

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION AND USE OF THE DRAFT
PROVINCIAL ART CURRICULUM GUIDE (GRADES 7 TO 9)
IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR: A CASE STUDY

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

KUMYUEN SALDOV, B.Ed.



**TEACHERS' PERCEPTION AND USE OF THE
DRAFT PROVINCIAL ART CURRICULUM GUIDE (GRADES 7 TO 9),
IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR: A CASE STUDY**

by

© Kumyuen Saldov, B.Ed.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

1990

St. John's

Newfoundland



The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-65291-8

ABSTRACT

The Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 has been reviewed through the eyes of the art teachers for its usefulness in the implementation of Newfoundland and Labrador Art Programs.

The teachers included in the survey, (N=84) and in the interviews, (N=2) revealed that the provincial guide has limited utility for teachers with little background in art working in adverse conditions where there are few resources to facilitate implementation. The design of art curriculum guides becomes even more important under these circumstances since teachers will have little else available to help them with implementation.

Implementation research can assist art education by identifying key factors such as structural constraints, preparation time and art resources. Art co-ordinators, consultants and specialists will need to orient their curriculum guides to the realities faced by Newfoundland teachers in remote areas with limited art backgrounds and resources to facilitate implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The extent of gratitude towards those who assisted me in the preparation of this thesis is enormous. Without their aid in providing me with information, guidance and technological assistance the completion of this work would have been more difficult. This thesis would not have been possible without the co-operation and assistance provided by the teacher-respondents who gave freely of their time, perceptions and ideas. Naturally not all of the people involved could possibly be incorporated in a brief listing of acknowledgements.

I want especially to thank my Advisor Mary Kennedy for her guidance, feedback, co-ordination and support in helping me to complete my research. The following persons also helped at various stages of preparation of the thesis: from the Faculty of Education, Ted Braffett; Bill Rose; Norm Schuell; Peter Chow; Martin Quigley; Gary Hollett; Lily Abbass. Heather Moore of the Ministry of Education provided valuable information and art curriculum materials.

I am grateful to my family who gave me the emotional and technical support I needed to help complete the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	viii
CHAPTER	
I	1
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	
Introduction	1
Curriculum Implementation	4
Purpose of the Study	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Definition of Terms	11
Organization of the Study	12
II	13
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
An Overview of Program Evaluation	13
19th Century Overview	13
Education and Social Change	16
Evaluation and Efficiency	17
Curriculum Evaluation	17
Eight Year Study	18
Changing Concepts in Curriculum Evaluation	22
Models of Evaluation	27
Consensus Models	28
Tylerian Model	29

CHAPTER

Experimental Model	29
Judgemental Model	30
Management Model	31
Interdisciplinary Model	33
Pluralist Models	35
Responsive Model	37
Democratic Model	38
Implementation Research and Program Evaluation	39
Evaluation and Art Education	53
Research Paradigm for the Arts	61
III	
METHODOLOGY	63
Design of the Study	63
Objectives of the Study	63
Case Study Design	64
Methodology Validation in Case Studies	65
The Survey	67
The Interviews	69
Instrument Validation	70
Administration of the Study	70
Sampling Procedure for the Survey	70
Interviews	73
Data Analysis	74

CHAPTER

IV	REPORTING AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	76
	Survey Results	76
	Characteristics of the Sample	76
	Teachers' Opinions of Art Education	83
	Teachers' Participation in Art Activities	87
	Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9	88
	Material and Human Resources	92
	Analysis of the Interview Data	98
	Background Information in T1 and T2	98
	The Importance of Art Education	99
	Prior Training to Using the Guide	103
	Usefulness of the Guide	104
	Concepts and Skills	105
	Developing Art Skills	106
	Class Discussion with the Use of Slides	106
	Evaluation	109
	Sequencing of Art Instruction: Grades 7 to 9	112
	Human Resources and Community Support	116
	School Support	117
	Board Support	118
	Art Specialist	119
	The Art Co-ordinator	119

CHAPTER

	Preparation Time	120
	Approaches to Teaching Art	122
	Teachers' Recommendations	125
	Newfoundland Teachers' Association	128
	Supplemental Analysis	131
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	132
	Summary	132
	Teachers' Backgrounds and Perceptions of Art Education	132
	The Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide	134
	Conclusions	136
	Recommendations	137
	Bibliography	140
	Appendices	
	Appendix I - Questionnaires and Covering Letters to Teachers	152
	Appendix II - Letters to School Boards	159
	Appendix III - Letters to Superintendents	160
	Appendix IV - Letters to Art Co-ordinators	162
	Appendix V - Letters to Principals	168

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Respondents' Art Teaching Experience in the Past Two Years	77
Table 2 Respondents' Background Training in Teaching Art	78
Table 3 Years Since Respondents' Last Partici- pation in Art Training Workshop(s)	79
Table 4 Respondents' Years of Teaching Art	80
Table 5 Respondents' Teaching Assignment to Art	81
Table 6 Respondents' Perception of Difficulty in Teaching Art	82
Table 7 Respondents' Workload Preference for Teaching Art	82
Table 8 Respondents' Opinions on Art Education	84
Table 9 Opinions Most Reflecting Teachers' Views on Art Education	86
Table 10 Opinions Least Reflecting Teachers' Views on Art Education	86
Table 11 Respondents' Participation in Art- Related Activities	88
Table 12 Art Guides Used by Teachers	89
Table 13 Clarity of the Guide	90
Table 14 Respondents' Perceived Usefulness of the Guide	92

Table 15	Material Resources for Art	
	Curriculum Implementation	93
Table 16	Time to Implement Art Curriculum	95
Table 17	Human Resources for Art Curriculum	
	Implementation	97

CHAPTER I

Background to the Study

Introduction

There is a growing interest in the evaluation of program implementation in education (Fullan, 1982). A significant 20th century contributor to the movement for the increased use of evaluation in education, Tyler (1986) notes that "the implementation of a new program is one of the most difficult problems of school improvement" (p. 61). Because new educational programs often call for new objectives and new teaching plans, their implementation is often complex and demanding on teachers.

The implementation of a visual art curriculum in elementary and secondary schools has posed a problem for art educators for a number of years. The difficulty in implementing such a curriculum lies mainly in the fact that art is considered a peripheral subject to the core curriculum. Art education has traditionally been viewed as a low priority item, when compared with science, mathematics and English, which are seen as foundational subjects for higher education. Although it is becoming increasingly acknowledged in the literature that the arts may be just as important as other curriculum areas in the development of foundational skills and abilities, in practice the arts have not been accorded the same allocation of resources as "foundation" subjects

(Hargreaves, 1985). Curriculum implementation in art education has been hampered continually by competition between the arts and other academic subjects for scarce educational resources.

The relatively lower status of art education has been examined by art educators and evaluators. Eisner (1987) points to some of the possible reasons for the perceived lower status of art education in American schools:

We are often reminded that education is serious business, that we live in an increasingly competitive world, and that our schools should prepare our children for the stiff competitive race in which they will have to participate. We are told that school programs should emphasize what is basic in education--a claim that is hard to dispute. What is not basic is considered marginal or ornamental, nice but not necessary. If our children are to make it in a world that thrives on competition, they need to be equipped with the tools they will need to run the race well. (p. 6)

Another reason given for the poor status of art education is its perceived subjective nature. Because learning and performance in the arts is frequently judged difficult to measure, research results and methodologies in art education have tended to lack significance and rigor (Courtney, 1987).

Hausman (1988) has pointed out the inconsistencies and practicality problems facing evaluators in art education:

On the one hand, there has been tacit acceptance of our rhetoric: "the importance of arts in our culture." On the other, there's a pressure for a clear demonstration of what it is that is being taught and the extent to which it's being learned. Practical minds are calling for operational clarity. Indeed, the bottom line in such an orientation is the ability to test and measure outcomes. The result is the moving of instruction toward those areas in which the content can be organized and sequenced and taught system-wide. (p. 40)

As a peripheral subject, art often does not receive equal funds for research. Through this kind of unequal treatment art is kept in a marginal position. Also it has been noted that "... the fact that art education is a relatively recent development may contribute to its ambivalent reception in the field" (Day & DiBlasio, 1983, p. 169).

McCaughy (1988), in the recent Canada Council study on Arts Education in Canada mentioned several reasons for the tension between education and the arts. McCaughy suggested the following to account for the low status arts is given in education systems across Canada: (a) In a system that puts

increasing emphasis on the pragmatic vocational aspects of education, the arts are seen as something only those with the talent to become professional artists should study, (b) the arts are considered leisure and not work activities, (c) the arts are seen to fall into the category of affective rather than cognitive learning, and (d) there is the belief that the arts are not amenable to testing and assessment (pp. 7-9).

Given these and the many other obstacles facing the implementation of an art curriculum, the challenges to those who design and implement visual arts programs are considerable. Program planners need to develop curriculum materials which are especially helpful for teachers charged with implementation under such difficult conditions. These planners not only have to design programs which will work in an environment where limited resources are available; they also have to take into consideration the background of teachers and the lack of in-service training and support for implementation.

Curriculum Implementation

Curriculum guides developed by School Boards and Departments of Education are one potential source of support to teachers in the implementation of art programs. However there is very little research-based information on how to design curriculum guides which take into account the diversity of

factors influencing implementation of art programs (Van Den Akker, 1988). There have been few attempts to research factors which influence the utility of curriculum guides (Westbury, 1983). As well there have been few systematic investigations which match field requirements and priorities with research activities (MacGregor, 1988).

MacGregor (1988) has suggested identifying skills that may be useful for general application to teachers' pre-service learning, specifically by researching how to help teachers learn about teaching art (as it is becoming more complexly defined) when the time available for learning has not been increased. Walker (1980) has suggested that there are a number of design challenges facing those attempting to design curriculum guides. They are: (a) how to attain sufficient clarity and specificity so that those who are supposed to be informed by a curriculum guide know exactly what they are being advised to do; (b) how to make a guide easy to consult, attractive and helpful so that it will be used; (c) how to allow for the variety of settings and circumstances for which the guide is intended; and (d) how to encourage the widest possible acceptability so that recommendations and suggestions will be followed in a school or community.

Problems identified in drafting guides have included the use of vernacular language by art specialists who have assumed a level of familiarity with terminology and concepts beyond the comprehension of teachers with limited art backgrounds.

Sequencing of curriculum, application of learning theories and techniques, analysis of concepts, and defining criteria for student evaluation are all elements which are frequently included in curriculum guides. A systematic review of these elements could provide additional information which would be helpful to art educators, researchers and decision makers concerned with the implementation of art education.

McCaughy (1988) has suggested that in the field of the arts, teachers are less likely to closely follow the guidelines than in "foundation" subjects (p. 9). One explanation for this may be drawn from the observations of MacGregor (1988). He noted the importance of well designed curriculum guides for art teachers with varying backgrounds in art who may otherwise have few resources to draw from on the implementation of their art programs (MacGregor). If the curriculum guides are not helpful, they may be perceived as a time-wasting, confusing and frustrating experience for teachers, who face intense competition for their limited teaching and preparation time.

According to Fullan (1985), all subject areas are difficult to implement. But an art program is even more difficult because of the ambiguities often associated with affective learning and the problems of objective measurement in the evaluation of performance in the arts. Intended curricula are not always implemented as set out in the guides due to many factors, some of which include the necessity to

vary teaching approaches, teachers' backgrounds, community and institutional support, and the quality of curriculum guidelines. Fullan (1985) has identified several factors, which he suggests can lead to the successful implementation of curriculum changes: (a) The development of clear and validated materials, (b) active administrative support and leadership at the district and especially, at the school level, (c) focused, ongoing in-service or staff development activities, (d) the development of collegiality and other interaction-based conditions at the school level, and (e) the selective use of external resources (both people and materials).

The Newfoundland and Labrador Task Force on Arts Education (1980) created under the auspices of the Canadian Conference of the Arts National Inquiry Into Arts and Education was critical of the lack of support for art teachers who had limited backgrounds in the subject. The report commented on the lack of program development in arts courses that are geared to the non-specialist teacher and teacher training which does not prepare generalist teachers to cope effectively with the arts as part of their teaching load. The Newfoundland and Labrador Task Force was also critical of the fact that many of the subjects in the arts disciplines were taught by teachers who have no background in and often no affinity for the arts.

The Task Force makes specific mention of the importance

of pre-service training of teachers in art education, which it claims is especially lacking in Newfoundland. Specialized training in art education has generally not been available in Newfoundland. Education students who wish to specialize in art often have to leave the province to get training. Since many do not return to the province when they have completed their training, few specialized art teachers are available to implement art programs, or to train generalists to implement them in Newfoundland schools.

In 1986 the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 was developed as a response to the need to support those teachers who have to teach art in implementing the art program. The guide consists of two booklets; one containing a philosophical statement and a series of objectives, and the other consisting of lesson units with slides. While there is a table of contents in the guide, it is not indexed, sometimes making it difficult to find particular sections. The statement of philosophy of art in the draft Guide addresses mainly two areas:

1. Art as theory and practice with elements of design and different media.

2. Art subjects as a reflection of students' interests and concerns. Particular attention is paid to implementation of the curriculum with adolescent students, which is deemed to require special reference to the understanding of the middle teenage years in trying to relate the students' interests and

concerns to subject matter. The program goal is to create a studio experience to prepare students "to be successful ... in the areas of subject matter, design, media and techniques" (Department of Education, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1986, p. 3).

The detailed statement of objectives, as outlined in the guide, delineates broader, more general objectives, such as promoting social interaction and cooperation, values clarification, physical activities, independent thinking and sensitivity training.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to explore teachers' perception of the utility of the 1986 Newfoundland and Labrador Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 in implementing the art program. The focus of the study is an examination of teachers' perception of the guide, taking into account school and community factors that could influence teachers' use of the guide in the implementation of an art program. Several questions are explored, which seek to clarify possible relationships among the factors selected for the study:

1. How do teachers view and actually use the guide?
2. Do teachers' perceptions of the importance of art education affect their use of the guide?

3. Do teachers' art backgrounds influence their perception and use of the guide?

4. Do administrative considerations such as teaching schedules, preparation time and the availability of supplies, equipment and classroom space influence the use of the guide?

5. Does the availability and support of human resources such as art coordinators, principals, librarians, artists and parents influence the use of the guide?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in its generalizability to other educational settings by a number of factors.

1. The study was restricted to the Art Curriculum guide of the province of Newfoundland.

2. The guide as described in this study may have undergone revision since it was distributed in 1986 in draft form.

3. This study was limited to an examination of art education in the junior high schools only. Art teachers for Grades 7 to 9 were selected for the study since art is designated as compulsory at that level for at least one of these three years.

4. A relatively small sample size of 84 teachers does not necessarily represent the views of most art teachers across the province. Furthermore, the sample size was

too small to permit a break-down in the reporting of results by urban-rural, school board and regional differences.

5. Self-reporting by teachers has been shown to be problematic in interpreting whether results are attitudinal (perceptions) or reflect actual conditions under study (Persall, 1972). The absence of a participant observation component to the study therefore limits the possibility of additional validity checks on teachers' responses.

6. The study sought to examine the utility of the guide only. No attempt was made to examine or evaluate the total implementation of the junior high school art program.

Definition of Terms

Art Curriculum: An organized set of educational plans and instructional materials intended to promote learning, experience and the making of visual art.

Curriculum Guide: A learning resource developed for use by educators in the implementation of educational programs.

Case Study: A method of evaluation research using an intensive examination of an issue or events with the purpose of making judgements (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 375).

Educational Evaluation: "... the process of making judgements about the merit, value, or worth of educational programs, projects, materials and techniques" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 733).

Curriculum Implementation: "Implementation consists of the process of putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities new to the people attempting or expected to change. The change may be externally imposed or voluntarily sought; explicitly defined in detail in advance or developed and adapted incrementally through use; designed to be used uniformly or deliberately planned so that users can make modifications according to their perceptions of the needs of the situation" (Fullan, 1982, p. 54).

Organization of the Study

Chapter II of this study presents a review of the literature related to curriculum evaluation, studies of implementation research, and evaluation of art education.

Chapter III presents an outline of the design of the case study with a description of sampling procedures, a discussion of data collection methods, a statement of the research questions to be answered, and an explanation of the approach to data analysis for the interviews and survey components of the research.

Chapter IV reports and analyzes the results of the survey and interviews.

Chapter V presents conclusions and implications for art program implementation.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

An Overview of Program Evaluation

The following overview and analysis of the history of curriculum evaluation traces many of the developments and contributions on the part of evaluation researchers to curriculum development. The early history of curriculum evaluation has largely been a struggle between the followers of different developmental theories--one group stressing the influence of environmental forces and the other emphasizing the primary importance of innate abilities. However these groups had a common concern for social investigation. They also shared a belief in using scientific methodologies to test their ideas.

19th Century Overview

John Stuart Mill was considered a pivotal figure in establishing the use of scientific methods for practical purposes in conducting social research (Hamilton, 1977). His contribution to curriculum evaluation was related to his concern about providing a coherent rationale for the conduct of the social sciences.

Mill also tried to develop an empirically based theory of ethics and to lay the philosophical foundations for what now has been termed "the welfare state" (Hamilton, 1977). This

led him to advocate a utilitarian role for experimental inquiry broadly related to matters of social welfare. He developed a utilitarian theory of ethics based on the liberal ideologies that were formed during the revolutionary social change periods in North America and Western Europe. This form of utilitarianism held that principles of conduct can be derived to judge social behaviour through a process of experimental inquiry.

By adopting this process of experimental inquiry to derive the moral principles to judge social behavior, Mill established a moral yardstick (a measure) which helped to overcome the criterion problem in evaluation. Believing that the chief moral problem was enlightenment and that men were misled by their institutions, Mill felt that government should stay out of men's affairs. House (1978) built upon Mill's theory by trying to operationalize in measurable ways what was this "greatest good" or "great happiness." Maximizing happiness, according to House (1978), refers to the utilitarian ethic which seeks "the realization of some type of subjective experience, often using surrogate measures like national product ... mean test scores in education ... as the indicators for happiness" (p. 49).

Mill's use of the scientific method for social science was boosted by the publication of Charles Darwin's The Origin of Species claiming that "differences between members of the same species provide the mainspring of biological evolution."

This Darwinian notion gave impetus to the empirical study of human characteristics and further influenced social researchers to develop new instruments for measurement of change.

Francis Galton was influenced by Darwin's evolutionary theory on the relevance of heredity. Mainly interested in the impact of social programs on the poor's motivation for self-help, Galton established through a series of anthropometric and psychometric surveys a psychology of individual differences and a type of inferential calculus which helped in the codification of empirical associations (Joncich, 1968). Galton's work on testing was supported by J. McKeen Cattell who first used the term "mental tests" in 1890 and E.L. Thorndike who built upon their work by constructing achievement tests, (Hamilton, 1977, pp. 322-323). The work of these social scientists emphasized individual characteristics rather than social and environmental factors.

Charles Booth, in his investigation into poverty, began his research by supporting Galton's emphasis on individual characteristics, but later he gave more weight to environmental factors. He and his assistants used questionnaires, official census data and participant observation methods to study and describe the impacts of various conditions resulting from different social program experiments. The influence of Booth's and Galton's works spread to the United States giving strong support to the settlement movements in Chicago and New

York (Cremin, 1961).

Education and Social Change

Around the turn of the century when the United States was affected by rapid social changes characterized by such movements as accelerating urbanization, massive immigration, economic boom and bust cycles, and labour unrest, education was advocated as the most effective instrument for the improvement of social conditions.

