9 percent),  
12 principals (33.3 percent), 7 parents (77.8 percent), 7 department (58.5 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent),  
4 university (44.4 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent),  
3 teacher representatives (75 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 17 teachers (27 percent),  
11 principals (30.6 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent),  
4 department (33.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent),  
3 university (33.3 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Little or Nil : 18 teachers (28.6 percent),  
13 principals (36.1 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent),  
1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent),  
1 department (8.3 percent).

C. Somewhat : 34 Albertans (38.2 percent)--  
11 teachers (37.9 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent),  
3 department (60 percent), 1 teacher representative

(50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent).

: 37 Tasmanians (52.1 percent)--  
16 teachers (47.1 percent), 4 parents (100 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 4 department (57.2 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Fully : 2 Albertans (2.2 percent)--  
1 teacher (3.4 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

Extensively : 24 Albertans (27.1 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 21 Tasmanians (29 percent)--  
10 teachers (29.4 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 2 university (50 percent).

Nil : 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
5 teachers (17.2 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Little : 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 11 Tasmanians (15.5 percent)--  
6 teachers (17.7 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent).

Question 24: To what extent do principals actually supervise teaching of classroom teachers?

A. Nil : 12 respondents ( 7.5 percent)  
Little : 69 respondents (43.1 percent)  
Somewhat : 52 respondents (32.5 percent)  
Extensively : 22 respondents (13.8 percent)  
Fully : 1 respondent ( 0.6 percent)

B. Somewhat : 14 teachers (22.2 percent),  
17 principals (47.2 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent),  
2 university (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 8 teachers (12.7 percent),  
8 principals (22.2 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

Little or Nil : 39 teachers (61.9 percent),  
11 principals (30.6 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent),  
4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent),  
3 teacher representatives (75 percent).

C. Somewhat : 30 Albertans (33.7 percent)--  
7 principals (38.9 percent), 4 department (80 percent), 7 school-system

administrators (43.8 percent), 8 teachers (27.5 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)--

10 principals (55.6 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 6 teachers (17.6 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Fully

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--

1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Extensively

: 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)--

1 teacher (3.5 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), no department.

: 12 Tasmanians (16.9 percent)--

6 teachers (17.7 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent).

Little

: 39 Albertans (43.8 percent)--

12 teachers (41.4 percent), 4 parents (80 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent).

: 30 Tasmanians (42.3 percent)--

16 teachers (47.1 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 2 university (50 percent).

Nil : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
 8 teachers (27.6 percent).  
 : 4 Tasmanians (5.7 percent)--  
 3 teachers (8.8 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

**Question 25:** To what extent do principals monitor weekly/daily plans of classroom teachers?

A. Nil : 26 respondents (16.3 percent)  
Little : 64 respondents (40.0 percent)  
Somewhat : 37 respondents (23.1 percent)  
Extensively : 23 respondents (14.4 percent)  
Fully : 7 respondents ( 4.4 percent)

B. Somewhat : 14 teachers (22.2 percent),  
 11 principals (30.6 percent), 5 department (41.7 percent), 3 school-  
 system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent),  
 1 parent (11.1 percent).  
Extensively or Fully : 14 teachers (22.2 percent),  
 8 principals (22.2 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 parents  
 (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 1 university  
 (11.1 percent).  
Little or Nil : 34 teachers (54 percent),  
 16 principals (44.5 percent), 13 school-system administrators (81.3  
 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent),  
 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent),  
 4 teacher representatives (100 percent).



C. Somewhat : 13 Albertans (14.6 percent)--  
 5 teachers (17.2 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 department  
 (20 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 cur-  
 riculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 24 Tasmanians (33.8 percent)--  
 9 teachers (26.5 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 4 department  
 (57.1 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Fully : 7 Tasmanians (9.9 percent)--  
 5 teachers (14.7 percent).

Extensively : 3 Albertans (3.4 percent)--  
 1 principal (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent),  
 no teachers.

: 20 Tasmanians (28.2 percent)--  
 9 teachers (26.5 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 6 principals  
 (33.3 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 curriculum committee  
 (100 percent).

Little : 50 Albertans (56.2 percent)--  
 11 teachers (37.9 percent), 5 parents (100 percent), 4 university  
 (80 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 4 department (80 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 10 school-system adminis-  
 trators (62.5 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent).

: 14 Tasmanians (19.7 percent)--  
 8 teachers (23.5 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 university  
 (25 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives  
 (100 percent), no department.

