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This study used a questionnaire to examine five research questions related to the implementation of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide). These questions were as follows:

1. To what extent are elementary Language Arts teachers using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

2. What is the general attitude of teachers toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

3. What do teachers perceive as the role of textbooks in determining their language arts program?

4. What are teachers' perceptions of the role played by their district in providing information and in-service program support related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

5. What relationship exists between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide and teachers' perceptions of district support?

A review of the literature indicated that curriculum guides have not played a major role in influencing teachers' language arts programs. The literature also pointed to the importance of the part played by both teachers and administrators in determining the degree to which a curriculum guide is implemented.

A three-part questionnaire was designed. The first two parts each used a five-point, Likert-type scale to examine various areas related to the five research questions. The third part gathered background information from each respondent. Six elementary schools were chosen at random from each of three Lower Mainland school districts and questionnaires were distributed to the teachers in these 18 schools. Of the 202 questionnaires distributed, 115 of these were returned, resulting in a return rate of 56.9 percent.
The results indicated that the teachers surveyed use the BCELAC Guide occasionally at the most, with long term planning being the most frequent reason for reference. The data related to teachers' attitude toward the Guide indicated that at least 50 percent of the teachers surveyed had a favourable attitude. There was no clear consensus regarding the role of textbooks in determining the language arts program. The data related to district provision of in-service program support related to the BCELAC Guide showed that the teachers surveyed perceive this as being provided only occasionally. The teacher attitude toward the support that was provided was ambivalent. There was generally strong agreement that more in-service support could be provided in the areas specified. A positive correlation was found between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the BCELAC Guide and their perceptions of district support.

Recommendations included a greater emphasis on the whole implementation process and on providing teachers with a clearer understanding of the changes and expectations involved with the BCELAC Guide. It was also recommended that teachers be more directly involved in the implementation and possibly the development process and that there be more release time for teachers to develop local materials. Further recommendations included additional research to seek possible explanations for the low level of use of the Guide. Finally, the whole concept underlying the present development of provincial curriculum guides was questioned and several points discussed.
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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction

The development of provincial curriculum guides for elementary schools involves a great deal of time and money. While the British Columbia Department of Education has control over the development and distribution of these guides, the implementation of them is left up to the local school district and its teachers. The view has been expressed by some teachers that these guides are placed in the schools and then forgotten. It was felt that a survey of elementary teachers would provide some indication of the extent to which the British Columbia Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide) is being used by teachers, what their attitude is toward this Guide, and what role they perceive their district to have played in the implementation process.

1.2 Rationale for the Study

The British Columbia Ministry of Education (1979), in a booklet on curriculum planning, state that the basic purpose of the provincial curriculum guide is "to provide the classroom teacher with a clear understanding of what is to be taught at each grade level" (p.5). This booklet also states that the textbooks and learning materials are selected to "support the provincial curriculum guide". (p.8).
Recent literature in the area of curriculum studies has indicated that there is often a discrepancy between what the developers of a curriculum envision, and what actually occurs at the classroom level. (Goodlad, Klein & Associates, 1970; Hall, 1975; Pratt, 1930). Furthermore, it has been observed that there is often a greater emphasis put on the textbooks used in a subject area than on the curriculum guide. (Goodlad, et al., 1970).

It is often assumed that a change will occur once a new curriculum guide is put into the hands of teachers.

As long as the teachers involved in the change do not raise significant questions or problems, the assumption is made that the change has taken place (Pratt, Melle, & Metzdorf, 1980, p. 11).

It was felt that this assumption should be tested by examining just how much use teachers do make of their curriculum guides, in particular, the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

The B.C. Ministry of Education (1979), has pointed out the need for

appropriate in-service programs at the local level to insure that teachers are provided with the continued support necessary to implement provincial curriculum (p.4).

McLaughlin (1976), in a review of the Rand Corporation study of Federal Programs supporting educational change (Rand Study), reported that the role of district officials had been found to be very important in the successful implementation of an innovation.
Therefore, the perceptions of B.C. teachers regarding the support provided by their district in the implementation of the BCELAC Guide was also seen as an appropriate area of investigation for this study.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study undertook an examination of the present situation relative to the implementation of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. This Guide was introduced to most B.C. elementary schools during the Spring of 1979. While there are many aspects of implementation which could have been examined, this study was limited in nature and took a fairly structured approach. Through the use of a questionnaire, information related to five basic research questions was sought. These five questions were:

1. To what extent are elementary language arts teachers using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

2. What is the general attitude of teachers toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

3. What do teachers perceive as the role of textbooks in determining their language arts program?

4. What are teachers' perceptions of the role played by their district in providing information and in-service program support related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

5. What relationship exists between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide, and teachers' perceptions of district support?
1.4 Definition of Terms

Implementation: For the purposes of this study.

Implementation consists of alterations from existing practice to some new or revised practice (potentially involving materials, teaching approaches, and beliefs) in order to achieve certain desired student learning outcomes (Fullan & Park, 1981, p. 10).

Until recently, implementation has been viewed as a separate process from those of planning, adoption, and evaluation.

Attitude: Attitude refers to the positive or negative feelings associated with an object. For the purposes of this study, the object was the BCELAC Guide and the degree of attitude was measured through the use of a specially developed attitude scale.

Curriculum Guide: In B.C., curriculum guides are developed at the Provincial level. These guides outline what is to be taught in each subject area at the various levels. Curriculum guides are unlike teacher manuals which are usually produced by publishers to accompany texts or learning materials.

District Administrators: This term refers to a group of people consisting of the Superintendent of schools, Assistant Superintendents, co-ordinators, consultants, and any other persons hired by the School Board to work with teachers in the area of professional development.
1.5 Limitations of the Study

In interpreting the results of this study, certain factors must be taken into consideration. First, the validity of the results is limited to the population used in this study and may or may not be truly representative of B.C. elementary language arts teachers in general. Secondly, the use of a questionnaire to gather data has limitations. Some of these limitations are discussed in Chapter Two. Also, the decision to keep the responses anonymous meant that non-responders could not be identified for any follow-up studies.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

The review of literature is divided into three main parts in this chapter. In Section 2.2 the use of the questionnaire as a research tool is discussed. Empirical studies and related literature dealing with the roles of curriculum guides and textbooks are examined in Section 2.3. In Section 2.4, the major findings that emerged from a review of literature and empirical studies on the roles of teachers and district administrators in the implementation process are presented. Section 2.5 provides a brief summary.

2.2 The Questionnaire as a Research Tool

Questionnaires have been used in the field of education for over a century. One of the earliest questionnaires was a ten page "circular" sent to Massachusetts' teachers by Horace Mann in 1847 (NEA Research Bulletin, 1930, p.5). The use of questionnaires has met with mixed reactions since that time.

One of the advantages of using a questionnaire to gather data is that it can be self-administered, thus allowing a large number of people to be surveyed in a short period of time. However, the fact that the questionnaire is self-administered means that there is no opportunity for the respondent to have a statement or question clarified by the researcher. This could result in misinformation being unintentionally provided.
Response rate is another area of concern associated with the use of questionnaires. Parten (1950) and Oppenheim (1966) both cite one of the major disadvantages of mass-distributed questionnaires as being the very poor response rate. Oppenheim (1966) states that:

For respondents who have no special interest in the subject matter of the questionnaire, figures of 40 percent to 60 percent are typical (pp.33-34).

Parten (1950) also reports that surveyors have found that such things as the interest in the subject of investigation, the prestige of the researcher among the recipients of the questionnaire, and a strong feeling of agreement or disagreement with the subject being surveyed, are all related to the response rate (p. 391). Taking these factors into consideration, it was felt that a return of 50 to 55 percent would be a reasonable expectation for the questionnaires examining the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide).