John Dewey was a major figure during this period. Perhaps more than anyone else he influenced the growth of systematic inquiry for practical application in educational evaluation. His belief "that moral knowledge was a species of empirical knowledge and that social life could be enhanced through the use of political technology" was well received by both the industrial sector and education authorities (White, 1972, p. 277). Dewey's belief in empiricism met the need for a new direction for social change at a time when psychologists, such as Thorndike and Woodworth, were expressing doubts on the full potential of experimental research evidence to demonstrate transfer of learning from one discipline to another. Empiricism also met the needs of educational authorities who were looking for ways to show that the curriculum could respond more adequately to the trend towards social efficiency movements in industrial and administrative life (Hamilton, 1977).

Evaluation and Efficiency

The response to the increasing preference for education to act as an instrument for social improvement and the demands for efficiency and practicality was an expansion in the number of innovations in evaluation methodology. Scientific methods were rigorously applied to streamline efficiency. Examinations were used for selecting students for higher education and "mental tests" were used to categorize school children. Age-grade statistics were collected to compare the quality of different school systems. Individualization became a key concept of educational theory. Evaluation was equated with the administration of standardized tests. The implementation of E.L. Thorndike's achievement scale, first published in 1908, represented new measurement techniques that stressed administrative control over curriculum development. These developments led to the centralization of education. The school curriculum fell increasingly under the influence of a kind of business ethic representing the interests of professional training and bureaucratic expertise (Hamilton, 1977).

Curriculum Evaluation

The Seventeenth Yearbook of N.S.S.E., published in 1918 and dealing extensively with evaluation, roughly marks the beginning of an emphasis on behavioral concepts in defining the objectives for evaluation (Pearse, 1981).

The Twelfth Yearbook of N.S.S.E. published an article by F.W. Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management, brought further support for the scientific movement. Taylor's ideas and those of F. Bobbitt, and W.W. Charters were important additions to the increased support for improved efficiency in education through the evaluation of curriculum design. Taylor's idea that educational efficiency could be increased through a detailed analysis of the skills that a child must acquire to become a socially mature adult influenced Bobbitt to focus on the organization of school subjects (Hamilton, 1977). Bobbitt was later joined by Charters and together they developed a linear system of curriculum design based on Taylor's idea. Bobbitt and Charters united administrators and teachers who had different group interests. Their appeal related to the search for educational goals that could be established by reference to "common aims." They saw evaluation of education as a technological task to facilitate effective changes in schooling. Moreover they looked to the superintendents and teachers for their curriculum designs and to the measurement community for quality control. Seen in this light evaluation research took on a more objective approach that was mainly concerned with the measurement of educational goal attainment.

Eight Year Study

The emphasis on curriculum construction advanced by

Bobbitt and Charters was complemented by the work of Ralph Tyler. Between 1930 and 1960 developments in educational evaluation were largely dominated by Tyler. This era was a trial period for many on-going evaluation activities based on a pattern of assessing the relationship between outcomes and objectives.

Tyler was research director of the Committee on Evaluation and Recording for the Eight Year Study (1932-1940). Tyler's Eight Year Study successfully demonstrated the efficacy of evaluation design. Several important evaluation guidelines emerged from it. A new emphasis was placed on the prior specification of objectives, along with the classification of objectives for the purpose of determining areas of educational focus and the types of instruments to be used to measure outcomes. Tyler also demonstrated that evaluators themselves might suggest situations in which achievement of objectives could be demonstrated so that they may interpret results or outcomes in relation to objectives (Boughton, 1976).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) point to the practical application of Tyler's main work--that curricula needed to be organized around certain objectives which are critical for forming a basis for planning, for providing explicit guides to teachers, and for serving as criteria for the selection of materials and preparation of tests. From an evaluation perspective, Guba and Lincoln note the importance of the idea

that the objectives serve as a basis for the systematic and intelligent study of an educational program.

Tyler's approach was an advance over the pupil-centered, measurement directed approaches. Building upon the prevailing scientific tradition, his approach gave an aura of legitimation to the fledgling field of evaluation. By differentiating between the concepts of measurement and evaluation, evaluation came to be viewed as a separate process from measurement. Tyler's rationale represented a major step forward in that it went beyond theoretical formulations and focused on the refinement of curricula and programs as the central thrust of evaluation, whereas previously evaluation had existed largely for the purpose of making judgements about individual students. Tyler gave new direction to evaluation, making it the mechanism for a dynamic process of curriculum improvement (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Teachers were seen as fully functioning competent professionals who were being provided a means whereby they evaluated their own work, as committed professionals, and provide feedback for suggested curriculum changes.

Finally Tyler's rationale made the implicit suggestion that ongoing feedback and evaluation were valuable, foreshadowing a more recent concept of "formative evaluation." His work came to be viewed by the research community as a basic pattern for the design and evaluation of school curricula. Moreover the concepts used in the guidelines of

his Eight Year Study have been subsequently adopted and further developed by other curriculum and evaluation theorists (Worthen & Sanders, 1973).

Tyler's concern for school-wide behavioral objectives received support in 1956 with the publication of Handbook I of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, a seven year collaborative project by two of Tyler's co-workers, J.T. Hastings and Benjamin S. Bloom (Bloom & Hastings, 1956). The volume refined Tyler's guidelines relating to specification, selection and classification of objectives, and moved evaluation procedures to the realm of "higher mental process" so often verbalized in abstract terms in our educational objectives (Merwin & Womer, 1969). Handbook I was followed by another volume on education and the affective domain (Krathwohl, 1964). The second volume attempted to clarify what goals are being sought and focused teachers' attention on the beginnings of complex objectives such as types of appreciation, interests and attitudes. With the growth of more complex statistical procedures like factor analysis and the applications of psychometric theory and experimental design, Tyler's work and those of his contemporaries pointed to new directions for the future of educational evaluation.

Changing Concepts in Curriculum Evaluation

Tyler's Eight-Year Study, despite its success, did not immediately encourage much growth in evaluation research. It was unfortunately followed by the lean years of World War II when politicians and the public were reluctant to invest time, personnel and resources that were necessary for the expansion of evaluation technology. The emphasis then was shifted to improve developing course construction rather than developing and enhancing evaluation procedures. School personnel became more involved in evaluating their own programs. This approach eventually was criticized and blamed for the decline in academic standards and for failing to meet the demand for scientific personnel in industry. In response to this societal problem, evaluation research began to change its focus towards improving the substance of course content. During this transition period, curriculum development was put in the hands of subject matter specialists from the universities. The emphasis on discipline-centered curriculum was reinforced by the launching of Sputnik by the Russians in 1957. Education was again blamed for the decline of scientific technology. The overall merit of the new discipline-centred curriculum, designed by various task forces of subject matter specialists, was not questioned because of the superior intellectual prestige of the pure sciences. Evaluation at this time remained an informal process conducted by members of

the subject matter team, in association with teachers in trial schools.

In the early 1960s the impact and value of these programs designed by subject matter specialists were questioned, because evaluations indicated little gains from these programs. It was believed that the non-significant results could be attributed to curriculum implementation problems, rather than curriculum content. Curriculum developers began to apply ideas from behavioral research, which was then dominated by psychologists whose emphasis was on an experimental approach focusing on individual differences. Evaluation gradually became a specialist activity, as attempts were made to organize curriculum approaches to apply to many types of programs and projects.

The 1960s were, on the whole, significant years for educational evaluation. The growth of interest in using evaluation to heighten the efficiency of educational programs stimulated researchers to study contributions toward the field. Resulting from this research on evaluation was the publication of a series of articles, many from the American Education Research Association (AERA) Monograph Series. Searching and probing articles by Cronbach (1963), Scriven (1967), Stake (1967) and Provus (1969) helped to extend and deepen evaluation theory.

Cronbach's paper, published in 1963, was the first of these articles. It provided a new emphasis on the process of

curriculum evaluation, which entailed an analysis of decision-making by those charged with program development. Cronbach urged that the traditional concept of evaluation be extended to include the ways in which refinements and improvements could occur while a course was in process. Evaluation, in his view, had to be more concerned with course performance characteristics than with comparative studies (Cronbach, 1963).

Cronbach (1963) suggested that the outcomes observed should include general outcomes such as attitudes, career choices, general understandings and intellectual powers, and aptitude for further learning in the field. Boughton (1976) felt Cronbach's paper greatly influenced the evaluation community to change the focus of evaluation from outcome to process evaluation.

Although Cronbach's (1963) pronouncements influenced federal government to spend heavily on educational research, development and dissemination, it was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which helped to give educational evaluation its biggest boost (Guba & Lincoln 1981). Tyler (1969) in his introduction to the Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the N.S.S.E., explains:

... Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 authorizes nearly \$1 billion to be allotted to schools with a high concentration of children from homes in poverty, and the Act

requires each local district receiving such funds to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational efforts thus supported. Many schools and a majority of the states reported that they had no means readily available for conducting such evaluative studies. (pp. 1-2)

The evaluation community was not prepared to face a new challenge posed by Title 1 and Title 3 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The new demand included the need to conduct massive educational auditing through output budgeting. This legislation gave rise to a new generation of evaluators and led to the establishment of several centres that developed new evaluation theories and procedures.

Scriven (1967) in his article The Methodology of Evaluation, insisted that evaluation should not only concern itself with the assessment of goal attainment but also with the values of the goals being sought by educational programs. To Scriven the primary goal of evaluation is to indicate whether the goals themselves are worth achieving. Scriven also distinguished between formative and summative evaluations; that is, evaluation studies done during the development of a program and those done after the program has been completed. Although not clear cut, the distinction helped to raise issues which have guided other researchers and stimulated inquiry and discussion. In illustrating the formative and summative stages of evaluation, Stake (1976) added to the clarification

of Scriven's distinction between these two stages:

... that when the cook tastes the soup it is formative evaluation and when the guest tastes the soup it is summative. The key is not so much WHEN as WHY. What is the information for, for further preparation and correction or for savouring and consumption? Both lead to decision making, but toward different decisions. (p. 19)

Scriven (1967) also made the distinction between professional and amateur evaluation, and he called for the professional evaluator to render judgement. Scriven maintained the view that the teachers who were subject matter specialists should play a significant role in the validation of program objectives since these teachers presumably would be the most informed in their respective subject areas. Glass (1970) supported this view by concluding that "human judgement was the only arbiter," when a consensus on evaluation methodologies could not be achieved. Further, Scriven has been recognized for "distinguishing intrinsic or process evaluation from payoff or outcome evaluation, and contrasting the utility of comparative evaluations with that of noncomparative evaluation arguing ... for the utility of comparative evaluations (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 9). While Scriven did not provide practical solutions to evaluation research, he contributed to the field by raising issues which required

further discussion and inquiry in the evaluation literature.

Eisner (1969) also attacked the concept of objectives, which he argued are not value neutral but are based on certain implicit metaphors that guide thinking about the nature of education, such as the industrial metaphor, the behavioristic metaphor, and the biological metaphor. In terms of evaluation, expressive objectives could not be dealt with in terms of a common standard, unlike those instructional objectives which could be determined by the congruence between the objective and student behaviour. Rather such objectives required a fundamentally different approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

The works of Cronbach (1963), Scriven (1967), Eisner (1969) and others, while helping to develop theories and approaches to educational evaluation, also led to increasing complexity in the view of curriculum evaluation. Consequently there was a need to develop models of evaluation which could translate the evolving conceptual materials into applied approaches.

Models of Evaluation

From the host of contemporary evaluation models that have evolved since the mid-sixties, essentially two categories of approaches to evaluation have emerged: the consensus models and the pluralist models.

Consensus Models

These models are, according to Hamilton (1977), based on "a consensual image of social life" with goals and criteria that in one form or other, can be agreed upon (pp. 335-6). The consensus models assume that there can be agreement on curriculum goals and the criteria for evaluating successes (Hamilton). The search for consensus among evaluators and educators has often been frustrated by a differences of values among the various participants in the evaluation process. Nevertheless this has not deterred the various interest groups from seeking to concur on goals for curriculum and criteria for evaluation. According to Aoki (1977), those subscribing to a consensus approach tend to emphasize technology of evaluation, educational reform and social engineering.

In the consensus models, evaluators are seen as a "surrogate interest group" that speaks for the welfare of society as a whole (Scriven, 1967, p. 81). Course developers and evaluators tend to play a strong role in getting consent, the establishment of which will vary from case to case. For example, the Tylerian tradition relies heavily upon the curriculum maker for its objectives (Stake, 1970), and Scriven's comparative model uses criteria that are validated by "highly qualified experts and professionally competent evaluators" (Scriven, 1967). Since so much stress is placed on the importance of agreement about objectives and/or criteria, the possibility that there will be areas of antag-

onism is played down. In cases when different individuals may have an "opposite preference" evaluators are inclined to focus upon areas of agreement (Scriven, 1972a, p. 84). Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Guba, Hammond, Merriman and Provus (1971) made a similar point: with consensus models it is presumed that values which are shared are more significant than discrepant values.

Tylerian model.

Tyler's goal attainment model, described earlier and derived from his Eight-Year Study on specifying and classifying objectives of education, was developed through 1970 into a widely recognized approach. The approach continues with modifications developed by Cronbach, Hammond, and Metfessel and Michael (Worthen & Sanders, 1973). The focus of the approach is matching student outcomes with educational objectives. Assessing goal attainment using agreed-upon criteria is the objective of the Tylerian approach.

Experimental model.

An experimental or comparative approach to evaluation uses research methodologies of experimental control groups and random sampling (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Although it is considered the preferred method for educational research, it has nevertheless been criticized for being overly academic in its pursuit, and therefore its usefulness in the practical

application of results is limited (Stake, 1976). Data collection and analysis by themselves, without judgement as to the application for curriculum change, may be research but this approach cannot be considered evaluation (Arasian, 1974). Therefore while still favourably viewed as more rigorous in methodological consideration, the experimental model has been criticized for its failure in providing guidance to those charged with developing and implementing curriculum.

Judgemental model.

Scriven, Eisner and Stake, among others, who criticized "value neutral" research have made the case for the development of goals, standards, and criteria for evaluations based on professional and personal judgements regarding the worth of educational programs. According to Popham (1975) there are two types of judgemental models, one emphasizing intrinsic criteria and the other, extrinsic criteria. Within the judgemental approaches, the accreditation model uses criteria intrinsic to the evaluators. Stake probably went the furthest with this model when he suggested the implementation of professional panels in the accreditation of programs.

Examples of this approach may be found in the Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) and Coming to Our Senses (1977). In these two cases professional panels were assembled to pass judgement on data which compared goals with outcomes not only by a review of goal attainment but also

by examining the value inherent in the goals at the outset.

In the judgemental model emphasizing extrinsic criteria the evaluator determines the worth of the goals and whether the goals are being met. This model, using the methodology advocated by Scriven, involves the gathering and combining of performance data with weighted sets of goal scales (Worthen & Sanders, 1973). The evaluator is ultimately responsible for judging the merit of an educational program for planners, if the evaluation is formative, or for consumers, if it is summative.

Management model.

Management models for evaluation (Stufflebeam et al., 1971; Provus, 1969; Rippey, 1973) can be either program, organization or system centered. The aim of evaluation, under management models, is to assist rational decision making involving policy formulation and program implementation processes. The data and performance criteria of management models relate to the "total system" and, as such, the management models reflect the aspiration of personnel with program wide responsibility, not the immediate concerns of classroom practitioners.

Stufflebeam et al.'s (1971) C.I.P.P. Model aims to provide relevant information to decision makers; it is systematic and cyclical. Based on consideration of a number of factors, Stufflebeam's model involves four distinct types of evalu-

ation: context, input, process, and product (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Context evaluation provides for the circumstances and conditions which facilitate the generation of a rationale for the development of objectives and implementation considerations. Input evaluation considers factors such as information or resources used to attain objectives that are helpful in curriculum development. Process evaluation is formative, providing feedback for policy-making and program implementation. Product evaluation is concerned with the summative approach, which aids in assessing goal attainment as compared with program objectives. The types of decisions and evaluation process steps are designed to interact, creating a model for providing useful information to help decision makers to facilitate quality educational control and improvements (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

Provus' (1969) "discrepancy model" is included by Provus in the management-oriented evaluation models because the information derived from examining discrepancies between actual performance and standards is used in making decisions to improve, maintain, replace, or terminate a program. In his model the evaluator is like a "management engineer" and the evaluation process functions as a "watchdog of program management" (pp. 245 & 260). In the discrepancy model the evaluation team works closely with program staff on standards to ensure collection of information relevant to program improvement. Concepts like feedback loops and cost-benefit

analysis are incorporated in this model.

Interdisciplinary model.

The fields of literary criticism, jurisprudence, and consumer science have also offered approaches to evaluation. The literary criticism model for evaluation developed by Eisner (1979) is intended to supplement the use of scientific procedures with "connoisseurship and criticism" drawn upon from an artistic tradition. Judgements are based on "the nature of artistic virtue." The literary criticism model incorporates ways of seeing rather than ways of measuring, thus making the human being a measurement instrument. Following the tradition of John Dewey, Eisner defines criticism as "the art of disclosure" and connoisseurship as "the art of appreciation" (Eisner, 1979, p. 193).

Through criticism, which is educational, the evaluator's goal is to "sensitize the individual practitioner (or reader) by rendering an account of the program, using the vehicles of suggestion, simile, and metaphor" (Eisner, 1972, p. 586). Because educational practices, like works of art, are extremely complex, the art of appreciation is aimed at developing a refined perception of educational programs and their products. The evaluator who uses this model is seen as an educational connoisseur who, by virtue of his background, is able to appreciate the characteristics and qualities of phenomena that he encounters to a better degree than is a less sophisticated observer (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Eisner (1979)

derives his methods for disclosing qualitative aspects of educational situations from the anthropologist's method of "thick description." Though this approach reveals and promotes multiple perspectives and tends towards pluralism, because the critic forms judgements, appraises value, and makes decisions grounded in rationality, it is considered a consensus model.

Kourilsky (1973), Levine (1973) and Wolf and Tymitz (1977) developed models of evaluation based on the use of jurisprudence principles of court room procedure, by examination and cross examination of evidence in a type of adversarial process to assess the merit of particular policy options. Although Kourilsky, Levine and Wolf and Tymitz all use their models to legitimate the existence of discrepant accounts presented by advocates and adversaries, the concepts of decision-making in their models are different (Hamilton, 1977). For Kourilsky the adversarial process of conducting informed debate on educational program alternatives is an attempt to uncover "the truth" and arrive at reasoned and judicious decisions on curriculum. His concern of selecting appropriate information is shared by Wolf (cited in Hamilton, 1977). Levine regarded the adversary model simply as a means of conducting debates about educational programs by emphasizing the "politics of decision making." The evaluator's role therefore is to arrive at the best choice possible after careful consideration of the range of options and their

potential costs and benefits. In this way the adversarial model may be seen to contribute to rational decision making in the development of educational programming. Kourilsky saw the development of the adversarial model as an end in itself, thereby contributing to the technology for decision making.

In the tradition of Scriven's (1972b) emphasis on actual effects of education, a model of evaluation has been developed which is derived from consumer science. In this model, impact upon the consumer rather than intentions (objectives) is the ultimate measure of the success of a program. For this model, termed Goal Free Evaluation, the judgemental criteria are not pre-specified by the curriculum developer. They are applied post hoc by the evaluator who uses external "standards of merit" derived from "the needs of the nation" (p. 2). The focus on outcomes rather than inputs is intended to inform consumers, advocates and program planners, irrespective of goals and objectives, about actual educational effects in order to obtain, as accurately as possible, an evaluation of educational results.