Nil : 22 Albertans (24.7 percent)--  
 13 teachers (44.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 school-  
 system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 teacher representative  
 (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).  
 : 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
 2 teachers (5.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Question 26: How much is there integrated planning to ensure that  
 facilities and resources accompany new curriculum ideas?

A. Nil : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)  
Little : 51 respondents (31.9 percent)  
Somewhat : 53 respondents (33.1 percent)  
Extensively : 37 respondents (23.1 percent)  
Fully : 3 respondents ( 1.9 percent)

B. Somewhat : 19 teachers (30.2 percent),  
 13 principals (36.1 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3  
 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 3 department (25 percent),  
 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent),  
 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).  
Extensively and Fully : 20 teachers (31.7 percent),  
 7 principals (19.4 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 3 university  
 (33.3 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent).  
Little or Nil : 21 teachers (33.3 percent),  
 15 principals (41.7 percent), 9 school-system administrators (56.3  
 percent), 5 parents (55.6 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent),

3 department (25 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent),  
2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

C. Somewhat : 33 Albertans (37.1 percent)--  
10 teachers (34.5 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 5 school-  
system administrators (31.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9  
percent), 2 university (40 percent), 2 department (40 percent),  
1 parent (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 20 Tasmanians (28.2 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 1 teacher  
representative (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 university  
(25 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Fully : 2 Albertans (2.3 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Extensively : 11 Albertans (12.4 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 teacher representative  
(50 percent).

: 26 Tasmanians (36.6 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 5 depart-  
ment (71.4 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 3 university (75 percent),  
1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Little : 30 Albertans (33.7 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 3 university  
(60 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 2 department (40 percent),

3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent).

: 21 Tasmanians (29.6 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), no university.

Nil : 11 Albertans (12.4 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent).

Question 27: Who should provide integrated planning to ensure that resources accompany new curriculum ideas?

A. Curriculum committee : 44 respondents (27.5 percent)  
Department : 34 respondents (21.3 percent)  
Teachers : 32 respondents (20.0 percent)  
Principals : 22 respondents (13.8 percent)  
No answer : 14 respondents ( 8.8 percent)

B. Curriculum committee : 19 teachers (30.2 percent),  
10 principals (27.8 percent), 5 department (41.7 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent),  
1 parent (11.1 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

Department : 11 teachers (17.5 percent),  
7 principals (19.4 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 4 parents (44.4 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Teachers : 15 teachers (23.8 percent),  
6 principals (16.7 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent), 3 parents (60 percent).

Principals : 8 principals (22.2 percent),  
7 teachers (11.1 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent),  
1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. Curriculum committee : 16 Albertans (18.2 percent)--  
7 teachers (24.1 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 2 school-system administrators (13.3 percent).

: 28 Tasmanians (39.4 percent)--  
12 teachers (35.3 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Department : 17 Albertans (19.3 percent)--  
3 teachers (10.3 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 6 school-system administrators (40 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 17 Tasmanians (23.9 percent)--  
8 teachers (23.5 percent), 3 parents (75 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Teachers : 21 Albertans (23.9 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.6 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 2 university

(40 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 5 school-system administrators (33.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 11 Tasmanians (15.5 percent)--

7 teachers (20.6 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), no parents.

Principals

: 18 Albertans (20.5 percent)--

1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 6 teachers (20.7 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--

1 teacher (2.9 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent).

Question 28: What are ways in which present planning could be improved?

A. Time for planning : 26 respondents (16.3 percent)

More teacher involvement: 25 respondents (15.6 percent)

Better facilities/more materials: 25 respondents (15.6 percent)

Improved communications : 10 respondents ( 6.3 percent)

No answer : 39 respondents (24.4 percent)

B. Time for planning : 6 teachers (9.5 percent),  
6 curriculum committee (75 percent), 5 principals (13.8 percent),  
3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent).

More teacher involvement: 9 teachers (14.3 percent), 7 principals (19.4 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Better facilities/more materials: 14 teachers (22.2 percent), 5 principals (13.9 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

Improved communications : 5 teachers (7.9 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. Time for planning : 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 5 curriculum committee (71.4 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 5 Tasmanians (7 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

More teacher involvement: 12 Albertans (13.5 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 4 school-system administrators (25 percent).

: 13 Tasmanians (18.3 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Better facilities/more materials: 3 Albertans (3.4 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)--  
 12 teachers (35.3 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 5 principals  
 (27.8 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Improved communications : 2 Albertans (2.3 percent)--  
 1 teacher (3.4 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
 4 teachers (11.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 university  
 (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Question 29: Do teachers understand the guide provided by the  
 Province/State?