While there are many questionnaire formats which can be used, the examination of attitudes and opinions is easily facilitated through the use of a Likert-type scale. This type of scale has been used to measure the intensity of attitude or opinion associated with a psychological object or construct, and/or sociological, academic, and professional issues. It is easily adaptable to the measurement of intensity of use, and opinion, associated with the issues being examined in this study. Statements related to these issues are presented with possible responses arranged on a continuum from most to least favourable,
or vice versa. This form of scale is advantageous in that it provides more precise information regarding a respondent's degree of agreement or disagreement. Also, its objective form lends itself more easily to simple data processing. One disadvantage however, is that the use of a Likert-type scale results in closed responses and doesn't allow the respondents to give qualifying statements to their responses. Thus, the results could be influenced by variables of which the rater of the data is unaware. Oppenheim (1966) points out that the use of a Likert-type scale can also be criticized because:

It offers no interval measures and it lacks a neutral point, so that one does not know where scores in the middle change from mildly positive to mildly negative (p. 140).

There is the added problem of validity since at the present time, there is no sure way of determining the validity of an attitude scale (Oppenheim, 1966, p.122).

2.3 The Roles of Curriculum Guides and Textbooks

Historically, curriculum guides do not have a strong claim as the arbiter of curriculum. Talmage (1972) reports that the McGuffey Reader of a century ago was the textbook, the reading curriculum; and by the nature of its presentation...determined much of the instructional approaches (p. 22).
During the 1920's and 1930's, as schools attempted to define their philosophy of education, massive curriculum development was undertaken by means of committees within school systems. The philosophy of each committee influenced the selection of textbooks, but these textbooks continued to serve as the determiner of the curriculum (Talmage, 1972, p. 22). During the 1930's and 1940's, a distinction developed between curriculum and instruction. Talmage (1972) reports that as curriculums were developed, the textbook was placed in a position subordinate to the philosophy and the curriculum of a school system. Textbooks were selected to assure attainment of the objectives of the curriculum (p. 22).

However, Foshay and Beilin (1969) report that the courses of study developed had relatively little effect on teaching (p. 278).

During the late 1950's and the early 1960's, in response to Sputnik, national curriculum committees were organized in the United States. One result of this attempt to upgrade the educational system, was an increase in the number of textbooks, workbooks, and other instructional materials, once again making the textbook the determiner of curriculum. Many of these textbooks and learning materials were adopted in Canada, thereby directly or indirectly having an influence on the Canadian school system.
More recently, partially as a result of the "back to the basics" approach, curriculum planning has become more centralized, with committees attempting to outline what they see as the goals and outcomes for each subject area.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1980) report:

The legislative arm of the education system attempts to capture socially shared images in a form amendable to systematic school intervention. In the Provinces of Canada ...the product of such image-capturing is usually a curriculum guideline (p. 2).

The study done by Flanders (1980), examining the professional development activities of the B.C. Teachers' Federation, found that "teachers seemed generally unaware of ministry moves toward control in the curriculum area" (p. 13). In fact, he found that while most teachers regard curriculum as providing organizing guidelines, they "do not appear to connect curriculum with making meaning with students" (p. 13).

Other studies would appear to support the view that the existence of curriculum guidelines does not necessarily mean that they have an impact on what occurs in the classroom. Goodlad, Klein, and Associates (1970) in their survey of American public schools, found that the textbook, as opposed to State guides or local curriculum bulletins, was the immediate learning stimulus in more than half the classrooms beyond kindergarten (p. 64). Shipman (1974) in his report on the implementation of a project in the United Kingdom, refers
to the "materials madness" and the fact that often the materials become the focus of a curriculum.

Goodlad et al (1970) also reported that "general or specific" classroom goals were not identifiable to observers" (p. 98), indicating a lack of centrality of educational objectives. Clark and Yinger (1977) in their review of research on how teachers think, concluded that teachers rely less on objectives than we had been led to believe.

In particular, the teachers studied did not begin or guide their planning in relation to clearly specified objectives or goals. Rather, teacher planning seems to begin with content to be taught and considerations about the setting in which teaching will take place (p. 300).

These findings are supported by Zahorik (1975) who studied the role of specified objectives in the decisions 194 teachers made prior to teaching. He found that objectives were not particularly important to these teachers. Taylor (1970), in a study of teacher planning in English in secondary schools, concluded that subject matter and the needs of the pupil took precedence over aims. He also reported that he found little consistency in the role which the syllabus plays and some doubt must be entertained about whether teachers consider that the syllabus serves any worthwhile purpose at all (p.51).

Jackson and Bedford (1965) interviewed 20 elementary school teachers who were considered to be outstanding by district officials. They reported that these teachers
left the impression that the school's curriculum guides lay unread at the bottom of their supply closets (p. 287).

In British Columbia, two studies undertaken on behalf of the Learning Assessment Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Education provide further information regarding the present role of textbooks and curriculum guides. Robitaille (1980) reported a considerable gap between the intended curriculum as described in curriculum guides and the implemented curriculum. Tuinman and Kendall (1980) found that teachers reported that curriculum guides and resource books made available by the Ministry of Education are frequently consulted but have had little impact on their teaching (p. 10).

2.4 The Roles of Teachers and District Administrators in the Implementation Process

It is only within the last ten years that the topic of implementation has become a major focal point. Prior to that, studies in the area of curriculum were mainly interested in the development of curriculum and its evaluation. The classroom teacher was seen merely as the tool for putting a curriculum into practice and the emphasis was on what teachers "ought to do". In fact, during the 1960's, the aim was to develop "teacher-proof" curriculum. However, evidence began to mount which indicated that what teachers "actually did" had an enormous influence on whether or not a curriculum was implemented. It also became evident that district administrators played a major role in determining the degree of implementation.
It has now become commonly accepted that a great discrepancy exists between what the developers of a curriculum envision, and what actually occurs in the classroom (Bergman & McLaughlin, 1976; Myers, 1977; Sabor & Shafriri, 1980). As Goodlad et al (1970) put it;

Many of the changes we have believed to be taking place in schooling have not been getting into classrooms; changes widely recommended for schools over the past 15 years were blunted on school and classroom doors (p. 97).

Fullan and Pomfret (1977) report that implementation at the user level reflects considerable discrepancies from intended plans (p. 354).

Studies have also shown that even when an innovation is implemented, there is a great variation in the type and degree of teacher use of the innovation (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford & Newlove, 1975).

Many theories have been put forth as to why this discrepancy exists. One explanation is that teachers and schools are not open to change. Lortie (1975) portrays teachers as being conservative and present-oriented and schools as being "self-perpetuating institutions" (p. 106). However, the majority of the literature cite the root of the problem as the failure to adequately attend to any one of a number of factors affecting the implementation of an innovation.
One important factor is seen as the impact an innovation has on the classroom teacher. Fullan (1980a) points out that:

The rational assumptions, abstractions, and descriptions of a proposed new curriculum do not make sense in the capricious world of the teacher (p. 52).

and Lortie (1975) claims;

Many proposals for change strike them as frivolous (p. 235).

Fullan (1980a) also reports that;

When change is imposed from outside it is bitterly resented...There is a strong tendency for people to adjust to the near occasion of change, by changing as little as possible - either assimilating or abandoning changes (p. 55).

This observation is supported by Johansen (1965) who found that when teachers perceived outside authorities as being the major source of influence in the curriculum decision-making process, the likelihood of curriculum implementation decreased.