Pluralist Models

The pluralist models arise from scepticism about the ability to achieve consensus in light of the competition among interest groups and values in the power structure of education systems. There is a recognition that attaining the standardization of goals and criteria for success may be difficult to

achieve, given the variety of social circumstances in which educational programs are implemented. The difficulties with consensus models, particularly in having to obtain agreement on social values by all political interests in the evaluation process, have led to acknowledgement of the fact of pluralism. Value differences among the people in the evaluation process inevitably led to conflicting goals, various methodologies, and widely varying interpretation and application of results. This often resulted in a lack of closure or consensus on educational issues. This difficulty logically gave rise to a pluralistic approach, where all values and perspectives are taken into account in the development of goals and evaluation methodologies. In these circumstances, the pluralistic models provided an effective approach for raising research questions and issues, to a greater extent than it served to answer the education system's need for data upon which to make decisions.

Stake (1967) indicated that pluralism takes into account the circumstances of contexts and situations and the various perspectives of the actors in the evaluation process. He suggested that part of the responsibility of evaluators is to make known which standards are held by whom.

The necessity to consider a wide variety of values indeed makes consensus almost impossible. Scriven (1978) notes that there are four kinds of values which can be considered: (a) rhetorical values of the institution; (b) actual values derived from the institutions' educational practices; (c)

institutional interests; and (d) ideal values (p. 23). Anyone doing evaluation using a pluralistic model would probably have to consider all of these types of values in thoroughly assessing goals and goal attainment.

Responsive model.

Stake's (1975) focus on the interest groups and individuals involved in the evaluation process led him to develop a "Responsive Model" of evaluation. In this approach there is less of a focus on objectives and more on the interests of what he called "stakeholding audiences" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 24). Stake explained the approach by saying,

For an evaluation to be useful, the evaluator should know the interests and the language of his audiences. During an evaluation study a substantial amount of time may well be spent in learning about the information needs of the persons for whom the evaluation is being done. The evaluator should have a good sense of whom he is working for and their concerns ... (responsive evaluation is) an approach that trades off some measurement precision in order to increase the usefulness of the findings to persons in and around the program ... An educational evaluation is a responsive evaluation if it orients more directly to program activities than to program intents;

responds to audience requirements for information; and if the different value perspectives present are referred to in reporting the success and/or failure of the program. (Stake, 1975, pp. 13-14)

Stake outlines twelve steps in his responsive evaluation model, demonstrating a widely consultative and formative approach, which takes time to involve and give feedback to the various audiences with an interest in the evaluation. These steps are not necessarily sequential and they subscribe to the pluralistic sensibilities which actively take into account the particulars, contexts, personalities and situations of parties to the evaluation process.

Democratic model.

Discontent with the efficiency models of the 1970s, which were felt to be too restrictive because they were confined to specific objectives and skills learning, gave rise to approaches which tried to capture a broader appreciation of human experience and feelings (Apple, 1974; MacDonald, 1973; Aoki, 1978). These authors view evaluation in the tradition of Scriven, as a process of valuation or a process of assigning value to educational processes and products. Evaluation, seen in this way, is much more of a socio-political process where competing ideologies struggle to have their value orientations incorporated into programs. MacDonald suggests that all evaluation is concerned with providing information

for decision-makers, but not all evaluators agree about who the important decision-makers are, or what information they need (MacDonald, 1973).

Pluralistic models developed by Stake and others have responded to a need for recognition of the political realities facing evaluators who are confronted with a variety of values and perspectives in the differing educational contexts in which they find themselves carrying out their work.

The development of consensus and pluralistic models of evaluation offers an array of possibilities to be considered by evaluators. Hamilton (1977) perhaps best sums up the status of evaluation in his day at the end of the 1970s when he stated that "evaluation is offered as an unfinished blueprint rather than a perfect technology. It generates issues not solutions. It is about information rather than confirmation" (p. 342).

Implementation Research and Program Evaluation

Implementation research has grown from the need to evaluate how educational innovations get carried out, to concerns with situational factors which influence the extent of the realization of education programs. It is concerned with the influences of teachers, students, administrators, parents, school systems and committees on the implementation process.

Program evaluation generally, but more specifically as applied to the field of education, has been improved by the development of implementation research. The importance of doing implementation studies has been demonstrated through research. Hess and Buckholdt (1974) found a positive relationship between student achievement scores and the degree of implementation. Leinhardt (1974) also reported that measured implementation categories accounted for 37% of the variance in student achievement. Studying teachers' implementation behaviour and the extent of implementation may contribute significantly to the understanding and evaluation of educational programs.

Various reasons have been identified in the literature for carrying out implementation research. Tyler (1986) believed that information from implementation research would help to explain why certain projects failed to attain their objectives. Factors explaining implementation successes or failures could possibly be considered by others planning similar innovative educational changes.

Borg and Gall (1983) suggested that ensuring the finished product would be implemented according to the developers' specifications was a way to justify the costs and time spent in developing an innovation. Other reasons identified by Fullan and Pomfret (1977) for studying implementation were: (a) it helps to know what has been changed; (b) it helps to identify some of the problematic aspects of bringing about

change; (c) it helps to differentiate between decisions to use an innovation and factors contributing to implementation with implementation itself; and (d) it makes easier the interpretation of learning outcomes and facilitates efforts to relate them back to possible learning determinants (pp. 336-339).

Despite its importance, program implementation was seldom studied until the mid 1970s. In both Canada and in the United States large curriculum projects failed to have the impacts on schools that had been anticipated (Gallagher, 1966; Goodlad & Klein, 1970). One major reason attributed to the failure of these projects to yield their intended effects was inadequate implementation. Therefore it was important to examine and understand the circumstances and conditions facilitating or blocking implementation.

Some writers suggested that a possible reason why promising innovations have had little effect on pupil learning was that probably many of these promising innovations might not in fact have ever been implemented. Innovations introduced into schools are only proposals for change; to achieve their intended effects, they must be implemented. Hymen, Wright and Hopkins (1962) speculated that, "The answer to why a program was ineffective may even be reduced to the simple fact that it was not in reality operative; it existed only on paper ... When the stimulus is not there, there is no process that it can generate" (pp. 74-75). The implementation studies

reviewed by Gross, Giacuinta and Bernstein (1971) revealed the paucity of knowledge concerning the conditions influencing the implementation of organizational innovations. Stufflebeam et al. (1971) also noted that knowledge about the implementation phase of the process of planned organizational change was limited.

The 1970s was an important period for developing implementation research. After Charters and Jones (1973) pointed out the risks of measuring "non-events," more attention was paid to the many variables associated with the implementation of innovations and was focused on the description and measurement of these variables. Impetus for this increased emphasis on implementation research was provided by Scriven (1976) when he explored the distinctions between summative and formative evaluation. The evolution of models for evaluation incorporating procedures for describing education processes also contributed to this development (Stake 1970; Stufflebeam et al., 1971; Rippey, 1973; Provus, 1971; Alkin, 1967).

Implementation research carried out during the period of the 1970s contributed to a strong base of evidence for evaluators and researchers to understand how and why educational reforms fail or succeed and how innovations worked in practice (Fullan, 1982). This growing interest in implementation research and its effects on educational practice has been demonstrated by a rapidly expanding literature (Gross et al., 1971; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1980).

Many of the implementation studies reviewed showed serious methodological or conceptual shortcomings (Gross et al., 1971). Researchers and evaluators saw the need to develop suitable conceptual and practical tools to assess the degree of implementation and to ensure that effects of implementation research are evaluated. New directions were adopted by these researchers in their implementation studies. Some researchers put forward many evaluation approaches to assess whether there was any empirical support for theoretical reasoning about circumstances that could influence the degree of implementation. Because the methods used in many previous studies to evaluate behavioral changes were highly questionable, Gross et al. stressed the importance of obtaining an accurate measure of the dependent variable in any study. They also believed it necessary that work be based on systematic observations of the behaviours in question.

In the 1970s, implementation variables were recognized as having important implications for analysis and interpretation of outcome data. Increasing attention was given to the many variables associated with implementation of innovations and to the description and measurement of these variables. Determining whether the innovation was actually in use and, if so, how it was being used was essential to the interpretation of any study.

Hall and Loucks (1977) also saw the need to systematically document the implementation of innovations. They

observed that first hand information about implementation is critical for interpreting outcome and consequence data. Being aware that in most evaluation studies, the presence of innovation was assumed rather than based on systematic documentation, they believed that many of the non-significant findings reported in evaluation studies might better be explained if more were known about actual use of the innovation. Hall and Loucks concluded that the only way to know for sure whether and how an innovation was being used was to assess each individual's use directly. They explored the implementation issues by using the concept of Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoUs). The individual classroom teacher, assumed to be the primary unit of adoption, was used as the unit of analysis. Some studies had demonstrated that asking more remote sources about the use or non-use of an innovation had serious validity problems (Berman & Pauly, 1975; Deal, Meyer & Scott, 1975; Greenwood, Mann & McLaughlin, 1975). Goodlad and Klein (1970) and Jones (1973) also found that it was not safe to assume that the innovation was being used because the materials had been purchased or because teachers had received in-service training.

Hall and Loucks (1975) used eight LoUs which had been identified and operationally defined in the Concerns-Based Adoption Model to measure the utilization characteristics of the innovation. The content of the LoU concept is the behaviors of innovation users and non-users. The focus is on

what teachers do in relation to the innovation. The eight levels of use identified were:

<u>Levels of Use</u>	<u>User's Characteristics</u>
Non-use	User has little or no knowledge of the innovation
Orientation	User has recently acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation.
Preparation	User is preparing for first use of the innovation.
Mechanical Use	User focuses most efforts on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than students' needs.
Routine	User gives little thought to improving innovation use or consequence.
Refinement	User varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within the immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short and long-term consequences for clients.
Integration	User is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact

on clients within their common sphere of influence.

Renewal User reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation and begins to explore alternatives to or major modifications of the innovation presently in use.

Within these eight levels of use, sophistication of implementation is defined by the user's expanding ability in practice to effectively implement the innovation to suit the abilities of his or her students in their own setting. The LoUs developed by Hall, George and Rutherford (1977) were seen by Leithwood and Montgomery (1980) as a step towards recognition of implementation as a process. They stated that,

The substantial value of this work lies in its operationalization of implementation as a process, empirical recognition of differentiated needs among implementors depending on level of use, the provision of well-tested sets of instruments and procedures for diagnosing both levels of use and stages of concern. (p. 206)

Leithwood and Montgomery (1980) considered it important to evaluate the nature and degree of implementation of program innovations. They believed that information derived from such evaluations might assist in developing accountability for management, decisions as well as serving research and develop-

ment functions. To be beneficial evaluations have to provide information relevant to its particular function. However, accountability, management and research and development are not independent functions. A decision maker can profit from information relevant to several or all of these functions at a given time. To obtain the relevant information for separate functions, many studies are undertaken by researchers and evaluators interested in implementation evaluation to design methodologies relevant to individual functions. For example, to evaluate program implementation which served accountability and management decisions, Leithwood and Montgomery developed a methodology which has the potential to indicate both current status and growth in use of an innovation. Their methodology, with added curriculum dimensions to the definition of implementation of the innovation, helps to provide a more diagnostically sensitive variation of the concept of levels of use. Like Hall and Loucks (1975) the methodology developed by Leithwood and Montgomery requires that definition be in terms of teacher knowledge, objectives, strategies, behaviors, and associated classroom practices.

In another study conducted by Regan and Leithwood (1974), it was found that implementation of an educational innovation should consider the complex structured relationship between system variables, human variables and technological variables in order to increase the predictive power of results from the innovation when implemented. In developing such a model for

curriculum innovation, Regan and Leithwood considered the specific roles of the teacher, principal, administrator and academic and their functions in the processes of innovation implementation and evaluation. Their study demonstrated the importance of considering several critical dimensions of the role of the teacher. These dimensions affecting implementation helped to indicate the amount of support the teachers needed and the kinds of support they valued.

The role of the teacher is described by many researchers as being pivotal in bringing implementation to any successful curriculum innovation (Sarason, 1971; Smith & Keith, 1971; Fullan, 1972; Leithwood & Russell, 1973). These researchers believed that implementation strategies which relied too heavily on reorganization of systems were unlikely to be effective, and therefore suggested that teacher-users be viewed in the context of other demands placed on them in order that they be provided the necessary support.

Regan and Leithwood (1974) also stated that, for innovation implementation to be successful, a change in the thinking or approach of the people involved in the educational change strategy is necessary. Innovation strategies without the necessary adjustments in people, they believed, may facilitate, but far from guarantee, changes in function since the new forms may be poorly developed and may not be understood by teacher-users.

Different researchers have examined the roles of individ-

ual users in the implementation of educational innovation. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) looked at implementation in terms of five change dimensions: changes in materials; changes in structure; changes in role behavior; changing knowledge and understanding; changing value internalization (p. 336).

Fullan (1982) looked to the significance of the meaning of change for understanding the implementation of innovations. He believed that underlying the question of implementation is the problem of finding meaning in change. He emphasized the importance of knowing what change looks like from the point of view of the individual teacher, student, parent, and administrator in order to understand the actions and reactions of each player. Combining the aggregate knowledge of these individuals' situations would, he suggested, help to comprehend the big picture of organizational and inter-organizational factors which influence the process of change. From his intensive research done on implementation of educational innovations, Fullan later identified 15 major factors on which there is enough evidence to warrant generalization about how and why particular factors influence implementation. He suggested that consideration of these factors in evaluating educational changes should facilitate a more systems-oriented approach. These identified factors are:

1. Need and relevance of the change
2. Clarity
3. Complexity

4. Quality and practicality of program (materials etc.)
5. The history of innovative attempts
6. The adoption process
7. Central administrative support and involvement
8. Staff development (in-service) and participation
9. Time-line and information system (evaluation)
10. Board and community characteristics
11. The principal
12. Teacher-teacher relations
13. Teacher characteristics and orientations
14. Role of government
15. External assistance.

The first four factors affecting implementation can be considered major aspects of the change itself.

The role of socio-political forces contributing to the shaping of values towards the subject discipline under study or the attitude to education in general may also be significant to the implementation of programming. The extent to which curriculum changes are implemented to the greatest degree possible is clearly affected by the teachers' and the support personnel's perception of the need for change. If teachers are satisfied that existing programming is adequate there may be more resistance to change.

The clarity of curriculum materials in their statements of objectives, their use and explanation of various concepts in the vernacular of the subject area and their degree of

specificity in detailing program changes may all affect the extent of implementation.

Any change can be examined with regard to the difficulty, skill required, and extent of alterations in beliefs, teaching strategies, and use of materials. For effective implementation it is necessary to understand the sophisticated array of activities, diagnosis and teaching strategies required for changes to be implemented.

The remaining 11 factors focus on the social conditions for change. The characteristics of the settings in which people work influence the implementation of educational changes.

The quality of educational materials and technologies (instruments of curriculum) can of course impact on learning. Poor quality or even the lack of availability of learning materials can be the result of political decisions on the priority given to certain subject areas. Political expediency and legislative requirements may formalize the inclusion of programming without due consideration for factors affecting implementation. Adequate preparation time, suitable guides, classroom size, space, supplies and equipment are frequently overlooked in the rush to adopt curricula (Fullan, 1982).

Some studies have even found that many teachers were unfamiliar with the provincial curriculum materials they were supposed to be implementing (Downey et al., 1975; Aoki et al., 1977; Simms, 1978). A mismatch between the training and

competency levels of teachers and the degree of complexity of new programming could be a barrier to implementation, unless adequate additional training and support are available and effectively used by the less qualified teachers.

Failure to learn from the history of the evolution of curriculum implementation efforts may frustrate attempts at educational change when certain critical implementation factors are overlooked. The political process which leads to adoption of curriculum may signal to those charged with implementation the seriousness with which their efforts might be pursued. The exclusion of key players (often politicians), community members, principals, coordinators or teachers from the development process may alienate those involved in implementation.

Time-lines and information systems intended to support implementation are important factors. Time perspective is a critical factor aspect of the implementation process (Sarason, 1971). Unrealistic time-lines, which could be caused by materials not arriving on schedule, and miscommunication or neglect of the timing of training and orientation, would add to the burden of implementation. Open-ended time lines are equally problematic since they create ambiguity about expectations and a lack of clarity about what constitutes progress. Information systems can be effective in facilitating change when it is linked with a system for acting on it. Collecting and using diagnostic information about implementation problems

has been found to be strongly related to school improvement.

School level factors such as the role and relationship of the principal to the teacher, the collegial relations among teachers, and the teachers' own backgrounds in their subject areas have all been shown to be important to implementation of educational curricula (Fullan, 1982).

Much of the literature on evaluation of implementation has concentrated on the traditionally core subject areas of the natural sciences, mathematics, English and social studies (Fullan, 1982). The relative paucity of implementation evaluation studies in the field of arts education points to the need for more research in this area.

Evaluation and Art Education

Evaluating art teaching and learning in the elementary and secondary schools has always been problematic. Precise measurement is not always possible to evaluate the innate qualities of the art experience that is often emotional in nature, even though learning activities in art include cognitive components. Learning in the arts does not always result in simple and measurable outcomes, and the central issues such as evaluating what actually happens to values, attitudes and aesthetic understandings of students, teachers, administrators and other community members do not readily lend themselves to traditional methods of evaluation. Concerted

and systematic study and research in the field of art has been made difficult partly because financial resources have not always been continuous or adequate.

In general the increased educational evaluation activities of the time fostered much interest in applying to school programs the "new learning" derived from research. The intensity of interest in the arts in education was reflected in the mounting of seventeen conferences on art between 1964 and 1966 (Efland, 1984). The purpose of these conferences was to promote research and development activity in preparation for curriculum change in the arts. The Penn State Seminar of 1965, the most notable of the conferences, gave attention to "art education as a discipline in its own right" (Efland, p. 207). The idea was put forward and supported that art teaching should be more disciplined and structured to cover the three domains including art history, criticism and studio work.

At the time when research and development work was being supported by the Arts and Humanities Program, assessing the arts in education still encountered problems. There was no connection or consultation between the Arts and Humanities Program and Titles I and III funds, because they were administered in separate bureaus of the United States Office of Education. Vast amounts of money were being used to support creative arts projects under Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). As allocation of

Title funds under ESEA was contingent on the evaluation of supported projects, participants in the projects were expected to conduct the evaluation. They produced behaviorially oriented data which could be analyzed to justify the continuation of projects. Such data were of limited use for the developmental work carried out by the Arts and Humanities Program.

Nevertheless, the money provided by the Federal Research and Development Funds was not wasted. Although evaluation of the arts had its problems, some gains were made. Of major significance was the establishment of a national constituency of educational researchers developed for the arts and humanities; also, for the first time an exchange took place between educators in the various arts and humanities fields with leaders in related fields (Bloom, 1975).

In 1967 funds were also made available from the Arts in Education Program of the J.D. Rockefeller the Third, (JDR 3rd) Fund to study whether the arts could be made integral to the general education of all children from kindergarten through high school. The need for the research was raised by Rockefeller, (President of JDR 3rd Fund), who, agreeing with researchers that the arts had value in learning, noticed that only a small percentage of the adult population was actively involved and interested in arts. This program also helped to bring together the knowledge and experience of researchers who were concerned with a broader educational framework. The

various perspectives of the different disciplines which were brought together in the 1960s under the Arts and Humanities Programs of USOE and the Arts in Education Program of the JDR 3rd Fund helped to enrich all of the arts/humanities disciplines and stimulated a reconsideration of research methodologies in evaluation designs for the arts (Talmage, 1982).

The two programs laid down funding criteria to support projects which made the arts and humanities integral to the education of all children and young people. The work done with the help of these funds generated information that added understanding and knowledge of the role of the arts in education. Under these programs progress was made in determining what aspects of learning could be evaluated and how the results could be made available and useful to teachers. Consequently the Arts in Education Program's central objective was redirected; its focus was on assisting school systems in their efforts to improve the quality of education for all children. This was done by emphasizing incorporation of all the arts into teaching and learning: a dynamic and complex concept that presented new challenges to educators as well as to evaluators.