A. Yes : 100 respondents (62.5 percent)  
No : 36 respondents (22.5 percent)  
Some : 12 respondents ( 7.5 percent)

B. Yes : 44 teachers (69.8 percent),  
 22 principals (61.1 percent), 9 department (75 percent), 7 parents  
 (77.8 percent), 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent),  
 3 university (33.3 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent),  
 3 teacher representatives (75 percent).

No : 8 teachers (12.7 percent),  
 10 principals (27.8 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5  
 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5  
 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent),  
 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Some : 3 principals (8.3 percent),  
 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 teachers (3.2



percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent).

C. Yes : 40 Albertans (44.5 percent)--  
8 principals (44.4 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent),  
7 school-system administrators (43.6 percent), 15 teachers (51.7  
percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 3 department (60 percent),  
1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 60 Tasmanians (84.5 percent)--  
29 teachers (85.3 percent), 4 parents (100 percent), 3 university  
(75 percent), 14 principals (77.8 percent), 6 department (85.7 per-  
cent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 2 teacher representa-  
tives (100 percent).

No : 32 Albertans (36 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.6 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 8 principals  
(44.4 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 teacher  
representative (50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5  
percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 department  
(14.3 percent).

Some : 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 university (40 per-  
cent), 2 curriculum committee (28.7 percent), 1 teacher (3.4 percent),  
1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Question 30: Rank the ways in which teachers came to understand the guide.

- A. Reading the guide : 69 respondents (43.1 percent)  
Department workshop : 24 respondents (15.0 percent)  
Teacher organization workshop: 10 respondents (6.3 percent)  
No answer : 19 respondents (11.9 percent)

B. Reading the guide : 37 teachers (58.7 percent),  
 8 principals (22.2 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 6 school-system  
 administrators (37.5 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent),  
 3 teacher representatives (75 percent), 3 department (25 percent).

Department workshop : 10 principals (27.8 percent),  
 6 teachers (9.5 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 curriculum  
 committee (25 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 parent (11.1  
 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

Teacher organization workshop: 5 principals (13.9 percent),  
 2 teachers (3.2 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 1 school-system  
 administrator (6.3 percent).

C. Reading the guide : 38 Albertans (42.7 percent)--  
 15 teachers (51.7 percent), 4 parents (80 percent), 4 curriculum  
 committee (57.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent),  
 6 school-system administrators (39.6 percent), 1 department (20  
 percent).

: 31 Tasmanians (43.7 percent)--  
 22 teachers (64.7 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 teacher

representative (50 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent).

Department workshop : 2 Albertans (2.3 percent)--  
2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)--  
6 teachers (17.6 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 3 department (60 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Teacher organization workshop: 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--  
1 principal (5.6 percent).

Question 31: What things hinder(ed) teachers from understanding the guide?

- A. Lack of time : 32 respondents (20.0 percent)  
Lack of understanding (ambiguity): 29 respondents (18.1 percent)  
Lack of help/training : 15 respondents ( 9.4 percent)  
Lack of training in social: 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)  
Nil and did not answer : 50 respondents (31.3 percent)

B. Lack of time : 13 teachers (20.6 percent),  
9 principals (25 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Lack of understanding/ambiguity: 12 teachers (19 percent), 4 principals (11.1 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent).

Lack of help/training : 6 teachers (9.5 percent), 4 principals (11.1 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Lack of training in social: 3 department (25 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 2 teachers (3.2 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

C. Lack of time : 23 Albertans (25.8 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.5 percent), 7 principals (24.1 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent).

Lack of understanding/ambiguity: 21 Albertans (23.6 percent)--  
7 teachers (24.1 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 4 department (80 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
5 teachers (14.7 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), no parents, university, or department.

Lack of help/training : 7 Albertans (7.9 percent)--  
 2 teachers (6.9 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 university  
 (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher rep-  
 resentative (50 percent).

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
 4 teachers (11.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department  
 (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Lack of training in social: 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
 1 teacher (3.4 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 per-  
 cent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 2 school-system adminis-  
 trators (12.5 percent).

: 5 Tasmanians (7 percent)--  
 3 department (42.9 percent).

Nil : 11 Tasmanians (15.5 percent)--  
 9 teachers (26.5 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department  
 (14.3 percent).

Question 32: Which ways would be best for teachers to come to  
 understand the curriculum guide?