The work of Sarason (1971) has done much to make us aware of the complexity of the change process and how it affects schools. Even when there is initial acceptance or enthusiasm, studies have shown that this is not enough to ensure the implementation of an innovation (Boyd, 1978; Gross, Neal, Giacautinta & Bernstein, 1971; Smith, 1971). The work of Hall et al (1975) also shows that prolonged use of an innovation does not guarantee a greater degree of implementation.
More recently, attention has begun to focus on the role of district administrators in the implementation process. Studies have shown that the strategies used by administrators, both district and school based, can have a great impact on teachers' willingness and ability to implement an innovation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Patterson & Czajkowki, 1979). One recognized area of importance is the role played by the district in improving teacher clarity of the goals of an innovation. Ben-Peretz and Kremer (1979), in their study of pre-implementation training courses, found that during in-service training little time if any was devoted to a thorough analysis of the curriculum and to interpretation of its major characteristics (p. 250).

As a result, they found that teachers tend to use instructional strategies with which they are familiar and to minimize use of instructional strategies that are not part of their everyday repertoire and are not clearly specified in the new curriculum (p. 254).

McLaughlin and Marsh (1978), in their review of the Rand Corporation study of Federal Programs supporting educational change (Rand Study), found that the specificity of goals had a major effect on implementation.
The more specific the teachers felt the project goals were, the higher the percentage of goals the project achieved, the greater the student improvement attributed to the project, and the greater the continuation of both project method and materials (p. 79).

The findings of Hughes and Keith (1980) tended to support their general hypothesis that;

The potential adapters' perceptions of an innovation, ...are related to the successful implementation of educational innovations (p. 49).

Another area cited in the literature as being important for providing better teacher understanding of an innovation and higher motivation as well, is teacher participation in day-to-day decision-making as an innovation is implemented (Kardas & Talmage, 1970; Langenbach, 1972; McLaughlin, 1976). However, in discussing the literature on teacher participation, Fullan and Pomfret (1977), point out that;

The best research on implementation that we could find tells us very little about one of the most theoretically prominent independent variables [participation] in the innovation literature (p. 376).

Two other important areas of district responsibility are the provision of in-service training, and mechanisms for teacher feedback. Berman and McLaughlin, (1976), in a review of the Rand Study, report that the interaction of staff training and frequent meetings were found to be important for successful implementation. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) concluded;
It appears that intensive in-service training (as distinct from single workshops or pre-service training) is an important strategy for implementation (p. 373).

Willson's (1980) study of teacher persistence found that in-depth study by means of in-service workshops tended to result in greater teacher persistence in the implementation of a new curriculum. Heusner (1964) reported that increased contact among teachers appeared to influence the utilization of curriculum guide materials. Gross et al (1971) concluded that failure to use feedback mechanisms to uncover "the barriers that arose during the period of attempted implementation" (p. 194) was one of the major possible explanations for the failure to implement an innovation. Kilbert (1980) in his study of the implementation of a business education curriculum, found that in-service training, teacher participation in planning, and the availability of feedback mechanisms for teachers were important factors in the successful implementation of the curriculum.

Despite the evidence that district support is important, it would appear that this support is not always readily available. A recent assessment of reading in B.C. (Tuinman & Kendall, 1980) found that nearly half of the elementary teachers surveyed stated that they had received no formal orientation toward the content and use of the BCELAC Guide. The report concluded that the lack of understanding regarding the use of this guide could be one reason why so many teachers reported that it has had no significant impact on their teaching. Goodlad et al (1970)
also found a lack of district support for teachers and little in the way of pre-service or in-service teacher education.

An important aspect of district support is the part it plays in motivating teachers to implement an innovation. A review of the Rand Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976) led to the conclusion that:

Unless the project seems to represent a district and school priority, teachers may not put in the extra effort and emotional investment necessary for successful implementation (p. 361).

McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) also report that the attitudes of district administrators can provide a "signal" to teachers as to how seriously they should take a proposed change. Willson's (1980) study found that district commitment had an effect on teacher persistence in the implementation of a curriculum. The stronger the district commitment appeared to be, the more effort the teachers gave.

A large proportion of the literature describing the role of the local school district in curriculum implementation, concerns curriculum that is developed by local districts. In B.C., curriculum is developed at the Provincial level, but responsibility for implementation is left to the local school district. Since there is little literature available that examines the relationship between a provincially developed curriculum and its implementation
at the local level, this study has focused on the implementation process as carried out at the local school district level. This has been done by assessing teachers' use of, and attitude toward, the BCELAC Guide and by assessing teachers' perceptions of local district in-service support related to the implementation of the Guide.

2.5 **Summary**

The questionnaire has been used for over 130 years and is a valid and useful data-gathering technique if used properly. The advantages and disadvantages as outlined in Section 2.2 point to the limitations of the questionnaire when used as a research tool.

A review of literature dealing with the roles of curriculum guides and textbooks indicates that historically, textbooks have played a greater role than curriculum guides in determining curriculum. More recent studies have also questioned the importance of curriculum guides in influencing a teacher's day-to-day decisions regarding what is to be taught.

The literature and empirical studies examining the roles of teachers and district administrators in the implementation process, indicate the importance of both parties in determining the degree of implementation. The teacher is seen as being the final determiner of what is actually implemented, while the district is seen as having a great influence on teachers' understanding of an innovation and their attitude toward it.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Organization of the Chapter

The population and sample used in this study are described in Section 3.2. The development of the questionnaire used to gather the data is described in Section 3.3. Section 3.4 describes the procedures used to gather and organize the data and Section 3.5 describes the method of data analysis.

3.2 Population

This study required data from elementary language arts teachers in the public school of British Columbia. Five Lower Mainland school districts were approached for permission to distribute questionnaires to teachers. Permission was obtained from three of these districts. One district was somewhat smaller but was otherwise similar to the other two. The attendance areas of all three districts included a socio-economic cross-section that was essentially similar. The names of the six schools surveyed in each district were drawn at random as described in Section 3.4. A total of 202 questionnaires were distributed and 115 of these were returned. Therefore, the sample consisted of 115 teachers from three Lower Mainland school districts.
3.3. Development of the Questionnaire

Initially, a preliminary questionnaire was developed and a pilot administration of this questionnaire was run. The information sought led to the development of three sections. The first section examined the frequency with which teachers use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide) and teachers' perceptions of the frequency of district in-service programs related to implementation of this Guide. The second section examined teachers' opinions of the general value of the BCELAC Guide and teachers' opinions of the usefulness of related district in-service programs. The third section gathered personal data related to the grade level taught, the number of years of teaching experience, and the educational background of each respondent. Items for the first two sections of the preliminary questionnaire were drawn from related literature, informal talks with teachers, sections of a reading questionnaire (Province of B.C., 1980), and personal experience. The first two sections of the preliminary questionnaire also used a Likert-type scale with three levels of intensity.

The preliminary questionnaire was subject to several revisions. These revisions were made on the basis of informal trials with several teachers and discussions with members of the writer's committee. Statements were added, deleted or reworded and the original scales were changed to five-point, Likert-type scales.
During the month of March, 1981, the pilot run of the questionnaire was done. The instrument (see Appendix A) was distributed to 18 teachers from three Lower Mainland school districts. There were 15 questionnaires returned, a return of 83 percent. Given the sample size, this return rate was much higher than would be expected with larger numbers. The returns were tabulated (see Appendix B) and comments noted. The results indicated the need for several more changes. Those changes are described below.

The "Survey of Use" was not altered to any great extent. The verb tense was changed in item one and the words 'long term' and 'short term' were underlined in items five and six respectively. Items ten through twelve had the phrase "In my opinion" put at the beginning of each statement.

The section on "Survey of Opinions" was altered considerably. In order to make tabulations easier, items five and six, were reworded to have these items focus on the role of the BCELAC Guide as compared to the prescribed texts. Items one through four were reworded to improve clarity. Item eight was eliminated and replaced with a comment regarding the general feeling of comfort in using the BCELAC Guide. Items eight and nine were interchanged on the final questionnaire. Items ten through fourteen were totally changed. The information obtained on the pilot study was used to come up with three general statements
regarding the provision of district in-service programs. Item fifteen was changed somewhat in the wording and included in the final questionnaire as a guide to areas in which teachers felt the need for more district support.

