137

0-315-12457-2

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

60362

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Penney Irene Clark

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
Nov. 1, 1950	Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

P.O. Box 697
Beaumont, Alberta
T0C 0H0

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Inside Mentor: A Program Development Project

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M. Ed.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1982	Dr. Donald Massey

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
Oct. 15, 1982	Penney I. Clark

NL-91 (4/77)

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

Tom - Because, very simply, Peter Lougheed doesn't give a damn about those kinds of goals. Peter Lougheed is concerned that kids know Canadian history and geography.

Mary - But, like, what criteria are we using to decide that? I mean . . .

Betty - Here's a good statement and I'd love to know how he thinks he's going to test this - "Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education intents to test students' knowledge about Canadian history, geography, and citizenship."

Mary - They'll give them paper-and-pencil tests.

Betty - How do you test citizenship?

Tom - Knowledge about . . .

Mary - Ask them things like - What does 'R.C.M.P.' stand for?

Tom - What is the function of the

Mary - How many seats are there in the House of Commons?

Tom - Senate? What is the function of the House and what's the function of the Prime Minister?

Mary - How old do you have to be to vote? Who's your M.L.A.?

Tom - Sure, that's citizenship.

Mary - Who's the mayor of Edmonton?

Tom - Those are the kinds of things that are going to go in there and . . .

Betty - "It will not be a test of current curriculum or instruction. It is intended as a preinstructional test and it is expected to assist in assessing appropriate instruction and content for the region."

Tom - Well, that's just the one this Fall. That's this little - that teachers' Black test.

Mary - But, it's saying that those things are the important things, because you want to find out what kids know about them now.

. . . . . .

Tom - So, apparently, there's a lot of concern that that statement about "Canadian knowledge as a precondition for integrated studies" meant that you had to start the year with a straight factual unit on chronological history and regional geography.

Betty - And, hopefully, get on to the social inquiry process later?

Tom - I don't know if "hopefully" is the word or not. But, at any rate, that should come first, and given the propensity of teachers to stretch their first unit out at great length, (I'm the same way, I must admit), if they never got around to social studies as it's written in that document, well, it wouldn't be surprising to anybody, I'm sure. And then, since they're going to have the testing, at the end of the year in Grades six, nine, and twelve, toward the end of the year everything else is going to get dropped while they work on factual knowledge.

. . . . . .

Betty - Well, where does this leave our in-service stuff?

Tom - The direction that we were given was to go ahead with the program as it was originally proposed and not to worry about the, any change in the program.

Mary - It's going to be just like the Kanata Kits - it won't fit.

Betty - We're creating a white elephant here, are we?

(May 13, 1980)

The 1981 social studies curriculum came in for a great deal of nihilistic comment as well. The following comments were made upon looking through a draft version of the new curriculum.

Tom - So, I guess what he was saying was, "You guys had better have a look at the treatment of analyzing, evaluating data and Openers and so on in the revised curriculum," because according to him anyway, there are some more specific definitions of those in this version which might have some implications for those modules, so it behooves us to have a glance at the revised document.

. . . . . .

Mary - "Social Studies defined" - that's going to be fun. I should have read that last week when I was doing my . . .*(Laughter) I'm always a week behind. Now, wait a minute - here we are, you see. My thesis is just going to be right in here - "Social studies is the school subject in which students learn to explore, and where possible, to resolve social issues that are of public and personal concern: a. history, geography and the social sciences provide the content for inquiry into social issues." You're going to have to shape up there Tom. It's going to be right into the history, geography. You're going to be right in line with Manitoba any moment now. They sit for one hundred and ten years and, by God, you're right back to us. (Laughter) "These disciplines enable students to bring to the issue a better understanding of their cultural heritage, their natural environment, the society in which they live, and the complexity of the human experience."

Tom - Love it.

Mary - Beautiful. "Citizenship - Effective citizenship is the ultimate goal of social studies." Gee! "The value, knowledge, and skill objectives of this curriculum are designed to help students develop intellectual independence," (Not bloody likely!), "moral maturity and more effective involvement in the political, economic, and social affairs of their communities." Well, that's certainly different than what was there before. That isn't the way it was defined before.

Tom - There must be an awful lot of room for political geography in that.

Mary - Um hm. Okay, and here it's all spelled out - where the geography is, where the history is, where the political science is, where the economics is. This is Ontario's curriculum, you guys. I told you. Hang in there. You'll be right with us.

Tom - The content is certainly far more specific. It makes the '71 version of the program look as nebulous as . . . Want to take bets on how many people will read that document?

Mary - About the same number that read the last one. (Laughter) A few.

Tom - This is fatter - more intimidating.

. . . . . .

Betty - It's quicker to give the kids a retrieval chart that's already done. That saves you a step in the process. And, better still, tell them what you want them to find out and they'll find out.

Mary - Well, in essence, you can't blame the teachers for holding that view, because, in fact, the curriculum says the same thing really. It doesn't really want teachers to, to come up with social issues from the children. It says, "These are the issues you should deal with in this unit."

. . . . . .

Mary - That curriculum really is prescriptive. And it's becoming more prescriptive, and what we're trying to do in this in-service is to make teachers less prescriptive and so we're flying in the face of what the curriculum is trying to do.

(Aug. 11, 1980)

Nihilism was directed toward the Kanata Kits and Teaching Units as well.

Betty - See, what I was thinking - the difficulty with planning examples to fit in the modules taken from the Teaching Units and the Kanata Kits would be phenomenal because some of the Units, for instance, have no affective stuff in them at all.

Hugh - Do you like this generalization?

Betty - How do you feel about it?

Tom - The whole cognitive and affective ( ) evaluating knowledge.

Mary - I <u>like</u> the fact that China ( ). It makes me feel good.

Brad - On a five-point scale, how good? ( ) skills, inquiry and participation skills.

. . . . . .

Betty - But if we have to confine ourselves to examples out of Teaching Units and Kanata Kits, we're going to be hard pressed.

(July 28, 1980)

Betty - Because in some of the units there are, and Kanata Kits, there are no analyzing activities. There are no evaluation of data activities. I don't know how you feel but if somebody arbitrarily

said, you know, "Here's what other people are doing," and it's not on the unit I designed, I might not take it too well. So . . .

Tom - You all see what her problem is?

Mary - Um hm.

Betty - I was talking to Mary about it before.

Mary - I suggested that she just put in a disclaimer saying, "For the purposes of this in-service, these categories were being, or these ways of organizing are being selected, while in the Teachers' Units and Kanata Kits, other titles were used. The type of activity was . . ."

Betty - It goes even deeper than that though. It's not just other titles that they used. It's wrong intents are specified.

Tom - I hear you saying part of the problem is that - a teacher teaching Grade Four looks at the back to find some examples of analyzing and evaluating data, and hits a blank. This Teaching Unit doesn't have any analyzing and evaluating data as such. So there's a teacher sitting there saying, "Hey, I thought we were supposed to be using a process which included analyzing and evaluating data. How come here's an exemplary unit that doesn't have it?"

. . . . . .

But it starts muddying when it comes to organizing it because as long as, I think Brad remarked the other day, these Kanata Kits have retrieval charts already done in them. You tell me the kids do any organizing of data when they've got the retrieval charts handed to them on a stupid handout with the data organized.

. . . . . .

Betty - It's hard to get round. Like you were saying, I don't want to have blanks appearing, saying, you know - it's pretty hard to say there are no analyzing data activities in this unit. But it would be true because there aren't in some of them. There aren't in some of them I was looking at this morning. There aren't in some of the Kanata Kits.

Tom - I'd put down what you can and at the top a sentence that said, "These are some examples that were found in some of the units."

Betty - It would have to be that way, but not in a way that says the other units don't have any. But it should be saying that, you know.

Tom - Well, just leave a blank place and type in there - "This lousy unit didn't have an example."

(July 31, 1980)

Mary - So there really isn't any way that children will define their own value issue anymore.

Betty - The Kanata Kits don't even pretend to do that. They start off with a value issue.

. . . . . .

Betty - The people who designed those Teaching Units didn't know the process. And those are the people telling others how to do it? Now, it seems to me that it's been left, it's kind of the onus is at our feet now.

. . . . . .

Betty - Have any of you looked closely at the Grade Eight Kanata Kit? It completely avoids the whole social inquiry process. It boggles. It does a token thing of it, but there is no resolving of any issue. There is no applying of any decision.

(Aug. 11, 1980)

Tom - It's one of the handouts I'm gonna use with my 312 course under the heading of "What do you get for 8½ million dollars?" That's what you get - to sing "Oh, Canada" every morning.

Brad - Symbols.

Tom - I'm surprised the Teacher's Guide doesn't have the words to "Oh, Canada" in it and some kind of pledge to the flag in it.

(Aug. 26, 1980)

Ted - Of course, I always think then if we told them it was from a Grade Two Kanata Kit, they should be up in the air about the damned Kanata Kit. They didn't like it. What the Hell do they think some kids are going to think of it?

. . . . . .

Ted - Because it seems to me that, however, we go about it, you know, the constraints, you know, like if I was teaching in Pincher Creek, you know, I mean, I'd probably be using the Kanata Kit to keep a desk up, you know, because the leg's broken off. And, I mean that could happen.

. . . . . .

Tom - Well, what are the units and Kanata Kits that stick out in peoples' minds as good ones?

Ted - Now, there's the problem.

. . . . . .

Brad - That's right! That's right! They took our Tourist unit and stuck it in there holus-bolus.

Tom - That's a lousy unit. That unit is the biggest mishmash!

Betty - Turn the tape off because I'm getting sick.

Brad - I think you'd better clarify that for that tape. You just said it includes our material and then you say it's lousy, so . . .

Tom - You know, what I was going to say was it diesn't seem to me to hang together very well.

. . . . . .

Betty - Scrap the Grade Six Teaching Unit. We may as well forget Grade Six completely, because that Grade Six Teaching Unit is very poor and there is no Kanata Kit.

(Aug. 27, 1980)

Betty - There's only one shared, just because

Bill - One shared and two teacher . . .

Betty - they're hard to find in the Kanata Kits and Teaching Units. That was about the best example Ted could find that he thought could be codified, and used that way, from that Grade Twelve kit, Kanata Kit.