School administrators and boards of education seemed to be reaching the conclusion that, if the quality of learning were to be improved, something other than merely continued emphasis on basic skills would have to be included. Educational evaluation technologies seemed to respond to the need

for help in determining whether the arts in general education might be that something more; something that could help to improve the overall quality of education.

Art educators began examining various components of evaluation in art education. Smith and Smith (1970) pointed to the importance of aesthetics for enjoyment, knowledge and experience. Efland (1973) emphasized the evaluation of goals and philosophy of education. Day (1972) prepared the ground for art education's significance by suggesting the following rationales for art education--visual perception, self-concept, subjective thinking and aesthetic experience.

With the growing emphasis on evaluation came the demand for greater specificity in the establishment of criteria for art evaluation (Clark, 1975). Eisner (1975) identified three types of art education objectives against which evaluation could be developed. In addition to instructional and behavioral objectives, he specified two other types: expressive objectives, which are the result of art education activity intended to generate a "personal, idiosyncratic response"; and Type III objectives, wherein a student must work through a solution to a problem or challenge, having to deal with a number of constraints imposed by space, equipment and other material limitations or lack of resources.

Another outcome of research work from the two funding programs was Stake's Responsive Model for evaluating the arts in education. The interest and growth in evaluation generally

during this period found expression in the views of Stake, who was seeking to broaden the role of evaluation to focus on the realities of program activities and audience requirements, rather than on objectives, goals and standards for education set before evaluation takes place. His book Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach marked one of the first steps taken by the evaluation community in considering the complex realities and multiple value perspectives of participants in a particular educational setting (Alexander, 1982).

The Responsive Model was able to evaluate all three areas of the learning domain; cognitive, psychomotor, and affective. In considering the importance of the Responsive Model, Bloom commented that, "the responsive approach provides a means for examining the process of educational change through the arts and the relationship of this change process to the quality content of teaching and learning" (Bloom, 1975, p.10). Stake's paper on the Responsive Model, presented at the 1974 annual American Education Research Association (AERA) conference, was well received by fellow evaluation researchers like Guba and Scriven. The Responsive Model was later adopted by Guba and Lincoln to evaluate the arts in education (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The interest and involvement of a number of educational researchers also encouraged discussion and use of Stake's fresh approach to evaluating the arts and humanities.

The Responsive Model provides a major contribution to the

notion that evaluation, in whatever educational setting, should make use of ideas from a paradigm that emphasizes ethnographic and participant observation techniques. There are many researchers who are making a shift to use this alternative paradigm to address both methodological and substantive problems in the study of teachers, curricula, classrooms, and schools. Those who are using these techniques believe in the value of context and the importance of the evaluation researcher as interpreter (Alexander, 1982). They share a dedication to a variety of research techniques termed "descriptive." Descriptive techniques, including observation and interviews, are used to make objective and standard the researcher's perceptions. Participant observers become involved with educational participants in order to ensure that the questions asked will elicit data of importance to those interested in the results of the research. Informality of the interview allows those using participant observation to gather information in a number of ways which help them to understand the situation in a comprehensive manner.

Bersson (1978) in reviewing participant observation in art education evaluation links these techniques with education evaluation, as it relates to Eisner's work in educational criticism (Alexander, 1982). Educational criticism developed by Eisner (1979) is based on the model of art criticism. The critic, in a role as educational evaluator/educational connoisseur, possessing a large and varied experience, uses

participant observation and ethnographic techniques to do the evaluation field work. Essential for this approach is the requirement that the critic be able to write about the program within the framework of aesthetics to convey the actual experience of the situation being described, rather than abstracting information about that experience. Following the descriptive portion, the educational critic provides a theoretical analysis of what has been described to reveal what happened, what it means, what it's worth is, and to sometimes make suggestions about how things could be improved. Finally the critic has to appraise the educational value of what has been described and interpreted.

Rubin (1982) describes another approach to assessment that uses the ethnographic and participant observation techniques and is referred to as the naturalistic evaluation method, evolving from the work of several researchers at the Indiana Center for Evaluation in Bloomington, Indiana (Wolf & Tymitz, 1977; Guba, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The function of naturalistic evaluation is to gather information relevant to concerns and issues in the minds of persons or groups who have an interest in the object being evaluated. The evaluator's main task is to identify the concerns and issues in terms of value conflicts inherent in all social contexts and to develop portrayals of these conditions. Methods of collecting data include predominantly human-to-human research skills such as interviewing, observation, and recording of verbal and

nonverbal behavior. Other techniques such as documentary analysis, records usage, and unobtrusive measures are also used. In art education a number of authors have utilized these methods and found justification for their use in education's evaluation.

As the number of ethnographic studies conducted in the field of art education increases, theoretical problems have become evident within the developing body of literature. A Taxonomy for Art Educators; Styles of On-Site Descriptive Research was introduced by Ettinger (1984) to help researchers, who are insufficiently educated in the foundations of these research approaches, to improve the quality of such investigations in art education. The attention given to seeking improvements to evaluation research in the field of art education is a promising sign for the future of the subject.

Research Paradigm for the Arts

As noted by Madeja (1977) there are many needs for evaluation in art education, ranging from developing instruments for measuring achievement in art, to creating diagnostic tests for assessing levels of development, to employing methods that reveal the structure and processes of art learning and teaching. Those researchers in visual arts education involved with forms of disciplined inquiry in education have tended to adopt the paradigm utilized by the

natural sciences (or rationalistic paradigm), and while naturalistic evaluation cannot serve all needs, it is ideally suited to the investigation of structure and process. It is appropriate for serving the needs of art program staff and audiences, since it draws directly upon personal interaction, observation, description, and revelation of multiple perspectives and individual meanings.

Rubin (1982) notes that naturalistic evaluation is uniquely suited to art program evaluation: naturalistic evaluation allows questions, issues, concerns, ideas and feelings to emerge during the process from the evaluation's audience; it enables investigators to study situations or programs where variables are ambiguous, conditions are in flux, and changes can be responded to or incorporated as they occur; it focuses on the development of empathy and understanding of individual meanings, and it puts emphasis on particulars rather than generalizations (p. 61).

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Design of the Study

Effective curriculum guides may be one of the key factors in the successful implementation of educational programs (Fullan, 1982). One way to examine how effective these guides are in facilitating implementation is to involve teachers (implementors) as evaluators of the guides which are available to them. This study was aimed at determining teachers' perception regarding the utility of the 1986 Newfoundland Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9. The teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of the guide in the areas of content, resources and support services.

Objectives of the Study

This study investigated teachers' perception of the usefulness of the 1986 Newfoundland Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 as one of the factors influencing the implementation of the art program in Newfoundland schools. The units investigated were teachers' personal interest in art; their perception of the relative importance of art education; the availability, clarity and usefulness of the guide in planning and developing art instruction; and the frequency of the actual use of the guide. In addition the study examined whether material and human resources were

supportive of curriculum implementation and were available in the school or community (i.e. art books, art rooms, supplies and equipment, local galleries, art studios and art work displayed in the school). Furthermore, teachers were asked to indicate whether they had adequate teaching blocks to be able to implement the curriculum as it is outlined in the guide. Human resources that may be supportive of an art program include the principal, an art coordinator, other teachers, parents, school librarians, public librarians, and local artists. Teachers were asked to indicate how important these human resources were to their art program's successful implementation.

Case Study Design

The design for this investigation was based on a case study approach. The case study is a useful strategy which seeks to help explain the causal links in real-life situations that are too complex for survey or experimental strategies alone to investigate or explain (Yin, 1984). It provides a useful approach in helping to explore or describe issues or concerns in real-life situations. The various research strategies are not mutually exclusive: one can use more than one strategy in any given study--for example, a survey within a case study or a case study within a survey (Yin).

In arguing for the case study as a research strategy, Yin (1984) suggests, "case studies have a distinctive place in

evaluation research" (p. 25). Although this approach was rejected by many educational researchers as unscientific because of its lack of research controls, the recent increased acceptance of qualitative research methods inherent in the case-study approach has given it a new credibility in the research community (Borg & Gall, 1983). Guba and Lincoln (1981) consider the case study approach as the most appropriate form to report on the results of naturalistic, responsive evaluations. Among its many uses, including depicting, chronicling and teaching, they believe case studies can also be used to test, that is, to "prove" or to try new educational products (pp. 370-373). Other advantages pointed out by Guba and Lincoln are: the case study provides the "thick description" so important to naturalistic observation methods; the case study is contextual and therefore provides an experiential perspective; the case study provides comprehensive and realistic results important for increased understanding and communication; the case study approach can also be adjusted to best fit the circumstances in each setting (p. 376).

Methodology Validation in Case Studies

Maintaining a chain of evidence in the case study is done to increase reliability (Yin, 1984). This principle allows an external observer to follow the derivation of any evidence from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions. Unlike descriptive case studies, which are less

demanding and provide fewer causal links in their analysis, analytical case studies face a greater challenge for explaining and interpreting data.

Case studies usually involve collecting evidence from multiple sources and/or through different methods (Yin, 1984). Guba and Lincoln (1981) point to the process of "comparing and contrasting information drawn from different sources and/or determined by different methodologies" being useful for verifying information on the same event from different participants. As a cross-validation technique, the process of triangulating information also has the capacity for producing more confidence in the data generated by different methodologies (Guba & Lincoln, p. 257). Triangulation is considered one of the most important strengths of naturalistic inquiry because of its ability to divorce itself from the unidimensional value-consensual paradigm that has guided social action research and evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Triangulation, cross-examination and testing of materials also enhances greater reliability of results, which is a critical concern for naturalistic inquiries, because it helps to act as a check against possible researcher bias.

This study followed Yin's (1984) model of a case study approach, employing both survey and interview methodologies. Broad-based and in-depth interviewing of the teachers who were using the art curriculum guide to implement the junior high school art program is a naturalistic method of gathering data

which is suited to revealing multiple perspectives and individual meanings. Rubin thinks that, in the realm of aesthetic experience which can be described more readily than measured, naturalistic evaluation can provide unique insights and perceptions (Rubin, 1982). By using an interviewing methodology, one is able to engage teachers, with varying backgrounds in art and with differing degrees of support from schools and the community, in a process of evaluation of the utility of the guide in implementing the art curriculum.

In addition to the interviews, a survey was conducted to get the views of a larger sample of teachers from different areas of the province. Questionnaires may provide an effective method for assessing teachers' "knowledge and understanding of the philosophy and basic strategies of an innovative program provided that both specific questions are asked and open-ended questions are used to assess various aspects of respondents' thinking and approaches to the innovation" (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977, p. 366). Interviews and surveys focusing on implementation issues have been used to gather information which has contributed to contextual analysis of the circumstances in which teachers are implementing curricula (Hall & Loucks, 1977).

The Survey

The survey method was used in this study to involve a larger number of teachers in the sample than would otherwise

have been possible with more qualitative approaches such as interviewing alone. The questionnaire was designed to elicit the teachers' perceptions of a number of factors related to implementation. They were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with a number of statements on widely held views on art. They were also asked to indicate which of these statements they most and least agreed with. In the second part, their personal interest in art, as reflected by their participation in various art-oriented activities, was assessed. They were then asked whether the official art curriculum guide was used in their school, whether they had a copy of it and the extent of assistance they received from art specialists/co-ordinators in using the guide. The frequency with which teachers used the guide was explored, followed by a series of questions on teachers' perceptions of its usefulness in various aspects of art education.

The survey also examined the availability of material resources for implementing the art curriculum including art books, school facilities, supplies and equipment and community resources supportive of art education such as galleries and studios. Other considerations, including preparation time and time-tabling, were also explored. Teachers were asked to rate the importance of a number of human resources including the principal, art coordinator and others in the implementation of the program. The survey also sought demographic information about teachers' backgrounds in art training and education.

The Interviews

The interviews were intended to provide elaboration on the many responses to the questions posed in the survey. Interviews were designed to elicit a descriptive exploration of the "real-life" situations of the teachers (Yin, 1984, p. 13). They attempted to explain and elaborate upon some of the findings in pursuing answers to the "why" and "how" of curriculum implementation. The interviewer used the questions from the survey as prompts in conducting the case study interviews. Using the survey questions also served to keep the investigator "on track" as data collection proceeded (Yin).

The interviews also acted as cross-validation for the data collected in the survey questionnaire. While questionnaires are seen to be relatively effective at measuring perceived implementation, because of their potential for gathering data from larger samples (Cole, 1971), semi-structured interviews with representative subjects may provide greater "thickness" of description and depth of analysis. The cross-validation afforded by using both interview and questionnaire methods helped to guard against validity problems associated with using perceptions as measures of the teachers' realities in using the guide.

Instrument Validation

To enhance the content validity of the data collected in the interviews, the analyses were returned separately to the interviewees who were asked to provide validity checks by supplying clarification, correction and any additional information on the original data they provided. To establish face and content validity, the questionnaire was submitted for review to a number of experts, including several professors and instructors from the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Provincial art consultant, Department of Education, and a research methodology professor in Educational Psychology. These experts were asked for feedback on the instrument's language, style, format, content, communication effectiveness and possible bias.

Administration of the Study

Sampling procedure for the survey.

The researcher used a stratified sample of six school boards across the province in an attempt to represent the diversity of schools in Newfoundland. All school boards listed in the Directory of School Boards (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1987) were categorized into three groups: (a) very rural; (b) rural; and (c) urban, according to the following criteria:

1. board population;

2. number of small schools (under 150 students);
3. school board personnel (those serviced by a coordinator who is responsible for the art program);
4. proximity to urban centres.

The Labrador East Integrated School Board and Conception Bay North Integrated School Board were chosen randomly as representing the very rural boards. Each board's student population was under 3000. Representing the rural boards were Notre Dame Integrated School Board and Placentia-St. Marys School Board, each of which has a school population of between 3000 and 5000. St. John's Roman Catholic School Board and Bonavista-Trinity-Conception School Board represented the urban boards of 5000 and more. There was difficulty in establishing the exact number of art teachers, since the Directory of School Boards does not indicate teachers by subject matter areas but only by grades taught. Hence the number of art teachers was arrived at through correspondence and telephone calls with the principals, school district supervisors, coordinators for the art program and through estimation based on school size. It was estimated that there were 73 schools with a maximum possible population of 475 classroom teachers responsible for art or art teachers at the junior high school level. It was not possible to determine the accuracy of this estimated number because it was discovered that art was not taught at all in some schools despite the provincial curriculum requirement for art education at the junior high level.

It was found in distributing the questionnaire, through program coordinators at the board level, that the number of teachers actually teaching art was less than two hundred.

Permission to conduct the survey was obtained from the superintendents of the respective school boards. Packages of questionnaires, together with cover letters, were sent to the principals and co-ordinators (see Appendices IV and V for sample cover letters). The letter explained the purpose of the study and requested the cooperation of the principals, co-ordinators, and teachers. The principals, and in some cases the art coordinators, were asked to distribute copies of the questionnaire to all respondents teaching grades 7 to 9 art. To ensure confidentiality, teachers were requested not to place their names on the questionnaires. They were asked to return the questionnaires, in the envelopes provided, to the schools' general office.

As of January 31st, 1989, of the 168 questionnaires distributed, 84 were completed and returned representing a 50% response rate. The response rate may have been higher except for problems with one particular school board where there was difficulty in establishing the number of teachers who should be included in the sample. Only four questionnaires were completed by teachers at this board, and seventeen were returned accompanied by the explanation that not all schools offered Grade 7, 8 or 9 art. There were problems in receiving back questionnaires from some of the more remote areas of the

Labrador East Integrated Board schools. Since the survey was administered in November, already winter in Labrador, the weather prevented some of the questionnaires from getting through to the target schools in time to participate in the survey.

Interviews.

Two teachers responsible for teaching art in the junior high school level were selected for interviews; one from a rural school district in eastern Newfoundland and the other from the urban St. John's area. The rural teacher (T1) had little background in art education since he had no formal training in art. The urban teacher (T2) was an art specialist. T1 taught grade 8 art as part of a general teaching load, while T2 taught mainly art in grades 7, 8 and 9.

The teachers interviewed were also asked to complete the survey questionnaire, however their completed questionnaires were not added to the survey sample. By completing the questionnaires they were given advance preparation for the focus of the questions in the interview, which sought to elaborate on the contents of the survey. The interviews were semi-structured in order to obtain as much information as possible. By verbal agreement and consent, teacher interviews were audio-tape recorded to enhance the accuracy of recording and reporting of the data obtained.

Data analysis.

The quantitative analyses employed in this study provided the data which were coded, tabulated and summarized into frequency and percentage scores using descriptive statistics. The qualitative data supplied from the interviews were analyzed using a descriptive-analytic and pattern-matching framework.

The proposition that teachers with greater background in art would find the guide more useful was explored through the interviews by examining the two teachers' perceptions of the guide, their attitudes to art education, and their own methods of curriculum implementation. Pattern-matching was used to examine the relationship between the teachers' backgrounds, their perceptions, and their use of the guide. At the same time other explanations for the perceived utility of the guide were sought through analysis of other patterns of relationships among contextual factors. "Alternate analysis of patterns of obscured relations can provide rival explanations for the same data" (Yin, 1984, p. 105). The importance of keeping an open mind to discover additional patterns to those being sought allowed for what Scriven (1972), has suggested is a less restrictive and freer interpretation of the data.

Because of their different art backgrounds, T1 and T2 were expected to provide divergent views on problems and prospects for implementation using the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9. While their views are

not necessarily generalizable to all art teachers with similar backgrounds, their perspectives may be considered as examples of teachers with very distinct orientations to art education. The study used the interviews to help expand on possible explanations of the survey and to discover additional evaluation data to enrich the consideration of factors contributing to implementation. As well additional related information about implementation which emerged during the open-ended interviews was explored for further analysis.

Results of the survey and interviews are reported in Chapter IV. Quantitative and qualitative findings are described in some detail followed in the final chapter by discussion, analysis and review of the implications of the data for the implementation of the art curriculum in Newfoundland schools.

CHAPTER IV

Reporting and Analysis of Results

This chapter presents the results of a survey of 168 teachers, with a 50% response rate, and the results of the in-depth interviews with two teachers responsible for the teaching of art at the junior high school level. Factors contributing to the implementation of the art program, as outlined in the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 are examined; specifically the survey and interview data are analyzed and reported descriptively.

Survey Results

Characteristics of the Sample

Teachers were asked to indicate the following: (a) the grade levels in which they had taught art within the past two years; (b) their level of training/education in art; (c) the length of time since they had received formal training in art; (d) the number of years they had taught art; (e) the degree of difficulty they had in teaching art; and (f) their preferences regarding art as part of their teaching workload.

All 84 teachers who responded to the survey had taught at least one of grades 7, 8 or 9, art and some had also taught lower and higher grades. Table 1 provides the distribution of grades taught by the teachers in the two years prior to

completing the survey.

Table 1

Respondents' Art Teaching Experience in the Past Two Years

Grades Taught	N = 84	Percentage
K-9	22	13
7	43)	
8	56) = 130	78
9	31)	
10-12	15	9

Table 2 outlines teachers' background training in art education. The figures suggest that most of the teachers participating in the study had little specialized knowledge of art, but had been exposed to some formal training through either workshops or university courses. With most teachers taking only a few workshops, less than half had participated in university courses or formal art education, and a very small minority were art majors.