- A. Reading the guide : 44 respondents (27.5 percent)  
Department workshop : 35 respondents (21.9 percent)  
Teacher organization workshop: 21 respondents (13.1 percent)  
No answer : 23 respondents (14.4 percent)

B. Reading the guide : 21 teachers (33.3 percent),  
 6 principals (16.7 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5  
 percent), 4 parents (44.4 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5

percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

Department workshop : 12 principals (33.3 percent), 8 teachers (12.7 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 3 parents (33.3 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Teacher organization workshop: 8 teachers (12.7 percent), 6 principals (16.7 percent), 3 department (37.5 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), no parents, curriculum committee, or teacher representatives.

C. Reading the guide : 25 Albertans (28.1 percent)-- 8 teachers (27.5 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 19 Tasmanians (26.8 percent)-- 13 teachers (38.3 percent), 3 parents (75 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Department workshop : 13 Albertans (14.6 percent)-- 2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 22 Tasmanians (31 percent)-- 6 teachers (17.6 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 2 university

(50 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Teacher organization workshop: 13 Albertans (14.6 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.6 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 university (20 percent), no department.

: 8 Tasmanians (11.3 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.6 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent).

Question 33: To what extent is the program given in the guide used in the classroom?

A. <u>Nil</u>	: 3 respondents ( 1.9 percent)
<u>Little</u>	: 17 respondents (10.6 percent)
<u>Somewhat</u>	: 63 respondents (39.4 percent)
<u>Extensively</u>	: 67 respondents (41.9 percent)
<u>Fully</u>	: 2 respondents ( 1.3 percent)

B. Somewhat : 30 teachers (47.6 percent),  
9 principals (25 percent), 9 school-system administrators (56.3 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 4 university (44.4 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Little or Nil : 12 teachers (19 percent), 3 principals (8.3 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 19 teachers (30.2 percent),  
24 principals (66.7 percent), 6 department (50 percent), 5 parents

(55.6 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.1 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

C. Somewhat : 43 Albertans (48.3 percent)--  
17 teachers (58.6 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 5 department (100 percent), 9 school-system administrators (56.3 percent), 3 university (60 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 20 Tasmanians (28.2 percent)--  
13 teachers (38.2 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Fully : 2 Tasmanians (2.8 percent)--  
1 parent (25 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Extensively : 32 Albertans (36 percent)--  
9 teachers (31 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 5 school-system administrators (31.3 percent), 1 university (20 percent), no department.

: 35 Tasmanians (49.3 percent)--  
10 teachers (29.4 percent), 3 parents (75 percent), 13 principals (72.2 percent), 6 department (85.7 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Little : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.9 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent),



2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 parent (20 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--

9 teachers (26.5 percent).

Nil

: 2 Albertans (2.3 percent)--

2 principals (11.1 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--

1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Question 34: What are things that hinder teachers most in using the program?

A. Lack of resource materials: 46 respondents (28.8 percent)

Inappropriateness of program: 18 respondents (11.3 percent)

Lack of understanding of concepts: 16 respondents (10.0 percent)

Lack of right teaching methods: 14 respondents ( 8.8 percent)

Lack of time : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)

Lack of detail in program : 11 respondents ( 6.9 percent)

No answer : 23 respondents (14.4 percent)

B. Lack of resource materials: 17 teachers (27 percent), 15 principals (41.7 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

Inappropriateness of program: 12 teachers (19 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent).

Lack of understanding of concepts: 3 teachers (4.8 percent), 3 principals (8.3 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 university (22.2 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent).

Lack of right teaching methods: 4 teachers (6.3 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

Lack of time : 5 teachers (7.9 percent), 4 principals (11.1 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

Lack of detail in program: 4 teachers (6.3 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 principal (2.8 percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. Lack of resource material: 22 Albertans (24.7 percent)-- 7 teachers (24.1 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), no department.

: 24 Tasmanians (33.8 percent)-- 10 teachers (29.4 percent), 8 principals (44.4 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Inappropriateness of program: 9 Albertans (10.1 percent)--  
5 teachers (17.2 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 1 principal  
(5.6 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
7 teachers (20.6 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent).

Lack of understanding of concepts: 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)--  
2 parents (40 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 3 curriculum com-  
mittee (42.9 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent),  
1 university (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent), no teachers.

: 6 Tasmanians (8.5 percent)--  
3 teachers (8.8 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 university  
(25 percent), no parents.

Lack of right teaching methods: 12 Albertans (13.5 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 1 parent (20  
percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent),  
1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 2 school-system administrators  
(12.5 percent).

: 2 Tasmanians (2.8 percent)--  
1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent).

Lack of time : 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department  
(20 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent).

: 1 Tasmanian (1.4 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Lack of detail in program: 7 Albertans (7.9 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8 per-  
cent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 4 Tasmanians (5.6 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.8 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 principal  
(5.6 percent).