(Feb. 11, 1981
10:10 - 11:50)

Ted - See, it was interesting that the few times I've been around where we've ever done any pilotting at all, if ever we've used examples from the Kanata Kit in the first step, they've always rejected them.

. . . . . .

Ted - That's the first time though that I've ever sat down and tried to do that Grade Seven one.

Betty - Well, I hadn't tried it before. There was no way we could understand the directions for it, about how to score yourself on a sheet.

Ted - And you could just imagine a Grade Seven kid trying to sort it out.

Betty - And, of course, they were holding us, as Susan was saying, they were holding us responsible for those pages out of the Kanata Kit.

. . . . . .

Susan - That's right, yes.

Betty - But we didn't develop it! This was developed by somebody else.

Susan - We were responsible for the whole curriculum.

Betty - We had to use them in these modules though. But we didn't actually do them. 'Cause they were giving us personal Hell, weren't they? We were supposed to have done these sheets and they were wrong. And we were getting the flack right there and then. And we kept saying, "We didn't do them, you know. We have to use them."

(Feb. 15, 1981)

Pilot teachers did not escape nihilistic comment either.

Pillotting the modules was a very disheartening experience. As a result, the developers became very discouraged.

Tom - Not a good way to start this morning because I just feel, why bother!

Susan - Well, that's natural. Why bother doing all this when they hate what we've done so far anyway?

(Feb. 15, 1981)

The quoted comments in the next excerpt (Aug. 26, 1980) are being read from feedback forms filled out by participants in a pilot session of the Openers module. Part of the module had involved viewing a videotape entitled "People In Need." The videotape showed two of the developers doing an Opener to a unit on Haves and Have-Nots, with a Grade 4/5 class. The children were asked to produce paper squares of a particular size, with one-half the class given the appropriate tools, and the other half not. The reward for each perfect square was a jellybean.

Brad - "Jellybeans are not nutritious." (Reading from a Feedback Form)

Susan - Can you believe it?

Brad - God!

Betty - The one lady who wrote that there - I couldn't believe it. She was most annoyed.

Brad - I just read that.

Betty - Two people responded that way, that they didn't like the idea of using jellybeans. They weren't nutritious. Too much sweet bugs the teeth. Question Four - "What activities were most helpful?" Now I think this is interesting.

Ted - "Lack discipline, rather noisy."

(Laughter)

Brad - I've been told that before. My students look at and say, "My God, you don't know how to control kids very well."

(Laughter)

Tom - We did accomplish what we were after.

Ted - "Is the use of candy as a reward necessary?"

Brad - Isn't that unbelievable?

Ted - "Do not teach for money."

Tom - "Activities that were least helpful."

Betty - One cheeky person wrote, "Filling out the questionnaire was least helpful."

(Laughter)

Ted - That's true. Look at all the trouble it caused us. Another winner.

(Aug. 26, 1980)

Betty - Will there also be some teachers who will sit and pick holes for the fact that they're not,

Tom - Likely.

Betty - they're not superfying the production?

Tom - Likely.

Susan - It doesn't matter what we do . . .

Betty - Look at the comments that John Black's, of course admittedly, we keep getting back to the fact that they were so picky, but John Black's group were saying things like, you know, "The noise in that V.T.R. was terrible!" and "I didn't know what he was really trying to do," and . . .

(Aug. 27, 1980)

Betty - To suit people with this attitude though! They don't give a shit! Why should we revamp things to suit people like this?

. . . . . .

Betty - See, they, they were talking about bringing stuff back from in-services. They like to bring things back that they could use in the classroom the next day. And we reminded them that this was a process.

Tom - Step Six is supposed to help them generate

Susan - But I guess the point is it helps them to generate.

Tom - something for their own classes.

Betty - Yeah, not us giving it to them. They wanted something handed to them. They were very happy when we told them there would be Appendices that would contain certain examples. They were very happy about that.

Susan - Yeah, in fact, that's what one of them mentioned was the best thing about Resolving the Issue, that it had examples in the Appendix.

Betty - But they still don't know the process, so what darn good are the examples going to be to them? You know, they're going to go about them in a teacher-directed nonprocess way. And the examples will fall flat.

. . . . . .

Susan - You know why they liked the Decision Tree?

Tom - Why did they? I was curious about that.

Susan - Well, the kids would be able to colour it.

Tom - (Loud laughter)

Betty - Are we ever flogging a dead horse, or are we not?

Tom - Oh, gee!

Susan - No, but the point is, I understand why.

Tom - Ohhh!

Susan - No, listen. You know, the point is that that was very straightforward. And they said, "You know, you can see how it works up and everything. It's the kind of thing I can see using in my class more than the Decision Map. I can see using that and I can see, you know, the kids may even want to colour it afterwards." And I knew that comment, you know, when you say it it sounds so superficial and everything, but at least she felt it was good because it was something she could take away from the in-service and use. And that gets back to your point about teachers wanting something to use. There was something she could use.

Betty - We were facetious months ago. Who was it said something about some workshop we were at, or whatever, conference - "Social studies is what you plan in the hallway on your way down after recess." That's it, isn't it? That's the attitude right there, that you got a sheet of paper to get the kids to colour. Then maybe a wee bit to do first before they colour it. That, that's social studies.

. . . . . .

Betty - I think that this group at Lakeside Elementary is suspect and I don't think we should be . . .

Susan - Well, Alice said they're representative though.

Tom - Representative of what she deals with all the time. She walks into an atmosphere of resenting the new curriculum, resenting somebody coming out to tell them what they're supposed to be doing in their classrooms, and the usual thing is to find the staff response similar to what we're getting at Lakeside Elementary.

Betty - But we're not responsible for this feeling of militancy on their part.

Tom - So we're not.

Susan - But we still have to work within that.

Brad - Could we create anything then that would - that they would like?

Tom - I think they'd probably like it if we walked on coals in our bare feet.

Ted - Well, they did bring up the point that . . . .

Tom - and cried a lot.

(Laughter)

Betty - And analyzed and organized at the same time.

Ted - Rita did bring up the point, didn't she, that they bring up these super speakers from the U.S.?

Susan - Oh, yeah, somebody from California really impressed her. She made her laugh and made her excited about . . .

Betty - That's entertainment though. That's not learning.

Susan - Yes, but that's the whole point.

Tom - At 3:30 they're ready for a little entertainment. Serious work is not what they're looking for at the end of their day.

Susan - But the point is, would they think this was any better at nine in the morning? I wonder.

Betty - What's the matter with their attitude? Heaven's to Betsy! Those teachers are really living compared to twenty years ago.

(Laughter)

They're getting time off class to go to in-services! I never in my life got that! I went to every in-service at the end of the day.

Susan - So did I and I always thought I was lucky.

Betty - And I could count on the fingers of one hand anything that was entertaining in any of them.

Tom - It's not twenty years ago.

Betty - ( ) That's what's happening. People are just giving them lots of goodies to placate them, entertaining sessions and what have you.

Ted - You said it.

. . . . . .

Ted - If I walked on coals I'd burn my feet and they'd say, "There you are. Bloody social studies educators. They burn their feet. Science guys can do it. They've got a better deal."

. . . . . .

Brad - What would, would there be any advantage, to, to not handing them the booklet? To have the pages, some of the pages separately.

Tom - Gee, the ones who were in on the plot to go through it in ten minutes would be really crushed.

Brad - Yeah.

Tom - "Give me that! Give me that! I want it!"

. . . . . .

Brad - On the overhead, though, you might just have the model itself. The other things you would talk to. And then, and then, once you've made them listen to it, . . .

Tom - Treating them like little kids.

Brad - Yeah, it is. Well, it's trying to control the communication that's going on.

Tom - Right.

Ted - Well, that gets at the idea of justification.

Tom - Make them sit so they're facing you so that ( ).

Brad - So that they can't be miserable, can't talk to each other, and make snide, offhand remarks.

. . . . . .

Ted - We'll lead 'em. We'll lead 'em. We'll say, - I'll share an example with them of the Riverbend one. And then try to get responses from them. "What have you done?" (Laughter) "Nothing." "That figured." "What have you got?" (Laughter)

Tom - "Oh, worthless one, what have you done?"

Betty - Rita'll pop you in the nose.

Ted - ( ) Get off your ass and do some social action! (Laughter)

. . . . . .

Ted - I'll wear a suit tomorrow. Come with a bandage on. "I tried puttin' my hand on hot coals, but it didn't work."

(Laughter)

Betty - And come limping in.

(Laughter)

Ted - I'll get you to paint a black mark across my hands for the poker.

Susan - Maybe this won't be so bad after all.

Betty - Do some of those cute and fancy experiments that kids love. You know, the kind where you put a saucer of water and a piece of paper and put a tumbler over the water glass. First of all you light the paper, put the glass over it, and the water all gets sucked up into the glass. Very effective. Kids love it.

Tom - Well, it's not social action though. I think what you do is you start off by having them decide to go on strike tomorrow."

Ted - And then they'll turn around and say, "Well, we needn't do the rest because we won't work."

(Feb. 15, 1981)

Nihilism is a plausibility structure involved with maintaining a shared viewpoint. A shared viewpoint is developed through conversation.

Berger has said that

> Plausibility, in the sense of what people actually find credible, of views of reality depends upon the social support these receive. . . We obtain our notions about the word originally from other human beings, and these notions continue to be plausible to us in a very large measure because others continue to affirm them . . . . It is in conversation, in the broadest sense of the word, that we build up and keep going our view of the world. It follows that this view will depend upon the continuity and consistency of such conversation and that it will change as we change conversation partners. (Berger, 1969, p. 43)

The developers engaged in a great deal of conversation, both in and out of committee meetings. These conversations served to maintain a shared viewpoint concerning "outsiders" such as members of the ad hoc committee. Through conversation, members gave one another support in a situation

where they felt relatively powerless, in that the parameters were determined by Alberta Education, ACCESS, and the ad hoc committee. They felt beseiged by external forces. The use of nihilism was a defense against all of this. By defining other viewpoints as unworthy, perceived threats to one's own point of view of reality are neutralized.

Design

The analysis of the Design involved two substeps. The first was a breakdown of the Mentor Program according to the implicit and explicit decisions which it represents, and their constraints.