The length of time since teachers had taken art courses or had participated in workshops varied from one year or less to twelve or more years. A little more than half of the teachers had received some training in art education within

Table 2**Respondents' Background Training in Teaching Art**

Studied Art	N = 84	Percentage
High School	10	12
1-3 University Courses	36	43
Art Majors	6	6
Art Minors	3	4
Workshops	62	74

the year prior to the survey, with most teachers (76%) in the sample having received training within the last three years. This suggests that most teachers have recently been involved in some form of teacher training for art education (see Table 3). How relevant this training is for implementation of the curriculum will be explored later in the discussion of interview results.

Three quarters of the sample had been teaching art for five years or less. As can be seen from Table 4, most teachers were relatively new to art education, with 71% having taught art only within the last four years.

Table 3

Years Since Respondents' Last Participation in Art Training Workshop(s)

Years Since Last Training	N = 84	Percentage*
<hr/>		
0	48	56
2	8	10
3	8	10
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
10	2	2
12+	4	5

*Percentage totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

Table 4

Respondents' Years of Teaching Art

Years of Teaching Art	N = 84	Percentage*
0	15	18
2	24	29
3	12	14
4	8	10
5	3	4
6	1	1
9	1	1
10	2	1
12+	4	19

*Percentage totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

Table 5 reveals that while most teachers indicated they taught art because it was assigned to them (61%), only one stated that she was asked to teach it because she was trained in art education. Less than one third (30%) chose to teach art, while only 6% reported that it was assigned but that they also wanted to teach it.

Table 5

Respondents' Teaching Assignment to Art

Art Teaching Assignment	N = 84	Percentage*
Art was assigned	51	61
Trained to teach	1	2
Chose to teach	25	30
Assigned and wanted to teach	5	6

*Percentage totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

As is demonstrated by the numbers in Table 6, no one thought teaching art was easy. Almost two thirds of the teachers said it was difficult and some found it very difficult; suggesting that a large majority found teaching art difficult.

As can be seen from Table 7, if given a choice only a few teachers indicated that they would teach art for a majority of their teaching time, while almost two-thirds responded that they would prefer to teach it only some of the time, and nearly one third stated that they preferred not to teach it at all. It might be that teachers who find teaching art difficult are also not likely to choose it as a preferred subject area. However there may be other reasons related to the lower status

accorded to teaching art and the limited resources available to implement the programs.

Table 6

Respondents' Perception of Difficulty in Teaching Art

Perception of Teaching Art	N = 84	Percentage
Easy	0	0
Somewhat easy	16	19
Difficult	53	63
Very difficult	15	18

Table 7

Respondents' Workload Preference for Teaching Art

Workload Preference for Teaching Art	N = 84	Percentage
Majority of the time	10	12
Some of the time	50	59
Not at all	24	29

Table 8

Respondents' Opinions on Art Education

Statements	SA %	A %	D %	SD %*
1. Provides opportunities/self-expression	57	41	2	0
2. Promotes sensitivity to others	14	67	16	1
3. Does not develop cognitive learning	1	10	71	18
4. Develops self-image	24	67	10	0
5. Benefits students with innate artistic ability	1	11	52	35
6. Uniquely contributes to total education	33	61	5	1
7. Ranks in importance with math and English	4	37	46	12
8. Mainly a form of recreation and relaxation	2	30	56	12
9. Develops independent thinking/ problem-solving	17	70	13	0
10. Is an educational frill	0	7	58	35
11. Is a waste of school funds	0	6	50	44

*Percentages totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

A summary of the profile of the sample suggests that most teachers had taught grades 7, 8 and 9 art for less than five years, had taken few university courses or workshops on art education, and had undergone some form of art training within the past one to three years. Very few teachers were art majors and therefore specialists. Most teachers were teaching art because it was assigned to them and would prefer to teach it only some of the time. The vast majority found it difficult and almost a third of the sample would prefer not to have to teach art at all.

Teachers' Opinions of Art Education

In Section One of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to reflect on and rate nine statements on the importance of art education for students. They were then asked to indicate which of the nine statements most and least represented their opinions on art education. The results are reported in percentages on a question by question basis (see Table 8).

Almost all teachers agreed that art education provides students opportunities for self-expression; most felt it promoted sensitivity among students. Teachers were very positive about the importance of art education for the development of self-image, and for practise in problem-solving. Also most of the teachers felt that art uniquely contributes to the total education of students. A large majority of teachers agreed that art education was important in promoting cognitive learning; however only slightly less than half could rank it as equal in importance to mathematics and English for the students' overall education.

Many teachers disagreed with the notion that art was only valuable for students who had innate artistic abilities, and more than two-thirds disagreed that doing art was mainly a form of recreation and relaxation. Finally it appears that most teachers supported the inclusion of art education as important to students' education, since only few saw it as an educational frill, and fewer still saw it as a waste of school funds.

Overall, the results seem to indicate that teachers held a high regard for art education. Nevertheless the views that it does not rank as highly as mathematics and English and that almost one third of the teachers consider it mainly a form of recreation and relaxation are deserving of further inquiry.

When asked which of the nine statements best reflected their opinion of art education, sensitivity training and art

education's contribution to the total education of students were clearly the two categories most frequently selected by teachers (Table 9). The opinions which least represented the teachers' views on art education were that art instruction was an educational frill and that spending on art education was a waste of school funds (Table 10).

Table 9

Opinions Most Reflecting Teachers' Views on Art Education

Statements	Frequency	%
Provides opportunities/self-expression	33	39
Develops self-image	6	7

Table 10

Opinions Least Reflecting Teachers' Views on Art Education

Statements	Frequency	%
Benefits students with innate artistic ability	9	11
Mainly a form of recreation and relaxation	6	7
An educational frill	21	25
A waste of school funds	36	43

Teachers' Participation in Art Activities

Teachers were asked how often they participated in a variety of art-related activities such as: visiting an art gallery, museum or studio (art places); reading art books or magazines; discussing art with artists; and purchasing art works done by professional artists.

As can be seen in Table 11, it appears that a majority of teachers were seldom involved in visiting art places and discussing art with artists. More than one third of teachers seldom went to art places in the past year, and an equal percent had never been at all, while nearly half of the teachers seldom discussed art and more than one third never talked about it. Overall this suggests minimal interaction between art teachers and the art community. The majority of teachers seldom read art literature during the year. Very few of the teachers met with artists to discuss art, and hardly any teachers bought art done by professional artists. The low rates of participation in art-related activities may reflect the lack of availability of art resources in their communities.

Table 11

Respondents' Participation in Art-Related Activities

Activities	Frequently	Seldom	Total
	%	%	%
Visiting art places	19	78	97*
Reading art literature	40	60	100
Discussing art with artist	8	92	100
Buying art	2	96	98*

*Percentage less than 100% indicates missing data

Frequently = 5 times or more a year

Seldom = 0 to 4 times a year

Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide For Grades 7, 8 and 9

Teachers were asked to indicate which curriculum guides were being used in their schools. Almost two-thirds of the teachers were using the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide For Grades 7, 8 and 9, while some were using school board guides or were using both guides (Table 12).

Table 12

Art Guides Used by Teachers

Art Guides	N = 84	Percentage
Draft Provincial Guide (1)	52	62
School Board Guide (2)	11	16
Other Resources (3)	1	1
(1) and (3)	5	6
(1) and (2)	13	16
(2) and (3)	1	1
(1), (2) and (3)	1	1

When asked whether the teachers had a copy of the provincial guide, almost all teachers responded positively. Sixty-three percent of the teachers reported that they had discussed the implementation of the curriculum in the guide with an art specialist or art coordinator. As well, 64% of teachers had access to occasional workshops or training sessions which discussed implementation. Availability of the guide did not appear to be a problem; however, the overall lack of art training for many of the teachers might have posed a serious limitation on their ability to implement the curriculum as outlined in the guide.

As can be seen from Table 13, more than two thirds of

teachers thought that the language used in the guide was clear, while slightly less than that number felt that the art concepts were well explained, suggesting that for most teachers clarity was not a problem.

Table 13

Clarity of the Guide

	Yes	No	Other	Total*
Clarity in Explaining Areas	%	%	%	%
Language	68	26	1	95
Art Concepts	64	27	1	92

*Percentage totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

Almost two thirds of the teachers used the provincial guide at least monthly, while slightly less than half used it at least weekly. It was surprising to learn that almost one third reported that they had hardly ever used the guide; instead they relied on other or their own resources for teaching art.

Teachers were asked for their opinions about how useful they found the provincial guide in implementing the seven areas of curriculum as follows:

1. learning art concepts for teaching;
2. initiating class discussion for visual analysis;
3. planning a sequence of lessons within grades;
4. developing a sequence between grades 7 to 9;
5. acquiring a vocabulary for understanding and communicating art terms and concepts;
6. developing skills and techniques in art production;
7. and learning criteria for evaluation of students' growth and development in art skills and production.

Overall it appears that the majority of teachers did find the guide useful, to some degree, in all seven areas of curriculum implementation. As can be seen from Table 14, there is a relatively large amount of missing data in response to every question, suggesting either superficial use of the guide by the teachers, a lack of understanding of the guide or, possibly, a lack of understanding of the survey questions. Where the guide seemed to be least useful was in helping teachers to develop art skills and to acquire criteria for evaluating students' performance.

Table 14

Respondents' Perceived Usefulness of the Guide

Content Area	Very Useful %	Somewhat Useful %	Not Useful %	Total %*
Learning art concepts	11	62	6	79
Class discussion	17	54	12	72
Lesson sequencing	18	48	16	8
Grade sequencing	18	49	13	80
Vocabulary for terms and concepts	13	61	7	81
Developing art skills	5	61	17	82
Criteria for evaluation	5	57	19	81

*Percentages totalling less than 100% indicate missing data

Material and Human Resources

Teachers were asked about the availability of art resources in the school and/or community, including:

1. the provision of art books;
2. the existence of suitable facilities for teaching art;
3. the adequacy of supplies and equipment;

4. the presence of art galleries and studios in their community;
5. the display of art in their schools.

The results indicate the teachers' perceptions of the extent of resources both in the school and in the community which might be supportive of the implementation of art programs.

As can be seen from Table 15, only half of the teachers indicated that the art books mentioned in the guide were available in their schools. However a large number of teachers stated that there were other relevant books available, suggesting that a majority of teachers were using art books other than those mentioned in the guide.

Table 15

Material Resources for Art Curriculum Implementation

	Yes	No	Total*
Resource Availability	%	%	%
Books mentioned in the guide	50	39	89
Other art books	75	23	98
Suitable facilities	38	61	99
Sufficient supplies and equipment	54	45	99
Galleries and studios	30	68	98
Art displayed in school	21	76	97

*Percentages totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

Almost two thirds of the teachers indicated that the room in which they taught art was unsuitable for implementing the program. This could place serious environmental constraints on a significant number of teachers charged with the implementation of art curriculum. A further limitation might be imposed by the perceived lack of adequate art materials, since only slightly more than half of respondents thought supplies and equipment were sufficient to implement the program. Opportunities for visual appreciation of the arts also seemed to be lacking, since few teachers had art displayed in their schools and slightly less than one third of the teachers knew of art galleries or studios in their communities open to teachers and students.

On the whole there appeared to be few resources in the schools and communities to assist teachers in the implementation of the art curriculum as outlined in the guide. The constraints imposed by the lack of adequate school resources, facilities and supplies may explain the relatively low number of teachers who used the guide, since they believe that they could not implement the suggestions contained therein. The perceived scarcity of community art resources (galleries, museums and artist studios) available to the teachers and students may pose a further limitation on the supports which could enhance art education. Three quarters of the teachers were aware of other art books not mentioned in the guide.

Preparation time, number of classes and the suitability

of class scheduling for teaching art may affect the degree of implementation of an art program. As shown in Table 16 slightly less than one third of teachers believed that they had enough time to prepare adequately for teaching the art program. Only half of teachers felt that they had sufficient time in the schedule to implement the program. Almost two-thirds however found that the times scheduled for teaching art were suitable. If teachers perceived that there was a lack of adequate preparation and teaching time, this could clearly have acted as a further impediment to implementation of the art program.

Table 16

Time to Implement Art Curriculum

Time Factor	Yes	No	Total*
	%	%	%
Adequate preparation time	32	66	98
Sufficient teaching time	50	49	99
Suitable timetabling	66	32	98

*Percentages totalling less than 100% indicates missing data

Teachers were asked how important principals, art coordinators, other teachers, parents, school and public librarians, local artists and other people were in supporting the art program in their schools. As can be seen from Table 17, teachers felt most strongly about the roles of the art coordinator and the principal; nearly half of the teachers felt that these two categories of human resources were very important in supporting the art program. Less prominent, but still a factor, appeared to be the influence of their colleagues, as nearly one third of the teachers thought that other teachers were very important to implementation. The apparent absence of local artists, with one quarter of the teachers having indicated they were not available, and the large amount of missing data perhaps suggest either a lack of knowledge about the presence of artists in the community or that there were in fact few artists available to them.

The fact that less than one third of teachers thought that interaction with artists was important to the art program may be a further reflection on the absence of artists or their lack of involvement with the schools. Perhaps if more artists were available to schools they would come to be seen as an important human resource.

Table 17

Human Resources for Art Curriculum Implementation

Human Resources	Very Impt. %	Somewhat Impt. %	Not Impt. %	Not Avail. %	Total %*
Principal	41	42	17	0	100
Art Coordinator	43	31	4	14	92
Other Teachers	30	49	17	1	97
Parents	10	33	49	2	94
School Librarian	10	37	33	13	93
Public Librarian	5	17	46	19	87
Local Artist(s)	12	20	23	30	85
Other(s)	0	4	0	0	4

*Percentages totalling less than 100% indicate missing data

The data presented here from the results of the survey may be further explained and interpreted through clarification of factors identified by the two art teachers who participated in the in-depth interviews. The interview findings might help to cross-validate the importance of some of the educational factors identified in the survey which may be pertinent to the use of the guide in the implementation of the art curriculum.

Analysis of the Interview Data

The two teachers interviewed, T1 and T2, were asked to talk about their perceptions of the usefulness and practicality of the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8, and 9 and the implications of their observations for the implementation of the art program in their classes and schools. Also included in the analysis are their perceptions of the importance of art education, and the extent to which art programs are supported by material, temporal and human resources. These factors are explored as part of an overall review of elements which may contribute to the degree of curriculum implementation as outlined in the guide.

Background Information on T1 and T2

T1's only experience in art was during his own junior high school education. T1 was assigned to teach art within an integrated Grade 8 class. He also taught several other subjects. In his opinion, the students in Grade 8 (in his school) did not hold a high regard for art. T1 reported a commonly held view by Grade 8 students in his school, "We participate in sport, not art or choir." There was a weekend art class run by a volunteer teacher (interested in art but not a specialist), and T1 observed that many of the students who attended her class were from the lower grades.

T2, as an art specialist, taught mainly art classes in

Grades 7, 8 and 9. He had also previously taught art at the high school level. He had six classes of Grade 7 students with approximately forty students in each class; six classes of Grade 8 students with approximately of twenty students in each class; and five classes of Grade 9 with approximately 20 students in each class. His other relevant experience included participation in previous years on the art curriculum development committee. The art program in T2's school was spread over three years, from Grades 7 to 9. T2 and the Music Teacher, whose program also spread over three years ran adjacent to the art program on the timetable, decided to team up to split their programs into the music and art streams at Grade 8 instead of the Grade 9 level. They obtained permission from the School Board to do this. T2 thought that splitting at the Grade 8 level was good in that it provided better organization and presentation of the course, and more interaction with students was possible because the groups were smaller (half of the group of 40 went to music and half to art).

To facilitate the explanation and clarification of the survey results, the description and analysis of T1's and T2's observations on art education is organized according to the different sections of the questionnaire.

The Importance of Art Education

T1 found it difficult to explain the educational benefits

of the art program and made some suggestions like, "let the students create; let them work together; let them express themselves through art..."

T1 believed that art is as important as other subjects like mathematics and English for the Grade 8 level. He suggested that at that level the students are integrating and consolidating what was learned in Grades 5, 6 and 7. T1 thought that at the Grade 8 level there should not be an overemphasis on intellectual activity, rather the students should be exposed to as many subject areas as possible in order to help them make a choice about future course selection. He also viewed art as a social opportunity for the students to work together before they moved into Grade 9 and selected the different courses and programs they would like to take. Some students, he suggested, would continue to take art since it was more important to them. Therefore he felt that it was necessary to continue to offer art in higher grades.

Furthermore, because his students had a high overall average score, some of them over a 90% average, T1 thought that the students should have time "to play with art" as a form of recreation and relaxation which could relieve some of the pressures associated with achievement in some of the "more serious" subjects. While T1 believed that art is an important part of the total education of the students, he would appear to reflect a view shared by many teachers in the survey that art also, if only partially, serves a more recreational and

relaxation function. The guide shares that view: it states that "Studio work provides relief from academic pursuits in art and in other subject areas" (Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9, 1986, p. 6).

T2 believes art is basic to education and should be taught right from kindergarten. He expressed the view that:

... the manual skills and thinking skills that the students get in the art program are important to develop because the experience gained will make the learning and production in other subject areas much more meaningful, enjoyable and fulfilling.

In this way T2 seemed to reflect a view of art as enhancing other subject areas. T2 thought that the art program provided this enhancing experience which students do not get in the other programs. T2 believes that skills are transferable. He stated:

Whatever skills they can develop in the art room will help them along the line in other areas, because in education there is an overlapping in different areas although we put things in different slots that we call math. and science. I think that art is one of the basic ones that can help good concept development and can develop good manual dexterity as well.

T2 thought that art education made a unique contribution since it enhanced students' visual appreciation. As an example, he stated:

When one is painting a landscape, one is looking at the sky to appreciate whether it is a foggy misty day or whether it is a bright sunny day. What the students will notice is not brought out in other subject areas.

T1 and T2 believed that art education is important in promoting self-expression. T1 was of the opinion that "... art is what results when a human being expresses himself/herself; the result can be emotional or it can be anything." T1 went on to talk about the way flowers were laid out in his garden:

When I am out in the garden planting flowers, I stand back and think about how it should be organized. To me that is art. It is an outward expression of my feeling. Everything that "makes me" is laid out in the flower bed--that's me.

T2 went even further with this aspect of art as an opportunity for self-expression and saw art as applying to all areas of a student's life, including what they wore, what they saw in the media and how they viewed diagrams in textbooks.

Both T1 and T2 appeared to clarify and support the almost

unanimous view of art teachers in the survey that art education is an important element of a student's education in providing opportunities for self-expression.

Prior Training To Using The Guide

T1 as well as T2 used the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 as the only official resource for their implementation of art programs.

Perhaps not unlike the 61% of the respondents of the survey who taught art because it was assigned to them and not because they chose the area, T1 was given a copy of the guide and told that he had to teach art. He reflected back on the experience:

I had no prior instruction in art. I didn't really know where to start. I tried to do the drawing module which is the first unit in the Guide. That did not mean a thing to me. The Introduction Section did not help me much either. There was no way to proceed or to make a start ... I was not even informed about the teaching time required for art and later found this out from a colleague who informed me that it would be an hour for an eight-day cycle.

T1's introduction to teaching art may or may not be typical of how other teachers were prepared to teach the

subject. If the guide is to be a resource for such inexperienced art teachers who otherwise may also have limited materials, space, time or human resources available to them, it may well have an important, if not crucial, role to play in aiding teachers with limited art backgrounds in the implementation of the art curriculum.

T1 initially tried to carefully follow the guide step by step. T2 however does not use it that often because, as he said, he adopted a different approach to teaching art, especially in the area of concepts and skills development as will be described later.