Question 35: Were teachers specifically trained to use the program?

A. <u>Nil</u>	: 34 respondents (21.3 percent)
<u>Little</u>	: 61 respondents (38.1 percent)
<u>Somewhat</u>	: 49 respondents (30.6 percent)
<u>Extensively</u>	: 10 respondents ( 6.3 percent)
<u>Fully</u>	: 1 respondent ( 0.6 percent)

B. Somewhat : 19 teachers (30.2 percent),  
8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 7 principals (19.4 per-  
cent), 6 department (50 percent), 3 curriculum committee (37.5 per-  
cent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 3 teachers (4.8 percent),  
3 department (25 percent), 2 principals (5.6 percent), 2 university  
(22.2 percent), 2 parents (11.1 percent).

Little or Nil : 38 teachers (60.3 percent),  
27 principals (75 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50  
percent), 5 parents (55.6 percent), 5 curriculum committee (62.5

percent), 3 teacher representatives (75 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 3 department (25 percent).

C. Somewhat : 31 Albertans (34.8 percent)--  
10 teachers (34.5 percent), 4 department (80 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 2 university (40 percent).

: 18 Tasmanians (25.4 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Fully : 1 Albertan (1.1 percent)--  
1 teacher (3.4 percent).

Extensively : 1 Albertan (1.1 percent)--  
1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
3 department (42.9 percent), 2 university (50 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 2 teachers (5.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Little : 34 Albertans (38.2 percent)--  
10 teachers (34.5 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 27 Tasmanians (38 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 12 principals

(66.7 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), no university.

Nil : 19 Albertans (21.4 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.7 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 15 Tasmanians (21.1 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), no parents, university, or teacher representatives.

Question 36: Rank according to relative importance in training teachers for understanding and use of a new program.

A. Commitment by the teacher: 85 respondents (53.1 percent)

Organized workshops : 45 respondents (28.1 percent)

Time from work : 19 respondents (11.9 percent)

No answer : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)

B. Commitment by the teacher: 24 teachers (38.2 percent), 18 principals (50 percent), 11 school-system administrators (68.8 percent), 9 department (75 percent), 7 curriculum committee (87.5 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent), 3 teacher representatives (75.0 percent).

Organized workshops : 22 teachers (34.9 percent), 10 principals (27.8 percent), 3 school-system administrators (18.8

percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent),  
2 department (16.7 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Time from work : 8 teachers (12.7 percent),  
8 principals (22.2 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5  
percent), 1 department (8.3 percent).

C. Commitment by the teacher: 54 Albertans (60.7 percent)--  
9 teachers (31 percent), 4 parents (80 percent), 5 university (100  
percent), 11 principals (61.1 percent), 5 department (100 percent),  
6 curriculum committee (85.7 percent), 2 teacher representatives  
(100 percent), 11 school-system administrators (68.8 percent).

: 31 Tasmanians (43.7 percent)--  
15 teachers (44.1 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 7 principals  
(38.9 percent), 4 department (57.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee  
(100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), no university.

Organized workshops : 20 Albertans (22.5 percent)--  
12 teachers (41.4 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 3 school-  
system administrators (18.8 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3  
percent), no department, university, or parents.

: 25 Tasmanians (35.2 percent)--  
10 teachers (29.4 percent), 7 principals (38.9 percent), 2 department  
(28.6 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 2 parents (50 percent),  
1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Time from work : 10 Albertans (11.2 percent)--  
4 teachers (13.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 school-  
system administrators (12.5 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
 4 teachers (11.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department  
 (14.3 percent).

Subsidy of direct costs : 2 Albertans (both teachers).

Articles, books : 1 Tasmanian (a teacher).

Question 37: Who should be responsible for spreading new curriculum  
 ideas?

A. Curriculum Committee : 44 respondents (27.5 percent)

Department : 29 respondents (18.1 percent)

Teachers : 28 respondents (17.5 percent)

Principals : 18 respondents (11.3 percent)

No answer : 22 respondents (13.8 percent)

B. Curriculum Committee : 17 teachers (27 percent),  
 15 principals (41.7 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 curriculum  
 committee (25 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 school-system  
 administrators (12.5 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Department : 7 teachers (11.1 percent),  
 7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 5 parents (55.6 per-  
 cent), 3 principals (8.3 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 3 cur-  
 riculum committee (37.5 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 per-  
 cent), no university.

Teachers : 18 teachers (28.6 percent),  
 6 principals (16.7 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 teacher  
 representative (25 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3  
 percent).