Implicit decisions are those which are adopted without consideration of alternatives. Explicit decisions are those which are made after due consideration has been given to alternative courses of action.

Each decision has been linked to an appeal to circumstance or to a principle. According to Walker,

> The curriculum designer wants to be able to say he was constrained either by circumstances or by his principles to decide as he did. To be constrained by circumstances is the curriculum designer's strongest possible justification, for then he has no genuine choice. (1971, p. 55)

The second substep was an analysis of the Design using the same categories applied to the Platform: Purpose, Format, Content, Setting, Role of Participants, and Evaluation.

Issue	Decision	Constraint
	(I) - Implicit (E) - Explicit	(C) - Circumstance (P) - Principle
1. Should the in-service program rely on a leader or should it be capable of being used independently by participants?	(E) - Leader directed	(C) - Pilot teachers - Alberta Education decision to appoint 125 resource teachers as in-service leaders

	Issue	Decision	Constraint
2.	Where are the classroom demonstrations to take place and who is to teach them?	(E) - Taught by teachers in a variety of classroom situations around the province	(C) - Ad Hoc Committee - ACCESS - Alberta Education
3.	Should an in-service with the intent of teaching <u>about</u> inquiry, <u>use</u> inquiry?	(E) - Partly	(C) - Pilot teachers (P) - Belief in learning theory
4.	Where did the role of developers end and that of ACCESS begin?	(E) - Developers - writing of print materials. Pilotting and revision of print materials. Editting of print materials. Writing of lesson plans for videotaped classroom demonstrations. Consultation during production. ACCESS - Production of program, including print and nonprint components.	(C) - Contract - ACCESS
5.	Were teachers to choose between two modules dealing with the same inquiry skill, according to their preferred teaching styles (teacher-directed or teacher-student shared decision-making) or were aspects of each teaching style to be in one module?	(E) - Aspects of each teaching style in one module	(C) - Could not seem to develop a separate module on teacher-student shared decision-making
6.	Where is the content for the classroom demonstrations to be obtained?	(E) - Primarily Kanata Kits and Teaching Units	(C) - Ad Hoc Committee
7.	Were the modules to be varied in format or uniform?	(I) Uniform	(C) - Ad Hoc Committee

The number of implicit decisions in the design of any program is endless. However, any implicit decision should be able to be retrieved by asking how a particular issue was decided.

While the number of explicit decisions is finite, the researcher does not claim that these six are the only decisions made on the basis of consideration of alternatives. However, they are certainly the major ones.

Purpose

In the Proposal the purpose was stated as being to explore "alternate classroom organizations and instructional sequences inherent in the 1978 Alberta Social Studies Program" (p. 1).

Since the final materials sent to ACCESS by the developers did not contain a statement of purpose, the final product produced by ACCESS was searched for such. This excerpt was taken to be a statement of purpose.

> The assumption is that, prior to using the Mentor Series, teachers will have undergone some initial experiences that will have given them a general introduction to the curriculum components, topics, objectives, and learning resources.
>
> The Mentor Series then can be utilized in giving more specific assistance to teachers in developing their abilities to help students with the various aspects of the inquiry process that is basic to teaching Social Studies, as outlined in the Curriculum Guide. (Mentor Project, 1981, p. i)

This statement is much more specific than the one found in the Proposal. It ties the in-service program,

not only to the provincial curriculum, but specifically to the inquiry model within it.

It should be noted also that the "program" referred to in the Proposal is the 1978 interim curriculum, while the "Curriculum Guide" referred to in the Mentor Project book is the 1981 curriculum.

Format

In the Proposal, the format of the program was organized around two sections. Part One was a self-awareness inventory. Based on this, participants would choose which of four kinds of in-service experiences they wished to pursue in Part Two: teacher-presenter, learning contracts, learning centres, or group investigations.

In the final product, Part One was retained, but Part Two, as described in the Proposal, had disappeared. Rather than choosing among four classroom organizational patterns, participants could now choose among thirteen modules, nine of which were tied to the steps of the inquiry model in the curriculum guide; three being concerned with student evaluation and one on valuing.

The developers, in the Proposal, make note of the fact that research indicates that in-service programs should be ongoing, as opposed to one-shot sessions. They also note that constraints of various types frequently make this impossible. Therefore, the program was to be flexible to enable it to meet the needs of both those who would be able to participate in a longterm program and those who would not.

The final format of the program would seem on the surface to have achieved this end. There is the option of participating in one or more of the self-contained modules. If an individual chose to become involved in every module, then the program would be longterm. However, it is left to the discretion of individual school jurisdictions as to whether or not the many advantages of longterm in-service are built in. These would include opportunities to try out some of the strategies with a trusted observer, who could provide feedback and coaching.

Content

The content of the in-service program, according to the Proposal, was to be concerned with two areas:

> Organizing Social Studies for inquiry approaches
>
> Using a variety of approaches and strategies to increase student interest and motivation (P. 11)

The focus was to be on the teacher developing a unit for classroom use based on one of the four classroom organizational patterns: teacher presenter, learning contracts, learning centres, or group investigations.

The content of each pattern was to vary according to the components considered necessary to making it most effective. However, each was to include case studies of classrooms in action, samples of children's work, pertinent articles, and samples of teacher tools useful to making the particular strategy most effective.

The Mentor Project ended up being very uniform in the kinds of experiences offered in each module. Each

contained the following steps:

Part 1: Introduction
Part 2: Experiencing a _____
Part 3: Characteristics of a _____
Part 4: Classroom Demonstrations
Part 5: Sharing Ideas about _____
Part 6: Developing a _____
Part 7: Examples from Kanata Kits and Teaching Units
Part 8: Module Evaluation Form

Retained from the Proposal were the case-studies, or classroom demonstrations, as they were now called. The other aspects of the proposed program were generally discarded, with the exception of the student work samples, which do appear in some modules.

A major difference was in the Proposal's focus on participants developing a unit for use in their own classrooms. Now, each module had one segment (Part 6) devoted to developing an activity using the skill with which that module dealt; i.e., in the Evaluating Data module, participants would develop an activity for their class involving evaluation of data for a unit with which they would be working.

However, there was some doubt that even the little that remained of the original focus on participants developing something for use in their own classrooms would materialize in practice. It was found in pilotting, that first, there was rarely enough time for this activity, and second, even when there was, participants weren't particularly interested in doing it.

Setting

No mention is made as to the efficacy of having the in-service take place in the school setting with the staff of the school as the participants.

However, participants could form "intact groups" on the basis of the self-awareness inventory. The idea of assisting group cohesiveness through the use of "pens, paper, folders, notebooks, etc. bearing a logo symbolic of their group goals" (p. 12) has been discarded. The group interaction built into the modules would promote this end.

Role of Participants

1. Prior to the In-Service Program

This note appeared in the Leader's Manual of each module.

> Pre-Attendance Preparation
>
> 1. With some groups it may be possible to involve teachers in preliminary activities such as:
>
> (i) Bring to the session specific issues/ problems they will be pursuing with their classes.
>
> (ii) Examples of ways to introduce issues/ problems they have used in their classes to share with others.
>
> (iii) Samples of children's work.
>
> (Leader's Guide, Openers, p. 2)

This was a way of helping participants to shape the session and, as a result, to have a stake in its success.

The Proposal (and the in-service literature) emphasized that teachers' needs should be taken into consideration when designing in-service programs and that teachers should have a role in the planning.

The results of two teacher surveys on in-service needs are itemized in the Proposal. These would seem to have been taken into consideration in developing the proposed program.

2. During the In-Service Program

While teachers did not have a role in planning the in-service program prior to its inception, the Proposal outlines a role for them in planning their experiences during the in-service. Based on their own knowledge of their preferences as to teaching styles and the additional illumination received as a result of the self-awareness inventory, they were to choose the in-service experiences in which they were to participate in Part Two of the session.

This element of choice was retained in the final product, in that participants were still intended to make a choice following the self-awareness inventory. However, the decision was no longer particularly pertinent to the questions in the inventory, since they dealt with teaching style. The choice, with the exception of the valuing and evaluation modules, was based on which step of the inquiry model one wished to explore. In the final draft of the

Proposal, each of these modules was actually going to be two. The activities in each of the two would be similar, but one module was to be intended for participants with a teacher-presenter classroom style and the other was to be intended for teachers who preferred to share the decision-making role with students. With this proposed format, the self-awareness inventory would still be useful in assisting participants to make a choice. However, in the final format, it was decidedly emasculated.

3. Following the In-Service Program

There was no change in the intent that participants would, following the in-service, implement the strategies learned. However, they would no longer be able to implement a unit developed in the in-service.

Evaluation

At the end of each module an evaluation form was included. The questions it asked were as follows:

1. What were the strengths of the module?
2. What were the weaknesses of the module?
3. What improvements can you suggest for the module?

The Leader's Guide for each module referred to the evaluation form in this way:

> Leaders may wish to ask participants to complete the evaluation form. The information gathered in the evaluation form may be useful in planning future in-service sessions.

As Nash and Ireland (1979) point out, feedback such as this is of limited value. This form does not begin to meet

either the intents for evaluation expressed in the Proposal or in the in-service literature.

No provision was made to determine whether or not the in-service program actually had any impact on the classroom behaviour or participants.

One of the major concerns of evaluation mentioned in the Proposal is to obtain descriptive data concerning teachers' activities in the in-service. There was no provision built in for this in the final outcome.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was concerned with describing the decision-making processes involved in the development of the Mentor Project, an in-service program.

It was intended to meet the call, dating from the late sixties, and continuing through the seventies, for

> individuals . . . [to] take the time to write down descriptions of their activities, the kinds of decisions that they make, the kinds of information upon which they base their decisions, the kinds of conflicts that arise within the initiator group and how these conflicts are resolved, etc. (Schwab, 1969, p. 19)

The researcher was a member of the development committee for the Mentor Project and participant observation was the methodology used.

Data collection, over a fifteen month period, included tape recordings of development committee meetings, informal interviews, and collecting of relevant documents.

Analysis of data was loosely based on Decker Walker's "naturalistic model" which grew out of observations of how curriculum development actually occurs, as opposed to theoretical stances as to the

way in which it is 'supposed to occur.' This model postulates three stages to the development process. These are platform, deliberation, and design.