Usefulness of the Guide

T2 found the guide useful in helping him structure his art program into specific areas--drawing, painting, print-making and sculpture--for exploration and development. He took into consideration his own experience, the facilities he has available, and he plans according to constraints on his time and the number of students in his classes. He found the guide's philosophy of a "hands-on" studio approach and the stress on skill and concept development(matched his own approach). It was his belief that "to be a good artist one also needs to be a good mechanic. One cannot produce something no matter how good one's ideas are if one cannot handle the materials."

Concepts and skills.

T2 taught the mechanics of using art materials first before teaching the concepts. He felt that this approach helped him to develop concepts and skills within the time constraints. He also felt that getting the students involved in doing art was a factor in avoiding discipline problems in the classroom.

T1 did not find that the guide's objectives were clearly stated. He felt that it needed a great deal of "reading out and into it." At the beginning of his experience in teaching art, T1 tried to closely follow the guide's objectives. For example, in the drawing module, he taught a little theory and adopted one of the suggested activities using various techniques to illustrate the theory, but he found it difficult. However, he thought that the guide did lead him, "in a small way," through line, shape, texture, value and shading; but in order to organize his lesson, he has had to combine what he learned from workshops with what is in the guide.

T1's discomfort in teaching art had a lot to do with his lack of familiarity with the concepts and terms used in describing methods with which he had not had much experience. Perhaps this is best reflected in T1's overriding and frank comment that, when teaching art, unlike when he is teaching other subjects, he does not know what he is doing. He stated that he used to feel the same way about teaching religion until he received a "good" text book. He believes he would

enjoy teaching art if he had better directions on how to teach it more effectively.

Developing art skills.

Only 5% of teacher respondents in the survey felt that the guide was very useful for the development of instructional art skills in the teachers. While T2 stated that he has been able to make effective use of the guide, it must be remembered that as an art specialist with a major in Art Education, he is representative of only 6% of the sample of survey respondents. T1's experience may be more typical of the majority of teachers who are looking to the guide for the development of their art skills for instructional uses. The fact that T2 found the guide very useful may be an indication of the level of understanding and expertise required to make effective use of the guide.

Class discussion with the use of slides.

The guide offers sets of visual slides with suggestions for stimulating discussion of art concepts. Again a small percent (17%) of the survey teachers found the guide's section on using slides very useful in facilitating class discussion of art. A strong "somewhat useful" response (54%) and a large amount of missing data (18%) may indicate some uncertainty about the slides' usefulness in promoting classroom discussion.

T1 tried to use the guide to help with discussing art but found that the guide was not very helpful. The difficulties he experienced are reflected in his comments:

The slides were suggesting things, and I felt like a student--which is the way it should be because of my limited background--but I did not go anywhere because there was no one there to lead the instruction or guide the discussion. I did not know what to ask. I did not like the experience with using the slides, and so I did not use them this year.

He went on to say:

It is like teaching a book you did not read, I did not know anything about it and did not know what I was talking about; for example, knowing the meaning of "value." I looked at the slides--What am I supposed to say to the students? "Do you see value there? See dark and light"? I give you one more example: the kids will say, "this is round or square or smooth"--what can I add? "What is round"?

T2 also found using the slides problematic. He did not use all the slides because he found some of them "not applicable for his students--too philosophical and too far out for students to catch on." Although he did not use them all, he

felt that some of the slides could be integrated with the slides which he designed himself.

T2 did not always discuss art or motivate students with the slides or visuals. He thought discussion and analysis of art could take a long time and he noted that:

Depending on the grade level, it is very difficult for 20 or 40 students to be absorbed in a class discussion on a number of lessons over a long period of time. The students without having done the practical work do not realise the process that has gone into developing the applied concepts and skills, and therefore cannot appreciate what they are seeing.

T2 however looked at other people's art where it was appropriate in the syllabus. For example, when he taught cartoons in Grade 8, the students looked at Lynn Johnson's works, saw a film about her work, and looked at some of her books of cartoons prior to doing their own art. T2 thought this approach was necessary to provide a direct connection between process and outcomes. He felt that the students had to study the artist's works first in order to appreciate and understand what had gone into them.

T2 also mentioned that the inexperienced art teachers he talked to at the Newfoundland Teachers' Association (N.T.A.) Annual Art Conference expressed difficulty with using the

slides. He reflected on their experiences by observing that, "Lacking knowledge in art they indicated that they are not comfortable with using the slides and therefore do not tend to use them with the students."

These critical comments of T1 and T2 highlight the difficulties with using the slides in class discussion and may further illustrate the previously stated problems with interpreting the "somewhat useful" category of the teachers' responses in the survey.

Evaluation.

When asked about the usefulness of the guide for evaluating art learning, only 5% found it very useful, 57% somewhat useful, 19% not useful and 19% missing data. The difficulties in interpreting the somewhat useful category for evaluation may be overcome by the explanations offered in the teacher interviews.

T2 did not have any problem with the evaluation section of the guide, mainly because he had worked in the evaluation area for so long that it was "second nature" to him. He agreed with the section in the guide about evaluation. T2 however envisaged difficulties on the part of inexperienced teachers in using this section. He noted:

This section has got nice big broad guidelines but it doesn't tell the teachers specifically what to look for. In this way inexperienced art teachers

would not know what to look for in a painting; what skills the students should have; how they should develop; how they should use the equipment and so on ... The problem always comes back to experience, and without a doubt, a quality art education program would be given by an experienced art teacher using the guide.

T2 thought that inexperienced teachers would also have difficulty in identifying examples of creativity. If students do something different the teacher may dismiss it because it is not exactly what he/she wanted them to do. They may not see, and therefore neglect to acknowledge and reinforce, the creativity.

T1 did not find the section on evaluation in the guide very useful. He found evaluation somewhat problematic because he did not know what he should be assessing since he was not familiar with evaluation criteria for art. He was therefore not sure whether his students were getting anything out of the program. This problem of evaluation was often discussed between T1 and the other Grade 8 teacher. They had similar problems at art workshops in understanding the evaluation criteria. When the art specialist showed examples of "good" works done by her students, he and the other teachers could not see what made the work good.

T1 believes that art is ambiguous and he was not sure whether his students had learned anything from his art

lessons. He felt he could only evaluate a student on technical skills, like how to hold a pencil, on how to roll the ink or even on how to clean the brush--mechanical techniques that T1 had learned in the workshops. Lacking criteria to judge the students' performance in art, he could not grade art like the other subjects he taught.

T1 also found testing in art a problem because, in his opinion, tests are administered on subjects that the students answer verbally. He did not think, therefore, a test was the correct way to evaluate, for example, "drawing value."

T1 stated, "It may be that we cop out because art is, to us, simply something that students are involved in, and we don't actually give it a grade." T1 thought that art should be evaluated "perhaps by seeing what the students are putting into their work and what they appear to be getting out of it, irrespective of other objectives or criteria."

T1 added that in other subjects, he would question whether the concepts were understood by the students or he would assess what he was doing, but in art he did not find any criteria in the guide for evaluation.

T1 recognized that he did not know the criteria upon which to judge what is good or bad art work when he said, "I cannot evaluate if this painting is better than the one a student did last week ... There is no way I am going to tell the students (or even know how to tell them) whether it is right or wrong, or if it is a good or a bad job." The

evaluation system of the school is based on attaining objectives and the students' grades reflect the degree that objectives are being met. T1's objective was getting the students involved in doing art. He evaluated students' performance in art based on their degree of involvement. Nobody failed in his school because projects were evaluated on an individual basis, that is, "according to each student's ability." He felt very satisfied with his teaching when the students worked hard and were very involved in what they were doing. T1 stated that "after a couple of workshops and a year's experience in teaching art, I have a good enough sense to be able to tell by looking at the students sitting there saying, 'I am enjoying it or this is trash'." T1 believed that the students took their art classes seriously; not just as an opportunity for "free time."

T2 evaluated his own art program by looking at the guide and making sure that he had covered the areas mentioned in it. He constantly checked whether he was giving the students a quality art program within the time, monetary and physical space restrictions set by the School Board. On the whole T2 felt very happy with what he was doing although he felt that some areas could be improved if he had more teaching time.

Sequencing of art instruction: grades 7 to 9.

According to T2, the guide does not say specifically what the teachers should do in each grade except that the four

areas--drawing, painting, printmaking and sculpture--should be explored during Grades 7 to 9. T2, however, did not really think that this lack of specific direction in sequencing was a weakness because of the many variables involved in the art program. He explained that,

Much depends on the school situation and teachers' qualifications and experience. Furthermore not all schools offer art over three years. Some schools offer it for only one year and others for two years. Also the time allotted for art in each school is not the same.

For these reasons, T2 thought that the guide could not be too specific. He elaborated:

Students coming from elementary and other schools to Grade 7 have different types of skills and abilities and one can find a variety of abilities within one group from one school. Therefore when students come in at a Grade 7 level, the teachers are working with a real hodgepodge both in past experience, attitude and ability level because they are not streamed in each homeroom. There is no continuity from elementary to Grade 7 and from one school to another. Given the varying backgrounds of students, the guide has to be flexible. Any one particular emphasis in the guide may not be effect-

ive for all students who have had such a mix of experiences and education in art.

T2 explained that the same lack of continuity applies from Junior High to Senior High School:

Though students in Junior High are supposed to be exposed to the four areas in the art program somewhere, it does not specifically say where. Also not specified is what the students have achieved in those four units in that particular time. The Senior High School Course Art 1000 at Grade 10 level is designed as an Introduction to the art program. The art teachers giving that course get students who have a wide diversity of abilities and experience in that group; it is also possible that the art teachers get students who do not have any art background at all and need to be trained from the beginning.

As there is an overlap of both concepts and skills education within the four separate areas, T2 planned art activities that would lead from one area to the next; for example, teaching drawing before painting.

T1, who taught art in Grade 8 only, also observed that the guide was not clear on sequencing information and was lacking in specifics on what to teach in each grade. He has often had discussions on the sequencing of art instruction

with the other grade 8 teacher. Together they decided that they would sequence art instruction for the various grade levels in the same way they sequenced instruction in the decimal system, with classes getting more detailed as the grades got higher.

Results from the survey revealed that 18% of teachers considered the guide very useful for lesson and grade sequencing, while approximately 48% saw it as somewhat useful. With 20% of the data missing, it is difficult to conclude that the guide is particularly helpful for sequencing, given that there is no specific mention of methods for planning a sequence of lessons or grades. Also, teachers may interpret sequencing to mean, for example, drawing before painting, as T2 did. The issue of sequencing from grade level to grade level was not addressed in the guide. Perhaps the teachers found it helpful to have the different areas of drawing, painting, printmaking and sculpture listed so that they could decide among themselves which sequence to follow within these areas, was appropriate for Grades 7 through 9. But given the lack of training of most teachers responsible for art, it seems unlikely that they would be aided very much by the information presented, in planning a sequence of lessons or grades. Planning over a sequence of grades is further complicated by the inconsistent offering, and sometimes even the complete absence of, art classes in Grades 7 through 9.

T1 described his own experience with this lack of

continuity. He remembered his own school environment when he was taught art. T1 specifically recalled the time he spent on a soapstone carving. It took him three months to complete it. His carving along with the other works produced by his school were displayed in the library at Memorial University. He remembered going there one day and was very delighted to see his work displayed. He found art enjoyable; however when asked why he didn't carry on doing art given his satisfying experience, the reply was that "art was not offered at grade 8 level. The teacher was gone and that was it! You know the way it is. It very much depends on who is in the school."

Human Resources and Community Support

T1 and T2 were not asked specifically how important the human and material resources were to implementing their art programs; however, when asked how they thought art was ranked with other subjects, both teachers felt that the administration would not consider art high in priority. T1's comment was:

Art is considered a regular part of the general school curriculum, but it is not given high priority on the general overall timetable schedule. In an 8-day cycle, art is given two 30-minute periods (or 1 hour in a 8-day cycle) as compared to 1 1/2 hours for religion; 7 hours for language arts, 7 1/2 hours for French. According to the new

Junior High Program, more time should be given to art and woodworking. Compared to time allotted to other subject areas, one can see that art is regarded as outside of the core curriculum.

T1 thought that the administration would rate mathematics and language arts highest in importance. Art and music would probably be considered least important. Physical education and French are also more heavily emphasized than art education.

Although T2 could not be sure, he thought that his students would not rank art education very highly, because they tended to look at things "vocation-wise" and did not see art as relevant to their future work. T2 thought that in Newfoundland art is still mainly looked upon as a hobby and not as professional work. Because there are few job opportunities for people who are trained in art, T2 thought that it was hard to give the subject equal emphasis. He therefore believed that career counsellors would probably rank art low on the scale. He also thought that his teaching colleagues would probably not rank art high on the scale because many of them had little art training, and they were not familiar with what went on in his classroom. He was not sure whether they would see any benefit to taking art.

School support.

Although money was in the budget for art programs, T1

felt that he and his colleague did not request it,

... because we do not know what we need. We see the things mentioned in the guide but we are not really sure about how to use them. The workshops that we attended have helped us to understand better what might be needed and financial support can be obtained easily from the principal if so required.

Board support.

In T1's community the Board sponsors a big art show every Spring at the local Shopping Mall where it exhibits art works done by students from Kindergarten to 12. T1 thought some of the work done by older students was impressive. This display helps to broaden the community's awareness of art. He believed that the Board had started to put more emphasis on art in recent years.

It is only four or five years ago that it began putting on the huge display of art every year. The Board also actually hired a full time professionally trained art teacher for the local high school. That teacher is used as a resource person in other areas of the Board. The Board has a coordinator who is partially responsible for art. There is no professionally trained art teacher in

the elementary or primary schools.

Art specialist.

T1 believed that the art specialist is of great help to the art teachers in his school. He found that the specialist has been indispensable, and without that person's help it would have been more difficult, if not impossible, to understand many of the assignments in the guide.

T1 reported that,

When a workshop is needed the art specialist is given a day off to conduct it. The specialist and the co-ordinator plan the workshop and call in the teachers into the Board. There may be 25 teachers in the workshop.

T1 attended the workshops planned for the Grade 7, 8 and 9 teachers. They offered hands-on experience, "hands with ink up to the armpits." T1 was very pleased to hear from the art specialist that the former students of T1 and his colleague, whom she was teaching this current year, seemed to be better in art. T1's happy comment was, "We must be doing something right."

The art co-ordinator.

The co-ordinator responsible for art visits T1's school regularly to determine whether teachers require help. He

arranges workshops when he sees that there is a need. The co-ordinator arranges, with the art specialist, workshops which cover the four areas mentioned in the guide. T1 pointed out: "the teachers complain among themselves about the problems regarding teaching what is in the guide but they have not had the chance to address these problems in writing or to discuss them with the co-ordinator." This suggests that, at least for some teachers, there are not enough workshops to deal with implementation problems despite the co-ordinators' regular visits.

T2 understands that a new Art Coordinator has been appointed in his Board. However, he has not met him/her; neither has he received any communication.

Preparation time.

It was clear from the survey results that less than one third of the teachers (32%) felt that they had sufficient time to prepare for art classes.

Because of his limited knowledge of art, T1 found it difficult to plan art lessons, therefore they took a lot of time from his day. He did not think he could afford to take a half hour to prepare for one hour's class work, especially when there is a lot to do in his normal work day, such as correcting and planning lessons for other subjects. He therefore felt that he should find a faster way to prepare art lessons. T1 indicated that he also has a family life and that

he found he could not be up till 11:00 every night doing class preparation. He indicated that some subjects like social studies and mathematics took less planning time than art. T1 stated:

I feel I am two people when I teach art. I can say that in some weeks when I find it so difficult to prepare (I always prepare ahead exactly what it is that I want the students to do) that I feel very hesitant to get the lesson started. However, once I get the lesson going, I always stand back and say, this is going well. They are loving it and I should really make sure that I do this every week; but when next week rolls around, and when something happens, I would say let us go on till next week.

T2 made no mention of difficulties with having sufficient preparation time for art classes. His experience and background knowledge in art might help to explain this. The structured approach he adopted requires specific instructions. The students are given information sheets regarding their assignments and what they are expected to cover in terms of concepts, techniques and materials. As a specialist who has been teaching art for several years, his lessons were prepared in detail. However he did seem to be very concerned about insufficient time to implement the program. For example, in the case of discussing Lynn Johnson's works, T2 outlined the

time and class periods he would take to complete the project. He stated:

It takes a whole lesson to explain what her style is, where she gets her ideas from and to look at the film; then it takes another lesson to point out the drawing techniques that she uses or any cartoon artist uses. Such an exercise would probably take one cycle out of 36 (or even may be only 30 allotted for the whole school year considering time taken off for exams., snowstorms, assemblies, furnace trouble and fire drills). It is all a question of time ... it is not an appropriate use of time to get into discussion and analysis too heavily with inexperienced students when time is better spent with a hands-on approach.

Approaches to Teaching Art

As mentioned earlier, T1 organized his lessons from what he learned in the workshops combined with what he gained from the guide. His objectives for "student involvement" in the art lesson were not written down and given to the art students as was done with his other courses. He sounded almost apologetic when he added, "I have not formalized the art course."

However, T1 felt his instructional development background

helped him to recognize and understand when his students lacked confidence in doing art and needed direction to know what they were supposed to do. T1 tried to encourage the students to help dispel their fears of doing poorly in art by giving direction on applying techniques such as how to hold and use a pencil when drawing and rolling the ink. These are techniques he learned from participating in the workshops concerned with implementation of the curriculum contained in the guide.

T1 did not really know where to start in teaching the art program. During his first year of teaching, he tried to use the guide to help students with discussing art but personally found the experience uncomfortable. He tried to understand the principles and elements of design. During the year of the interview T1's emphasis in his approach to teaching was on "making" art.

As mentioned earlier, T2 took a different instructional approach from the one advocated in the guide. He first taught the mechanics of using art materials and supplies before concentrating on the concepts. T2 stated that "this is not a materials-based approach, but is founded on his belief that 'unless the students can handle the different media they will not be able to develop the concepts because they do not know where to start'." He believed that his approach to developing the ability to handle materials would prevent students from getting too frustrated at the beginning. He further believed

that his approach was useful in ensuring that an art project involved a concept and a material or a style of art. He also aimed at completion of a project or assignment within a specified time limit. Because of limited class time, T2 was convinced that it was necessary for the students to know exactly what they should be doing at a particular time in order to keep to the schedule of each project. As part of his more structured approach to teaching art, T2 provided all the students with information sheets with technical terms, the concepts to be learned, and what was to be included in the assignment. The information sheets were kept in an exercise book, to which the students added their illustrations. Using this integrated approach, T2 felt that,

In their little exercise books, which are called portfolios, the students demonstrate their learning about the concepts, the techniques they have used and their familiarity with the equipment through the art work they have produced from whichever area they are working in.

T2 realized that there might be a problem with his approach. It might not allow students time to find their own ways to solve problems or to get familiar with materials; nevertheless with his more structured approach he believed that there was a greater likelihood that the students would get a bigger overall picture, thus allowing them to learn

about more concepts and materials with less frustration. This more controlled approach, he thought would also mean less problems with discipline. T2 felt that a learning and developing structure worked best in his situation considering the students, the time available and the facility restrictions he has had to work with.

T2 took the integrated and more structured approach to teaching art, instead of dividing each lesson into sections as suggested in the guide. The guide recommends discussing slides, their themes or subject matter, the use of media and technique in production and lastly discussing the students' work.

T2 felt that "the discussion of art work normally goes on in their work stations. If the students were impressed with somebody's work they either told that person or asked him to tell their friends to look at it."

T2 saw art education as a retention experience not unlike other subjects such as mathematics, history and English. His more structured approach to teaching, involving testing students on the terms and concepts they have learned, emphasized the importance he attached to the retention aspect of art education.

