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.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

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.

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

NL 339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

0-315-19369-7

(21)

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

67277

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
TERRANCE RONALD CARSON

Date of Birth — Date de naissance
21 AUGUST, 1944

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
CANADA.

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe
4612 - 124 ST.
EDMONTON, ALBERTA.
T6H 3T7

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse
A HERMENEUTIC INVESTIGATION OF THE MEANING OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION FOR CONSULTANTS AND TEACHERS.

University — Université
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

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

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade
1984

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
DR. T. AOKI

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
April 18/84

Signature

NL 91 (4 77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A HERMENEUTIC INVESTIGATION OF THE MEANING OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION FOR CONSULTANTS AND TEACHERS

by

© TERRANCE R. CARSON

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Terrance R. Carson

TITLE OF THESIS A Hermeneutic Investigation of the Meaning of Curriculum Implementation for Consultants and Teachers

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1984

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

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.

(Signed) . . . .

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

4612 - 124 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

DATED April 18 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Hermeneutic Investigation of the Meaning of Curriculum Implementation for Consultants and Teachers" submitted by Terrance R. Carson in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

....
Supervisor

....

....

Harry Garfinkle
....

....

....
External Examiner

Date April 18, 1984

A DEDICATION

In loving memory of my father Dr. George Donaldson Carson who devoted a lifetime to helping others to become more fully human.

And

To the memory of Wendy Mitchell, a tireless and dedicated social studies educator.

ABSTRACT

This study makes problematic the relationship between a conception of curriculum implementation as a rationally planned action and educators' orientations towards the improvement of their own practices. Such a distinction between institutionally managed change and the concern of educators to improve education raises important questions for school practice. This study investigates this distinction with teachers and consultants in the context of their experiences in implementing a newly mandated provincial social studies curriculum.

An interpretation of the meaning of the relationship between the management of change through implementation and the intentions of educators raises questions about our typical ways of planning and acting in school curriculum settings. This leads to a hermeneutic questioning of the technological presuppositions which underlie social action. A hermeneutic questioning is made possible by critically reflecting upon these typical modes of planning and acting in public schools in the context of a particular situation of curriculum change.

Conversations with three consultants and three teachers participating in the curriculum change form the principal approach in this investigation. The mode of research is informed by insights gained from an understanding of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics relating conversation to questioning. According to Gadamer the ontological structure of a genuine question is one of openness lying in the direction of that which is questionable. Conversation as a mode of research allows the participants as educators to pursue the question

objectively as a problem of practice, while at the same time acknowledging its implications for them as practitioners.

The procedures followed in the implementation of the 1981 Alberta Social Studies Curriculum were guided by recent research findings about factors which influence the school change process. The administrative use of these research conclusions to control and manage the curriculum change produces contradictory results for the participants. These contradictions originate in a fundamental difference between the practical rationality of the participants' concerns and the technical rationality of administrative action rooted in a bureaucratic requirement that the change be managed by transforming it into a rationally planned action.

The existence of a tension between conceptualizations of curricular ends as objects of administrative action and a change process as a situational praxis of the participants is not new to teaching. However, this study concludes that traditional mediations which might serve to practically resolve these contradictions are now being anticipated through research into practice and are themselves becoming objects of bureaucratic control. This contributes to a growing technological penetration of the lifeworld of both teaching and consulting. An understanding of these effects helps to indicate the shape of alternative school improvement activities which are based upon a self-transformative practice of the actors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been helped by the advice, support and example of many teachers, colleagues, friends and family during the course of this research. I wish to acknowledge them here.

I feel especially fortunate in having a most supportive and scholarly supervisory committee; Professor Ted Aoki as chairman, and Professors Harry Garfinkle, Bruce Bain and Max van Manen as committee members. I would like to thank them both for their collective help as a committee and for their individual contributions to my thinking about the various aspects of the research question; to Professor Garfinkle for introducing me to critical theory and historical social analysis and for his kindly advice and incisive criticism as I attempted to apply it; to Professor Bain for his help and encouragement in my efforts to understand an existential phenomenological view of language and for his deep interest in many aspects of the study; and to Professor van Manen for his helpful advice concerning Continental philosophy and phenomenological research and for his continued reminders about the essential purposes of curriculum research. As chairman of my supervisory committee Professor Ted Aoki has been a true mentor, sharing in the excitement of the question, showing an unflagging confidence in my ability to pursue it, and serving as an example of scholarship and teaching that I hope someday to be able to emulate. Despite my frequent hesitations and self-doubts he continued to nudge me ahead, guiding the way by pointing to new opportunities and presenting exactly the right question at the appropriate time. I wish to convey my special thanks to Ted as teacher, colleague and friend.

I have also been very fortunate in having Professors Ken Jacknicke and Bill Pinar as members of the examining committee. Professor Jacknicke's supportive and probing questioning was much appreciated. Professor Pinar's work in reconceptualizing curriculum theory has been both an inspiration and a guide in my research into curriculum implementation. His participation as external examiner is, therefore, especially gratifying and his questions and advice have been most helpful in suggesting future research directions.

I would like to thank a number of social studies educators who have given of their time and thoughts about curriculum as conceptualized and school practice. Their words speak of their life-long commitment to children and school improvement. Here I would especially like to thank Hans Bernard, Jackie Hobal, Roberta MacKay, Mike Burke, Ed Harasim, Sheila Mawson, and the late Wendy Mitchell.

The learning community of the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta has been an especially rich one within which to do curriculum research. I would like to particularly mention both the institutionalization of the doctoral research learning community in the form of the Ed CI 690 seminar, as well as the informal community of friends and colleagues meeting over coffee or in seminars formed by graduate students. Informal meetings of this kind were immensely valuable testing places for ideas in an atmosphere of scholarly inquiry. Fellow graduate students Eric Burt, Basil Favaro, Linda Peterat, Michael Bopp, Eric Chappell and Roger Neil have all been influential and helpful with various asppects of this research. I am especially indebted to Angeline Martel and David Smith whose knowledge and interest in language, hermeneutics and pedagogy have helped to shape the direction of my questioning.

I would like to thank my friend and neighbour Margaret Voice for her patience and speedy typing of the conversation summaries during the research. Her care and expertise in typing the dissertation has also been most helpful.

[illegible]ly, the dissertation has been completed with the loving suppo[illegible] of my family. I am especially grateful to my wife Rillah whose teaching and consultative experience helped me to keep my feet on the ground, and to my children Richard and Sarah who are glad that daddy has at last "passed his dissertation."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. SITUATING AND ORIENTING THE QUESTION OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION 1

Introduction 1

Purpose of the Study 2

Research Questions 3

Organization of the Study 3

Limitations of the Study 5

Definitions 6

Autobiographical Reflections 8

II. CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION AND THE CURRICULUM FIELD . . . 15

Introduction 15

Curriculum, Public Education and the State: The Historical Context of the Implementation Problem . . . 18

The General Problem of Providing Public Education 18

Mass Education and the Emergence of the Curriculum Field 19

Technical Reality and the Growth of State Involvement in Education 21

The Implementation Problem is Created 25

Alternative Modes of Viewing Curriculum Implementation 29

Criticism of the Traditional Field 29

The Reconceptualist View 29

The Deliberationist View 31

The Critical Interpretive View 32

Chapter Page

The Radical View 35

Reconceptualism-Revisited: Linking Story and Structure 36

III. CONDUCTING THE QUESTIONING OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION 39

Introduction 39

The Development of Modern Hermeneutics 44

Explanation and Understanding: The Hermeneutic Question 44

Schleiermacher and Dilthey's Epistemological Hermeneutics 47

Challenges to Rational Knowing 50

Gadamer: Philosophical Hermeneutics 52

Criticism and Hermeneutics 56

Hermeneutics as Distanciation and Participation 58

The Conduct of Research Using a Conversation . . . 63

The Nature of Conversation 64

Conversation as Distanciation and Participation 67

Conducting the Research 69

Context of the Questioning 73

Historical Context 74

The Curriculum Guide 76

Learning Resources 78

The Inservice Programme 78

IV. THE PARTICIPANTS' MEANINGS 82

Diane 86

Chapter Page

Her Background 86

Our Relationship 86

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation 89

Linda 103

Her Background 103

Our Relationship 104

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation 106

Jennifer 120

Her Background 120

Our Relationship 120

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation 123

Jim 133

His Background 133

Our Relationship 133

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation 138

Fred 155

His Background 155

Our Relationship 156

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation 158

[illegible] 173

Her Background 173

Our Relationship 174

Themes of Conversation 177

V. REFLECTIONS ON THE RESEARCH 198

Introduction 198

Chapter Page

Working in the School System: Mediating Technical Control and Pedagogical Concern 201

Contradiction between Inquiry as an Attitude toward Teaching/Learning and Inquiry as a Model 203

Contradictions between Helping Children and Citizenship Production 209

A Contradiction between Education as Having an Enlarged Understanding and Outcomes Based Education 213

Contradictions and Educational Practice 215

The School as the Site of Conflicts between Technical and Practical Perspectives of Teaching 218

Being Technical and Being Practical as Educators 220

Managing Teaching through Rationally Planned Acts 223

Collegial Relationships are Becoming Objects of Control 225

A Tendency towards a Standardization and Control over School Outcomes is Reinforced 227

The Erosion of Practical Reason 228

Some Concluding Observations 230

Towards Improved Practice 233

BIBLIOGRAPHY 237

APPENDIX A. INTRODUCTORY LETTER AND INITIATING QUESTIONS TO TEACHERS AND CONSULTANTS 249

APPENDIX B. TRANSCRIPT SUMMARY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH A PARTICIPANT (LINDA) 256

APPENDIX C. PARTICIPANTS' REFLECTIONS ON THE RESEARCH 305

APPENDIX D. DISSERTATION WRITING: A PERSONAL HISTORY 313

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. A Comparison of Bureaucracy, Technical Curriculum Theory and Scientific Management 23

2. Participants' Themes 84

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure | Table

1. Social Inquiry Model 77

Chapter I

SITUATING AND ORIENTING THE QUESTION OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

> There is a need to bridge the gap between the printed curriculum and classroom practice. (Chamberlin and Crowther, 1973, p. 17)

> We conclude that the Master Plan is still, five years after its creation, far more than an idea in the minds of its creators than it is a guide to Social Studies education in the classrooms of the province. ("Downey Report," 1975, p. 7)

> You know it's really frustrating . . . how the inquiry process on a philosophical base is so exciting and you see what's happening to it [in implementation]. In the name of inquiry the opposite of real inquiry is being done. (Jennifer, Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

> Between the idea
> And the reality
> Between the Motion
> And the act
> Falls the Shadow
> (T. S. Eliot, *The Hollow Men*)

Introduction

This is a study of the meaning of curriculum implementation for a group of consultants and teachers engaged in the implementation of a social studies curriculum declared mandatory by the provincial department of education. These participants are immersed in the practical task of translating a rationalized plan for action, in the form of a curriculum guide, into classroom practice. Some of the potential implementation problems had already been anticipated by means of a thorough evaluation of the difficulties experienced with the preceding curriculum. This, coupled with research literature on effective inservice practices, was used to design an extensive programme of inservice teacher education at a considerable cost. In order to further obviate possible implementation problems, an $8 million grant was provided by the provincial government from a special trust fund to produce an array of teacher and student resource materials supporting the new curriculum. These resources, and the inservice plan based on the research literature have enabled the production of a rational plan of action for the implementation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to question the extent to which our hopes for children and society find meaning and are realized through the taken for granted technical rationality of installing a plan into practice which informs this, and many other efforts at school innovation. The situation of the participants in this study is a common one for teachers and curriculum consultants who work, as do most educators, in bureaucratically structured state school systems. As participants, they are endeavouring to institute a mode of teaching which will improve children's learning and will help to realize key aspects of society's goals. In this case, the aim is to prepare children to become concerned citizens, skilled in the investigation of public issues, through a social inquiry process of teaching.

The goals of this curriculum are clear and the implementation is carefully planned, but the results are complex and, in many ways, contradictory. The meaning that the curriculum implementation holds for the participants forces us to consider again the nature of the relationship between improving teaching and the task of curriculum development in school systems. On a still more fundamental level, the purpose of this study is to reflect more deeply on who we are as educators and to ask what possibilities exist for us to improve educational practice within schools as institutions for public education.

Research Questions

There are three questions which have guided this research. They are as follows:

1. What do the concrete acts and objects of curriculum implementation, i.e., inservices, the teaching/learning resources, curriculum guides, etc., mean to the participants?

2. What do these acts, objects and meanings reveal about the way we live as educators within institutionalized educational settings?

3. What possibilities exist for reforming current practices so that curriculum implementation will fulfill the participants' desires for better education?

Organization of the Study

The dissertation, which poses a problem of practice, begins with a recollection of my own practical experience with curriculum implementation as the originating point of the research. In Chapter II these reflections will join the conversation about curriculum implementation which exists in the literature in order to situate historically and conceptually my questioning of implementation. The review of this literature shows how curriculum implementation finds its roots in the managerial origins of the field. It also shows how curriculum theorizing, critical of the technical rationality, which makes "implementation as installation" possible, has tended to critique at the level of theory, over the heads of the participants caught within the very real constraints of working within a public education system.

A hermeneutic mode of research seems to offer possibilities for engaging participants in a critical reflection of their own concrete experiences of curriculum implementation. Chapter III sketches a brief history of the development of hermeneutics as inquiry into the human sciences. Drawing upon Gadamer's (1975) example of conversation as being illustrative of the universality of the hermeneutic situation, I explore the features of conversation as a means of hermeneutic questioning.

The meaning of curriculum implementation for the consultants and teachers is presented in Chapter IV in the form of various themes which have emerged from the conversations. In Chapter V these themes are drawn together in the form of several conclusions about the relationship between the implementation of a rationalized representation of teaching contained in the curriculum and the lived world of teaching. These conclusions point to a technical reason which transmutes the educators' wishes to improve schools into the production of more effective mechanisms of control over teaching and consulting. This leads, in turn, to a final concluding question—Is it possible for emancipatory change to take place within the bureaucratized structures of public education?

Limitations of the Study

As a reflection on situational practice, this study does not make a statistical claim that the actors in this study are representative of the general population of secondary social studies teachers and consultants. Nor is there any claim that specific features of the research have a general predictive validity. The research is generalizable to the extent that readers as participants in the educational enterprise share in an experience of schools as institutionalized structures for education. The research ~~is~~ generalizable, too, in the sense that readers share in an ethical commitment to making schools more educational places. As such the study is a part of what Max Stephens refers to as "practical discourse," a guide to practical action (Stephens, 1982, p. 87).

In Chapter III I relate the question of validity to hermeneutics as participation and distanciation. Research conducted as conversation for the participants, and as a written text for the readers, becomes a means by which we distance ourselves from practice and permit critical reflection to take place. Distanciation, however, does not remove the essential belongingness that we as educators have to the educational enterprise. A hermeneutical awareness of our situatedness as actors acting in this setting returns to us as we appropriate the insights gained in critical reflection.

Definitions

The term curriculum implementation is defined broadly as being the process intended to bring about a planned educational change. The act of implementing curricula *in plenum* (in-filling) encompasses activities such as inservice sessions and meetings aimed at introducing and discussing the change, as well as written documents, like curriculum guides and new resource materials, which are intended to accompany and clarify the proposed change for the audience.

By defining curriculum implementation in this way, I am at risk in seeming to support an instrumentalist separation of theory and practice. With writers like Fay (1975) and Freire (1973), I note that any conception of the relation between knowledge and action in social life is a political theory. The claim that curriculum specialists as policy scientists may recommend an efficient course of action for reaching social goals through schooling, also claims for them a right to dominate teachers and consultants responsible for putting these goals into action. The fact that the participants are familiar with the term curriculum implementation and its implied assumptions already points to the existence of a taken for granted structure of domination. By questioning the meaning of curriculum implementation, I seek to make problematic the commonsense assumption of the neutrality of the theory into practice mode of acting.

At this point I wish to introduce a second term, educational practice, as a counter balance to an assumed technological relationship between theory and practice contained in the term curriculum implementation. Education as *e ducare*—a leading out is a leading out of children—*pedagogy*. A leading out from "which" and to "what" is not defined because any definition would not be sufficient to conveying precisely what "it" is. This is an important difference between practical and technical reason implied first by Aristotle in the distinction he makes between making and doing. One reflects on the meaning of justice not to know what it is, but to be just (cf. Lobkowicz, 1967, p. 12). What teachers are involved in doing in educational practice is not only putting some predefined theory into action, although there is a certain amount of technique which is like this, they are more fundamentally concerned with leading children to the good.

Gadamer's (1982) essay on practice indicates the sort of initial distinction which I would also like to make between technical theories of education and practical theorizing about education. Practical theorizing consists of reflecting on the universal, the idea of the good, concretized in teaching. It consists of asking "is this the right thing to do for this child?"

> . . . the meaning of any universal, of any norm, is only justified and determined in and through its concretization. Only in this way, too, is the practical meaning of utopia filled in. It, too, is not a guide for action but a guide for reflection. . . . One does not "act" in-as-much as one executes one's freely and well-thought out plans, but practice has to do with others and codetermines the communal concerns by its doing. (Gadamer, 1982, p. 82)

The above definitions of curriculum implementation and educational practice are not intended to be the authoritative, last words, but merely the first words of an inquiry into the relationship between a curriculum to be implemented and educational practice. The research is an exploration into this relationship, both as a question for philosophical reflection and as a political question of who's reality shall prevail in the classroom.

Autobiographical Reflections

> There is no place to stand, apart from a standpoint.
> We are always living out a story.
> There is no way to live a storyless, or a
> standpointless life. (Novak, 1978, p. 62)

In becoming aware of my own standpoint I will attempt here to recollect how the question of curriculum implementation has originated in my autobiography as a teacher, department head, consultant, curriculum worker and graduate student. The story is that of the educator in the system.

As a beginning teacher, the curriculum had an insistent and unquestioned presence. It is the task at hand, it is what "they" in authority say constitutes a grade nine education for these children. Was I really that accepting of the manifest expectations in the first year of teaching? In retrospect it seems so, although I always had the belief that children were not really learning unless what was "learned" had meaning for them. There was always a prohibition against memorization in my history and English literature classes. But like many green teachers, I did not question that the acquisition of curricular knowledge, albeit in a manner that was comprehensible to the students, was not, in fact, what constituted the educational process.

My grade XIB European history class stands out for me as a stark example of an irreconcilable conflict between curricular knowledge and the cultural capital of the students. This happened in my third year of teaching when I was given a class of struggling students to somehow get through the public exams.[1] I dutifully began covering the textbook topics, a succession of revolutions; the Puritan, the French, on to the Industrial, but what was the point? The gulf between this curriculum and their lives in a small Newfoundland coastal town was too wide. I recall the looks of fear and frustration in history class as I laboured to make these great events of "our cultural heritage" seem relevant. Homework assignments were a litany of repeated phrases from the text. I remember Walter's prodigious feat of memory, a whole page summarizing Napoleon's accomplishments, copied by rote in response to the wrong question! Could there be any purpose in this curriculum except to deny these students a high school diploma?

The following year I experimented quite freely with the prescribed tenth grade course where there was no public examination, but my interest turned to the development of an alternative curriculum, one which would be relevant to the average student. Having now become a social studies department head, I approached the school principal with the idea for a new course called "Community Problems." I outlined five units which we agreed were of great relevance and importance to citizenship in the modern community. These were: government, law, labour and management issues, the news media and the future. Supported by advice from a professor of social studies curriculum and winning the approval of the province's director of instruction; I completed the course ~~in~~ time for Fall classes. In January my programme won a national award for innovative teacher-developed curricula. But in the classroom it was far from a clear success. Students, who shared my liberal assumptions of the possibility of effective citizen involvement in an ostensibly egalitarian social structure, appreciated the course because it "showed how things really were." But I recall Ross, too, bringing his parents to the school with the complaint that he couldn't understand my classes and that there was no textbook to learn. And there were the same frightened and puzzled looks from the same students who couldn't grasp world history. Students like Ross and Walter had been the impetus for the course, but it now appeared that this programme even further complicated school for them.

---

[1] In the province of Newfoundland students wrote a common province-wide public examination in their graduating year. Until 1973 this constituted the sole measure of determining the students' final grades in each course.

In retrospect I can partly explain what happened in Freirian terms. The students were not allowed to problematize and begin to name their own reality. I merely replaced the academic cultural capital contained in the official curriculum with my own taken for granted one. But there is also the question of how one fits as a teacher~~, into~~ the system. Challenging the relevance of a curriculum in the reform conscious ~~early~~ 1970's was not difficult, particularly if one proposed what seemed to be a plausible alternative. My alternative plan contained the requisite statement of objectives, content outline, student texts and a clear indication of how student learnings would be evaluated. However the plan was, in fact, a poor guide for practice. I generally followed the course outline and used the student texts, but I barely looked at the objectives and evaluation statements following their submission to the various levels of administration who had requested them. What set the real objectives and the actual evaluation practices were the well worn expectations set out in the routines and rhythms of the school year. There were reporting periods and evaluation protocols to be observed. Tests had to look like tests and had to be given by the teacher. Certain percentages were allotted for unit work and examinations, students had to do well or poorly on the course, and each one required a numerical assessment in the form of a mark. Students, in short, needed to be sorted as tangible evidence that the school was doing its job.

These are the brute realities of the situation which we all, students, colleagues, parents, administration, took for granted and which were affected very little by a new plan. The neat curriculum guide which flattened out the course into objectives, materials, strategies and evaluation, while not necessarily superfluous to classroom practice, did not represent what really would happen and did not address the original reformist impulse of broadening the number of students who derived meaning and success from school. What the guide did do, however, was to establish me as someone who knew something about social studies curriculum. I thus became one of the part-time writers of the new master guide for the provincial curriculum and about the same time, school district curriculum consultant.

In our work as task force members charged with writing the master guide for the new provincial social studies curriculum, we asked ourselves how do we design and help to implement a programme of [illegible] studies education [illegible] faithful to well thought [illegible] and clearly stated principles of learning and beliefs about person and society in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador? We deliberated on these beliefs and principles and reflected upon our own experiences as district curriculum consultants which had taught us that the formalized intents expressed in the conceptualization of curriculum plans usually fell short of reforming ways of teaching. Our ruminations about how teachers might become part of the planning process for the new curriculum, while at the same time remaining mindful of our task force responsibilities, were cut short as Department of Education officials set deadlines for the production of documents. The Department was being pressured by some vocal school districts to get the new curriculum guide out for implementation. The chain of command could not begin operating without the material to be passed down. Curriculum leadership from the Department to the districts and from the district offices to the schools required that document production be the outcome of curriculum development. We were instructed to 'get on' with the development task and leave the question of implementation for the school districts.

As a first stage to implementation we introduced the curriculum master guide at regional meetings of district consultants and selected teachers. While there was some interest in discussing this document which consisted of a rationale statement, a K-12 content outline and general statements about teaching, the audience was waiting to hear the practical information of what should be taught at grade such and such. But while impatiently waiting, district office consultants, the Department and, from what I could see, most teachers were pleased that with the master guide done, specific grade level guides and materials would be imminently available, indeed some were already underway in subsequent departmental development committees.

For two years I had experienced what seems, in the retelling, to be the inexorable workings of the provincial curriculum making and implementing bureaucracy. As developers, we made efforts to find the fissures in the vast edifice which would allow the participants to enter into a dialogue with our assertions in the master guide, and so to reflect on their own teaching. But we searched less as the deadlines approached, and the token meetings with participants which were allowed to us were mostly the one way sessions everyone was used to. In retrospect it seems as if the system runs as it is set up to run, and we as participants play predefined roles. (I have since learned to call this functionalism.) Despite these frustrations, my colleagues and I on the development team appreciated the weight of our responsibilities and were convinced that we were ultimately improving social studies education. How else could we do it?

This was my question as I entered a doctoral programme in curriculum and instruction. Two years of reading and discussing curriculum implementation as a theoretical question produced a conceptual dichotomization of positions useful in thinking about the question, but somewhat less applicable to practice. On the one hand, there were researchers like Fullan (1982), Joyce and Showers (1980) and others who unproblematically accept the neutrality of the technical rationality inherent in implementing curriculum plans. Their studies are confined to investigating self professed innovation projects for the purposes of isolating variables at work in such changes, and applying these to improve the efficiency of organizational change as a technical process. Critical literature opposed to such technically inclined intrusiveness, seems unable to move beyond a critical stance and to display a real willingness to work with those who find themselves within the technically-oriented structures being criticized. Phenomenologically-oriented writers like Greene (1973) seek to give prominence to the knowledge that teachers and students construct as co-participants in the world. Structural Marxist critics like Apple (1979) and Whitty (1974) show how schools tend to preserve and reproduce an essentially unequal social system and seem to imply that these structures lie beyond the power of individuals to alter them.

Clearly these impressionistic remarks on the conceptualizations of curriculum implementation in the theoretical literature are gross oversimplifications of a rich research literature. Technical, phenomenological and critical writings have provided crucial insights into the question. But conceptualizations of practice only prove themselves "on the way back," by the way they are able to speak to practitioners. Chapter II provides a reading of the curriculum literature as it applies to implementation with this practical interest in mind.

Chapter II

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION AND THE CURRICULUM FIELD

Introduction

A review of the curriculum literature reveals a variety of ways of framing the question of implementation. The most common, or so-called 'dominant view,' treats it as a technical problem of schools and school systems as organizations.

> How to get new educational programmes to work in practice has increasingly frustrated and mystified those involved in education over the past two decades. (Fullan, 1982, p. ix)

The question of implementation is posed in a straight forward and commonsense manner and is persuasive in its simplicity, i.e., how do we bring about change within our existing institutional structures? But as Fullan suggests, the matter of school change has proven resistant to simple solutions. Nonetheless, for historical and ideological reasons the search for an effective relationship between curriculum plan and school practice as the solution to the problem of change in institutional settings has been well-funded, persistent and world-wide in scope[1]

---

[1] Examples of such studies include the RAND Change Agent Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1977); Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (Crandall et al., 1983); National Science Foundation researches into the effects of innovations in various subject areas (A.S.C.D., 1980). Non-U.S. examples include the work of IMTEC (The International Movement Towards Educational Change) sponsored by O.E.C.D. headquarters in Paris (Dalin, 1978) and SAFARI (Success and Failure and Recent Innovation) in the U.K. (MacDonald and Walker, 1976). Canadian

A less obvious and more fundamental question is raised by the quandry over curriculum change. Noting the failure of the simplistic development and diffusion assumptions in the technical paradigm, writers like Grumet (1981) and Aoki (1983) have reconsidered the problem in terms of human action—how do we, as participants in the world, simultaneously transform ourselves and the humanly constructed social world? Because we are participants we cannot simply develop and carry out a rational plan for school change in the absence of a critical self reflection. Practical action requires that we problematize the world in an ongoing fashion as we seek to make improvements. Curriculum implementation literature of this type is concerned with the moral and ethical content of both the ends and the means of the change itself, rather than on general rules for effective action regardless of the quality of the change proposed. Further questions are raised by authors like Young and Whitty (1976), Apple (1982a), Wexler (1982) and others, who work in a critical structuralist research tradition. They are concerned with the extent to which situated individuals can implement changes through critical self-reflection and transformation. Apple, for example, argues that existing cultural, political and economic practices are reproduced in schools in complex and sometimes contradictory ways. Because these relations are productive and reproductive, they can neither be purposively-rationally altered nor can they be adequately understood through practically-oriented critical reflection. Structural-historical

---

examples include Leithwood et al.'s (1979) case studies project and the Downey Report (1975) in Alberta which is described in Chapter 3.

explanations are also required if the participants are to make the necessary linkages between the distortions and relations of domination which they experience in schools and the social arrangements which cause these. It is only in this way that effective and lasting change becomes possible.

Since Schwab's (1969) call for a return to the practical, a new curriculum literature has developed in alternative directions from the dominant technical theories of change. One general direction, rooted in a concern for humanly transformative practice, has adopted a hermeneutic-interpretive stance which is oriented towards a view of curriculum implementation as a dialectical seeing of self in situation, wherein both the curriculum and the teacher become changed. Here there is an implicit recognition of an ongoing pedagogical vocation to make schools more educational, along with a deeply rooted suspicion of curriculum guide or unit plans which purport to be 'the way' to improvement. Another direction, rooted in a similar concern for transformative practice, has argued that this project is only achievable if we first understand how the dominant tradition became dominant. We are not able to change in ways which do not essentially serve to reproduce existing inequities and structures of domination in society unless we recognize the powerful forces which have served to maintain these.

These alternatives attend to the intentionality of the participants and a historical-structural perspective of the participants' situation which are ignored in traditional technically oriented curriculum work. Both of these alternatives, the individual and the contextual, need to be addressed in a review of curriculum literature on implementation, but they also need to be understood in relation to the dominant tradition to which they are a response.

Barton and Lawn (1981, p. 241), quoting C. Wright Mills, indicate how history may overcome the polarity of self and structure in curriculum studies.

> Social science [curriculum studies] deals with problems of biography, of history, and of their intersections within social structures. (Mills, 1970, p. 159)

This chapter begins with an historical examination of the origins of the curriculum field and the dominant theories of change originating in the administration of schools in the United States. Situating the field historically contextualizes both the current research directions in curriculum implementation as well as the theorizing of the curricularists. The second section deals in more detail with some of the various streams of curriculum thinking and their implications for curriculum implementation.

A. Curriculum, Public Education and the State: The Historical Context of the Implementation Problem

The General Problem of Providing Public Education

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the industrial nations became faced with the problem of providing a basic public education for the general population which now included the working classes. The exact form which such national education policies were to take varied somewhat from country to country. In England, for example, three basic stances developed which still exist as tensions within the system; education as industrial training, public education as a democratic right, and education founded in a traditional liberal humanism (Williams, 1961, p. 162). Public education in the United States reflects a history of the massive immigration of that period and the concern for the maintenance and transmission of traditional American values (Apple, 1979). English Canadian education followed a course similar to that of the U.S., but instead of the traditional values of rural America it substituted a conscious preservation of values imported from the United Kingdom (Thompkins, 1983).

Mass Education and the Emergence of the Curriculum Field

The question of curriculum implementation is rooted in the need to institute and reform public social policy through the schools. Pinar and Grumet (1981) point out how the curriculum field originated out of such an administrative need rather than as an academic discipline. It developed as an atheoretical, ahistorical activity which addressed itself to managing and administering policies through the instrument of the school curriculum.

The history of curriculum field parallels that of educational administration. The earliest curriculum writers like Franklin Bobbitt (1918) were administrators who turned their attention from school finance and organization to the development and organization of the instructional programmes. Callahan in Education and the Cult of Efficiency (1962) outlines how, during its formative years, educational administration, lacking a strong discipline base like philosophy or psychology, was particularly vulnerable to influence by the dominant values of American business culture. This led to the uncritical adoption of business thinking, imbued by Frederick Taylor's scientific management, into education. The features of scientific management as adapted to schools included:

1. definite and clear aims
2. efficiency of means for reaching the aims through a rationalization and standardization of the teaching process
3. an organization capable of achieving these aims
4. strong management control of all educational processes

(Callahan, 1962, p. 56).

Callahan documents how a predominant emphasis on organizational efficiency in the training of administrators in the first half of this century led to their inability to respond to the educational aspects of innovations proposed for schools. From an administrative perspective the curriculum field consisted of a practical and efficient means for achieving whatever goals "society" deemed desirable. Tyler's thin volume on curriculum development summarizes this seemingly neutral process in four basic questions: (1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? (2) How can learning experiences be selected which are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives? (3) How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction? (4) How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated? (Tyler, 1949). The assumed neutrality of the four questions has tended to obscure the ethical and political conflict over which purposes the schools should seek to attain and who should decide by reducing these to technical problems.

During the 1920's and 1930's there had been some criticism of the narrow instrumentalism of these administrative views of curriculum and schooling. In 1934, Jesse Newlon of Columbia Teachers' College noted, in a content analysis of administration texts then in use, that over four-fifths of the pages were devoted to the 'how' of administration with "very little critical examination of the educational and social implications of the structure and procedures discussed" (Newlon, 1934, p. 90). John Dewey (1929) and Boyd Bode (quoted in Pinar and Grumet, 1981) offered similar criticisms. But these criticisms aside, the fact remained that curriculum practices and curriculum studies in the United States remained informed by an instrumentalist rationality typified in Tyler's model.

Technical Rationality and the Growth of State Involvement in Education

The rationalization of teaching in technically-oriented curriculum models, like Tyler's, requires an abstraction and idealization of practice. I have attempted to indicate above how the susceptibility of American education to scientific management has led to the general acceptance of these models for school administration. But in order to gain a deeper understanding into the historical roots of the present implementation problem and the concern it evinces in the educational research literature, the increased role of the state in the post-war growth of education needs to be examined.

Between 1950 and the end of the 1960's there was a tremendous increase both in the number of students and in real public expenditure on education. In the OECD member countries the number of secondary school students grew by almost one hundred percent and the percentage of GNP spent on education more than doubled (Karabel and Halsey, 1977,

p. 5). With the great expansion of education came an increasingly active state intervention through curriculum reforms. There was a widespread adoption of Tylerian type curriculum models in these centralized curriculum reforms. Because these models separate the activity of development from the activity of teaching, a problem of implementation is created. The relationships between conceptions of action in bureaucratic organizations and technically-oriented curriculum models suggests why Tylerian curriculum models found an easy acceptance and unquestioned assumption of practicality.[2]

There are some striking parallels between technically-oriented curriculum theory, business management and bureaucracy.[3] The following table (Table 1) represents my effort to compare Weber's six characteristics of bureaucracy with technical curriculum theory and techniques of scientific management. The table is somewhat oversimplified and is merely meant to suggest reasons for the stability and dominance of technical curriculum theory.

---

[2] In his work on bureaucracy, Max Weber has outlined the profound change that the social world had undergone as a result of the growing complexity of modern life. Weber traces a shift from a somewhat undifferentiated communal life to an increasingly differentiated society requiring bureaucratic structures. This shift is accompanied by corresponding transformation of social action into rationally organized action (Weber, 1968, p. 987).

[3] Kliebard speaks partially to this link in his observation that the Tyler model offers a technique for rationally managing controversy:

> "It is an eminently reasonable framework for developing a curriculum; it duly compromises between warring extremes and skirts the pitfalls to which the doctrinaire are subject" (Kliebard, 1970, p. 266).

Table 1

A Comparison of Bureaucracy, Technical Curriculum Theory and Scientific Management

Bureaucracy[4]	Technical Curriculum Theory	Techniques of Scientific Management (Taylorism)[5]
1. Systematic differentiation of duties into fixed jurisdictional areas.	Responsibilities for curriculum development, implementation and evaluation separated.	Labour process is rationalized and systematized.
2. Hierarchical levels of authority and firmly ordered system of super and subordinate.	Assumes a "top-down" development and diffusion of innovation.	Firm management control of all stages of the process.
3. Management based on written documents ordering responsibilities.	Job descriptions and terms of reference define responsibility.	Tasks analyzed and described.
4. Positions held through expertise.	Roles of curriculum developer require special expertise. Teacher has technical expertise to instruct.	Special expertise required by management. Workers trained in a particular process.
5. Functions of bureaucracy require full working capacity of an official.	Full-time curriculum supervisors, developers, consultants, teachers.	Division of responsibilities between management and worker.
6. Follows general codified rules of operation.	Authority to develop and mandate 'official' curriculum is laid out in statutes. Curriculum guides have legal status.	Work is accomplished by following established principles of operation.

---

[4] Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy," in *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

[5] Callahan, Raymond. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

The table shows how there appears to be a relationship between rationalized modes of action and hierarchical structural functional organization in bureaucracy, and the assumptions of technical curriculum theory. These modes of action and organization also correspond to techniques of scientific management which have underpinned conventional business organizational thinking. The parallels between the three help to explain why technically-oriented curriculum models have been taken for granted as a natural way of carrying out school reform. As governments have become more and more actively involved in the conscious use of education as an instrument of social policy, such models have provided a means for the management and control of change through bureaucratic structures. Through these curriculum models the various aspects of the development and implementation of new programmes can be differentiated and assigned to persons who perform these aspects as their specific functions in the system. Programme initiatives, therefore, can be made in planning departments by persons having expertise in curriculum planning. These plans can be given to other experts, curriculum consultants, to help teachers understand the change. The school principal, as the building manager, then is responsible for overseeing the change as it is carried out in the school.

The parallels between bureaucracy, technical curriculum theory and scientific management show how curriculum innovations support and extend rationalization and control of teaching. In recent years a further effect of this tendency has been noted by some writers. Dale (1979), Ozaga and Lawn (1981) and Apple (1982b) have pointed out how teachers' work is now becoming deskilled and further intensified as a result of a control of curricular form and its interpretation.

The Implementation Problem is Created

The implementation problem occurs because rationally ordered action logically separates the curriculum plan from teaching. Unlike communal action which is based upon a shared understanding of intentions, rationally ordered action is based upon a pre-constructed, linear relationship between plan and action.

By the mid 1970's a number of evaluations assessing the success of centralized initiatives into curriculum improvement were in progress. Ponder (1979), in a review of research sponsored by the American National Science Foundation into the results of innovative programmes in social studies, indicates that attempts to introduce social science concepts and modes of inquiry into the teaching of school social studies have largely failed. Most teachers, unfamiliar or unacquainted with social science methods, still approach social studies as a historical and geographical study of society. Ponder concluded that content and methodology have changed little since 195[illegible], because the innovations failed to address the social complexity of the [illegible] and [illegible] school system the innovation is supposed to change.

MacDonald and Walker (1976), as researchers [illegible] Project (Success [illegible] Innovation), evaluated [illegible] of [illegible] Science and the Humanities [illegible] official [illegible] ha[illegible] co[illegible] [illegible] lation [illegible] the [illegible] Co[illegible] could be seen as moments in a tradition of a gradual reform of school science which had been taking place since the nineteenth century. Stenhouse's Humanities Curriculum Project in contrast was a bold innovation inviting teachers to lead inquiry into controversial value issues. Not attached to any established subject area, the new programme envisaged a changed role for teachers who, as researchers in their own classrooms, would transform students into reflective inquirers. Macdonald and Walker observed that while this powerful new vision of teaching won a following in the profession, the gap between this and the educational process as lived inside the existing school culture and structures resulted in serious tensions for teachers which could not be bridged.

Other studies, such as those by Berman and McLaughlin (1974) and Popkewitz et al. (1982) have shown that a deeper examination even of innovations claimed to be successful reveals that little change has actually taken place. Furthermore even as evaluative research was being conducted, the assumptions of reform through technical practice were also being questioned by its former advocates. Guba and Clark (1975), for example, abandoned their widely accepted R. D. and D. (research, development and diffusion) model as being too narrow, unimaginative and centralized.

The hopes for social improvement through a general mobilization of resources directed at public education were disappointed. This may be partly understood by noting that such liberally inspired social reform was fundamentally ahistorical and technical. Such a stance forgets that the school as an institution is both historically and socially constructed and maintained. The construction of the implementation problem is a typically technical and ahistorical response to an inevitable negativity of experience.

The bulk of the research into the implementation problem has been directed toward a systematic analysis of the change process which takes place in schools.

This growing body of research literature includes many recent works which have formed certain generalizations about the change process from numerous empirical studies (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Herriott and Gross, 1979; Loucks and Pratt, 1979; Joyce and Showers, 1980). But despite this extensive and well-funded research, the link between these generalizations about change, and educators making improvements in their particular situations remains tenuous. Fullan (1982), for one, cautions that the mere application of factors known to impede or assist change is insufficient in itself, because change depends on a multitude of situational variables.

The complexity of the situational variables which exist in the school change process casts doubt on the claims of the efficiency and effectiveness of reform through technical practice. More fundamentally, it demands a reconsideration as to the extent to which generalizations about change in schools can adequately inform the efforts of educators who are guided by a practical concern for improving education. An emphasis only on the means of change fails to appreciate the educational content of the educators' intentions.

Most existing research into curriculum implementation within school systems may be understood as an example of managing social change within a [illegible] [illegible]. As an instrument of management, bureaucracy has been highly stable, relatively efficient, and quite effective in contrast with earlier patrimonial and patriarchal forms of organization. These disappointing results of research into the change process, however, represent something of a crisis of management which threatens the effectiveness of bureaucratic school systems by questioning assumptions about the possibility of hierarchically inspired change. In terms of organizational interpretations, it has been difficult to detach implementation from management, consequently the response has been to use what is known about the change process to bring more aspects of the curriculum development process and teaching itself under research scrutiny and overt control.

Although the research literature on organizational change ostensibly includes all participants as active subjects, their inclusion is largely rhetorical. By isolating the features of change as an organizational process (Hall and Loucks, 1977; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Fullan, 1982), the meaning of the change for the participants is not addressed. A desire to make schools more educational places for children essentially constitutes the content of change for educators. But by focussing on procedural concerns, much of the research literature on curriculum implementation diverts attention from this originary pedagogical interest.

The following section reviews some recent literature which has questioned the historically dominant bureaucratic/technical modes of curriculum as management in an effort to recover the deeper educational interest.

B. Alternative Modes of Viewing Curriculum Implementation

Criticism of the Traditional Field

A critical historical analysis of the administrative-bureaucratic origins of the curriculum field sketched out in the first half of this chapter, has shown how a rationalized and technical view of curriculum theory has gained wide acceptance to become the so-called dominant perspective. Such acceptance has carried with it the underlying assumption that there exists a clear and effective relationship between a curriculum as planned and its eventual installation as classroom practice. Critics of this approach have pointed out that such an assumption is unwarranted suggesting that it is based more on unfounded technical assumptions about educational practice than on an appreciation of the complex processes of institutional and social change (House, 1974).

The Reconceptualist View

A number of alternative modes of curriculum-theorizing have developed in the past decade or so as a response to criticism of these unwarranted assumptions of the dominant perspective. In 1975 William Pinar drew together many of the significant critical articles of this kind under the label of reconceptualization. In his editorial introduction to this collection, Pinar argued that the majority of the critics of the dominant mode were not reconceptualists because they continued to tacitly accept its purposes, i.e., that social systems should be controlled by administrative action. They merely questioned the adequacy of the prevailing assumptions which experience had shown to be unworkable and simplistic. These writers, like Beauchamp (1975) and Johnson (1970), sought to replace the atheoretical and unsystematic methods of the technically oriented practice of the traditional curriculum field with the methodology of the behavioural social sciences. Beauchamp, for example, situated implementation as a problem of curriculum engineering, solvable by further research into its dynamics. Pinar indicated that the concerns of the reconceptualist critics were different, founded as they were upon an interest in understanding and questioning the taken for granted conceptual schemas of the dominant mode and in exploring alternatives. Pinar identified two major currents of this writing; a critical-historical stream which attempted to surface the presuppositions of domination and control which inhere in the technical interest of traditional curriculum work, and a "post-critical" stream which explored new ways of seeing curriculum (Pinar, 1975, p. xiii).

The publication of Pinar's book was an important event for the curriculum field in that it coalesced and articulated a growing sense that a paradigm shift was now taking place in curriculum studies simultaneous with changes in other branches of social science theory. But the notion of reconceptualization was a temporary phenomenon which brought together disparate forms of curriculum theorizing and, in doing so, tended to obscure the important differences among these writers. Reid's remarks are typical of this criticism.

> [I]t is something of an historical accident that makes it appear as though existential and radical writers share a common platform. They were united more by what they opposed than by what they stood for. (Reid, 1981, p. 183)

The Deliberationist View

Reid suggested instead a more refined interpretation of the field which located four schools of curriculum theorizing, differing from one another on philosophical and political grounds. Philosophically, curriculum thinking may be differentiated by whether or not it accepts *a priori* assumptions about control, planning and innovation in schools. Politically, there are differences between curriculum theorizing which supports the existing institutionalized system and those which are either indifferent to it or oppose it. Reid categorizes the dominant instrumentalist rational paradigm (the systemic model) as being both system supportive and a priorist. The critical stance is described as being system opposing and a priorist, while what he terms "existentialist" is neither system supporting, nor does it accept any a priori notions of control over planning and innovation. He describes his own curriculum theorizing as 'deliberationist' which is non apriorist, but which supports the liberal educational assumptions of the current system. The deliberative approach finds its source in Aristotelian foundations, recognizing education as an activity of morally and ethically engaged participants. Schwab (1973), Westbury (1972), and Connelly (1972) are some of the major theorists of this view.

Reid's work focuses on the practical in the tradition of J. J. Schwab, which makes no sharp distinction between curriculum as plan and its implementation. Despite this, critical reflection, in the sense of having critical insights into the situatedness of one's own thinking, is missing from deliberationist theorizing. This is shown, in part, by Reid's interpretation of existentialist theorizing as being primarily psychologistically-based (1981, p. 166). In categorizing reflection as being merely psychological, he seems to imply that consensual, purposive-rational action remains as an adequate foundation for curriculum decision making. In doing so, he has missed both the major thrust of reconceptualism as a curriculum reform movement that is oriented towards a critical reflection upon actual practice and the theoretical conceptions of practice, as well as the new insights into consciousness provided by the twentieth century continental philosophy. Reconceptualism is a project which united existential and radical writers through ". . . challenging each other's representations of our situation . . . constantly remind[ing] each other of the inevitably incomplete nature of our attempts to grasp and signify our practice" (Pinar and Grumet, 1981, p. 37).

The Critical Interpretative View

Aoki (1980) explicitly incorporated the distinction between the critical and interpretative levels of reconceptualization by adapting Habermas's thesis on the relationship between knowledge and human interests (Habermas, 1971) to curriculum theorizing. Within this framework, Reid's conception of curriculum as a practical, eclectic, and reasoned deliberation of possible courses of action is considered to belong to technical reason. Technical reason consists of an ends-means rationality which is rooted in a fundamental human interest in work. Action within this paradigm is motivated by a view of the world as an object to be acted upon. Curriculum thinking in a technical mode is interested in objective data on abilities, trends, relationships and so forth. Such inquiry distances the researcher from the researched in the interests of establishing an objectively verifiable knowledge.

Most curriculum work belongs to the technical paradigm by virtue of its being the product of bureaucratic policy making activities. The historical reasons for this have already been discussed. Decision making in a bureaucratic mode requires that curriculum proposals be developed in advance and either faithfully installed as planned, or adapted to meet local conditions.

The historical interpretative paradigm belongs to a different frame of reference rooted in a practical human interest in communication. Rather than viewing the (human) world as a facticity to be discovered, the interpretative paradigm understands this world to be constructed from the taken for granted stocks of knowledge and shaped by the meaningful projects of actors. Curriculum research in this mode does not assume an objective stance on problems, such as implementation, which it recognizes as a product of assumptions based in the possibility of controlling the classroom activities of teachers. The interpretative view, on the contrary, is concerned with precisely the way in which problems like implementation come to be considered problematic. The inquirer himself/herself is thus immediately implicated in the research and is also forced to reflect upon how he/she typically views the world at the same time as questioning implementation.

An awareness of the situatedness of understanding comes about through the inquiry interest in communication which places the interpretation of meaning at the centre. In Habermas's words:

> [I]t is the understanding of meaning and not controlled observation which provides access to the facts. (1973, p. 293)

By understanding that people give personal meanings to experienced situations, and that these meanings may differ, allows for dialogue and reflection on ways of seeing. Aoki points to a number of kinds of inquiry which are conducted with this interest. These include phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and hermeneutics

Habermas's third paradigm involves critical reflective inquiry which is rooted in an interest in emancipation. Following the model of psychoanalysis, Habermas suggests that the critical mode is necessary in order to liberate interpretative understanding from a condition of false consciousness. The actual relationship between criticism and interpretation in curriculum inquiry is more ambiguous than it would seem from Habermas's conceptual formulation. The problem revolves around the extent to which a communi[illegible]tive interpretative understanding enables participants in education to pose against a consensus imposed by official interpretations. Critical practice in education is often associated with the work of Paulo Freire (1973). But the critical insights which are acquired by Freire's participants become available through re-interpretation of their own concrete situations in such a way that the previously accepted definitions by others now become questionable. (This question is dealt with further as a problem of philosophy in Chapter 3 and in terms of the lived experience of implementing curriculum in the final chapter of the dissertation.) Aoki notes this ambiguity of the existence of three paradigms of curriculum theorizing when he makes reference to Langeveld's phenomenological pedagogy. Referring to an observation originally made by Van Manen, he indicates that

> Langeveld is said to argue that phenomenological disciplines are constructed within the dialogical context of ongoing situationally interpretative activity but guided by some meaningful purpose of what it means to educate within the critically reflective orientation. (Aoki, 1980, p. 14)

In writing about curriculum implementation practices, Aoki draws the interpretative and critical paradigms together as an alternative view of the role of teachers in relation to school change (Aoki, 1983). Curriculum implementation has traditionally been guided by an administrative rationality of instrumental action wherein teachers are viewed as agents serving to bring about desired changes. The alternative possibility is that a new curriculum becomes the occasion for teachers to critically reflect upon their own practice in the light of the proposal and, in so doing, to transform their own practice as well as transforming the curriculum. This activity is a hermeneutical activity of distanciation and appropriation as opposed to the phenomenon technically interpreted as mutual adaptation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976).

The Radical View

The source of Habermas's emancipatory paradigm is located in a Marxist-based critical theory of society and not in a situational praxis. Curriculum thinking in this view is oriented towards an analytical critique of schools as they serve to either sustain or reproduce existing structures of domination in society. The work of Apple (1979, 1981, 1982) and Wexler (1982) are examples of this radical critique of curriculum, which generally holds that such a macro analysis is required in order to properly situate what schools actually do.