From the Mentor Proposal was drawn "an idea of what is and a vision of what ought to be" (Walker, 1971, p. 52) which were considered to constitute the platform of the development committee. Implicit within the platform was a view of teachers, children, evaluation, in-service, resources, and social studies. These, along with explicit statements concerning the shape of the intended program, surveys on teacher needs, the recent research on in-service, and certain practical restraints listed in the Proposal, were used to paint a picture of the Mentor Program, as the developers envisioned it.

The second stage in Walker's model is called deliberation. He identifies four deliberative episodes within this stage. These are issues, explications, brainstorms, and reports. All of these were identified in the Mentor tapes.

Four other episodes were identified as well. These episodes took up a great deal of time during meetings, but were concerned more with preparation for deliberation, rather than deliberation itself. These episodes were organization, presentation, update and invention.

Another aspect of deliberation emerged from the

transcripts of the Mentor development committee. It was noted that, in many cases, there was a social aspect to the deliberations. In searching for a way to make sense of this social aspect, Berger's idea of "plausibility structures" was discovered. The plausibility structures which seemed most appropriate to these data were legitimations, appeals to significant others, and nihilism. These were used in two ways by the developers. Legitimations and appeals to significant others were used to justify their decisions. Nihilism was used as a means of 'letting off steam' and as a way of drawing committee members together.

The third stage of Walker's model is called design. The design was analyzed in two steps. The first step involved a categorization of the major decisions according to whether they were implicit or explicit and a delineation of the circumstances or principles which were used to justify each decision. Circumstances were used far more than principles as a justification for decisions.

The second step (not part of Walker's model) involved an analysis of the design, using the same categories as applied to the platform. It was found that much of the "vision of what ought to be" had vanished during the development process.

Werner (1977) has said, in reference to a completed social studies program, that it is "a 'frozen

slide' in the film, as it were, of the program developers' streams of intentionality" (p. 125). The Mentor Program is such as this. This piece of research attempted to present not only the 'frozen slide' of the program, but some snapshots which depict the growth and change along the way.

Conclusions

As with any model, the naturalistic model has its strengths and limitations.

One limitation concerns the use of the category of deliberation. Walker concerns himself only with "the intellectual processes of inquiry, judgment, decision, and action that preceded, surrounded, and underly the design of a curriculum" (1975, p. 110). He categorizes this discourse according to four deliberative episodes - issue, brainstorm, report, and explication.

However, while these episodes may comprise the whole of deliberation, deliberation does not comprise the whole of the development process. Other kinds of episodes were found in the Mentor transcripts. These were called update, organization, presentation, and invention. These episodes comprise the "agenda-making and reviewing, making of announcements, reviewing progress to date, and the like" (1975, p. 109) which Walker chooses to ignore.

A third aspect of discourse is not included in Walker's naturalistic model and yet is present in the Mentor transcripts. This was a social aspect. It is a

question for further study as to whether or not the Mentor Project was unique in this regard. However, it did comprise a part of the discourse. The categories used to organize this data originated with Berger's (1969) concept of plausibility structures. These categories were nihilism, appeals to significant others, and legitimations.

By including only deliberative discourse for consideration in his model, Walker excludes much of the data which gives the "flavour" of the development process. For instance, the organizational episode in which the Mentor developers are handing out the sheets of a trial module, is indicative of one aspect of the development process. If only deliberative episodes had been included, the picture presented of the development process would have been incomplete. Deliberative discourse cannot proceed without the assistance of the discourse of the other episodes.

The four deliberative episodes, the additional episodes of organization, update, presentation, and invention, and the three plausibility structures could all be subsumed under a title such as "Dynamics."

Another limitation concerns one of Walker's deliberative episodes, the issue. Walker's definition of issue is: "opposing points of view are propounded and defended, and discussion is intense and animated" (Walker, 1971, p. 119). This definition was changed

somewhat when applied to the Mentor data. It became simply the idea of trying to resolve a problem. This did not necessarily involve hot dispute, but rather the laying out of alternatives in trying to come to a decision.

Walker's definition seems to depend on there being strongly opposing points of view within the development committee itself. This is not always the case, and was not the case with Mentor. It was not usually the developers who had opposing viewpoints, but the developers and members of the ad hoc advisory committee. Therefore, when the developers dealt with an issue, it was usually a matter of anticipating or reviewing ad hoc committee agreements and then preparing counter-arguments. While feelings ran high at times, there was not much point in engaging in hot dispute with people who were not present.

Another limitation concerns the design. The design, as Walker defines it, is very difficult to specify precisely. While the number of explicit decisions is finite, the implicit decisions can never be completely specified.

Walker notes this problem, but decides that it is not serious since

> with accurate records any question that can be asked about the implicit design can be answered. In framing the question the questioner must ask how a particular issue was decided and this characterization of the issue defines the decision of interest. (1971, p. 55)

The problem here stems from the fact that it is difficult to identify those issues that do not result in explicit decisions. Walker defines the implicit design as being made up of "unconsidered choices" (1971, p. 54). It is difficult to identify the issue involved when courses of action are adopted automatically without consideration of alternatives. Furthermore, most projects do not keep the "accurate records" upon which Walker seems to be depending for specification of the implicit design.

A second limitation of the design as a set of decisions is the difficulty of using it as a basis for comparing the platform and the final products. For this reason a second level of analysis was added to this research. In this level of analysis the final product was analyzed in terms of the same categories which had originally been applied to the platform: Purpose, Format, Content, Setting, Role of Participants, and Evaluation.

This level of analysis allowed a comparison to be made between the final products and the developers' platform. The necessity of including this step was determined by the holistic nature of this research, as opposed to Walker's emphasis on analyzing several deliberative episodes in detail.

The strengths of this model are many. First and

foremost, it shows program development as it really is, with all its flaws; not as pundits may have decided it should be.

When compared to the classical model as outlined by Tyler, certain specific advantages become evident.

In the classical model, objectives are essential, since without them, learning experiences cannot be rationally selected or assessed. The problem here is that developers do not always explicitly state their objectives, and if they do state them, it is not necessarily the first task they undertake. Walker's concept of platform, the system(s) of beliefs and values held by developers, accounts for this. If no set of objectives is formally stated, then the researcher can turn to articles written by developers, correspondence, a project Proposal which outlines intents, or any other documents which might illuminate the pertinent beliefs and values held by the developers.

If objectives are explicitly set out, the research (Wooten, 1965; Eisner, 1967; Shipman, 1974; Shaw, 1975) indicates that they are not the starting point, but rather, they rise out of deliberation.

As Reid points out:

> Deliberation can be a process of discovery - can take an existing situation and move it to a new plane of understanding and insight before an attempt is made to state what problems we ought to be trying to solve. (1978, pp. 63-64)

Therefore, it is inappropriate to place objectives at the beginning of the cycle.

The naturalistic model, then, begins further back in the development process than does the classical model. The stating of objectives is preceded by deliberation and the deliberation stems from the platform or system(s) of beliefs and values held by the developers. The stating of objectives is, in a sense, a late development of the platform.

Analysis of deliberation makes evident the actual processes of decision-making that occurred during development. By exposing these in this way, other people are enabled to analyze them and determine which data determined which decisions. This information can then be used to improve the decision-making processes of future development projects. Developers can at least be aware of possible pitfalls and take measures to avoid them.

By representing the final products as a series of decisions, the products are related directly back to the decisions that produced them, and to the deliberation that preceded the decisions themselves.

Another strength of the naturalistic model is its flexibility. Walker's purpose was to analyze the deliberative episodes in great depth, using his three-tiered System for Analyzing Curriculum Deliberation (SACD).

One intent of this study was to trace the Mentor issues over the entire course of the development of the project. The analysis used in this research involved only the bottom tier of the SACD, that of determining deliberative episodes.

While Walker's intent was not to show changes over time, his naturalistic model was able to be adapted to that purpose. (A fruitful research project might be to take the Mentor transcripts and analyze portions of the discourse using Walker's SACD.)

The key strength of this model is that it is descriptive, rather than prescriptive. The classical model makes decision-making in program development appear to be a straight-forward, logical, analytical process. It is not. It is messy and confused. Many factors and influences come into play along the way. There are no guarantees that the final products will end up looking anything like what was originally intended. This model accounts for all of this.

This study began with some general research questions. The naturalistic model was used as a means of portraying the Mentor Project data in a way that would provide some answers to these questions. The questions and their "answers" are as follows:

1. Upon what basis did the development committee begin its work?

Like the Kettering Project (Walker, 1975) and the Keele Project (Shipman, 1974), the development process did not begin with a clearly stated set of objectives. The Mentor development committee produced a proposal, which was taken to the ad hoc advisory committee for approval. The Proposal was in two sections, the first being devoted to a summary of pertinent research on in-service, a listing of practical constraints on the incorporation of all of the research findings into the plan for Mentor, a summary of two surveys of teachers' needs with regard to in-service, and a description of the implications of all of the above for the Mentor Project. The second section of the Proposal described the proposed format and content of the Mentor Project.

As with the Kettering Project, there was no argument about the platform because of the way in which persons were selected for the team.

> Those who were not enthusiastic about the approach described to them might pursue the matter no further, nor, if they did, were they likely to find a warm reception from the director or the rest of the staff. Eisner's talks and writings no doubt persuaded many who had not already formed strong opinions on the matters he spoke and wrote about. And in some minor matters individuals swallowed their reservations in order to get on with the work. (1975, p. 100)

The members of the Mentor development team were like-minded individuals, all in elementary social studies, all with many of the same views on teaching and learning. Consequently, the platform, as stated, was not discussed.

It was simply accepted. The only concerns ever expressed were editorial ones, such as use of punctuation and what portion of the American survey to include.

Curriculum theorists (Schwab, 1973; Reid, 1975) recommend that development committees be composed of members representing a variety of areas of expertise and experience. However, it seems that it is common practice to include like-minded individuals as development committee members, rather than incorporating a variety of skills, experiences, and even values (Shipman, 1974; Walker, 1975).