Teachers' Recommendations

T2 believed that a good basic workshop for the four main areas would be useful for teachers without an art background.

Teachers without such backgrounds need to be familiar with certain basic techniques and media. T2 felt that some areas of teacher training were not appropriate. For example, he thought that the four-week summer school run by Memorial University Faculty of Education, though it provided a wonderful experience for teachers' own development of art skills, was not specifically targeted to improving art instruction. The course is intensive and covers a lot in depth, but the problem is that it is aimed at training teachers to be artists--learning how to use acrylics and oil paints and to stretch a canvas--unrealistic activities because the schools can only afford to use paper and tempera-paint. T2 thought that such experience was good for the teachers, but without good organization and follow through in the classroom there would be much wastage of time and equipment. With the absence of art specialist workshops within the St. John's school boards, teachers have access to these university courses only, which may have little to do with classroom realities and teachers' training requirements needed to enhance art curriculum implementation.

T2 went on to make the following general comments and observations about the usefulness of the guide. He believed that the guide was aimed at teachers who were inexperienced in teaching art. Although it had very good points and guidelines, it also contained sweeping statements and assumptions. T2 thought that the teachers must have some successful

art experience to assist them in implementation, although he was not sure where the teachers would get that experience. He did not believe, however, that even for the inexperienced teacher, the guide should be too specific "as that would not leave room for growth for the students and teachers." His concluding comment on whether the guide was meeting the needs of inexperienced teachers was, "something as varied as the art program tries to offer is not easy to put down in a simple little manual."

T2 did not think that it was a weakness that the guide's recommended flexible approach did not get implemented; he thought the fault lay with the elementary school art program where the students were not taught skills or concepts. At the junior high level, the fault lay with not having enough time to teach skills and concepts and with trying to give students a wide experience. To resolve this problem, T2 suggested "one has to find a happy medium between the two." Adolescents who often wanted their work to be recognized as being of good quality did not have enough time to develop the art skills needed to produce good art work. Without the development of art skills they had a hard time in understanding how to relate to the art concepts.

T1's frustrations with teaching art may have been common to other teachers who had similar limited backgrounds in teaching art. He offered some suggestions on how the guide might be improved to help develop teachers' skills for

teaching art. If given a chance to redesign the art curriculum guide, T1 would have liked to see more samples of what and how the teachers would actually go about doing the assigned projects. He commented that he had difficulty in getting sufficient information from the guide on how to start a project. He even had trouble in understanding or finding out what materials he was supposed to use.

He would have liked to see how a piece of work was produced by an artist. For example, "does the artist start from the top, middle or bottom and does he/she draw an outline with strokes"? T1 thought that the guide must really assume that the teachers knew nothing about art education. He would have liked to see the demonstration of a lesson laid out step by step in pictures to show teachers exactly what to do. He noted a particular problem with the section on "Experimentation to Learn Relief Printing" which suggested trying some of the following: (a) ink with a paint brush using an ink pad technique or equivalent (b) transfer the image to paper by pressing the painted object to the paper. T1 found it difficult to follow the process or techniques and thought that in this particular case some visuals to demonstrate the technique would have been helpful.

Newfoundland Teachers' Association (NTA)

The NTA is a professional organization of teachers which could act as a potential resource for those in art education.

T2 has been active in promoting art education through this organization. He had many reasons for taking leadership in setting up a special interest group for junior and senior high school art teachers. T2 was interested in finding a group of teachers to develop a workshop with a grass-roots, hands-on approach that would be relevant to classroom practice. He felt there was a need for this type of workshop since the impression he has been given by many inexperienced teachers was as follows:

They are not getting practical and relevant information from the workshops. They spend much time in listening to talks from local artists and experienced crafts people. Some of these workshops may be on one or two specific areas which may benefit the experienced teachers. But most of the information they received was not useful for classroom application. They could not make use of the information because either it was too far above their ability to understand or to convey it to their students. Also, the equipment mentioned was too complex or expensive to be available for use in the classroom.

T2 felt that workshops with an emphasis on a hands-on approach were essential.

When you are doing drawing you need such and such

materials and techniques ... these are the concepts you should be covering; this is how you do it; this is how you manage it in the classroom; this is how you do it in 20 minutes or in 40 minutes whatever you get to do it with.

He believed that such workshops would be appreciated by the inexperienced teachers because they could use this kind of structured approach when they went back to their schools.

T2 was disappointed with the attendance at the special interest group meetings. Only two of the eleven teachers invited by him to participate attended and they were not art specialists. T2 felt that the people in his district were very insular, and he stated:

They tend to stay in their own little place and do their own thing; they don't get involved--maybe they feel comfortable with what they are doing (I don't know) but I know in other parts of the province when you hold a workshop many people want to come because they want to know what is going on and they do want to be helped. Maybe the people here do know what is going on and they do not want to be helped; maybe they don't want to help anybody else and that may be a factor too.

T2 felt that inexperienced teachers may have been disillusioned by the lack of support they received and the low

priority assigned to art. This in turn may have led them to feel that they were teaching a second class subject, with little payoff for participation; there would likely be little recognition or appreciation, and limited preparation time for other subjects may have been the result.

Supplemental Analysis

If T2 as an experienced teacher had to use his own approach instead of that suggested by the guide in order to cover all the areas, could this mean that there was not enough time to implement the program? Or, if the teachers surveyed did not find time to be a problem, would this indicate that they had not actually implemented the total program? Regarding the suggestion that the fault for inadequate implementation of the curriculum contained within the guide lay with the elementary teachers, could a teacher without an art background do better if the students were better trained in elementary schools? How would such a situation improve the way the inexperienced art teacher got information from the guide? It is important to be aware that "The frequency of a particular trait or response should not be used to characterize the population of teachers" (Yin, 1984, pp. 449-50). Neither T1 nor T2 could be said to be more or less representative of the sample drawn for this study. Their views may assist in interpreting the survey results according to their

own perspectives on art education.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

This study has examined the extent to which teachers (as implementers) view the Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 (1986) as useful in the implementation of their programs. It has also explored teachers' interest in and perspectives on art and art education; the availability of school and community resources to aid in the implementation of curriculum; the teachers' own art backgrounds; their preferences for teaching art. These factors have been seen as important to the implementation of art education programs (Chapman, 1979(a)) and (Fullan, 1982).

Teachers' Backgrounds and Perceptions of Art Education

Most teachers in the survey were relatively new to art education and had little formal training in art. While many had recently taken university courses or workshops on art, the reports by the teachers interviewed suggest that these experiences may have been of limited benefit. T2, the art specialist interviewee, did not think these training opportunities were designed to respond to the realities of the classroom situations. While teachers developed new art skills from these courses and workshops, back in the schools they did not have the equipment or supplies to integrate these new

skills. While T1 gained general skills in making art covering the four areas suggested in the guide, he reported that he had not learned to teach art concepts from the workshops. Emphasis on the practical, without ensuring conceptual clarity, may not equip teachers to impart their new knowledge to students.

A majority of the teachers found teaching art difficult. Many were assigned to it, and would prefer to teach art only some of the time or not at all. Despite this rather gloomy picture of the teachers' interest in teaching art, many held a high regard for the subject feeling that it was important for the development of cognitive skills, self-expression, social sensitivity and self-image. They did not believe that art education was only beneficial to students with innate artistic abilities, nor did they see it as an educational frill or a waste of school funds. While they felt art education was important to the overall education of students, they did not agree that it ranked equally in importance with mathematics and English.

A majority of teachers did not agree that art education was mainly an opportunity for student relaxation and recreation. However, T1 may have reflected the view held by many teachers when he stated that the students were under a lot of pressure to perform academically in other core subjects, and therefore art served as an opportunity for a more relaxed and enjoyable activity. Few teachers engaged in art-related

activities outside of their teaching. Teachers seldom visited art galleries or museums (art places), read art books, discussed art with artists or bought professional art works. The apparent lack of interest in art may have been a reflection of the lack of art resources available to them in their communities, since many teachers were not aware of art places or artists in their area.

The Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide

A majority of the survey respondents and both interviewees were using the guide either solely or in combination with school board guides and other art education resources. Most teachers had also discussed the guide with an art specialist or co-ordinator and they had available to them workshops or training sessions to assist them with implementation of curriculum contained in the guide. While the guide is described by most teachers as clearly written and the concepts well explained, the reported limited usefulness for learning art concepts, skills, and criteria for evaluation was salient. Also teachers had difficulties in using it to promote class discussion. Sequencing of lessons within grades and between grade levels was a problem not sufficiently addressed by the guide. The learning of art vocabulary was also problematic and led teachers to feel ill equipped to communicate art concepts and skills or to conduct class discussions on art.

It seems that despite the clarity with which the guide

may have been written it has been of limited use in assisting teachers with the implementation of the art curriculum.

The lack of school resources, including art literature mentioned in the guide and suitable facilities, supplies and equipment, are possible sources of frustration for teachers. A common complaint made by the teachers was the lack of adequate preparation time for teaching the art program as outlined in the guide, even though most felt timetabling of art classes was satisfactory.

The perception that principals were considered an important human resource for implementation does not bode well for art, in light of a recent study of Newfoundland principals and their perceptions of the relative importance of art education (Manuel, 1988). Principals in Manuel's study generally were found to lend little support for art education relative to other core subjects. Art coordinators, while not considered as important to implementation as principals, were considered to be important human resources, even though their assistance through training and workshops were perceived to lack relevance to the school and classroom situation of many teachers.

While the guide may have been designed with maximum flexibility in mind, to deal with the varying conditions and teachers' backgrounds throughout Newfoundland, the fact that the majority of teachers had limited backgrounds in art and the relative lack of resources to assist them with implementa-

tion perhaps suggests a major support role for the guide. Failure to take into account teacher backgrounds and support factors have been shown to be important barriers to implementation (Fullan, 1982).

Conclusions

Implementation of art curriculum depends on a number of factors, some of which have been examined and explored here. The Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 (1986) provides a plan for the implementation of the art curriculum in Grades 7 to 9 in Newfoundland schools. It reflects the values, backgrounds, training and experience of art educators and coordinators who are the leaders in the field of curriculum development. Whether there is a match between the objectives and procedures outlined in the guide and the realities of the contexts facing both trained or untrained art teachers responsible for curriculum implementation has been the subject of this study.

Many teachers have had to cope under adverse conditions unfavourable to implementation of the art program. This study has demonstrated that the provincial guide was not particularly helpful in overcoming these unfavourable conditions. With a largely untrained population of art teachers struggling with implementation of the curriculum, if the guide is to be helpful, it must be written in such a way that it will be

useful to teachers with little or no background in art. Lacking the necessary supports the teachers and the students have had to make do with less than adequate programs and sometimes no art programs at all.

Evaluation implementation research in art education can assist in the problem-solving task to bring about the necessary improvements to achieve greater excellence in the field of art education. More commitment to art education by politicians, teachers, curriculum developers and researchers, art co-ordinators, principals, and other key players in the art education community might provide the necessary support to achieve a higher standard of implementation in art education in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Recommendations

The results of this study provide the basis for the following recommendations:

1. That the Department of Education, in revising its Draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide for Grades 7, 8 and 9 (1986), consider the academic backgrounds and experience of art teachers and the structural constraints, such as limited preparation time and the lack of art resources in the communities where they teach.
2. That the consultants and co-ordinators in art education seek input from classroom teachers with varying

backgrounds in art in designing relevant workshop experiences to be provided before teachers begin to implement the art curriculum, and on an continual basis to ensure implementation of the program as detailed in the guide.

3. That further study be undertaken in the form of a case study involving participant observation with a limited number of representative art classes. Such a study may not only provide an additional validity check on the data in this study, but may also yield more factors contributing to or inhibiting implementation.

4. That future research explore further with teachers possible reasons why they declined to respond to specific parts of the survey given that there were large amounts of missing data in response to some of the questions. The apparent contradictions between the large number of teachers who found the guide useful, when "very" and "somewhat" useful categories were combined, could be clarified by using a different scale or by asking teachers to explain the usefulness of the guide in their responses to the survey.

5. That further qualitative data be gathered in order to help explain implementation problems and prospects. Interviews could be conducted with key informants such as principals, art co-ordinators and more teachers with varying backgrounds in art.

6. That research be conducted using a larger survey sample. Such a sample could yield large enough values in more

categories of responses to use inferential statistics in comparing urban-rural, teacher background and art resource differences which may be significant for the implementation of art education in various Newfoundland and Labrador communities.

Bibliography

- Alexander, R.R. (1982). Participation observation, ethnography, and their use in educational evaluation: A review of selected works. Studies in Art Education, 24(1), 63-69.
- Alkin, M.C. (1967). Towards an evaluation model: A systems approach. Berkeley Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, University of California.
- Aoki, T. et al., (1977). British Columbia social studies assessment Vols. 1-3. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Ministry of Education.
- Aoki, T. (Ed.). (1978). Curriculum evaluation in a new key. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.
- Apple, M.W. (1974). The process and ideology of valuing in educational settings. In M.W. Apple, M.J. Subkoviak and H.S. Lufner (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Analysis and responsibilities. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Arasian, P. (1974). Designing summative evaluation studies at the local level. In W.J. Popham (Ed.), Evaluation in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Berman, P., & Pauly, E.W. (1975). Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. ii: Factors affecting change agents projects. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Bersson, R.D. (1978). The use of participant observation in the evaluation of art programs. Studies in Art Education, 19(2), 61-67.

- Bloom, B.S., & Hastings, J.T. (Eds.). (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook i: The cognitive domain. London: Longmans Green.
- Bloom, K. (1975). Introduction. In R.E. Stake (Ed.), Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach. Columbus Ohio. Charles E. Merrill.
- Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1983). Educational Research. An introduction (4th edition). New York: Longman.
- Boughton, D.G. (1976). Development and validation of a curriculum evaluation model for the visual arts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton, AL: University of Alberta.
- Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chapman, L.H.. (1979). The bearing of artistic and educational commitments on the teaching of art.. In G.L. Knieter and J. Stallings (Eds.), The Teaching Process and Arts Aesthetics. St. Louis, MO.: CEMREL, Inc.,
- Charters, W.W., Jr., & Jones, J.E. (1973). On the risk of appraising non-events in program evaluation. Educational Researcher, 2(11), 57.
- Clark, D.C. (1975). Evaluation in art education: Less sub-conscious and more intentional. National Art Education As

sociation Journal.

- Cole, H. (1971). Implementation of a process curriculum by the campus team strategy. Syracuse, New York: Eastern Regional Institute of Education.
- Courtney, R. (1987). The quest: Research and inquiry in arts education. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Cremin, L.A. (1961). The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1963). Course improvement through evaluation. Teachers College Record, 64, 672-683.
- Day, M. (1972). Rationales for art education: Thinking through and telling why. Art Education, 25(2), 17-20.
- Day, M., & DiBlasio, M. (1983). Contributions of research to the teaching of art. Studies in Art Education, 24(3), 169-176.
- Deal, T.E., Meyer, J.W., & Scott, W.R. (1975). Organizational influences on educational innovation. In J.V. Baldrige, T.E. Deal and M.Z. Ancall (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Department of Education, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (1986). Draft provincial art curriculum guided for Grades 7, 8 and 9.
- Downey, L. and Associates. (1975). The social studies in Alberta - 1975. Edmonton, AL: L. Downey Research Associates.

- Efland, A.D. (1973). Normative evaluation in aesthetic education. Paper presented at the Institute on Evaluation of the Total School Program. San Diego: National Art Association Conference.
- Efland, A.D. (1984). Curriculum concepts of the penn state seminar: An evaluation in retrospect. Studies in Art Education, 25(4), 204-211.
- Eisner, E.W. (1987). The role of discipline-based art education in America's schools. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1975). The perceptive eye: Toward the reformation of educational evaluation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
- Eisner, E.W. (1972). Emerging models for educational evaluation. School Review, 80, 573-590.
- Eisner, E.W. (1969). Instructional and expressive objectives: Their formulation and use in curriculum. AERA Monograph Series in Curriculum Evaluation, (3). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Ettinger, L.F. (1984). Styles of on-site descriptive research: A taxonomy for art educators. Studies in Art Education, 28(2), 79-95.
- Fullan, M. (1985). Curriculum implementation. In T. Husen

- and T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1208-1215.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Ontario: OISE Press.
- Fullan, M. (1972). Overview of the innovative process and the user. Interchange, 2(3), 1-46.
- Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 47(1), 335-397.
- Gallagher, J.T. (1966). Teacher variation in concept presentation in BSCS curriculum programs. Urbana: Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois.
- Glass, G.V. (1970). The growth of evaluation methodology. Boulder, Colorado: Laboratory of Educational Research (mimeo).
- Goodlad, J.I., & Klein, M.F. (1970). Behind the classroom door. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Greenwood, P.W., Mann, D., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1975). Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. iii: The process of change. Santa Monica, SA: Rand.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J.B., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Guba, E.G. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. CSE Monograph Series in Education, 8. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of E

valuation.

- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Hall, G.E., George, A.A., & Rutherford, W.C. (1977). Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
- Hall, G., & Loucks, S.A. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether or not the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14 (3) pp.263-276.
- Hamilton, D. (1977). Making sense of curriculum evaluation. In L. Shulman (Ed.), Review of research in education. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock.
- Hargreaves, D.H. (1985). The arts and the whole curriculum. Secondary Education Journal, 15(3), 3-4.
- Hausman, J.J. (1988). Back to the future: Reflections on present-day emphasis in curriculum and evaluation. Art Education, 41(2), 37-41.
- Hess, R., & Buckholdt, D. (1974). Degree of implementation as a critical variable in program evaluation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- House, E.R. (1978). Assumptions underlying evaluation models. Educational Researcher, 7(3), 4-12.

- Hymen, R.H., Wright, C.R., & Hopkins, T.K. (1962). Applications of methods of evaluation: Four studies of the encampment for citizenship. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jones, J.E. (1973). An elementary school under conditions of planned change. In W.W. Charters, R.B. Everhart, J.S. Packard, R.J. Pellegrin, L.J. Reynolds and C.T. Wacaster (Eds.), The process of planned change in the school's instructional organization. Monograph No. 25. Portland: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, the University of Oregon.
- Joncich, G. (1968). The sane positivist: A biography of Edward L. Thorndike. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
- Kourilsky, M. (1973). An adversary model for educational evaluation. Evaluation Comment, 4(2), 3-6.
- Krathwohl, D.R. (1964). The taxonomy of educational objectives - Use of cognitive and affective domains. In C.M. Lindvall (Ed.), Defining educational objectives. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Leinhardt, G. (1974). Evaluation of the implementation of a program of adaptive education at the second grade (1972-1973). Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. (1980). Evaluating program implementation. Evaluation Review, 4(2), 193-214.

- Leithwood, K.A., & Russell, H.H. (1973). Focus on implementation. Interchange, 4(1), 10-25.
- Levine, M. (1973). The Kourilsky adversary model: An adversary comment. Evaluation Comment, 4(2), 1-3.
- McCaughy, C. (1988). Arts education in Canada. An exploratory study (Ref. No. 600-187). The Canada Council, Research and Evaluation Section.
- Macdonald, B. (1973). Humanities curriculum project. In Evaluation in curriculum development: Twelve case studies. London: Schools Council Publications, MacMillan Education.
- MacGregor, R.N. (1988). On the construction and occupancy of mazes, according to section 18b of the building code and apa 3. Studies in Art Education, 30(1), 6-9.
- Madeja, S.S. (Ed.). (1977). Arts and aesthetics: An agenda for the future. St. Louis: CEMREL.
- Manuel, A. (1988). The influence of the principal in art program promotion in Newfoundland secondary schools. M.Ed. Thesis, U.B.C., Vancouver.
- Merwin, J.C., & Womer, F.B. (1969). Evaluation in assessing the progress of education to provide bases of public understanding and public policy. In R.W. Tyler (Ed.), Educational evaluation: New roles, new means. Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pearse, H. (1981). Program evaluation then and now: A literature review. Halifax, NS: Atlantic Institute of Education.

tion.