It is difficult to project a radical analysis of schooling and curriculum onto the question of implementation. On one hand, curriculum implementation as it now exists can be interpreted by critical theory only as a subsidiary and telling example of distorted communication structured by the overall relations of control, through which schools serve to maintain the dominant interests in the state. On the other hand, the implementation of its own critical insights is a highly problematic question for critical theory itself. Fay (1975) states this problem of practice as follows:

> A critical social theory is meant to inform and guide the activities of a class of dissatisfied actors which has been brought into existence by social agencies which it claims can only be comprehended by this theory, and it does so by revealing how the irrationalities of social life which are causing the dissatisfaction can be eliminated by taking some specific action which the theory calls for. (Fay, 1975, pp. 97-98)

Reconceptualism Revisited: Linking Story and Structure

The explanations of critical theory as applied to curriculum studies must be grounded in the educators' interpretations of their own situation. However, new ways of implementing the explanations need to be discovered and applied which will avoid re-instituting new relations of domination. Ways of linking the situational meanings of the participants with the critical-structural explanations of these meanings requires a dialogue between phenomenologically-based work and critical analytical interpretations. Pinar's original work on reconceptualizing the curriculum field seems to have begun in this spirit and he urges its continuation.[1]

Barton and Lawn (1981) suggest that an inquiry into the biography and life history of working teachers might help to restore a common enterprise of emancipatory practice to the poles of interpretative exploration and explanatory critique in reconceptualist curriculum studies. They argue that not only are curriculum studies as yet unable to link the individual teacher with the social environment, but that teachers cannot connect with one another in their own work situations. This enterprise is now more vital than ever.

> . . . educational researchers need to reconstruct the working lives of teachers today, especially in the light of the resurgence of managerial intervention and the arrival of the computerized classroom. (Barton and Lawn, 1981, p. 243)

They cite trends in sociological research (Gouldner, 1975) and historical studies (Thompson, 1979) which are looking to the everyday life experiences of working people as legitimate sources for illuminating the social world.

Gouldner and Thompson see their research forming a new social relationship between "researcher" and "researched" which also creates new possibilities for practical action. Thompson describes this collaborative enterprise as it takes place in oral history as follows:

> . . . this is material which you have not just discovered, but in one sense helped to create; and is thus quite different from another document. This is why an oral historian will always

---

[1] In a guest seminar given at the University of Alberta in May, 1983, Pinar noted that phenomenologically-based curriculum work and critically-based studies were tending to return to their discipline bases in philosophy and sociology, rather than participating in a renewing dialogue with one another on curriculum. He argued that this tendency to seek validation in the discipline, rather than in concrete school situations, weakens the curriculum field

> feel a specially strong tension between biography and cross-analysis. But this is a tension which rests on the strength of oral history. The elegance of historical generalization, of sociological theory, flies high above the ordinary life experience in which oral history is rooted. The tension which the oral historian feels is that of the mainspring: between history and reality. (Thompson, 1979, p. 209).

Life histories of educators working within state school systems are rare, but these can offer the potential for bringing together self and structure within curriculum studies. By giving voice to the experience of these individual educators, they are removed from their isolation within the system and the potential for meaningful action is restored from a ground of practice.

Chapter III

CONDUCTING THE QUESTIONING OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

In this chapter I will outline the approach used to question curriculum implementation in the study. The research has been centrally informed by hermeneutic philosophy in the sense that it seeks to uncover the relationships with the world which make possible the problem of curriculum implementation. My interest has been to go beyond a natural impulse to adopt a problem-solving stance, typically used in most curriculum research, in order that I may re-search and make problematic the assumptions about planning and teaching which allow implementation to appear as a problem to be solved. Hermeneutics, with its focus on an interpretive understanding of the human world seems suited to this [illegible]

The decision to employ hermeneutics as a central mode of inquiry in this study comes about as a result of a recognition that the lives and experiences of individual educators offer a legitimate source for illuminating both the micro [illegible] world of the [illegible] society [illegible]

Reconceptualist curriculum theorizing has become increasingly unable to fulfill its original reformist intents. Its two major streams of critique, phenomenology and critical social analysis, have become increasingly alienated from one another. The result has not been helpful to the curriculum field, as the potential for a reformed practice based upon the concrete experience of the practitioners becomes endangered.

Barton and Lawn (1981) suggest that research based upon the working lives of teachers is now all the more urgent with the advent of more intrusive technology in the form of the "computerized classrooms." This is only one of the more obvious manifestations of technical change which has been taking place at an accelerating rate for some time. The problem is not one of halting the advance of technology. The real question relates to an extension of technical reason which lies behind the creation and spread of new technologies both in the form of machines (like computers), as well as in social organization (like bureaucracy). David Tyack (1976) argues that since the 1890's an "organizational revolution" has taken place in American school systems. As these become urbanized, the small local community controlled school boards were supplanted by specialized administrative structures staffed by professional educational managers. The working lives of teachers both shape and are shaped by these bureaucratic structures.

In this study hermeneutics fulfills both programmatic and methodological research tasks. With regard to the programmatic task, both the philosophical and the critical streams of modern hermeneutics share a common concern with the "technological penetration" of social lifeworlds (Habermas, 1971a, 1971b, 1981; Gadamer, 1981). The development of critical responses to this human condition lies at the heart of hermeneutic reflection. The methodological task relates to the problem of securing valid knowledge about meaningful experience. These two tasks shape the following historical review of the development of hermeneutic inquiry from Schleiermacher to Ricoeur. The discussion centres on the problem of interpretation as it was originally conceived of by nineteenth century philosophy showing how the question shifted from epistemological to ontological grounds in the twentieth century, and concluding with Ricoeur's attempts to re-address the unresolved problem of validity occasioned by this shift. While the focus treats the question of validity systematically, the underlying concern for critical social insights is indicated as central to the continuing programme of hermeneutic reflection.

Hermeneutics is the name given to the study concerned with the interpretation of meaning. It originally came into being in specific fields such as theology, philology and law, where interpretation of past meanings was necessary to bring appropriate messages to contemporary audiences. In each of these areas the art of interpretation was employed. The recognition of a more general problem of interpretation as being foundational to a human science came about in response to the development of the natural sciences and their influence on modern epistemology. Nineteenth century philosophers were left with the question of the appropriate conditions of knowledge for human consciousness and action once empiricism was established as being central to an understanding of the physical world. One response was the drawing together of the science and art of interpretation used in the diverse fields of religion, classics and law, into a theory of knowledge of the human spirit (*Geisteswissenschaften*) under a general hermeneutics. As a general theory of knowing hermeneutic philosophy would establish both the methodology and conditions for valid knowledge of a uniquely human science.

Nineteenth century hermeneutic philosophy was ultimately unable to establish empirically valid grounds for interpretive knowledge which had the same degree of intersubjective verifiability as that enjoyed by the natural sciences. In this century the renewed interest in hermeneutics has come about largely in response to two new developments. One development has been the growing sense that "normal" social science, founded upon an assumption of the existence of a unified scientific methodology, is inadequate to the task of fully understanding human life. Parallels have been drawn between this and the paradigm shifts described by Kuhn in his analysis of the structure of natural scientific revolutions (Gouldner, 1971). The other development has been a radical re-evaluation of former assumptions about knowing occasioned by the advent of the phenomenological and critical sciences. This re-evaluation owes much to the phenomenological investigations of Husserl and his students and to the critical theories of Marx and Freud. The contemporary philosophical hermeneutics of Gadamer and the critical hermeneutics of Habermas have, respectively, developed from these traditions of phenomenology and critical social science. There are also now an increasing number of introductory works in the English language which are devoted to describing the development of modern hermeneutics, interpretive theory and their fundamental implications for the human science (Palmer, 1969; Hoy, 1978; Bauman, 1978; Bleicher, 1980; Howard, 1982).

A sketch of the philosophical tradition of interpretation follows. This serves as an introduction to the second part of the chapter in which the salient features of philosophical hermeneutics and critical hermeneutics, which have informed my research, are explained. A methodological focus will complete the second section. This will centre on a discussion of the structure of conversation and how it can be related to interpretive and critical reflection on curriculum implementation acts.

The context of the questioning will be described in the third part of the chapter. Here, I will briefly describe the history of the new curriculum and the provincial and school board plan for implementing it. The roles of the consultants and teachers participating in this research will be indicated at this point.

A. The Development of Modern Hermeneutics

Explanation and Understanding: The Hermeneutic Question

The name "social science" has carried with it an internal contradiction which has preoccupied philosophers for several centuries. To be counted as scientific knowledge must present itself as being stable, organized and coherent. In order to present itself to us in this way it must have certain standards of agreed upon objective validity. Natural science developed these standards through a methodology of rational empiricism, in which the inherent logic of the physical world may be deduced and structured through observation, experimentation and explanation. Regularities in nature may then be explained, and anticipated, through a circle of imposed logic and empirical evidence. In this way natural laws come to be developed.

The question of knowledge in the social world is another matter. If knowledge, to be scientific, must have the qualities of stability, coherence and organization, how is it possible to gain such an objective stance on human life so that its regularities may also be deduced and structured like those of the physical world? Does not the very self-consciousness and intentionality which separate out that which is human from the natural world forbid such a perspective? The fact that we speak of the former in terms of understanding and the latter in terms of explanation, already indicates a difference in the way we apprehend the two forms of knowledge. But the question remains, what is the epistemological status of understanding? How do we achieve objective knowledge of the social world which does not ultimately appeal to the individual's subjectivity for its validity?

The question of the relative status of explanation and understanding has broader implications for the relationship of social science to social life. Since Kant, there has been a split between science and ethics. By establishing the epistemological conditions for science, Kant also removed traditional moral and ethical philosophical questions from the realm of knowledge now constituted as objective science. Understanding belongs to the realm of human action while explanation belongs to the stance of the detached observer.

There has been a tendency to polarize explanation and understanding in social science. At the pole of explanation there stands social science research in the positivistic tradition which recognizes no discontinuity between the natural sciences and inquiries into the human world. In this tradition we find behavioural psychology, functionalist sociology and Hemplian history. Their concern is with observing and explaining the manifestations of human behaviour, with an underlying interest in the prediction and control of certain aspects of social life. At the opposite, "understanding pole," are those investigations which seek to interpret more fully the richness of meaning in human social relations and relations with the natural world. This tradition includes phenomenological sociology and psychology, which are no less rigorous in their question for a deep sense of understanding human life than is explanatory social science in its concern for predictive validity. This interest is exemplified in the following passage comparing fictive with actual human being by novelist James Agee.

> In a novel, a house or person has his meaning, his existence, entirely through the writer. Here, a house or a person has only the most limited of his meaning through me; his true meaning is much huger. It is that he exists, in actual being, as you do and as I do, and as no character of the imagination can possibly exist. His great weight, mystery and dignity are in this fact. As for me, I can tell you of him only what I saw, only so accurately as in my terms I know how; and this in turn has its chief stature not in any ability of mine but in the fact that I too exist, not as work of fiction, but as a human being. Because of his immeasurable weight in actual existence, and because of mine, every word I tell of him has inevitably a kind of immediacy, a kind of meaning, not at all necessarily 'superior' to that of imagination, but of a kind so different that a work of imagination (however intensely it may draw 'life') can at best only faintly imitate the least of it. (James Agee and Walker Evans, Let Us Now Praise Famous Men, quoted in Natanson, 1967)

There exists a continuing tension in social science between achieving a depth of understanding, while at the same time as measuring up to the standards of truth and consensus as required of a science. Zygmunt Bauman (1978) has termed this tension as "the challenge of hermeneutics." Bauman begins at the pole of science and attempts to show how successive scholars from Marx and Weber through Husserl and Parsons to Heidegger and Schutz have attempted to counter the challenge of hermeneutics.

A good case might also be made for proceeding from the opposite direction, showing how hermeneutics as the sciences of understanding the human spirit (*Geisteswissenschaften*) have developed as the result of the challenge of the natural sciences. This view holds that hermeneutics has grown out of a sense of a need to recover and maintain a fullness of human understanding in the face of the powerful claims of natural science to explain the world.

Within the context of traditional educational research, informed as it is by an orientation towards the explanation of behaviour, there has been a tendency to ignore the meanings which the participants give to schools as active subjects. In this sense educational research may be seen as a part of a larger "culture of positivism" (Whitty, 1974) or as an activity governed by the dominant rationality of the "age of science" (Gadamer, 1981).

Because much of traditional educational research has been founded upon positivist assumptions, I will trace the development of hermeneutics as a reaction to this tendency. It is a response to the need to recover and define a science of human understanding. What follows is a summary of the movement of hermeneutics beginning with Schleiermacher's initial proposal for a general hermeneutics through Gadamer's ontological turn, to Ricoeur's efforts to unite explanation and understanding. In this summary I will attempt to show how hermeneutics has been pushed forward by an interest in understanding, while at the same time as having to address the questions of truth and consensus. This discussion will conclude with some of my observations on the relationship between explanation and understanding, and action, particularly in the light of Habermas' and Ricoeur's criticisms of Gadamer.

Schleiermacher and Dilthey's Epistemological Hermeneutics

In the nineteenth century the question of how one gained reliable insights into human life was framed epistemologically. In the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant had developed the transcendental conditions for knowledge in the natural sciences. It was within this context that first Schleiermacher and then Dilthey attempted to develop a framework for the conditions of knowledge in the human sciences.

As a theologian, Schleiermacher was familiar with the practice of attempting to divine the original meaning of biblical scriptures and the application of these understandings to current questions of belief. He also understood the work of classical scholars attempting to interpret the meaning of ancient texts. It was in the direction of these "regional hermeneutics" that Schleiermacher sought a "general hermeneutic" which would provide the conditions for understanding the genius of the originating spirit behind the creation of the classical and biblical texts. He held that the genius of interpretation lay in the understanding of the author's unique insights.

Schleiermacher was able to deal with the question of explanation and understanding in the human sciences by contrasting a psychological interpretation with a grammatical interpretation of texts. The grammatical interpretation was concerned with the objective features of the language, while the psychological interpretation dealt with insights into the author's subjectivity. But in his formulation of hermeneutics Schleiermacher was faced with a pair of oppositions which he could not successfully resolve at the level of a theory of knowledge. Objectively there was the question of how to simultaneously entertain the common language and the individuality of the author, on the subjective level there was the problem of a mediation between an empathetic understanding of the author and an appreciation of differences between the subjectivities.

Dilthey took up the epistemological question opened by Schleiermacher concerning the conditions for understanding in the human realm. There are two features of note concerning Dilthey's contribution. One is this concern which he shared with Schleiermacher for a resolution of the objectivist/subjectivist dichotomy in the creation of a science of the spirit, the other is the influence of positivism which was contemporaneous with his own work. These two features indicate the direction of his major work Critique of Historical Reason in which he attempted to extend Kant's work into the conduct of human life.

Dilthey tried to heal the split between science and life by introducing a new dichotomy between natural science and human science. He accepted that Kant had successfully developed the epistemology of the natural sciences. What was required was an epistemology of the human sciences which, according to Dilthey, must take into consideration our essential "connectedness" to the human world. The introduction of the concept of '*Erlebnis*' (life) as the objective content of the '*Geisteswissenschaften*' made a parallel epistemology possible. '*Erlebnis*' referred to the meaning content of life experience. Life objectifies itself in the structures of meaning, from the structures of these objectifications we may trace back to the 'spiritual livingness.' For Dilthey, however, the life experience itself remained essentially subjective.

> What can be called an experience establishes itself in memory. We mean the lasting meaning that an experience has for someone who has had it. This is the reason for talking about an intentional experience on the teleological structure of consciousness. On the other hand, however, in the notion of experience there is also a contrast of life with mere concept. The experience has a definite immediacy which eludes every opinion about its meaning. Everything that is experienced is experienced by oneself, and it is part of its meaning that it belongs to the unity of this self and thus contains an inalienable and irreplaceable relation to the whole of this one life. (Gadamer, 1975, p. 60)

It is this irreducibly present subjectivism in the face of need for an objective content required by an epistemology which ultimately produces an unsatisfactory outcome to Dilthey's hermeneutics.

As a nineteenth century thinker, Dilthey was attempting to define the human sciences against the powerful claims of the emerging philosophy of positivism. In doing so, he was sensitive to the need to establish strong empirical grounds for such a human science. The desire for epistemological strength eventually frustrated Dilthey's project of healing the split between science and life. It did so for two reasons. Firstly, he began his work by accepting that Kant had established the logical grounds for natural science, consequently, he preserved the dichotomy by developing a separate 'science of the spirit.' By basing the '*Geisteswissenschaften*' on separate, but equal conceptual-empirical grounds, he could not link them to the '*Naturwissenschaften*.' The second reason for the failure was that the conditions of knowledge in the human science could not be as strong as the natural sciences because they rested, as in Schleiermacher's hermeneutics, upon an empathetic understanding of another. The consequence of this was that understanding remained separate and not equal to explanation.

Challenges to Rational Knowing

In the twentieth century the influence of Marxism and Heidegger on hermeneutics has been decisive. Both have questioned the possibility of rational human self understanding. Marxists have pointed out how existing social and economic relations structure consciousness. Writers in this tradition seek-out means by which we might uncover and explain the ways that understanding becomes distorted. These insights have introduced an historical/anthropological-critical moment into hermeneutics which is present in the work of Jürgen Habermas.

Heidegger's philosophical inquiries have radically questioned the meaning of understanding and interpretation in the hermeneutical theory of Schleiermacher and Dilthey. This is accomplished by the introduction of an existential-ontological hermeneutic which appears to resolve the epistemological dualism of understanding and explanation faced by nineteenth century philosophy. Heidegger indicates that understanding is not arrived at through interpretation, but that all conscious understanding, and the act of interpretation itself, is made possible by a pre-predictative understanding which is a structure of our Being-in-the-world.

The fundamental shift between this and the earlier form of interpretive theory may be seen through the example of the hermeneutic circle. Schleiermacher's hermeneutical method is dialectical, in which the special insight of the author is present in each part of the work, as well as in the whole. Interpretation requires a continuous movement of part whole part (Hoy, 1978, p 7). The interpreter of an historical text requires the historical and linguistic knowledge to understand the text as it was shared by the author and the original audience. At the same time, an understanding of the author's intentions will facilitate an understanding of the meaning of the text. The text illuminates the time, while a knowledge of the time illuminates the text. This double knowledge puts the interpreter in the position of potentially knowing more about the author than the author knew of himself (Bleicher, 1980

p. 15). Heidegger's hermeneutic circle holds that one does not stand over against the past as an omniscient observer. Interpretations which present themselves to us are only possible because we are already situated within a fore-structure of understanding. The knowledge which allows understanding or explanation is derivative of the existential structure of understanding. The hermeneutic circle is inescapable, but if one is able to enter into the circle in such a way that the fore-structures themselves become open to question, then there are possibilities of insights into our original Being-in-the-world.

Gadamer: Philosophical Hermeneutics

Heidegger's student, Hans-Georg Gadamer, has continued in the tradition of existential-ontological philosophy and has elaborated on the hermeneutic aspect of it. A central insight has been his rehabilitation of the notion of prejudice which applies Heidegger's fore-structures of understanding. Gadamer holds that our situatedness in tradition makes possible both our understanding and ensures that this understanding will be prejudiced. Failure to acknowledge this is a denial of our own history and we become unable to comprehend the situatedness of our own understanding. He points out how prejudice gained its negative connotation during the Enlightenment, which attempted to dogmatically assert the supremacy of reason over history. Romanticism which opposed this was not an effective denial of the presupposition because it merely reversed rationalism (Gadamer, 1975, p. 242).

For Gadamer hermeneutics is universal. The understanding of one's own situation happens simultaneously with an understanding of texts. This understanding flows from an openness to the meaning of the text, i.e., being prepared for it to tell us something new. In this way the hermeneutic task is an outer directed questioning which proceeds dialogically between the text and one's own tradition.

> The hermeneutical task becomes automatically a questioning of things and is always in part determined by this. This places hermeneutical work on a firm basis. If a person is trying to understand something, he will not be able to rely from the start on his own chance previous ideas, missing as logically and stubbornly as possible the actual meaning of the text until the latter becomes so persistently audible that it breaks through the imagined understanding of it. Rather, a person trying to understand a text is prepared for it to tell him something. That is why a hermeneutically trained mind must be, from the start, sensitive to the text's quality of newness. But this kind of sensitivity involves neither 'neutrality' in the matter of the object nor the extinction of one's self, but the conscious assimilation of one's own fore-meanings and prejudices. The important thing is to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text may present itself in all its newness and thus be able to assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings. (Gadamer, 1975, p. 238)

Gadamer refers to this consciousness of the hermeneutical situation as effective historical consciousness. Unlike the [illegible] individualistic understanding of the intentions of the other in the hermeneutical interpretation of [illegible] effective historical consciousness is [illegible] the [illegible] between one's [illegible] and the text [illegible] fusion of the [illegible] of each.

The [illegible] takes place within language [illegible] forms the [illegible] hermeneutic because it is through it that the subject matter of the text is brought to [illegible]. The subject matter of the [illegible] relates [illegible] the world; in Gadamer's words [illegible] language [illegible] p[illegible]

> Language is by no means simply an instrument, a tool. For it is in the nature of the tool that we master its use, which is to say we take it in hand and lay it aside when it has done its service. That is not the same as when we take the words of a language, lying ready in the mouth, and with their use let them sink back into the general store of words over which we dispose. Such an analogy is false because we never find ourselves as consciousness over against the world and, as it were, grasp after a tool of understanding in a wordless condition. Rather, in all our knowledge of ourselves and in all knowledge of the world, we are always already encompassed by the language that is our own. We grow up, and we become acquainted with men and in the last analysis with ourselves when we learn to speak. Learning to speak does not mean learning to use a preexistent tool for designating a world already somehow familiar to us; it means acquiring a familiarity and acquaintance with the world itself and how it confronts us. (Gadamer, 1976, pp. 62-63)

Language as being and the dialogical fusion of the horizons of the text and interpreter come together in conversation. In Truth and Method, Gadamer refers to the example of conversation as being illustrative of the hermeneutic experience. In order to interpret a written text the reader must seek out the question to which the text provides the answer. The reader, like the participant in the conversation, does not place himself within the subjectivity of the author, but turns with the author to the topic of the text. The words used by the participants are not the tools of discourse possessed by the individuals, but the products of a common heritage of being in the world. In the conversation the world is disclosed through the language.

> What emerges in its truth is the logos, which is neither mine nor your's and hence so far transcends the subjective opinion of the partners to the dialogue that even the person leading the conversation is always ignorant. Dialectic as the art of conducting a conversation is also the art of seeing things in the unity of an aspect, i.e it is the art of the formation of concepts as the working out of the common meaning. (Gadamer, 1975, p. 331)

The example of conversation suggests both philosophical and, in a certain sense, the methodological aspects of Gadamer's hermeneutics.

in terms of the philosophical aspect, the question of relating understanding to explanation is subsumed under an overall ontological question which occupies us as co-participants in a common world. The certainty of explanation exists only insofar as we accept the supremacy of rationalism. Gadamer returns to an earlier form of validity, in which philosophical inquiry seeks a harmony between reality as it appears and the human mind. "Truth happens over and above our [conscious] wanting and doing" (1975, p. xvi). In saying this he implies that there is no method by which truth claims may be worked out in advance.

Gadamer's extended description of the conduct of conversations does suggest a method by which truth will emerge. He asserts the hermeneutic priority of the question, in which the participants are conducted by a sense of openness in the direction the question lies. He contrasts questions with opinion. Solutions to problems are expressions of opinion which tend to hide the genuine question. Questions take precedence over opinion because they are more foundational, they are what the assertions of problems and solutions are about.

> To conduct a conversation means to allow oneself to be conducted by the object to which the partners in conversation are directed. It requires that one does not try to out-argue the other person, but that one really considers the weight of the other's opinion. Hence it is an art of testing. But the art of testing is the art of questioning. . . . to question means to lay open, to place in the open. As against the solidity of opinions, questioning makes the object and all its possibilities fluid. (Gadamer, 1975, p. 330)

Conversation in Gadamer is, however, not intended to be methodological. It is more of an illustration of the course that understanding takes, which one becomes aware of and follows when there is an appreciation of the universality of the hermeneutic solution.

The human sciences mutually imply both subject and object. Where Dilthey tried to solve this problem working within the limits of epistemology, Gadamer located the inescapable source in Being. In locating the source ontologically, he argues against the alienating distanciation required of a methodology of social science which seeks objective explanation. Where there are questions conversation recognizes the mutual participation of the partners in dialogue in a commonly held world, but it does not return to the methodological demands for an external validation outside of the participants.

Criticism and Hermeneutics

Gadamer's hermeneutic philosophy, building as it does on Heidegger's existential-ontological hermeneutics, has provided a satisfactory response to the epistemological problem posed as the question of relating explanation and understanding. There can be agreement as to its correctness for us as participants within a communal social world. But there remain doubts regarding its status as social science, and while these remain there are questions as to its validity as a source of "knowledge" along side empirically oriented science. By returning to ontological foundations Gadamer may be, in effect, accused of breaking off dialogue with explanatory science. A second area of doubt, and a more important one for the purposes of a study like this which purports to speak to practice, is the question of the critical moment. How do participants come to take a critical perspective on their activities and, by so doing, escape a false consciousness?

These questions are central to my entire study and will be re-addressed in the final chapter. In this chapter I shall indicate how these questions have been treated philosophically by Ricoeur and Habermas. I shall close this section by returning to Gadamer and noting how he displays the critical element in his most recent work.

Habermas's critique of Gadamer, originating from a Marxist perspective, questions the universality of hermeneutics. Both are in agreement that interpretative methods of social science which focus on the subjectively intended meaning of others as objects are inadequate. They are critical of such methods in that these naïvely accept the interpretation of the actor and because they do not recognize both actor and interpreter as partners within a dialogical-dialectical situation (Bleicher, 1980, p. 153). Unlike Gadamer, however, Habermas wants to claim that it is possible to provide an objective critique outside of tradition. Tradition, he argues, is influenced by the historic structures of economic and social domination existing in society which systematically distort communication. Participants in conversation will be unable to recognize these distortions unless they gain an historical/evolutionary perspective on their situation.

In Knowledge and Human Interests (1971), Habermas shows how the model of Freudian psychoanalysis might be applied to society as a way of bringing these distortions to the attention of the participants. He also announced, in the revision of another earlier work Theory and Practice (1973), the elements of his own programme of critical hermeneutics which would provide the tools for a critical theory of society. This would require

> an explanation within the framework of a theory of systematically distorted communication. If that could be developed satisfactorily in connection with a universal pragmatics and combined with precisely formulat[illegible] basic assumptions of historical materialism, then the systematic comprehension of cultural tradition could become possible. It may be that a theory of social evolution leads to testable assumptions concerning the logic of the emergence of systems of morals, of cosmologies and corresponding cultural practices. (p. 19)

In his writings over the past ten years, Habermas has maintained and refined these basic elements of critique of historical consciousness and the development of a critical theory of social action which can replace it. His newest interest has been in the direction of the development of a theory of communicative action which finds its basis in continental and Anglo-Saxon critical and analytical philosophies of language.

Hermeneutics as Distanciation and Participation

The above outline of the development of hermeneutics has shown how the major questions of human self understanding and action have been addressed in relation to the development of the human sciences. The mutual implication of persons as both the subject and the object of the human sciences has raised the central questions of how much we may understand ourselves in our social lives and to what extent this kind of understanding can lead to reflective action. The philosophical debate within hermeneutics has reflected this mutual implication of subject and object by alternately emphasizing human existence as participation and distanciation from the social world. Heidegger and Gadamer have spoken to participation in their objections to the alienating distanciation of science, while Dilthey and Habermas have emphasized the critical distance required for reliable knowledge.

The writings of Paul Ricoeur seem to open the possibility of a rapprochment between participation and distanciation through new insights into the activity of interpreting texts. These new insights, drawn from Ricoeur's own philosophical journey through existentialism and structuralism to hermeneutics, are helpful in two ways. Firstly, they institute a dialogue between ontology and epistemology, and thus help to re-address the question of validity on new grounds. Secondly, they provide a link between Gadamer's hermeneutics and Habermas's critical theory at the level of practice.

Ricoeur introduces his own hermeneutic philosophy at the point where ontology supersedes epistemology. He is in agreement with this position, but feels that it is inadequate, because it ignores legitimate questions of validity.

> With Heidegger we can move backwards to the ground but any return from ontology to the epistemological question about the status of human sciences is impossible. This situation is the most unhappy that one can think of, for a philosophy which breaks the dialogue with these sciences is left with only itself. Moreover, it is only on the way back that we can prove the claim that questions of exegesis and of historical criticism in general are derivative questions. (Ricoeur, 1973a, p. 125)

Ricoeur points out that the text serves as a model of distanciation which is necessary in all communication. He shows this by tracing the primary distanciation which occurs in speech between meaning and event through its inscription in written texts and the eventual appropriation of its meaning by the interpreter. With Gadamer, he agrees that the task of interpretation is not to seek insights into the subjectivity of the author of the text, but to "explicate a sort of being-in-the-world unfolded in front of the text" (1973b, p. 140). The appropriation of the meaning of the text remains the end of interpretation. But contrary to Gadamer, Ricoeur holds that distanciation is a necessary condition for understanding the meaning.

Ricoeur (1973b) uses the example of the interaction of genre and style in texts to show how distanciation takes place prior to understanding. In texts, discourse is objectified as a work and individualized as style, but it is so recognized because it is part of a genre. The genre has a genetic rather than taxonomic function in the sense that it produces a common ground between speaker and hearer. As such, the genre rules the production and interpretation of the work, but because it does this, it makes understanding possible. Individualization in style is seen only within the structure already provided by the genre.

The text itself, as a work, is a product of distanciation from discourse, which in turn, is distanced from the event. In discourse only the meaning of the event is preserved. In spoken discourse, like conversation, the subject, audience and reference are given. In text the subject is hidden from view, presented only through style and selection of genre. The audience, in a sense, selects itself because it consists of readers who see the relevance of the text for themselves. The reference, no longer ostensive as it is in spoken discourse, is to a world shared by reader and writer. These levels of distanciation allow the reader to participate in the world of the text. Here Ricoeur uses the example of literature as the most extreme form of distanciation in which the real is distanced from itself in the *mythos* of the story and the *mimesis* of the tragedy.

Ricoeur reverses Dilthey's thesis by noting that self understanding and the understanding of others come as an end of interpretation rather than as a necessary prerequisite for it. The appropriation of meaning only becomes possible through an initial distanciation from the text. In this way Ricoeur is able to escape psychologism by linking understanding to explanation.

> If the last act of understanding is appropriation of the meaning of the text, this appropriation here can only be tied dialectically to distanciation proper to discourse, writing and a work. (Ricoeur, 1973b, p. 141)

Ricoeur's re-introduction of the hermeneutic circle as the dialectic between distanciation and participation continues as a theme through other writings as he introduces further examples of how these are linked in interpretation. The examples he draws on include a theory of history (1978) and a theory of action (1971).

Of particular interest to this study is the way in which this dialectic is employed to mediate the problem of tradition and criticism in the Gadamer-Habermas debate. The seeming opposition does not exist when the participants in this debate are seen as representing moments in ethical life which is "a perpetual transaction between the project of freedom and its ethical situation outlined by the given world of institutions" (1973c, p. 165). Ricoeur argues that the theoretical debate over the precedence of ethics over culture, in fact, becomes resolved in practice.

Ricoeur sees the dialectical link between ethics and culture concretely working in two ways. The first is the critical distance, as outlined above, which must be taken in order for understanding to take place at all. Distanciation is, initially, already immanent in the bringing to language of lived experience. But it is not only language, because an understanding of the language speaking to us is rooted in "an anthropology of care." Secondly, beginning from the pole of criticism, the dialectic is also at work. The critical interest only makes sense through its immersion in the practical situation which it seeks to change. In this sense it carries into being and owes its existence to a tradition within which it finds itself.

> The ethical life is a perpetual transaction between the project of freedom and its ethical situation outlined by the given world of institutions. (Ricoeur, 1973c, p. 165)

The ethical situation which has given impetus both to Gadamer's hermeneutics and critical theory is the same, the evolution and spread of technical reason. Habermas refers to this as the "inner colonization of the Lebenswelt" (Habermas, 1981 quoted in Rasmussen, 1983, p. 5). Gadamer describes this ground in the following concrete example:

> In a technological civilization it is inevitable in the long run that the adaptive power of the individual is rewarded more than his creative power. Put in terms of a slogan, the society of experts is simultaneously a society of functionaries as well, for it is constitutive of the notion of the functionary that he be completely concentrated upon the administration of his function. In the scientific, technical, economic, monetary processes and most especially in administration, politics and similar forms, he has to maintain himself as what he is: one inserted for the sake of the smooth functioning of the apparatus. That is why he is in demand, and therein lie his chances for advancement. Even when the dialectic of this evolution is sensible to each one who asserts that ever fewer people are making the decisions and ever more are manning the apparatus, modern industrial society is oppressed by immanent structural pressures. But this leads to the degeneration of practice into technique and—through no fault of the experts themselves—to a general decline into social irrationality. (Gadamer, 1981, p. 74)

The project of both Gadamer and Habermas is a common one, to rescue human social action within the increasingly technological lifeworld.

B. The Conduct of Research Using a Conversation

Using conversation as a mode of researching curriculum implementation finds its rationale in Gadamer's statement about the hermeneutic priority of the question. The priority of the question is posited by the observation that we are already immersed (prejudiced) in a historical situation which structures consciousness. The question, by admitting to this absolute finitude of experience, creates a structure of openness which allows us insight into the way we typically view the world. "The revelation of the questionability of what is questioned constitutes the sense of the question" (Gadamer, 1975, p. 326).

Conversation is related to questioning in the sense that participants in conversation are directed by a sense of openness, by something presently indeterminate which is worthwhile talking about. The topic, and the world to which the topic belongs, are held in common by the conversants, but the question arrives during the course of the conversation, in Gadamer's words it "presses itself upon us" as the negativity of experience counters preconceived opinion. In my research, for example, the problem of implementation, of the actual relation between a rational curriculum plan and the practical activity of teaching, is sustained by the underlying question of "how do we as educators make schools more educational?" This question presents itself to us in the dialectic of reflection on practice. It goes beyond the technical research which seeks "opinion" about exemplary and poor curriculum implementation practices to be emulated or avoided.

Gadamer refers to questioning as an art which preserves the structure of openness and which enables the conversation to continue.

> The art of questioning is that of being able to go on asking questions, i.e. the art of thinking. It is called 'dialectic', for it is the art of conducting a real conversation. (Ibid., p. 330)

The Nature of Conversation

Michael Oakeshott in his famous essay "Poetry and the Conversation of Mankind" has suggested that conversation is the appropriate image of human intercourse

> because it recognizes the qualities, the diversities, and the proper relationships of human utterances. As civilized human beings, we are the inheritors, neither of an enquiry about ourselves and the world, nor of an accumulating body of information, but of a conversation, begun in the primeval forests and made more articulate in the course of centuries. It is a conversation which goes on both in public and within each of ourselves. (Oakeshott, 1959, p. 11)

It is in this same sense of conversation, as the voices of participants making sense of a commonly held world, that I wish to introduce the nature of conversation. What I do not wish to do is to embark on the analysis of conversation as a structure of everyday life, a project which has been of interest to ethnomethodology. Writers, like Garfinkel, Sacks and Goffman have shown how conversation structures intersubjective reality. The researcher in such studies is an observer interested in how members accomplish this reality, but he is not concerned with the nature of the reality itself. My concern in this study is as a participant in the conversation about curriculum implementation. As such I want to look at conversation from the perspective of how what is spoken about relates to reality. My interest is in the topic of the conversation itself.

Roland Barthes (1980) provides a helpful beginning when he indicates how conversation defies classification according to a fixed structure. He describes it as belonging to the order of "almost" (*presque*) which is not easily accepted by science. The interlocutors are speaking of something which cannot be completely articulated. ~~This is also~~ Gadamer's point when he speaks of the structure of openness in the question. Barthes suggests that literature as the "science of the indirect" and the plural is more faithful to what the conversation is about than is analysis.

Conversations as belonging to the order of 'almost' do not follow the systematic, orderly fashion of scientific description or rational argumentation. In their orality they harken back to an earlier, pre-literate tradition. Havelock (1976) outlines how oral language is based on an acoustic memory which is associative rather than being comprehensive, like literate memory. The topics of conversation are linked together in loose bundles of images which are recognizable immediately and bring to mind other instances "like this." Associations follow a logic of happenstance, hence the movement of conversation is not linear. Barthes (1978) calls this movement of conversation *dis-cursus*, the action of running here and there.

In A Lover's Discourse (1978), Barthes shows how love is spoken about by a lover in such a way that is understood by the "reader" as a participant in the conversation. What is presented are not statements about love, but figures of the lover at work 'caught in action." It has the character the "almost," which we recognize as aspects of being in love.

> Figures take shape insofar as we can recognize, in passing discourse, something that has been read, heard, felt. The

> figure is outlined (like a sign) and memorable (like an image or a tale).' A figure is established if at least someone can say "*That's so true! I recognize that scene of language*" [italics original]. (Barthes, 1978, p. 4)

A lover's discourse employs references to books, experiences, friends and authorities. But the references are not to be considered authoritative, but amical.

> I am not invoking guarantees, merely recalling, by a kind of salute given in passing, what has seduced, convinced, or what has momentarily given delight of understanding. (p. 9)

Conversation about curriculum implementation is somewhat like this. As participants we do not attempt to define with any degree of finality what curriculum implementation is. Teachers and consultants experience their own and others' efforts to improve education in practical ways, and speak about implementation from this ground. The figures (instances, recollections, hopes, etc.) are brought forth against this background and referred to as supportive examples to help understanding.

Discourse, at this point, is not dialectical as Gadamer asserts, but it unrolls, it "turns like a perpetual calendar" (Barthes, p. 7). The dialectic of question and answer is a second layer which introduces the critical moment more formally into conversation. This refinement, crucial to the discussion of conversation as a mode of research, will be discussed below as it relates to practice. At the first level, however, participants in conversation are more fundamentally concerned that what they are speaking about is understood in its various aspects. Conversations are characterized by a profusion of examples, ostensive references and vivid recollections. It is these, more than anything else, which give a conversation its form and motion. This originates in the participants' primary interest in conversation, which is to come to some common understandings of what the conversation is about.

Conversation as Distanciation and Participation

If hermeneutic research requires both objectivity and understanding, how may conversation become a mode of hermeneutic research? Following Barthes, we note that conversation has a rhythm which distinguishes it from other forms of discourse. It is a form of discourse which seems well suited for allowing us to catch the participants' experience of everyday life. The intent of this research has been to approach the question of curriculum implementation from the perspective of those interested in improving schools. I have been critical of technically-oriented research which tends to rationalize and control teaching by gathering data on practice. Conversation allows research to return to a ground of practice by letting the participants themselves speak.

Bourdieu, in *An Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977), has shown how the theoretical logic of the language of research is different from the logic of practice. Theoretical constructions of practical life necessarily seek generalizations and smooth out contradictions in order to construct an abstract and comprehensive picture. In practical life contradictions can exist quite easily if they do not have practical consequences. But when practice becomes the object of scholarly research it becomes transmuted by the requirements of theoretical representation.

Conversation about curriculum implementation is close to practice in the sense that the participants speak about the meaning of their activity. The talk contains both prospective and retrospective views which allow participants to compare intentions and results of their efforts. The possibility of hermeneutic understanding is present in such a conversation as the negativity of experience forces us to realize that the hopes for school improvement lie beyond current implementation practices. In addition to this historical-effective groundedness of the conversation, a possibility for hermeneutic understanding is also present in the practical interest of the participants. A practical interest, as opposed to the technical interest, implicates the participants in an active reflection on their own activities and is oriented towards doing.

The potential for a hermeneutic understanding into the question of curriculum implementation is accentuated in this research by making the conversations themselves texts available for reflection. This introduces a supplementary distanciation in which participants may reflect on what is revealed about curriculum implementation in the conversation. It is at this level of conversation-as-text that the dialectic can be recovered (recalling Barthes' point about the non-dialectical nature of conversation.) Directed by the openness of the question, the conversation itself may be continued as a dialectic between how we speak of implementation practices, what these reveal about our understanding of teaching, how this is shown in the conditions of work of teachers and consultants, and how these all relate to our practical interest in making schools more educational.

Conducting the Research

The research was conducted by entering into a series of four conversations with each of six consultants and teachers who were implementing a new social studies curriculum. The curriculum mandated for adoption for the coming school year. The participants in the conversations were as follows:

The Consultants

Diane - the district supervisor of social studies
Jennifer - a district social studies consultant
Linda - a district social studies consultant

The Teachers

Jim - social studies teacher and department head, Northern Junior High School (5 years teaching experience)
Mary - social studies teacher, Northern Junior High School (7 years teaching experience)
Fred - social studies teacher, Northern Junior High School (15 years teaching experience)

The conversations were carried out over a three month period from early March to late May, 1982 at the junior high school and at the school district's teacher centre.

Three stages of conversational research may be identified: initiating conversation, continuing the conversation and reflecting on the meaning of curriculum implementation. Each of these stages followed certain guiding principles drawn from my understanding of hermeneutics. In some cases these principles were established prior to the research; in other cases they emerged as the study progressed. The three stages and the guiding principles of each are summarized as follows:

	Purpose	Guiding Research Principles
Stage I	To initiate conversation.	Orienting participants to my interest in curriculum implementation. Coming to know participants and their experiences.
Stage II	To continue the conversation by keeping the question open.	To remain mindful of the hermeneutic priority of the question and to continue to search out the questionability of implementation as reflected in practice.
Stage III	Reflecting on the meaning of curriculum implementation and its implications for practice.	To interpret and accurately show the meaning of curriculum implementation for the participants. To critically reflect upon the relation between technical and pedagogical practice within the existing school system.

The first stage of the research consisted of securing contacts with the social studies teachers of Northern Junior High School and with several of the school district consultants. Once the contacts were made, I provided each participant with a letter of introduction and a copy of my research questions (Appendix A). The questions were intended to initiate and orient the conversation, rather than as an imposition of questions which were relevant to me and my research hypotheses. My purpose was to "break open" the problematic of implementation in order to seek out what it reveals about practice.

What I have called the second stage of research constitutes the actual conduct of the research. Guided by Gadamer's admonition of the hermeneutic priority of the question, I sought to maintain a structure of openness toward the meaning of curriculum implementation which would bear up and conduct the conversation. Following each conversation I would identify the topics contained therein along with samples of our dialogue about those topics. At the same time I would write my interpretation of how the conversation spoke to the practice of curriculum implementation. Contained within the interpretation were further questions I had regarding how this curriculum related to teaching, curriculum change and the improvement of practice, and so forth (Appendix B). These summary transcripts and interpretive observations and questions were returned to a participant prior to the next conversation.

The third stage involved a further interpretation of the meaning of curriculum implementation as it emerged through the conversations. Here, I attempted to surface and articulate the themes of teaching, curriculum change and setting which emerged during the course of the conversations with each individual. These themes are shown in Chapter IV. Subsequent to this interpretation of the themes of, individual practice, I have also attempted to draw together some overall observations on the relationship of a technical-theoretic practice of curriculum change and the situational interpretive practice of teaching. These are presented in Chapter V.

Infused throughout the research is an interest in coming to a fuller understanding of ourselves as beings who make curriculum implementation possible. This overall interest is guided by a desire to understand implementation as an activity in which we have engaged as educators wishing to make schools more educational. As we seek to understand the presuppositions of our typical modes of "seeing" problems and acting to make changes, we ask what does this reveal about the way we are? The questioning is hermeneutic, the interest is in emancipatory practice.

The overall guiding research principles are linked to this action-oriented critical reflection on curriculum implementation. The first of these is the principle of validity. The notion of validity in technically-oriented research requires that findings be verifiable to all competent observers. This is normally accomplished by empirical references which will adequately show the findings to be the case. Interpretive research, such as that of Psathas (1973), is left with the task of retrospectively testing an ultimately subjective agreement in order to satisfy questions of validity.

Validity in hermeneutic research is based on different grounds. Following Gadamer, we begin by agreeing that there exists no privileged externalized way of arbitrating validity. My research inquires into the practical and it includes the practitioners as co-inquirers. Practical action has its own in-build "validity for practical purposes" which is derived from the stock of knowledge available to the actor and the knowledge that s/he must act. This is true of both reflective and routinized action. The research findings shown here as the meanings of the participants as acting subjects have a certain validity as the representations of those meanings for participants.

The hermeneutics of Gadamer and Ricoeur allow a further level of validity beyond intersubjective agreement by turning outwards from these internalized meanings to a common world. This validity is rooted in a dialectical seeing of self in situation. With Ricoeur this can be traced first from a distancing of self from situation through conversations about practice and about desires for improvements in teaching. Through this distanciation an interpretive understanding becomes possible by means of a participation in, and appropriation of, the meaning which stands in front of the text of our conversation.

> Understanding precedes, accompanies, closes and envelops explanation. In return, explanation develops understanding analytically. (Ricoeur, 1978, p. 165)

The test of validity of the research findings remains a validity in terms of the participants, but through hermeneutics we come to understand that as researchers and educators interested in improving schools we are all participants. The negativity of the experience of technical action in the form of the implementation of rationalized curriculum plans, which is shown in this research, produces critical insights into the way we inhabit the social world. In hermeneutic research there is a self-implicated validity, oriented towards practical action. It was validity in this sense which I have attempted to follow as an overall guiding research principle.

C. Context of the Questioning

What follows is a brief description of the curriculum change itself and the accompanying implementation programme which the participants were engaged in at the time of the conversations. This provides the context of the questioning and will help the reader to understand some of the specific references being made by the participants in Chapter IV.

Historical Context

Like most newly mandated curricula, the new 1981 Alberta social studies curriculum may be best understood in terms of what it was replacing. The previous curriculum (1971) emphasized the need for students to develop independent inquiry and decision making skills on significant social issues. The programme sought to accomplish this through attention to the valuing process and inquiry-oriented experiences. The knowledge of specific and prescribed social studies content was de-emphasized in favour of attention to major conceptual frames of thought. This curriculum orientation stressed the importance of addressing local needs and expressed confidence in the teacher as programme developer. As a consequence of this there were no prescribed textbooks or content specifications beyond a general thematic framework.

The evaluation of the curriculum, carried out some four years later, reflected a general concern that the 1971 programme had not been well implemented.

> Indeed, we conclude that the Master Plan is still, five years after its creation, far more an idea in the minds of its creators than it is a guide to social studies education in the classrooms of the province. (Downey Report, 1975, p. 11)

The 1981 curriculum, itself, grew from a 1978 interim revision which attempted to address this concern for implementation among others. Ostensibly, the interim curriculum was to make minor changes to the original curriculum in response to the need for a more explicit and balanced curriculum, but much was changed (Clark, 1982, p. 78). The 1981 curriculum was a modification of the 1978 interim guide. In it central orientation of social studies as social inquiry remained the declared intent, but the revision endeavoured to be more specific as to the nature of social inquiry and to outline more clearly how knowledge, skills and values were related to this overall aim. The task of improvement was interpreted to mean improved inservice and better programme development, particularly in terms of classroom and teacher resource materials.

Although the Downey Report is often cited as the source of direction taken in the 1978 and 1981 editions of the new social studies curriculum, there were other political pressures at work during the development process which gave the programme its particular tone and shape. In an historical study of the development, Mawson (1982) outlines how various stakeholder groups such as Canadian studies advocates, the Alberta School Trustees Association, and others were promoting the need for a greater degree of control over what was to be taught in social studies. A newly created Curriculum Policies Board, made up of representatives of the general public and educators, became an instrument whereby specific public concerns for accountability and basic education could influence curriculum decisions. Mawson indicates how the Social Studies Curriculum Coordinating Committee (SSCCC), which was a committee made up of social studies professionals who had influenced the direction of the 1971 curriculum, were challenged by the Curriculum Policies Board and forced to institute more specificity and prescription in the curriculum than they wished to do.

While studies like Mawson's show up the political struggle between conflicting interests in curriculum development, there were other demands from the teachers themselves for help with teaching the programme. These demands were made known through the Alberta Teachers' Association and various local school districts. The shape of the 1978/1981 curricula[1] and the subsequent inservice programme which accompanied it can be understood, in rather simplified form, as the confluence of these twin pressures of control and help.

There are three aspects of the implementation of this new curriculum which I will highlight here because of their importance to the participants in this study. These are: the curriculum guide, the learning resources, and the Mentor inservice programme.

The Curriculum Guide

The new curriculum guide was structured in such a way so as to show the major components of an inquiry oriented teaching as well as the general content of each particular unit. A model of social inquiry was constructed as a heuristic device to show the inquiry process common to all teaching units (Figure 1).

Each unit was organized around a social issue involving a value conflict. The social issue becomes the focus for inquiry, with the conflict being resolved by following the steps of the model. (The documents are careful to point out that this is a sample process, not the only process.) The value, skill and knowledge objectives which should acrue from going through this process are also listed for each unit.

---

[1] Because the guide for the 1981 curriculum, which was being implemented by the participants in this study, was substantially the same as the 1978 guide, I will refer to them both as the "new curriculum." Clark (1982, pp. 83-84) summarizes the minimal differences between the two guides.