The section on "Background Information" was not changed except for the addition of the directions "Please Check One".

A description of the final questionnaire is outlined below.

The section "Survey of Use" was designed to assess the frequency with which teachers use the BCELAC Guide and teachers' perceptions of the frequency of district in-service implementation programs. Each item had five categories of response, Constantly (C), Frequently (F), Occasionally (O), Seldom (S), and Never (N), as in the following examples.

1. During the past month I made use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

2. My District provides me with information regarding the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

The five responses, C, F, O, S, and N were weighted four, three, two, one, and zero respectively for tabulation.

The section "Survey of Opinions" was designed to measure the attitudes of teachers toward the general value of the BCELAC Guide, toward the role of this Guide as compared to the prescribed texts, and toward district in-service programs designed to aid implementation of the Guide. Each item had five categories of
response; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Uncertain (U),
Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD), as in the following
examples.

1. I see the goals of the B.C. Elementary SA A U D SD
   Language Arts Curriculum Guide as
   providing the framework of my
   Language Arts program.

2. In my opinion, my District SA A U D SD
   has provided me with adequate
   in-service support for the
   implementation of the B.C.
   Elementary Language Arts
   Curriculum Guide.

The five responses SA, A, U, D, and SD were weighted four, three,
two, one, and zero respectively for tabulation.

The last section of the questionnaire provided for gathering
data related to the grade level taught, the number of years
教经验 and the formal educational background of each
respondent. This information was used to ensure that there was a
balance, both within the total sample and between each district,
in the areas outlined above.

The questionnaire items were spaced out on each page with
every response requiring either a circle or a check mark. The
questionnaire itself had a total of 32 items and was five pages
long. The "Survey of Use" section was put first on half the
questionnaires while the "Survey of Opinion" was put first on
the other half. It was estimated to take approximately five
minutes to complete the questionnaire. (See Appendix C for final
questionnaire).
3.4 Procedures

This section describes the sampling techniques, the distribution of the questionnaire, and the follow-up procedures.

The list of elementary schools in the telephone directory was numbered for each of the three districts, omitting the schools used in the pilot study. Corresponding numbers were written on slips of paper and the slips for each district were combined separately. Six numbers were drawn at random from each pile.

The principals of the individual schools were contacted by telephone and permission was obtained to distribute the questionnaires at each school. During the first two and a half weeks of May, 1981, the questionnaires were delivered to each principal with instructions to distribute the questionnaires to teachers from grades one to seven who taught language arts (English only). Each questionnaire had a covering letter (see Appendix C) and an envelope stamped with the writer's name. A sign asking for assistance was left for the staffroom. The sign mentioned that the study was being conducted by a full-time teacher and asked that teachers willing to take part in the study complete the questionnaire within a week and turn it in to the school principal. A total of 202 questionnaires were distributed.
Permission was obtained from each district to use their inter-school mail to collect the questionnaires and principals were given the name of the person to whom the questionnaires were to be sent. At the end of the week, each principal was contacted by telephone in order to check on the number of returns. Extra questionnaires and a follow-up letter for each teacher were then sent to the schools in an attempt to improve the return rate. By the end of June, a total of 115 questionnaires had been returned.

3.5 Method of Analysis

All items from both the "Survey of Use" and the "Survey of Opinion" sections of the questionnaire were assigned to one of the first four research questions. These divisions are outlined in Chapter 4 as the items related to these four questions are analyzed. The various responses for each item were recorded on a master sheet and the responses for each district were recorded in separate colours. This provided the results for the total sample and in addition, it allowed comparisons to be made between the districts. The percentages were also calculated separately for each district. Comments were noted and some of them are presented in Chapter 4.

The information for question five was obtained by grouping the items from the "Survey of Use" and the "Survey of Opinion"
into three general categories: Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide; Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide; and Teacher Perceptions of District Support. Values of four, three, two, one, and zero were assigned to strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree, respectively. The same five values were used for constantly, frequently, occasionally, seldom, and never, respectively. Scores were tabulated for each of the three categories as outlined below.

A score for "Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by calculating the total score for items one through nine on the "Survey of Use". A score for "Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by calculating the total scores for items one through nine on the "Survey of Opinions". The scores for items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Use" and items ten through twelve on the "Survey of Opinion" were tabulated to provide the score for "Teacher Perceptions of District Support". The three scores for each teacher were recorded and then ranked separately with the highest score in each category receiving the rank of one. The ranks were then used to compute Spearman's rank order correlation (rho) for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide", and for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Opinion of the BCELAC Guide".
Additional findings included the data from the section on "Background Information". These data were recorded and tabulated to ensure a balanced sampling from the various grade levels, years of teaching experience, and educational background. The Spearman rank order correlation for "Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide and Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide", was also computed. Finally, some of the comments written on the questionnaires were listed.
Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Organization of the Chapter

This chapter reports the results obtained from the responses to the final questionnaire and the analyses that were performed on the data. The questionnaire return rate is presented in Section 4.2. In Sections 4.3 through 4.7, the data related to the five basic research questions are analyzed and additional findings are discussed in Section 4.8.

4.2 Final Questionnaire Return Rate

The return distribution of the final questionnaire is presented in Table 1. The total return rate was 56.9 percent. This was slightly higher than the expected return rate of 50 to 55 percent as outlined in Chapter 2.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>% Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Analysis for Question One

The first basic research question was;

To what extent are elementary language arts teachers using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

The data for this question were obtained from the first section of the "Survey of Use" which examined the frequency of use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide). The responses to items one through nine were tabulated. This information is presented in Table 2.

These results indicated that the majority of teachers surveyed do not use the BCELAC Guide frequently or constantly for any of the items listed. Long term planning was the only area in which over 35 percent of the teachers reported more than an occasional use of the Guide (36.8 percent reported using the Guide frequently and 12.3 percent reported using it constantly). In answer to the item regarding the frequency with which teachers consult the BCELAC Guide, 52.6 percent reported consulting it occasionally and 29.9 percent, seldom or never. While 50 percent of the teachers surveyed reported occasionally spending time familiarizing themselves with the content of the Guide, the other half were split between less than occasionally (25.5 percent) and more than occasionally (24.5 percent). Just under half (46.5 percent) of the teachers reported never having used the Guide during the previous month. Overall, 70.2 percent reported having used it occasionally (47.4 percent), frequently (20.2 percent), or
### TABLE 2

**Teacher Use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. **</td>
<td>0 0 5.3 1.8</td>
<td>15 19.4 13.2 15.8</td>
<td>60 41.7 55.3 52.6</td>
<td>25 27.7 21.1 24.6</td>
<td>0 11.1 5.3 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0 5.6 2.6 2.6</td>
<td>25 19.4 21.1 21.9</td>
<td>57.5 36.1 55.3 50</td>
<td>15 27.8 18.4 20.2</td>
<td>2.5 11.1 2.6 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0 2.8 2.6 2.6</td>
<td>20 25 15.8 20.2</td>
<td>52.5 36.1 52.6 47.4</td>
<td>17.5 19.4 23.7 20.2</td>
<td>10 16.7 2.6 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.5 2.8 5.3 3.5</td>
<td>5 8.3 0 4.4</td>
<td>17.5 27.8 21.1 21.9</td>
<td>35 11.1 23.7 23.7</td>
<td>40 50 50 46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>12.5 8.3 15.8 12.3</td>
<td>37.5 41.6 31.6 36.8</td>
<td>37.5 33.3 26.3 32.5</td>
<td>10 5.5 23.7 13.2</td>
<td>2.5 11.1 2.5 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.5 0 2.6 1.8</td>
<td>5 19.4 18.4 14.0</td>
<td>47.5 33.3 36.8 39.5</td>
<td>35 30.5 26.3 30.7</td>
<td>10 16.6 15.8 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.5 5.5 7.9 7.0</td>
<td>37.5 25.0 21.1 28.1</td>
<td>42.5 44.4 39.5 42.1</td>
<td>12.5 19.4 26.3 19.3</td>
<td>0 5.5 5.3 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0 0 2.6 .9</td>
<td>12.5 19.4 7.9 13.2</td>
<td>45 38.8 44.7 43.0</td>
<td>30 11.1 28.9 32.5</td>
<td>12.5 30.5 15.8 19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0 2.7 0 .9</td>
<td>12.5 8.3 15.8 12.3</td>
<td>55 44.4 39.5 46.5</td>
<td>27.5 22.2 21.1 23.7</td>
<td>5 22.2 23.7 16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A** = District A  **B** = District B  **C** = District C  **T** = Total of all Districts