> The development was done by a small, homogeneous group of subject specialists with past teaching experience, but not by practising teachers, and with no significant involvement of students, school administrators, or laymen. (Walker, 1975, p. 99)

The reasons for this are no doubt based in practicalities. If the people who are asked to take on a project are based in a university, it is much easier to work with others in the same setting than it is to coordinate schedules with people outside the setting. Also, in the case of both Mentor and the Kettering Project, professors used the project as an opportunity for graduate students to apply some of the theory to which they had been exposed.

However, it is interesting to note that, in both cases, the theory regarding the composition of program development committees was ignored. In the case of Mentor, one tenet of the theory on in-service was also

ignored. According to the literature, practising teachers should be involved in planning their own in-service programs.

While the Proposal document went through three drafts before being accepted by the ad hoc advisory committee, the first section was never changed. All the stakeholders - the development committee, ACCESS, and the ad hoc advisory committee - were willing to accept the rhetoric without argument. It was the translation into a practical plan of action that the ad hoc committee thought worthwhile to question.

> Tom - We seem to have talked a good game in our rationale. But when it comes down to carrying it through in the development of the thing . . .
>
> Mary - We abandoned that a long time ago.
>
> Ted - That was abandoned from about the second week.
>
> Tom - Okay.
>
> Mary - When you go back and listen to the tapes, that was abandoned. It's interesting that, I think the advisory committee, in a sense, accepted the rationale, in that they've never really changed it. But then they've directed all of their attention to the second part of the thing, which is how are you going to do this. And in dealing with - "how are you going to do this - this is where the practicalities, the realities, the perceptions of what you can do, have shaped how we're coming to this.
>
> Ted - So the rationale's sort of become just empty rhetoric.
>
> Mary - It's something that everybody can agree on, and like, you can send out, you know, anybody who is on that committee would agree with the rationale.

Tom - Okay.

Mary - So it legitimizes the . . .

(April 11, 1980)

There was little or no discussion even on the part of the developers as to what was to go into the first part of the Proposal. One of the developers simply took it home one night and wrote it. After that it was not questioned. The developers devoted their attention to the second part.

The creation of products began even before the final version of the second part of the proposal was accepted.

2. What were the components of the curriculum building process?

Walker found four episodes in deliberation. These were issues, where two or more sides of a problem are advocated; reports, when others in the group are briefed on situations about which one member has privileged information; brainstorms, when ideas are generated in a brisk fashion; and explications, when one member explains some point to the others.

All of the above were found in the Mentor deliberations. However, by no means most of the meeting time was spent in deliberation. Much of it was devoted to other pursuits.

Those that were identified in the Mentor transcripts were organization, when time was devoted to tasks intended to keep things running smoothly; presentation, when one or more members would offer something which they had

involved a reminder by one member of what had been accomplished to date, and possibly, a listing of what had yet to be done; and invention, which involved the actual production of materials during meeting time.

In addition to the above, a social aspect to deliberation was discovered. Three plausibility structures were used to categorize this aspect of deliberation. Legitimations were used by the developers to justify or "legitimize" certain decisions, usually ones with which they were displeased. Nihilism, whereby "alternative reality interpretations are given a negative status" (Werner, 1977, p. 115) was used as a means of 'letting off steam.' Appeals to significant others were again used to justify decisions. The developers' significant others seem to have been research in the areas of learning theory and in-service education for teachers.

3. How were decisions made during the development process?

As Walker points out, one might have "the impression that the rest of the curriculum making task could be little more than a logical deduction from platform beliefs" (1975, p. 107).

He gives two reasons why this is not the case. First, the platform is incomplete.

> One cannot anticipate all the working principles he will need. As the work progresses the need for principles of some unexpected kind will become acute and they will be devised and incorporated into the platform. (1975, p. 107)

Second, platform statements are not specific enough to apply directly to problems that arise. A situation could fall under several such principles. In the light of one principle, it might be a desirable situation, while in the light of another, not so desirable. Therefore, deliberation is required in order to reach a decision as to what is best in each situation by establishing a hierarchy or principles.

> A project with a sound, comprehensive, but as yet unused platform is in somewhat the same position as our legal system when a new law has been passed. The formulation and passage of the law is only the beginning of an often extensive set of procedents that must be established as that law is applied to particular cases. (1975, p. 108)

Walker says of the Kettering Project, "the answer to how platform became operating policy is simply this: they argued about it" (1975, p. 109).

A number of issues arose during the deliberation phase of the Mentor Project. The major ones were these:

- Was the in-service program to rely on a leader or was it to be capable of being used independently by participants?

- Where were the classroom demonstrations to take place and who was to teach them?

- Should an in-service with the intent of teaching <u>about</u> inquiry, <u>use</u> inquiry?

- Where did the role of the developers end and that of ACCESS begin?

- Was the material for the videotaped classroom examples to be obtained from Kanata Kits and Teaching Units (material developed by Alberta Education) or could it be obtained elsewhere?

- Were teachers to choose between two modules dealing with the same inquiry skill, according to their preferred teaching styles (teacher-directed or teacher-student shared decision-making) or were aspects of each teaching style to be in one module?

According to Walker, "to be constrained by circumstances is the curriculum designer's strongest possible justification, for then he has no genuine choice" (1971, p. 55) when making a decision.

In coming to a decision on each one of these issues the developers appealed to circumstances in the form of the ad hoc advisory committee. If the advisory committee reached a particular decision on an issue, then the developers had no choice. They had to follow the direction of the committee.

It would seem that the developers never really took "ownership" of their products. As one developer said later, "We never put down something that we believed in and then stood up for it. We never said, 'We will not do this.'" (April, 1981).

There were several reasons for this unwillingness to take "ownership" of the products.

The first is connected with the fact that the developers accepted a directive role for the advisory committee. In short order, the advisory committee was no longer acting in an "advisory" capacity. The relationship between this committee and the developers was very much a superordinate-subordinate one.

> We just snapped to it. When they said, "We want examples from the Teaching Units and Kanata Kits," we said, "Yes, sir, how many do you want?" (April 10, 1981)

It was also a defense against the criticism of this committee. It became very discouraging to have things go to them and come back to be revised again and again.

In retrospect, one of the developers commented, "I can remember saying, 'There's no point in polishing it and putting it into finished form because they'll just suggest all kinds of corrections anyway'" (April 10, 1981). On one or more occasions two of the developers sent products in this unfinished state to the advisory committee, only to have them come back approved as they were!)

Time was also a factor here. Three of the members of the development committee were graduate students with full-time course loads and assistantships. The fourth grad student was working as a counsellor in a school system half-time, as well as taking courses and carrying an assistantship. The other two members of the team were professors with full teaching loads. The Mentor Project was over and above all of the other commitments, which both ethically and practically had to take first priority. Taking "ownership" of the products could have involved a great deal of time, defending them at advisory committee meetings, etc.

A reference was made to this during discussion of the issue of whether the classroom demonstrations should follow one class through a unit from start to finish or whether a different classroom should be used for each episode.

> Tom - I think what we've got to do is get all five of us to go and talk with the committee. Get an equal number of people working from that point of view. Because we sure got talked down on that one last time.
>
> Brad - We did.
>
> (Aug. 27, 1980)

In fact, one of the grad students did attend two or three of the advisory committee meetings, but he was the exception. (Whether or not members of the advisory committee would have wanted all of the developers attending their meetings is another question.)

The developers were able to cope with the restrictions which were imposed upon them (or which they allowed to be imposed upon them) by the ad hoc committee through a number of devices.

Humour was one such device. Looking through the transcripts of the development committee tapes, one can see that humour was a common thread throughout the meetings. Much of the humour, too, occurred outside the meetings, such as this example.

"It's like World War I really. We're in the trenches and just poke our heads above the trench and smile

and get a bayonet in the throat" (Mar. 12, 1981).

In another example the Mentor Project was likened to a tennis game. The grad students were depicted as ball boys. The professors were "off for coaching" but couldn't find the coach. The members of the advisory committee were depicted as serving balls at our throats and an individual on the advisory committee was crying "Foul," at every turn (Mar. 23, 1981).

As is the case in these two examples, much of the humour was directed against the advisory committee.

Another means of coping with this situation was through the use of nihilism, a means by which "alternative reality interpretations are given a negative status" (Werner, 1977, p. 115).

In many cases there was a degree of nihilism in the humour that was used, as in the above two examples.

In addition, nihilism was applied directly to the advisory committee, ACCESS, Alberta Education, the new social studies curriculum, and to the Kanata Kits and Teaching Units.

Not only was time a problem for the developers as individuals, in trying to cope with often frenetic schedules, but time seemed to be a problem for the project as a whole. There was very little time for reflection about what we were doing. No sooner was the Proposal written, than we were "hammering out" modules.

External events had a direct bearing on the need for haste in the project. The 1978 interim curriculum, which had originally been intended to be in place until 1982, was suddenly revised and appeared in final form in September of 1981. To assist in its implementation, $2.2 million was spent on hiring resource teachers to conduct in-service sessions. Mentor was now intended to be used as training material for this group of people, and secondly, as material for them to use in their in-service sessions with other teachers.

The never-ending revisions seem to be a common occurence in curriculum projects. Wooten, in his description of the School Mathematics Study Group, says that the "continuous writing and rewriting, discussion and criticism, suggesting and commenting was the very essence of SMSG production" (1965, p. 77).

It was certainly the essence of Mentor.

Of course, one difference between Mentor and this particular project, and others as well, is that in this project the writers came together in the summertime and spent their time working on the project exclusively. They were not hindered and harrassed by other commitments, so perhaps the continual revisions were not quite the burden that they were to the Mentor developers.

One unalterable fact about a Mentor development committee meeting was that one member would have to leave early to attend to another commitment, or that another would arrive late for the same reason.

Also, in the case of the SMSG project, the criticism came primarily from other developers. So, while someone might be judging your work today, you could be judging their's tomorrow. In the Mentor situation, it was a group of "outsiders" who did the criticizing. There was never any reciprocal exchange of products. This is perhaps why the developers became rather defensive about their work.

Shipman said:

> This was not a clear-cut, one-off operation, but an untidy affair, involving bargaining as much as abstract definition; a victim of more than one uneasy modification. (1974, p. 145)

Mentor was certainly a result of many an "uneasy modification," on the part of all of its stakeholders.