Evaluate the Decision and Process
8.
Beginning Inquiry Anew
Considering Next Steps
Implementing Action Strategies
Postpone Taking Action
Apply the Decision
7.
Identify and Focus on the Issue
1.
[illegible]loping
[illegible]ess
Deciding not to Act at this Time
Planning Action Strategies
Resolve the Issue
6.
Establish Research Questions and Procedures
2.
Taking Personal Value Position
Developing Awareness
5.
Synthesize Data
3.
Gather and Organize Data
4.
Analyze and Evaluate Data
Developing Understanding
Developing Understanding

Figure 1

Social Inquiry Model

Learning Resources

A major concern of teachers and certain interest groups had been the dearth of learning resources and teaching guides accompanying the 1971 curriculum. This concern was addressed originally in 1975 through a series of teacher developed units in locales around the province and intended for general dissemination. In 1977 the process of materials development was accelerated dramatically by the infusion of $8 million from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the creation of learning resources. Money was now available for the large scale development of learning resources. The principal resources for teachers were two: the Kanata Kits and the Teaching Units. The Kanata Kits were multi-media resource packages for teachers to enable them to follow an inquiry teaching programme for one of the units at each grade level. The Teaching Units were "exemplary" unit plans for a second unit at each grade, developed by contracted teachers in the province. Unlike the earlier local development projects, these kits and units were supervised centrally and developed along a standardized format by expert teachers.

The Inservice Programme

The importance of an inservice teacher education component of the curriculum implementation was recognized early in the evaluation and revision process, but explicit attention was not given until the development of the new curriculum guide and the initial production of the learning resources. In the Spring of 1978, Alberta Education launched the preparation of an 'awareness' inservice package to inform teachers of the rationale and nature of the revised programme. The awareness package consisted of two films: Change: The Ultimate Challenge, outlining the programme rationale, and Patterns and Parameters which indicated the objectives of the curriculum and introduced the social inquiry process. Included were also some introductory "hands on" sessions introducing the Kanata Kits and Teaching Units.

At the same time as the awareness package was launched, a longer term, more analytical inservice programme entitled Mentor was begun. Mentor would accompany the mandatory introduction of the curriculum in the 1981-1982 school year. It was intended to help teachers with aspects of the programme with which they felt themselves to be in need of assistance. Teachers could select from one of fourteen modules in the Mentor series. The subject matter for series was the social inquiry model. The modules were as follows:

1. Openers
2. Gathering Data—Maps
3. Gathering Data—Surveys
4. Gathering Data—Historical Documents
5. Gathering Data—Interviewing
6. Organizing and Evaluating Data
7. Evaluating Data
8. Synthesizing Data
9. Resolving the Issue
10. Applying the Decision
11. Valuing
12. Evaluation of Knowledge
13. Evaluation of Skills
14. Evaluation of Values.

The modules were designed by a development team of graduate students and professors at the university and produced by ACCESS, the Alberta Educational Communications Corporation. Each of the fourteen workshops followed a common format involving a video-taped presentation of an exemplary lesson and a series of worksheets and discussion activities related to the particular aspect of the inquiry model in question. The Mentor series as well as the introductory 'awareness package' of workshops were presented locally by some 125 teacher/consultants seconded from the classrooms of their local areas and trained to provide the inservice to their colleagues. The provincial ministry of education set aside some $2.2 million to defray the cost of producing Mentor and released time for teachers.

The inservice programme which was engaged in by the participants in this study consisted of an adaptation of the provincial series. Some Mentor workshops were given, but the majority of the sessions consisted of the introduction of Teaching Units or the addressing of other areas of concern such as evaluation. The school district workshops, like the provincial ones, followed several principles of inservice education which were recommended by a Tripartite Committee on Inservice Education (a committee made up of representatives of the ministry, school trustees' association and teachers' association). In making its recommendations in 1980, the committee acknowledged certain contradictions and dichotomies reported by research into curriculum development and implementation, including the tension between centralized and de-centralized development, and the need to regard teachers as active participants in the inservice (Tripartite

Committee on Inservice Education, 1980, pp. 6-9). While they recognized these contradictions they had to provide recommendations for the implementation of mandated programmes.

> New, revised and continuing programs of study are statements of public policy and as such are mandatory. (Tripartite Committee, 1980, p. 11)

Their recommendations, therefore, were constrained by the implementation of "some-thing" having the status of public policy. This resulted in a compromise which attempted to employ aspects,of decentralization and teacher autonomy, while retaining the overall aim of control. The recommendations included the clear identification of skills, knowledge and attitudes to be engendered by the new curriculum, a focus on the needs and personal goals of the individual teacher related to these aims, the development of competencies related to the programme change "by demonstration in real or simulated settings" most closely resembling conditions of use, and the "delivery of inservice by peers or resource people with credible, relevant experience" (Tripartite Committee on Inservice Education, 1980, pp. 13-14).

Chapter IV

THE PARTICIPANTS' MEANINGS

This chapter interprets the meaning that curriculum implementation has for the participants in this research. The meanings displayed here have emerged in conversations held with three consultants and three teachers over a period between March and the end of May, 1982. During this time they were just completing the year of inservice activities designed to assist in the implementation of the newly mandated provincial social studies curriculum.

The conversations during which these meanings emerged were about how curriculum implementation related to teaching. Our conversations were carried forward by certain fundamental questions about the relationship of curriculum to teaching. What is the difference, for example, between a Teaching Unit (plan) and teaching itself? How is consulting different from teaching and how do consultants help teachers? In what sense can we say that a curriculum is and can be implemented? and so forth. Questions of this sort emerged within the context of the conversation as we attempted to probe more deeply the meaning of curriculum implementation for us as educators.

The meaning of curriculum implementation to teaching practice was interpreted in an ongoing fashion as we continued with each conversation building on the previous one. The themes displayed in this chapter were produced following the four conversations and ongoing interpretation with each participant. This thematic interpretation was made possible by an analysis of the summary transcripts of the conversations and my interpretive remarks.

I have attempted to contextualize the themes displayed here by indicating something of the person's teaching background and my interpretation of the relationship which grew up between ourselves as participants in conversation. This is important for the research, because conversation is a friendly and personal form of discourse.

As a final introductory note to this chapter, I have provided the following summary (Table 2) which indicates the themes of each of the six participants.

Table 2

Participants' Themes
(Consultants)

Diane	Linda	Jennifer
To be held responsible.	1. "Loving what you do": personally identifying with the curriculum change.	1. Advocating changes while recognizing the risks of imposing ideas on teachers.
2. Frustration with being held responsible for helping teachers and principals to implement a new curriculum, while recognizing the complexity of human action and social change.	2. Inquiry as technique.	2. Being a helper: personally linking pedagogy and consulting.
3. Conflict between curriculum implementation and a belief that teaching is a way of being.	3. Experiencing and overcoming resistance.	3. Working together with others.
4. Striving to act authentically.	4. Dialogue: going beyond expertise and enthusiasm.	4. Experiencing alienation.
		5. Working in a bureaucracy: finding the fullness of meaning—curtailed by demands for organizational efficiency.
		6. Faith in the possibility of meaningful communication.
		7. Experiencing growth through the development of shared meanings.
		8. Questioning the possibility of reconciliation between communication and control.

Table 2 (continued)

Participants' Themes
(Teachers)

Jim	Fred	Mary
1. Searching for stable expectation of me as a teacher.	1. Reconstructed rationality and teaching.	1. Good teaching: being an autonomous person who empowers the personal thoughts and actions of others.
2. Faith in technique.	2. Security and choice: the expectation of the authorities and the freedom to teach.	2. Accountability and personal responsibility.
3. Personal conflict between pedagogy and technique.	3. The meaning of pedagogical concern.	3. The problem of effecting change: My belief and *influencing the practice of others.*
4. The feeling of isolation from other teachers.	4. Pedagogical decisions and community *expectations.*	4. Being managed.
	5. Humanizing teaching *and* maintaining control.	5. Discouraging signs: the *tendency of the school* system to fragment and control teaching.
		6. Hopeful signs: *some* tendencies toward reuniting thought and action.

Diane

Her Background

Diane has been supervisor of social studies for City School Board for about two and a half years. Immediately prior to assuming this position she had been on leave from her teaching position as a primary school teacher in order to embark on a master's programme in curriculum and instruction at the local university. She first began teaching in her early twenties after completing a bachelor's degree in education, and continued to teach after marrying and having had children. Now in her mid-thirties Diane feels that she is still "very much in the formative stages of her career" as a teacher and as a curriculum supervisor.

Our Relationship

I first contacted Diane by telephone in her office at the school board central office. I explained that I was interested in coming to a fuller understanding of curriculum implementation through the experiences of consultants, school administrators and teachers who were currently involved in a programme of curriculum implementation. I asked if I might meet with her to explain my research interest further and to discuss which of the school board social studies consultative staff might be willing to participate with me in the study. In her position as supervisor of social studies, Diane was responsible for the organization and development of a programme to assist the teachers and principals in their task of implementing the 1981 provincial social studies curriculum.

> As a supervisor in this district, we are a service . . . so really you have to define as a part of the service branch of the operation what is my responsibility in bridging the gap of the theory that is mandated from Alberta Education and the practice that is expected out in the field. . . . I view my role as being the teacher supporter, providing any kind of support, facilitating as much as possible putting the theory into practice, but not actually doing it. (Conversation 2, 4-20-82)

We arranged to meet in her office. Prior to our meeting I sent Diane a brief paper indicating my research interest and outlining my initial questions (Appendix A). Owing to a snowstorm she was unable to come to her office at the appointed time but suggested a luncheon meeting a week hence so that she might compensate for having missed this first appointment with me. At the first meeting she outlined the school board inservice programme and her role in the implementation of the new social studies curriculum. Because this implementation programme was such a large undertaking for herself, the school board and the provincial department of education she believed that as much research information as possible should be collected on it. Accordingly she warmly welcomed my research proposal and suggested the names of several of the social studies consultants she might contact as participants in the study. Since this first conversation was informal and exploratory it was not tape-recorded.

I tape-recorded our three subsequent conversations. The first two of these conversations took place in Diane's office with each lasting about three-quarters of an hour. These meetings were cordial but I felt that she was being cautious in her statements, taking care to indicate how her implementation plans and actions were consistent both with her beliefs about change and teaching and with existing school board policies and organization. Having also worked at a school board office, I was sensitive to the fact that to do a central office job like her's one must be loyal to the direction and the goals of the organization, ~~and~~ must also demonstrate a confidence in exercising one's own responsibilities. Accordingly, I was circumspect in my questioning, not wishing to force Diane to be defensive about the school board nor to make statements which she might feel would compromise her own position. There were several occasions within these conversations where I offered to turn off the tape-recorder or to delete statements from the summary. In her office I was also aware that both of us sensed the pressure of her work there. There were papers demanding her attention on the desk and phones ringing (although her secretary was taking messages). In this room I felt conscious of imposing upon Diane's time and how our ever more reflective talk about implementation was becoming inappropriate here. We agreed to meet at a restaurant for our final conversation.

It was one month before we met for our extended luncheon conversation. During that month Diane had had a profoundly moving educational experience. She had attended a week-long retreat/workshop on native education with some 30 teachers, principals and central office colleagues in preparation for the development and implementation of the board's native education programme. This workshop had encouraged all those present to reflect deeply on the meaning of their own lives as educators. Diane referred to both this experience and our own conversations as a much appreciated occasion to reflect and talk about her work, an opportunity which was seldom available in her busy schedule. We met on this final occasion for two and one half hours.

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation

Theme One: *To be held responsible.*

The responsibilities of her own position and those of others emerged almost immediately as a theme in our conversations. Diane spoke of how as a curriculum supervisor she was responsible for facilitating the implementation of the social studies curriculum and not for implementing the curriculum herself. She reminded me of this distinction several times during our conversations when I inadvertently referred to her task of implementing the curriculum.

> T We began [in our last conversation] with the idea that certain decisions are made regarding the curriculum, [and] as supervisor of social studies . . . you are responsible for carrying them out.
>
> D Some clarification is needed here, because it is not my responsibility for putting this curriculum, this theory into practice . . .
>
> A major part of my work has been to let principals know, with some support from the associate superintendents, [that] it is in fact their responsibility.
>
> (Conversation 2, 4-20-82)

She also spoke of her own responsibility with respect to principals.

> D To make their job as easy as possible [by] identifying and articulating what the essentials are that they should have, to make some recommendations as to what sort of inservice they should have that would give them enough of the important aspects of the programme so they could judge whether or not implementation was happening in their school for themselves.
>
> (Conversation 2, 4-20-82)

Diane pointed out how the programme of school based budgeting recently implemented by the school board had clarified the curriculum responsibilities of the principal. Through school based budgeting the principal and school staff are able to set educational objectives and allocate resources to reaching these goals.

> D When you adopt a mode where you are attempting to articulate results in education and put a dollar figure beside it. Once these dollars are allocated you are responsible for the results.
>
> (Conversation 3, 5-27-82)

While indicating the responsibility of others Diane was acutely conscious of her own responsibilities. She maintained extensive files of her own memos, reports and plans related to the inservice programme. She had also ke[illegible] diary until the pressure of time forced her to suspend it in[illegible]r. She indicated that she wanted to keep a record of her activities to show how she had carried out her responsibilities. She felt that research information, such as mine, would also be helpful in showing this.

At the beginning of our conversations Diane claimed that the seeming inconsistency between the teacher's pedagogical responsibility to children and the responsibility assigned to him within a functionally structured educational hierarchy did not really exist.

> D Right away there is a conflict for the teacher, do I respond to the youngster who is my responsibility to teach, or do I pay attention to what somebody else thinks I as a professional in the classroom ought to teach the kids. . . . this is a fundamental problem . . . I say we can do both . . . we have expectations which are defined and determined by society in this province. It is the Curriculum Policies Board. They are the lay people in the province who advise the politicians about what it is we ought to be teaching kids in the social studies. This advice has come out in the form of a curriculum guide . . . we tell teachers if you are going to teach in the province of Alberta you will do this.
>
> (Conversation 1, 4-8-82)

This proved to be a particularly troublesome question which could not be so easily dismissed by Diane and me as our conversation progressed. It was a question which led us to ponder more deeply the meaning of teaching and the question of who is responsible for speaking for society and in what manner they should speak.

D Your question here [in T's reflections on our first conversation] about the role of society, and do you feel that society is being represented by our Curriculum Policies Board [or] by our teachers. I don't know, that's a really tough one.

T The question I ask myself is if the teacher has traditionally been charged with the responsibility of teaching young children, therefore, the teacher is assumed to be a responsible member of society . . .

The conversation became less philosophical at this point and turned to how the provincial educational authorities are tending towards more centralized control of teaching. Diane cited what she regarded as the unfortunate imposition of province-wide achievement tests as an example of how teaching will be made to conform to externally imposed expectations. Being responsible then developed into a political question, the question being who has the power to define the expectations that one is responsible for having to meet?

D Backing up from there you enter into the political arena and have to ask some fundamental questions about who decides what change is necessary.

(Conversation 3, 5-27-82)

The conversation also began to address the experience of being responsible in a more direct way, particularly following Diane's participation in the native education workshop. She recalled workshop experiences which drove home for her how lonely positions of responsibility are for those who occupy them. When one is a superintendent or a principal charged with personal responsibility for leading a school district or a school there are so few people in whom one can confide. I recalled similar examples from my own experience working closely with my superintendent. Diane indicated that for her in her own position her closest confident is another female curriculum supervisor with whom she converses often. When I went on to question the wisdom of vesting so much responsibility in individuals Diane responded by describing the way the native education workshop was run as a counter example to our current practices.

> D . . . . the consultant [from the firm who ran the workshop] was 35 or 36 years old. He brought with him an elder who spoke Cree and a middle-aged interpreter. Part of the message there for me as an educator and someone concerned about teaching other adults, is that one person cannot teach another person. Many people are involved and many ages are involved. .
>
> . . . The three of them worked together in a very spontaneous fashion . . . [if] the elder would indicate his displeasure at something, the young man would stop and clarify something immediately with him. But there was a great deal of mutual respect and he would never criticize the younger man.
>
> (Conversation 3, 5-27-82)

Theme Two: *The frustration of being responsible for helping teachers and principals to implement a new curriculum while recognizing the complexity of human action and social change.*

Despite the care which Diane took in our conversation to define the limits of her own responsibility as a "helper of implementation," she acknowledged that she was responsible for the success of the inservice programme, but not the implementation itself. She felt uneasy about this, because she recognized that ordinary measures of success in the form of immediate tangible results would be inappropriate to something so complex as teachers changing their way of teaching.

> D Implementation to be effective has to come from within . . . so you have to change the whole value and belief system of the individual involved.
>
> (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

Diane saw that the intentions behind the new social studies curriculum went far beyond having teachers employ some new text materials "in the same old way." She saw it as an attempt to put into action a belief that children should learn to inquire into their social world and, in so doing, take an active role in their own learning. The curriculum being implemented, therefore, was questioning the very meaning of teaching held by many teachers.

It was a source of frustration for Diane that the scheduling of an implementation stage within a curriculum process structured on the traditional continuum of development, implementation and evaluation, implied that each of these was a discrete event. The massive infusion of provincial funds into the school board for implementation had helped provide for an increase in her consultative staff and had given two inservice days for all social studies teachers. But this funding was for one year only.

> D There is no question in my mind that this is a very complex, integrated curriculum. I question whether it is possible to learn enough about the curriculum to put the intentions into the classroom with only a two day inservice. . . . All the [research] literature says this takes three to five years.
>
> (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

Diane feels that the inservice programme itself has been helpful for the social studies in the district, because it has increased awareness and given a sense of excitement to the subject area. But there is little support for her as she confronts the complex task of implementation understood as human change and development. In our final conversation we talked of this in terms of trust and community. Diane remarked how in the interests of getting on with the job we fail to allow time for trust to grow in a community of people.

D How do you go to an associate superintendent or trustees and say we need an extra million dollars worth of people time to establish trust before we're going to do anything to them or teach them anything? [laughs]

T It almost makes you laugh to say it, "to buy a million dollars worth of trust" . . . in that sentence you show the complete incompatibility of the two modes.

D Oh yes, and yet I really believe that when I listen to the trustees' honest and genuine concerns and frustrations about education . . . they are human development kinds of things. But they never talk about them [at Board meetings].

(Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

The university and the research literature on curriculum implementation has not been particularly helpful to Diane either. She recounted the criticisms made by one of her graduate school professors on a research study into curriculum implementation. This professor claimed that anyone who talks about implementation superficializes the process. In one sense Diane agrees.

D . . . as soon as you're talking about implementation, you're talking about change . . . teacher change. Everything we've done in implementation has been very superficial. We've provided new materials . . . but that is not really what needs changing . . .

In our district we're starting to go beyond, we're talking about effective teaching and affective learning. Looking at what really makes a difference in the classroom. And it's not curriculum materials, it's not Kanata kits, not those technical kinds of things.

. . . I believe that we are still at a very superficial level . . . as soon as you start dealing with another level, it becomes difficult to explain what you're doing. So you don't have support . . . and when you don't have support it's hard to go forward.

(Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

But when faced with the implementation task Diane had to fall back on the available research literature which "superficialized" its meaning.

> D . . . these are the five areas [identified in the article[1]] upon which I based my entire year's plan. Just because there was nothing else for me of a structural nature to build some logic into what I was doing . . . to organize what I was doing.
>
> (Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

In a sense Diane has been cast adrift in a stormy sea between theory and practice. She supports the new curriculum because it is an attempt to put into practice many of her beliefs about what teaching should be. Her position seemingly provides her with the power to facilitate the implementation of the curriculum, but more importantly, she must show results because she has been given the resources to carry out the task. This is the meaning of "outcomes based education" which has recently been adopted by the school board as a system of management. So practically she must get on with the job of implementation. The criticism of implementation on a conceptual level at the university strikes a responsive chord with her, and resonates with her own theorizing about teaching and curriculum plans. But she is left without any way of linking this theory with her own very practical situation in which she cannot possibly so easily disavow the notion of curriculum implementation. So she unhappily retreats to what she acknowledges as an inadequate theory as the only firm ground on which she can stand

Theme Three: *Conflict between curriculum implementation and a belief that teaching is a way of being.*

Diane's appreciation of the complexity of human change, and hence her understanding of the magnitude of the implementation task, is rooted in a belief that teaching as a way of being consists of far more than a collection of learnable skills and techniques.

> D I feel that as a professional charged with the responsibilities I do have, I just cannot go into a group of teachers and talk about concepts, the valuing process, the inquiry process and all these things,[which are component parts of the new curriculum] . . . ignoring the child and the relationship between the child and teacher. I feel [that you have to] grab teachers emotionally . . . . they have to know that you are speaking to them personally.
>
> (Conversation 2, 20-4-82)

In this second conversation Diane directed me to an article entitled "Teaching as Being: The Right to Personhood" by Beverly Cunningham[2] which developed for her the distinction between teaching as doing a job and teaching as an act accomplished by a person acting authentically. Cunningham says of teaching:

> Clearly there is a need for the recognition of teachers, not as things, but as beings. Things can be described, defined, fragmented, measured, controled. Things do not change from within. Things can perform actions, but they do not experience. Beings, on the other hand, actively describe, define, seek wholeness, elude measurement, pursue freedom. Beings change and grow and experience. Things do. Beings not only do, but are. This distinction is probably of greater significance than has in the past been recognized. It is time teachers began to think about it. Teachers need to recognize their human-ness and to take responsibility for improving the quality of the experience they call teaching. (1979, p. 18)

Diane pointed to the distinction raised in this article as we conversed about the need for self-reflection if teachers are to see the need for changing their way of teaching. She was uncomfortable with the way the self-reflection activity built into the provincial inservice programme on the new curriculum (Mentor) only addressed teaching on an objective "doing" level.

> D The kind of reflection in Mentor is still very objective because Mentor has been designed for every teacher in the province.
>
> T So [what's needed is] a reflection coming from within, not an externally imposed one?

D Yes, and I see MENTOR as being very superficial in that way . . .

T You can't get a [true] reflection by asking a direct question can you . . . . it's a bit insulting to a teacher to ask them to type themselves as a teacher.

(Conversation 2, 20-4-82)

Diane accepts that there are some aspects of teaching which are amenable to an incremental acquisition of skills and that these can be communicated through inservice activities and teaching units.

D I like the word repertoire. These teaching units help to expand our repertoire as teachers and show us another way to achieve our goals in the classroom. In this way the teacher grows.

(Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

But the relationship between skills and what it is to be a teacher is a complex one which is a source of conflict for Diane in her day to day work of helping others to implement the new social studies curriculum. In one sense she is able to rationalize her activities by saying that:

D What teachers lack is training, the skills required. The new curriculum is addressing this training need . . .

(Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

But as we continued to discuss the question of how to address this training need of teachers, while wishing to respect the teacher's autonomy as an acting person the essential tension between freedom and control emerged again and again.

D . . . and as an individual when you provide somebody with a curriculum guide or teaching unit you are wiping out, to a certain extent, the right of that individual to be truly professional.

(Conversation 2, 20-4-82)

I expressed a similar sentiment in a subsequent conversation.

T Change to what? I think that's the wrong question though . . . as soon as you prespecify change . . . then that's manipulation. That person becomes the object. The change itself becomes the important thing.

(Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

So in the end, our conversation turned to a deeper questioning of the whole direction curriculum development and implementation activities have taken.

D I'm not sure what the long term effects are of the massive curriculum development activities which have taken place. I'm not sure if that has been good. It has taken away the desire . . . and confidence of that individual teacher to give something of himself.

T That's exactly what I've been thinking.

D And if you can't give something of yourself in that instructional process what are you giving?

. . . I've written a little unit for grade one that is being used throughout the province. And I shudder to think about how that's being used by some teachers. And I shudder to think about how poorly I was able to put down in black and white about how that should happen [in the classroom]. And what right do we have to impose one way of teaching on thousands of teachers and hundreds of thousands of kids?

(Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

Here Diane has also raised the question of interpretation which was another aspect of the conflict between implementation and teaching as being which reoccurred frequently in the course of our conversations. We noted how unit plans, curriculum directives and inservice descriptions of teaching methods could only be but pale reflections of real teaching in the presence of real children.

D The teacher who made this particular unit intuitively has a sense of what to do with kids, with this topic, the objectives . . . you lose something when you translate this to written form.

(Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

And yet these pale reflections are re-interpreted by real teachers who are teaching real children in real classrooms and who are guided by their own beliefs about teaching. Diane sees this sending of these curriculum "communiques" as merely communicating on what she calls "only an intellectual level."

> D It's fine to send and receive at an intellectual level, but we need more crossovers . . . [the intellectual level] does not make the communication complete. Traditionally we send out a unit and expect it to be implemented . . . and all sorts of changes happen when you start de-coding.
>
> (Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

Interpretation of unit plans is inevitable, but what teaching essentially is cannot be communicated through them. So Diane finds herself in a double bind when it comes to relating implementation to teaching. She wishes to communicate with teachers intellectually and emotionally as one who is fully human herself and as one who regards teaching as a fully human act (teaching as being), but the means of communicating through written plans and formally scheduled inservices at which the plans are distributed are inadequate. This is because Diane works within an organizational hierarchy which pre-structures communication to remain on an informational level.

> D I hate the word supervisor . . . I'd like to be called something else, master teacher even. There are so many divisions we create. Even a consultant—there is a division there. I think the most important thing in effecting change is to speak their language and to speak directly and personally to them.
>
> (Conversation 2, 20-4-82)

Theme Four: *Striving to act authentically.*

Within the restrictions imposed by the job and the organizational structure Diane strives to act in accordance with her beliefs about teaching. Teaching for her means to be interested in the intellectual and the emotional life of children. In order to act authentically in inservice with teachers Diane feels that she must first establish the existence of that common interest in children with teachers. She described in one of our conversations how she employs pictures of classroom situations with captions like "the geranium on the windowsill just died, but you, teacher, went right on talking" as a common experience of teaching.[3] Some, like this one, are negative examples, others are positive statements of the relationship of teacher and child in the shared world of the classroom.

The need to develop a sense of community founded upon trust and a communal interest in children and the improvement of life in the classroom were continuing themes, particularly in our second and third conversations. But as we continued to discuss the importance of this, Diane reflected on how the day to day pressures of her job as supervisor afforded her so little time to sit back and think about how the direction of these daily tasks she performed as a supervisor related to her beliefs.

> D I'm very much a changed person from when I took on this job, almost two and one half years ago. I need to get back . . . [to university]. I'm missing talking and thinking about education in this way.
>
> (Conversation 3, 27-5-82)

The pressure to do her job and the consequent lack of opportunity for personal reflection is an alienating experience for Diane. She usually has the feeling that above all else action is required of her, but she is uncomfortable with this. In a letter to me reflecting on our conversations she said it this way:

> The opportunity for reflection and discussion of truly significant issues in education have become a "luxury" for me personally. Often I become forced into a mechanistic/technical role and do not take the time to engage in critical and deep reflection about myself and my work. As educators become called upon to account for themselves, quantity is often substituted for quality. In the Service area of public education accountability usually shows itself in behaviors that are of high profile/visibility and often technical in nature.
>
> (Letter, 8-6-82)

The native education workshop has been one of the few occasions that she has been able to get back in touch with herself, and in so doing be able to once again communicate with others.

> D . . . and we had the time [at the workshop] to reflect . . . that was an absolute luxury to go away for five and a half days and talk about your feelings about education.
>
> T . . . But you were really changed by the experience . . . we are so impatient about getting on with the job, that we forget what the job really is . . . what is efficiency really?
>
> D I [now] have a new understanding of patience with other human beings. Hopefully, I'll let people talk more . . . I feel like I'm always on the edge of my seat and I'm trying to fix something.

Diane links her own experience of alienation with the alienation of the teacher from his work. She sees that her own authentic acting must attempt to restore the power of the teacher to act authentically.

> Until we (teachers) have the freedom to create total learning environments for children that are not continuously at the mercy of individuals and controls external to us, the responsibility for education cannot belong to the classroom teacher. It seems logical that the person charged with the responsibility should have some say in the decisions affecting that classroom.

> . . . It is apparent to me that a few events over the past weeks have affected my thinking with respect to these issues. The cultural awareness retreat as well as the discussions with you have forced me to reconsider my beliefs and consequently my actions.
>
> (Letter, 8-6-82)

The opportunity to reflect is possibly a beginning to the restoration of a link between self and work.

Linda

Her Background

Linda had recently returned to teaching after having been on extended leave for eleven years while her children were young. She had begun teaching first in 1965. Looking back, she felt that there was no question of her not being a teacher like her mother before her. Linda quickly developed a reputation as an innovative and energetic junior high school social studies teacher. Her personal talents found a ready ground for development in the experimental and expansionist educational milieu of the late sixties. She was asked to join the staff of a new junior high school where she helped, at the request of the then district social studies supervisor, to spearhead a totally school-developed curriculum. She described this as being:

> an incredible experience getting teachers together planning curriculum and working together implementing it. Where you really understand what you have planned and you go in and try it out with one group of students, go back and revise it. (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

At the time the Provincial Ministry was also beginning to lay plans for a curriculum revision which eventually became the 1971 social studies programme. Linda was invited to serve on an initial planning committee discussing the shape of this curriculum before her leave of absence in 1969. Upon her return to full-time teaching in 1980, she found it interesting to see how many of the early ideas she had advocated, like inquiry, were now part of the curriculum.

Linda was among thirteen teachers from the school district selected as teacher inservicers for the 1981 social studies curriculum.

At the time of our conversation she was teaching junior high school social studies in the mornings and performing consultant duties in the afternoon. Just prior to our final conversation in late May, she learned that she would be continuing on in the coming year as the single junior high social studies consultant for the district.

Our Relationship

I met Linda through my initial contact with Diane, the district supervisor of social studies. We had four conversations between April 8 and May 26, each lasting from three quarters of an hour to one and a half hours. The first three conversations took place at the teacher centre, with the last being held at the school in which Linda taught in the mornings.

Linda was always well prepared for our meetings. Prior to our sessions she would have read the summary transcript of our conversation along with my interpretative remarks and further questions. She prepared her own written remarks in response to mine, which she read to me. These remarks would normally take the form of clarifications and additions to what she had originally said in the conversations.

Our conversations were not so much in the fashion of a mutual questioning of curriculum implementation as they had been with some of the other participants. This was particularly true in our first three sessions. Here, Linda most often interpreted the questions I raised as problems demanding solutions. Accordingly, her responses were limited to a description of what she was actually doing in her inservice sessions, or to an identification of techniques still needing to be developed in order to correct difficulties I suggested.

These solutions were usually given against a backdrop of specific instances of resistance which Linda was meeting in her inservice activities.

In the fourth conversation this relationship of "problem-poser" speaking with "solution-giver" altered slightly as I began to indicate some of the deeper contradictions I was noticing in the intentions and practices of curriculum implementation.

I began this fourth session by recalling Linda's comment following the third conversation that "we seemed to be going around in circles." I used this as an occasion to introduce the idea of the hermeneutic circle. This notion, new to Linda, captured her interest and she asked a number of questions about it. She then introduced her own written comments on the third conversation which highlighted several question-like responses to the current inservice programme. One of these was the concern that teachers were being presented with the inquiry method of teaching social studies in a didactic manner, another was her observation that a structured inquiry model made inquiry more 'politically acceptable' than the more open values oriented curriculum of 1971. These suggested a nascent criticism of the implementation programme. In connection with these points, we began to talk about the kinds of things that the inservice programme and teaching units were not doing and perhaps could never do. Linda expressed some concern that there was too little time for teachers to get together to talk as colleagues about curriculum and that in the coming year there would be even less time as the Mentor implementation programme ended.

Linda was working with a colleague developing a teaching unit to accompany one of the topics in the curriculum at the time of our conversations. She referred to this writing on a number of occasions as we spoke about the relationship between curriculum as concept and teaching. In the initial conversations, references were confined to how this unit reflected the social inquiry model of teaching and how it was received in early draft form at inservices. The process she and her colleague were engaged in in developing the unit was becoming more important. In later references, however, Linda talked about how the activities of discussing, writing and rewriting were so helpful in making significant changes.

Although cordial, and often animated, our conversations lacked a certain openness which would distinguish them from more standard procedures of interviewing and observation.

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation

I have identified four major related themes which seem to emerge from the over sixty topics we touched on during our conversations about the meaning of curriculum implementation. The promotion of social studies as social inquiry is the way to prepare children to live in the world of the future. Linda firmly believes that this is a necessity. Themes are as follows:

1. "Loving what you do: personally identifying with the curriculum change."
2. Inquiry as technique.
3. Experiencing and overcoming resistance.
4. Dialogue: going beyond expertise and enthusiasm.

Theme one: *"Loving what you do: personally identifying with the change."*

> L I was involved in the initial planning of the '71 programme. [There was] a recognition at that point, maybe not very clearly focused, that we could no longer teach social studies as facts and that society would be changing more and more rapidly. . . . Somehow we had to provide children with a process for dealing with facts, with people . . . A way of getting away from a whole emphasis on facts to an emphasis on process and people. (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

Linda has a vision of the future as a place where the individual is caught up within a milieu of rapid technological and social change. It is a world within which one must cope with masses of information in order to survive successfully. One must harness all personal resources; all of one's knowledge, skills and values in order to deal with pressing social problems.

The curriculum reforms of 1971 and 1981 had purposively addressed the issues of values and skills. In the 1981 curriculum the social inquiry model provided a clear and explicit way of attending to skills that she felt children urgently needed for the future.

> L [There is] a recognition in the curriculum that students are not going to be able to deal with this ever-increasing volume of knowledge that's going to come at them . . . we have to give some way of dealing with it, or they'll be swamped . . . and faced with more and more serious issues [like] the environment vs. industrialization. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

Linda felt a strong personal identification with this curriculum change which espoused intents and strategies which so closely corresponded to her own beliefs. She was unreserved in her energy and enthusiasm for implementing the programme. But what of those who did not share this conviction? In the implementation of such a curriculum how does she as a consultant reconcile the fact that much of what she does in her classes bears first and foremost on the way she envisages the future and how the children she teaches should live in it. I raised the question in this way in my interpretive remarks related to the second conversation:

> I read your very strong commitments to the social inquiry process in this second conversation. I was impressed too with the Kenya unit* and your description of it. To me it shows a realization of your commitment to inquiry into significant social questions in the concrete form of a teaching guide. Because it is in the form of a guide, it may be taken and used by other teachers.
>
> The social inquiry process places many demands on the children and the teacher. Your plan and inservice work show how you have taken on this challenge and achieved some very impressive results, as evidenced by the examples of children's work in the teaching guide. In our conversation you tend to downplay your own role as a teacher in achieving these results. You say (on p. 6) that the fact the teaching went well for you was not only a reflection of your own enthusiasm. But it seems to me that your personal commitment may have been the crucial factor in making this unit so successful for you. If this is so, then we are brought squarely back to the consulting "problem." If it is the spirit rather than the individual techniques and strategies which make the differences, how do teachers come to take on the spirit of a curriculum? (Interpretive notes, Conversation 2, 21-4-82)

Linda admitted that her strong convictions were central to the success of the teaching unit in her own classes. But she noted that you have to have the courage as a teacher to indicate your stand and support it through the way you teach.

> You have to be able to say "I love what I do" and not to dwell on the negative. As a teacher in the classroom if you dwell on the positive, that's the kind of response you got back. Negative thinking breeds negative thinking.
>
> . . .
>
> . . . that attitude thing if you know what your long-range goals are, have done your planning carefully . . . it sets up confidence I suppose. The trick is to instill that in your class, and it is a trick.

---

*Linda had lent me a draft copy of the unit which she and her colleagues were developing for the Department.

T Is that experience and technique . . . or enthusiasm?

L All of it, and you never get to all them [the students] . . . I keep trying to think of how you apply that in an inservice, because that's the direction of all this. Two or three criteria come to mind. One, the person [giving the inservice] really has to know their material . . . The other is an enthusiasm, it carries across as a belief in what they are doing. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

Social inquiry is clear and unproblematic as a goal. Not only is the goal desirable, but it is also achievable by all children if they are only given the opportunity to take on the challenge. The problem becomes one of mastering the appropriate techniques for reaching this goal: This is true in terms of teaching,

L . . . The potential is there with any school in the city; maybe not to the same extent or the same numbers involved and maybe it won't be as easy . . . That's saying that kids are smarter over here, and I won't buy it. (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

As it is also true for consulting.

T Have you found it quite an adjustment for yourself to move from the classroom to doing inservices?

L Sure . . . I've had no training in oral communication skills in school . . . Where do you go for training in terms of doing an inservice and coming across as enthusiastic and knowledgeable? (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

The next two themes show how we addressed these questions of teaching and inservice in the conversations.

Theme two: *Inquiry as technique.*

Linda regards the inquiry process as being a technique which may be taught to students. Techniques consist of learnable procedures which may be skillfully employed to meet certain predefined ends. It is in the nature of a technique that it may be mastered by anyone possessing a knowledge of the procedures and requisite skill and practice in its use. Teaching the inquiry method is in itself a technique which she feels can be mastered by all teachers.

Linda regards the Kenya unit as being a model of how the inquiry process may be taught to students. We talked about how teachers should use this unit and what they should learn by its use.

> T The question I have is this; how do you help teachers to do this? How do you have other teachers follow that method?
>
> L It [the unit] simply follows the inquiry process very clearly. . . . some teachers will never do it, some should never do it. But I'm convinced that there are a number of teachers in the middle who are more than willing to use the inquiry process, but are not quite sure how to do it.
>
> * * *
>
> T . . . This is the way you teach and you were able to create a unit based on this, to show teachers how to do it. . . . when a teacher looks at this my view would be that he will pick out a few ideas from here and use them.
>
> L Sure . . . the whole teaching unit is meant to be an example of how you could do this for one topic in grade 8, that's all it's meant to be. Anybody might go through it once [as printed] but by the second or third time they'd be making adjustments to suit yourself and class.
>
> T The scientific method is sometimes depicted like this [the social inquiry model]. One of the things that scientists say about that is, "that's not how I work, that's an idealization of the process." . . . Do you have any thoughts on this [as it applies to the inquiry model]?
>
> L It's an example. It represents a process, not the process, but a process that can be used. And I really feel strongly about teaching children a process that will work for them. They can take this process, apply it or modify it . . . I have no problem with that, so long as the emphasis is on process. (Conversation 2, 21-4-82)

My question about the transferability of Linda's way of teaching to other teachers was intended to explore the limits of technique. But her reply and subsequent conversation was consistent with a belief in inquiry as a technique which is available, and may or may not be used at the discretion of the practitioner.

As a technique the inquiry process becomes ethically neutral. The ethics of a technique reside in the user, not in the method. I was uncomfortable with this interpretation of inquiry and began to question as to how we might then understand teachers' resistance to adopting inquiry. I brought up some objections suggested in an earlier conversation I had with Fred. Fred doubted that all children were prepared as a result of their home experiences to accept a rational method of social inquiry. Linda had this reaction:

L It's a cop-out.

T It's a deep cultural thing too. If you are the kind of person used to making your wishes felt in the public arena, you've experienced . . . a personal efficacy . . . then you're going to have a different attitude to public affairs than if you feel that you've been kicked around. . . .

L But this curriculum provides for that opportunity if teachers will trust enough in themselves to do it. You see, part of what you're saying is that that teacher doesn't believe that kids can get what they need unless the teacher gives it to them. . . . somehow he knows what they get at home, what they can and cannot do . . . and I don't buy that!

T But . . . the kids come already with a world into the classroom and the teacher has to know that.

L Yes, more so with this [inquiry method] than any other . . . You're not going to take kids from a conservative-traditional classroom . . . you can't jump from there to there. There has to be a gradual process over a series of years . . . you are going to have to make small changes in order to get into the full process. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

If inquiry is a technique to be learned by observing and emulating models of proficient use, then resistance can only be overcome by the person trying it out in incremental steps. Efficacy is the measure of its worth and efficacy may only be seen in use.

T One of the big things I have here is this issue of how the child is uppermost in the teacher's mind in terms of their own class. And yet, in an inservice the only thing we can provide is a technique—that's one thing an expert can provide: "this is how you do it."

L "This is one way, and these are the results we get in the classroom." These go over much better.

T But isn't that still a technique in a way? "This is what I did"?

L Sure, but it's going the next step. Showing what the students did as a result of that. It tends to put the person on the same level of the teacher as well . . . it sounds more like teacher talking to teacher. You're talking techniques yes, but you're talking techniques in terms of your classroom. . . . So you're trying to get this joining together, but the vehicle is really through the students. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

Viewing inquiry primarily as a technique allowed Linda and her colleagues to identify and address specific component skills which were necessary, but not sufficient conditions for the implementation of the "full process." The one which was occupying her attention most at the time of our conversations was the aspect of evaluation.

L . . . We talked about it yesterday. Bob [one of the other consultants] said, and I agreed totally, that if evaluation is not dealt with, then the whole curriculum will be undermined. Because if teachers don't feel confident in evaluating in the new curriculum . . . it won't stand a chance of ever being implemented and it doesn't matter how many resource teachers there are, it will never work. (Conversation 2, 21-4-82)

If the goal and the means for reaching the goal remained relatively clear for Linda, she found the question of how to convey her belief in the social inquiry process to be somewhat more problematic. This question emerged in the form of experiencing and overcoming resistance.

Theme Three: *Experiencing and overcoming resistance.*

During our conversations Linda recounted a number of instances where teachers did not share her strong beliefs about the direction the social studies should take. These were interpreted by her to be resistance to change. She ran across this first as she visited classrooms during the one term she spent lecturing part time in secondary social studies at the university.

> L I was told by one co-operating teacher "that the inquiry process is fine for the theoreticians at the university; it has nothing to do with the practicalities of the classroom" . . . which was really neat, because I came from the classroom [her junior high school class she taught in the mornings] to have them tell me this. . . .
>
> . . . One of the biggest problems of implementation has to be a breaking down of this reserve within teachers [to try something new]. There is always a reluctance to take on something new when what we've been doing is comfortable, where we've had success. To go to something new we're not sure there will be success and maybe we don't even agree. There are many people who don't go along with the lack of emphasis on knowledge, who are reluctant to get into values. . . . You don't have self-confidence in what you are doing [with a new curriculum]. That's the crux of the issue in implementation—bringing people to that degree of self-confidence where they feel they can really try a new idea. (Conversation 1, 8-4 82)

Linda feels, however, that the majority of teachers are willing to try the inquiry approach provided the nature of the change is made clear and they are shown how they may go about implementing it. In our first conversation, she indicated that it was these ordinary teachers between the "diehard" resisters and the inquiry "enthusiasts," to whom the inservice effort was addressed.

> L These are the ones the implementation is directed to, not the diehards who will never change their ways. You just forget about them. Maybe that's an unfair statement, maybe it's just that their own philosophy simply can't work with the philosophy behind the curriculum.

> It's tricky getting to the teachers in the middle—you have to bring them out of the classroom. (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

Throughout our conversations Linda continued to refer to "the diehards" as a source of irritation.

> L I talked to a teacher here yesterday and she is quite prepared to have inservices tell her what to teach, but not how to teach . . . a process of inquiry. [She says] "just give me the materials and a curriculum guide [with more] prescribed knowledge areas." She wants it in more detail, so she knows exactly what she has to cover. And I have so much trouble with that. I got up and walked away as a matter of fact, because I knew we were both going to get into it. . . .
>
> . . . It's just so opposed to the way that I'm thinking, because I don't think we can mandate knowledge . . . we do have to give students a process for working with knowledge. And I think we have to do that with teachers too. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

I asked Linda how we should regard resistance. Intransigent resistance might well be ignored, but could we learn something from these "diehards" too?

> T I was wondering can the "diehards" show us something? In the sense that what they are saying is representing a particular view of teaching which they may articulate and others may feel . . . and at the same time it's something which causes us to think again about what we're trying to implement.
>
> L . . . and not get too carried away. That's a valid point, you need your devil's advocate . . . and they can be very frustrating.

* * *

> There isn't any one way of doing it and it's not as if one way was correct. And sometimes it's necessary to have people remind us of that. . . . The diehard at least forces you to think through your position very carefully, because you are going to have to defend your position . . . maybe that's a little inquiry process in itself. (Conversation 2, 21-4-82)

Linda indicated her willingness to defend her beliefs against those who disagreed with her and implied that the goals and methods of the inquiry curriculum would be made stronger by this opposition. She noted that even if a teacher were to reject the curriculum outright there would be no retribution, "nobody is telling teachers if you don't do it, you're going to be fired" (Conversation 2).

In our first two conversations questioning of the new curriculum seemed to be attributed to either misunderstanding or opposition. The possibility of alternative interpretations of the inquiry process being developed was not acknowledged until the third conversation. This came up as we talked about how Fred objected to the inquiry model as being too "computer-like."

> L Hmm . . . and I would say exactly the opposite. Inherent in that process is the opportunity for the child to / but that is the difference between what I see and what he sees in the process, which is legitimate.
>
> My interpretation is that the whole thing of trusting the child is inherent in it. Which is one of the major problems of implementation, bringing people to see that we will interpret it differently.
>
> T . . . how do you have the programme not appear to be computer-like?
>
> L You can't in writing . . . as soon as you put it on paper you are limiting the scope. You are saying that there is one process, but that wasn't the intent.
>
> By talking! [Here Linda described the experience of going to Northern with a fellow consultant to talk to the social studies teachers about how the curriculum related to their activities in the school.] Fred, for example, said some of the things he was doing which fit beautifully into our interpretation of social action. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

Theme Four: *Dialogue: Going beyond expertise and enthusiasm.*

The tension between dialogue and technique occupied our attention more and more as our converations progressed. Linda had to admit that her own conviction and enthusiasm for social inquiry had much to do with the demonstrable success of the unit with her own class. At the beginning of our third conversation she saw this as being a technical problem of communication. How does one convey enthusiasm to other teachers at an inservice?

> L I keep trying to think of how you apply that in an inservice . . . one, the person [giving the inservice] really has to know their material . . . The other is an enthusiasm, it carries across as a belief in what they are doing. If the person giving the inservice is lukewarm, then it is hard for the people there taking the inservice to be very enthusiastic.
>
> There is a problem in that teachers are not very good public speakers as a rule. It's not something we've had as training. Often what is mis-read as a lack of enthusiasm, or lack of knowledge, may simply be a nervousness in that kind of speaking situation. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

At the end of this third conversation this question emerged again not in the form of a problem of training but as a contradiction which must be recognized.

> L It really does get back to one of my original comments that you can't separate intellect and feeling. The intellect is the knowledge and techniques, but the feeling is "the related to." You have to have both in order to have a successful programme in the classroom or inservice. If you enter an inservice programme thinking you have this wonderful thing "to give" the teachers the response is going to be the same as to the teacher who has all this wonderful information "to give" to the students.
>
> T So with feeling, we're talking about more than enthusiasm. We're talking about a relationship between teacher and student. That's a good distinction. (Conversation 3, 3-5-82)

In the fourth conversation we took up this question of the relationship between dialogue and presenting a ready-made technique to teachers in the form of a unit plan. In my written reflections following the transcript summary of the third conversation, I made the following comment to Linda:

> You indicate a need to clarify what the teacher is doing already in relation to the proposed changes in the new curriculum. . . . But isn't there something beyond clarification in question here too? In a sense, the new curriculum is already an answer to a problem posed by the developers. That is "how do we prepare

> students to cope with the explosion of knowledge [information]." In other words, "how do we teach students to learn how to learn?" I don't say that this isn't a problem, but I see a difficulty in presenting teachers with a ready-made solution to a problem which they have little part in posing. This seems to limit implementation to the literal "filling up" interpretation of the word. (Interpretive Remarks, Conversation 3)

She responded by noting the importance of dialogue between participants.

> L You have to get past coming across as a teacher talking to students. So long as you're doing that you're coming across as a someone who knows it all . . . so long as you're in that kind of position there's not going to be dialogue back and forth. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

Later in the same conversation Linda pointed out the irony of teaching teachers about inquiry in a traditional way with the teacher/inservicer being styled as the expert.

In questioning the relationship between technical expertise and dialogue in bringing about change in teaching, we explored what appeared to be another contradiction. In this part of the conversation we talked of pre-service as well as inservice education within the context of Linda's recent experience as a university instructor.

> T The world that you bring as an expert is already a solution to a problem which you have already posed. That has always moved about two steps beyond where that other person is. I think it's a question of whether you want to call teaching . . . a bundle of techniques or if it's a [way of] being . . . we tend to approach inservice and teacher education on the assumption they are techniques.
>
> L But if you don't do that you'll have some [students] who are thinking that you're not giving them anything. . . . I taught that class from September to December on social studies methods and attempted to teach it as a being . . . some found it incredibly frustrating . . . "you never did teach me how to do a unit plan." We are very conditioned to thinking in terms of techniques.
>
> T And yet in teacher ed. there may be a little more justification for that, because they've never taught before.

L But somewhere along the line they have to get more than just pieces. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

The meaning of communication was now shifting from technique to dialogue, as later in the conversation Linda remarked:

L . . . it's not enough to get experts. That's maybe the least important. Maybe the [Mentor inservice] money should have gone to giving teachers a half-day off within their schools. With half as many consultants . . . who would go out and sit and talk with teachers within a school . . . where dialogue would begin with small groups within a school. I think we've gone all in the wrong direction. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

In trying to decide what the "right direction" might look like we began to talk about how our aspirations get translated in action within the formal organization of the school. This started with a discussion of the importance of goals and aspirations in human life.

T As human beings we move through life guided by certain principles and aspirations. . . . We articulate them from time to time. I may articulate a goal, but that's not my real goal. It's my goal in sight . . . it relates to my aspiration. What you say, what you do, points to that.