**See items one through nine on the "Survey of Use" (Appendix C)**
constantly (2.6 percent) during the past year. The responses to the remainder of the items indicated that over 64 percent of the teachers surveyed use the Guide occasionally or less for the following: short term planning (72.4 percent), as a reminder of the skills to be taught (64.9 percent), as a source of teaching strategies (94.8 percent), and to help assess the present program (86.9 percent).

In summary, for most of the areas examined, it would appear that the BCELAC Guide is used only occasionally by the majority of teachers surveyed. Long term planning was the only area in which there was a significant indication of more than occasional use.

4.4. Analysis for Question Two

The second basic research question was:

What is the general attitude of teachers toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

The data for this question were obtained from the first part of the "Survey of Opinion" which examined teachers' attitudes toward the BCELAC Guide. The responses to items one through four and seven through nine were tabulated. This information is presented in Table 3.

An examination of the responses indicated that over 55 percent of the teachers surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they need to be familiar with the BCELAC Guide (87.9 percent); that
### Table 3

**Teacher Attitude Toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A*  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.**</td>
<td>30  36.1 48.7 38.3</td>
<td>62.5 44.4 41.0 49.6</td>
<td>2.5 8.3 5.1 5.2</td>
<td>5 8.3 5.1 6.1</td>
<td>0 2.7 0 .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15  16.6 28.2 20</td>
<td>60  50 35.9 48.7</td>
<td>7.5 11.1 10.3 9.6</td>
<td>10 13.8 25.6 16.5</td>
<td>7.5 8.3 0 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>15  8.3 15.4 13</td>
<td>37.5 47.2 43.6 42.6</td>
<td>25 0 12.8 13</td>
<td>17.5 36.1 25.6 26.1</td>
<td>5 8.3 2.6 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>20  8.3 23.1 17.4</td>
<td>60  58.3 59 59.6</td>
<td>15 11.1 7.7 11.3</td>
<td>2.5 19.4 10.3 10.4</td>
<td>2.5 2.7 0 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>12.5 13.8 25.6 17.4</td>
<td>37.5 44.4 41 40.9</td>
<td>42.5 27.7 33.3 34.8</td>
<td>0.11.1 0 3.5</td>
<td>7.5 2.7 0 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>5  2.7 12.8 7.0</td>
<td>57.5 52.7 56.4 55.7</td>
<td>27.5 27.7 25.6 27.0</td>
<td>2.5 13.8 5.1 7.0</td>
<td>7.5 2.7 0 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>5  5.5 7.7 6.1</td>
<td>70  50 61.5 60.9</td>
<td>17.5 25 25.6 22.6</td>
<td>5 16.6 5.1 8.7</td>
<td>2.5 2.7 0 1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = District A  B = District B  C = District C  T = Total of all Districts

** See items one through four and seven through nine on the "Survey of Opinion" (Appendix C)
they need to be familiar with the Guide in order to do a good job of teaching the language arts (68.7 percent); and that the Guide is the major reference source in the planning of their language arts program (55.6 percent). Over 58 percent also agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with the format of the present BCELAC Guide (62.7 percent); that it is an improvement over the previous guide (58.3 percent); and that they are quite comfortable using the Guide (67 percent). Just over half (55.6 percent) agreed that the Guide is seen as the major reference source in the planning of their language arts program.

In summary, it would appear that while the general attitude of the teachers surveyed was favourable toward the BCELAC Guide, just under one-half (44.4 percent) did not see the Guide as the major reference source in the planning of their language arts program.

4.5 Analysis for Question Three

The third basic research question was:

What do teachers perceive as the role of textbooks in determining their language arts program?

The data for this question were obtained from the "Survey of Opinion" Section of the questionnaire which examined teacher attitudes. The responses to items five and six were tabulated. This information is presented in Table 4.
TABLE 4

Teacher Perceptions of the Role of Textbooks in Determining the Language Arts Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A* B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
<td>A B C T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.**</td>
<td>10 5.5 7.7 7.8</td>
<td>22.5 30.8 33.3 31.3</td>
<td>35 11.1 35.9 27.8</td>
<td>30 30.5 23.1 27.8</td>
<td>2.5 13.8 0 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.5 5.5 12.8 8.7</td>
<td>37.5 41.6 43.6 40.9</td>
<td>22.5 13.8 20.5 19.9</td>
<td>27.5 27.7 23.1 26.1</td>
<td>5 11.1 0 5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = District A  B = District B  C = District C  T = Total of all Districts

** See items five and six on the "Survey of Opinion" (Appendix C)
The data indicated that the teachers surveyed are divided in their opinion regarding the importance of the BCELAC Guide, as opposed to the prescribed textbooks, when it comes to the planning of their language arts program (39.1 percent agree the BCELAC Guide is important; 33 percent disagree, and 27.8 percent are uncertain). While 49.6 percent agree that the Guide provides more of a framework for their language arts program than the prescribed textbooks, half (50.4 percent) reported that they were either uncertain (19.1 percent) about this; disagreed (26.1 percent), or strongly disagreed (5.2 percent).

In summary, it would appear that there was no clear consensus regarding teachers' perceptions of the role of textbooks in determining the language arts program.

4.6 Analysis for Question Four

The fourth research question was:

What are teachers' perceptions of the role played by their district in providing information and in-service program support related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

The response to this question was drawn from two sections of the questionnaire. One set of information came from the "Survey of Use" Section examining teacher perceptions of the frequency with which their district provided information and in-service program support related to the BCELAC Guide. The responses to items ten through thirteen were tabulated and the information is presented in Table 5. The second set of information came from
Table 5

Teacher Perceptions of the Frequency With Which Their District Provides Information and In-Service Program Support Related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = District A  B = District B  C = District C  T = Total of all Districts

** See items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Use" (Appendix C)
the "Survey of Opinion" section examining teachers' attitudes toward the in-service program support provided by their districts. The responses to items ten through twelve were tabulated and the results are presented in Table 6. Item thirteen of the "Survey of Opinion" examined teachers' attitudes towards possible areas in which their district could provide additional information and in-service program support. The responses to item thirteen were tabulated and are presented in Table 7.