Principals : 6 teachers (9.5 percent),  
6 principals (16.7 percent), 2 department (16.7 percent), 1 parent  
(11.1 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 curriculum committee  
(12.5 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

C. Curriculum Committee : 17 Albertans (19.1 percent)--  
6 teachers (20.6 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 2 school-  
system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 cur-  
riculum committee (14.3 percent), no department.

: 27 Tasmanians (38 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 3 department  
(42.9 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100  
percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Department : 22 Albertans (24.7 percent)--  
5 teachers (17.2 percent), 3 parents (60 percent), 3 department  
(60 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 7 school-system  
administrators (43.8 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 7 Tasmanians (9.9 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.8 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 2 principals  
(11.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Teachers : 15 Albertans (16.9 percent)--  
7 teachers (24.1 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 1 curriculum  
committee (14.3 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent),  
no parents or teacher representatives.

: 13 Tasmanians (18.3 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Principals : 11 Albertans (12.5 percent)--  
5 teachers (17.2 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 7 Tasmanians (9.9 percent)--  
4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 1 teacher (2.9 percent).

Teacher organization : 3 Albertans (3.4 percent)--  
1 teacher (3.4 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

: 3 Tasmanians (4.3 percent)--  
1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Question 38: To what extent does the teacher organization give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

A. <u>Nil</u>	: 15 respondents ( 9.4 percent)
<u>Little</u>	: 55 respondents (34.4 percent)
<u>Somewhat</u>	: 57 respondents (35.6 percent)
<u>Extensively</u>	: 27 respondents (16.9 percent)
<u>Fully</u>	: 1 respondent ( 0.6 percent)

B. Somewhat : 20 teachers (31.8 percent),  
13 principals (36.1 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 6 school-

system administrators (37.5 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 3 university (33.3 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 9 teachers (14.3 percent), 8 principals (22.2 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Little or Nil : 30 teachers (47.6 percent), 15 principals (41.7 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent), 5 department (41.7 percent), 2 teacher representatives (50 percent), 2 curriculum committee (25 percent), 1 parent (11.1 percent).

C. Somewhat : 39 Albertans (43.8 percent)-- 11 teachers (37.9 percent), 4 parents (80 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 4 curriculum committee (57.1 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent).

: 18 Tasmanians (25.4 percent)-- 9 teachers (26.5 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 1 university (25 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 department (28.3 percent).

Fully : 1 Albertan (1.1 percent)-- 1 parent (20 percent).

Extensively : 18 Albertans (20.2 percent)-- 6 teachers (20.7 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 2 department

(40 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), 1 university (20 percent).

: 9 Tasmanians (12.7 percent)--  
3 teachers (8.8 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 1 department (14.3 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), no teacher representative.

Little : 26 Albertans (29.2 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.6 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), 8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 2 curriculum committee (28.6 percent).

: 29 Tasmanians (40.9 percent)--  
13 teachers (38.2 percent), 3 university (75 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Nil : 3 Albertans (3.4 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.9 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

: 12 Tasmanians (16.9 percent)--  
7 teachers (20.6 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Question 39: To what extent do principals give leadership in spreading new curriculum ideas?

A. Nil : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)

Little : 42 respondents (26.3 percent)

Somewhat : 69 respondents (43.1 percent)

Extensively : 36 respondents (22.5 percent)

Fully : 2 respondents ( 1.3 percent)

B. Somewhat : 24 teachers (38.1 percent),  
19 principals (52.8 percent), 6 parents (66.7 percent), 6 school-  
system administrators (37.5 percent), 5 university (55.6 percent),  
4 department (33.3 percent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent),  
1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Extensively or Fully : 13 teachers (20.6 percent),  
12 principals (33.3 percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 3 parents  
(33.3 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent),  
1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5  
percent).

Little or Nil : 23 teachers (36.5 percent),  
8 school-system administrators (50 percent), 5 principals (13.9  
percent), 4 department (33.3 percent), 4 university (33.3 percent),  
3 curriculum committee (37.5 percent), 1 teacher representative  
(25 percent).

C. Somewhat : 38 Albertans (42.7 percent)--  
11 teachers (37.9 percent), 5 parents (100 percent), 2 university  
(40 percent), 9 principals (50 percent), 2 department (40 percent),  
6 school-system administrators (37.5 percent), 3 curriculum commit-  
tee (42.9 percent).

: 31 Tasmanians (43.7 percent)--  
13 teachers (38.2 percent), 1 parent (25 percent), 3 university  
(75 percent), 10 principals (55.6 percent), 2 department (28.6

percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 1 curriculum committee (100 percent).