L It's like enthusiasm, the fact that you love what you do. That has to do with your aspirations. Your aspirations are reflected in your enthusiasm.

T What you are enthusiastic about is reflected in your aspiration.

L It has nothing to do with the curriculum, but how you connect with your students. The empathy and feeling in the classroom. The trust . . . The atmosphere where students feel secure enough to step out on a limb and try to do something original . . . that takes them beyond without and not have a fear of being shot down.

T I think that's a very important point. I understand now more of what you mean by risk taking than when you said it [in our earlier conversations]. To me [that risk taking] means that there is an interest in something outside of you . . . the question which pulls you foward and the student forward into inquiry. So you're willing to focus on the question . . . you are not afraid that somebody is assessing you, looking for a mistake. . . . Then you can take risks.

> L . . . I think that also has to do with your aspirations . . . your philosophy. That we should each be all that we can be. That . . . over-rides all the objectives of a social studies, or whatever programme. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

We finished up with some critical reflections on how bureaucracies tend to neutralize and control conflict by reducing aspirations to techniques.

> T What worries me is we don't seem to address this in the political process . . . this gets back to the question of bureaucratization, we want to make it all non-threatening to people.
>
> A bureaucracy abhors any kind of open dialogue at that level. They want to have a controlled discussion which is not controversial. You make the inquiry process into a technique . . .
>
> L . . . and water down the teaching units so that they're non-contentious.
>
> T And yet isn't it making a mockery out of our social studies, where we are trying to address what it means to be a person in the world.
>
> L Sure . . . bureaucracies are not getting smaller . . . so what that says about the future for developing and implementing new ideas is really quite scarey. (Conversation 4, 26-5-82)

Jennifer

Her Background

Jennifer had been a social studies consultant with the school board for three years. She came to the social studies consultancy through a background in elementary school language arts. Following three years of elementary school teaching for a suburban school board, Jennifer had completed a master's degree in language arts. She then returned to the central office of a different school boardin order to develop social studies resources for the 1971 curriculum. It was through this work that she became involved in several Department of Education Committees developing various aspects of the curriculum and support materials. This was followed by work with several more departmental committees on various aspects of the development and selection of materials for the new curriculum and finally, as a member of two ad hoc committees, one of which drafted the topics and themes of the 1981 curriculum and the other which oversaw the Mentor inservice project.

Our Relationship

I met Jennifer through my original contact with Diane. We had four conversations of forty-five minutes to one and a half hours each between April 8 and May 21, 1982. From the beginning, our conversations took the form of an open dialogue about the intentions and practice of curriculum implementation. Our initial conversation began with Jennifer inquiring as to my interest in curriculum implementation. As we continued, she offered comments on the progress of our questioning, on my research questions and on the validity of my interpretations.

Jennifer's active involvement in questioning contributed much to my own understanding of the practice of research in a hermeneutic mode. In our second conversation, for example, her question regarding the relationship between the themes I identified in the summary of our conversation and my original research questions about implementation prompted a deeper consideration of the meaning of research questions. This is illustrated by my interpretive remarks following this conversation.

> Your question [on page one of the summary transcript] has caused me to pause and think again as to the relationship between my original guiding research questions and the direction of our conversation. I see conversation, as opposed to interviewing, to be an appropriate mode of research which seeks to understand the meaning of curriculum implementation. The traditional interview presupposes that implementation exists as an object which can be known. By my asking the right questions and by [illegible]u providing the answers, I am able to find out your perception of implementation. . . . A conversational mode of research does not presume that such an objectified knowledge of the perceptions of curriculum implementation is sufficient. Implementation is, after all, a human construct which has a meaning we give to it and we act in accordance with that meaning. As consultant and researcher you and I are both interested in coming to an understanding of the meaning that curriculum implementation has for us as a practical activity. We are, in other words, making the very idea of curriculum implementation problematic so we can reflect upon the relationship between the social studies curriculum and teaching (Conversation #2, "interpretive remarks," 21-4-82)

Probing questions of this sort about the research enabled us to form an open and trusting relationship.

T Well I'm glad you asked that question, and you persisted . . . so I asked myself again . . . and really started to think about it, because it gets at the relationship between interviewing and conversation.

J I think it gets at your own meaning of implementation.

T Tell me what you mean by that.

> J Well I'm far more comfortable operating in this mode, picking up on things and talking about them and developing them. I didn't like your [written] questions when I first read them. It's not that I didn't like them but . . . I thought "Oh no. these questions again! How many times have we talked about these questions? This is going to be really boring!"
>
> But it has been really interesting and I'm really enjoying it. That's because we haven't looked at your questions one by one, you've asked and I've said "dah duh duh duh dah." But we've developed a meaning and I think that's we. I feel that your meaning is developing and going on too.

The openness of our conversations permitted a willingness to share our thoughts and feelings about how we talked about curriculum implementation as well as what we were saying about it.

The saying was an object of interest too, as our conversations took a distinctly linguistic turn. Jennifer's background in language arts coupled with my hermeneutic interest caused us to reflect critically on how our speaking showed the way we regarded the relationship between planning and teaching. We spent considerable time, for example, focusing on the we/they language which develops between people who perform different functions within large organizations like school districts, department stores and government bureaucracies. We also spoke at length about the [illegible] when consultants provide inservices.

Our explorations and mutual interests eventually led us to exchange books and articles which had been influential in our own thinking. I lent Jennifer articles by Gadamer, while she lent me Toffler's Third Wave. We wanted to share these as texts which opened new possibilities for present understanding and future action. But I also see these exchanges as further signs of our continued willingness to allow each other to learn more about who we [illegible]

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation

I identified over seventy topics of conversation which were raised during the course of our four discussions about the meaning of curriculum implementation. The first conversation mainly dealt with my research interest and Jennifer's experiences as a consultant. Topics included such matters as how she tries to help teachers use new ideas without an implied criticism of their present practices, the failure of demonstration lessons, success she has had with team teaching and so forth. During the second conversation we began to speak about areas of difficulty; the difficulty of forming collegial bonds of trust between teacher and consultant, the organizational problem of consultant cast in the role of "expert" and teacher in the role of "needy" and the general problem of allowing for communicative social relations within the bureaucratic structure of the school system.

In the third and fourth conversations we entertained more general philosophical questions while at the same time reflecting back on the concrete experience of consulting within the context of implementing the new social studies curriculum. It was during the third conversation that we attempted to bring to language how consulting serves teaching. simultaneously we also began to critically assess the way that the dialogue of the participants in curriculum implementation was pre-structured by the expectations of the school system. This led to a questioning of how concepts like zero based budgeting and the language of production are borrowed from business and uncritically applied to education. We experienced some frustration as we recognized how such language distorted communication, but how we, as a part of such organizational structures accepted and reinforced existing practices as part of our natural attitude. We gave instances of alternatives, suggesting Freire's writings and citing personal experiences, but we kept returning to the existing school board and Ministry structures and how these prevented the institution of these alternatives.

> J I really get elated by these discussions . . . but we keep running into these dead-ends. The ideas are exciting and I keep saying "why don't these ideas go somewhere?" It's partly for the reason you're saying that all of us in our roles are caught in a certain structure, but I hate to believe that we can't break out of that. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

In analyzing these four conversations I have identified eight overall themes related to curriculum implementation. These themes are indicated below:

Theme One: *Advocating change while recognizing the risk of imposing ideas on teachers.*

Jennifer realizes that she must work with some delicacy as a consultant involved in implementing the new social studies curriculum. She has participated in various aspects of the development of the programme and is a firm believer in its aims. She has also worked closely with teachers through the E.O.F. project,* so she has enjoyed a collegial relationship with these teachers. Curriculum implementation means that there must be some imposition of an innovation on teachers, but this must be accomplished without the implied corollary that there is fault in what the teacher is presently doing.

---

*Educational Opportunities Fund. This is the name given to provincially funded local educational initiatives. This particular project involved helping a group of fifteen elementary school teachers to become resource teachers to help implement the 1978 version of the curriculum.

> It's always imposing something on someone else isn't it? When you look at a system this size with 4,300 teachers, the logistics of involving them personally in provincial level curriculum change are impossible. To make it a part of them they have to be involved in the change . . . you can see the resentment when someone else comes and says they have to change and the implication is always what they're doing isn't any good. (Conversation 1, 8-4-82)

The balance between imposition and respect for the integrity of a teacher's practice remained as a constant theme through all four conversations. How one advocates change without resort to the position of authority, which the consultant already occupies, led us to question the nature of communicative action more deeply.

Ultimately, we had to agree that the advocacy of a curriculum change rested on moral and ethical grounds rather than grounds of authority. The personal responsibility for advocacy then became clear.

> T We are really getting back to what is our essential being in the world and right action with one another.
>
> J Even then, you're still imposing some kind of value judgement by asking what is right. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Theme Two: *Being a helper: Linking pedagogy and consulting.*

Jennifer sees teaching as helping children to grow and become able to cope with a complex and changing world. This is best accomplished, she feels, by developing in children the skills and processes which will enable them to be life long learners and critically aware citizens. She regards consulting as an extension of this role of helping, helping children through helping teachers. In this way there is a homology between teaching and consulting allowing her to use the word "we":

> J . . . generally speaking we as teachers view ourselves as helpers too . . . that's why people go into teaching . . .

> I don't have any trouble seeing myself in that helping sort of function. I guess the question is if that isn't what we are about, then what is it?

> T One of the thoughts I have had on that is I'm not sure that we don't have that vision. . . . but it's the way we're going about it. The problem is we have to ask why do we go about things in that way [referring to the imposition of expert advice on teaching].

> J . . . part of that vision needs to be "we" that means all of us who are involved. . . . We as adults do have a function of helping children to grow up so that they're going to be able to function and contribute in the most effective way in society. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

<ins>Theme Three</ins>: *Working together with others.*

Developing personal relationships with teachers is important to Jennifer. She likes working with people and is sensitive to their feelings about her. There are important moments when dialogue bridges the existing gap between being a consultant and being a teacher.

> J With conversation your meaning develops . . . that's why when I have teachers going out of my inservices and coming up to me and saying "Gee, Jennifer, I really learned something" or even "I enjoyed that."

For Jennifer that sort of evaluation is more meaningful than the survey feedback forms which are valued by the bureaucracy.

> J Like our evaluation forms rating from 10 to 1 . . . I don't use those, now I sometimes hand out forms which I say they can use if they'd like to comment. But that's not nearly as meaningful to me as someone coming up to me at a workshop. To even come up and talk to me, I know we must be establishing a relationship. Nothing is worse than after you give a presentation, having everyone file silently out. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

<ins>Theme Four</ins>: *Experiencing alienation from self and others.*

In addition to considering how actions spoke of being, our conversations also reflected upon the way that language showed a separateness of individuals within the school system. Jennifer pointed out how the reduction of people to role prevents our coming to understand others as persons engendering a suspicion and lack of trust. This is reflected in the alienated language of "they-ness."

> J . . . . so how can we get anything done and go about our business when there is all this confrontation set up? Student-teacher; teacher-school administration; teacher-central office; central office-ministry . . . . . and that's very much in people's language when they talk about their relationships with these sorts of groups. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

Being forced into performing merely a function for the organization is also an alienating experience for her. She described how she felt doing the implementation of the 1978 curriculum which had regarded the consultants as the instruments for conveying mandated methods to teachers.

> J . . . in '78 there was a very definitive element "we are going to make teachers do this." . . . the kits and teaching units will show them how . . . I really felt uncomfortable doing inservice sessions where I was laying this on to teachers. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

Theme Five: *Working in a bureaucracy: Finding the fullness of the meaning intended in a curriculum curtailed by demands of organizational rationalization.*

In considering the question of how to retain an open dialogue between the curriculum change and the teacher's existing practices, we began to discuss the ways that the bureaucratic structure of the school system places limits on the dialogue. We talked of how the curriculum must become an object in order to be handled by various individuals who perform specified functions within the system. Jennifer sees her own role within this structure as a kind of "middleman."

> ". . . interpreting and constructing meaning for the teacher . . . between the teacher and the central authority that brings the curriculum into being. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

She accepts that a certain amount of centralized control over the curriculum is necessary and that this requires a mandated curriculum. The difficulty with this particular curriculum is that in order to produce it as a document for general distribution, the ministry must have to make the change explicit and devise a plan by which it may be reduced to component parts for planned implementation into general practice. The central idea of the new curriculum is the social inquiry process. The inquiry process has been rationalized for explication, but in so doing it has undergone a drastic alteration and reduction in its original meaning and intent.

> J Since we've changed the curriculum [from 1971] in the sense that we've made it more explicit and prescriptive and turned the inquiry process into . . . not inquiry. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Jennifer attributes this to the poverty of the kind of language which a bureaucracy is constrained to use.

> J . . . again it's this business language, it's called it, but it's not it. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Jennifer's interest is in communicating the idea of inquiry to other teachers. On the surface, it appears as if her work with the interim (1978) guide, and for positions as an ad hoc curriculum committee member and school district consultant, have given her considerable opportunity to influence the development and implementation process. But she finds that her wishes become subordinated to the usual means for processing and enacting policy within the structure. These standard procedures, and not the original impulse for the change, provide the actual result of implementing this new curriculum.

> J I still think the theory or philosophical base of inquiry is sound. It's ideal . . . we'd like to be striving for it. We'd like to see children and adults able to operate in this mode. But it isn't consistent with the whole way our society operates and whether that's a part of this business language and technical, mechanistic . . . outlook we generally have in our society.
>
> . . . You know it's really frustrating . . . how the inquiry process on a philosophical base is so exciting and you see what's happened to it. In the name of inquiry the opposite of real inquiry is being done. Kids are being given the questions, manipulated to feel some emotion about that question and to explore it to come to an end that somebody else has already decided. It's really ludicrous.
>
> T Yes, it's sort of been bureaucratically packaged and sold to the mass audience. . . . you were involved in developing this . . . [it reflects] your own thinking and the way you would teach yourself?
>
> J Yes, except I started working on the revisions in the "Topics and Themes Committee" in 1976 and I know very well I never had any explicit thoughts about the kinds of things we're talking about here. Maybe some of the people who were directing us did, I sure hope so. . . . Maybe I was reflecting a philosophical base in what I was doing, but that wasn't an explicit thing for me. That happens often in education . . . then you get happening what's happening here. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Theme Six: *Faith in the possibility of meaningful communication.*

Although Jennifer is often frustrated by the way that open communication between her and other teachers is distorted by the structure of the formal organization, she retains a faith in the possibility of being able to communicate meaningfully on a personal level. She sees this happening through conversation between persons who share a commitment to teaching rather than through preplanned activities which tend to objectify teaching. She refers to the native education workshop which Diane attended as an example of this.

J . . . they weren't allowed to objectify anything. Everything was on a personal and affective level. We talked about that last time, for developing meaning that affective component [is necessary].

. . . just like the inquiry model the intention of the opener is to grab the kids emotionally, to get them involved in the study of the issue. Of course [there] the whole thing is backwards, because that affective commitment to an issue should come from the children [first]. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Theme Seven: *Experiencing growth through the development of shared meanings.*

Jennifer's faith in being able to communicate meaningfully with other educators is sustained by her own experiences of growth in understanding through dialogue with others. She contrasts the "real curriculum" which grows through the dynamic interaction of teacher and children with the flattened representation of the curriculum in ministry guides.

J [The ministry] brings the curriculum into being and then they pass it on to a completely different department, Field Services. . . . My view is that it's not curriculum until it's something that's influencing children's behaviour in the classroom.

T So the curriculum isn't an object.

J You might call it a relationship, the child and the teacher and what happens in the classroom. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

The best inservices, too, are the ones which allow the meaning of the curriculum to grow through the interpretation of the participants in open dialogue. Jennifer's work with the E.O.F. project has been like this for her.

J . . . we can't get away completely from the fact that we have a mandatory curriculum but in terms of how to work with it we can do that other [collegial] relationship we were talking about. . . . We got more to the point where our inservices were ones in which we tried to interpret together. . . . "tell us what your experiences are, have you tried any of this, if

> you haven't here are some of the things" . . . and they would say, "hey, I've done that before."
>
> . . . [in this way] we got that relationship . . . that dialogue, that conversation and started structuring some meaning of that group of individual teachers to that curriculum. (Conversation 3, 6-5-82)

Jennifer also noted that our conversations about curriculum implementation have been still another example of developing a shared meaning through our efforts to make sense of curriculum experiences and aspirations.

> J But we've developed a meaning and I think that's we. I feel that your meaning is developing and going on too. . . . it's not like having some answers to some questions.

Theme Eight: *Questioning the possibility of reconciliation between communication and control.*

Jennifer and I came to no resolution as to how one might implement a provincially mandated curriculum while at the same time preserving a freedom of action based on consensual understanding. Nevertheless, our conversations enabled us to locate and clarify this contradiction and to question whether or not the contradiction was irreconcilable and fundamental. Towards the end of our fourth conversation Jennifer stated this question in concrete terms like this:

> J Well it depends on what you want . . . everybody teaching the same thing . . . or whether you give people the ideas and allow them to go where they go. But we're not comfortable that way right? . . . the Downey Report [the evaluation of the 1971 curriculum] was done in '75 . . . maybe they didn't give it time. . . . Sure people weren't doing the same thing and maybe that's what should have been happening. But the evaluators came in looking for uniformity which is interesting, because the inquiry process fosters diversity. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

We also realized that despite our preference for dialogue over control, that considerations of control continued to predominate, because of the very nature of the bureaucratic structure within which curriculum development and implementation take place. We saw how, in the example of school based budgeting, even the very emancipatory impulses which are meant to increase freedom themselves become objects of administrative control. We realized that we were also a part of this.

> T [School based budgeting] is an extremely efficient use of power . . . you are making the principals and the teachers control themselves. . . . that only piles more on top of the responsibility that is already there.
>
> J Our bureaucratically-oriented society still tries to pay lip-service to these ideas like school based budgeting, which in its ideal should be a freeing sort of mechanism. Same with inquiry . . . they want to say they have them . . . yet everything they do almost denies the essence of these ideas.
>
> T And as individuals they're nice people and responsible people . . .
>
> J Then you ask "who's the bad guy?" But we have to take the responsibility ourselves. (Conversation 4, 21-5-82)

Our conversations thus ended with a feeling that a different form of collective action is needed, a form of collective action above the exigencies of productive efficiency. We come to realize that our work and even our questioning take place within an administrative framework which endeavours to establish institutional meanings of inquiry (by means of a common curriculum) and democratic decision making (through a policy of school based budgeting). By failing to question these prestructured institutional meanings, we risk losing what is essential to human inquiry and decision making. The opportunity for those who are affected to join in the conversation and the time to dialogue is required if teachers and consultants are to interpret the curriculum in a situation of open communication.

Jim

His Background

Jim joined the staff of Northern Junior High School in September 1981 as one of the three full-time social studies teachers. At the same time as joining the staff he became social studies department head. Unlike senior high headships, the junior high positions do not receive salary bonus, but an extra "prep period" is provided. Jim took this extra responsibility seriously and seemed to be well respected as a conscientious teacher and subject area co-ordinator by his colleagues and the school principal.

It has been a struggle for Jim to break into the school system. Although he had qualified as a social studies teacher in 1975 by virtue of completing the professional certification requirements in the faculty of education, following a bachelor of arts degree in political science and philosophy, he had not obtained a continuous contract with the school board until 1979.

> J I've been teaching six years altogether. For the first two years I subbed in a variety of subjects. I had many interim contracts, then taught at Fern Avenue for two years. I came here this fall from Fern Avenue. (I, 3-24-1982)

Like many young teachers Jim had been caught in the reduced demand for teachers caused by declining school enrollments. Social studies teachers had been among the first to be affected by this reduction.

Our Relationship

I had been introduced to both Jim and Fred through my original contact with Mary. Mary had indicated to me that there was some initial reluctance on Jim's part to become involved in this study owing to the time commitment it might require of him. This reluctance seemed to be allayed when I clarified that his commitment would be for four conversations of one hour or so each in duration scheduled at a time which was convenient for him at the school.

Jim and I met four times between March 24 and May 28 at intervals of approximately two to three weeks. By mutual consent we had arranged that these meetings should take place at the school immediately after lunch during one of his free periods. We met in an empty classroom which was available at that time. Each of the conversations lasted about 40 minutes and was tape-recorded. Following the conversation I analyzed the tape recording in order to identify the themes (topical runs) of our talk on curriculum implementation. Under each of these themes I recorded verbatim samples of our dialogue. The resulting thematic summaries of the conversations served as reminders of the topics we had addressed in the conversation, while at the same time recapturing the flow of the talk in our dialogical interplay. Following each summary, I provided Jim and myself with my interpretation of the relationship between the conversation and the overall research question. Contained within this interpretation were further questions which seemed to arise, as a result of my reflections on this relationship. I presented these as well as a way to continue our conversation.

Our first conversation centred mainly around my interest in coming to know Jim as a teacher engaged in curriculum implementation activities. I asked him questions about his views on the new 1981 curriculum as compared with the social studies curriculum guidelines when he had first begun teaching. I also inquired as to his feelings about the adequacy of the inservice and other information he was receiving on the new programme, and how much direction he felt he required as a teacher. Throughout this initial conversation Jim indicated his appreciation for the efforts of the curriculum developers and inservicers in specifying the curriculum and showing teachers how to go about teaching it. He was critical of what he saw to be the lack of direction and indecision in the former social studies programme, and was particularly critical of the fact that his pre-service teacher education had also failed to show him what to teach in social studies. He expressed optimism that this uncertainty would soon be overcome by what he saw to be a welcome trend towards a greater specification of content and identification of teaching techniques.

In my interpretive remarks accompanying this first conversation, and in our second conversation, I attempted to express some of my own uneasiness about such a technical view of curriculum implementation which treated the curricular content so unproblematically. I saw that Jim was anxious to do what was required of him as a teacher, but I also sensed within his words an interest and concern for the children in his classes. His anxiety to do what the social studies curriculum experts expected of him seemed to be obscuring this interest, causing our conversation to focus on the lack of explicitness of instructions for the teacher in the inservice rather than on his own pedagogical relationship with the children. In the second and third conversations I probed this question with Jim both in terms of the general philosophical issue of the proper proportions of external structure and situational flexibility that are required in teaching, and in terms of a concrete example of the problems he foresaw in introducing a unit on multi-culturalism in his own ethnically mixed grade seven class.

> J I didn't touch it [the multi-culturalism unit] last year, because a lot of my kids were native and it was scarey in that sense. Our principal said, "I wouldn't touch it." A lot of these kids come from poor backgrounds.
>
> T Do you see this as being an issue at the school that should be addressed sometime? . . . this is a very ethnically diverse area.
>
> J Certainly . . . but it's a controversial topic and I can see running into all sorts of problems.

Following the second conversation Jim remarked that he enjoyed our talks and found them one of the very few opportunities he had had to sit back and reflect on teaching. I was still acutely aware of the need for me to make a conscious effort to enter into Jim's world of teaching in order that the conversation continue in a friendly manner and that he not feel forced to defend his view of teaching.

The tone of our third conversation was in sharp contrast to the first two. In the earlier sessions Jim had been generally positive about the helpful intentions of the provincial ministry of education and the school board. Now he indicated that he felt discouraged by the kind of pressure he was under from all sides. He felt "caught in the middle' between public criticism of social studies in the popular press and demands to attend the inservices required to properly teach the new curriculum and use the new teaching units. On yet a third front he was faced with the apathy of his students towards the content that these outside authorities mandated.

I felt that I had caught Jim on a "down" day and yet I could see this same dilemma he expressed so vividly during the course of this conversation. Who should the conscientious teacher listen to for direction? Should he/she attend to the demands from the community, should they see their role instrumentally as agents for effecting the changes that the curriculum developers then interpret to be necessary, or should they pay heed to their pedagogical sense of what the students need? Jim's expression of frustration during this conversation had allowed these essential features which inhere in the very notion of curriculum implementation to stand out in sharp relief. I felt that this conversation marked the beginning of a more open relationship between us as co-inquirers into the meaning of curriculum implementation. There followed a much more spontaneous questioning of how curriculum implementation and teaching were related in the context of this new social studies curriculum as opposed to our assuming roles of interviewer and interviewee.

I initiated our fourth conversation with a request that Jim write a few comments at some future time on how these conversations had affected his views of curriculum implementation and teaching. From this opening request we began reflecting upon the process of inquiry which we had embarked upon. We remarked upon the kinds of insights which were shared in these meetings between myself as a researcher interested in the question of curriculum implementation and Jim as a practitioner engaged in implementing this particular social studies curriculum. I thanked him for his insights of the previous conversation and he in turn, pointed to some specific examples he had taken note of since this talk which he felt illustrated some of the difficulties of relating the desires of the curriculum makers with the practical exigencies of the classroom. He indicated that his experiences during the course of the programme of implementation as well as our conversations had made him "a bit more cynical" about the possibility of inservice and the teaching units helping him to implement successfully the new curriculum plan.

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation

I identified some 60 topics, or thematic runs in Goffman's (1975) terms, related to the meaning of curriculum implementation during the course of the four conversations. These ranged from my initially requesting and receiving biographical information about Jim's past teaching experiences, through to our discussion of the question of curriculum implementation as it relates to the dilemmas facing social studies teachers concerning the teaching of substantive values. The complexity of the question of curriculum implementation began to manifest itself as we probed more deeply into the meaning of being a teacher. The following four themes are the result of a second, deeper level of interpretive analysis in which I am attempting to arrive at the meaning of curriculum implementation as it relates to Jim's sense of what it is essentially for him to be a teacher.

Theme One: *Searching for stable expectations of me as a teacher.*

Jim has a strong sense that it is his duty as a teacher to carry out the aims of the social studies curriculum as defined by the provincial curriculum authorities. He feels that it has been unfortunate for him as a comparatively new teacher to have begun teaching in a period of change in the social studies when the old certainties had vanished.

> I think social studies since '71 has been in a turmoil stage of trying to establish that consistency throughout the province. (Conversation 1, 4-6-82)

His teacher education at the local university had left him unprepared to teach in such a situation.

> J I did a B.A. and P.D.A.D. [Professional Diploma After Degree] programme and I don't think I was well prepared.
>
> T What did you do a B.A. in?
>
> J Philosophy and political science. I was ill-prepared for what was out there. They really went through teaching us different techniques for getting things across, but we didn't talk about what ideas we were supposed to get across. When I began I was just grasping for something to teach, that's why when the school board came out with these workbooks I was so grateful. (Conversation 1, 4-6-82)

Jim implied that it was a mistake to upset the stability of social studies expectations by introducing the 1971 curriculum which allowed so much latitude for differing interpretations. But this error was now being gradually corrected, first by the school board providing practical materials specifying content and method, and more recently by the carefully planned implementation of the better defined 1981 social studies curriculum that he was now required to teach. Things seemed to be coming full circle and Jim was glad of this trend.

> J . . . I think a lot of veterans are really sitting pretty now because the curriculum is coming back to where they've been. I know one teacher who has been teaching Russia for 15 years now—she is right on top of it now with this new curriculum—even though she has to use the inquiry method now. (Conversation 1, 4-6-82)

In further conversations we explored the possible dangers of defining the expectations too explicitly. Jim initially felt that that danger was still somewhat remote.

> J Well in '78 [the interim curriculum between 1971 and 1981] when there was so much flexibility I wanted structure, but I think we have a long way to go before we are structured right in there where we have no flexibility. I like a system which has structure first and allows for flexibility. (Conversation 2, 4-16-82)

What did emerge in subsequent conversations was, for Jim, a discouraging lack of societal consensus in the expectations held out for the social studies.

> J I'm just a little discouraged with it, this last unit. I was just reading an old Edmonton Report . . . referring to the "Canadian Awareness Test" saying we were poor Canadians because we didn't know this Canadian content, where the Cordillera region was . . . that was just a little discouraging reading that, because I don't know how relevant that is.
>
> I don't know, a lot of this stuff isn't turning the kids on and I teach it right out of the teaching units. I'm just a little discouraged. . . .
>
> I'm happy we have something . . . now we've got so much further to go to rip it apart . . . a lot of this [content] is irrelevant to the kids. They find this particular part so boring. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Jim is trying to do what is expected of him as a teacher, but exactly what is expected is still far from clear. He is reminded of this by the public controversy over the social studies curriculum as well as in the reaction of his own students. The gratitude he feels towards the developers of the teaching units and those curriculum authorities who are responsible for specifying the guidelines more clearly, is tempered by a growing sense that these topics and strategies are being specified without a proper regard for the interests of the junior high school children he is teaching.

> J . . . I enjoy [teaching about] Canada. The bright kids pick up on it. But thinking back to some of the inservices I've gone to, we're trying to make them all into prime ministers, you know. Darn it, 60% of those kids are not going to come close to that, and they're getting turned off. It's unfortunate. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Theme Two: *Faith in technique.*

Throughout our four conversations Jim showed a strong faith in the know-how of experts to design successful strategies for reaching the important goals of the curriculum. A good teaching unit in his view, shows the teacher how to go about presenting the material.

> J I did hear a comment at one of the inservices that bothered me, that the units were being taught page by page by some teachers. That's a good complaint, but a unit should have that—but if you want to stick in the flexibility that's for you to decide. I didn't think that was a valid criticism.
>
> T Yes, that's the person's fault, not the unit's.
>
> J That's why the unit needs to be top-notch . . . it has to be able to work on its own in spite of the teachers. (Conversation 2, 4-16-82)

A good inservice, in Jim's view, is one which lets the presenter demonstrate his expertise without "wasteful" discussions.

> J Fifty percent of the inservices have become general discussions. This becomes very confusing, very wishy-washy. I much prefer an inservice that works through the material we have. Even if it's step by step I would sit there for hours if that was there. I like these because they actually show you how to teach that material, what's expected: what it was meant to do. (Conversation 1, 5-6-82)

Even though the focus of our conversations gradually shifted from teaching the curriculum to teaching children, Jim did not seem to consider that there was a relationship between his reliance on experts and his frustration that many of the things the children were being expected to learn were not meaningful in their own lives. An example of this was the question of dealing with racial discrimination in a seventh grade unit on multiculturalism. This topic emerged during the course of our second conversation.

> J This [unit] comes directly from a Kanata kit, but personally I'm scared to touch this one, I really am. I'm going to try on the fringe of multiculturalism, but I think I'm going to leave out discrimination . . . maybe next year.
>
> T Why, don't you think the kids are ready for this?
>
> J I went to a one hour session [this year at the teachers' convention]. What the man said at the end of the session was, if you don't know how to teach about prejudice in the classroom, don't. He was supposed to talk about how to teach about prejudice. After an hour he ended with, "if you're not fully competent with it, don't touch it." . . . At that time I made a decision in my own mind that I'll leave it alone. He said if you use the right techniques you can bring out the concepts of discrimination and try to work with the class to resolve those, but if you bring these out in the open—and my classes are very diverse ethnically—and don't know how to resolve them and go beyond to concepts of multiculturalism you can do a lot of damage.
>
> Quite honestly, I don't feel confident to do it. . . . (Conversation 2, 4-16-82)

I felt that as a teacher Jim saw a need to deal with this topic, because it was relevant to his students, so relevant, in fact, that there existed a strong potential for conflict. But this pedagogical sensitivity, which initially generated his interest in attending the inservice session, gave way before the opinion of the expert whose advice was couched in the language of technical competency. Because Jim felt that he had not mastered the "right techniques" he could not address this concern. This particular conversation led me to begin to consider that this faith in technique was, in effect, allowing the expert to stand between Jim and his class. This consideration led me to pursue the question in the third conversation.

> T I was very interested in our discussion [in conversation 2] . . . I looked over the [teaching] unit after we had talked about it, and I thought this unit doesn't seem very controversial . . . not much potential for conflict. But you seemed to be aware that there was a lot more potential for conflict. And I read in your comments a need that you saw [for your class]. Yet you were bothered by the unit.
>
> J Well, that's interesting. Maybe I'll have to get back to that unit.
>
> There are some good inservices coming up on prejudice and discrimination in relation to films. Because [illegible] is a problem. Probably the most serious problem I have in any of the grade levels. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Jim was willing to reconsider his initial decision to avoid the topic, but still would not teach it until he had been adequately prepared through inservices. Perhaps his willingness to reconsider was, in part, based on the credibility lent to it by my interest as someone from the university.

Faith in technique continued as a theme through our fourth conversation as Jim spoke of the relationship between the model of social inquiry, which formed the central core of the 1981 curriculum, and the question of teaching moral values.

> J Many times I sense the kids when they read a story . . . they can determine what is right and wrong, but when they step out of the classroom that social action doesn't go with a lot of them. Do you know what I mean? In theory yah, but somehow when they're acting there are so many other things that are hitting them.

[illegible] There might be something there that you cannot cognitively understand and, therefore, can't teach it in a way of being able to articulate it clearly.

J Certainly, but then again, I may be interpreting the inquiry process wrongly. I'm not there technically to teach them, values. I'm there to teach them a process for determining what their values are . . . maybe that's where the [former] valuing system got into a lot of trouble. The kid could come to a rational, supported argument and his action may have been immoral . . . I'd better back-track and say maybe what we're teaching them is supposed to be the process, but not the value itself—citizenship.

T But are we happy with that?

J No. Well . . .

T To me it seems to fly in the face of what teaching really is . . . a teacher is entrusted by society with a certain responsibility . . . really the parent for that time . . . in law they use the term "in loco parentis."

J Yes, and I guess in the curriculum citizenship is a large part of that, a large part of social studies. There may be some conflict there . . . if you teach the inquiry process to a "T," you shouldn't impose your ethics on that student, he's got to come to some conclusion. If you let that flow freely, you could make the wrong decision according to me, yet according to himself . . .

T But is there any such thing as an ethically free situation in which a child can do that? . . . if you say that the child is free to come to any kind of ethical conclusion, then you're saying the [overall] ethic of the classroom is that he can come to any kind of conclusion he jolly well pleases to. That's already an ethic there . . . anything goes so long as you give good reasons for it.

J That's right, and I certainly don't agree with that . . . that's where the valuing* of the [former] social studies got into trouble. (Conversation 4, 5-28-82)

---

*The 1971 curriculum advocated a values clarification approach in teaching values.

Prior to these two particular topical runs Jim had described a situation in which his social studies students had gotten into a heated argument over the price of meal tickets for the grade 9 graduation celebrations. He expressed concern that the rational inquiry procedures he had been teaching in social studies seemed to be completely forgotten by the students once they became involved in a question which mattered to them personally.

Our conversation, at this juncture, had begun to point to the limits of technical reason, and with it, some of the problems inherent in the meaning of "implementing a curriculum." We recognized that the question of ethics went beyond successfully teaching a process of reasoning about social issues without some ethical content. And yet the imposition of particular ethical conclusions was not considered by Jim to be educationally acceptable. Because of the heterogeneity of the school population at Northern Junior High and the lack of social consensus that we noted earlier, it is likely that any other course of action on Jim's part would meet with parental opposition.

But to be a teacher is to already be engaged in ethical action. This is a fact of life of teaching and a normal expectation of schooling. Much of the public criticism of social studies teaching and the curriculum, premised as it is on the school's failure to inculcate the traditional social values, implicitly recognizes this fact. Central to these attacks is the perceived ethical relativism of the 1971 curriculum. The 1981 curriculum has addressed some of this criticism, as Jim points out, and has adopted a more comprehensive moral reasoning approach to the question of values. It is unlikely that this will satisfy the conservative critics of the new curriculum, nor will it solve the question of making practical ethical decisions in everyday life. The new curriculum presents the teacher with a rational process by which social issues involving conflicting values may be analyzed and acted upon. This much may be learned and implemented. But the disposition to act in such a rational way on social issues is the ultimate concern of the curriculum developers. Jim shares this concern and finds that it is precisely this disposition (value) which he has failed to teach. This is the age-old problem faced by the teacher of ethics.[1] Ethical principles cannot be learned in advance and applied dogmatically, rather the student can learn from ethical instruction only if he already has the sensitivity to situations which call upon him to act in an ethical manner. Such understandings require a reflection on self in situation. The curriculum which Jim is implementing is itself premised on a belief in technical reason and, as such, cannot help with the vital question of application.

Theme Three: *Personal conflict between pedagogy and technique.*

Our talk about the dangers and benefits of introducing the topic of racial discrimination in the unit on multiculturalism indicated some of the personal conflict that Jim felt between putting a curriculum in place and the real world he shared with his students. The experts held out the possibility of avoiding the dangers of the strong feelings which might be released by bringing up the subject once he mastered the right technique. This belief that the social inquiry model was the rational alternative to conflict was a major reason for Jim's support and acceptance of the new curriculum.

---

[1] H. G. Gadamer in a discussion of Artistotle's Ethics, points out how ethical acting is a paradigmatic case of hermeneutical reflection/action which he contrasts with technical reason (1975, pp. 278-289).

> J . . . but with inquiry approach—and that's a whole new thing in 1981—if you would accept the inquiry process, then it's hard to sidestep valuing, because that's the end part of inquiry . . . once you start synthesizing, evaluating and making a decision, then you're valuing . . . if you use it properly.
>
> . . . And those units too do that, most of those units have built in valuing steps . . . so maybe they've given it [valuing] another name, maybe that will cool a lot of people's heels because now there's almost a scientific approach to valuing. It's not just a question of tossing your opinion out and defending it to the death—now there is a real logical scientific process and it's good. I like it because it's scientific. It's very much like the scientific method.
>
> Mary will tell you that there are different approaches to inquiry . . . but I'm a disciple of this wheel . . . and being a young teacher yet, well it's the law, you know. (Conversation 2, 4-16-82)

Jim appreciated the specification of the process of social inquiry in the curriculum, because it removed the previous uncertainty among teachers over the question of teaching values. Because the process itself is "scientific," it stands above the substantive questions which it is employed to solve. The method is a touchstone of certainty in a social studies course which portrays the world in terms of contentious issues.

The teaching units which accompanied the new curriculum showed in some detail through lesson plans and teaching strategies how to move through the stages of the inquiry process with the students. These represent the expectations of the curriculum for Jim and they are presented to him in the form of a usable technique. Although he has a strong belief that technical solutions are available to solve instructional problems, he is sometimes frustrated by the way that these prearranged plans interfere with the pedagogical relationship he has with his students. I interpreted this as a feeling of being caught between external solutions and his personal sense of pedagogy—of leading children.

> T Do you find you are caught in the middle in some ways? That there is an [external] demand being made of the curriculum and you're in there with the students and you know what they're like too . . . that curriculum affects your relationship with the students?
>
> J Absolutely. You come in with that technique, lesson 19 or whatever, and if they find it boring that's a direct reflection on you as a teacher up there. As [the inservicer] said, if it's boring toss it out, but that's not so easy to do. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

By following the teaching guide Jim feels he is losing the interest of the students. The guide helps him to have his class work through the inquiry process, but it does so at the expense of his pedagogical relationship with the children. To inquire, questions must be of interest to the inquirers. Many questions Jim and his class are dealing with are those deemed to be important by some one else.

Jim immediately introduced the topic of motivation at this point in the conversation, anticipating that this would be my response to the lack of student interest. He spoke about the difficulty of motivating students who were used to television and, as a possible consequence, were also poor readers and writers. He felt himself to be very much caught in the middle between the critics who were demanding that the schools show better results and students who had become apathetic.

J . . . You hear it from the kids say, "hey you've failed us because you're not motivating us" and you hear from the other side, saying that . . .

T You're not teaching it.

J And that's not true. We're trying to teach it. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

He didn't feel that the motivation problem would be one which was to be easily solved by the application of better strategies.

J And to think of some of the things we give these kids now. The games, the strategies you use to get the things across. And they still find a lot of this boring and that's discouraging.

T You are doing more to interest them, and they're more bored than you were [referring to an earlier description by Jim of his own textbook-centred social studies education in high school].

J Definitely . . . now when they see a filmstrip they say, "Oh no Mr. Ballard, aren't we going to have a film?" (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Jim implies that motivation lies within the student and that we must look deeper into the way they are relating to the world in order to come to a better understanding of the reasons for their lack of interest.

Despite the tensions between technique and pedagogic relationships which Jim experiences in his attempts to implement the new curriculum, he remains essentially hopeful and optimistic about the children he teaches and about the future generally. This optimism also allows him to view social conflict and criticism slightly more positively as our discussions progressed and to see within conflict the educative role he plays as a teacher of social studies. Jim describes this positive linkage between criticism and social studies education as follows.

> T I wonder why we're living in this situation where teachers aren't supported any more. You are charged [as a teacher] with teaching the young person in the society. So it's a position of trust . . . what's caused the erosion of that trust? . . . is there something about our society where we are mistrusting our directions . . . and looking for scapegoats?
>
> J Maybe a lot of that stability in our society is eroded and because of that trust position we become the first ones to catch the flak.
>
> On the other hand, the media has been excellent and our society is becoming very aware and I would like to think that the social studies has had something to do with that . . . society is becoming a lot more aware of problems we are faced with. I would think that ten years ago . . . if you gave the "Canadian Awareness Test" you would find people knew a lot less. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Jim finds the thought of social studies being in the vanguard of a new critically thinking society to be a somewhat daunting prospect as well.

> J I don't know, that's a big burden isn't it? As we talk I certainly see that the implementation of a curriculum has many factors . . . I don't think I've looked at it quite that closely before.
>
> . . . what social issues do you deal with [in social studies]? and of course there are those who would like it to be just history and geography and I don't agree with that . . . I think we should become a thinking society and I don't know if you get that out of a history-geography course. I think a lot of burden has been placed on social studies. We have to make the thinking society, where the other subjects are a little more cut and dried. You have the scientific method . . logic in math, but we have to deal with all those social problems. It's quite a big burden. (Conversation 4, 5-28-82)

Jim seems to be suggesting here that inquiry in social studies lacks some of the certainties of the natural and logical-analytical sciences. By our fourth conversation we had moved through some of the limitations of viewing curriculum implementation as a mastery of technique, as well as questioning the relationship between the situatedness of the classroom and the prescriptions of the curriculum. In an effort to reconcile himself to continued uncertainty and conflict, Jim now reflects that this is, after all, inherent in the very nature of the social studies. Nonetheless he feels the personal burden of this task as he looks down the hard road that lies before him.

Theme Four: *The feeling of isolation from other teachers.*

While our first and second conversations tended to focus outwards on the nature of the expectations held by Jim as a teacher of social studies, the third and fourth conversations turned inward, reflecting on the meaning of teaching social studies in the context of curriculum change within the current political and social climate. The theme of isolation from other teachers was present in all four of these conversations. At first Jim indicated an irritation with inservice sessions which degenerated into a general discussion amongst the participants. Such conduct, he felt, detracted from the message of the inservicer attempting to demonstrate the use of the teaching unit. Underlying this irritation was Jim's feeling that he had a personal responsibility to make this curriculum work as intended.

> J I've been to too many [inservices] that are general discussions and that's fine sometimes. But this is almost a panic stage. We have to know what to teach next year so I much prefer something specific. (Conversation 1, 4-6-82)

Jim accepted that it was appropriate for the inservice to focus on the activity of the individual teacher in the classroom, and having accepted this, turned away from the opportunity to socially interpret and define the curriculum with his colleagues.

By the end of our second conversation Jim indicated that he was beginning to appreciate our sessions as one of the few opportunities that were available to him to reflect on his teaching. Initially, he had been somewhat reticent to become involved in my research for fear of the time it would require of him. Our third conversation allowed me to begin to relate the question of time to Jim's sense of alienation from other teachers.

T I was interested in your comment about how these conversations gave you a chance to . . . sit back and look at your teaching, where ordinarily you don't get a chance to.

J No. That's certainly true.

T . . . One of the things I see in curriculum implementation is an opportunity to do the same thing.

J I think right now [the Ministry of Education] is doing that with the inservice programme. It's an assessment workshop.

. . . but I don't think I'm going to get an opportunity to sit in on it. Usually you could go after school, but now they're one [p.m.] until about five-thirty.

T Did you run out of [professional development] days?

J Yes, we've really overspent our "sub" money. It's a busy time now that's for sure.

T I was talking to a couple of people at the Teacher Centre . . . they were really discouraged, apparently they had all of this [student assessment] material laid out and only one teacher came. They had five consultants [there] too, willing to help. I thought there's something wrong here, you've got willing people there who think they know what teachers need and want, and people like yourself who are interested in going.

J That's a good point. I'm surprised. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82).

Jim, and the consultant I had been speaking with as well, were discouraged by the fact that they saw so many more aspects of the new curriculum requiring attention through inservice, but time had run out. The number of inservices organized through the MENTOR series developed by the Ministry of Education and the school district had been keeping both consultants and teachers like Jim very busy. Jim had been to seven out of a possible fifteen inservices on various aspects of the new curriculum which had been offered to date at the Teacher Centre.

In past years Jim had had regular contact with a zone social studies co-ordinator who would meet with him at his own school. He preferred this arrangement to the current scheduled series at the Teacher Centre.

> J . . . with the inservice down there everything is thrown into a nutshell . . . . you've got to get all of your answers at that two hour session. If you have a co-ordinator, you can ask one question today, if something comes up a week later you can give him a call . . . . Somehow this present system seems far removed. The inservice is excellent but, well I guess it's my fault really, because the consultant is available I'm sure. (Conversation 3, 5-10-82)

Meetings between teachers and consultants now take place at scheduled inservices having fixed agendas. The interpretation of the curriculum in these sessions is already pre-structured according to the logic of the teaching unit and the intended outcomes of the curriculum. Previously, at the school session Jim could interpret the curriculum in terms of his own questions in face to face meetings with the co-ordinator. Together they could communicatively come to a meaning of the curriculum in the light of Jim's questions raised in the environment which originally provided the context for the question.

During our fourth conversation Jim and I began to reflect on how a dialogue might be restored at the school level in order to counter this tendency towards isolation. These reflections developed out of our talk about the inevitability of conflict in the issues oriented social studies curriculum. Jim had commented that social inquiry was a heavy personal burden to carry. I asked:

> T What are they doing in those other subjects; how does a child come to see the world mathematically? . . . scientifically? And how much chance do you have to talk to [these other teachers]?
>
> J Again, this comes out of the conversation. I don't think I've really discussed it with them, except for the science teacher and the comparison between the scientific method and the inquiry process. . . . but that's a good point, how do they see the world through those different aspects, I don't know.
>
> . . .
>
> T Maybe the big questions of social studies are also the big questions of education. Underlying all curriculum is really a vision of what's a good life and what's a good person.
>
> J That does seem true, doesn't it.
>
> T . . . I don't know how you feel about it, but people are often impatient with those questions . . . It doesn't have the nice elegance of a mathematical equation, or the predictability of something in science . . . tends to be indeterminate, people can't have the last word.
>
> J That's a good observation on our education system . . . all curriculum is an overtone of what should be a good life, whether in math or in social. (Conversation 4, 5-28-82)

Fred

His Background

Fred had been teaching for sixteen years, with fifteen of those years being at Northern Junior High. He was happy being at Northern; he felt that he had grown to like the children and to understand what the parents wanted of the school. He recalled his first year teaching as being a very difficult experience in which he was responsible for planning and teaching a variety of subjects to some of the poorest classes.

> F I didn't like my first year teaching. I suffered "reality shock" in that I wasn't prepared to teach after my university education courses . . . I found out later that I got the leftover courses because I was the last man on staff. (Conversation 1, 3-24-82)

He came close to leaving teaching at the end of his first year, but came to Northern at the suggestion of a school board supervisor. There his course load was reduced to his specialties, social studies and language arts.

> F I stayed at this school because I haven't pictured any as being any better. (Conversation 1, 24-3-82)

The social studies curriculum which Fred had begun his teaching under was interpreted by him to be explicit and knowledge centred. He was able to write meticulous and highly detailed plans based on this curriculum. With the coming of the 1971 curriculum, Fred never again felt the same security that he was "following the letter of the curriculum" (Conversation 1). Nevertheless, he has come to appreciate the importance of attending to more than knowledge objectives and would not like to return to the former curriculum despite some nostalgic feelings for old certainties.

Our Relationship

I was first introduced to Fred by Mary in mid March, 1982. At this meeting, which also included Jim, I explained my research interest and how I envisaged their participation. Fred indicated his interest and happiness to participate. We agreed to meet during the lunch hour at Northern at intervals of two to three weeks over the next few months. We had four conversations of between three-quarters of an hour and one hour in duration between March 24 and May 14.

Fred was anxious to express his views on curriculum implementation, inservice and teaching to me. Particularly in the beginning, our conversations were animated by this dominant interest of Fred's. He would indicate the ways in which he felt that the curriculum or the inservices were inadequate to his task of implementing it in the classroom. He responded to my questions with prescriptions as to how the Ministry or the school board might improve the curriculum documents or the information conveyed through the inservices.

The underlying motivation behind the introduction of the new curriculum was a subtopic of our first conversation and it continued as a theme throughout our four sessions. Fred saw links between the initiation of a school inspection programme, the announcements of external comprehensive exams and the implementation of the social studies curriculum. These were noted as manifestations of an increasing interest in control over education and a surveillance of teaching. Much of Fred's concern over the explicitness of the curriculum was evinced by this interpretation of the centralizing interests of the authorities.

The relationship between Fred's interest in teaching and concern for children and these centralizing interests was a theme which began in our second conversation. This tension came to dominate much of our talk in the final two sessions. It was in this context that Fred began to express some of his doubts about the social inquiry model as it related to the children at Northern. We talked about the "hyper-rational assumptions" (my words) of the model and how this was so foreign to the culture of the working-class families served by this school. Fred also noted how it failed to take account of the essential non-rationality of junior high school children.