4. Are the products created by the development committee congruent with the basis from which they began their work?

The major difference between the intents expressed in the Proposal for the in-service program and what was actually developed lies in the extent to which teachers have a role in shaping their in-service experience.

In Draft #1 of the Proposal, teachers were to make a choice as to which one of four teaching patterns they wished to explore, on the basis of a self-awareness inventory and their own knowledge about themselves as teachers. In the third draft of the Proposal, the

four teaching patterns: teacher presenter, learning centres, learning contracts, and group investigation, had been changed to modules based on the inquiry process in the curriculum guide, with the addition of three modules on evaluation and one on valuing. In each case, there were two modules from which to choose, one for a teacher who preferred a teacher-director type of teaching mode and one for teachers who preferred to share decision-making with students.

Teachers, then, could choose, not only a module on the stage of the inquiry model they were most interested in learning about, but one in their preferred teaching mode.

However, over the course of development, the two modules were collapsed into one module, thus removing even that element of choice.

> Tom - . . . the rationale came down pretty strong on the need to try to involve teachers in the planning of their own experience, and accepting some responsibility for thinking about themselves and how they work in their classroom and, then out of that reflection, making some conscious decisions about what they want to, to experience, to learn about. And it just seems like we're sort of backing away from that somehow. The choices left open to teachers, really now, we've only one - which of these modules might I pick up and go through? So their decision-making role in shaping their own experience is really not, there's not much left.
>
> (April 11, 1980)

The self-awareness inventory now bore little relation to the only choice that teachers had to make.

In the same way as the element of choice gradually diminished as time went on, so did teachers' input into the in-service experience itself.

In looking at Draft #2 of the Openers module, teachers were asked to generate a list of characteristics of an effective Opener, based on an experience with an Opener, earlier in the module. By Draft #3, they are given a list of characteristics and asked to check the ones which they consider to be most important.

Implications

I. Implications for Practice

Shipman and others have lamented the lack of "experience of the job . . . to be done to serve as a guide to new curriculum development teams to use" (Shipman, 1974, p. 64).

As more developers or observers of development teams record their experiences, hopefully new teams will be able to avoid some of the pitfalls encountered by previous projects.

A number of points, which may be of use to others, emerge from the data gathered over the course of the Mentor Project.

The Outset of the Project

1. One contract which covers the entire project is preferable to separate contracts for parts of the project. By agreeing to a contract at the outset of a project, developers are clear as to what the expectations are for their role. If expectations differ, then this is the time either to come to a compromise or to reach a decision that the parties will not be able to work together. It is much easier to abandon a project at this point, than later, when part of the project has been completed. It is difficult to negotiate when one has already undertaken certain development commitments,

and has both an interest and a stake in the success of the project. In the case of Mentor, two separate contracts were signed; one near the beginning of the project, and thebther in June of 1980. When it came time to sign the second contract, the developers found that their role encompassed more than they had anticipated.

Another advantage of one contract is that it ensures the financial arrangements are set down in writing at the outset of the project. People's memories fade and even their understanding of arrangements at the time when they are made, can vary remarkably. If financial arrangements are taken care of at the outset, then they will not crop up later and cause negative feelings on the part of all parties involved. In the case of Mentor, the first contract covered a small piece of the total task and was for a very small sum of money. The developers and the other parties involved had widely different figures in mind, as to what had been originally agreed upon as the final total which they were to receive for their efforts. When it came time to sign the second contract, there were serious problems.

2. The context of a development committee and an ad hoc advisory committee seems a difficult one in which to work. If this, by necessity, is the situation, then the roles of each committee, and any individuals connected to, but not part of, the committee, should be made clear initially.

Developers then can make a decision as to whether or not they are prepared to work within the prescribed parameters.

3. Developers need to ensure at the outset of a project that the timelines are realistic. It is important that timelines allow for extensive pilotting and the possibility of extensive changes as a result. It is also important that developers have time to reflect on what they have done and where they are going. It might even be wise to consider secondment of the developers for a period of time, so that concentration on the project could be total.

4. Organizational matters, while seemingly of minor importance, do impinge upon the effectiveness of a project. Every project should have a permanent place to call its own. Preferably the "place" should be a locked room with plenty of storage space.

The Mentor Project did not have its own place for the first five months, and as a result, material was lost in transit and a great deal of time was spent prior to, and at the beginning of each meeting, in sorting through piles of papers picked up off desks and brought to the meeting place.

5. Educational program development is not for the weak in spirit. Developers need to be mentally prepared, at the outset of a project, for a stressful period in their lives.

> One cannot stress too strongly the emotional impact of the job, especially in the early stages. All of us experienced it as a 'shock to the system'. (Shipman, 1974, p. 136)

A developer needs to be determined, yet possess an ability to compromise. A developer needs to be intelligent, knowledgeable, and committed. A developer must have endless patience, a ready sense of humour, and a hard outer shell to withstand the 'slings and arrows' of pilot teachers and advisory committees.

6. Plan for inclusion of practising teachers on the development committee. The curriculum literature clearly points to the importance of practising teachers being members of development committees.

Shipman makes a distinction between

> (a) Teachers fully cooperating in the development from the start, including the defining of aims.
>
> (b) Teachers only helping a project to try out its materials and its suggested methods.
>
> (1974, p. 144)

The Mentor Project chose the second option (as did Shipman's Keele Project). Perhaps greater input from practising teachers during the development process would have made the program more acceptable to teachers when it came time to pilot.

<u>During the Project</u>

7. Be aware that many decisions take a great deal of time to reach. Be concerned about lengthy discourse only when it is trivial or repetitive.

8. Take the time to record the deliberations for future committees. Walker said, when beginning his research, that he "thought there must be a body of lore somewhere

that would enable curriculum makers to profit from the insights and mistakes of their predecessors" (1975, p. 92).

He soon discovered that this was not the case. Instead, he found what Schwab has referred to as a "virtual absence of record" (1975, p. viii) of the deliberations of development committees.

As more and more studies attempt to do this, there will be a picture built up of what educational program development is really like. It is only then that we can begin to build upon what has gone before.

9. Consider taping one or two meetings and then transcribing the tapes in order to study the language used. Ask how communication could be improved. Are some members of the committee dominating others? Is everyone given time to express opinions? Are people delineating their positions clearly, or are they making unwarranted assumptions that their meaning is understood?

10. Be aware that developers must tread a fine line between standing up for their own products and ideas and being open to the views of other stakeholders. This is not an easy task.

Shipman (1974) has probably done one of the most extensive studies available, portraying curriculum development and the roles of various stakeholders. He comes to the conclusion that program development is a process of "bargaining, negotiation and horsetrading" (1974, p. 43) between the parties involved. Perhaps this is the way it should be, with the final program a beneficiary of varied perspectives.

From a developer's point of view, this is not what happened with the Mentor Project. The mode became one of developers carrying their products to advisory committee meetings, where they were told how they were to be revised.

However, if developers wish to have a degree of autonomy, then they must exercise it. In an interview, a member of the ad hoc advisory committee stated that the developers had "allowed themselves" to become tied down to the use of the Kanata Kits and Teaching Units in the Mentor modules (April 6, 1981).

Until that point, we as developers, had considered ourselves as victims. But perhaps, victims are such because they 'allow themselves' to be victimized.

In a conversation long after the development of Mentor, two of the developers likened the development committee to a woman who is beaten by her husband. Instead of taking a stand, she complains to the neighbours of her harsh treatment, and then goes back for more (July 30, 1982). The analogy is apt, except that the developers complained to one another.

Connected to this is the aspect of "selling" things to other parties involved; in this case, the development team being the merchant and the ad hoc committee the shopper.

> Ted - But I suspect the committee will go for Number Three.

Susan - Then maybe we should present a strong argument for the other two.

Ted - I think we did. I think Tom did.

Susan - I do too.

Betty - You could sell that.

(Aug. 27, 1980)

Shipman (1972) refers to program development as a "busy marketplace" (p. 152). Perhaps the buying and selling should be reciprocal, rather than one party always doing the buying or rejecting and the other the selling.

Following the Project

Take time to evaluate the decision-making processes and to discuss ways in which practice could have been improved. What would we do differently another time? What implications can be drawn from our experience that might be of benefit to other developers?

II Implications for Further Research

Before we can judge the worth of contemporary practices, we must develop a thorough understanding of them.

Considerable reference has been made in this study to the dearth of research on the processes of program development. It should be noted that part of the reason for this is that not every curriculum development committee is amenable to having its deliberations recorded and made public. The members of the Mentor committee were somewhat unique in this regard.

This may have stemmed partly from the setting of the project and the backgrounds of the committee members. Research is, of course, a major reason for the existence of universities. If individuals at universities are going to use others as objects of research, then it seems only fair and reasonable that they, themselves, should be open to the same scrutiny. This is perhaps why the projects reported in the literature tend, with few exceptions, to be at universities, rather than at the school district level.

It is understandable that members of a development committee would be concerned about having their deliberations recorded for posterity. Remarks, presented out of context, sometimes do not convey the meaning intended. Sometimes statements are made, in the heat of the moment, tape recorder or not, that are regretted later. Also, almost anyone, no matter how well educated, appears somewhat incoherent when their words are put on paper exactly as they were uttered. The tendency to interrupt one another and to leave sentences unfinished, the long pauses, the "um's," and the "uh's," do not make individuals appear particularly articulate. Pseudonyms are a thin disguise at best, for those outsiders who know the committee members.

None of the developers expressed a concern about having language tidied up. These people were willing to let their words stand. By doing so, they allowed the

researcher to capture the true flavour of oral conversation. It is unlikely that all development committee members would be as willing to let this happen.

With that proviso, there are a number of areas in which the naturalistic model could contribute to further research. Walker (1971, pp. 60-63) has identified five of these areas, each of which has been delineated below. Some of the questions listed are the same as, or have been based on, those Walker has suggested. Others fit into his categories, but suggest slightly different directions for study.

1. The model itself contains propositions that need to be tried.

Do developers, in fact, share a greater body of common beliefs than one would expect of groups of similar composition? Do members of a development committee, in fact, appeal to a platform, or common body of beliefs, when making decisions? Do development committees with similar platforms conduct similar deliberations and produce similar designs?