- Persall, J. (1972). An assessment of the instructional and organizational innovation implemented in a selected school system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Auburn University.
- Popham, W.J. (1975). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Provus, M. (1969). Evaluation of ongoing programs in the public system. In R.W. Tyler (Ed.), Education evaluation: New roles, new means. Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Provus, M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation for educational program improvement and assessment. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Regan, E.M., & Leithwood, K.L. (1974). Effecting curriculum change. Research in Education Series/4. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. (1967). Children and their primary schools. England: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Rippey, R.M. (Ed.). (1973). Studies in transactional evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Rockefeller, D., Jr. (Ed.). (1977). Coming to our senses: The significance of the arts for American education. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Rubin, B.M. (1982). Naturalistic evaluation: Its tenets and

- application. Studies in Art Education, 24(1), 63-69.
- Sarason, S.B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation (1). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Scriven, M. (1978). Merit Vs. Value. Evaluation News, 8, 20-29.
- Scriven, M. (1972b). Pros and cons about goal-free evaluation. Evaluation Comment, 3, 1-4.
- Scriven, M. (1976). The methodology of evaluation. In R.W. Tyler et al. (Eds.), Perspectives of curriculum evaluation. Stokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Simms, G. (1978). The implementation of curriculum innovation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Alberta.
- Smith, L.M., & Keither, P.M. (1971). Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, R.A., & Smith, C.M. (1970). Justifying aesthetic education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 4(2).
- Stake, R.E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68, 523-540.
- Stake, R.E. (1970). Objectives, priorities and other judgment data. Rev. of Educ. Researcher, 40(2), 181-212.

- Stake, R.E. (Ed.). (1975). Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Stake, R.E. (Ed.). (1976). Evaluating educational programmes: The need and the response. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G., Hammond, R.L., Merriman, H.O., & Provus, M.M. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision-making in education. Itasca, ILL: Peacock.
- Talmage, H. (1982). Evaluation of programs. Encyclopedia of Educational Research (5th edition). New York: MacMillan, 592-611.
- The Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Task Force on Arts Education. (1980). Comin' to our senses. St. John's, NF.
- Tyler, R.W. (Ed.). (1969). Educational evaluation: New roles, new means. Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R.W. (1986). Changing concepts of educational evaluation. International Journal of Educational Research, 10, 1-113.
- Van Den Akker, J.J. (1988). The teacher as learner in curriculum implementation. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 20(1), 47-55.
- Walker, D.F. (1980). A barnstorming tour of writing on curriculum. In A.W. Foshay (Ed.), Considered action for curric

ulum improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Westbury, I. (1983). How can curriculum guides guide teaching?

Introduction to the symposium. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18, 1-3.

White, M.G. (1972). Science and sentiment in America: Philosophical thought from Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolf, R.L., & Tymitz, B.L. (1977). Towards more natural inquiry in education. CEDR Quarterly, 10(3), 7-9.

Worthern, B.R., & Sanders, J.R. (1973). Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio: Jones Publishing Co.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research. Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX I

Questionnaires and Covering Letters to Teachers

Kum-yuen Saldov,
Box 14,
Memorial University of
Newfoundland,
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 3X8

2nd November, 1988

Dear Teacher,

As part of my thesis in Learning Resources at Memorial University, I am conducting a survey. My thesis concerns the utility of the 1986 draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Grades 7-9, and I am seeking participation of teachers, whether they are Art Specialists or regular classroom teachers, who have responsibility for Art in those grades. Permission to conduct this survey has been obtained from your School Board. I know from experience how busy you are, therefore I have designed the enclosed questionnaire to be completed in a maximum of 15 minutes.

Teachers' art background, their perception of art education and supporting resources are often seen as important factors influencing implementation of art education programs. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to gather information to study the relationships between these factors and the perceived utility of the draft Provincial Art Guide.

The success of this study is dependent upon your willingness to participate and the frankness of your answers to the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will be kept confidential since no individual responses will be identified in the findings. Data will be reported in summary form only. The results of this survey will be available to all participants, should you wish to request the information. A copy of this study will be at the Centre for Newfoundland Studies at Memorial University.

Please try to complete and return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. To ensure anonymity, please return your questionnaire, sealed in the enclosed envelope marked ART CURRICULUM SURVEY to *Mrs. Borlase*, the Program Coordinator responsible for Art Education, by November 30th.

Your assistance and co-operation in responding to this survey is very much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Kum-yuen Saldov

SECTION 1 - OPINIONS

1. The following statements reflect some commonly held opinions about art education. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements because people differ widely in the way they view art education. Therefore please give your frank opinion on each statement. Circle the response which best reflects your opinion.

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|----|
| a. Art education provides students opportunities for self-expression..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| b. Art education promotes sensitivity to other people..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| c. Art education does not develop cognitive learning..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| d. Art education develops positive self-image..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| e. Art education is for students with innate artistic ability..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| f. Art education can uniquely contribute to the total education of each student..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| g. Art can be ranked, in terms of curriculum importance, with Mathematics and English..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| h. Art education is mainly a form of relaxation and recreation..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| i. Art education develops independent thinking and problem-solving..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| j. Art has little utilitarian value and is an educational frill..... | SA | A | D | SD |
| k. Art education is a waste of school funds that can profitably be spent on other subjects..... | SA | A | D | SD |

2. Which of the above statements best reflects your opinion?

Statement _____

3. Which of the above statements least reflects your opinion?

Statement _____

SECTION 2 - PERSONAL INTEREST (Art activities you have participated in during the past year).

Please check the appropriate column for each statement below:

	<u>1-4 times</u>	<u>5-9 times</u>	<u>10+ times</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
1. Visited art gallery/museum/studio	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Read art books/magazines	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Discussed art with an artist	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Bought art works by professional artists	_____	_____	_____	_____

SECTION 3 - CURRICULUM GUIDE

1. Which official art curriculum guide is used in your school? (You may check more than one).

Provincial _____ School Board _____ Other _____ Please specify _____

Please check YES or NO for the following questions:

	YES	NO
2. Do you have a copy of the 1986 Provincial Guide (grade 7-9)?.....	_____	_____
3. Do you discuss implementation of the Guide with an art specialist/art coordinator?.....	_____	_____
4. a. Is there a workshop or training session which explains the use of the Guide?.....	_____	_____
b. If not, do you think there should be a workshop or training session?.....	_____	_____

SECTION 3 - CURRICULUM GUIDE (continued)

- | | YES | NO |
|--|-----|-----|
| 5. Is the language used in the Guide appropriate and clear?..... | ___ | ___ |
| 6. Are the art concepts in the Guide clearly explained?..... | ___ | ___ |
| 7. How often do you use the Provincial Art Guide? | | |

Daily ___ Weekly ___ Monthly ___ Seldom ___ Not at all ___

(If you have checked Not at all, proceed to SECTION 4).

8. Please indicate usefulness of the Provincial Guide for the following by checking the appropriate column.

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
a. Learning art concepts for teaching.....	___	___	___
b. Initiating class discussion on visual analysis.....	___	___	___
c. Planning sequence of lessons within a grade level.....	___	___	___
d. Developing sequence of lessons for grade 7 - 9.....	___	___	___
e. Acquiring a vocabulary for understanding and communicating art terms and concepts...	___	___	___
f. Developing skills and techniques in art production.....	___	___	___
g. Acquiring criteria for evaluating students' growth and learning in art.....	___	___	___

SECTION 4 - MATERIALS/RESOURCES

1. Please check the appropriate response to indicate whether the following materials/resources are available in your school or community.

	YES	NO
a. Does your school have the books mentioned in the Guide?.....	___	___
b. Does your school have other art books related to the level of art you are teaching?.....	___	___
c. Is the room in which you teach art suitable (adequate facilities) for implementing the art program?.....	___	___
d. Are there sufficient supplies and equipment to implement the program?.....	___	___
e. Are there art galleries or studios in your community open to art teachers and students?.....	___	___
f. Are there professional art works displayed in your school (classroom, offices, and halls, or other places)?.....	___	___

2. Time is also an important factor in implementing a quality art program. Please check your responses to the following questions:

	YES	NO
a. Do you have sufficient time to prepare adequately the art courses as outlined in the Guide?.....	___	___
b. Do you have sufficient teaching time to adequately implement the curriculum?.....	___	___
c. Do you have satisfactorily scheduled teaching blocks in the timetable?.....	___	___

SECTION 4 - MATERIALS/RESOURCES (continued)

3. Please indicate by checking the appropriate response column, the importance of the following human resources which currently support the art program in your school.

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Resource Not</u> <u>Available</u>
Principal	—	—	—	—
Art coordinator	—	—	—	—
Other teachers	—	—	—	—
Parents	—	—	—	—
School librarian	—	—	—	—
Public librarian	—	—	—	—
Local artist(s)	—	—	—	—
Other(s) (Please specify)	—	—	—	—

SECTION 5 - DEMOGRAPHICS

Please circle the appropriate response(s)

1. Grade level(s) of art you have taught in the past two years

K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----

2. Level of training/education in art

High School	1-3 University Courses	Art Major	Art Minor	Art Workshop(s)
-------------	------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------------

3. Length of time (in years) since courses taken in art or workshop participation

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12 or more
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	------------

4. Number of years teaching art

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12 or more
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	------------

5. I teach art because

It was assigned	I was trained to	I want to
-----------------	------------------	-----------

6. I think teaching art is

Easy	Somewhat Easy	Difficult	Very Difficult
------	---------------	-----------	----------------

7. If given a choice I would teach art

Majority of my teaching time	Some of my teaching time	Not at all
------------------------------	--------------------------	------------

Please look over your answers. Make sure you have checked the right answer for each question.

Thank you for your time and for caring enough to respond.

APPENDIX II

Letters to School Boards

Kum-yuen Saldov,
Box 14, Hickman Bldg... 159
M.U.N. St. John's,
A1B 3X8
November 27, 1988

Dear Teacher,

As part of my thesis in Learning Resources at Memorial University, I am conducting a survey. My thesis concerns the utility of the 1986 draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Gr.7-9, and I am seeking participation of teachers, whether they are Art Specialists or regular classroom teachers, who have responsibility for art instruction in those grades. Permission to conduct this survey has been obtained from your School Board and your Principal. I know from experience how busy you are, therefore I have designed the enclosed questionnaire to be completed in a maximum of 15 mins.

Teachers' art background, their perception of art education and supporting resources are often seen as important factors influencing implementation of art education programs. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to gather information to study the relationships between these factors and the perceived utility of the draft Provincial Art Guide.

The success of this study is dependent upon your willingness to participate and the frankness of your answers to the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will be kept confidential since no individual responses will be identified in the findings. Data will be reported in summary form only. The results of this survey will be available to all participants, should you wish to request the information. A copy of this study will be at the Centre for Newfoundland Studies at Memorial University.

Please try to complete and return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your assistance and co-operation in responding to this survey is very much appreciated.

Yours sincerely, . /

U
Kum-yuen Saldov

APPENDIX III

Letters to Superintendents

Kum-yuen Saldov,
Box 14, Hickman Building,
Memorial University of
Newfoundland,
St. John's, Newfoundland.
A1B 3X8

160

November 7, 1988

Mr. Lloyd Ryan
Asst. Superintendent
Notre Dame Integrated School Board
P.O. Box 70
Lewisporte, NF
A0G 3A0

Dear Mr. Ryan:

With reference to the telephone conversation between you and my thesis supervisor, Dr. M. Kennedy, I have been informed that you have very kindly agreed to pick up the completed questionnaires of my survey. Knowing how busy you are, your assistance and co-operation is deeply appreciated.

I have contacted your School Board and obtained permission to conduct a survey of teachers as part of my thesis in Learning Resources at Memorial University. A copy of the letter giving this permission is enclosed. I am surveying teachers who have responsibility for Art in grades seven to nine, whether they are Art Specialists or regular classroom teachers. My thesis concerns the utility of the 1986 draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Grades 7-9.

Teachers' art background, their perception of art education and supporting resources are often seen as important factors influencing implementation of art education programs. The questionnaire, which will take a maximum of 15 minutes to complete, is designed to gather information to study the relationship between these factors and the perceived utility of the draft Provincial Art Guide.

Copies of the questionnaire have been sent to the Principals to be distributed to those responsible for teaching art in grades seven, eight, and nine. Since I have had to estimate the number of copies of the questionnaire, there may be extra copies. If so, I have requested the Principals to send the blanks to you in order for me to keep track of my sample size.

The teachers have been requested to return to you their completed questionnaires in sealed envelopes marked ART CURRICULUM SURVEY by 30th November. Please contact any teachers who have not returned the questionnaires by then. A stamped self-addressed mailer is enclosed for your convenience.

- 2 -

Thank you once again for your assistance and co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

Kum-yuen Saldov

APPENDIX IV

Letters of Art Co-ordinators

Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's

BELVEDERE
BONAVENTURE AVENUE
ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND
A1C 3Z4

162

1988 11 18

Kum-Yuen Saldov
Memorial University of Nf.
Box 14
Hickman Bldg.
St. John's, Nf

Dear Kum-Yuen,

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter and questionnaire.

Approval has been granted by the Board for you to do a survey on Art in our Jr. High Schools, if the principals are able to accommodate you.

You may contact the principals in those schools to set up an appointment.

A list of our schools teaching Art is enclosed for your information.

Yours truly,

J. M. Geraldine Roe
Associate Superintendent
Curriculum/Instruction

cc: Principals (Art 7-9)

GR/gfp

R. C. School Board

Conception Bay North
P. O. Box 400
CARBONEAR, NEWFOUNDLAND
A6A 1T0

163

October 27, 1988

Ms. K. Saldov
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Division of Learning Resources
Faculty of Education
P. O. Box 14
Hickman Building
St. John's, NF
A1B 3X8

Dear Ms. Saldov:

This letter is in response to your letter of
October 18, 1988, requesting permission to contact the
teachers of grades 7, 8 and 9 in our schools for the
purpose of conducting your survey.

I hereby grant you permission.

Yours truly,

PATRICK J. COLLINS
English/Language Arts Coordinator

mg



Notre Dame Integrated School Board

P.O. BOX 70
LEWISPORTE, NEWFOUNDLAND A0G 3A0
CANADA

Phone 535-6919
535-6949
535-8525
164


October 24, 1988.

Mr. K. Saldov,
Memorial University of Newfoundland,
Division of Learning Resources,
Faculty of Education,
Box 14, Hickman Building,
St. John's, Nfld.
A1B 3X8

Dear Mr. Saldov:

I have no objection to your contacting art teachers
in this district concerning your survey.

Yours truly,

 W. Hunt,
District Superintendent.

JWH/ly

Placentia - St. Mary's R. C. School Board 165

P. O. BOX 340
PLACENTIA, NEWFOUNDLAND
A0B 2Y0

October 26, 1988

Mr. Kумыen Saldov
Division of Learning Resources
Faculty of Education
Box 14
Hickman Building
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, NF, A1B 3X8

Dear Mr. Saldov:

You have our permission to conduct a survey of teachers, Grades 7-9, on the usefulness of the Provincial Art Curriculum Guide. You will want to write our Art contact person, Jim Leonard, to make him aware of your study.

I take this opportunity to wish you every success in your research.

Yours truly,

BON FAGAN
Assistant Superintendent
(Curriculum & Instruction)

BF/fng



Box 430, Stn C, Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Labrador, NF, A0P 1C0
Telephone (709) 896-2431

October 27, 1988

K. Saldov
Division of Learning Resources
Faculty of Education
Box 14, Hickman Bldg.
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NF
St. John's, NF
A1B 3X8

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing to grant permission for you to conduct a survey in our schools on the utility of the Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Grades 7-9.

Our Co-ordinator responsible for Art education is Tim Borlase. By copy of this response and your letter, I am informing him of your survey.

Good luck with your project.

Sincerely, /

Jack Wayne
Superintendent of Education

JW:rm

c.c. Tim Borlase *Ed. No.*

**Bonavista-Trinity-Placentia
Integrated School Board**

Clarenville, Nfld. A0E 1J0

167

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

October 20, 1988

K. Saldov
Division of Learning Resources
Faculty of Education (Hickman Bldg.)
P. O. Box 14
St. John's, NF
A1B 3X8

Dear Mr. Saldov:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated October 18, 1988.

Permission is hereby granted for you to conduct your survey.
I wish you well in your endeavours.

Yours very truly,

William G. Carter
District Superintendent

WGC:ajr

APPENDIX V

Letters to Principals

Kum-yuen Saldov,
Box 14, Hickman Building,
Memorial University of
Newfoundland,
St. John's, Newfoundland.
A1B 3X8

November 7, 1988,

Mr. Tim Borlase
Program Co-ordinator
Labrador East Integrated School Board
P.O. Box 430, Stn. C
Goose Bay, Labrador
A0P 1C0

Dear Mr. Borlase:

With reference to the telephone conversation between you and my thesis supervisor, Dr. M. Kennedy, I have been informed that you have very kindly agreed to distribute and pick up my questionnaires. Knowing how busy you are, your assistance and co-operation is deeply appreciated.

I have contacted your School Board and obtained permission to conduct a survey of teachers as part of my thesis in Learning Resources at Memorial University. A copy of the letter giving this permission is enclosed. I am surveying teachers who have responsibility for art in grades seven to nine, whether they are Art Specialists or regular classroom teachers. My thesis concerns the utility of the 1986 draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Grades 7-9.

Teachers' art background, their perception of art education and supporting resources are often seen as important factors influencing implementation of art education programs. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to gather information to study the relationships between these factors and the perceived utility of the draft Provincial Art Guide.

Enclosed are copies of the questionnaire to be distributed to those responsible for teaching art in grades seven, eight and nine. Since I have had to estimate the number of copies of the questionnaire, there may be extra copies. If so, please return the blanks to me in order that I might keep track of my sample size. On the other hand, should you require more copies, or any information, please do not hesitate to call me collect at 576-6181. The teachers have been requested to send the questionnaires back to you in sealed envelopes marked ART CURRICULUM SURVEY by November 30th. Please contact any teachers who have not returned the questionnaires within two weeks. A stamped self-addressed mailer is enclosed for your convenience .

- 2 -

Thank you once again for your assistance and co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

Kum-yuen Saldov

Kum-yuen Saldov,
Box 14, Hickman Building, 170
Memorial University,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
A1B 3X8

November 22, 1988

Dear Mr. Martin,

As part of my thesis in Learning Resources at Memorial University's Faculty of Education, I am conducting a survey on the utility of the 1986 draft Provincial Art Curriculum Guide, Gr. 7-9, as perceived by teachers responsible for teaching art, whether they are Art Specialists or regular classroom teachers. Your Board has given me approval to do this survey in your school if you are able to accommodate me. A copy of the letter indicating their approval is enclosed.

In order for me to successfully complete the survey, it is important to have a good response rate. I am therefore writing to seek your cooperation in facilitating the participation in my study by those responsible for teaching gr.7-9 level art in your school. Knowing how busy teachers are, the questionnaire to be used in my survey was designed to take a maximum of 15 minutes to complete. A copy of this questionnaire is enclosed.

Your assistance and co-operation will be greatly appreciated. In about a week, I shall be calling to enquire about your support for my study. I look forward to speaking with you.

Yours sincerely, , ,

Kum-yuen Saldov