> T The way I understand it . . . [those responsible for implementing the social studies] feel that as good citizens we have to be able to synthesize a lot of information and make decisions about it.
>
> F I agree that that should happen, but with a grade 7, 8, or 9 child the emotions interfere to a tremendous degree . . . The curriculum guide looks too reasonable. At this age the emotions are changing, they are growing up. How much reasoning are you going to do at this school? I do believe that there are schools where this method might be able to be applied. (Conversation 2, 16-4-82)

In these two final conversations Fred talked about the potential which these tendencies to control hold for changing the nature of his job and the way he feels about teaching. How much freedom he would have under the new curriculum was still unclear to him. There were signs, such as a district wide assessment test which his students wrote just prior to one of our conversations, which pointed to increased levels of interference. Did this mean that his job would eventually be reduced to carrying out the orders of others? He liked teaching, but he wondered how long he would continue to enjoy it if his job became one of a technician effecting another's plans. He also questioned the propriety of a society expecting him as an individual to rectify societal concerns for order and discipline, when these were no longer reinforced in the home and in the community.

By the final conversation, some of the more fundamental questions were beginning to emerge. For Fred the question of acting in a human way with his students, as against the need to maintain control and direction over them, continued to be a matter of daily practical concern. This question was essential to what he regarded to be the goal of his pedagogic activity, that is, helping students to mature. Related to this was the link between the pedagogic concern for individual children and the kind of societal expectations for children as they represent society's hopes for the future. Who should he pay attention to, the child in his class or the societal expectations as expressed in curriculum objectives and comprehensive examinations? As he put it succinctly, should he as teacher be attentive to test validity or fairness to students?

The Meaning of Curriculum Implementation

During the course of our meetings we touched on nearly sixty topics of conversation related to the meaning of curriculum implementation for Fred's work as a teacher. I have identified five themes which seem to have emerged from the conversations. These themes include the following:

1. Reconstructed rationality and teaching.

2. Security and choice: the expectations of the authorities and the freedom to teach.

3. The meaning of pedagogical concern.
4. Pedagogical decisions and community expectations.
5. Humanizing teaching and maintaining control.

Theme One: *Reconstructed rationality and teaching.*

> F The curriculum guide looks too reasonable. At this age the emotions are changing, they are growing up. (Conversation 1, 24-3-82)

Fred felt that the curriculum, centred as it was on a model of social inquiry, did not represent the way that the children in his care thought. The curriculum model, in his view, seems to represent an adult's thinking about thinking about contemporary social issues. The remoteness of this reconstructed logic from the everyday modes of thought of the children and their parents at Northern has two important consequences. One consequence is the impression that there is a standardized way of addressing social questions to which everyone must conform.

> F What I disagree with is that everything has to be that standardized according to the [inquiry] wheel—you synthesize, analyze, gather your data—it makes it sound as if every human being is a computer. My students do not have that value system.
>
> T The students are not involved in the questions of the curriculum makers?
>
> F No. These students are not involved and you can't force them to. They see that science and math may work in that logical way, but social has never been like this. I think that this new curriculum with its value system is very premature—if I took it seriously and taught it as outlined. (Conversation 1, 24 3-82)

The second related consequence is the fact that this standardized form of thinking does not relate to the kinds of interests and competencies which many of the children have. They lack the reading, writing and research skills to do what is required by the inquiry model, and the inquiry questions do not make it likely that the process will be learned in action.

T The questions are adult questions and, as such, have no meaning to the students?

F Well, I was told not to worry about the adult questions but to adjust them. But questions like "should we have a democracy or not?" mean little, or quite often they only discuss so long and run out of things to say. That's my feedback—so then I concentrate on facts and knowledge and then I pose some questions saying "you have all these facts, now you can answer the questions."

I find that many students cannot read and will not do assignments—so you can't follow the inquiry curriculum. At least 30 percent of the students are like this and you can't just fail them because they don't do assignments and read.

* * *

F . . . [I]t puts all the kids in the same category, everyone has the same ability as outlined. . . . I see them in the morning and know that they are not interested in that question on Africa or China. It could be that there are those teachers who can make the questions interesting. I try this, I don't ignore it. For example, I have an assignment comparing life in China with Canada.

T It seems to me that one of your main criticisms is that the questions lack meaning for the students. . . .

F . . . [T]hey may try to answer, but without an understanding that religion is behind it, because there is no base in the home. And the same with politics at times, they don't talk politics at home. [Fred went on here to explain how he taught about China.] (Conversation 1, 24-3-82)

Fred indicates through his talk that he regards the inquiry process as someone else's method to be addressed to someone else's question. Although he criticizes the relevance of the model for his students he does not condemn the reconstructed rationality of the model itself. As an ideal it's a good thing, "I agree everyone should think that way" (Conversation 2, 16-4-82). It should work at the university or some other schools where the predisposition already exists for thinking in such a pattern.

Fred also sees some value in the teaching units and inservice sessions, based as they are on the rationalized inquiry model. The teaching units provide a clear plan which he may follow and upon which he is free to make some modifications.

> F . . . There is nothing wrong with putting a pre-printed lesson plan in front of the teacher. I will use it. But I feel equally free to vary it. . . . I can leave some parts out without feeling that I'm not following the curriculum. They have some excellent ideas in them. (Conversation 2, 16-4-82)

Similarly, inservice programmes serve to introduce the unit to teachers in order to educate and inspire them, but they cannot represent an ideal teaching plan for them to follow.

Fred feels that the reconstructed logic of the plan should be read as ideas which he can fit into the way he understands teaching in his daily practice.

> T What makes you want to try it [the unit of work]? Is there something that you are thinking about in your own class that that will appeal to? Are you thinking about something that your children need?
>
> F If questions and methods seem to fit the pattern—and I'm talking about my relationship with the students and the students' understanding of the subject area, then I will try different methods and not just stick to the one that I previously thought was superb. I'm in favour of changes and inservice sessions, I listen to possibilities . . .
>
> T So you see it as being another way of relating to your class.
>
> F Of course. I cannot go to an inservice and copy exactly what I hear if I think it isn't proper.

Inservices present him with new possibilities, but they are always subordinated to a more essential meaning of teaching. But this choice of methods is not unconstrained. The curriculum with its rationalized inquiry model also describes the expectations of those in authority, so it is problematic for Fred as to how much freedom he actually does have to interpret this plan.

Theme Two: *Security and choice: the expectations of the authorities and the freedom to teach.*

> T How much do you want the right [spelled out]? That's the question puzzling me. On one hand we don't want the curriculum to say too much. We don't want the curriculum to interfere with the teacher's teaching, because the teacher knows his students. But on the other hand we want the curriculum to say what the teacher should or shouldn't teach. I see that as a problem.
>
> F You should clearly state the topics which must be covered . . . some of the methods . . . the skills. We have included the choice of teaching units. . . . right now everything is printed as if we must use it, but doesn't state what would happen if we don't use it.
>
> . . . I don't believe in complete freedom of choice, we had that. . . . I want security and choice . . . the teaching units I have here [the Law] are an example that it is possible. (Conversation 2, 16-4-82)

Looking at some of the teaching units alone, Fred had little difficulty in interpreting them in terms of what he should do and what he may choose to do. But this curriculum implementation is taking place within the atmosphere of centralization and control which is infusing the educational environment. Consequently, the freedom to interpret is ambiguous. He pointed to several specific examples of this control relating to the implementation of this programme. One was the system of school inspections established by the Ministry that fall.

> T But in order to obey the spirit [of the curriculum] what is required must be clear.

> F Yes. Now more than ever, because when the provincial government comes and checks, they really don't care how I feel. They are here to see if I'm really implementing the curriculum—no "buts" or "the children really don't care for this." . . . it is quite possible that no matter how I feel about this I'll have to make more changes—I see this coming.
>
> T Is this the reason for the concern with the implementation now? The fact that there will be an inspection?
>
> F No. I've heard one teacher in another school mention it. But I'm not overly concerned. I'm concerned that they may want the letter of the curriculum followed; then I have no freedom to say what the students need. The committee that checks wouldn't know, they are concerned with implementation. They have something on paper and want to see it happening in the classroom. That's hard to come by. (Conversation 1, 24-1-82)

Another example occurred on the day of our second conversation when Fred's students had just written a school district wide test intended primarily to assess writing skills, but having a social studies topic.

> F . . . you talk about "buffer zone" [in my written interpretive comments on Conversation #1]. You can see the way I felt today [having to administer a school district assigned essay]. I wasn't any buffer zone . . . I was just relaying an order like in the army—here's your package, here's what you do—and I did it! It's my job! But I don't like to feel about my job that way. I don't like anyone putting a booklet in my hand . . . here is the topic, here is the method, here are the references you use, here are all the questions, this is what you must teach. (Conversation 2, 16-4-82)

He indicated that uncertainty heightened his concern and preoccupation with authority. If he were given a better idea of how much freedom he had to interpret, then he would feel more comfortable in making interpretations. He suggested a number of specific ways that the curriculum guide could be written and inservices might be planned in order to indicate the compulsory and optional aspects of the programme.

Following the second conversation, I attempted to point out the contradiction I saw in the notion of granting freedom.

> I wonder about this question of freedom. We talk of freedom being granted by the curriculum makers and those responsible for the implementation, but must freedom be granted to the teacher? Does the teacher have a certain amount of freedom to interpret the curriculum as his/her right? I was particularly interested in the way you spoke of the need for the questions to mean something to the children, so you re-interpret the inquiry questions, particularly in the light of the importance of their feelings about things which affect their lives. I'm not sure that I would agree that the rational way of solving value issues is the ideal, not if it leads to a complete rationalization of life. ("Some Interpretive Remarks" following Conversation 2)

Initially, Fred responded to this question with more prescriptions as to how the curriculum authorities might use inservices to specify areas of freedom. Toward the end of the third conversation, however, we returned to the contradictory nature inherent in the notion of "granting freedom."

> F There was one question [from conversation #2] that would have been the most difficult one. How did you word that?
>
> T [Referring to written interpretive remarks on conversation #2 summary paper.] "The question of your freedom to interpret the curriculum is a constant theme in the discussion . . . but I ask the question must freedom be granted to the teacher or does the teacher already [possess it] . . . by the very fact that you are the person charged with the responsibility of teaching children?" . . .
>
> F That is my impression at the present time, that the government is using the curriculum to get much tighter control on education. On what is taught and how it is taught . . . I'm not convinced that will produce better, more knowledgeable citizens. But I'm not sure that the government is really after this type of control. . . . So at the present time I am using my freedoms as if I have them and probably will continue to do so until somebody tells me "no you don't have them."
>
> . . . if you know of any book that contradicts my opinions I would have to say, well maybe I'll have to change. But if teaching would still be worthwhile after that, that's another question. Right now it is I'm happy being a teacher. (Conversation 3, [illegible])

The meaning of teaching children is addressed in the third theme. This meaning is expressed within the context of "freedom in order to," in which we attempt to make explicit pedagogical concerns.

Theme Three: *The meaning of pedagogical concern.*

Fred criticized the way that the new curriculum did not appear to take into account the differences and special needs he saw among his students. For him being a teacher meant being happy about children who could succeed but also being interested in those who could not.

F So when I see a student getting 70 in social and 40's and 50's in other subjects, then I think that student has at least demonstrated good will. He's willing to work in my class and I'm always pleased with that.

Equally I'm pleased with students who fail . . . teachers might think "that's rather odd." Because students who fail are often called on the carpet [by these other teachers], "why aren't you doing this?" and behind their back [the teachers say] "oh, they haven't got any brains, it's a miracle they didn't flunk sooner." I may very well fail the same students and get along well with them in the class. But some teachers will always nag the same students with no results. You check the report card with 30's and 20 percent often and I ask myself why. So I count success not only if a student passes, but also whether he has learned to get along with the teacher or has learned to accept school as something reasonable and normal.

T We say "get along," but we mean more than getting along. It's more than just not causing trouble. There is also this caring relationship between the people.

F That's right. I'd also like the students who ~~fail~~ to get along with other students.

T . . . Geoff [the principal] expressed the concern that some teachers are too subject oriented and can't see the whole child. . . . I see what you're saying is you have to look beyond the day to day subject matter or the fact you're teaching social studies . . . because you're also concerned about the student as a whole person and how they're going to make their way in life.

F I look years ahead in time . . . the very failure of today can be some kind of success tomorrow.

T Have you seen that happen?

F Yes, I've seen kids come back [here] years later and say, "Hi, Mr. Birkholz, how are you doing?" Sometimes they were the worst kind of students who would practically fight with me. They would say, "Hi, Mr. Birkholz, you sure looked after me." . . . I say "how are you" and they'd say "wonderful, I'm married and have a job."

I refuse to think too negatively about most students; occasionally I will. Quite often in the staffroom when teachers talk about students I will sit back and not contribute anything seriously, because I think it's very short sighted to think [negatively] that way. (Conversation 3, 28-4-82)

To ~~be a~~ teacher means to be hopeful for children. Fred remains hopeful but his experience has taught him to take the long view. How does one speak of the aims of teaching then? The aim does not consist in developing some specific vision of the future and developing a means for getting there. In contrast, the inquiry model, like most curricula for school systems, seeks to form the future in some explicit ways. Curricula become manifestations of policies which are brought into being by following plans.

Fred talks about the aims of his teaching not in terms of objectives, but in terms of helping children to mature. This was illustrated during the course of a conversation in which he described a lesson which involved some students role playing a situation between a policeman and a driver stopped with liquor in his car. Fred saw in the occasion an opportunity for teaching something about human relationships. The official curriculum topic is "how should we relate to our legal institutions?"

F And I always discuss human relationships . . . I believe the policeman has the power of discretion so therefore I said to the [child playing] the policeman, "tell that driver to put the bottle in the trunk." One student tried to say, Mr. Birkholz it's illegal to carry a bottle on the front seat, the driver should have been arrested." I said "yes . . . but seeing the driver was not drunk, had not been drinking, had not broken any laws, I do believe that the policeman has the power of discretion." I wanted the students to understand that.

T It's very difficult to get that across in a textbook way.

F That's right, and in the teaching unit this is never discussed or stated as clearly, and this is where the teacher's experiences and the students' experiences help a great deal to make up the course.

T I guess a lesson like that teaches a lot more about life than just a relationship between a policeman and a man in that one situation.

. . . That's a good example, it seems like it is very hard to teach a lesson like that except between teacher and student.

F . . . You talked about the relationship between teacher and student (in your interpretive remarks of conversation #2 [referred to part 3, [illegible] 7 of conversation #2] in which [T] stated, "I agree that the most important thing about teaching is that essential relationship that develops between the teacher and the children in the classroom.")

I think that today's lesson was an example of my relationship with the students. I see my role as part instructor and as part friend. As an instructor I could make them take notes . . . handed out the usual handouts; answer these questions; "yes; you answered these correctly, thank you, you get your points." But as a friend I would put myself into their shoes and ask . . . "how will they relate to that . . . just another chore, another assignment." And they get these assignments, because sometimes I don't know any other way. But there are times when I feel very strongly that a lesson has to be presented differently, but you can only do that if I'm your friend, not just your teacher who bosses you around and makes you do all this work.

This is why I was very pleased this morning with lessons because they accepted that and enjoyed doing that. If I was just an ordinary teacher . . . they probably wouldn't.

T . . . the traditional idea of teaching is that you're supposed to help the child towards what's good, towards maturing and growing up.

F Yes, that's just what I was thinking about yesterday, that I would like to have them mature. If possible in the most

> pleasant way. I admit when you have 30 students that that's almost impossible. There are lots of times that I act like the typical teacher, just in order to discipline the class and have some law and order in there . . . it's a balance . . . when a lesson goes over very well I say good, I've struck the balance. (Conversation 3, 28-4-82)

The real rewards in teaching as a pedagogical concern for children come from helping a child to mature, to grow up. Fred sees the fruits of his labour in the former student who comes back to see him. Simultaneously, he recognized that there are community expectations of him as a teacher.

Theme Four: *Community expectations and pedagogical decisions.*

During our conversations we talked a great deal about the relationship between the situational pedagogical decisions one makes as a teacher and community expectations. Fred distinguished between the community of families whom he knows at Northern and the community's wishes as a society as they are made known to him by the curriculum.

> F . . . I have no objection to what the curriculum makers want. . . . right now I stand between what the curriculum makers want and what the children need.
>
> T The curriculum makers don't really understand what [your] children are like?
>
> F There are schools in the city where this curriculum will work . . . because the parents care more about education, they are putting on the pressure [for more work]. . . . but in this area the support from parents for anything that radical is lacking.
>
> You can't teach by saying I'm here to implement this curriculum whether you like it or not . . . that's the law I have to do that. What kind of teaching is that? . . . I don't want to hide behind the law.
>
> I would like to do far more than the curriculum—to have children stay in school and enjoy school, and still come out having learned what they should have been learning. (Conversation 2, 16-4-82)

Fred recognizes the necessity to interpret the curriculum in the light of classroom conditions and with regard to the expectations of the more immediate community. He is not a technician merely translating the provincial curriculum. His interpretive horizon is primarily formed by a pedagogical concern that children stay in school and learn. The tension comes when the society seeks to use the school as an instrument for correcting social ills. It is here that the role of the teacher as pedagogue is in conflict with the role of the teacher as a public servant.

The tension between community expectations and pedagogy is most keenly felt in the area of testing.

> F . . . there are conflicting messages about the authority of testing. Who should test, for what purpose, who should give the marks in the end?
>
> T In our last conversation you said you suspect more control is coming. . . . I pick up the same message. . . . compared with '71 there is a lot more control now.
>
> F Yes, more freedoms will be taken away. . . . [for example] if the teacher should be free to set his own tests, his own standards, then the Department of Education is doing it all wrong. They are bringing in testing. What kind of tests and how much they should count may not be clear to anyone at this time.
>
> The more freedoms you take from a teacher in this regard the more it will have to influence his teaching. . . . because there are a great many students who want to do well on tests. The only way they're going to do well on tests is by the teacher structuring his lessons towards . . . a test. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Fred draws a distinction between fairness to students and test validity which highlights the difference between a pedagogical concern for "this child" and a societal expectation for productive schools.

> F And it really doesn't matter if the tests are fairly constructed . . . a fair construction (for example) would be that children would have to use their skills; to read,

analyze, draw conclusions. That could be a very fair construction. But the average student may not be able to learn that method and may not catch on to the same degree and I may spend far more time with other things in that class than with teaching that method that they must have for that test.

T Because your interest is in the student and not with that which is to be learned.

F On an intellectual level it simply doesn't matter whether the test is fairly constructed . . . fairness according to whoever makes the test up.

T That's a very important point you raise. I hadn't thought about it in quite those terms either. But if you're talking about a test set up centrally, then of course what has to count is what is on the test. The actual students and what they are learning about social studies in your classroom, it's important only insofar as it matches up with what it is expected they'll be learning in the test. That's where the interest is. The interest is not in the student who's failing by those measures. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

By making teachers more accountable for specific outcomes the tendency for control extends into the classroom and becomes the dominant mode of being a teacher. And yet it is fundamentally unfair too, because the unanimity of purpose required for the achievement of such outcomes is lacking. Fred indicates the problem of discipline as a case in point. We discussed this question in the context of the larger problem of freedom and control in a curriculum which aims at a society of effectively active individual citizens.

T I'm rather puzzled by this business of freedom and control. On one hand I don't quite agree with what you say about control in the classroom . . . I don't want to go back to the disciplinarian, because I don't think that that kind of discipline is very healthy anyway.

Then I wonder [too] about this business of freedom in society. If you want us to live in a free society, which social studies teachers are concerned with, then you have to look at coercive measures.

F . . . I would prefer the present system . . . it's the one I'm acquainted with, the one I'm used to, the one that I actually could feel comfortable with, even though I criticize it. . . . But when I can see a trend coming . . . which would make teaching more difficult, not because the students have changed, but because what somebody else demands who does not understand the students.

T. That's the point.

F Then I could become very frustrated. Then if I cannot change that system, but only adjust to it . . . then you can ask that you also get more power, not only the government, but the teachers get more power as a counter-measure. Then I'm saying I could live with a more totalitarian system.

I think you understand that. My idea of having more control in the classroom is only a counter-measure to something I expect could happen soon. It is not meant as a solution . . . no, I don't think it is any good. But if the teacher is to be controlled more, what choices do I have? Do I stay in teaching? Do I go along quietly with the system? (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

In this final conversation we moved from highlighting the tension between freedom and control to discussing how this tension is lived. Fred speaks of it in terms of humanizing his teaching and maintaining control.

Theme Five: *Humanizing and maintaining control.*

F I run into almost daily conflict between humanizing my standards and still achieving some semblance of control. That problem has never been solved and I don't know if it ever will be. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

As a way of trying to come to terms with a pedagogic concern within the confines of an educational paradigm increasingly structured on the logic of control, Fred spoke metaphorically.

F In one way I consider myself like a front-line soldier. The general says go conquer. I do care where I go, I do care very much. At which point do I say, you can run this war without me? . . . and if I have to be in this war, even if I don't like it, could I not ask for more reasonable standards? Can I wear a steel helmet . . . ?

. . . I would like to be free . . . to fraternize with the enemy. Let's be nice to each other, never mind the generals. What do they know? They just want the fighting.

T That's an interesting sort of analogy you're using. In some ways there's a lot of truth in what you're saying. The generals fight from afar and you're the foot soldier in the trenches. What are they fighting against in the war [though]? The war against ignorance? The educational war? They're not doing the fighting themselves.

F No, they order it done and they tell me how I must do it. . . . and I know there is always a point at which the commanders can issue ruthless orders, which do not make sense and should not be obeyed. When is that point? That's where the analogy stops, because in a real war I would know . . . in education it is very hard to determine. This is why I appreciate your comment about what is the value of freedom and how much control should be exercised. I can only end in a question mark. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

We partially understood that the resolution of this question lay in the political sphere; "Whose reality would come to dominate school life?"

F That would make mine a very narrow scope. The Government might see the whole of Alberta and I can only see the school. . . . do I really see the whole?

T But don't you?

F In one way I do. But the Government collects statistics, they collect numbers. They're very fond of that and they're always supposed to prove something.

T But what's real? Is the number the Government has real or is Johnny sitting in row one real?

F To me this is real, where I am now and the students I teach. And you know in the previous conversation where I referred to the printed word and unwritten. The Government cares more about the printed word than they care about people. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Mary

Her Background

Mary is in her seventh year of teaching social studies at Northern Junior High. Looking back, she has rather suprised herself that she is still there. She joined the staff of the school upon her graduation from university and had never seriously thought about leaving. She joked about "being in a rut," sensing that others might see her in that way but, in fact, she has stayed because she feels that this teaching situation has allowed her room to develop both personally and professionally.

One major factor in Mary's satisfaction in her personal and professional development as a teacher is the 1971 social studies curriculum. Initially, this curriculum had presented her with some difficulty. She had spent three weeks in the school in June, 1974 prior to joining the staff in September. During these three weeks she realized that no one at the school had yet developed a social studies programme from the provincial guidelines, as had been originally intended by the curriculum developers. This meant that she had to spend her summer preparing a programme to teach for the fall. Planning and teaching totally consumed Mary's life over the next two years, but she was exhilarated by the challenge and happy with the programme that she eventually produced.

In 1980 Mary was given a half-time sabbatical from teaching to begin a master's programme in secondary education curriculum and instruction. For the next two years she taught at Northern in the mornings and attended university in the afternoons. Through her studies at the university she became acquainted with interpretative and critical/historical social science. In her thesis research she was able to combine the insights gained from these studies with her personal interest in the changes she had experienced in the provincial social studies curriculum. She had seen the 1971 curriculum replaced by a 1978 interim guide which provided the social studies teacher with much more specific directions as to the content and objectives of the programme. At the time of our conversations Mary was in the final stages of researching and writing a master's thesis which explored the politics of the development of the 1978 interim document. She accomplished this investigation through an extensive analysis of ministry of education documents and by means of personal interviews with twenty-two of the individuals intimately involved with either the development or evaluation of the original curriculum or with the development of the interim guide. This research provided Mary with many critical insights into the curriculum process, at the official level, while her teaching allowed her to experience the implementation of a programme.

Our Relationship

Mary was my original contact at Northern Junior High School. I had first met her in a graduate course in curriculum and instruction at the university in the fall of 1980. During the next year we were together in two other graduate seminars on curriculum history, and on qualitative research methodologies. While developing the proposal for my doctoral study I approached Mary with the suggestion that I might explore the question of curriculum implementation with her and her colleagues at Northern. She was interested in the study and offered to introduce the idea to her fellow social studies teachers and the school principal.

Through our studies together at the university we had discussed many issues of curriculum and research, and had come to share many of the same orientations. In our readings and discussions we had become critical of traditional research methodologies which tended to objectify "the researched" and ignore the fact that the social world was both constructed and given meaning by the actors. We also shared a similar sense of the researcher's responsibility towards the participants in the research. We shunned the pretense of disinterestedness of researchers who claimed merely to observe and report selected aspects of "social reality." It was, therefore, somewhat disconcerting when Mary began by asking me to make my own research interests explicit to her as a participant. She began our first conversation by forcing me to tell her what I was trying to get by talking to her and her colleagues, how I proposed to conduct my investigations, and how I felt this research would benefit them as participants.

Throughout our conversations Mary assumed the posture of being a very active participant in the research. In our second conversation, for example, she indicated that our discussion about curriculum implementation was becoming too general, forcing her to make equivocal statements which did not portray her experience. As our discussion continued her own interest in educative practices allowed her to search with me through the contradictions of freeing and controlling the teaching acts of others which is so problematic in the notion of implementing an inquiry-oriented curriculum. We also became frustrated together with the limitations of our conceptualizations of change which are so intimately bound up in our traditional curriculum languages. A particular moment of frustration came at the end of our third conversation. Mary had talked about the origins of her own beliefs about teaching relative to how she might continue to grow and help other teachers. At the same time we discussed budgetary controls and the district's administrative structures which were tightening managerial controls. Mary summed up the research to this point by saying "implementation is hopeless, is that your conclusion?" (Conversation 3, 4-22-82).

The value of Mary's insistence that the critical insights from the research be used to inform the practice of her and her colleagues began to bear fruit following the third conversation. In our fourth conversation Mary related how this research was now promoting critical reflective talk between herself and Jim.

> It's interesting, I was talking to Jim . . . he said that he felt at first these conversations were really impinging on his time, but he said he's really gotten to like them . . . He said they really were an opportunity to reflect, although this isn't the word he used. . . .
>
> He said "a lot of these things he didn't really have an opinion on [at first] . . . but as we went along I did have an opinion . . . I just hadn't had a chance to articulate them, or nobody asked me." He said that he really liked the opportunity to do it. And we sort of talked about how in the schools we just don't have the time, or the possibilities, for whatever reason, aren't there. . . .
>
> . . . We're frustrated with certain aspects, but we don't even articulate them to each other. We'll sit down and talk with you. . . .

> . . . It was interesting [this time] Jim and I had quite a good talk after we had talked a little bit about what he thought about these sessions with you, and we got off on our own and talked about these questions. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

During this final conversation Mary also probed my commitment to the insights coming from this research. Since I had just been appointed to a teaching position at the university which included the teaching of undergraduate social studies majors, she asked what sort of implications I anticipated for my teaching. By this time we had explored many aspects of change within the existing institutional structure of the school. Her question for me was how would I help prospective teachers of social studies to maintain their own freedom of action to contribute to the development of an institutional structure which would be supportive of this freedom.

Themes of Conversations

We had four conversations, taking place at intervals of two to four weeks between March 8 and May 14, 1982. The first three conversations took place at the university, with the final one at No[illegible] Junior High. In subsequent analysis I have identified six themes related to the meaning of curriculum implementation which seem to have emerged from these conversations. These are as follows:

1. Good teaching: being an autonomous person who empowers the personal thought and action of others.

2. Accountability and personal responsibility.

3. The problem of effecting change: my beliefs and influencing the practice of others.

4. Being managed.

5. Discouraging signs: the tendency of the school system to fragment and control teaching.

6. Hopeful signs: some tendencies towards re-uniting thought and action.

At first, the topics of conversation were initiated by one or the other of us in the form of a question. Many of these questions were mine, but Mary also asked more questions of my research than any of the other participants. The flow of conversation assumed a fairly standard question-response pattern. This pattern allowed the topics to remain somewhat discrete from one another in my analysis of the first two conversations. For example, in the first conversation, our topics could be sorted into a fairly orderly sequence; my research, consultants, inservice, personal development as a teacher, external tests, Mary's self-image as a teacher, and the new curriculum. There was an implicit associative relationship between each of these topics which enabled us as participants to continue our conversation. As our conversations continued, however, we began to see explicit linkages between the various topics. Links were made, for example, between planned change, management's co-optation of consultants through controlled inservice and the extension of technical control over teaching. Individual topics of conversation then became less easy to discern, but came grouped in related 'bundles.' A statement about consulting, for instance, could no longer be clearly classified under the topic of 'consultants' in my analysis of the conversation. Rather we would link this statement to [illegible] participating in decisions."

"being managed" and "me as a teacher" within the context of the conversation. To respect this insight in subsequent analysis I would, therefore, have to place this single statement about consulting into the several categories we saw it relating to.

Theme One: *Good teaching: being an autonomous person, empowering the personal thought and action of others.*

> T . . . that program [the 1971 Alberta social studies curriculum] required a lot of development on the part of the teacher?
>
> M Well it was just unbelievable really. I remember going into my first year teaching and had my '71 guidelines and that was it, there was nothing in it. . . . I realized that there was nothing there [at the school], so I really couldn't expect much help from the teachers there
>
> . . . When I realized that in June I spent quite a bit of the summer making up units and visiting the curriculum library. And, yes, it was quite a horrendous year, it was a really tough year. . . . I did develop things I was really quite happy with and that I used for quite a lot of years afterwards--changing things here and there. So, I really was very positive about '71 It was a huge amount of work, but I really liked it
>
> I remember having quite fierce debates with the person who eventually ended up coming to Northern to teach grade 9 with me in my second year. He had taught for a long time maybe ten years He didn't feel that he should have to [illegible] units, he was a technician, you know, "give me the unit I'll do it but I'm not paid to be a curriculum devel[illegible] I remember having very heated debates with him saying "Would you sacrifice making these units?" "Did you experience some joy in finding they [illegible] liked '71 (Conversation 1, [illegible])

Mary found a good deal of resonance between her beliefs about the nature and importance of social studies education and a curriculum which allowed for the latitude to develop and teach her own program. The [illegible] big val[illegible] traditional emphasis on knowledge acquisition with an emphasis on the clarification of values and social action. For Mary, the specifics of what and how students learned in social studies was secondary to their independent thought and commitment.

> . . . I do want kids to think and not come in and be industrious little beavers. That's why my heart is in social studies, because I think it's a subject where they can do that and it's very exciting to me. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

Mary's conviction about the value of social studies taught as social inquiry allowed her to withstand the inevitable criticism that the children were not learning the basic facts or skills. This was the kind of criticism that was most commonly levelled at this curriculum and it tended to discourage teachers who were inexperienced in the inquiry mode of teaching.

> T But then people argue "well children have to be able to read" . . .
>
> M Although my approach is not devoid of that. I tell my kids to read too.
>
> T Sure, but you have a different belief about how kids learn to read. My view is that people learn to read . . . and write . . . because they see how it fulfills their own purposes as a person.
>
> M That's the essence . . . if the kids find no meaning in it, then they are not going to learn it . . . if you can show [other teachers] that by having them involved in a programme with meaning for them [the kids], then they are more enthusiastic about [the] basic things. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

She has also learned not to be discouraged by the uncertainty felt [illegible] children used to more traditional approaches to social studies

> M . . . [illegible] an idea that's in your classroom . . . if students have [illegible] with [illegible] ity, it takes a while because for [illegible]

> or thinking about curriculum in different ways; it's also the children thinking in different ways . . . you have to be very patient with them as well.
>
> I usually find at the beginning of the year in my class kids say "this is social studies?" . . .

> T Does that ever cause you to doubt yourself?
>
> M [No] . . . because I have the experience [of good things in the past] I can ride out these kinds of things. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

These comments were made in the context of how she might help other teachers to come to understand social studies as student-active social inquiry. This will be explored more fully under Theme Four. Theme Two portrays the kind of uncertainty that the proposed introduction of external, ministry sponsored comprehensive exams brings to Mary's life as a teacher, despite the self-confidence she ordinarily feels about what she is doing.

Theme Two: *Accountability and personal responsibility.*

> M . . . the problem with achievement tests is then that becomes the measure for teachers . . . in my school people have a view of me as a teacher; my colleagues, the administrator, my kids, and all of a sudden if my kids do pathetically on these achievement tests then that whole view of me is all of a sudden called into question. Everything else that happens is not the key thing, it's those achievement tests. Then if my kids do fantastically well, it will just verify everything they thought, right? (Conversation 1, 8-3-82)

Hitherto, Mary has been ready to take the responsibility for planning and teaching that which she felt was important for the children to know. She is fully aware of the kind of hard work that this responsibility entails, but willingly undertakes the task. The [illegible] achievement test introduces a new element [illegible] this [illegible] confidence as a teacher [illegible] derived from the subjective knowledge of her competence which is developed through her everyday dealings with children and her colleagues and the school's administration. The test is superfluous to anything which is important to teaching, but it cannot be easily ignored because it has the potential to influence the views that others have of her.

For Mary, the achievement test per se only represents something of an irritant to her work. The irritation comes largely from a realistic sense of the authority of the ministry of education to arbitrarily define what is important to know in social studies.

> The [test] guidelines are quite general . . . in the Soviet Union, have some understanding of the national and cultural groups, the geography. But they're vague in a sense, so you're caught in a bind too. While you want to gear your kids up for achievement, well what do they mean know the national groups of the Soviet Union? Know that there are a lot of them? What's the biggest? Smallest?
>
> So you sort of proceed, you can't let them stifle the things you do in the classroom, but it's something you're aware of. I think most teachers are concerned about what they mean. (Conversation 1, 8-3-82)

The power of the ministry to hold teachers accountable is reinforced by the lack of definition of precisely what they are being held accountable for. Mary doesn't allow this to control what she does in the classroom, but it diverts her attention somewhat from teaching social studies as active student inquiry into society and social issues.

While the achievement test in itself is only an irritant, Mary locates it as part of a pattern towards increased management of teaching within a general conservative trend in education. The analysis of the curriculum guides resulting from her graduate research allowed her to document this trend.

> M If you read the [1981] guide thoroughly you'll see some differences. I can pinpoint some restraints; "be aware," "caution" . . . [related to] the use of extra materials other than what's prescribed and so on.
>
> T . . . the cautions I've seen are more of a commonsense thing that just want to warn teachers not to get themselves in a bad position.
>
> M Yes, the one on resources is a bit strong when they cite the Schools' Act, but who reads those curriculum guides anyway? I hate to be cynical, but one reads, I teach grade 7 so I read what the topics are, but do I read all the preamble to it?
>
> I think some teachers are leary about social action . . . even though it's [explicitly] supported, but with the cautions and with their reading of the political situation . . . they are leary about the social action component. (Conversation 1, 8-2-82)

As Mary points out, the explicit statements in the guide are less likely to deter teachers from a social activist interpretation of the curriculum than is a sense of conservatism in the air. It is this sense which exercises a far more effective control on teachers' conduct.

Much of our initial conversation was about the new curriculum and the programme of implementation as it affected Mary and her colleagues at the school. Our conversations subsequent to this, began to probe more deeply into the dilemma that this implementation presented from the point of view of school reform. One of the major criticisms levelled at the 1971 social studies curriculum was that the Department of Education failed to implement it effectively. The 1981 curriculum appeared to rectify this deficiency while, at the same time, retaining a similar inquiry social action orientation of [illegible] curriculum. The guide [illegible] of a model for social inquiry which outlined the steps of the process and the learning objectives which could and would be met as a result of using the process. The implementation plan, consisting of the MENTOR inservice programme as well as inservices on individual teaching units, was developed and carried out by people who had been successful in teaching the 1971 curriculum. Their task was now to help other teachers to do the same. We had noted the cautionary language and the more conservative social context which were tending to blunt the social action component of the curriculum, but there was something more subtle and more fundamental in the managerial form of the curriculum and implementation which we attempted to surface in our final three conversations. Essentially we were both wrestling with the question of what was wrong with attempting to bring about this desirable end efficiently and effectively in the school system? The remaining four themes developed from our asking this question.

Theme Three: *The problem of effecting change: my beliefs and influencing the practice of others.*

Mary was not unhappy with the way that the consulting and the inservice programme were affecting her personally. She acknowledged the competence of those who developed the materials and knew them to be good social studies teachers. Because she shared their view of the curriculum, she could readily appreciate the objectives of their task. Mary's account of a visit made by two consultants to Northern showed how her perspective allowed her to see them as colleagues. Mary and her colleagues in the social studies department at Northern had requested an inservice on "resolving the issue" which was an aspect of the inquiry wheel (model) they had some questions about:

> M . . . they came out just basically to share some ideas with us . . . we were doing quite a good job and I think that we sort of found that out. . . . People [the consultants and us] just gave examples from their classes of what they were doing and that was good.
>
> T Was it an opportunity to reflect for you?
>
> M I think that's why it was good. It wasn't so much of them giving ideas or anything like that, but giving us some confidence in what we were doing and sharing amongst the groups. . . .
>
> . . . Even in a school you just don't share that much. If I'm teaching grade 9 and Fred is teaching grade 7, I don't talk to him and say "and how are you resolving your issue today?" (Conversation 1, 8-3-82)

Reflecting on this account in our second conversation, I asked Mary if perhaps there wasn't some contradiction between having a workshop as a confidence booster, an opportunity for reflection, and as help in an area they felt "weaker" in. Mary indicated that the difficulty they felt was with the depiction of the inquiry process, in which a unit would begin with a social issue being raised and then not "resolved" for many weeks later with much background study. They found that the rationalized process shown by the model didn't work in practice, because the children forgot the original question.

> M The answer we got during the inservice was that others had experienced similar problems. This was reassuring for us and showed that we hadn't missed anything
>
> T Are you really questioning the inquiry model itself in the inservice then?
>
> The model with its two-way arrows is not meant to be that rigid. The problem is that it doesn't come across that [illegible]

> a series of steps, which is probably O.K. for people who aren't very familiar with inquiry. (Conversation 2, 22-3-82)

The dilemma facing the implementers could be clearly seen by us at this point. In order to rationalize the inquiry process to make it "implementable," that which was to be implemented had to be distorted. Inquiry, as understood by Mary, was not a technical process, but an active questioning of a social issue by the teacher and students as participants in society. How was this attitude to be communicated to other teachers? We pursued this point in our third conversation.

> T Let's get back to that question you raised. You want teachers to use a social inquiry model . . . but the social inquiry model in the curriculum really misrepresents social inquiry.
>
> M Under the present structure it's really hard to overcome that. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

As an example Mary indicated how one of her colleagues was beginning to adopt a model of teaching consistent with inquiry and, in so doing, was gaining a new appreciation of the students' abilities. But how this takes place is problematic.

> M But I don't know how one accepts through persuasian or example things that happen in your classroom. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

We talked about the importance of time in this process of change.

> T You mentioned last time the value of inservices in being together with other teachers and reflecting with them on what you are teaching. I wonder if there might be some possibilities there for getting across changes in teaching . . . it's an opportunity to sit back and look at what you are doing when presented with another idea.
>
> . . . you don't actually adopt the inquiry model step by step, but it's a question of having a different idea coming into your way of thinking . but you need time for that.

M That's really important. And . . . giving an idea time in your own classroom. . . . (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

Having agreed on the necessity of allowing for time for dialogue and critical reflection of our classroom practice, we began to discuss the ways the organizational structure of the formal school system has prevented this. This led to extensive talk about the experience of being ma[illegible]

Theme Fo[illegible]: *Being managed.*

During our third conversation Mary asked what sort of alternative I saw to regarding implementation as convincing or persuading other teachers of the value of a certain way of teaching. I related my experience of working with Catholic schools to develop a school philosophy and then helping them to plan actions which were consistent with this stated philosophy. In response to this example, Mary countered with her experience of goal setting under the school-based budgeting programme which had been recently set up in her school district.

'' That's interesting. In school-based budgeting we have to come up with the goals of education for our school . . we have a very limited time to get these done, so it's "let's get something down on paper." It has no meaning whatsoever.

. . . In social studies we have to have one goal that we set out to accomplish during the year. This has to be something that can be directly measured. So we set out a goal like "we will buy enough texts so that the grade 8 social studies programme will have enough textual material."

T But that's not a student goal! That's a budgetary goal for you as teachers!

'' It's a goal and very measurable . . . it's a joke! . . [illegible]

> in the kind of concrete way they want it. They want to see you have bought those books!
>
> So you would not want to have a goal that says you're going to increase the self-esteem of youngsters or facilitate their critical thinking . . . these are too nebulous, how do you measure this? (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

For Mary and her colleagues school-based budgeting has added another item of paper work. It is seen as one more thing in an already busy day which does not allow them the leisure to thoughtfully discuss what they are doing as teachers. The school board central office adopted school-based budgeting as a move towards decentralizing and rationalizing district administration. Under this new organization, each school was granted a per pupil allowance of approximately $2,200.00 to cover all budgetary expenditures, including school staff salaries, instructional materials, and building maintenance. This was also being extended to include central office support staff, like consultants, whose services were being charged back to schools based on the number of hours of consultant's time the school used.

The school board planners claimed that this programme of decentralized budgeting had the advantage of granting each school greater autonomy to decide its own priorities while ensuring rational and efficient spending. For Mary, however, school-based budgeting meant yet another instance of increasing management control over her work. The principal at Northern encouraged a considerable amount of teacher input into deciding spending priorities. Mary recognized and respected his efforts as a democratic administrator. But the latitude for real decision making at the school level was severely limited because the structure and role of the school had not basically been altered with this change.

We discussed at length about how the combination of accountability through budget related goals, setting of prescribed curriculum materials and the imposition of financial restraints, served to manage teachers' time and place greater restrictions on their freedom to act.

M When we were considering our budget there really was no room . . . for creativity. We were going to lose staff for our school . . . how were we going to maintain programmes? People talked about an ESL programme, librarian, counsellor. When your funds are drying up, there isn't that arena for creativity.

T Because people are losing jobs. That's a tremendous responsibility for a school staff.

How do you make budget decisions at your school?

H . . . our principal Geoff wants very much to have teacher input . . . and I respect him for that.

But what input can he bring? . . . the funds are limited and he has to have this much for caretakers, cleaning supplies . . . xerox, so where are decisions to be made?

. . . as a department we meet and discuss how much funding we want for the year. We submit it to the staff as a whole . . . if it's reasonable we get it . . . [illegible] things are [illegible] set

T And how much money do you get [in the social studies department]?

H . . . this year about $2,000, last year $2,500, which is quite a lot of money compared to some schools that are a lot smaller than us

You are not going to fundamentally change the system on $2,000 a year. All you can do is purchase the prescribed materials

This gets back to curriculum implementation and the question of prescription . . . it seems to me in this present curriculum that there is so much prescribed . . . in services and you have all these materials coming out from the Department [illegible] you don't [illegible] buy

> M No, you don't have to, but we will for convenience. . . . It's good that teachers have these resources, but they take on a sort of prescribed nature. (Conversation 3, 22-4-82)

It is these factors in combination which contribute to the experience of being managed. Because there is so little room to manoeuver, the work required to account for the expenditure of money becomes a ritualized charade of real decision making in order to carry out the school system's version of autonomy. The local board sets the spending parameters, the provincial ministry recommends the purchasing priorities, and the teacher's work in which dialogue and reflection with other teachers is already discouraged, becomes further intensified.

In our fourth conversation we extended our discussion of being managed to consider the changed role of consultants within the context of implementing the new social studies curriculum. Mary indicated that she and Jim had been talking recently about the way that consultants seemed no longer to be helping "on the teacher's side," but rather serving the interests of the department. This impression had come about as a result of the tightly structured inservice programme which provided little opportunity for the informal contacts that had previously been enjoyed between teachers and consultants, as well as the consultants' seeming tacit support of the proposed achievement tests.

> . . . we haven't had much contact with the consultants except at inservices. Except Jim and I had requested a few things we wanted, or we wanted to know if they had taken a position on these achievement tests. . . . we were quite frustrated because we couldn't get anything out of them . . . whether that's fair or not I don't know.

> . . . [one of the consultants] has indicated that very much of the time she saw herself as being a teacher advocate. She feels that because of her efforts [the department]

> is more willing to allow [the curriculum materials] to be used as a resource within which teachers may pick and choose as they wish to.
>
> What you're saying is something different . . . what [this consultant] means is not so much a teachers' advocate, but what works effectively and what doesn't. . . .
>
> M . . . Because the consultants this year have been so busy with the inservice, we don't really have the kind of contact we had before . . . it was more personal [before]. For myself that's what I liked. If he had an idea, he'd bring it over. But this year, because these people are so busy, we don't have that same kind of relationship. They give the inservice, you meet them there. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Here we were drawing a distinction between consulting as standing with the teacher and seeing the task through the teacher's eyes, and consulting as merely altering ministerial outputs in such a way that would be acceptable and would "work" with teachers. Advocacy for Mary had a different meaning from that held by the consultant I had been speaking with earlier.

Our conversation at this point was also indicating that there was a corresponding tendency to manage the activities of consultants as well as those of teachers. This tendency was showing up in a growing alienation of consultants from teachers. In this final conversation we explored other ways that the increasing rational[illegible] of education was serving to [illegible] reflection from meaningful action and [illegible] educators [illegible] the[illegible]. We [illegible] saw in [illegible] recognition [illegible] possibilit[illegible] [illegible] theory and action. These [illegible]

Theme Five: *Discouraging signs: the tendency of the school system to fragment and control teaching.*

In our mutual questioning of the nature and sources of the limit situations which teachers were experiencing, we again brought up the subject of the achievement tests which would be administered to grade nine pupils. Mary initially raised the topic in this conversation by way of commenting on the recent news that the testing programme had been delayed for a year. This comment led to an interesting series of associations.

M The tests have been postponed this year, did you know that?

T Yes . . . it seems to me that the reason for postponing them wasn't the reason we were talking about before . . . straight logistical kinds of reasons instead of any kind of serious questioning as to the prudence of trying to test the whole curriculum

* * *

T The danger I see . . . is the technical way the [evaluation people] approach their task . . . The curriculum is a concrete manifestation of an aspiration, as such it is so much less than the actual desire that motivated it [and] you can never test all that is articulated. It's so reductionistic! . .

M Some of the people I've talked to in the curriculum branch are quite worried about achievement tests which are in another branch, the Student Evaluation Branch . . .

Conversation three has been a real breakthrough for me in terms of my understanding of implementation. . . . It's almost as much about organization theory . . . Here you have two groups in the Department of Education . . . we reify these very artificial [rationalized] constructs of human thinking in government departments [illegible] our own freedom to act is [now] restricted

* * *

I suppose if you're in these positions your role is to [illegible] directives

T You do your job, but who's in power? We as a society are the powers that be. We have these desires and put pressure on the politicians. The politicians react bureaucratically . . . a programme is set up. . .

M Do you think that's exactly right? . . . if we are the powers that be, then why are these things being imposed on us? Because we haven't exercised our power [as teachers] to say that these things are detrimental. Can you say that it's society as a whole or certain segments . . . that have been vocal and used their power?

T I think it's the latter . . . pressure groups and the way that politicans react to things . . . There is not a very good forum to be able to discuss [things like] back to the basics in a democratic way . . . pressure groups get heard in the political arena, because they know how to do it.

M . . . a demand for standards and a reaction against moving too far in a progressive direction, that's being heard. And the present government has an inclination in that direction as well (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

I note here the interplay of our perspectives in searching for the origins of control over teaching. We begin by questioning the way that organizational theory has uncritically applied systems rationalization of curriculum to the bureaucratic structures of the ministry of education. We talk about how this has resulted in the transformation of practical human action into a reductionistic functionalism. We bring to bear our different perspectives here in searching out the reasons for this. I tend to interpret this transformation speculatively and philosophically, while Mary gives an overtly political interpretation. At this distance, some [illegible] months later, I am able to better understand these differing perspectives in the light of my reading at the time in existential phenomenology, and Mary's thesis research on the politics of the development of the [illegible] studies curriculum [illegible]

[illegible] is my [illegible]

to it, at least this is the way I interpreted it within the context of the conversation. My point about the problems engendered by a rationalized existence is not necessarily lost in the flow of talk, but is built upon by Mary's comment "do you think that's exactly right? . . ." In this way we each continue to conversationally build a shared reality rather than attempting to win a point by developing a cogent argument. Disputation and conversation are both forms of dialectic. However, as a more friendly form of dialectic, conversation seems to be a more appropriate way of bringing to language a shared reality.

Our conversation continued by noting further ways that a rationalized control over the curricular and instructional processes was co-opting the talents of innovative teachers who had been working autonomously. One example we referred to was the Canada Studies Foundation work which had brought together teachers to work on curriculum development.