Fully : 2 Tasmanians (2.8 percent)--  
1 parent (25 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Extensively : 13 Albertans (14.6 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.9 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 1 department (20 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 23 Tasmanians (32.4 percent)--  
11 teachers (32.4 percent), 6 principals (33.3 percent), 3 department (42.9 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 2 parents (50 percent).

Little : 31 Albertans (34.8 percent)--  
11 teachers (37.9 percent), 3 curriculum committee (42.9 percent),  
1 teacher representative (50 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent),  
7 school-system administrators (43.8 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 2 department (40 percent).

: 11 Tasmanians (15.5 percent)--  
7 teachers (20.6 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 principal (5.6 percent).

Nil : 5 Albertans (5.6 percent)--  
3 teachers (10.3 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent),  
1 university (20 percent), no principals.

: 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
2 teachers (5.9 percent), 1 university (25 percent), no principals.

Question 40: Which is best in spreading new curriculum ideas within a school?

A. Subject meetings : 60 respondents (37.5 percent)

Staff meetings : 46 respondents (28.8 percent)

Informal discussion : 27 respondents (16.9 percent)

Administrative visits : 9 respondents ( 5.6 percent)

No answer : 8 respondents ( 5.0 percent)

B. Subject meetings : 20 teachers (31.7 percent),  
12 principals (33.3 percent), 12 school-system administrators (75 per-  
cent), 4 curriculum committee (50 percent), 3 teacher representatives  
(75 percent), 3 department (25 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent),  
2 university (22.2 percent).

Staff meetings : 16 teachers (25.4 percent),  
15 principals (41.7 percent), 7 department (58.3 percent), 3 parents  
(33.3 percent), 2 school-system administrators (13.5 percent),  
1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent).

Informal discussion : 15 teachers (23.8 percent),  
7 principals (19.4 percent), 2 parents (22.2 percent), 2 curriculum  
committee (25 percent), 1 teacher representative (25 percent).

Administrative visits : 4 teachers (6.3 percent),  
1 parent (11.1 percent), 1 university (11.1 percent), 1 principal  
(2.8 percent), 1 curriculum committee (12.5 percent), 1 school-system  
administrator (6.3 percent).

C. Subject meetings : 44 Albertans (49.4 percent)--  
11 teachers (37.9 percent), 2 university (40 percent), 10 principals

(55.6 percent), 4 curriculum committee (42.9 percent), 12 school-system administrators (75 percent), 2 teacher representatives (100 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 1 department (20 percent).

: 16 Tasmanians (22.5 percent)--  
9 teachers (26.5 percent), 2 department (28.6 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent), 2 principals (11.1 percent), 1 parent (25 percent).

Staff meetings : 20 Albertans (22.5 percent)--  
8 teachers (27.5 percent), 1 parent (20 percent), 5 principals (27.8 percent), 2 department (40 percent), 2 school-system administrators (12.5 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 26 Tasmanians (36.6 percent)--  
8 teachers (23.5 percent), 2 parents (50 percent), 10 principals (71.4 percent), 5 department (71.4 percent), 1 university (25 percent).

Informal discussion : 8 Albertans (9 percent)--  
2 teachers (6.8 percent), 2 parents (40 percent), 3 principals (16.7 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent).

: 19 Tasmanians (26.7 percent)--  
13 teachers (38.2 percent), 4 principals (22.2 percent), no parents, 1 curriculum committee (100 percent), 1 teacher representative (50 percent).

Administrative visits : 6 Albertans (6.7 percent)--  
3 teachers (10.3 percent), 1 school-system administrator (6.3 percent), 1 university (20 percent), 1 curriculum committee (14.3 percent), no principals.



: 3 Tasmanians (4.2 percent)--  
1 principal (5.6 percent), 1 teacher (2.9 percent), 1 parent  
(25 percent).

## LIST OF REFERENCES

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anderson, V. E. Practices and Procedures of Curriculum Improvement. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.
- Annual Review, 1973. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1974.
- Babbie, Earl. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.
- Beauchamp, G. A. The Curriculum of the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Planning the Elementary School Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1956.
- Beck, R. H.; Cook, W. W.; and Kearney, N. C. Curriculum in the Modern Elementary School. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Burdin, J. L., and McAuley, J. D. Elementary School Curriculum and the Teacher's Role. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1971.
- Cay, D. F. Curriculum: Design for Learning. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1966.
- Chalmers, John W. Schools of the Foothills Province. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- A Choice of Futures. Report of the Commission on Educational Planning. Edmonton: Government Printer, 1972.
- Christoff, Anton Edward. "A Study to Determine How Teachers in the Sheboygan Public Schools, Sheboygan, Wisconsin, Perceive the Freedom They Have and the Freedom They Feel They Should Have to Make Instructional Decisions." Ed.D. thesis, The University of Northern Colorado, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972-73, 7-8.
- Crary, Ryland W. Humanizing the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.
- Crosby, Muriel. Curriculum Development for Elementary Schools in a Changing Society. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1964.