2. The model provides a conceptual basis for descriptive studies of curriculum development.

What kinds of statements comprise a typical platform? Are they statements of aim? Are they theoretical statements? What kinds of issues are common to deliberation? What proportion of deliberation time is commonly spent dealing with issues, and what proportion is devoted to organization, updates, presentations,

explications, brainstorming, reports, and production? How many alternatives does a development group typically examine before coming to a decision? Does new information change decisions already made? What are the data sources commonly used in decision-making? Does decision-making commonly rest in the hands of one or two more powerful developers?

3. The model provides a conceptual basis for studies of the effectiveness of various design elements.

An important area which has received little research, is the problem of determining whether or not different design elements produce different results. In the case of an in-service program, examples of appropriate questions might be: Does group interaction result in a more effective program? What effect does building in a choice element for participants have on the perceived success of the program? Does group interaction in an in-service program result in the development of longterm support groups? How effective are support groups in facilitating change in the classroom?

4. The model could facilitate curriculum research by making it possible to formulate succinctly questions that have not received enough attention from curriculum specialists.

Walker points out that a model has an effect in

shaping the kinds of questions that are asked. For instance, the classical model, by its nature, has suggested studies into how to formulate objectives most effectively. The naturalistic model encourages studies in other areas.

Which grounds for justification are the most appropriate? (This involves studying the logical and empirical foundations of the process of justifying decisions.) Decisions are justified by many different means. Developers can go back to platform principles. They can incite an outside constraint as determining their decision. They can cite information which they have gathered, pertinent to the data at hand.

What is the most effective order in which to make decisions? By making decisions with widespread significance early in the development process, the scope of further decisions can be so reduced that many options are cut off before they can be considered. We need to study the consequences of looking at various kinds of questions at different points in deliberation.

5. The model should help to identify problems from other fields whose solution would facilitate curriculum development.

The field of psychology is directly related to the study of program development. What is the optimum size for a group which has the task of designing an educational program? Is a democratic model the most effective in terms of decision-making? What skills should members of

the committee possess? What should their backgrounds be? How do members of a development committee influence one another? What are the paths of influence in a particular development committee?

The purpose of this study was "to map an unfamiliar terrain" (Doyle & Ponder, 1976, p. 4). We have very little knowledge about the processes involved in the development of educational programs. As we become more familiar with the ways in which educational programs are actually developed, we will be able to make informed decisions about how they should be developed.

Reference List

Abramson, D. A. Curriculum research and evaluation. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 388-395.

ACCESS and Alberta Education. Mentor Project. Edmonton, Alberta: ACCESS, 1981.

Alberta Education. 1978 Alberta social studies curriculum interim edition. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education, 1978.

Alberta Education. 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education, 1981.

Alberta Report. $2.2 million to prevent a flop. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Report Ltd., May 15, 1981.

Allen, D. W. In-service teacher training: A modest proposal. In L. J. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Arrends, R. I. Concepts for grading responsive inservice education in schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Teacher Corps. Project, 1979.

Bacon, R. Inservice in Britain: INSET or inservice education and training. Elements: Translating Theory Into Practice, 1980, 12, 1-2.

Bailey, S. K. Teachers' centres: A British first. Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 53(3), 146-149.

Bain, R. K. The researcher's role: A case study. In R. N. Adams & J. J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research: Field relations and techniques. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960.

Baldwin, R. F. The effects of teacher in-service training and knowledge of research on spelling instruction and achievement of elementary school children. Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 7847A.

Berger, P. A rumour of angels: Modern society and the rediscovery of the supernatural. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Implementation of educational innovation. Educational Forum, 1976, 40, 345-370.

Blake, W. Annotations to Sir Joshua Reynold's Discourses, 1798-1809.

Boag, N.H. Teacher perception of curricular change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1980

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S.J. Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Bolam, R. Innovation in the in-service education and training of teachers: Practice and theory. Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, 1978.

Bollens, J.C., & Marshall, D.R. A guide to participation: Field work, role playing cases, and other forms. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Boschee, F., & Hein, D.D. How effective is inservice education? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 427.

Boyce, T. Teacher-staff perspective of curriculum change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation proposal, The University of Alberta, 1981.

Brimm, J.L., & Tollett, D.J. How do teachers feel about in-service education? Educational Leadership, 1974, 31, 521-525.

Bruner, J. The process of education revisited. Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 53(1), 18-21.

Bruyn, S.T. The human perspective in sociology: The methodology of participant observation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Bush, R.N. Curriculum-proof teachers: Who does what to whom. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Butler, P. The tap code: Ascribed meanings in prisoner of war communications. Urban Life, 1977, 5 (4), 399-416.

Cane, B. Meeting teachers; needs. In R. Watkins (Ed.), In-service training: Structure and content. London: Ward Lock Education, 1973.

Caston, J. The Schools Council in context. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1971, 3(1), 50-64.

Chamberlin, C. & Crowther, F. Elementary social studies: Where are we? What's ahead? The A.T.A. magazine, 1973, 53(5), 13-17.

Chamberlin, C., McCarthy, M., & Shortt, M. Recommendations to the Minister of Education: In-service for the 1978 Social Studies Curriculum - Position of the ATA Social Studies Council Executive. October 10, 1979.

Cole, S. The sociological method (2nd ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1976.

Connors, B., Chamberlin, C., Clark, P., Graham, E., Irvine, J., & Massey, D. The mentor series proposal. University of Alberta, 1980.

Connors, B., Wright, I., Geddes, K., & Grant, J. Reform or reaction?: The new social studies program in Alberta. The History and Social Science Teacher, 1980, 15, 115-118.

Cooley, W.W., & Lohnes, P.R. Evaluation research in education. New York: Irvington Publishers Inc., 1976.

Crowther, F.A. Factors affecting the rate of adoption of the 1971 Alberta Social Studies Curriculum for Elementary Schools. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, 1972.

Cruickshank, D.R., Lorish, C., & Thompson, L. What we think we know about inservice education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(1), 27-31.

Cusick, P.A. Inside high school: The student's world. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Cuyler, F.O. The docent's interpretation of stated gallery philosophy: A comparison of docent training programs in three Canadian art galleries. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, 1980.

Dalton, M. Men who manage. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Daniels, L.B., & Elliott, M. Alberta in Wonderland: Some comments on a curriculum rationale. Journal of Education (U.B.C.)., 1974, No. 20, 63-80.

Davies, D.R., & Armistead, C.D. Inservice education: Current trends in school policies and programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1975.

Davis, E., Maier, G., & Mitzman, B. In-service education and its relation to higher education. In A. Osborne (Ed.), An in-service handbook for mathematics education. Reston, Virginia: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1977.

Davis, F. Comment on "Initial interaction of newcomers in Alcoholics Anonymous." In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Dawson, A.J. Criteria for the creation of in-service education programs. Canadian Journal of Education, 1978, 3, 49-60.

deLeeuw, G., & Zelinski, V. Alberta social studies curriculum: A guide to confusion? The A.T.A. Magazine, 1975, 56(2), 31-33.

Denzin, N.K. The logic of naturalistic inquiry. Social Forces, 1971, 50, 166-182.

Department of Education. Experiences in decision-making, elementary social studies handbook. Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1971.

Department of Education. The social studies scene. Edmonton, Alberta: Department of Education, June, 1972.

L.W. Downey Research Associates Ltd. The social studies in Alberta--1975: A report of an assessment. Edmonton, Alberta: The Department of Education, 1975.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. The practicality ethic in teacher decision-making. Paper presented to the Milwaukee Curriculum Theory Conference, November 12, 1976.

Drummond, W.H. Don't give up on inservice Harry. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(1), 39-41.

Edmonton Journal. Edmonton, Alberta: Southam Inc., May 20, 1981.

Eisner, E.W. Educational objectives: Help or hindrance. School Review, 1967, 75, 29-47.

Eisner, E.W. Curriculum development: Sources for a foundation for the field of curriculum. In E.W. Eisner (Ed.), Confronting curriculum reform. Chicago: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Eliot, T.S. Four quarters. Burnt Norton, 1935.

Erikson, K.T. A comment on disguised observation in sociology. In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Feinberg, M.W. An analysis of guidelines for in-service teacher education practices in selected schools - grades 5-9. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1974. Cited in Wilen, W.W., and Kindsvatter, R. Implications of research for effective in-service education. Clearing House, 1978, 51, 392-396.

Field, P.A. An ethnography: Four nurses' perspectives of nursing in a community health setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1980.

Flanders, T. Summary report: Professional development study. Vancouver: Professional Development Division, British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1980.

Francombe, B. Alberta social studies--"Mickey-Mouse - or man-size?" The A.T.A. Magazine, 1972, 52(4), 17-19.

Frey, W.P. How to keep those new programs alive and well. Educational Leadership, 1980, 37, 208-210.

Fullan, M. Overview of the innovative process and the user. Interchange, 1972, 3, 1-46.

Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 335-397.

Gallaher, A., Jr. Plainville: The twice-studied town. In A. Vidich, J. Bensman, & M.R. Stein (Eds.), Reflections on community studies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Geer, B. Studying a college. In R.W. Habenstein (Ed.), Pathways to data: Field methods for studying ongoing social organizations. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Gold, R.L. Roles in sociological observations. In B.J. Franklin & H.W. Osborne (Eds.), Research methods: Issues and insights. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.

Graham, E. Multiple realities in a social studies classroom: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation proposal, The University of Alberta, 1981.

Gullahorn J., & Strauss, G. The field worker in union research. In R.N. Adams & J.J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research: Field relations and techniques. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960.

Gunn, A. New social studies in Canada. Social Education, 1971, 35, 665-666.

Hayden, R., & Lloyd, D. A review of research on in-service projects related to mainstreaming the handicapped child. Unpublished paper, Edmonton, Alberta, 1980.

Henderson, E.S. The evaluation of in-service teacher training. London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1978.

Hentschel, D. Change theory applied to inservice education. Planning and Changing, 1977, 8, 103-114.

Honnigmann, J.J. The personal approach in cultural anthropological research. Current Anthropology, 1976, 17, 243-261.