> "Project Canada West . . . had a decentralized view of curriculum . . . when the government embraces this idea, it became changed and re-centralized again becomes product oriented . . .
>
> Process is an important idea that came out of those projects, which isn't understood very much by bureaucratic thinking. There already is a bureaucratic process . . . you take these products [of curriculum development] and put them into the bureaucratic mill.
>
> I was talking to [one of the original PCW consultants) . . . he said that a lot of the teachers who were working at it came away really quite cynical . . . because of their experience of their material being taken over by the Department of Education. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Toward the end of this final conversation we also briefly

[illegible] other [illegible] splitting away individuals into separate functions within the larger educational enterprise. The following excerpt is an example of how our conversation was calling to mind further instances of fragmentation, but within our criticism we were searching for ways to bring about change without controlling or manipulating others. I recalled an experience which Mary had related to me earlier in the year in which she told me about attending the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Detroit.

> T You mentioned about CUFA [College and University Faculty Assembly] how they spoke of teachers as "they" . . .
>
> M That's one example of other people who are no longer classroom teachers. They are consultants or in the Department of Education. They become removed from the classroom and experience frustration. I mean I get frustrated with teachers too.
>
> T It's really easy from my perspective [criticizing from the university] to be removed and see all the "problems" . . . to be down on the bureaucrats and side with the teachers.
>
> M There is quite a division depending on what you are . . . where is the melding of these groups?"
>
> T You almost think that it has gotten too big for us to handle.
>
> M It was kind of a neat experience being here part time and at the university part time last year [illegible] for me. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

At this point we discussed some of the details of the courses which Mary and I had been taking. We then looked at the potential this experience had [illegible] reflection and action.

[illegible] Hopeful sign [illegible] towards [illegible]

[illegible]

M I think you're much more conscious of what you're doing . . . it raised my consciousness about trying to see [the children] in a more human way . . . I did a lot of those things before, but now I was more conscious of it. Then you do more things to bring that out . . . You are thinking consciously about what you are doing in that classroom, not only the lesson plan or what you are studying that day, but the relations in the class, how the kids feel they're a part of the class. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Prior to this particular reflection on the way in which our studies had changed our own outlooks on teaching, we had been questioning one another on how we might personally and working within a community bring about a new attitude towards the process of human change. I remarked on a meeting I had attended with the consultants and some outside evaluators of the inservice programme. The consultants had been criticized for their excessive "messianic" zeal in promoting the new curriculum. Mary replied:

M I wonder if I wouldn't do the same. . . . What alternative models do you see?

T I'm very uncertain about the messianic view. . . . A very important component in any community change programme is people reflecting on their situation seeing what's making them unhappy in that situation and trying to devise ways of acting in order to change that situation. It's necessary that that's done in concrete situations.

So we look at the Alberta social studies programme, we have to somehow get back to the roots, to the motivating force for social inquiry. What does social inquiry mean? That's where I have problems with the messianic view. . . . a reflective attitude in your own life has to be there.

. . . We have to ask the basic questions . . . you can't ask them in generalities either. You have to ask them in very concrete situations . . . This is why I say the messianic thing might not be a bad idea, provided you have the right sort of attitude towards it. . . . you say "here. I'm showing you another way of relating to your students . . . and social studies."

We can see why we would want to change social studies. We both went through the "one damn thing after another" school

> of social studies teaching . . . you have to somehow keep in mind the impulse that sees the need for change . . . but you have to push off the technical implementation of it and re-capture the original spirit. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

Mary also sought out how my personal actions would be altered by those insights through her questioning of how I might now teach undergraduate social studies education students.

> M You are going to do the undergraduate student teaching. Are you going to get those kids to reflect when they say "give me the goods!"?
>
> T You have to do two things . . . on one hand they expect you to be able to tell them something . . . they have to know the inquiry process, the provincial curriculum. And they are going to ask questions about discipline and things like that and there are things you should be able to say . . . .
>
> [But] . . . you have to get at what motivates us to teach . . . teaching is not all technique, it's also a vocation. I've seen some interesting ways of doing this [describes a nursing education programme which includes descriptions of nurses caring for patients as examples of what it means to be a nurse]. I'd like to do that about teaching. (Conversation 4, 14-5-82)

As our conversation progressed we continued to suggest alternatives to a managerial control of teaching. These suggestions were never articulated in the form of a programme or alternative plan by which teachers could become more autonomous in their daily work with children. Rather, we tended to put forward concrete examples of practices and possibilities for action which would encompass our hope that changes and improvements were possible in teaching, but which would extend rather than limit the freedom of others. Our critique of technical control was sustained by this hope. The difficulty of the struggle to develop counter examples to technical practice, showed how deeply our thinking about school change was influenced by the technical language of systems control and organization.

Chapter V

REFLECTIONS ON THE RESEARCH

Introduction

In Chapter IV the participants in the conversation about curriculum implementation have spoken about their work as teachers and consultants engaged in implementing a new social studies curriculum. Viewed functionally, there is a difference between the roles played by the consultant and the teacher as the consultant guides the teacher through the intricacies of the new curriculum in order to put it into practice. But accepting the separateness of these categories risks a reification by defining these people in terms of their function within the formal organization. This is an assumption of bureaucratic rationality which is laid open to questioning by the conversations. Behind the ostensive role differences, there lies a common interest of both consultants and teachers as educators interested in helping children to grow and learn. The school is their work place. In a more essential way, curriculum implementation is about how to make the school as the work place for educators a more educational place for children.

Hermeneutic conversations with participants engaged in the implementation of the social studies curriculum have allowed a questioning of both the project of improving teaching and the way that this project is undertaken in the workplace of the school. In the questioning, which conducts the conversation, implementation appears not only as the object of research for the participants, but also as the ground of practice from which the questioning begins and to which it always returns. In a sense, the conversation is the life story of educators who teach and implement curriculum. At the same time, the project and the activities which occur under the name of implementation become an object of research as the participants distance themselves from their work in the conversation. Nor is implementation only an object for me as a researcher in curriculum. As an educator, I too engage with the participants in a reflection on practice for the purpose of improving practice.

In our conversations we point to the relationship between curriculum implementation as an administrative strategy for bringing about planned change and our desires as educators to do a better job helping children. The motivation for the school as an institution and for the educators who work there appears to be the same, the difference seems to lie in the differentiated functions of the personnel. The administration possesses the responsibility and authority for planning and enabling the change to take place on behalf of the school system, while the teacher's function is to interpret and apply the plan at the classroom level. However, the conversations indicate that this system rationality is contradictory in practice. Curriculum implementation as a managerial responsibility is carried out as a rationally planned action having clear and explicit aims and strategies which are consistent with the defined goal. Improving classroom practice for teachers is also rational, but it is a different form of rationality. The aim is not as explicit and the strategies cannot be so clearly mapped out in advance. Teachers experience their classroom situation as a concrete and complex reality which requires many daily accommodations and adjustments in order to bring about change.

The source of the differences between managerial and pedagogical interpretations of reality appears explainable on a theoretical level in terms of the differences between technical and practical reason referred to by Habermas (1971a) and others. However, for the participants in this study this difference is often experienced as an alienating and contradictory practice which intrudes into many aspects of their working lives as educators. The first section of this final chapter is a descriptive analysis of how the participants have expressed these contradictions through conversation.

The conversations themselves have focussed on contradictions in an effort to locate that which is questionable within curriculum implementation. Gadamer notes that genuine questions arise from a negativity of experience which "breaches the smooth front of popular opinion" (Gadamer, 1975, p. 329). Elsewhere he states "experience is experience of human finitude" (p. 320).

Within these hermeneutic conversations, we endeavoured to come to an agreement about the meaning curriculum implementation has for us as educators. How do we as participants come to understand one another's interpretation of curriculum implementation through conversation? Understanding does not entail entering into one another's subjective experience. Rather we reach agreement about curriculum implementation as the object of conversation by bringing to language our knowledge of schools as they are. This is a knowledge which we already share as educators. The conversation, carried forward by this object, makes possible understanding as a fusion of horizons which comes about through language (Gadamer, p. 350). A hermeneutic understanding of curriculum implementation, in the sense of seeing ourselves in our situation, comes about through a reflection on how we talk about what we do in schools. In this way the technically oriented and practically oriented traditions, which co exist in the language of education, are allowed to speak again (Gadamer, p. 414).

Working in the School System: Mediating Technical Control and Pedagogical Concern

Lortje (1975) and others have noted how teaching is a relatively private form of work, carried out in physical isolation from fellow teachers allowing little opportunity for observations and discussion with colleagues. This condition changes somewhat during the implementation of a new curriculum as a teacher's work becomes the object of attention for the purposes of altering it. One of the effects the failure of the research, development and dissemination (R. D. and D.) model of curriculum change has been a new interest in the teacher's craft and how practical classroom decisions are made (Clark and Yinger, 1977, 1980; Doyle and Ponder, 1977). Interest has also been sparked in the differences between a teacher's craft and technically planned innovations (Wolcott, 1977; House, 1979). Certain insights into teachers' practical knowledge are accessible to objective investigation. Doyle and Ponder (1977), for example, have identified three factors which influence teachers' decisions regarding the practicality of a proposed change for their classroom situation; instrumentality, congruence, and relative cost.

However, most investigations of practice in curriculum research are carried out in a technical scientific mode which intends to objectify the practical itself in order to render it suitable for investigation. The essential meaning of practice, which is not in itself technical, escapes this research. In his discussion on Aristotelian ethics (1975, pp. 278-284), Gadamer points to the difference between making and doing which is not appreciated by modern technical science. *Techne*, belonging to the sphere of making (*poiesis*), is the attitude of standing over against objects for the purposes of (re)production. Practice (*praxis*) belongs to the sphere of doing (*phronesis*) and it is the ethical attitude of doing the right thing in concrete situations. Because practice involves making ethical decisions, the actor cannot assume a 'scientific' non-self implicating objectivism. Understood in this way, practice cannot essentially be grasped by using technical means of investigation.

My claim is that it is the lived relationship between technically motivated action and practical reason which constitutes the meaning of curriculum implementation in the work of educators. The lived differences between technical rationality and practical reason may be apprehended as they become apparent in the form of contradictions which emerge in the conversations about curriculum implementation. Three kinds of contradictions seem to have surfaced in our questioning. These three are:

1. A contradiction between inquiry as a way of teaching/learning and inquiry as a model to be implemented.

2. A contradiction between teaching which helps children to grow and develop as persons and the function of social studies as helping to produce good citizens.

3. A contradiction between education interpreted as enlarging one's understanding of the world and education as a planned activity to reach specified outcomes.

1 Contradiction between Inquiry as an Attitude toward Teaching/Learning and Inquiry as a Model

Contradictions between social inquiry as an attitude toward the way learning should take place and social inquiry as a thing which could be identified and implemented through a series of planned workshops, began to surface as we conversed about the relationship between the model for social inquiry (see Figure 1) and inquiry as a style of teaching and learning. There was a general agreement amongst the participants regarding the rationale for social inquiry. Regardless of their past familiarity with this form of teaching, they all appreciated the importance for the future of children [illegible] to carry out [illegible] social issues.

How to implement social inquiry in a way which remains consistent with inquiry as a vision of appropriate teaching is highly problematic in this new curriculum. As a teacher who feels comfortable [illegible] teaching is [illegible] the rigid portrayal of inquiry in the form of the model is somewhat unfortunate, but perhaps necessary (Mary, Conversation 2). Jennifer is more blunt in her criticism of the way that the social studies curriculum has tended to transform genuine social inquiry into the appearance of a step-wise passage of students through a rationalized process reaching a predefined conclusion.

> Kids are being given the questions, manipulated to feel some emotion about the question, and to explore it to come t[illegible]an end that somebody else has already decided. (Conversation 4)

In their criticisms of the way that social inquiry is represented in the curriculum, Jennifer and Mary also imply a sense of what inquiry is and what one does when teaching with an inquiry oriented attitude. Inquiry typically focusses on some social issue which is meaningful and worthwhile to investigate. The result of the inquiry is not known in advance. If it were, why should inquiry be necessary?

Mary and the consultants see themselves as already having been initiated into the way of teaching and learning through social inquiry. Jim and Fred, on the other hand, regard themselves as initiates being introduced to something new. But as an initiate, Fred also senses that the process represented in the curriculum is not what he understands teaching to be. The model looks "computer-like" and too rational for his students (Fred, Conversation 1). He is willing to allow that this might be what is meant by social inquiry, but it is not something appropriate for the junior high school students whom he teaches at Northern.

Linda (a consultant) and Jim (a teacher) persisted for a time [illegible] conversation in [illegible] belief that [illegible] between inquiry as an attitude and inquiry as a model were solvable through technical means. Linda was energetic and aggressive in seeking out ways of handling the many facets of instruction requiring attention for successful implementation, but she felt frustrated because time for inservice was running short and resources available for consulting would be a cut back in the coming year. Jim was experiencing similar logistical barriers as a teacher who had subject area co-ordinating responsibilities. He no longer had the time to attend the many inservices being offered on various aspects of the new curriculum. Equally disturbing for him was the discovery that some of the unit plans were inappropriate for the children he was teaching (Jim, Conversation [illegible]). Quite apart from these logistical problems, Linda and Jim were also beginning to acknowledge that some aspects of inquiry teaching which were necessary for successful implementation were not inservicable. Linda, for example, averred that both intellect and feeling were required, but there were no techniques for acquiring feeling (Linda, Conversation [illegible]).

The alternative to a rationalized 'misrepresentation' of social inquiry puzzled all of us during the conversations. Curriculum implementation within the city school system required that that which was to be implemented be specified in advance and that a rational plan of action be followed to ensure a successful installation. As I have pointed out in Chapter III, considerable resources were made available by provincial educational authorities for the implementation effort. The expenditure of some $2 million for the inservice component of the [illegible] ite [illegible] preceding [illegible] educational research literature, supported by demands from teachers, that inservice should accompany any curriculum change. This research and these demands were influential in developing new government policy on inservice. ~~The~~ recommendations of the Tripartite Committee on Inservice and suggestions made by the Alberta Social Studies Teachers' Council were included for the first time in the planning of the Mentor inservice programme. The result was that the inservice was conducted in a collegial fashion, i.e. by teachers seconded from the field, and the sessions were structured so that teachers could select required inservices from what was termed as a "menu" of possibilities.

The meaning that the recommendations regarding inservice have for the participants in practice and the way that these became extracted and systematically applied as an inservice policy is instructive. In our second conversation Mary described one exceptional inservice which took place at Northern, in which Linda and another consultant met with Jim, Fred and herself. The meeting was at the request of the Northern teachers who felt some uneasiness with the "resolving the issue" portion of the social inquiry model. How one resolves issues in the social studies classroom was discussed, with each person sharing ideas of what this meant to them and how it was accomplished in their own situation. Each of the participants seemed to find this experience valuable as a source of support and as a generation of ideas for teaching (Mary, Conversation 2; Linda, Conversation 3). Within this meeting, teachers and consultants encountered one another as colleagues and participated in a kind of inquiry themselves regarding the meaning of social issue resolution and its application in their teaching. The meeting was appreciated as part of a process of improving teaching by means of discussing common concerns and mutually developing interpretations of the curriculum proposal. But Linda noted that meetings of this sort were rare and becoming increasingly less possible (Linda, Conversation 3).

As valuable as these encounters are for teachers, their application in practice in the school system was being discouraged. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) note how curriculum implementation needs to be understood as a process rather than as an event. Diane indicated how she believed this to be true and how she would like to see this notion administratively supported as she carries out her job as social studies supervisor. However, it is difficult for her to achieve support for this interpretation of change within the school board bureaucracy. Proposals for inservice require budgetary allocations, clearly defined strategies and predictable results. It is difficult for Diane to define and defend the kind of dialogue, which she feels is required, to the bureaucratic hierarchy of the Board office which is oriented towards controlling the system (Diane, Conversation 3).

The imperatives of responsibility and control come through much of Diane's talk about her work. On a broader level these may also be seen in the way that the application of the research recommendations for collegiality and responsiveness to individual needs becomes transformed by these bureaucratic imperatives. The launching of the inservice programme required a planned series of workshops [illegible] a preconstructed rationalization of how teachers come to learn and adopt new ways of teaching in order to promise predictable results. Predictability was made necessary by the requirements of advance planning. The bureaucratic imperative of control also requires mechanisms for accountability. These imperatives of predictability, accountability and control served to place an increased surveillance and structure on collegial relationships between consultants and teachers. In our conversations, it was noted that despite the presence of more consultants in this implementation year (over double the number in the city school system), the teachers now saw consultants less often in collegial situations. Communication between consultants and teachers now took on an increasingly structured form at inservice sessions in which the topic for discussion was already established according to a pre-arranged schedule (Jim, Conversation 2; Mary, Conversation 2; Linda, Conversation 3).

The great attention given to help teachers implement social inquiry was also tending to create a greater degree of managerial control over the consultants' and the teachers' time. This increased structuring of time was actually serving to hinder inquiry rather than helping it. Opportunities for meetings to deliberate on the change, such as the one which took place at Northern, were becoming increasingly rare, allowing few possibilities for open-ended inquiry into the curriculum change itself. An understanding of this emerged in many of the conversations as the implementation became linked to other external controls which were developing (Fred, Conversations 3 and 4; Mary, Conversation 2). I discuss these further controls more fully below.

2. Contradictions between Helping Children and Citizenship Production

A traditional rationale for the inclusion of social studies as a subject area in the school curriculum is the role it plays in citizen education. But beneath the rhetoric of the function of social studies, there also lies a contradiction between this rationale statement and the meaning of teaching as a pedagogical activity of living and working with children. In order to meet its mandate for citizen education, the 1981 curriculum explicitly indicated the nature of good citizenship and presented teachers with a plan for producing this through the selection of appropriate topics of study and the inculcation of the requisite skills and values for the process of social inquiry. The appearance of a consistency of purpose is very important in the writing of the curriculum document itself and in the creation of the accompanying unit plans and Kanata Kits. Important objectives are identified and separated into knowledge, skills and values at each grade level. A chart appeared at the beginning of the curriculum guide (p. 2) showing how the various social sciences are included within the various topics. A second chart shows the scope of global studies in the curriculum (p. 3).

The uncertainty of the results of teaching stands in contrast to the consistency of purpose portrayed in the curriculum documents. Lortie's (1975) study indicates that in the midst of this uncertainty most teachers find the rewards of their work in the "striking success of individual students" (p. 121).

The contradiction between producing citizens and helping children is reflected in the work of the participants in this study. In our conversations, Jim seemed to feel this contradiction most keenly as his language conveyed a frustrated sense of being caught in the middle between curriculum expectations and his daily experiences with the children. As a conscientious teacher, Jim was honestly attempting to do what he understood was expected of him. Good citizenry was defined in the curriculum as being a socially aware person, skillful in the methods of social inquiry, respectful of other's views and knowledgeable about the community and the nation. Jim attended inservices regularly to learn the appropriate techniques for teaching this curriculum and made use of the recommended unit plans. In classroom practice, however, the results of these efforts were discouraging. Often the Canadian content was uninteresting to the students, yet at the same time he noted how teachers were publicly chastised through the news media for failing to produce students who were knowledgeable about their country. In another instance he indicated that the children appeared to ignore the skills of rational social inquiry when they encountered an issue which personally affected them (Jim, Conversation 3). There were also a number of areas of importance for his classes which were not addressed by the curriculum.

Where this contradiction tended to discourage Jim, Linda worked hard to resolve it through developing a sample unit plan and by conducting appropriate inservices. She saw this work as being vital for the future.

> . . . students are not going to be able to deal with this ever-increasing volume of knowledge that's going to come at them . . . we have to give them some way of dealing with it, or they'll be swamped. (Linda, Conversation 3)

In much of Linda's conversations she showed a complete clarity of both the ends and means of citizen education, a clarity whose successful execution was, at times, frustrated by resistance from others and by her own perceived lack of communication skills. The other two consultants expressed concern about this contradiction between teaching and the production of children who were good citizens and consciously tried to avoid imposing a way of educating on teachers. They appreciated the contradiction as something of a practical difficulty, which they reflected on and also attempted to mediate through face to face meetings with teachers (Diane, Conversation 3; Jennifer, Conversation 4). But they experienced frustration with the increasingly few opportunities for dialogue with teachers which would allow for a mutual interpretation of the curriculum change in the light of teachers' situations (Jennifer, Conversation 3).

As teachers, Mary and Fred were somewhat less frustrated by the contradiction between explicit expectations in the curriculum and their pedagogical concern for children. Perhaps because of his long experience, Fred implicitly understood that the hyper-rationality of the curriculum model is not meant to be assimilated by his students. His pleasure in teaching comes when he feels he has taught something worthwhile, such as in the object lesson contained in the roleplay of the policeman and driver (Fred, Conversation 3). And he is gratified when former students come back and he sees that they have made their way in life (Conversation 4). Mary feels confident that she can help her students to be investigative and thoughtful. This is a more genuine meaning of good citizenship for her than that explicitly conveyed in the objectives of the curriculum or in the demands of the news media.

At issue for Mary and Fred is the conflict between pedagogical and administrative interpretations of the curriculum. They can, for practical purposes, reconcile the contradictions between the official curriculum and pedagogy at the classroom level by selectively reading the guidebooks. Moreover, Mary holds that change may be possible if there are more opportunities for unconstrained dialogue between the teachers at Northern and with the consultants (Conversation 3). But the power of administration to impose its interpretations at the classroom level was becoming more apparent. Links are made by Mary and Fred between the magnitude of the effort to implement this social studies curriculum and the growing emphasis on the management of school outcomes through external examinations and school-based budgeting (Mary, Conversations 3 and 4; Fred, Conversations 3 and 4). Fred points to this conflict of interpretations in concrete terms when he poses the notion of test validity against fairness to students (Conversation 3). Test validity is a statistical concept whereby the technical application of a test may be administratively justified, whereas fairness is rooted in a practical, ethical and situational decision by the teacher. One measure of the relative power of interpretations is the extent to which the arguments for fairness are accepted as against bureaucratic arguments for validity based on imperatives of standardization and control.

3. A Contradiction between Education as Having an Enlarged Understanding and Outcomes Based Education

The third contradiction is a more general one related to the overall theme of dichotomies which exist between the technical rationality of curriculum planning and teaching as a practical activity. Here a contradiction may be identified between teaching as part of an ongoing process of education, and teaching as a kind of strategic activity which is oriented towards specific goals.

I have pointed out in Chapter II that there is a natural affinity between the ways that a bureaucracy rationally plans action and the technical rationality of the traditional Tylerian-type curriculum models. Within these models teaching becomes re-interpreted as the application of techniques to reach objectives. The educational talk of this rationally planned action easily adopts technical metaphors borrowed from the military, business or medicine (Johnson, 1977). An appreciation of the hold that technical language has on us came through some of our conversations as we attempted to formulate alternative ways of seeing teaching and learning, and more difficult still, other visions of how to make changes in school practices as participants in the school system. Jennifer's comment about being elated by the conversations, but frustrated by "being caught in a role in the structure" illustrates a way this contradiction emerged.

The effort to seek out non-technical modes of acting can be noticed by our many explicit references to the need for time to dialogue and to reflect on practice (Diane, Conversation 3; Jennifer, Conversations 3 and 4). There were also many implicit references to the need for dialogue in the remarks the participants made about the value of the conversations themselves as learning experiences. Coming to articulate learning as a dialogical, as opposed to a technical activity, often emerged in the form of negative examples. Mary, for example, describes how dialogue within the social studies department at Northern is transformed by management by objectives into meaningless paperwork (Mary, Conversation 3). In another example, Diane talks of how, as a supervisor, she is kept so busy handling her management responsibilities and her assigned tasks, that she seldom has the opportunity to reflect on where she's going (Diane, Conversation 3).

Alternative action was becoming increasingly difficult for the participants. At the classroom level, Fred shows how he helps the children to enlarge their understanding of justice by posing the codified law against a concrete life situation (Conversation 3). But signs of growing demands for accountability for the coverage of specific content leave him uncertain about the kind of freedom he will have to seize upon such learning opportunities. He vividly describes the process of being transformed into a functionary through his soldier metaphor in Conversation 4. Diane indicates the constraints which she experiences in proposing alternatives at the supervisory level. She asks ironically "how do you go to an associate superintendent or trustee and say we need an extra million dollars worth of people time to establish trust?" (Conversation 3).

An outcomes-based system is founded upon bureaucratic management imperatives of accountability and control. Dialogical alternatives can achieve little recognition in this milieu. As opposed to the abstracted clarity of stated goals and seemingly congruent procedures for reaching them, a process of dialogue is indeterminant and difficult to defend in terms of managerial forms of rationality.

Contradictions and Educational Practice

The curriculum guides and inservice activities connected with this social studies curriculum have been planned and executed with the intention of closing the gap between theory and practice. This is a technical response to a problem interpreted as being amenable to technical solutions, i.e., it is developed under the assumption that a theory can be abstracted from observations about practice and then be employed to direct practice. Yet, the contradictions also point to the inappropriateness of technical solutions. How we should regard these contradictions, and exactly what implications they have for conceptions of curriculum implementation have figured prominently in the conversations already being answered by administrative action through the many specific examples of increased control over teaching and consulting as they came up as topics of conversation. These examples will be discussed more fully below. Alternatives to these technical solutions require a deeper consideration of the nature of practice and the way that it handles contradictions.

Some initial distinctions between theoretical representations of practice which render practice open to technical action and lived practice are provided by Bourdieu (1977). Bourdieu notes that theoretical constructs typically try to smooth out contradictions, whereas in everyday life contradictions can exist in many specific situations because they have no practical consequences (p. 123).

Practice is situational by nature, and what is to be done is seen within the situation itself. Gadamer, in his discussion of the hermeneutic problem of application (1975, pp. 274-278), makes a similar point when he argues that ethical practice is not a rule governed activity but, on the contrary, it is within a specific situation that a person understands something general asked of him or her.

There is little that is surprising or new in the contradictions spoken of here by the teachers and consultants. There always exists a tension between the day to day concerns of even the most thoughtful kind of pedagogical practice and the explicit and sometimes strident demands that formal education perform certain specific social functions. The general expectations held out for the Alberta social studies curriculum, as understood by the participants, are interrelated and have deep roots in the history of education. Educating for good citizenship is a taken for granted raison d'être of education itself. The inquiry process lies at the very basis of commonly held understandings of what being educated means, in contrast to being trained or indoctrinated, for example. Moreover, the outcome of an education has generally been regarded as possessing an enlarged understanding of the world which enables one to thoughtfully and rationally approach life situations and that these actions will be of benefit to the social and civic life of the community. Teachers live daily with contradictions between these long term goals for children and some of their daily classroom practices. Experienced teachers are conscious of the child-like nature of children and how adult expectations must be interpreted and modified in a pedagogical spirit. They are also familiar with the exingencies of life in classrooms which require many compromises and often require them to participate in activities which seem to bear little relationship to the long term goal of educating children for life.

The difficulty of technical reasoning lies in the assumption that a teacher's practice needs to be modified in specific ways which are planned in advance, in order to make it conform to educational goals. The nature of the goal itself must also undergo a transformation in order to become the object of technical action. The goal necessarily becomes articulated in the form of a clear and achievable aim. (The accountability movement and management by objectives are examples of more extreme applications of this process.) Practical reasoning understands a different sort of relationship existing between aspirations and actions. There may be statements of aims, but these do not hold a central place in dictating appropriate practice. The statements themselves are provisional—present articulations of purposes—which point in the direction of the actual aspirations. Upon reflection, certain practices may be seen to have been events which contribute to the achievement of these "goals in sight" but at the same time they also enlarge the understanding of actual goals themselves. Conversely, this reflection and deliberation may also indicate that certain actions are inconsistent with larger p[illegible] but in so doing, this also provides better insight into [illegible] nature of the purposes themselves.

According to Gadamer (1975, p. 278) there can be [illegible] uncertainty concerning the [illegible] of [illegible] are precisely the goals which give ultimate direction and meaning to teaching as a practical activity. Ethical principles are always grasped retrospectively as lessons of practical actions. The negativity of experience, of which Gadamer speaks, means that often it is the contradictions which extend our understanding of our aims better than fully achieved intentions.

Negativity of experience for the participants has been an overall feature of this hermeneutic inquiry into curriculum implementation. Within these conversations there are many specific examples of how, by highlighting the contradictions, we as participants enlarged our understanding of the kind of appropriate alternative practices that we desire. Mary's reflections on school based budgeting, for example, as actually limiting local autonomy help to better illuminate the nature of an emancipatory practice.

The School as the Site of Conflicts between Technical and Practical Perspectives of Teaching

A dominant reading of curriculum implementation for the participants in this research is a heightening of the ongoing tension between technical and practical perspectives of teaching. This may be partially explained by the fact that actual classroom practice is seldom addressed in the curriculum guides for teachers. Anderson (1981) notes that what actually passes for practice in such "practical" guides can be more accurately regarded as "simplifications of theory" (p. 152). He states that within the pages of the so called practical guides, the classroom is portrayed as a 'sanitized' place where the teacher has the complete control required to select and employ appropriate teaching strategies in order to reach desired ends. The "appropriate" strategies which are identified, with their attendant views of children, are often derived from generalized theories about learning rather than representing real children situated in real classrooms. Using insights derived from ethnomethodology, Anderson argues that lessons are not, in fact, controlled by the teacher in this fashion, but are actually mutual accomplishments of both teachers and students requiring collaborative work. This is not to say that students' actions are always consonant with the teacher's intentions; it merely suggests that lessons are interactive, so that if a teacher wishes to ignore an inappropriate remark or to highlight and extend an appropriate one, he or she must 'do' ignoring and highlighting work.

Anderson's ethnomethodological research is instructive in that it points up the difference between technical assumptions about classroom action and the realities of everyday classroom life in which curriculum topics and formal lesson agendas become enmeshed in forms of normal interaction. His research is a kind of hermeneutic reading of the taken-for-granted structures of everyday life. Missing from such an analysis, however, is the depth of the ontological and critical dimensions of the conflict that teachers and consultants meet in carrying out their activities of teaching and implementing a new curriculum. Ontologically, there exists for each of us a tension related to securing and maintaining a [illegible] and communicative way of being with others in a predominately technical world. The critical dimension of this conflict lies within the relations of power which [illegible] define the kind of reality [illegible] ways [illegible] school, and the effects that this unequal distribution of power has to define a certain reality and to effect a transformation of the work of the participants.

Being Technical and Being Practical as Educators

The conversations with the participants show that, as educators, we live teaching as a way of being that is both technical and practical. The curriculum change in this study is administratively commanded and its implementation technically planned, but through hermeneutic conversations the participants have the opportunity to consider the meaning that such a plan has for teaching. While this is what the conversation is explicitly about, the language of our discourse also points beyond the ostensive contradictions between technique and practice to more profound kinds of contradictions which exist for educators wishing to make schools more educational places. The language of our reflections shows how the essential features of a pedagogic concern for children become transformed by ways of being in the world which are fundamentally technological.

Education and technology each share a futurist orientation. To have a pedagogical concern for children means that one is hopeful about children and the future. Fred says this directly as he talks about overlooking present frustrations with certain students in order to "look years ahead" (Conversation 3). The deep conviction that many of the participants feel toward the need to implement a social inquiry way of teaching/learning exists because of the responsibility they [illegible] for preparing children for the future.

Technology would seem to provide the means by which resources are marshalled in order to achieve desired ends. However, Heidegger (1954/1977) points out that the essence of technology is not in itself the institution of an ends-means rationality, but it is a way of being in the world which reveals everything as standing in reserve for our potential use. This allows us to begin to speak of both children and ourselves, as educators, as resources to be drawn on for the future. This form of talk occasions profound changes for teaching. The urgency felt regarding the implementation of the inquiry process expressed by some (Linda, Conversation 3; Jennifer, Conversation 2), points to a vision of children as society's resource for the future, standing in reserve in order to process "the massive amounts of information which will be coming at them." The inquiry process itself then also becomes a resource to be picked up and laid down in a tool-like fashion and to be adopted by others as something "that works" (Linda, Conversation 3).

Diane's ironic remark about convincing the school board administration of the need to buy "people time" (Conversation 3) suggests a growing consciousness she has of how we have come to view ourselves and our time as resources available for use. But Diane also speaks of her work in terms of her responsibilities. She identifies others by their functions within the organization and insists on defining the limits of her own function (Conversations 1 and 2). Jim searches for a stability in expectations, so that he may define himself as a teacher (Conversation 1) and sees consultants as people who play particular roles in helping him to carry out his job. Linda talks of her own enthusiasm for teaching as "loving what you do"

(Conversation 4). All this language speaks of an availability for use.

But there is also an unwillingness to be reduced to standing in reserve too. In many of the conversations we push the limits of normal technological talk about what we do in schools in an attempt to recover something that is even more basic about teaching. In these conversations, we search out ways to transform schools into places in which we might more truly become educators. A sense of this began in some of the early conversations with consultants concerning ways of avoiding the impression of criticizing teachers' activities in the classroom. The talk was not merely of finding techniques for manipulating messages at inservices. There was also a deeper sense, that to help other teachers one needs to speak pedagogically about children. Consultants and some teachers are pleased with the occasions which permit this, like the times when they do not have the formal agendas of the planned inservice sessions. They talk of such sessions as times when they get back in touch with themselves, and do not have the pressure of having to implement something, which they find to be an alienating experience. But the pressure of having to implement an inquiry way of teaching is always there. Behind explicit criticisms of the flattened out portrayals of inquiry, as well as the recognition of the inappropriateness of manipulation, there also lies a definite push to change teaching in the direction of specific conceptions of what social inquiry is. One might ask as Mary does in Converation 4, how can we do any differently when we believe that a way of teaching like inquiry is more educational than what many teachers are now doing?

Behind much of the talk about the inadequate portrayals of the desired change and imposing things on teachers there is a rejection of the imposition of a theoretical attitude which is made necessary by having to convey ideas about improving teaching to others. To do otherwise is a difficult task because, as Dreyfus (1981) points out, theory has been regarded as the access to reality since the time of Plato. To communicate as educators about what they do, educators have to become theoretical about teaching. The requirements to be explicit about the change and about its practical ramifications are rooted in a way of being in the world which is more deeply technical. The implementation of a planned eductional change requires the adoption of a theoretical attitude towards teaching. This suggests that conscious attempts to push off a narrow instrumentalism in order to plan "more human" ways of interacting might serve to advance technology and to further reduce teaching as a practical pedagogical activity.

Managing Teaching through Rationally Planned Acts

This next section is a critical analysis of the meaning of curriculum implementation which has emerged as a result of the conversations with the participants. From a managerial stance, failure to implement curricula is often interpreted as a problem of staff inertia needing to be overcome (Hall and Loucks, 1977). A theory of resistance, on the other hand, will interpret such a failure more positively as being worker resistance of control over their labour (Apple, 1980). Curriculum implementation is clearly a far more complex affair either than a conservative resistance to innovation, or than practitioners fending off managerial efforts to rationalize and control their work. Teachers and consultants do indeed resist a reduction of their work to managerial rationalizations, but as the preceding discussion suggests, to attempt to explain this only in technical or in socio-political terms would be too reductionistic.

Shipman's (1972) research has rejected the notion of managerial power that assumed the implementers of new programmes were powerful and teachers weak. He argued that quite the opposite was true, that teachers and school heads were powerful gatekeepers who could effectively counter any change. This fact is borne out by my own rather non-reflective personal experience as a consultant and by much of the curriculum implementation research of the past ten to fifteen years (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Doyle and Ponder, 1977). In a recent piece of research Popkewitz _et al._ (1982) have advanced this notion further and showing how the language of school reform is manipulated in order to make it appear as if change has occurred while, in fact, legitimizing existing views of children, society and knowledge under the guise of the innovation.

While the hermeneutic conversations with the participants in this study of curriculum implementation do not necessarily reject the conclusions of earlier studies that show that schools tend not to implement changes in the manner anticipated by curriculum makers, our discussions do show that efforts to improve schools through administrative action have certain subtle and profound effects on the meaning of educational practice for the educators. The conversations point to a number of specific ways that a nexus of existing research on school innovation applied to bureaucratic attempts at school reform, tend to make teaching more technical, and that this transforms and erodes teaching as a pedagogical activity rooted in practical reason. The following is a discussion of some of the more specific trends towards this transformation which may be discerned in the research.

1. Collegial Relationships are Becoming Objects of Control

During the past decade or so, the research interest in innovations and the organizational change process have produced a considerable body of empirical data. These data have indicated the importance of multiple situational factors in curriculum implementation like; having a supportive administration, maintaining continuous inservice during implementation through a sustained interaction with consultants, and having sound staff development in which teachers learn from one another (Fullan, 1982, pp. 66-68). As pointed out in Chapter III, the technical assumptions which underlie a research-based theory about change, allow research of this kind to be put into practice in order to improve 'poor' implementation and inservice activities. My investigations show how the Mentor inservice programme, and the supporting activities and documents supplied by the Department of Education and the school board, were based on such research. Arrangements were made to hire practicing teachers to provide intensive inservice, at hitherto unmatched levels, in order to support the implementation of the curriculum. While there was explicit provision for a choice of sessions, which itself was also a message from research, real choice was in fact constrained by the extensive planning that went into the Mentor materials and the accompanying documents which had been produced by experts.

Although the planned inservice and implementation activities were informed by the research findings, attempts to use these in a technical way removed the very essence of their collegiality. In a number of conversations (Mary, Conversation 4; Jim, Conversation 3), the participants talked of how the collegial relationship with consultants had been altered. The meetings between consultant and teacher were no longer set around a common pedagogical interest, but were structured on implicit or explicit agendas set by the intended direction of the change. The replacement of talk among colleagues with prescribed agendas entailed more than just a change of the content of the meetings; it also involved an imposition of hierarchical relationships between participants. This resulted in a tendency to associate consultants with other hierarchically imposed decisions, like new evaluation policies (Mary, Conversation 4).

As collegial relationships became integrated into the administrative inservice plans, they too became more open to monitoring and accountability. A school district policy of zero based budgeting had been instituted as a financial management measure shortly before this implementation programme. This new budgeting policy had two central features which served to further intensify and control the work of teachers and consultants; one was school based budgeting, the other was a system of monitoring of consultants' time through a programme called Recording of Services.[1] Although both of these measures had economic justifications, they served to reinforce the feeling among the participants that their time spent together in inservices was reducible to money and an object of administrative interest.

---

[1] The consultants called this programme "dots" because they were required to punch dots on computer readable sheets to identify how they spent their time.

2. A Tendency towards a Standardization and Control over School Outcomes is Reinforced

The help for teachers provided by consultants and other experts in this social inquiry curriculum is oriented towards the implementation of the curriculum as an object. As I have pointed out in Chapter I, bureaucracies transform practical action into rationally planned action. In order to do this, an object is required. The participants in the conversation all understood that the implementation effort had been directed towards installing something called social inquiry which has now been administratively defined. The participants subsequently conducted themselves as if the notion of what social inquiry was had now been settled and had, hence, been standardized. Diane and Linda deny that this necessarily occurred by protesting that the inservices only presented one way of inquiry teaching (Diane, Conversation 3; Linda, Conversation 3). Nonetheless the fact that these are unavoidably presented as models for emulation belies these protestations.

> Practicality tends to be one of those things people ask for, secure and relieved in the knowledge that it will not be delivered. (Anderson, 1981, p. 172)

While this observation by Anderson may be generally true, the participants in this study saw good reasons in the particular history of this curriculum to conduct themselves otherwise. The initiated and uninitiated alike felt a sense of responsibility to make this particular version of the inquiry curriculum work now that it had become more practical. The implementation programme was interpreted by the participants as being a response to demands that inquiry be more understandable and practical for all teachers. The result was a tacit support for a standardization of inquiry. This is shown in several ways in the conversations. One way it is displayed is through a prevalence of talk about evaluation, which may be partly explained by new provincial initiatives in comprehensive examinations which were occurring at the same time as this implementation programme. These two tendencies serve to reinforce one another and they appear as linked in many of the conversations (Fred, Conversation 4; Mary, Conversation 1; Linda, Conversation 4). Another example is the content of the aforementioned teacher initiated inservice held at Northern which, although unstructured, had as its content a form of self-evaluation against an externally set standard which was provided by the social inquiry model. The very existence of such externalized standards produces a sense of uneasiness concerning the relationship between these expectations and one's own practice. This is also clearly shown in other conversations with teachers (Fred, Conversation 4; Jim, Conversation 3) when they indicate an uncertainty about doing what they consider to be right. Their appeal is to outside authorities and not to any moral or ethical sense of what appropriate situational action might be.

3. The Erosion of Practical Reason

An erosion of practical reason is linked to the pressures for standardization inherent in the implementation of the curriculum.

Gadamer remarks how practical reason has become "scientized" in the political arena through a process of continuous feedback of public opinion (1982, p. 73). This tendency usurps the essential moral content of practical reason in public life. A similar erosion of the practical reason of educators is shown in the conversations by the growing tendency within the curriculum implementation to defer to expert opinion for essentially practical decisions.

It would appear from a description of the conversations with Jim in Chapter IV, that he is the most receptive participant to technical advice. He looks to experts for a resolution of the question of how to deal with prejudice in a sensitive and educational way, and he sees the inquiry process as a method for scientifically resolving contentious value issues (Jim, Conversation 3). However, the implementation of this curriculum advanced technical reason in less obvious ways for all participants. The curriculum guide itself and the accompanying documents, served as a common text for each participant in the conversation. These materials separated the learning objectives into value, knowledge and skill components. How these were to be combined was shown by the inquiry wheel. The fact that these are actually analytical representations of the exercise of practical reason in personal and civic life, i.e., the practice of inquiry, was hidden by the central place given to this representation of the process in the curriculum materials and the inservice sessions. The actual practical wisdom which is required to make good decisions cannot, by its very nature, be reduced to representation on the inquiry wheel. Therefore, prominence was given almost entirely to the process, which is open to a technical expertise. The transformation of practical rationality to technique is thereby completed.

The conversations show that this transformation results in the attention of the participants being turned towards the way that the curriculum planners and unit plan writers represent the social inquiry process for the purpose of implementation, not towards the social inquiry questions themselves which serve as the contentious issue topics of the curriculum and the appropriate focus of practical reason. Each of the three consultants who participated in these conversations been involved in the production of some of the guides, but in producing the guides they, too, must assume a technical-theoretical stance. Bourdieu notes how theoretical representations of practice require this kind of activity on the part of practitioners (1977, p. 98). The guides written by Diane, Linda and Jennifer become displays of their proficiency at using the inquiry process. In so doing, the consultants become participants in the transformation of inquiry from an emancipatory activity having a practical intent by helping to reproduce the process as a standardized set of procedures to be followed.

Some Concluding Observations

Social studies education, and educators generally, need to be concerned about the reduction of practical reason to technique. Practical reason forms the essential content of both civic and social education, as well as giving meaning to the essence of teaching in a pedagogical sense. The incipient spread of technical reason into all corners of everyday life is beginning to effect profound and subtle changes on the way that we view ourselves as teachers in a democratic society. This raises some important questions about the long term effects that this will have on us both as citizens and as educators, as it asks us to consider how we might best respond in ways which will help to recover a more original sense of practice.

I shall mainly limit my concluding remarks to some specific observations on the ways that certain current school practices, such as manifested in the planned implementation of this new social studies curriculum, are now changing the work of consultants and teachers. Prior to doing this I would like to, first of all, suggest that such practices are part of a larger set of tendencies which have important implications for social life generally in a technological age. In the late twentieth century industrial state we are witnessing an intensification of certain trends in the direction of a greater bureaucratization and increased rationalization of human social life. This is a tendency which has already been recognized by a number of social theorists including; Weber (1968), Ellul (1964) and Habermas (1971b) With Habermas, I would generally agree that a growing rationalization of systems is an unavoidable feature of the increasing complexity of society. But there is also an urgent need to recognize the danger that this present to social and political life and that these dangers need be responded to in a manner which is [illegible] points.

In discussing the way that inquiry becomes misrepresented as a technical process Jennifer comes to the [illegible] about technology as does Heidegger [illegible]

[illegible]

> Then you ask "who's the bad guy?" But we have to take the responsibility ourselves. (Conversation 4)

We need to acknowledge the ontological dimension of the struggle by realizing that the contradictions between technique and practice lie within us. This points to a requirement for us to be continually reflective as we carry out our everyday tasks as educators. But the political dimension also needs to be taken account of through an appreciation of the fact that this contradiction is now currently being resolved in technical ways through administrative action.

Apple (1982b) points out some of the effects of technical control in schools, effects which seem to have relevance to the experience of the participants in this study. Following Braverman (1974), Apple notes that technical rationalization has led to a deskilling of white collar work. One has to be cautious in applying such a concept to the work of educators, but there appears to be a strong tendency toward a deskilling and a reskilling of the jobs of both the consultants and the teachers as a result of the efforts to provide implementation help to teachers. The individualized help given to teachers is based on an abstracted and technical notion of individualization which varies the rate but not the kind of help that the teachers get. The actual kind of help is increasingly specified. The conversations show clearly that the consultants and teachers feel that their work is being intensified as a consequence of the greater amount of control being exercised over it.

School change which is carried out on the basis of this individualized notion of help denies the explicitly social and [illegible] that innovations which aim to make schools more educational places for children need to respect these essential features of practical action. Specific recommendations as to how this might be accomplished lie beyond the scope of this study, but examples of alternative forms of action do exist in the community education and action work of Freire (1973a, 1973b) and others. In many ways our search for alternatives as educators in advanced industrial states is both more complex and all the more urgent than in third world situations. Most of our social and economic needs are seemingly satisfied through ways which have been institutionalized in formal organizations: schools, governmental agencies and the like. However, precisely because these services are institutionalized in these large formal organizations, they become increasingly subject to the problems of bureaucratic rationalization which technicize action. Energetic efforts to bring about social change through these organizations, like this example of social studies implementation, appear to further advance the tendency towards technical control. I see the role of a study like this one as being a way of initiating a line of questioning which will eventually lead to [illegible] ing and to gaining [illegible] a distinctively pedagog[illegible] form of p[illegible] in [illegible] communal life generally.

Towards Improved Practice

The contradictions between the intentions and the effects of this attempt to implement a new social studies curriculum offer possible starting points for alternative ways of improving teaching practice. [illegible] implementation [illegible] the participants, we are able to expose and reject efforts to manage institutional change which result in increased controls over teaching. In this rejection we wish to affirm a commitment to pedagogy as more than a function definable by a job description, and to teachers as persons who are capable of transforming their own practices through critical reflection. Thus these contradictions enable us to redefine two basic ethical values related to the continuance of the school as a social institution; that the school be an educational place for children to learn, and that it be a democratic place for educators to work.

The contradictions described in this chapter initially play a role in critical reflection. Specifically, they lead us to ask what is it about current school practice which contributes to the kind of reductionism described in these contradictions; that inquiry be reduced to technique, that democratic citizenship be reduced to persons having certain prespecified traits, and that education consist of measurable objectives? This critical reflection points to the need for a deeper understanding and appreciation of the historical development of the school as an institution and the way that this shapes the nature of change efforts. David Tyack (1980) describes how the process of the bureaucratization and professionalization of school systems was a response to exingencies of mass public education in this century. This helps us to understand why political and ethical questions become transformed into technical problems. The contradictions also point to the need for a better analysis of the school as a social institution. In order to understand why this change effort had the effect of introducing greater controls over teaching, we need to appreciate the narrowness of institutional change possibilities in schools as they now exist in order that we may begin to locate ways to transcend these. If the study by Cuban (1982) shows the conservative nature of the high school as an institution, then we need to re-examine modes of change which focus on controlling outcomes and monitoring processes, but which fail to address the nature of the institution and the conditions which maintain it.

This critical reflection on the sources of the contradictions is rooted in a commitment to bringing about positive educational change. By rejecting the reduction of social inquiry, citizenship and education in this implementation effort, we also deliberate on the fuller potential meaning that these have for improved social education relative to our existing practice. Posed against this reductionism, for example, is a fresh understanding that social inquiry is more than a process for resolving prescribed social issues. Social inquiry as a process only makes sense in relation to questions which are meaningful for our society. This, in turn, defines the substantive content of citizenship, i.e., that students think about and act thoughtfully on social questions. Citizenship in a democratic community requires a continuous redefinition of democratic ideals within the context of concrete social questions. How to foster this in educational ways in schools is the task of social studies teaching and how to create the conditions for a reflective action on the meaning of this, in relation to current practice, is the task of consulting

The contradictions become educative for the participants only when they are able to reflect upon the change in relation to their own teaching situations. Reflection illuminates both the meaning of the change as well as existing practice, but the value of this as a social process needs to be appreciated. The importance of social inquiry to citizen education requires deliberation by teachers and consultants on the nature and shape of inquiry in the development of democratic citizenship and how these ideals relate to and be given meaning in relation to the everyday practicalities of teaching. These are central educational questions which cannot be decided by administrative decision, rather they are always open to further questioning and revision based on practice. However, it is through these deliberations that the teachers and consultants may participate and it is through this participation a democratic educational community is both developed and sustained.

What is significant in this curriculum implementation programme is the way that the technically planned action served to narrow the range of opportunities allowed for teachers and consultants to deliberate on the change and to transform their own practice. An improved practice requires a reversal of this tendency, but reversal is only possible if the central importance of reflection oriented towards educational practice is recognized and a concerted critique is mounted against those working conditions for educators which mitigate opportunities for deliberation. This study indicates that the present direction of 'normal' school improvement practice both misses this essential ingredient and actively creates additional blocks to the development of a self transformative practice on the part of the actors themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Education. 1981 social studies curriculum guide.

Anderson, D. C. Evaluating curriculum proposals: A critical guide. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Aoki, T. T. Toward curriculum inquiry in a new key. University of Alberta Curriculum Praxis Occasional Paper Series No. 2. 1978.

Aoki, T. T. Curriculum implementation as instrumental action and as situational praxis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Apple, M. W. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979a.