- Dempsey, Charles Nathan. "Patterns of Effectiveness and Ineffective Behavior of Elementary School Principals as Perceived by a Selected Group of Class-Room Teachers in Virginia." Ed.D. thesis, The University of Virginia, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 7-8.
- Dittman, Laura L., ed. Curriculum Is What Happens. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1970.
- Doll, R. C. Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.
- Easton, Donald Louis. "The Supervisory Role of the Elementary School Principal in Montana." Ed.D. thesis, Montana State University, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 39, 9-10.
- Edington, A. B. "A Case Study of the Teaching Aids Centre, Tasmania, Australia." Paper presented to the Commonwealth Ministers for Education, Jamaica, June 1974.
- The Educational Needs of Rural Areas. Hobart: Education Department, 1971.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1971.
- Experiences in Decision Making. Elementary Social Studies Handbook. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1971.
- Fawcett, Margot J., ed. The 1974 Corpus Almanac of Canada. Toronto: Corpus Publishers Services, Ltd., 1974.
- Flååten, Wayne Richard. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal, Teachers and Parents in the Area of Curriculum Improvement." Ed.D. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972, 5-6.
- Frost, Joe L., and Rowland, Thomas G. Curriculum for the Seventies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Gourley, Harold Eugene. "Issues at the Building Level as Perceived by Elementary Principals." Ed.D. thesis, Indiana University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 11-12.
- Grobman, Halda. Evaluation Activities of Curriculum Projects: A Starting Point. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1968.
- Harris, Juanita Edwards. "A Study of the Opinions of Selected Teachers Concerning Curriculum Planning at the Regional Level in a Decentralized School System." Ed.D. thesis, Wayne State University, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972, 5-6.

- Hicks, Wm. Vernon; Houston, W. Robert; Cheney, Bruce D.; and Marquard, Richard L. The New Elementary School Curriculum. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1970.
- Hurley, B. D. Curriculum for Elementary School Children. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.
- Inslow, Gail M. The Emergent in Curriculum. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Miel, Alice. Changing the Curriculum. New York: Century Company, Inc., 1946.
- Morris, Van Cleve. Philosophy and the American School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Nerbovig, Marcell H. Unit Planning: A Model for Curriculum Development. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.
- 1976 Handbook. The Alberta Teachers' Association 59th Annual Representative Assembly.
- Palmer, D. G. The Attitudes and Interests of First Year High School Pupils and Their Teachers (With Particular Reference to the New Social Sciences Courses). Hobart: Education Department, 1973.
- Pritzkau, Philo T. Dynamics of Curriculum Improvement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Ragan, W. B. Modern Elementary Curriculum. Rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Richmond, Kenneth W. The School Curriculum. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1971.
- Rodwell, Grant. "Putting Science Into Social Sciences." Tasmanian Journal of Education 7 (July-August 1973).
- The School Act, 1970. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, n.d.
- Sloan, Harold Richard. "Innovation and Change in Iowa Elementary Schools: Principals and Teachers' Perceptions." Ph.D. thesis, University of Iowa, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts 1972-3, 11-12.
- Swifte, H. L. "Aims and Means in Social Sciences." Tasmanian Journal of Education 6 (April 1972).

- Taba, Hilda. Teacher's Handbook for Elementary Social Studies.  
Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley (Canada), Ltd., 1967.
- Tasmanian Matriculation Colleges. Hobart: Education Department,  
n.d.
- The Tasmanian Teacher. Hobart: Education Department, March 1971.
- Tasmanian Year Book. No. 7: 1973. Tasmanian Office, Australian  
Bureau of Statistics.
- Tasmanian Year Book. No. 8: 1974. Tasmanian Office, Australian  
Bureau of Statistics.
- The Teaching Profession Act. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1955.
- Walker, Helen, and Lev, Joseph. Statistical Inference. New York:  
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.
- Ward, William Douglas. "The Role of Teacher Organizations in Professional Development and Instructional Improvement as Perceived by Selected Teacher Organization Leaders."  
Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Wright, Betty Atwell; Camp, Lorrie T.; Stosberg, William K.; and Fleming, Babette L. Elementary School Curriculum. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102291477