Hughes, E.C. French Canada: The natural history of a research. In A. Vidich, J. Bensman, & M.R. Stein (Eds.), Reflections on community studies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Hulleman, H.C. An Eisner look at the new (?) Alberta social studies curriculum. One World, 1979-80, 18(2), 5-9.

Humphreys, L. Tearoom trade: Impersonal sex in public places. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Hurd, P.D. Biological education in American secondary schools: 1890-1960. Washington, D.C.: American Institute of Biological Sciences, 1961.

Jarolimek, J. A model for in-service teacher education. Social Education, 1970, 34, 329-332.

Johnston, G.S., & Yeakey, C.C. Administrators' and teachers' preferences for staff development. Planning and Changing, 1977, 8, 230-238.

Jones, L.L., & Hayes, A.E. How valid are surveys of teacher needs? Educational Leadership, 1980, 37, 390-392.

Joyce, B. The state of the art. Elements: Translating Theory Into Practice, 1980, 12, 2.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 1980, 37, 379-385.

Junker, B.H. Field work: An introduction to the social sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Lawrence, G. Patterns of effective inservice education: A state of the art summary of research on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in inservice education. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Department of Education, 1974.

Ledgerwood, C.D. Preparing decision-makers for the seventies. The A.T.A. Magazine, 1970, 50(3), 8-11.

Ledgerwood, C.D. Toward a conceptualization of ideal styles of curriculum decision-making in small groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1975.

Ledgerwood, D. Introduction to winter issue of One World. One World, 1979-80, 18(2), 4.

Liebow, E. Tally's corner: A study of Negro streetcorner men. Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, Inc., 1967.

Lippitt, R., & Fox, R. Development and maintenance of effective classroom learning. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Lofland, J. Reply to Davis' comment on "Initial interaction." In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Lofland, J.F., & Lejeune, R.A. Initial interaction of newcomers in Alcoholics Anonymous: A field experiment in class symbols and socialization. In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Lutz, F.W., & Ramsey, M.A. The use of anthropological field methods in education. Educational Researcher, 1974, 3(11), 5-9.

Lytton, H. A critique of the new social studies. One World, 1972, X(2), 1-6.

Maguire, T.O. Decisions and curriculum objectives: A methodology for evaluation. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 15, 17-30.

Massey, D.L. Social studies for the seventies--Sense and nonsense. One World, 1973, 12(2), 18-29.

Massey, D. A handbook for unit planners. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education, 1978.

Master's Degree Candidates in Elementary Education (1980-81), & Therrien, S. Inservice education in public schools: A review of research. Elements: Translating Theory Into Practice, 1980, 12, 4-6.

Mauksch, H.O. Studying the hospital. In R.W. Habenstein (Ed.), Pathways to data: Field methods for studying ongoing social organizations. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

McCall, G.J., & Simmons, J.L. (Eds.). Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

McClure, R. Procedures, processes, and products in curriculum development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of California, Los Angeles, 1965.

McLaughlin, M.W. Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. Teachers College Record, 1976, 77, 339-351.

McLeod, G.T. Educational governance as theatre: A study of interaction underlying Alberta school boards' collective agreements with teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1976.

Meade, E.J., Jr. No health in us. In L.J. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Millikan, R.H. Consultative needs and practices in selected senior high schools in Alberta. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1979.

Nash, C., & Ireland, D. In-service education: Cornerstone of curriculum development - Or stumbling block? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Saskatoon, June 6, 1979.

Odynak, E. Kanata Kit One: A classroom experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1981.

Osborne, A. (Ed.). An in-service handbook for mathematics education. Reston, Virginia: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1977.

Osborne, A., & Bowling, J.M. Supervisors and in-service education. In A. Osborne (Ed.), An in-service handbook for mathematics education. Reston, Virginia: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1977.

Pearsall, M. Participant observation as role and method in behavioral research. In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Polsky, N. Hustlers, beats and others. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969.

Ragan, W. Modern elementary curriculum (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Rapport, R., & Rapport, R.N. Leisure and the family life cycle. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Reid W. The changing curriculum: Theory and practice. In W.A. Reid, & D.F. Walker (Eds.), Case studies in curriculum change: Great Britain and the United States. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Reid. W. Thinking about the curriculum: The nature and treatment of curriculum problems. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Reid. W.A. Practical reasoning and curriculum theory: In search of a new paradigm. Curriculum Inquiry, 1979, 9, 187-207.

Reid, W.A., & Walker, D.F. (Eds.). Case studies in curriculum change: Great Britain and the United States. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Richardson, S.A. A framework for reporting field-relations experiences. In R.N. Adams, & J.J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research: Field relations and techniques. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960.

Ridgeway, D. CHEM Study: The story of a successful curriculum project. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Sons, 1969.

Reimer, J.W. Varieties of opportunistic research. Urban Life, 1977, 5, 467-477.

Roth, J. Timetables. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Roth, J. Comments on "Secret Observation." In W.J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago, Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Rowen, T.E., Capehart, E., & Sharpe, G.H. Characteristics of successful in-service programs. In A. Osborne (Ed.), An in-service handbook for mathematics education. Reston, Virginia: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1977.

Roy, D. The study of southern labor union organizing campaigns. In R.W. Habenstein (Ed.), Pathways to data: Field methods for studying ongoing social organizations. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Ryor, J., Shanker, A., & Sandefur, J.T. Three perspectives on inservice education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 13-19.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A.L. Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973.

Schwab, J.J. The practical: A language for curriculum. School Review, 1969, 78, 1-23.

Schwab, J.J. The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. School Review, 1973, 81(4), 501-522.

Schwab, J.J. Foreward. In W.A. Reid & D.F. Walker (Eds.), Case studies in curriculum change: Great Britain and the United States. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1975.

Schwartz, M.S. The mental hospital: The research person in the disturbed ward. In A. Vidich, J. Bensman, and M.R. Stein (Eds.), Reflections on community studies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Searle, D. Directions for inservice in Alberta. Elements: Translating theory into practice, 1980, 12, 6-7.

Shaw, K.E. Negotiating curriculum change in a college of education. In W.A. Reid, & D.F. Walker (Eds.), Case studies in curriculum change: Great Britain and the United States. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Shipman, M.D. Contrasting views of a curriculum project. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1972, 4, 145-153.

Shipman, M.D. Inside a curriculum project: A case study in the process of curriculum change. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1974.

Silverblank. F. Analyzing the decision-making process in curriculum projects. Education, 1979, 99, 414-418.

Slater, S.E. The teachers' centre as a base for professional growth and innovation in education with particular reference to the current state of such centres in Canada. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1980.

Smith, H.W. Strategies of social research: The methodological imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Smith, L., & Keith, P. Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. Toronto, Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Smith, L.M., & Pohland, P.A. Education, technology, and the rural highlands. In D. Sjogren (Ed.), AERA monograph series on evaluation 7. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1974.

Spradley, J.P. The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979.

Stake, R. The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7, 5-8.

Syrus, Publilius. Maxim 469, First Century, B.C.

Taba, H. Curriculum development: Theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962.

Taylor, P.H. An exploratory study of teachers' perceptions of the process of planning courses. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 40, 253-259.

Tough, A. Learning without a teacher. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1967.

Tough, A. A study of the major reasons for beginning and continuing a learning project. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Tough, A. Why adults learn. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Tough, A. The adults' learning projects. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.

Trentham, L.L. Auburn's cooperatively governed teacher centre. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(5), 16-18.

Tri-Partite Committee on Inservice Education. Inservice education for implementation of new and revised programs: A study conducted for Alberta Education, Edmonton, Alberta. Unpublished paper, October, 1980.

Tyler, R.W. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Vickers, G. The art of judgment. London: Chapman & Hall, 1965.

Vidich, A., & Bensman, J. The validity of field data. In R.N. Adams, & J.J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research: Field relations and techniques. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960.

Walker, D. A case-study of the process of curriculum development. Mimeographed, Stanford University, July, 1969.

Walker, D. Toward more effective curriculum development projects in art. Studies in Art Education, 1970, 11(2), 3-13.

Walker, D. A naturalistic model for curriculum development. School Review, 1971, 80, 51-65.

Walker, D. A study of deliberation in three curriculum projects. In F.M. Connelly (Ed.), Curriculum Theory Network Monograph Supplement Elements of Curriculum Development, 1971, 118-134.

Walker, D. Strategies of deliberation in three curriculum development projects. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.

Walker, D. What curriculum research? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1973, 5, 51-65.

Walker, D. Curriculum development in an art project. In W.A. Reid & D.F. Walker (Eds.), Case studies in curriculum change: Great Britain and the United States. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1975.

Watkins, R. The role of the school in in-service training. In R. Watkins (Ed.), In-service training: Structure and content. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1973.

Wax, R.H. Twelve years later: An analysis of field experience. In R.N. Adams & J.J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research: Field relations and techniques. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1960.

Werner, W. A study of perspective in social studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1977.

Whyte, W.F. Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Whyte, W.F. Organizational behavior: Theory and application. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1969.

Wilen, W.W., & Kindsvatter, R. Implications of research for effective in-service education. Clearing House, 1978, 51, 392-396.

Williamson, J.B., Karp, D.A., & Dalphin, J.R. The research craft: An introduction to social science methods. Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.

Wise, R.I. The use of objectives in curriculum planning: A critique of planning by objectives. Curriculum Theory Network, 1976, 5, 280-289.

Wise, R.I., & Peshkin, A. Retrospective analysis as a source of knowledge about curriculum development. 1977 AERA Annual Meeting: Abstracts of papers and symposia. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1977.

Wolcott, H. The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Wolcott, H. Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. Human organization, 1975, 34, 111-127.

Wood, F.H., & Thompson, S.R. Guidelines for better staff development. Educational Leadership, 1980, 37, 374-378.

Wooten, W. SMSG: The making of a curriculum. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Yancey, W.L., & Rainwater, L. Problems in the ethnography of the urban underclass. In R.W. Habenstein (Ed.), Pathways to data: Field methods for studying ongoing social organizations. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Young, E. Inservice education - A guide to effective practice. Unpublished paper, July 26, 1979.

Zigarmi, P., Betz, L., & Jensen, D. Teachers' preferences in and perceptions of in-service education. Educational Leadership, 1977, 34, 545-551.