Apple, M. W. The other side of hidden curriculum: Correspondence theories and the labor process. Journal of Education, 1979b, 157, 47-66.

Apple, M. W., Social structure, ideology and curriculum. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Apple, M. W. Reproduction and contradiction in education. In M. W. Apple (ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction in education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982a.

Apple, M. W. Curricular form and the logic of technical control: Building the possessive individual. In M. W. Apple (ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction in education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982b.

Aristotle. Nicomachean ethics. In W. F. R. Hardie, Aristotle's ethical theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Ball, T. (ed.). Political theory and praxis: New perspectives. Minneapols: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Barrett, W. The illusion of technique. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1979.

Barritt, L. et al. Meaningful educational research: A descriptive phenomenological approach. Unpublished manuscript, 1979.

Barthes, R. A lover's discourse. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.

Barthes, R. Presentation. Communication, 1979, 30, 3-5.

Bauman, Z. Hermeneutics and social science. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Beauchamp, G. *Curriculum theory* (3d ed.). Willmette: Kagg Press, 1975.

Becher, T., & Maclure, S. *The politics of curriculum change*. London: Hutchinson, 1978.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. B. Implementation of educational innovation. *Educational Forum*, 1976, *40*, 344-370.

Bleicher, J. *Contemporary hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as method, philosophy and critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Blenkin, G. The influence of initial styles of curriculum development. In A. V. Kelly (ed.), *Curriculum context*. London: Harper and Row, 1980.

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

Bobbitt, F. *How to make a curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918.

Bottomore, T., & Nisbet, R. (eds.). *A history of sociological analysis*. London: Heinemann, 1978.

Bourdieu, P. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. *Schooling in capitalist America*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

Braverman, H. *Labor and monopoly capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.

Callahan, R. E. *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Chamberlin, C., & Crowther, F. Elementary social studies: Where are we now what's ahead. *Alberta Teachers Association Magazine*, April-May, 1973.

Clark, C., & Yinger, R. Research on teacher thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1977, *7*, 279-304.

Clark, C., & Yinger, R. The hidden world of teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Association, 1980.

Clark, P. I. *Inside Mentor: A program development project*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1982.

Connors, B. T. *In-service: A research*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1982.

Cuban, L. Persistent instruction: The high school classroom, 1900-1980. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1982, *64*(2), 113-118.

Cunningham, B. A. Teaching as being: The right to personhood. Edmonton: Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Occasional papers series No. 6, 1979.

Dale, R. Education and the capitalist state: Contributions and contradictions. In M. W. Apple (ed.), *Cultural and economic reproduction in education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Dalin, P. *Limits to educational change*. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Downey, L. *The social studies in Alberta—1975*. Edmonton: L. Downey Research Associates, 1975.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. A. The practicality ethic in teacher-decision making. *Interchange*, 1978, *8*(3), 1-12.

Dreyfus, H. Knowledge and human values: A gene[illegible]gy of nihilism. *Teachers College Record*, 1981, *82*(3), 102-13[illegible].

Elbaz, F., & Elbaz, R. Literature and curriculum: Toward a view of curriculum as discursive practice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1981, *11*(2), 105-122.

Eliot, T. S. The hollow men. In *Selected Poems*. London: Faber, 1962.

Ellul, J. *The technological society*. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Fay, B. *Social theory and political practice*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975.

Fay, B. How people change themselves: The relationship between critical theory and its audience. In T. Ball, *Political theory and praxis: New perspectives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Frank, A. W. Reality construction in interaction. *Annual Review in Sociology*, 1979, *5*, 167-191.

Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury, 1973a.

Freire, P. *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury, 1973b.

Fullan, M. *The meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE Press, 1982.

Fullan, M., & Park, P. Curriculum implementation: A resource booklet. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1981.

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

Gadamer, H-G. Hermeneutics and social science. Cultural Hermeneutics, 1975a, 2, 307-316.

Gadamer, H-G. Truth and method. New York: Seabury Press, 1975b.

Gadamer, H-G. Philosophical hermeneutics (D. E. Linge, trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976

Gadamer, H-G. Reason in the age of science. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1982.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Giddens, A. New rules of sociological method. London: Hutchinson, 1976.

Giddens, A. Positivism and its critics. In T. Bottomore & R. Nisbet (eds.), A history of sociological analysis. London: Heinemann, 1978.

Goffman, E. Forms of talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Golby, M. Practice in theory. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies: A radical approach. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Gouldner, A. The coming crisis of western sociology. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Gouldner, A. For sociology: Renewal and critique in society. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975.

Groome, T. Christian religious education: Sharing our story and vision. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980.

Guba, E. G., & Clark, D. L. The configurational perspective: A new view of knowledge production and utilization. Educational Researcher, 1975, 4(4), 6-10.

Habermas, J. Knowledge and human interests (J. Shapiro, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1971a.

Habermas, J. Toward a rational society (J. Shapiro, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1971b. (Originally published, 1968.)

Habermas, J. *Theory and practice* (J. Verteil, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1973. (Originally published, 1963.)

Habermas, J. *Legitimation crisis* (T. McCarthy, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1975.

Habermas, J. *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1981.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1977, 14(3), 263-276.

Havelock, E. A. *Origins of western literacy*. Toronto: OISE Press, 1976.

Havelock, R. G. *Planning for innovation through the dissemination and utilization of knowledge*. Ann Arbor: Center for the Research and Utilization of Knowledge, 1971.

Heidegger, M. The question concerning technology. In M. Heidegger, *Basic writings* (D. F. Krell, ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Heidegger, M. The age of world view. In W. V. Spanos (ed.), *Martin Heidegger and the question of literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Herriott, R. G., & Gross, N. The complex nature of educational change. In R. G. Herriott & N. Cross, *The dynamics of planned educational change*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

House, E. Technology vs. craft: A ten year perspective on innovation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1979, *11*, 1-15.

Howard, R. J. *Three faces of hermeneutics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Hoy, D. C. *The critical circle*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Hummel, R. P. *The bureaucratic experience*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Jehenson, R. A phenomenological approach to the study of the formal organization. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Phenomenological sociology: Issues and applications*. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Johnson, G. Ideological roots of educational thought: A study of 'borrowing' from industry, the military and economic theory. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for Social Studies, 1976.

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

Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. *Power and ideology in education.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Kelly, A. V. Ideological constraints on curriculum planning. In A. V. Kelly (ed.), *Curriculum context*. London: Harper and Row, 1980.

Kliebard, H. M. Persistent curriculum issues. In W. Pinar, *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975a.

Kliebard, H. M. Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale. In W. Pinar, *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975b.

Krawchenko, K. *et al*. Curriculum in Alberta: A study of perceptions. Edmonton: Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Occasional Papers Series, 1979.

Lawn, M., & Barton, L. (eds.). *Rethinking curriculum studies*. New York: Halsted Press, 1981.

Lobkowicz, N. *Theory and practice: History of a concept from Aristotle to Marx*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Lortie, D. *School teacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Loucks, S., & Pratt, H. A concerns-based approach to curriculum change. *Educational Leadership*, 1979, *37*, 212-215.

Macdonald, B. Innovation and incompetence. In D. Hamingson (ed.), *Towards judgement: The publications of the evaluation unit of the humanities curriculum project 1970-1972*. Norwich, U.K.: Centre for Applied Research in Education, Occasional Publications No. 1, 1974.

Macdonald, B., & Walker, R. *Changing the curriculum*. London: Open Books, 1976.

Macdonald, J. B. Curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Marcuse, H. *One-dimensional man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Mawson, S. *Social studies curriculum development in Alberta 1975-1978*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1982.

McCarthy, T. *The critical theory of Jürgen Habermas*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1978.

McHugh, P. *et al*. *On the beginning of social inquiry*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

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

Mendelson, J. The Habermas-Gadamer debate. *New German Critique*, 1979, no. 18.

Merleau-Ponty, M. *Consciousness and the acquisition of language* (H. J. Silverman, trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973a.

Merleau-Ponty, M. *The prose of the world* (J. O'Neill, trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973b.

Misgeld, D. Phenomenology, social science and the social service professions: The case for the integration of phenomenology, hermeneutics and critical social theory. *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, 1983, *1*(2), 195-214.

Mueller, C. *The politics of communication*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Natanson, M. Phenomenology as a rigorous science. In T. Luckmann (ed.), *Phenomenology and sociology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Novak, M. *Ascent of the mountain, flight of the dove* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

Oakeshott, M. *Poetry and the conversation of mankind*. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959.

O'Neill, J, *Making sense together: An introduction to wild sociology*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Ozaga, J. T., & Lawn, M. *A social danger? A study of organized teachers*. Lewes, U.K.: The Falmer Press, 1981.

Palmer, R. E. *Hermeneutics*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

Pinar, W. F. (ed.). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. F. Life history and educational experience. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1980, 3(2)

Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. Socratic Caesura and Schooling. Unpublished paper presented at the University of Alberta, March 27, 1981a.

Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. Theory and practice and the reconceptualization of curriculum studies. In M. Lawn and L. Barton (eds.). Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981b.

Ponder, G. The more things change . . .: The status of the social studies. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 515-518.

Popkewitz, T. et al. The myth of educational reform. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Psathas, G. (ed.). Phenomenological sociology: Issues and applications. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Rasmussen, D. M. Communicative action and philosophy: Reflections on Habermas' Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns. Philosophy and Social Criticism, 1983, 9, 3-28.

Reid, W. Thinking about the curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Reid, W. The deliberative approach to the study of curriculum and its relation to critical pluralism. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Ricoeur, P. The model of text: Meaningful action considered as text. Social Research, 1971, 38, 529-5[illegible].

Ricoeur, P. The task of hermeneutics. Philosophy Today, 1973a, 17([illegible] 112-128.

Ricoeur, P. The hermeneutical function of distanciation. Philosophy Today, 1973b, 17(2/4), 129-141.

Ricoeur, P. Existence and hermeneutics. In C. E. Reagan & D. Stewart (eds.), The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978a.

Ricoeur, P. Explanation and understanding: On some remarkable connections among the theory of text, theory of action, and theory of history. In C. E. Reagan & D. Stewart (eds.), The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978b.

Schutz, A. On phenomenology and social relations (H. R. Wagner, ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

S[illegible]b, J. J. The practical: A language [illegible] curriculum. [illegible] J. G[illegible] & [illegible] Pur[illegible] (eds.), Curric[illegible] [illegible]

Shipman, M. D. The impact of a curriculum project. In J. R. Gress & D. Purpel (eds.), *Curriculum: An introduction to the field.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1978.

Stenhouse, L. *An introduction to curriculum research and development.* London: Heinemann, 1975.

Stephens, M. A question of generalizability. *Theory and Research in Social Education,* 1982, *9*(4), 75-89.

Thompson, P. *The voice of the past: Oral history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Tomkins, G. The social studies in Canada. In J. Parsons *et al.* (eds.), *A Canadian social studies.* Edmonton: Publication Services, University of Alberta, 1983.

Tripartite Committee. *Report on teacher inservice education.* 1977.

Tyack, D. B. Ways of seeing: An essay on the history of compulsory schooling. *Harvard Educational Review,* 1976, *46*(3), 355-389.

Tyack, D. B. *The One Best System.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

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

Van Manen, M. Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 1977, *6*, 205-228.

Van Manen, M. Pedagogical theorizing. In T. T. Aoki (ed.), *Re-thinking education: Modes of enquiry in the human sciences.* Monograph No. 3 in the Curriculum Praxis Monographs. Edmonton: Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1981.

Van Manen, M. Edifying theory: [illegible] the good. *Theory into Practice,* 1982, 21(3), 44-50.

Walker, R. Getting involved in curriculum research. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Weber, M. *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (E. Fischoff et al. trans.). New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

Werner, W. *Guidelines for program implementation.* Victoria: Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education, December 1980a.

Werner, W. Implementation: The role of belief. Unpublished paper. Centre [illegible]

Wexler, P. Structure, text, and subject: A critical sociology of school knowledge. In M. Apple (ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction in education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Whitty, G. Sociology and the problem of radical educational change. In M. Flude & J. Ahier (eds.), Educability, schools and ideology. London: Croom Helm, 1974.

Willis, P. Learning to labour. Farnsborough: Saxon House, 1977.

Wolcott, H. Teachers vs. technocrats. Eugene: Centre for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977.

Young, M. F. D. Curriculum change: Limits and possibilities. Educational Studies, 1975, 1, 129-137.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER AND INITIATING QUESTIONS TO TEACHERS AND CONSULTANTS

Terry Carson

2nd Year Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Secondary Education,
University of Alberta

Phone: (Home) 437-5568
(Office) 432-5723

Statement of Research Interest

As a former teacher, curriculum developer and consultant (in Newfoundland) I am interested in coming to a deeper understanding of the meaning of curriculum implementation for teachers. My own past experience and what I now read in the educational research literature tell me that we really don't understand very much about the relationship between curriculum planning and the day to day practicalities of teaching. In other words, we really don't understand the meaning of curriculum implementation.

I feel that through a series of conversations with the teachers of your school, which has recently attempted to implement a revised curriculum, I may come to a deeper understanding of the meaning of implementation in your lives as teachers. In order to accomplish this I would like to pose the enclosed questions as representing my interests in the topic. To some extent, this is also collaborative research, so you will be involved as co-researchers in this project. By opening up questions of the meaning of implementation our dialogue will lead to greater insights for each of us. Asking the right questions is of crucial importance. I would, therefore, welcome any observations you may have on my questions or any other questions which you feel are important to this research.

I anticipate that I will have four or five conversations with each teacher, of about one hour duration. The actual times of these conversations may be decided between us. Since this will be written up as a piece of research we will have to come to an agreement as to what will be, and how it will be, reported. We can discuss this in our first meeting.

Sequence of Meetings

I.	First meeting:	An introduction of the topic of research and my reasons for finding implementation questionable. Sharing some personal historical background on our lives as teachers.
II.	Second meeting:	A discussion on the teachers' own intentions in teaching social studies related to inservice, consultative help and other assistance which is provided in order to teach the programme.
III.	Third meeting:	A critical focus on the role of curriculum guidelines, the way they are presented and the meaning of their presentation to the teachers.
IV.	Fourth meeting:	A reflection on some of the assumptions the social studies curriculum makes, and that we make, about the abilities of the students and the hopes or expectations held out for them.
V.	Fifth meeting	If needed.

For the Teachers

Some Guiding Questions for a Dialogue about Curriculum Implementation

A. Some General Background Questions

1. How long have you been teaching social studies in junior or senior high schools?

2. What sort of programme planning have you been involved with in the past in social studies.

3. What formal inservices have you attended on this new 1981 social studies programme?

4. Describe some of the other ways you have received information on this programme?

B. Research Questions

My research centres around the question of the relationship between the formal social studies curriculum, as a set of guidelines, inservices, plans and prescribed materials and your own teaching. I am interested both in your view of the curriculum itself and of the way it is presented to you. My primary concern is with the implementation of this social studies programme and the way it influences your teaching. I am also interested in some more general feelings you have on what it means to implement a curriculum.

1. a. In your view, how should the new social studies curriculum be taught? Why?

   b. What do you think of this new curriculum in relation to how social studies should be taught?

2. What have the inservice sessions on the new curriculum been like for you?

   a. Describe the first inservice session.

   b. Did your view of the programme change after the first inservice? In subsequent inservices?

   c. How do you see the inservice sessions relating to your teaching?

   d. Ideally, how should inservice help teachers?

   e. To you as a teacher, what does it mean to go to an inservice?

3. What is your view of some of the other aspects of the implementation of the 1981 social studies curriculum?

    a. What kinds of information about the programme constitute the curriculum for you?

    b. How does this curriculum influence you in planning and teaching for your social studies classes?

    c. In what ways do you see these influences as helpful to your teaching? In what ways are they harmful?

4. What does it mean to plan as a teacher and what is its relationship to teaching?

    a. Why do teachers plan? What limits do you see for planning in teaching?

    b. What role do you see for Department and School Board curriculum guidelines and plans in teaching generally? What direction are they going in now? What direction should they take?

5. From a teacher's point of view will you describe a successful implementation?

6. What has it been like for you as an individual and for your school to participate in this study?

For the Consultant

Some Guiding Questions for a Dialogue about Curriculum Implementation

A. Some General Background Questions

1. How did you first become involved in the inservice of the new social studies curriculum?

2. What has been the extent of your involvement with the inservice programme for the new social studies curriculum?

3. Were you involved in the development of this curriculum? In what way?

4. Have you worked as a consultant to teachers in the past? Describe some of this work.

5. What has your teaching experience been like?

B. Research Questions

My research centres around the question of relationship between the formal social studies curriculum, as a set of guidelines, inservices, plans and prescribed materials and teaching. I am interested both in your view of the social studies curriculum itself and how you feel it should influence teaching. I am particularly interested in the role that you see for inservice in connection with implementing the new social studies curriculum. I would also appreciate any more general feelings you have on what it means to implement a curriculum.

1. a. In your view, how should the new social studies curriculum be taught? Why?

   b. What do you think of this new curriculum in relation to how social studies should be taught?

2. What have the inservice sessions on the new social studies curriculum been like for you?

   a. What information were you given about the new curriculum in order to prepare for the inservice?

   b. How did you go about preparing the inservice?

   c. Describe what it has been like to lead an inservice session.

d. What modifications have you made in the inservice sessions as a result of your experience.

e. How do you see the inservices you have led relating to teaching?

f. Ideally, what should be the role of inservice vis à vis teaching?

3. What do you see to be the relation between consulting and teaching?

4. What is your view of the other aspects of the implementation of the 1981 social studies curriculum?

    a. What do you see the social studies curriculum to be? (documents, ideas, books, etc.)

    b. How should the curriculum influence a teacher's planning and teaching?

    c. In what ways do you see this curriculum helpful to teaching? In what ways is it harmful?

5. From a consultant's point of view, how would you describe a successful implementation?

6. What has it been like for you as a consultant to participate in this study?

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT SUMMARY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH A PARTICIPANT (LINDA)

Note: The following are the transcripts used for analyzing the conversations held with Linda. The marginal notes and markings are left to indicate something of the process of analysis.

Dear :

Q. 1

Enclosed is a somewhat edited summary of our conversation of April 8. You will notice that I have attempted to analyze the discussion for major themes. I would appreciate any comments you might have on the adequacy of these themes. Do you see any others? Are they (the themes) helpful in the continuation of our conversation? I would also appreciate any comments you might have on the quality of the conversation itself. How are we doing at getting at the meaning of curriculum implementation from your standpoint as a consultant participating in a planned implementation effort?

self confid.

hence breaking down resistance

reflection

Q 4

I see several questions about implementation that I would like to pursue in our next conversation. I am intrigued by the points you raised about the importance of teacher self-confidence to try a new idea. Is another side of this "breaking down" of resistance by fostering self-confidence, also a creating of conditions which would allow teachers to question their own teaching of social studies? How is this best accomplished?

initial.. ② →

interpret

Perhaps a prior question might be to talk in more detail about the new social studies curriculum and how that relates to your view of how social studies should be taught. How negotiable is the curriculum to be implemented and how negotiable should it be?

I'm looking forward to our next conversation on Wednesday, April 21.

Yours sincerely,

Q 2 What is the inquiry model (the new [illegible]) compared with your view [illegible] compared to "dialog" [illegible]

Q 3 - How negotiable

[illegible] Evaluation [illegible]

[illegible]

Conversation with

Major Themes April 8, 1982

1. Early involvement with change in the Alberta social studies programme.

(30) L I was involved in the initial planning of the '71 programme.

L [There was] a recognition at that point, maybe not very clearly focused, that we could no longer teach social studies as facts and that society would be changing more and more rapidly. . . . somehow we had to provide children with a process for dealing with facts, with people . . . A way of getting away from a whole emphasis on facts to an emphasis on process and people.

T Was this a general feeling?

L No, I don't think I was alone. I was teaching in an innovative situation already. We were put into a new school as a team in a new school. We worked on team planning, team teaching. It was extremely exciting. We were given permission by the School Board to create our own curriculum. The social studies supervisor worked closely with the principal.

2. Curriculum decision making as a teacher.

(67) L . . . an incredible experience getting teachers together planning curriculum and working together implementing it. Where you really understand what you have planned and you go in and try it out with one group of students, go back and revise it.

T That's the ideal isn't it?

L Very natural to go from there to working on provincial curriculum.

T You were just transferring what you were already doing.

T You came back teaching two years ago? What was it like to come back to the social studies?

(100) L It was easy for me to come back into this new program, it was what I was doing before . . . way of dealing with conflicting values somewhat different, the emphasis of the three levels of objectives we had talked about ten years earlier. More books and more support were there for the things we were trying to do earlier.

3. Experiencing resistance to innovation

(130) T Did you experience resistance to the new curriculum?

L Not in the school. . . . As practicum associate I found that new curriculum was not taught in some classrooms or
(140) if it is . . . in a very traditional way—emphasis on knowledge and a lack of inquiry processes. It was an eye opener for me.

(158) L I was told by one cooperating teacher "that the inquiry process is fine for the theoreticians at the university, it has nothing to do with the practicalities of the classroom." Which was really neat, because I came from the classroom have them tell me this.

(170) L More readiness among [university] students than teachers in the field. We all fall back on experience of being
(185) student to a degree, but not as much as to our [illegible] teaching experience

[illegible] king down resistance to change

(190) One of biggest problems of implementation has to be a breaking down of this reserve within teachers [trying something new]. Always a reluctance to take on something new when what we've been doing is comfortable, where we've success. To go into something new we're not sure there w[illegible] be success and maybe we don't even agree. There are many people who don't go along with the lack of emphasis on knowledge who are reluctant to get into values . . . you don't have self-confidence in what you are doing [with a new curriculum]. That's the crux of the issue in implementation—bringing people to that degree of self-confidence where they feel they can [illegible] a new [illegible]

building self confidence [illegible]

[illegible] ing and consulting [illegible]

You became involved in curriculum development because [illegible] see a need. The curriculum developed now must be implemented. You then became consultant, but this is different from teaching it yourself. I wonder if there's not something there in the difference between being a consultant and being a teacher. How do you see this [illegible] and teaching [illegible]

a [illegible] between consultant and teachers

In terms of implementation it's important that teachers [illegible] that you have been a teacher [illegible] soon [illegible]

(245) . . . That you really understand what it is like to be a teacher. "It sounds terrific, but do you know how many hours I'm going to have to work with it at night?" "Do you know what it is like to have 32-34 pupils in your class?" These are the kinds of things we tend to forget once we're out of the classroom. ⑫

T Did you forget quickly when you were out of the classroom?

[illegible] I To a degree except I was teaching in a very good school where the kids were success oriented. The problems I would face would be far different than the problems in some other area, and the kind of results you can get there. Except I don't totally believe that either, but others do. I personally question that.

T Why do you question that?

I Because I don't know that any one school has a hold on success or a hold on achievement. The potential is there with any school in the city; maybe not to the same extent or same numbers involved and maybe it won't be as easy to ( ). That's saying that kids are smarter over here, and I won't buy it. They don't have the same work habits, but they're sure not going to have those work habits if you're feeding them and they're supposed to hand it back to you.

T That's sort of a cop out among teachers. These students are poor students so we can't expect much of them.

I We underestimate kids constantly. Maybe that's something else I've come to feel in the past few months is we underestimate teachers too. We believe that most teachers are going to be reluctant to t[illegible] the new teaching [illegible] have kids in groups, etc. That [illegible]

[illegible]

ordinary teachers"

I think there are a lot of people in the middle, if you can get to them will be quite willing (if you can understand what you're trying to accomplish). They're quite willing to have kids [illegible] they have that kind of self [illegible] implementation is about. These are the ones the implementation is directed to, not the die-hards who will never change their way. You just forget about them. Maybe that's an unfair statement, maybe it's just that their own philosophy simply can't work with the philosophy behind the curriculum. (12)

c. Time for teacher and consultant to be together.

(316) L It's tricky getting to the teachers in the middle—you have to bring them out of the classroom.

T I always felt that the necessary time for getting together was lacking You were given one day here and one day there. (7)

(350) L In rural areas implementation is more successful because inservice has been on a more personal basis.

- a p.d. day—followed up by consultant visiting the teachers in the classroom. Using copies of teacher's ideas for others. The ideas would start flowing and teacher-teacher sharing began to take place.
- the consultant was doing job well enough so that he was not needed. The consultant was a facilitator only, which is what I see a teacher being.
- consultant takes things that the teacher has done. This promotes teacher self-confidence. The teacher becomes more involved and more willing to risk

d Relationship in the light of change being implemented.

(490) Let's talk about the importance of the curriculum being brought in. What is the relationship between the consultant and teacher vis à vis the inquiry model being implemented? Is it a case of the consultant knows the inquiry model and the teacher doesn't? Therefore, the job of the consultant is to teach the model to the teacher But the teacher has practical knowledge of getting along in his own classroom.

20) L Both of these factors are true. Has to be a way of combining the two. Don't lecture to teachers, but have them experience part of it. e.g., you have them come up with an opener and share what they've done. There are elements of the inquiry process they've done in their own teaching. There are elements of it as it appears in the curriculum which is different Show what they have done before in their own teaching that is the same. The only difference is how we go into it and get out of it, so you have them experience those two things and share these experiences. You're co[illegible] [illegible] to the unknown, so it takes away th[illegible] (10) 3

[illegible] perception [illegible]

6. Need for teachers to work together.

T You were involved in the workshop that they requested ( )

(480) L Rosslyn experience—has been rare—and that's difficult to prepare for.

T It does put a lot of demands on you because you really are trying to take account of the teacher's own knowledge.

L You just have to know what you're talking about—grade materials, experience. You have to know the curriculum and have the experience of having taught it.

(520) L At , it was just social studies teachers talk about social studies. It wasn't consultant and teacher at all.

T That's the idea isn't it. It's a chance for teachers to reflect on what they are doing and to plan how to make it better.

L Yes, and to share with one another. It was really interesting to watch that afternoon. Because not only were Craig and I hearing what was going on at the different grade levels, but they were hearing as well. There were terrific ideas there! And inherent in that a reaffirmation of respect of "hey that fellow really can teach."

7. Opportunities for teachers working together.

T The day to day interaction in schools does not promote that kind of talk. You go to the staff room, sit down, have a coffee, not that many formal meetings . . .

L The chance to know what is going on is better in small schools. In the school I taught at there was an attempt to work together across the curriculum. Share what was going on. In that school we made reading and writing across the curriculum as an objective for each subject area.

8. "Internal" and "external" decision making.

(553) T But you were doing objectives as a way of recording what you wanted to do as a result of these meetings about the needs of the school—as opposed to objectives being imposed.

L True, there had been meetings like that prior to school based budgeting, but we didn't write down objectives. When school based budgeting happened there seemed to be more clearly focussed objectives because we were required now to do it.

(580) T I'm uncomfortable about using objectives as a way of justifying getting money.

L Right. The idea of having a staff work together to develop goals and objectives for a school is excellent. (7)

T The whole process is good, isn't it? You really have to reflect on what we're all doing here at this school.

9. Curriculum implementing as an opportunity for reflection.

T Is curriculum implementation not also an opportunity for reflection and looking again at what we're doing and what we take for granted as to what social studies is?

(600) T I see implementation not as an implementation of a particular thing like the inquiry model—more a fact that you feel a sense that there needs to be changes in social studies. Conditions have changed therefore we need to look again at social studies and be reflective in our teaching.

(606) L This is more of an implementation of a philosophy than a particular method. Times have changed, we can't learn everything, we have to look at interpersonal relations . . . that kind of thing, I guess.

a view of the world

10. Social studies as a reflection of our social life.

(620) W A boy said to me in this grade 8 class "social studies is about life—what do you learn about life in math? Social studies is living!" If you could have teachers and kids believe that then implementation would be a snap. 13) (12)

are we going to have a conflict over change – old values new?

(625) T We are asking in social studies for people to reflect on their lives and society. I guess this is why social studies is so frustrating. You sense this among teachers and civil servants when they say other subject areas are ticking over all right—we get materials put together and so on and then they say why can't you get a good textbook in social studies?

(640) L Only it's not enough to learn facts and it's only going to get worse in social studies. Facts (3)

T Science is like that too?

L People don't realize that yet. They realize you can't just deal with facts, but coming to grips with the problems they will have to face in society hasn't hit them yet. (1)

11. Social studies and the computer.

(660) T No, social implications of science—privatization of life with computers, videogames, etc. What happens to social life? "Where is the social in all this?"

L Computer can be set up to be part of social studies as long as we decide how we use them—so we aren't left with the question of where is the Social in all this.

(675) End

Didn't we misunderstand each other here?

Test this out.

4

p.7
p.8. . a process of inquiry - to be learned by all students . . which they can use or reject - (a tool).

The context

L -265

Conversation #2

April 21, 1982

I. Themes

1. Linda : Two additions from our first conversation.

(03) T You were saying there was something you would like to add from last time?

L Two things. That I wrote down last night having read it [account of conversation #1] that I feel hadn't been dealt with, that I feel have to be, and are yet to be dealt with. The first has to do with evaluation . . .

T Teacher or student evaluation?

L Everything, but primarily students . . . affecting students in terms of the new curriculum.

2. Student evaluation needs inservice attention if the social studies curriculum is to be implemented.

(09) L We are being asked to teach not just knowledge . . . but knowledge, skills and values, but very little has been done about how to evaluate in those areas. 4

. . . we talked about it yesterday.   [another consultant] said, and I agreed totally, that if evaluation isn't dealt with then the whole curriculum will be undermined. Because if teachers don't feel confident in evaluating in the new curriculum . . . it won't stand a chance of ever being implemented and it doesn't matter how many resource teachers there are, it will never ever work. L

. . . we are running a series of nine workshops on evaluation . . . it's a fine idea, but just to come with the expertise to do that, there isn't any place you can go for help.

(26) T Very often I find that the bottom line is evaluation. That's where the real curriculum [of the teacher] begins to show through. . . . that seems to be where implementation breaks down. A person can see a lot of merit in what you're doing . . .

L But how do I test it? ④

T Right.

(40) L The most common response [I get from teachers] and it's one I'm fighting at the moment has to do with they won't get enough knowledge . . . it totally ignores process. . .

(53) T . . . you look at teachers having to cope with school regulations, like common exams. . . . I can understand, to some extent, the principal's reasoning where he says "I'm accountable for the curriculum being covered . . . results . . . so I have to be able to show it."

L . . . Someone suggested having common time [for different ways of gathering evaluative information] rather than common exams.

(71) L [We are trying to] create questions that teachers can look at and say "yah, I can make that kind of question," "It does do what it is supposed to do," and "it's not going to take me forever to mark it." Because they're conditioned to think multiple choice, easy marking.

T . . . I can see the dilemma you're in . . . how do you reflect [in evaluation] the citizenship skills and value aims of social studies.

Especially if there is a grade 9 [comprehensive] social studies exam this year. . . . by admission of the person who is in charge of the exam it will not test the process of social inquiry or participation skills.

. . . What message is that giving teachers. . . . here they pay for . . . 125 resource teachers for the year and they can conceivably undo all that good.

. . . unfortunately the people writing the exam are not particularly enamored with the inquiry process.

3. Communication skills, particularly writing, is the second area not mentioned before, needing attention in the implementation of the social studies.

(116) L The other is . . . the movement away from knowledge requires a greater emphasis on communication skills both oral and written. . . . teachers of social studies have not been adequately prepared to teach writing . . . to teach the skills of writing or verbal skills. We don't know how to teach them and we don't know how to evaluate them. 4

(142) L There seems to be a real fear, and I hesitate to use the word, in getting into this area. . . . what this is requiring is some imput of self and you can't do that without communication skills. . . . [social studies teachers lack language arts courses].

(165) T One of the things I've often wondered, from my experience as a consultant, is how much can you actually do in an inservice in terms of writing . . .

. . . inservice seems quite effective in teaching a skill to a teacher, to add to a teacher's repertoire. When it comes to allowing a student to write expressively first and bringing him along as a writer is a very long term thing. It's not necessarily a skill, but it's an attitude towards . . .

L Yes, you have to have the attitude first and then the skill. It's tough.

(182) L I'm involved in two [inservice] things. The evaluation workshop . . . [giving examples of how to help your students to get into writing and how to evaluate it].

(185) [. . . the other is the Role, Audience, Format, Tense technique of teaching writing.]

(190) L . . . the intent [of RAFT] is instead of having the student write an essay for the teacher . . . you try to put some variety into it . . . [for example] in 8c they take on the role of a British official who has been living in Kenya for some time, who is writing back to his family, his audience, a letter, in present tense . . .

. . . with a RAFT assignment you can test knowledge and you can test values, by asking them to do a role exchange.

(226-328) L [explains how students in grade 8 will be writing a district assignment using a RAFT assignment and she will be inservicing teachers on marking this assignment and on the RAFT technique itself.]

(312) L . . . and the RAFT process is really so wide open you could apply it anywhere at any level.

this is an example of a technique ④ + ⑥

4. Does the introduction of a new technique in an inservice present an opportunity for teachers to reflect?

(328) T Where I see the advantage of the RAFT—and maybe this is a more general point about inservice as it applies to a person's own way of teaching—it gives the teacher an opportunity to think about what he is doing and to evaluate what is being presented.

L Yes, can't use it this way but . . .

(343) T [Relates this to L's comments about "diehard" teachers in conversation #1, p. 3.]

5. What is to be learned from "resistance to change"?

(358) T I was wondering can the "diehards" show us something? In the sense that what they are saying is representing a particular view of teaching which they may articulate and others may feel . . . and at the same time it's something

which causes us to think again about what we're trying to implement.

L . . . and not get too carried away. That's a valid point, you need your devil's advocate . . . but you need somebody who's willing to question. And they can be very frustrating. ①

a devil's advocate is still a devil.

There was one there yesterday driving me up a wall. [He said] "it's impossible to evaluate the curriculum, so why bother. . . . nobody knows what they are doing, you don't know what you're doing, so why bother?"

T So what do you do with that [statement]?

is this necessary

L I'm not sure. It was really only that that was coming and there was no suggestion of what to do instead.

(400) T [A stranger makes us aware of our culture], does that have applicability to us understanding the inquiry model?

L There isn't any one way of doing it and it's not as if one way was correct. And sometimes it's necessary to have people remind us of that. . . .

. . . the diehard at least forces you to think through your position very carefully, because you are going to have to defend your position . . . maybe that's a little inquiry process in itself. ①

already has answer?

6. Interpretation and the curriculum.

(427) T I'm wondering how much the question of interpretation enters into it as well. How much is the curriculum a particular thing . . . as suggested by the word "implementation." How much is a teacher allowed to interpret according to his own way of teaching?

L There's a lot of freedom and nobody is checking to see if people are doing the in[illegible]ry process anyway. Even if you follow the intent of the inquiry process [there is a lot of choice]. Topic 8c for example, there is a teaching guide on Kenya, if you don't want to do Kenya, if you want to do Uganda or India; the choice is up to you.

. . . but it [the curriculum guide] is not being done all over and nobody is telling teachers if you don't do it you're going to be fired . . . even for somebody who refuses to accept it, there is a lot of freedom within the classroom.

T Well maybe the real penalties are not for people who don't buy the curriculum; but those who don't buy the evaluation end of it that is coming out from Alberta Ed.

7. Influence of the comprehensive examination on the implementation of the social studies programme.

(481) L What I'm concerned about is that this exam written in grade IX . . . doesn't test the inquiry process. Yet, it will be sending so many [concrete] messages back to teachers and administrators and so on that there won't be a chance for that test to [illegible] [critically] checked and a more accurate one developed. Because they will take the results of that test . . . and the whole question of the evaluation in terms of the curriculum will be distorted. To the loss of both.

T It really is unfortunate that the two things are coming at the same time. There is a real emphasis on implementation and a real emphasis on evaluation. I think in many teachers these two things are combined.

L Ideally, the evaluation could encourage the implementation of the curriculum, if the test was good enough. If it did test in fact values, skills and knowledge. If it was true to the curriculum it could encourage teachers to implement it. Unfortunately, the reverse is going to happen. how? ⑫

T Yes, the evaluation tail is going to wag the dog again.

L Yes.

8. Description of the Kenya teaching unit developed by Wendy.

(509) L The other thing you wanted to see is what we've done on Kenya [a teaching unit developed for Alberta Education for topic 8c].

(514-604) L [Description of draft unit plan given to teachers at inservice and an outline of how this was presented.]

9. Response of teachers to the Kenya unit inservice.

(605) T In the inservice did you have a good response to that from the teachers?

L An interesting response:
Some said "great when can I do it?"
Some were "w-e-e-l-l."
Some who said "that may be fine for your class, but there is no way I could ever trust my class to do that." In other words, "Hey my kids aren't capable of doing that." ①

L The one thing that set me back the most was in taking them through it [the unit] and having teachers actually develop an issue question, and then saying "O.K., if you'd like to turn the page [I pointed out] that first page is all student outcome in response to [my opening question], What is an African?"

And having the teachers say I could work with any one of those just as much as one of my own.

T And the ones who were concerned were mainly concerned that this wouldn't fit their class.

L And the knowledge component—there is very little geography in the unit it comes out . . . one of the teachers said "I'd have to do a two or three week geography section on Kenya so that when it came to my multiple choice test I could have 200 of the 250 multiple choice items on geography." Quote! ①

And at this point you say "Yuk! Forget it" because there's no point in arguing with that kind of thinking.

. . . that man is writing items for the grade 9 exams.

10. Teaching the Kenya unit.

(676) T How would you formulate an inquiry question like that?

(677-714) L [Explains how she taught the unit on Kenya in her own class—a field test of the unit she had developed. The teaching is illustrated by the flowchart in the unit—formulation of the issue question, formulate research questions.] ⑨ What is this sayi about teaching planning

(714) L It is possible to have more than one issue question . . . it works well to have one that the majority accepts. In this unit everyone went along with that issue question ["should a competitive culture be able to force another to change?"].

T And there was a lot of student interest in the unit?

L Yes. It was a great . . .

T . . . one of the better ones for you?

L Certainly, and that would reflect a number of things . . . my own enthusiasm . . . but that's too simple an answer. It's not just my own enthusiasm.

L . . . I had them fill out a little form about how they felt about the unit . . . one boy said "my dad and mum and I really enjoyed this unit." That's the kind of enthusiasm you can get. They were getting involved and discussing it. This one!

11. How should other teachers follow this example?

(733) T I can see how it would be a marvelous experience for the kids and the way of going through it would be excellent.

The question I always get back to is this; how do you help the teachers to do this? How do you have other teachers follow that method?

the implementation question again

L It simply follows the inquiry process, very clearly. . . . some [teachers] will never do it, some should never do it. But I'm convinced that there are a number of teachers in the middle who are more than willing to use the inquiry process but are not quite sure how to do it. ④

. . . . this is where Kanata kits fall down [they spend too long getting into an issue].

It is my interpretation that you get into an issue right away. It should be hard hitting, fast, maybe even emotional, because what you're trying to do is get an emotional involvement on the part of the students [at first] . . . go through the process of inquiry is to provide them with the intellectual—so by the time they resolve the issue they are doing so on the basis of knowledge—knowledge and feeling together. ③

12. Teacher fears.

T Do teachers have problems with there not being enough facts?

L Sure and they're very leery of emotionalism . . . They're afraid of having their kids get emotionally involved for fear they won't [illegible] able to handle it. . . . for fear that it will go home [illegible]th the children and they won't feel competent enough [illegible]o defend it. ①

13. Teacher right to pick and choose in the Kenya teaching unit.

(781) T . . . this is the way you teach and you are able to create a unit based on this, to show teachers how to do it.

. . . when a teacher looks at this my view would be that he will pick out a few ideas from here and use them.

L Sure.

T The idea of the flowchart for example . . .

L The whole teaching unit is meant to be an example of how you would do this for one topic in grade 8, that's all it's meant to be. ④

Anybody might go through it once [as printed] but by the second or third time they'd be making adjustments to suit yourself and class. ④ technical problem?

14. The importance of giving children a process which works for them.

(803) T . . . the scientific method is sometimes depicted like this [social inquiry model]. One of things that scientists say about that is, "that's not how I work, that's an idealization of the process." . . . Do you have any thoughts on this [as it applies to the inquiry model]?

L It's an example. [The social inquiry model] represents a process, but not the process, but a process that can be used. And I really feel strongly about teaching children a process that will work for them. They can take this process, apply it or modify . . . I have no problem with that, so long as the emphasis is on process. * ④ ⑨

. . . That's just off the top of my head. I haven't really thought about it.

T Well let's just leave it on the tape and take it up from there. But that's always been one of my concerns, you get a reification of the model and the model is so much less than what it represents—really what you're trying to do is make a model of human thinking and acting . . .

. . . but I find your answer interesting. I've never thought about it in those terms that they should know a process that will serve them in certain cases.

(840)
End

II. Some Interpretive Notes

I read your very strong commitment to the social inquiry process in this second conversation. I was impressed too with the Kenya unit and your description of it. To me it shows a realization of your commitment to inquiry into significant social questions in a very concrete form, and because it is in the form of a guide, it may be taken and used by other teachers.

The social inquiry process places many demands on the children and the teacher. Your plan and inservice show how you have taken on this challenge and have achieved some very impressive results, as evidenced by the examples of children's work in the teaching guide. In our conversation you tend to downplay your own role as a teacher in achieving these results. You say (on p. 6) that the fact the teaching went well for you was not only a reflection of your own enthusiasm. But it seems to me that your personal commitment may have been the crucial factor in making this unit so successful for you. If this ~~is~~ so, then we are brought squarely back to the consulting "problem." If it is the spirit rather than the individual techniques and strategies which make the differences, how do teachers come to take on the spirit of a curriculum?

I was impressed by your comment that attitudes come before skills. To me, this speaks volumes to education. We take on skills, because we see how they will serve our purposes. Writing is a good example of this. I mentioned in this conversation some of the concerns I've had with giving inservices on writing. While I can appreciate the value of ~~a~~ RAFT assignment as a good technique, and as a technique it is something which may be taken up and used by another teacher, I wonder if that is all we want. Doesn't a successful teacher of writing have to be first and foremost interested in what a child has to say and be interested in the child him/herself to really promote writing? This is why I agree that attitudes come before skills.

I would be very interested in our next conversation in pursuing the question of the implementation of the social studies curriculum in the context of this relationship between teacher and child

caring - intellect
emotion / ~~thought~~

enthusiasm

positive accentuated
I love what I do!

L-3

Conversation #3

May 3, 1982

I Topics of Conversation

1. A correction: units are only suggestions.

(03) L P. 7 [of conversation #2] . . . instead of "would, "could." The teaching unit is meant to be an example of how you "could" do this one topic in grade 8.

(36) . . . teaching units. Kanata kits are meant to be one way, not the way.

2. Some reactions to T's interpretive notes to conversation #2.

(37) T Was there anything else, Wendy?

L Mostly just reacting to your page 9 [of conversation #2].
. . . want to hear what I have to say.
. . . these are some notes I wrote down [reads notes].

(46) First, enthusiasm is contagious and I really believe that. There are some random points I put down not in any sort of order: . .

. . we have to be able to say that "I love what I do" . . . In doing so we may help to create an atmosphere in which others can say they . . . I love what they do and can say it. ⓑ

. . . it's too easy to get into the negative . . .

why, are teachers

(63) A different point: we cannot continue to separate intellect and emotion. We must, by example, allow our students to feel secure enough to risk without fear. Somehow we must bring this feeling to an inservice. . . . somehow we've been led to believe that feeling and relating hasn't been part of teaching. "Keep your feelings out of the classroom" . . . that's wrong . . . that's not suggesting that the teacher gets all emotional, but there has to be this element, as with the Kenya unit, that there is an emotional reaction to what is happening. You
(94) can't leave it there—but it's part of it.

inservice 8
going beyond technique.

3. Enthusiasm.

(100) L You have to be able to say "I love what I do" and not to dwell on the negative. As a teacher in the classroom if you dwell on the positive, that's the kind of response you get back. ①

Negative thinking breeds negative thinking . . . ②

T You're doing things out of fear . . .

I . . . and because you have to.

T I read into your comments [in conversation #2] that as a teacher [illegible] had [illegible]tive relations with parents and with student[illegible]

I . . .

. . . since you aren't defensive towards what a parent or student might say . . . you have that belief or enthusiasm in [illegible] you're doing that you can positively defend it

I . . . that attitude thing if you know what your long-range goals are, have done your planning carefully . . . it sets up confidence ( ) I suppose. The trick is to instill that in your class, and it is a trick. (4)

I [illegible] communicating enthusiasm

Is that experience and technique [illegible] or enthusiasm . . . ?

All of it and you never get to all of them [the students] . .

I keep trying to think of how you apply that in an inservice, because that['s] the direction of all this. Two or three criteria come to mind. One, the person [giving the inservice] really has to know their material . . . The other is an enthusiasm, it [illegible] as a belief in what they are doing (8)

If the person giving the inservice is lukewarm, then it is hard for the people there taking the inservice to be very enthusi[illegible]

There is a problem in that because teachers are not very good public speakers as a rule. It's not something we've had as training. Often what [illegible] mis[illegible] lack of enthusiasm [illegible] lack of knowledge [illegible] speaking situation

Have you [illegible] d it [illegible] an adj[illegible] [illegible] ?

Sure [illegible] ha[illegible] [illegible] al [illegible] ool (4)

[illegible] for training in terms of doing an [illegible] as [illegible] busias[illegible] [illegible]

L And did it?

T . . . if I really attended to the techniques that Toastmast[illegible] taught then it was quite successful.

L Maybe we should all join it for a year or two

T . . . set up [illegible] people [illegible] not entirely appli[illegible] to education

T . . . [could] [illegible] branch [illegible] Toastmasters that [illegible] teachers

. . . Toastmistresses is the basis of the publi[illegible] speaking course that I teach [illegible] student [illegible] well.

T Yes, it does work in terms of a technique but [illegible] enthusi[illegible] is not a technique, it's something you feel.

T Right, unless you have the techniques the enthusiasm [illegible] come across . . . it is the knowledge, the enth[illegible] those techniques that [illegible] you to make [illegible]

. . . maybe part of an implementation [illegible] [for consultants] in doing inservice

. . . you should [illegible] have [illegible] practi[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

In your first and second [illegible] feel care [illegible] those inservi[illegible] [illegible]te[illegible] [illegible]

Well I didn't give one until March [illegible]. My first [illegible] was this topic 80 [illegible] which was something I was [illegible] enthusiastic about and obviously knew something about [illegible]. It [illegible], that's different in Edmonton Public [illegible] where [illegible] people who were all there by [illegible] you don't get antagonism under those circumstances [illegible] were question[illegible] but [illegible] point of view.

. . . that's quite different from dealing [illegible] just [illegible] [illegible]. Th[illegible] PD [illegible] [illegible]

L "Waste of my time being here" to "you people are always bringing in a new programme, when are you going to get something settled down," "social studies that's the subject where kids are always all over the school . . . making all this noise.". And against having teachers out of the classrooms this year and requiring that they go to these inservices.

. . you can imagine what this means to the teacher who isn't very enthusiastic. You imagine what that means to the teacher who is enthusiastic . . .

I [illegible] and being interested in teaching children.

. . . getting back to communicating your own enthusiasm to other teachers . . . what's happening when that's taking place? One of the things I'm looking at curriculum implementation is looking at what does it mean to be a teacher . . . I keep coming back to one commonality—an interest in children.

. . when you're bringing in a new programme you're talking about the what to teach. And yet when the teacher is in the inservice they have in their own mind their own class, their own children and there is an interpretation taking place there . . I see this kind of interpretation going on in comments like "that wouldn't work in my class."

What are your thoughts on that kind of dynamic that takes place between teacher and inservice?

Maybe that's one of the keys to an inservice . . . talk to the teachers not in terms of the programmes, but how it affects the students in the class. Maybe that's why that 8C inservice works, because so much of it is geared to student outcomes . . . as opposed ~~to talking about~~ the material itself so much. It really makes the connection between the material and what you do with your [illegible] to this. (10)

. you've [illegible] to make that connection somehow in your inservice . . . show them what the material has to do and [illegible] their students.

what you want to take place is exactly what you described. Whether they accept it or reject it is irrelevant, what you want to get them doing is thinking in those terms [illegible] thinking [illegible] this in the classroom.

. . [illegible] that connection as well, hey my students really [illegible] the things they [illegible]

7. Different views of children.

(422) T I wonder if all teachers believe that . . . in one of my conversations with a teacher at , he really doesn't believe [that kids are kids] . . . he says I see the inquiry process as being an i[illegible]l . . . for university-oriented people, but for my kids here in a basically working class area I don't see it working.

. . . he's already making that interpretation.

. . . the only thing that's going to change there is not at the inservice. He may get some ideas and be willing to pull some [of them] . . . and if that does work and you start pulling more and more, maybe you end up piecemeal getting into it slowly, gradually. Because the kids can, in fact, prove they can do one thing . . . and it may gradually evolve to where they're doing the whole thing. (3)

. . . or if the teacher is willing to risk it . . . [simply] because it works in another class.

. . . one of his concerns . . . is that what is essential [in the inquiry process] is that the student is able to work a lot on his own.

. he wasn't denying that the students couldn't think about it . . but students could not work on their own very much. They learn much more in an oral way and they need a teacher who understands what their life-world is like.

. . . the fact that their parents tend to be skeptical about the "high falutin" ideas from school, they watch a lot of TV, public issues aren't talking about at home . . not "socially aware" family, the kind of family used to .

It's a cop-out.