Teacher responses to the questions regarding the frequency with which their district provides information related to the BCELAC Guide (Table 5), indicated that the majority (over 74 percent) feel that information related to the content and use of the BCELAC Guide is provided occasionally or less. Over half of the teachers surveyed (57.9 percent) reported never receiving release time to work on areas related to the Guide. An examination of the separate districts showed some marked differences. Over half the teachers surveyed in District C (55.3 percent) reported receiving release time frequently (34.2 percent) or occasionally (21.1 percent) compared to five percent from District A and none from District B who reported frequent release time, and five percent from District A and 2.7 percent from District B who reported occasional release time. The majority of the teachers surveyed in District A (90 percent) and District B
Table 6

Teacher Attitudes Toward District In-Service Program Support
Related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.**</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>25 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.5 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20 19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = District A  B = District B  C = District C  T = Total of all Districts

** See items ten through twelve on the "Survey of Opinion" (Appendix C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A*  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
<td>A  B  C  T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 a)**</td>
<td>17.5 16.6 0  11.3</td>
<td>50  61.1 51.3 53.9</td>
<td>17.5 11.1 23.1 17.4</td>
<td>12.5  8.3 23.1 14.8</td>
<td>2.5 2.7 2.6 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>15  5.5  2.6  7.8</td>
<td>55  52.7 56.4 54.8</td>
<td>20  30.5 17.9 22.6</td>
<td>7.5  8.3 20.5 12.2</td>
<td>2.5 2.7 2.6 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>25  11.1  7.7 14.8</td>
<td>50  58.3 46.2 51.3</td>
<td>20  25  17.9 20.9</td>
<td>2.5  5.5 23.1 10.4</td>
<td>2.5 0 5.1 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>15  13.8  7.7 12.2</td>
<td>57.5 61.1 53.8 57.4</td>
<td>17.5 16.6 20.5 18.3</td>
<td>7.5  5.5 15.4  9.6</td>
<td>2.5 2.7 2.6 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = District A  B = District B  C = District C  T = Total of all Districts

** See item 13 (a-d) on the "Survey of Opinion" (Appendix C)
(97.1 percent) reported receiving release time seldom or never. There appeared to be no consensus regarding the frequency with which reference is made to the BCELAC Guide during district workshops, with 24.6 percent reporting frequent reference, 35.1 percent reporting occasional reference, and 26.3 percent reporting that reference is seldom made.

The data shown in Table 6, reporting teachers' attitudes toward the in-service program support provided by their district, indicated no overall consensus on any of the items. Just under 30 percent were uncertain whether or not the in-service programs were adequate, just over 30 percent agreed that they were adequate and just over 30 percent disagreed. However, a higher proportion of the teachers surveyed in District C have a positive attitude toward district in-service program support dealing with content of the Guide (56.4 percent agree or strongly agree) and toward the general in-service program support (56.4 percent agree or strongly agree). The teachers surveyed in District A generally had a more negative attitude (at least 50 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed) toward all aspects of their districts in-service program support. The teachers surveyed in District B were somewhat split in their opinion of the in-service program support related to the content and use of the Guide, but were more negative (52.7 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed) regarding district provision of adequate in-service program support for implementation of the BCELAC Guide.
The data from Table 6, examining areas in which the district could provide additional in-service program support related to the BCELAC Guide, indicated that the majority of teachers surveyed (over 60 percent) agree that more support could be provided in all the areas listed.

In summary, the teachers surveyed appear to perceive district provision of information related to the BCELAC Guide as occurring occasionally at the most. There was no consensus regarding teachers' attitudes toward in-service program support provided by the district, although there was generally strong agreement that more support could be provided in the specified areas.

4.7 Analysis of Question Five

The fifth basic research question was:

What relationship exists between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide, and teachers' perceptions of district support?

The material related to this question was obtained by tabulating three scores for each questionnaire. Values of four, three, two, one, and zero were assigned to strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree, respectively. The same values of four, three, two, one, and zero were also used for constantly frequently, occasionally, seldom, and never, respectively. A score for "Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by calculating
the total score for items one through nine on the "Survey of Use". A score for "Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by calculating the total score for items one through nine on the "Survey of Opinions". The score for "Teacher Perception of District Support" was obtained by calculating the total score for items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Use" and items ten through twelve on the "Survey of Opinion". The scores for each of the three areas were then ranked, assigning the rank of one to the highest score in each area. These ranks were used to compute the Spearman rank order correlation (rho) for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide" and for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide". The results are presented in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8</th>
<th>Rank Order Correlations for Perceived District Support and Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide, and for Perceived District Support and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived District Support and Teacher Attitude</td>
<td>$\rho = .414 \ p &lt; .05 \ n \geq 30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived District Support and Teacher Use</td>
<td>$\rho = .354 \ p &lt; .05 \ n \geq 30$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated a significant correlation between teacher perceptions of strong district support and both a positive teacher attitude toward, and use of, the BCELAC Guide.
The data were also correlated for individual districts. These results are presented in Table 9.

### TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>ρ = .44</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>n ≥ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>ρ = .41</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>n ≥ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td>ρ = .51</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>n ≥ 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Perceived District Support and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>ρ = .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>ρ = .35</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>n ≥ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td>ρ = .58</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>n ≥ 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of "Perceived District Support and Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide" there appeared to be a correlation in all three districts, with a higher correlation in Districts A and C. There was no correlation in District A in the area of "Perceived District Support and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide" while the correlation of District C was higher than that of District B in this area. This would suggest that where teachers perceive strong district support, they have a more positive attitude toward the Guide and make greater use of it.
## TABLE 10

Teacher Background Information

1. Grade level you teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>%A</th>
<th>%B</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>%TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Years of teaching experience as of June, 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>%A</th>
<th>%B</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>%TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Formal Education level

- less than a B.Ed. or B.C.
- B. Ed. or B.A.
- B. Ed. or B.A. plus additional courses
- M. Ed. or M.A.
- M. Ed. or M.A. plus additional courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%A</th>
<th>%B</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>%TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Additional Findings

The data from the section "Background Information" are presented in Table 10 above. The results showed a fairly even distribution between primary and intermediate teachers. Of all the teachers surveyed, 36.9 percent reported having taught from six to fifteen years. Just over 35 percent of the teachers surveyed in Districts B and C reported having taught 16 years or more as compared to 18.4 percent in District 4. The majority of teachers surveyed (79.2 percent) reported having a B.Ed., a B.A., or one of these degrees plus additional courses. A higher percentage of the teachers surveyed in District C (51.2 percent) reported having additional courses beyond their B.Ed. or B.A. compared with 13.2 percent in District A and 26.4 percent in District B.

The Spearman rank order correlation was calculated for "Teacher Attitude and Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide". The results are presented in Table 11.

\[
\rho = .63 \quad p < .01 \quad n \geq 30
\]
The results showed a significant correlation between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the BCELAC Guide. This suggests that teachers with a positive attitude toward the Guide are more likely to make greater use of it.

A few teachers wrote additional comments on their questionnaires. Some of these comments are as follows;

1. We have another "wishy-washy" programme. I have developed my own programme and materials. (District A)

2. I feel that the reading program - not the curriculum guide - provides the basis for the language arts program. Most teachers build their program around this program. They add to their program whenever necessary so that the items mentioned in the curriculum guide are covered. (District B)

3. I have read and referred to the main guide in the past, but do not find it practical enough to help me greatly with day-to-day or month-to-month planning. It does give a good general overview, but requires too much reading to be handy, for reference. I find materials prepared by my district to be far more valuable. (District B)

4. Having read the curriculum guide through once, I seldom refer to it again, as I feel I am "on target" in my program. (District B)

5. I do not feel it is necessary for a district to go to such lengths as workshops, meetings, etc. to familiarize teachers with the guide, it is quite straight forward. (District B)

6. Have never seen the new guide or knew the new guide existed. (District B)

7. I've worked a great deal on local curriculum so I haven't felt it necessary to use the provincial guide. (District C)

8. Curriculum Guide is very superficial at Intermediate Level in regards to skills, methods, goals, and teaching strategies. (District C)
9. (District C) has developed its own Primary Language Arts Resource Guide based on the Provincial Guide.