It's a deep cultural thing too. If you are the kind of person used to making your wishes felt in the public arena, you've experienced being able to persuade a politician . . . a personal efficacy . . . Then you're going to have a different attitude toward public affairs . . then if you feel you've always been kicked around . . . "all politicians are crooked" and so on.

I But this curriculum provides for that opportunity if teachers will trust enough in themselves to do it. You see, part of what you're saying is that that teacher doesn't believe that the kids [illegible] get what they need unless the teacher gives it to t[illegible] somehow he knows what they get at ho[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

T But . . . kids come with a world already into the classroom and the teacher has to know that.

L Yes, more so with this [inquiry method] than any other . . . you're not going to take kids from a conservative-traditional classroom . . . you can't jump from there to there, there has to be a gradual process over a series of years . . . you are going to have to make small changes in order to get into the full process. ③

whose solution for whose problem?

But that's an interpretation of the process too . . . it implies one extreme where the kids are off doing their own thing all of the time. It doesn't have to be that way. You work with the class to develop an issue . . . the research questions . . . with only one or two periods when they may do something on their own . . . or maybe a mini-unit to learn the process, before you get into one of the major units..

retreat back into the method?

③

②

. . . There is a lack of understanding, it's a developmental thing and you can't go from one [method?] to the other . . . that sounds what that man is talking about . . . that his kids can't do that independent thinking. Maybe they can't because they haven't been trained to do it.

T . . . he recognizes what's possible to do with his students, and I think he's pretty accurate. He has done quite a few new things with his students this year . . . and has recognized that they can think quite a bit on their own. ②

(562) L And maybe that's as far as he can go this year.

8. Freedom to interpret the inquiry model.

(563) T Yes, but . . . one problem he sees is that there is a certain ideal in mind in the implementation, and this is what . . . all those in authority want.

L Except that's not even true, that's not a fair statement.

T . . . that's what come through to him. He says, "What would ever happen if they came into my classroom? Because I'm happy the kids are learning things."

L And that he's moving along getting to what he perceives is the ideal.

T . . . Whose ideal are we talking about? He wouldn't totally agree that what he sees to be Alberta Ed.'s ideal is necessarily the ideal. But he sees a lot of merit [in it], particularly (595) the teaching unit ①

9. Articulating a model of the inquiry process mis-represents inquiry.

(596) L He has trouble with the inquiry process?

14

T He sees it as a mechanistic type of process. That's where he really has problems . . . and in the independent work he sees as being required.

L That's one way of interpreting it . . . [but] I don't think there is any one way of interpreting it.

. . . it is an attempt to provide teachers and students with a process for learning.

[spoke at 's class in the fall presenting a totally different model] saying "it is a process yes, but it is a process of learning and there is no one process of learning." (635)

10. Teachers adopting the inquiry model.

(636) L Because of the resource teacher time and the media . . . there has been a fair amount of pressure on teachers—"come on you should be doing this." Whether that is real or only within their expectations . . .

. . . his goal [Frank Crowther's] is . . . if this one doesn't work for you then adjust it and adapt it, so that you can work successfully with your students so they can get not only knowledge but a process for using knowledge.

I guess in some ways you have to mis-represent something in order to simplify it.

Except teachers in this province . . . are not going to accept something coming down from the top without making their own adjustments. Which is fair.

10

T Seems to me to be a necessity.

ideal

L You have to choose a model that is the best of the alternatives but it is nevertheless still one of the alternatives. (675)

11. goals of inservice in the new programme.

. . . when we evaluate the success of the inservice . . . we evaluate what against what? . . . there is an ideal against which classroom practice will be evaluated . . . it's got a built in failure [illegible] because it will always be less than expected.

. . . [illegible] looking for [illegible] in [illegible]

L . . . and a recognition in the curriculum that students are not going to be able to deal with this ever-increasing volume of knowledge that's going to come at them . . . we have to give some way of dealing with it, or they'll be swamped . . . and faced with more and more serious issues [like] environment vs. industrialization. (712)

12. Evaluating the successful implementation of the programme.

(713) L The evaluation will be very interesting.

. . . if they're going to classrooms, but they're asking teachers "are you using inquiry?" well what does it mean? It depends so much on the teacher's interpretation . . . "I'm supposed to be using the full inquiry model?" or "I did one of my units that way?" ②

T I ask how would the three teachers in my study answer that question? Two would say yes and one wouldn't . . . he would say I'm using what I think it is and what I think is good for my class.

L Which is really what this curriculum is all about. .

T . . . and are probably using it a lot more this year than they were last year.

L So, therefore, the inservice has had an effect.

T Yes!

L But that wouldn't come out [on the evaluation].

T It's used in different ways. being a young teacher more or less buys it as presented. has had 14 years teaching experience.

L . . . And is more likely to question. How can you argue with that? Question it; pick and choose from it, that's really what would be the ideal with an experienced teacher. (768)

13 Too few opportunities for dialogue between teachers and consultants.

(770) T . . . when a teacher is presented with a new idea there is little opportunity to really talk about what is being presented to them. You go to a half-day inservice session . . . the interpretive process takes place . . you can argue with the person giving the inservice and say "that wouldn't work in my class"

L Most people won't say that

T They silently turn you off?

L Sure, the biggest problem with the inservice programme in [illegible] is there hasn't been the provision for follow up ~~in terms~~ of in-school inservicing.

. . . [during that afternoon at] [showed] he was doing many of the ideas already in his class.

You get the idea that something new and wonderful is coming with implementation when, in fact, many good teachers have been teaching partly this way for years. An inquiry process isn't something new . . . (804)

7

14. The impression of novelty and the need for dialogue.

(805) L . . . but the problem with inservice and implementing a new programme is that it makes people question what they're doing and think that there is something new coming.

(809) T That has the answer. That's the "right" way of doing it

15. Consulting and promoting dialogue.

(810) L Right . . . When, in fact, you could be [already] doing many of those same things . . . and the informal inservicing brings that out, because it's people sitting around the table talking . . . it would happen next year when there are no consultants

T Within that kind of [illegible] you [illegible] the consultant acting as what?

L Facilitator, that's all

T Facilitator in [illegible]?

L . . . in terms of getting people to share their ideas. Not as someone who comes and "brings and gives to" [them], but as someone who "allows a sharing to take place." First, within a school and then between two schools and maybe the consultant will take one idea from one school and bring it to another, to the point where the teachers themselves get into that kind of role

. . . but that kind of sharing, talking about what's happening, time to reflect about ideas [illegible] talk about things

[illegible] consultant's an a consultant [illegible]

L Initially only. You sort of start the ball rolling, but if the consultant were to fulfill his or her job ideally . . . at the end they will be no longer needed. If you get the process going properly . . . maybe you need someone in each school. (851) 10

16. Consulting and being a teacher.

(852) T I think they tried that with the E.O.F. There were problems . . . by making a person an E.O.F. teacher you are removing them from their peers . . .

L That person. But what about the other people?

T Well, I don't think it helped the other people either . . . we have a certain social relationship in a school where we are all peers . . . you know yourself in becoming a consultant. You may have taught in the next classroom to that person . . . you come back to that school as a consultant and you're not the same person any more. You may feel yourself to be the same person, but you're not seen as being the same.

It depends so much on the person and the people you're working with.

. . . there is a new study released in Ontario . . . an [inter?] school project . . . they brought one resource teacher into each school . . . the results have been dramatic.

I One of the things I kind of question in my own mind is this notion of consultant as expert . . . expert in what? One of the things we've sort of been hinting at here is that the consultant is the occasion . . . for reflection on what you're doing by bringing in something new. In that way you have to be an expert

T But you probably don't know it any better than any nunber of teachers

I Well isn't that selling yourself short? You are being hired as

L Oh, of course there are only so many hired, but I don't believe for a minute that the ones who are hired are the only ones who have that working knowledge . . . of the curriculum. There may be many others who have that working knowledge who do not want to leave their classroom . . . there aren't only 13 experts.

So much of it depends on how the consultant approaches it, and [illegible] have no training in it.

T How much of this is a product of the situation you find yourself in [as a consultant] and how much is training? . . . you're the expert in terms of the curriculum, but you're not the expert in terms of those teachers' teaching situations. So you have a coming together there.

L Yes, it can be looked upon in that way, it isn't always.

T You are caught in a situation where you don't have the time to ~~develop that.~~

L It happened in the rural areas . . . the programme would be more [illegible]essful [there] for that reason. [In] we didn't even [illegible]de schools because the numbers . . .

T [illegible]hat did you do?

L Mostly they were brought in [to] on PD days . . . I'm not sure if all the junior highs were even contacted. In discussing with the ones contacted, [pupil] evaluation seemed to be a very common problem. . . . As a result, this series of evaluation workshops was developed. It was thought to be more practical than to go into each of the schools and do anything.

who came?

public did theirs differently. A one-day training session for all teachers . . . the second day was done totally in response to teachers answering the [needs] questionnaire and saying "I want . . ." So it's quite different. It'll be nice if the evaluation [of the MENTOR inservice programme] could look at those kinds of [differences]. (957)

17 Speaking of children: the content of the teacher/consultant dialogue

(960) T One of the big things I have here is this issue of how the child is uppermost in the teacher's mind in terms of their own class. And yet, in an inservice the only thing we can provide is a technique—that's one thing an expert can [illegible] "this is how you do it."

L "This is one way, and these are the results we get in the classroom." These go over much better.

T But isn't that still a technique in a way? "This is what I did."

L Sure, but it's going the next step. Showing what the students did as a result of that.

T It tends to put the inservice person on the level of teacher . . . well . . . it sounds more like teacher talking to teacher. You're talking techniques yes, but you're talking techniques in terms of your classroom . . . you're trying to get joining [illegible]

(1001)

18. The Kenya unit as an example of speaking about children.

(1016) T Your Kenya unit seems to be a teacher talking to teacher . . .

L Hopefully, that's what it was meant to be . . . sharing student experiences.

T One of the things that struck me [about the student responses in the unit] a teacher might say "I haven't got any students like that!"

L But that's a policy the province made [regarding the development of teaching units]. The examples were to be what students could reach for . . . [but] legitimate examples from the classroom.

why would they want to do this?

T How do you feel about that? . . . if you had your choice would you include more of a range of [actual] outcomes?

L Probably more of a range. All of the student outcomes in the Kenya unit are not the very best . . . I'm not sure there is any point of putting in low ones. It's understood not everybody is going to be that good. Above average to excellent, maybe. (1074)

(4)

19 "That wouldn't work in my class."

(1075) T And yet that's what really troubles a teacher, is the poor student . . . when he says "that wouldn't work in my class," it seems to me that the teacher has in mind some of his worst students.

L That's one of the ironies you can never put into a [teaching] unit . . . a couple of things in that Kenya unit are included from students who you would say could never ever do it . . . and surprised everybody.

(2) the expert ~~[illegible]~~ 9

T Did you talk about that student at the inservice?

L Briefly, not a great deal . . . you see your "super student" is often judged on the basis of the ability to give you back what you have given them . . . often it is the kid who is bored or refuses to memorize who when presented with a situation where his critical thinking is challenged . . . may come up with something brilliant.

And that's part of [the rationale] for this whole curriculum, that we haven't challenged children's critical thinking abilities, we've just required them to memorize.

(9)

That makes a consultant into a teacher, that bad things happen to the consultant too and all kids are not perfect

Personally, I'd be against that kind of [Alberta Ed.] policy. You mentioned [in our first conversation] that you can understand that statement by a teacher, as another teacher [yourself].

One of the things I wonder about, is what is being said between teacher and teacher that underlies the actual talk about the curriculum. There is something about being with children that teachers understand . . .

L A feeling and caring—I don't think that you can separate it and be successful.

(11)

T You can interpret much of teachers' talk as a caring about kids. Even that statement "that wouldn't work in my class." Is there a caring about children or is it merely negative?

L It could be either one. It depends on the teacher. Maybe they're making a valid evaluation of the kids in their room. And maybe at this point [the inquiry curriculum] wouldn't work in their room . . . But it can be a very negative response— that the teacher isn't willing to try.

(1194) Is she assuming the latter

20. Intellect, feeling and enthusiasm.

(1196) L It really does get back to one of my original comments that you can't separate intellect and feeling. The intellect is the knowledge and techniques, but the feeling is "the related to. You have to have both in order to have a successful program in the classroom or inservice. If you enter an inservice programme thinking you have this wonderful thing "to give" the teachers the response is going to be the same as to the teacher who has all this wonderful information to give the students.

So with feeling, we're talking about a lot more than enthusiasm. We're talking about a relationship between teacher and student. That's a good distinction.

[illegible] . . . you can be enthusiastic about the inquiry process, because you have a belief in children too.

21. Accounting for the child's world in the implementation of the inquiry process.

35) . . . you have a belief in the worth of the child in being able "to say" things for themselves. The saying is a very important thing in education to me . . . what that means to me is that you are very interested in what he has to say, in his world.

I guess this is one of the things I see that objects to about the process. He says it's almost a "computer like [illegible] [the inquiry model] and that leaves the child out of it.

(11)

Hmm . . . and I would say exactly the opposite. Inherent in that process is [illegible] the child [illegible] but

* but you can't just dismiss it - this is the very basis of dialogue.

that is the difference between what I see and what he sees in the process, which is legitimate. ⑭

(1265) What it says is that . . . in order to put the child into the process, he has to alter the process.

22. Dealing with different interpretations of the inquiry process.

(1266) L My interpretation is that whole thing of trusting the child, is inherent in it. Which is one of the major problems of implementation, is bringing people to see that we will interpret it differently. ⑫

. . . the point is not to convince him to do it in such a way that he takes the child out of the programme, but to change the programme.

T How do you do that?

L How to convince him?

T Not so much convince, how do you have the programme not appear to be computer-like.

L You can't in writing . . . as soon as you put on paper you are limiting the scope. You are saying that there is one process, but that wasn't the intent. ⑦(14?)

By talking! The day we went to we talked about social action. The interpretation [the teachers] were making about social action would have been some grandiose scheme. In fact, when asked "what are some of the things you are doing in your classroom?", , for example, said some of the things he was doing which fit beautifully into our interpretation of social action. Maybe just saying that . . . and again you're back into that problem of .

T Time and that sort of thing

L [illegible] way

I [illegible] let you go.

(1318)

11. Going On

I recall that at the end of this conversation you remarked that we hadn't said very much new and seemed to be going around in circles. Yet in analyzing and preparing the summary, I found many questions about curriculum implementation raised in a remarkably clear fashion. This leads me to wonder if human understanding isn't essentially circular. That we sense many of the problems, and in talking about these problems we, in fact, begin to locate some of the real questions. Let me try to identify some of what I [illegible] to be the main questions raised in this conversation.

We ended by coming back to the question of time to dialogue. This was necessary, because you said you can't represent the intent of the new curriculum properly in writing. This has come up in many of my conversations. I think that this alone points to one of the real questions. Why isn't time allowed? Why do we set things up in such a way, especially this year, where the consultant must be the presenter, the giver, the expert, in half day inservice on some particular thing? What does this say about the curriculum, and the teachers and what is wrong with this? If we know it's wrong, why don't we change it?

Although the need to dialogue re-occurs often in our conversations, I see some differences between our beliefs about the form that this dialogue should take. You indicate a need to clarify what the teacher is doing already in relation to the proposed changes in the new curriculum. I certainly agree that this is a need, particularly in the light of the seeming novelty (and consequent teacher insecurity) which is bred by the massive effort on curriculum implementation this year. But isn't there something beyond ~~classification~~ clarification in question here to? In a sense, the new curriculum is already an answer to a problem posed by the developers. That is, "how do we prepare students to cope with the explosion of knowledge (information)." In other words "how do we teach students to learn how to learn." I don't say that this isn't a problem, but I see a difficulty in presenting teachers with a ready-made solution to a problem which they have had little part in posing. This seems to limit the meaning of [illegible] inter[illegible] w[illegible]

I [illegible] that the presenting of teachers with a solution in the form of the inquiry model is [illegible] way of promoting an open dialogue which will [illegible] eventually [illegible] problem [illegible] this [illegible]

[illegible]

Conversation #4

May 26, 1982

I. Topics of Conversation

[illegible]ol and freedom as lived by the teacher.

In the eyes of the teacher [much of this control] comes together in the classroom. May be separated in the minds of people at the Board Office or Alberta Ed. who are planning all of these different things: they they all come together in the classroom.

Like what?

We are talking about the question of freedom and control in the curriculum . . . during the second conversation [with this teacher] he had to give the [Board] writing assessment assignment to his students. He said "look today I had to do this. the topic was given to me . . . it was confusing to the kids and yet I was required to give this topic, to these kids, in this form, today." He said then "how much freedom do I have [as a teacher]?

No. that particular assignment he couldn't . . . you have to have that commonality of assignment in order to do the comparison for all of the students. Sure it's a valid point, but i[illegible] of the very few times when anything [illegible]

[illegible]

2. Student writing assessment assignment.

(60) L Did he comment [about the topic]? Many people questioned the topic.

T Oh yes, . . . he said all kids aren't interested in that . . . that's an important point about writing, because people write to fullfil their own purposes.

T And it's very difficult to come up with something they can write about. I spent the first 15-20 minutes of the [assessment] workshop exaplaining wh[illegible] not a social studies oriented topic.

[illegible] [L gives rationale for selecting the topic—a letter about Confederation celebrations, 1967—rather t[illegible] on some aspect of the grade [illegible]]

T He wasn't so much concerned ab[illegible] some kids aren't interest[illegible]

Sure that [illegible]

Some would [illegible] vie[illegible]

I think the ones that come to the day [on marking writing assignments] were less threatened by it, because they could accept my explanation of why it was [illegible] content . . . [illegible]

. . . [director of the project] who is language arts and student consultant [illegible] they did an assess[illegible] in the F[illegible] all language a[illegible] for doi[illegible] it [illegible] is th[illegible] there [illegible]

T They've been doing a lot of intensive work in writing? . . .

I . . . the emphasis in language arts is moving towards communications skills of all kinds. There are still some schools where grammar is taught for the sake of grammar but it's discouraged.

. . . and the school board has said it's one of their priorities . . . language arts across the curriculum. So schools can't really ignore it.

Interpretive understanding is circular

T Well do you want to get into the conversation [transcription of conversation #3] now?

I All right.

. . . We may of had the sense after the last conversation that we weren't going anywhere. Going around in circles. . . . it's funny when I go back about a week or ten days afterwards . . . sometimes there is a lot that does go on (that I'm not aware of at the time).

I'm wondering . . . reading about interpretation . . . the hermeneutic circle says that understanding is circular. When [illegible] round and round, there is no last [illegible]

T Yes . . . not a vicious circle. It's a circle which gets us closer to understanding.

L What an interesting idea. I haven't come across it before What is it again?

(248-166) T [Explains some of the origins of the word hermeneutics and some names associated with it.]

Anyway I wasn't discouraged after the [last conversation]. I felt that we did seem to be going around in circles a bit, but after doing this [summary] [illegible]

[illegible] It puts a different light on it doesn't it?

[illegible] Yes. I actually felt quite excited [illegible] coming back to the [illegible] tion of [illegible]

[illegible] I've got a couple of comments [illegible]

[illegible] O.K. Go ahead.

[illegible] Can I just go back to it [summary of conversation #[illegible]] because I wrote a couple of comments [illegible] [illegible] emphasis [illegible]

[illegible] expert [illegible]

[Page 2 re: teachers are not good public speakers] Another thing that came to me is you have to get past coming across as teacher talking to students. So long [illegible] doing [illegible] coming across as someone [illegible] you're in that [illegible] [illegible] presenter does not have sufficient confidence to step out of that role of control, for fear they won't be able to deal with the questions that come back. I'm not sure how you get people to do that, but that ties in with the next page [of the summary of conversation #3], "your practice shouldn't have to be on the job."

We are assuming that consultants are experts, and they may well have a considerable knowledge they can share in their area, but that doesn't mean that they have the ability to do so. There doesn't seem to be anywhere to go to work through those skills. . . . It was neglected in terms of the whole provincial thing. They brought people together . . . talked about what was going to happen but . . . not the how.

(312) Some of the people that were doing it probably weren't that particularly good at the how themselves.

5 What is the difference between teaching and consulting?

(314) T . . . I'm of two minds . . . I agree on one hand we don't clearly enough make the distinction between teaching your own class, which we may do very well, and becoming a consultant. One problem of this is . . . we tend to treat the other teachers as if they were students . . .

If you are hiring consultants and fail to make this distinction . . . you can be in trouble.

T . . . and the process for hiring consultants doesn't even have that basis. It's not as if anybody comes into your classroom . . . The selection for consultants is done on the basis of an interview . . . You may have someone who gets into an interview and connects very well with the people . . . I don't know how you get around that. It's not that I have a better answer.

T I'm not really sure . . . if the really good teacher is going to be the really good consultant.

L Yes, or if the person who is particularly good in the interview situation might not be a good teacher or a good consultant.

T That's exactly right . . . there is a technique to being interviewed effectively. One of the commonalities of people who are elevated to high positions . . . glib people, people who have all of the answers immediately at hand . . . What does that mean in terms of working .
(370) you will always get the glib answer in every situation.

6. What does consultant as expert mean?

(372) T . . . the other thing, and this is where I've become maybe a little more convinced or a little more puzzled about what the meaning of consulting is. Maybe we shouldn't have the expert come in . . . teachers are experts in their own . . class. Whatever you say to them must be interpreted in terms of that world as they see it.

The world that you bring as an expert is already a solution to a problem which you have already posed. That has always moved about two steps beyond where that other person is. I think it's a question of whether you want to call teaching . . . a bundle of techniques or if it's being a living everyday . . . We tend to approach inservice . . . and teacher education on the [illegible] like [illegible] technique

L But if you don't do that you'll have some [students] who are thinking that you're not giving them anything. . . . I taught that class from September to December on social studies method and attempted to teach it as a being . . . some found it incredibly frustrating . . . you never did teach me how to do a unit plan.

We are very well conditioned to thinking in terms of techniques.

T And yet in teacher ed. there may be a little bit more justification for that, because they've never taught before.

(418) L But somewhere along the line they have to get more than just pieces.

7. Inservice: Show me what not how.

(419) L . . . Page 4 has "when you're bringing in a new programme you're talking about what to teach." I talked to a teacher here yesterday and she is quite prepared to have inservices tell her what to teach, but not how to teach . . . any process of inquiry, "just give me the materials and the curriculum guide (needs more) prescribed knowledge areas." She wants it in more detail, so she knows exactly what she has to cover. And I have so much trouble with that. I got up and walked away as a matter of fact, because I know we were both going to get into it

T What was her reasoning?

L I suppose it wasn't the place of anybody to tell her about process. The process she used in the classroom was going to be hers and that was that . . . It's just so opposed to the way that I'm thinking because I don't think we can mandate knowledge. We do have to give students a process for working with knowledge. And I think we have to do that with teachers too.

T Would it be that it were that simple to say "this is knowledge and this is process." That's a dichotomous kind of thing . . . how you teach is what you're teaching . . .

L . . . her [this teacher's] is very much from the disciplines, geography as separate from history . . . which makes a difference because social studies is holistic.

(458-467) T [History and geography tend to be unconscious of methods as a way of being in the world.]

(467-476) L [Geography Department has expressed willingness to cooperate with Alberta Ed. to help develop social studies units.]

8. The inquiry process as represented by the inquiry model.

(4[illegible]) Next point, page 7, where we talked about the model . . accepted [this] model as most acceptable of all alternatives. But has to be politically acceptable too. That was a big factor, because it had gone from the values curriculum which was very wide open. There was a lot of publi[illegible] [illegible] for something that got it out more [illegible]

T Yet we talked about how you immediately mis-represent inquiry itself when you make it into a thing which is implemented in the classroom.

L Yes . . . here we are trying to teach teachers about an inquiry process and we're telling them about it. We're doing all of the inservices in a most traditional way, expecting them to break with tradition.

T Yes . . . and you're trying to separate process and content there. It gets into a funny game.

L I'm not sure that anybody knows how to break it either . . . most of the consultants in ________ are feeling some frustration. They wanted to do more . . . a lot of time they went into that evaluation workshop and to have a handful of people show up. (505)

9. The student assessment workshops.

(506) L . . . it was meant to become . . . we've got all kinds of examples, consultants will be there too to help you . . . The idea was not that you come and pick up handouts, but that you read what's there, sit at a table, use some of the examples there. [But the teachers who did come] wanted sheets to take away with them.

T It must have been incredibly frustrating . . . a teacher like Ed who can't get there and consultants who are working very hard to do it and nobody comes. It seems such a pity that you can't get together.

L We . . . wondered if we took all the [assessment displays] around the room to four different schools. Would people come to the . . . school closer to them. But it sounds as if you're making excuses for people.

. . . part of the reason for setting it up [at ______] is that we'd hope there would be enough questions developed, and consultants contributed too, that anyone who contributed would get a complete copy . . . of everybody.

T Really you probably know yourself . . . that when you suggest four schools rather than one school, that that's really not the problem.

(590) L No, it's not. It's again trying to deal with the symptoms and not the problem.

10. Revision of the Kenya unit: The value of having time for reflection

(593) L I'm beginning to feel more and more that the time we spent talking and reflecting becomes absolutely crucial.

The unit on Kenya (for example) going through it now, and I made a very significant change (after each having taught it and making revisions in it before).

It becomes so frustrating because the time isn't going to be there (less and less time is allowed for reflection in the future). I find that [illegible] threatening in terms of [illegible]

([illegible])

11. Time, not experts, is needed by teachers in curriculum implementation.

(641) L . . . it's not enough to get experts. That's maybe the least important. Maybe the money should have gone into giving teachers half a day off within their schools. With half as many consultants . . . [who] would go out and sit and talk with teachers within a school . . . where the dialogue would begin with small groups within a school . . .

I think we've gone all the wrong direction.

T That's such a profound difference . . . you wonder how you can make that change. Because it's a different attitude towards consulting, towards teaching . . . (6[illegible])

12. Implementation and the bureaucratization of education.

(6[illegible]1) T . . . the bureaucratization of education is so pervasive . . . and in itself it has such an ingrained process that it takes anything . . . puts it through the bureaucratic mill and it comes out the same. It's the process which makes it what it is . . . the idea of expertise, making things technical. So you can take the inquiry process as something which can be written down on a piece of paper. In writing it down you can take it component by component and work on it . . . that's the Mentor series, and do discrete inservices on it. You can also have teaching units which are also things . . . if you follow those you will be "implementing."

[For example] with the Kenya unit . . . it's not very often that you would sit down and write a unit (in that way) for your own teaching

L I have, but not as detailed as that one.

T And do you follow it as a teacher?

L I have always been one to develop rather detailed plans, but [would vary from them]. I'm not sure whether everybody does or that's a need that I have

T . . . I developed a course one time when I was teaching . . the next year when I went to teach it I almost [regarded it] as somebody else's course. My teaching was so different.

L I think that's what it's like whether it's your unit or somebody else's unit. But that initial going through it is important. So that, in fact, you do set down your goals and you do work to achieve those goals throughout the unit. I think there's something wrong if that doesn't change each year.

T. I'm sure you've talked to teacher who plan quite differently . . [who say] "I have sort of a general idea of what I want to do." . . . They have a topic of concern to them they think it of concern to their students and addresses a need their students have

I think in order to do that you still have to have your long-range goals. . . . I do [illegible] that it is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the process of

13. The difference between aspirations and objectives.

(777) T One of the things I've thought about in connection with this issue of bureaucratization is the difference between human aspirations and objectives. I agree, you have to have some specific objectives in mind . . . some notion of what has to be covered. Particular skills, particular kinds of knowledge.

But we're talking also about goals and aspirations which guide your life . . . As human beings we move through life guided by certain principles and aspirations, which we never articulate necessarily. We articulate them from time to time, I may articulate a goal, but that's not really my goal. It's my goal in sight . . . it relates to my aspiration. What you say, what you do, points to that [aspiration].

[Referring to earlier conversations.] It's like the enthusiasm, the fact that you love what you do. That has to do with your aspirations. Your aspirations are reflected in your enthusiasm?

What you are enthusiastic about is reflected in your aspirations.

It has nothing to do with the curriculum, but how you connect with your students. The empathy and feeling in the classroom. The trust . . The atmosphere where students feel secure enough to step out on a limb and try to do something original . . . that takes them beyond [illegible] fear of being shot down.

T I think that's a very important point. I understand now more of what you mean by risk taking than when you said it [in our earlier conversations]. To me [that risk taking] means that there is an interest in something outside of you . . . the question which pulls you forward and the student forward into inquiry. So you're willing to focus on the question, you are not afraid that somebody is assessing you, looking for a mistake . . Then you can take risks

. . . I think that also has to do with your aspirations your philosophy. That we should each be all that we can Th . . . [illegible] provides [illegible]

[illegible] studies [illegible]

One of the things I've often thought that makes social studies rather a difficult subject to deal with in terms of making curriculum is the fact that it [illegible] to that overall [illegible] ations . . . [illegible]

[Relate the [illegible] clas[illegible]]

Perhaps th[illegible]'s [illegible]

T What worries me is we don't seem to address this in the political process . . . this gets back to the question of bureaucratization, we want to make it all non-threatening to people.

A bureaucracy abhores any kind of open dialogue at that level. They want to have a controlled discussion which is not controversial. You make the inquiry process into a technique . . .

[illegible] . . . and water down the teaching units so that they're non-contentious.

And yet isn't it making a mockery out of our social studies, where we are trying to address what it means to be a person in the world

Sure . . . bureaucracies are not getting smaller . . . so what says to the future for developing and implementing new ideas is really quite scary.

[illegible] the position paper on "Paperland."]

[illegible] posing. Getting back to the questions that concern us.

[illegible] T Are you familiar with Paulo Freire? . . . he puts forward a way of countering this in a practical vein.

[Talks about Freire's background.]

. . . it's because of our [previous] conversations that I read what Freire said on dialogue . . .

But that's absolutely fascinating, because really that's what that curriculum was talking about. You've got to bring students to where they recognize that there is a problem. . . And unless they can feel that they are problems they can relate to and understand, what you do thereafter is meaningless.

[illegible]

weakest part of most of the teaching units. Most of those teaching units go on and on trying to develop the issue. It can't be that way.

T Maybe that's because they are teaching units for mass consumption, you can't do it.

L But you can do it. That's one thing the Kenya unit does. It develops the issue simply in one lesson.

T How does it do that?

L That's the one where you read "The Parable of the [illegible] to them. [The speech by Jomo Kenyatta.]

(980-1000) L [Explains it.]

(1022)
End

II Going On

I'm going to pursue this conversation, and the ones with the others in my own reading and writing during the summer. Hopefully, I will have a draft completed by early fall which I will send to you for your comments.

Thank you very much for allowing me to [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible]

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS' REFLECTIONS ON THE RESEARCH

1982

Hello Terry,

It was an enjoyable experience for me to be interviewed by you. I liked the topics and and your style of directing questions. Teaching, and anything connected with it, is alwasys close to my heart.

You also gave the impression that you cared a great deal about teaching methods, individual students and teachers, and about the philosophy behind all teaching-related activities.

Your concern showed itself in the following manner:

(1) The thoroughness of preparation for the interview.
(2) The accuracy and consistent quality of the transcripts.
(3) The curteous manner in which you replied to questions I asked.
(4) Your willingness to state your opinions whenever I gave you a chance to do so.

I always read your transcripts with great interest. You always "zero" in astutely on new questions arising from the previous interview. Even though my answers were spontaneous (and not planned or rehearsed), at no time did I wish to change anything I had said. [illegible] I have any [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Hi Terry,

I would like to make one small change in your final transcript, if [illegible] possible.

June 8, 1982

Terry Carson
University of Alberta
84 Avenue & 114 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Terry:

Re: Personal reflections on discussions concerning implementation

The following comments are intended to illustrate perceptions and feelings I had at the conclusion of our conference(s):

Firstly with respect to the process, I experienced a great deal of satisfaction particularly with your role. As an active participant in the process, I felt a mutual commitment and concern not only for the predetermined topic(s) of discussion but also for ideas that emerged throughout our time together. You did not feel compelled to bring closure to discussions/ideas that were generated. The opportunity to meet more than once facilitated the building of trust. I felt this development was affecting depth and significance of our discussions.

The opportunities for reflection and discussion of truly significant issues in education have become a "luxury" for me personally. Often, I become forced into a mechanistic/techncial role and do not take the time to engage in critical and deep reflection about myself and my work. As educators become called upon to account for themselves, quality is often substituted for quantity. In the Service area, of public education accountability usually shows itself in behaviors that are of high profile/visibility and often technical in nature.

Letter 8-6-82)

I enjoyed very much our discussions about the role of the teacher in the change (and implementation) process. Because of my belief that human action is the result of deep personal beliefs and attitudes, at this point in time I feel these are the areas that require significant study and attention. (I think you also share that belief)

The belief that we can effect teacher change through pre-packaged, "teacher proof" guides and resources simply is not working. The teacher's professional value has been reduced to that of technical "go-between" in the instructional process. Many of the new resources in social studies could be construed as being manipulative and staged. Pre-planned Provincial standardized social studies programs cannot be disguised as authentic education. Responding to youngsters as human beings in the classroom has been replaced with "coverage" of content ("getting through a Kanata Kit).

*

Although it may be too soon to tell I believe the Alberta Education Inservice project which emphasized the technical aspects of social studies education may have had a limited impact on teachers and students.

Until we (teachers) have the freedom to create total learning environments for children that are not continuously at the mercy of individuals and controls external to us, the responsibility for education cannot belong to the classroom teacher. It seems logical that the person charged with the responsibility should have some say in the decisions affecting that classroom.

Without rambling on further, I will stop. It is apparent to me that a few events over the past weeks have affected my thinking with respect to these issues. The cultural awareness retreat as well as the discussions with you have forced me to reconsider my beliefs and consequently my actions.

*

Thank you for allowing me to share in the discussions. Hopfully we can pick these ideas up again.

Sincerely,

Diane

Supervisor Social Studies

[illegible]/cm

Terry:

I must admit I was not very enthusiastic when Diane told me I'd be meeting with you. As is often the case, at least for me, when I have no expectations from a situation, I seem better able to go with the situation and learn from it. That certainly has been the case in this instance. I have very much enjoyed our sessions—the opportunity to bounce ideas off another is far too rare. I've had to reflect on my own views—about the curriculum, implementation, my role as teacher and consultant, my philosophy of education—even about me as a person. It was important for me to go through this process, just as it is important for all teachers to have some reflective and dialogue time. But there is so little time within the schools for any reflection or discussion. There are tremendous implications in this for implementing a new curriculum—there must be time for talk, reflection and more talk. The idea we discussed last day of starting small (with a few teachers in a single school) and then slowly expanding seems to make much more sense. The role of consultant then becomes that of facilitator rather than of "knowledge-giver"—not unlike my understanding of the role of teacher.

The idea of going around in circles continually coming closer to understanding was marvelous. I think this has great significance for anyone who acts as a facilitator (consultant or teacher). Those with whom we work need to understand that going around in circles can be a very positive experience. The problem is that people expect to go from point A to point B.

If we want teachers to be facilitators our role as consultants must be that of facilitators. You can't expect people to learn about and then use new methods, processes etc. . . . when we use all the old methods, processes when dealing with them. Inservicing must become more of an "experiencing."

It is important to make university programs not just theoretical but also practical, and as a consultant to work closely with new teachers. Could these people not become instruments of change within a system?

Implementation is a long, slow process. We have to "get to" a few, who in turn may influence a few . . .

Research indicates that teachers unintentionally communicate their expectations to students. Is the same true of supervisors and consultants working with teachers?

I think many teachers lack self-confidence. Why else the closed classroom door and fear of having someone in the room. We have to build self-esteem. But How?

Teachers have to understand new ideas from the "inside out" if they are to successfully use them—another reason for "experiencing" in inservice.

If learning is making connections between the old and the new (and I think it is) then implementation must reflect this. By throwing the new at teachers (as in lecture-type sessions) we don't allow for this connection, in fact we may be doing more harm than good as we may appear to be threatening—"What you've been doing is lousy (the old)—here you've got to do it this new way!" No wonder teachers get their backs up.

Finally, we have to help teachers come up with the right questions. Then and only then can we help them to find answers which will work for them.

Terry, hope you can make some sense of my ramblings. Thanks again. I look forward to talking with you again.

Linda Smith

May 10, 1983

Terry Carson
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Terry:

I hope everything went well for you in Montreal. I'd be interested in talking with you about the experience, and the reactions to your presentation.

I've enjoyed working with you on your research project and I want to commend you on the work you've done. I was very impressed with your ability to take our conversations and organize them to bring out the main themes of those discussions. Taking conversations, transcribing them, and then attempting to organize them in a coherent manner is an arduous task - one which I am somewhat familiar with as a result of my own work. I think you've not only organized them in a coherent fashion, but you've captured the "essense" of these conversations; and in doing so, you have revealed many crucial aspects of curriculum implementation.

Best wishes on the completion of your project.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Jefferies

Terry:

As I have mentioned to you in our conversations, I have enjoyed being a participant in your "interviews." I felt less like a participant in an interview and more like a colleague exploring ideas about implementation and its meanings with you.

I must confess I have a certain distrust of educational research(ers). Often, I feel we are our own worst enemies and destructive (not constructive) critics. By this, I mean, ed. research often "slams" the people and methods directly "impacting" classrooms, by showing them to be less than ideal. Although practicalities and realities are acknowledged somehow we often look like we don't know what we're doing. While this may be true, I can't think these "revelations" in research help us to grow and to "do better." As I write this, I'm not sure why I'm rambling into this area, except that again I see parallels between some of the feelings I have and how teachers perhaps feel about consultants and inservices!!

Also, I guess I feel we have a trust relationship and that I have found you to be very sincere in your research and hope that you will be able to reflect this in your "written translation" of your explorations of implementation with the various individuals. (What an awkward sentence!!)

To follow up my first paragraph, I have enjoyed participating in our conversations because I was able to freely contribute ideas, which were acknowledged and held with some value. I found our conversations stimulating because I was able to explore, clarify, expand, "play with" some ideas about implementation, thanks to your input. Our conversations helped me to think about what I think about implementation!! This type of reflection really helps me clarify and expand my thoughts about some of the things I have been doing—in a way, I also have evaluated some of my own thinking about implementation, solidifying some ideas and discarding others, adding some new ones. In short, I added to my repertoire of thoughts re: implementation—I learned something—I have some new questions to ask (à la Gadamer)!!

Jennifer

APPENDIX D

DISSERTATION WRITING: A PERSONAL HISTORY

Dissertation Writing: A Personal History

The dissertation which appears as an artifact entitled A Hermeneutic Investigation into the Meaning of Curriculum Implementation hides a personal learning process which made its production possible. The following few pages are an attempt to recapture something of this process as a pedagogical experience. This recounting of a journey of curriculum research is based upon a journal which I kept between September, 1980, when I began my doctoral studies, until August of 1982, by which time I had completed and had begun analyzing the conversations with the participants in the study. The journal entries constitute only fragmentary evidence of the excitement, the struggle and the uncertainties of the pre-writing phase of the dissertation, but in re-reading these entries a wealth of personal memories flows from the words. The memories recollect something of the depth of what it has meant for me to learn, not in terms of flattened out representations of the learning process, but of learning as a social experience, an endeavour to make sense with others of a complex world of schools. The words of the journal also evoke personal memories of the adventure of coming upon new ideas and the uncertainties and doubts engendered by trying to appropriate these in the formation of new perspectives.

The pre-writing period of the research seems to fall into three stages: first came an initial time of adventure and excitement of coming into contact with critical social analysis and phenomenology. This was followed by a time of personal struggle which appeared first in the form of serious doubts and then conflict and confusion as I attempted to appropriate these [illegible] my own [illegible] curriculum implementation. The final period of pre-writing is marked by a kind of personal resolution of the appropriation question through the concrete research project described in Chapter IV of the dissertation. This is a tentative resolution only, as it is a part of a continuing dialectic of question and answer which originated as an inquiry into the process of curriculum change in school settings.

The resolution stands now as a preparation for a new stage of questioning beginning from a clearer understanding of a more fundamental interest which underlies this concern for curriculum implementation, that is that schools become more educational places for children to learn and more democratic places for teachers to work. At the same time, there is also a sharper focus on the need for further investigations and explanations of the sources of the contradictions in current practices which frustrate the realization of these ideals. What follows is a brief [illegible] of the personal stages of development to reach this point.

1 Adventure (September, 1980 May, 1981)

There was a sense of adventure in coming back to the university for doctoral work after six years in the school system. Adventure was also tinged with a feeling of relief at being released from the daily cares and practical concerns of a school board central office. I was ready to begin to think about the big questions and I didn't have to wait long. It was critical social philosophy which first captured my attention through its explanatory power to make connections between what I intuitively understood to be the case in schools and the larger social and political interests which structure these arrangements.

My first journal entry shows a rather crude idea drawn, from some critical literature, of how schools reproduce social structures, along with an equally crude application of this to some curriculum development work I had been recently doing. The hook was in though, and I went to the seminars on a history of schooling and curriculum full of questions. Through that first term my office mates and I never tired of talking about critical social analysis and how it might be applied to reform the schools of our experience. With subsequent questioning and through an intellectualized application of the critical insights gathered from further reading, more of this fascinating field unfolded.

Phenomenology was also part of this initial adventure. The notion of a linguistic being in the world seemed to open up new possibilities for both education and social research. But with phenomenology too, came initial doubts about the possibility of clear explanation. [illegible] understanding which structures subsequent understanding [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] The pow [illegible] is much in [illegible] first two terms [illegible] Their [illegible] ings were [illegible] as on [illegible] oke the [illegible] way things are." Through all of this I was encouraged by my supervisor, who shared my excitement about what I thought were new and wonderful ideas. At the same time he reminded me that curriculum research had a responsibility to address practice; the question was how could these new insights be applied to the problem of curriculum implementation in a way that is meaningful to those who dwell in schools.

A journal entry in January, 1981 shows an early attempt at application. The major elements of the present study are there in this entry in a still as yet undigested form, but the idea of application is firmly caught within a technical notion of practice. The outline reflects a view that phenomenological research could be employed to get at the lifeworld of practitioners and grafted on to a critical interpretation of technical models of curriculum implementation in order to produce a new model to reform practice. The task of carrying out this programme seemed only to require more knowledge and expertise [illegible] the techniques of phenomenologically oriented forms of research and critical social theory.

Doubts, Conflict and Confusion
(May 1981–March 1982)

Looking back, serious doubts about the technical application of critical and phenomenological analysis began in my own criticism of other researchers. It was with some personal satisfaction that I was able to question the ethnographic research of Wolcott and Janesick for their objectivist biases. The opportunity presented itself at a [illegible] qualitative research methodology, a conference which I [illegible] an amorphous label as qualitative research. But the criticism of method also presented a serious personal research dilemma. How does one then proceed without a method?

At first I did not suspect the depth of the dilemma. This realization began during the course of writing a kind of "pre-proposal paper" in which I planned to mount a critical historical analysis of both qualitative and quantitative research and to propose an alternative based upon implementation conceptualized as linguistic interpretive process. When my supervisor pronounced this to be "half a dialectic" I realized that I had not really yet internalized the meaning of "a critical self reflection with a practical intent" (a phrase from Habermas which I had been fond of quoting). At about the same time I had begun to enter into conversation with some of my other committee members about the substance of the research. A chance conversation with one committee member stands out as he questioned me at length about the source of my personal interest in curriculum implementation. He asked if this interest was not founded on [illegible] interest in domination. I protested of course, but I realized that some of my beliefs and past actions were indeed founded upon a non-critical practice. At the same time, I felt that these criticisms were unfair because they were not located [illegible] of the practicalities of schools as they are.

The pre-proposal proved to be difficult to complete. Without a secure methodology to follow, the parameters remained uncertain. I realized that the paper needed to be [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] existential phenomenology. I immersed myself in Merleau-Ponty and attempted to acquaint myself with Ricoeur as a bridge from phenomenology to explanation. It was here too that I first began to feel some appreciation for the ontological dimension of reflection through an article by Dreyfus entitled "Knowledge and Human Values: A Geneology of Nihilism." About this time I also began having conversations with a fellow graduate student about Gadamer's works.

Rather than solidifying the research, the completion of the pre-proposal paper ushered in a time of even greater uncertainty and conflict. The pull of powerful new ideas remained, but the excitement was diluted by the push to get on with the job of completing a dissertation proposal, at least by Christmas. The push to focus and delimit the question of curriculum implementation was a sober reminder that the seductive pull of the insights from philosophy, sociology and history had to be tempered by a sense of responsibility to the field.

Part of the ensuing personal struggle for a recommitment to practice found expression in a dominant theme of our doctoral research seminar that year. The concern of the seminar, and the content of the public debate which revolved around it, was the identity of the person who does educational research and the nature of his or her responsibility to the "researched." The seriousness and passion with which I entered into the public debate reflected the depth of my personal uncertainty about relating research to reformed practice. Another aspect of the struggle was the search to find my own way of doing research. It is this which makes doing a dissertation as much a journey of personal exploration as it is an investigation into an educational question. One journal entry of October 29, 1981 entitled "On the Need to Get Down to It" expresses well the tension and irony of getting launched into a piece of worthwhile research while still full of doubts about the appropriate direction and even of one's ability to pursue it at all. Instead of feeling more secure of my footing, the more I read and talked, the less sure I was about how much I understood. The realization that I had as yet only scratched the surface of critical and phenomenological modes of thought was now manifested in a questioning of what I had understood in the first place. The reason for doing so was a growing evidence that I had not yet appropriated these understandings; one committee member asked why I was abandoning a critical stance; the chairman of my supervisory committee returned a proposal outline filled with marginal notations. The general thrust of the notations indicated that the dissertation was still bent towards technical problem solving. In the midst of this there was still the need to get down to it. I intuitively recognized that a resolution of the theoretical questions would only come with a concrete application in research, but how to begin?

I was stuck. Admitting this to some committee members brought solace and support but did not really help to resolve the issue, despite what I had wished to believe at the time. The struggle to get launched had only just began. What followed was one of the most genuinely unsettling times I have ever experienced, culminating but hardly ending in an unhappy candidacy examination in March. Learning as an interpretative process, as represented by the hermeneutic circle, hides the risks one takes in appropriation and the pain of realization of the need to return again to explanation. One can optimistically report that a deeper level of understanding has been reached with each turn, but this in itself requires a distance which is impossible to gain during the process. In the light of this, I am still left questioning the value of a candidacy examination which consists of theoretical speculations about practical research matters. How does one adequately answer a question of "what would you do if . . .?" about conversations yet to be entered into with teachers and consultants? This is an important and fundamental question of application, and as such it has implications for all of who one is, and what one brings to a concrete research situation. But the real answers to questions of this type only come, as I was to discover later, through seeing their relevance in practice.

3. The Research Situation Itself
(March, 1982-August, 1982)

With the candidacy hurdle over, I began the conversations with the consultants and teachers participating in the research. When all was said and done, I ventured forth with nothing more in the way of method than a belief in the hermeneutic priority of the question, which I had drawn from an interpretation of Gadamer, and an implicit confidence in my own ability to be able to enter into conversations with the participants. During the course of doing the investigation a new meaning of method was revealed, i.e., a "method," as opposed to the application of a technique, is how one conducts onself as a researcher. Conduct is influenced by many things: the question itself (the meaning of curriculum implementation), the concrete context of the questioning (the social studies inservice programme), the differences and similarities one shares with the participants which allow for productive conversations to take place, and, not the least, who one is and has become through the preparatory study.

The first conversations were very tentative. I didn't know the participants very well, nor they I. Even at this time, nearly two years after the beginning of doctoral work, the parameters of the study were still uncertain. My own experience as a teacher and consultant had taught me that curriculum implementation was inextricably linked to a whole array of school curricular, instructional and administrative practices. Part of the task of this research was to find out the nature of these links and what this revealed about life as lived in schools.

I was surprised by the progress of the conversations. My relationship with the participants grew around our efforts to make sense of the meaning of curriculum implementation. For the most part they seemed to welcome the opportunity to reflect on their work. My initially naive faith in the power of the question to carry inquiry forward bore fruit in the development of better questions, and with new questions came a growing self-confidence in the worth of the research. What was particularly gratifying was the reappearance of the general philosophical, historical and sociological insight inside this concrete context. The practical intent of these critical theoretical inquiries was revealed as they helped in the formulation of questions. I found myself re-reading Gadamer, Freire and others because of things which would come up in the conversations or because of a sense that some new input was needed to go on. It was here too that entirely new areas of reading began to open up about bureaucracy, for example. Conversations with committee members and graduate student colleagues at the university were also very helpful at this time as guides to the next steps of inquiry.

The uncertainties were still there too, but they were easier to deal with because they had a practical relevance to the conduct of the research. The problem of how one deals with conflicting interpretations came up not as a question for hermeneutic philosophy, but in the context of how I should deal with a disagreement that one of the participants had with the way I had interpreted our conversations. A decision had to be made. I sought guidance from my supervisor and the literature on hermeneutics, but I also considered the ethical question of my responsibility as a researcher for making my own conclusions as weighed against fairness to the participants.

The question of ethics and understanding in a practical research context formed the content of my final journal entry, made August 17, almost exactly two years after beginning the doctoral programme. Recognizing this question in the same way would not have been possible without the uncertain and often difficult journey of those intervening two years. Looking back over these brief and fragmentary recollections of this period I suspect that there is little that can be derived by others concerning a research methodology. Research told as a learning process can, perhaps, only be told as a story.