10. (District C) has spent a great deal of time on Language Arts. These teacher comments indicated that some teachers do not feel the need to make extensive use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. They also indicated that teachers in District C are aware of the materials developed by their own district.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

In this study, descriptive data was compiled relating to the implementation of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide (BCELAC Guide). These data were used to examine five basic research questions:

1. To what extent are elementary language arts teachers using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

2. What is the general attitude of teachers toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

3. What do teachers perceive as the role of textbooks in determining their language arts program?

4. What are teachers' perceptions of the role played by their district in providing information and in-service program support related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide?

5. What relationship exists between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide and teachers' perceptions of district support?

The review of literature supported the use of a questionnaire and outlined some of its limitations as a research tool. An examination of the role of curriculum guides and textbooks, both past and present, indicated that curriculum guides have not played
as important a role as textbooks in influencing a teacher's
day-to-day decisions regarding what is to be taught. The
literature which reported on the roles of teachers and district
administrators in the implementation process, showed the
importance of both groups in determining the degree to which a
curriculum change is implemented.

A special three-part questionnaire was designed in order to
examine the five basic research questions. The "Survey of Use"
section of the questionnaire examined the frequency of use of
the BCELAC Guide and teachers' perceptions of the frequency with
which their district provides information and in-service program
support related to the Guide. The "Survey of Opinion" section of
the questionnaire examined teachers' attitudes toward the BCELAC
Guide, teachers' perceptions of the role of textbooks in
determining their language arts program, teachers' attitudes
toward district in-service program support related to the Guide,
and teachers' attitudes toward the need for additional in-service
program support related to the Guide. The third part of the
questionnaire gathered background information from each respondent.

After a lengthy process of refinement, including a pilot
study, the final questionnaire was distributed to 202 teachers in
three Lower Mainland school districts. Six schools were chosen
at random from each school district. A total of 115 questionnaires were returned.

In the analysis, the data for question one were obtained by tabulating the responses to items one through nine on the "Survey of Use". The data for the second question were obtained by tabulating the responses to items one through four, and seven through nine, on the "Survey of Opinion" while the responses to items five and six on the "Survey of Opinion" were tabulated to provide the data for question three. Question four was examined through the responses to items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Use" and items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Opinion". The data for question five were obtained by calculating three scores for each questionnaire. Values of four, three, two, one, and zero were assigned to strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree, respectively. The same values were assigned to constantly, frequently, occasionally, seldom, and never, respectively. A score for "Teacher Use of the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by tabulating the scores for items one through nine on the "Survey of Use". A score for "Teacher Attitude Toward the BCELAC Guide" was obtained by tabulating the scores for items one through nine on the "Survey of Opinions".
The scores for items ten through thirteen on the "Survey of Use" and items ten through twelve on the "Survey of Opinion" were tabulated to provide a total score for teachers' perceptions of district support. The scores for each of the three areas were then ranked, assigning the rank of one to the highest score in each area. These ranks were used to compute the Spearman rank order correlation (rho) for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Use", and for "Perceived District Support and Teacher Opinion".

5.2 Conclusions

Despite the limitations of the questionnaire, it was deemed to be the most practical method of data-gathering for this study. The return rate of 56.9 percent was slightly higher than the expected rate of 50 to 55 percent.

In answer to question one, it would appear that the BCELAC Guide is used occasionally at the most by the majority of teachers surveyed. Long term planning was the only area in which there was a significant indication of more than occasional use. The results suggest that the BCELAC Guide does not play a major role in the day-to-day, short term planning of the majority of teachers surveyed. Rather, it would appear that the Guide is something that teachers refer to occasionally during the year.
In answer to question two, at least 50 percent of the teachers surveyed indicated a favourable attitude toward the general value of the BCELAC Guide. However, the results also indicated that just under one-half of the teachers surveyed do not necessarily view the Guide as the major reference source in the planning of their language arts program. This would suggest that simply valuing the Guide does not imply that it is used extensively.

There appeared to be no clear consensus in answer to question three regarding teachers' perceptions of the role of textbooks in determining the language arts program. There was a fairly even split in opinion regarding the question of whether the Guide or the textbook played the more important role in the planning of the language arts program. However, there was stronger support for the Guide as providing the basic framework of the language arts program rather than the textbook. The results suggest that the teachers surveyed do not agree on what role textbooks play in determining the language arts program.

In answer to question four, it appeared that the teachers surveyed perceive their districts as providing only occasional information related to the BCELAC Guide. It is not surprising therefore, that the teachers were somewhat ambivalent in their attitude toward the in-service program support that was provided.
However, there was generally strong agreement that more in-service support could be provided in the areas specified.

There was a marked difference in the amount of release time reported by the teachers surveyed when the separate districts were examined. The teachers in District C reported receiving release time with greater frequency than was reported by teachers in Districts A or B.

The data related to question five indicated a significant correlation between teachers' attitude toward, and use of, the BCELAC Guide, and their perceptions of district support. The results suggested that where teachers perceive strong district support, they have more positive attitudes toward the Guide and they make greater use of it.

The data from the section on "Background Information" showed a substantially even distribution among the districts in the number of primary and intermediate teachers; in the number of years teaching experience; and in educational background.

The data related to teachers' attitudes toward the BCELAC Guide and their use of the Guide showed there to be a positive correlation between these two areas. This suggests that teachers with a positive attitude toward the Guide are, on balance, more likely to make greater use of it.
A few of the additional comments written on the questionnaires indicated that some of the teachers do not feel the need to make extensive use of the BCELAC Guide. The comments also indicated that teachers in District C are aware of the materials developed by their own district.

5.3 Recommendations

Presuming that the purpose of BCELAC Guide continues to be that of identifying "the basic aims of the Elementary Language Arts Program in British Columbia" (Ministry of Education, 1978, p. 9) and that local districts continue to be charged with the role of helping teachers implement the Guide, the results of this study suggest the following recommendations:

1. There should be a greater emphasis on providing teachers with a clearer understanding of the changes and expectations involved with the new BCELAC Guide. This recommendation is in accord with the views of Tuinman and Kendall (1980) who recommended ensuring that all teachers have the opportunity to participate in orientation sessions designed to increase the understanding and use of curriculum guides (p.61)

and also the findings of the Rand Study (McLaughlin, 1976) which suggested the need for a shift in focus from the delivery system to the deliverer. This attempt to clarify the purpose of the Guide could mean not only the provision of orientation sessions but also the inclusion of clarifying statements by
the developing committee. These statements would outline
the beliefs upon which the Guide is based, the way(s) in
which it differs from the previous guide, and what
implementation of the Guide involves. There should also
be an attempt made to help teachers understand the whole
process of implementation.

2. The local development of materials related to the BCELAC
Guide should be encouraged. This recommendation is in
accord with the findings of the Rand Study (Berman and
McLaughlin, 1976) that the development of local materials
is important in bringing about teacher change. This
material could be developed as a supplement to the Guide
and would provide opportunities for teacher participation
at the local level.

3. There should be an increase in financial support to provide
more release time for local teachers to receive information
related to the BCELAC Guide and to work in areas related to
the implementation of the Guide. This release time would
also provide for increased teacher interaction which was
found to be an important factor in successful implementation
by the Rand Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976) and by
Heusner (1964). Providing release time during the school day
would increase the likelihood of reaching teachers who do not have the time or energy to attend after school sessions.

4. The teachers surveyed in this study indicated that they felt a need for additional in-service support related to the BCELAC Guide. Districts should re-evaluate their present program support keeping in mind the findings of the Rand Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976) that teachers prefer very concrete "how-to-do-it" workshops rather than the general lecture, inspirational format.

5. There should be a longer time line for the implementation of a new curriculum - especially in the area of in-service programs. There should also be fewer introductions of new curriculum into the elementary school within a five-year time span. With numerous guidelines etc. to be implemented at any given time, it is difficult for the regular district administrators to handle all the areas effectively. This is further reason for providing classroom teachers with release time so that they can help plan for ongoing in-service support.
6. Further research should be conducted to determine if either the format of the BCELAC Guide, or the implementation strategies used, are responsible for the low level of use of the Guide.

5.4 Discussion and Implications

The findings of this study as well as other studies (Goodlad et al., 1970; Jackson & Bedford, 1965; Taylor, 1970; Tuinman & Kendall, 1980) indicate that curriculum guides are not widely used or recognized as important by teachers. Based on these findings, there would appear to be grounds to question the whole concept of curriculum guides developed by central authorities at the state or provincial level. Is the money spent on developing and implementing curriculum guides justified by the impact they have in the classroom? If further research indicates that neither the format of the BCELAC Guide, nor the implementation strategies used, are responsible for the low level of use, then perhaps the role of this curriculum guide should be re-examined. There are several areas that should be considered.

1. If teachers are not using the BCELAC Guide extensively, then the basis for their program is unclear and may lie elsewhere. Further studies focusing on this problem might come up with a more acceptable common source which could be used as a framework for the language arts program.
2. The findings of the Rand Study (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978) point to the need for teachers and administrative staff to "reinvent the wheel" each time an innovation is introduced to the schools (p. 87). This reinvention helps those involved to understand the innovation and adjust it to local needs. With this in mind, perhaps there should be only a skeleton outline stating the expected outcomes for the language arts. This outline could then be augmented at the district level allowing the teachers to more fully develop the program. This would provide local teachers with the opportunity to help develop a program which would suit the local needs and which teachers could more readily identify with. The comments by some of the teachers surveyed in District C, for example, would seem to indicate that they are more comfortable using the language arts materials produced by their own distruct.

3. Recent literature on implementation indicates that this important area of curriculum is often neglected, or handled as short term projects instead of an ongoing process. There needs to be a great deal more time and money devoted to the study of this area and to helping teachers and administrators gain a better understanding of the whole process. Whatever
form curriculum guides might take, there will still be
the job of implementation. Until teachers and administrators
more fully understand this complex and difficult process,
curriculum innovations could continue failing to gain wide-
spread acceptance by teachers.
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Appendices
Appendix A

PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE
SURVEY OF USE

For the following statements, please circle one of the five responses.  
C (Constantly)  
F (Frequently)  
O (Occasionally)  
S (Seldom)  
N (Never)

1. I have consulted the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

2. I spend time familiarizing myself with the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

3. During the past year I made use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

4. During the past month I made use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

5. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to assist in the long term planning of my language arts program.

6. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to assist in the short term planning of my language arts program.

7. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to remind me which skills must be taught.

8. I use the teaching strategies suggested in the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

9. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to help assess my present language arts program.

10. My District provides me with information regarding the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
11. My District provides me with information regarding the use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

12. Reference is made to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide during District workshops related to language arts.
SURVEY OF OPINIONS

For each of the following statements, please circle one of the five responses. SA (Strongly Agree) A (Agree) U (Uncertain) D (Disagree) SD (Strongly Disagree)

1. The B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide is important to me. SA A U D SD

2. I believe that it is important for me to refer frequently to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. SA A U D SD

3. I see the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as the major determiner of my language arts program. SA A U D SD

4. I see the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as the prime reference source for my language arts program. SA A U D SD

5. I see the prescribed texts as the major determiner of my language arts program. SA A U D SD

6. I see the prescribed texts as the prime reference source for my language arts program. SA A U D SD

7. I find the new B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide an improvement over the previous one. SA A U D SD

8. I feel that I can do a good job of teaching language arts without using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. SA A U D SD

9. I am satisfied with the format of the present B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. SA A U D SD
10. Useful aspects of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide include:
a) the non-graded approach
b) the teaching strategies
c) the goals
d) the learning outcomes
e) the communication skills chart
f) other (specify)

11. I feel that there is a need for a different format for the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

12. A more useful format would include:
a) a clearer statement of scope and sequence
b) more ideas for day to day activities
c) suggestions for modified and enrichment programs.
d) suggestions for evaluation and record keeping
e) ideas for integration with other subjects
f) other (specify)

13. In my opinion, my District has done an adequate job of familiarizing me with the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

14. In my opinion, my District could do more to familiarize me with the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

15. The District could provide more support in the areas of:
a) workshops dealing with specific areas of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide
b) individual consultatuons for teachers
c) small meeting for sharing ideas with peers
d) hands-on work sessions
e) printed resource material
f) other (specify)
## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Grade level you teach.
   - 1-3
   - 4-5
   - 6-7

2. Years of teaching experience as of June, 1981.
   - 1 year or less
   - 2-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 16 years or more

3. Formal educational level
   - less than a B.Ed. or B.A.
   - B.Ed. or B.A.
   - B.Ed. or B.A. plus additional courses
   - M.Ed. or M.A.
   - M.Ed. or M.A. plus additional courses
### Teacher Attitude Toward the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See item one through four and seven through twelve on "Survey of Opinion". (Appendix A)*

### Teacher Attitude Toward Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See items five and six on "Survey of Opinion". (Appendix A)*
Teacher Use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See items one through nine on "Survey of Use". (Appendix A)

Teacher Perceptions of the Frequency With Which Their District Provides Information and In-Service Programs Related to the B. C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See items ten through twelve on "Survey of Use". (Appendix A)
Teacher Attitude Toward District In-Service Program Support Related to the B. C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*13.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.a</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

COVERING LETTER AND FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE
SURVEY OF USE

For the following statements, please circle one of the five responses.

C (Constantly)  
F (Frequently)  
O (Occasionally)  
S (Seldom)  
N (Never)

1. I consult the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
2. I spend time familiarizing myself with the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
3. During the past year I made use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
4. During the past month I made use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
5. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to assist in the long term planning of my language arts program.
6. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to assist in the short term planning of my language arts program.
7. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to remind me which skills must be taught.
8. I use the teaching strategies suggested in the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
9. I use the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide to help assess my present language arts program.
10. My District provides me with information regarding the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
11. My District provides me with information regarding the use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

12. My District provides me with release time to work on areas related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

13. Reference is made to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide during District workshops related to language arts.
SURVEY OF OPINIONS

For each of the following statements, please circle one of the five responses: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), U (Uncertain), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree).

1. I feel that it is important for me to be familiar with the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

2. I feel that I need to be familiar with the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide in order to do a good job of teaching the language arts.

3. I see the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as the major reference source in the planning of my language arts program.

4. I see the goals of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as providing the framework of my language arts program.

5. I see the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as playing a more important role in my planning of the language arts than the prescribed text books.

6. I see the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as providing more of the framework of my language arts program than the prescribed text books.

7. I find the new B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide an improvement over the previous one.

8. I am satisfied with the format of the present B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

10. In my opinion, my District has provided adequate in-service programs to familiarize me with the content of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

11. In my opinion, my District has provided adequate in-service programs to familiarize me with the intended use of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

12. In my opinion, my District has provided me with adequate in-service support for the implementation of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.

13. My District could provide me with more support in the areas of:
   a) workshops dealing with specific areas of the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
   b) small meetings for sharing ideas related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
   c) make-and-take sessions for developing additional materials related to the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide.
   d) suggestions for using the B.C. Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide as a resource in my planning of the language arts.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Please check one)

1. Grade level you teach
   K-3
   4-5
   6-7

2. Years of teaching experience as of June, 1981.
   1 year or less
   2-5 years
   6-10 years
   11-15 years
   16 years or more

3. Formal educational level
   less than a B.Ed. or B.A.
   B.Ed. or B.A.
   B.Ed. or B.A. plus additional courses
   M.Ed. or M.A.
   M.Ed. or M.A. plus additional courses

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS