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Educational change depends on what teachers do and think – it’s as simple and as complex as that. It would all be so easy if we could legislate changes in thinking (Sarason, 1971, as quoted in Fullan, 1991, p.117).

For both stability and change, the mental health and attitudes of teachers are absolutely crucial to success (Fullan, 1991, p.117).

Why is educational change implemented or not implemented by teachers? A recurring factor identified in studies of implementation of change has been the perceptions of teachers, their beliefs, predispositions, and psychological states (Fullan, 1991).


The context of the present study is the implementation of a new course introduced under the Language Arts umbrella by the British Columbia Ministry of Education as part of its restructuring of school curriculum in 1995/6. English teachers seem to be divided over the issue of implementing the Technical Professional Communications 12 curriculum in British Columbia school districts (Jones, 1995; Schultz, 1996; Lord, 1996; pilot survey, 1996). A principal concern of the discussion was seen to be the debate between aesthetic and efferent literature – which of the two is more essential for students’ education? While some teachers have begun teaching the course, others continue to be concerned about its implementation.
THE QUESTION

Are teachers’ beliefs related to curriculum implementation? What are the factors that contribute to these beliefs? Are teachers’ backgrounds related to curriculum implementation? These questions need to be addressed if there is to be effective implementation of proposed curriculum change.

Based on the theoretical framework outlined below and a review of the literature in Chapter II, the present study made the following assumptions:

1. teachers’ decisions to implement changes in curriculum are based, among other things, on their beliefs about the objectives and teaching practices of the subject they teach (Fullan, 1991; Werner, 1980, 1991)

2. the central difference in beliefs about teaching English is between the teaching of bellettristic literature and the teaching of practical language and literacy skills, termed “aesthetic literature” and “efferent literature” respectively by Louise Rosenblatt (1978). This difference in beliefs has been a dominant feature of the culture of English as a school subject, with the teaching of literature and aesthetics being preferred to the teaching of language and literacy skills (Goodson, 1990, 1993; Yagelski, 1994; Davies, 1996; Hollindale, 1986).

This study examined the relationship between teachers’ beliefs about the objectives and content of teaching English and curriculum implementation, and sought to investigate the following central hypothesis:

Teachers who are less willing to implement the TPC12 curriculum believe that teaching English should be principally based on reading and writing aesthetic literature whereas teachers who are willing to implement the TPC12 curriculum believe that teaching English should be based on reading and writing efferent literature.

---

1 Various other terms have also been used: “language vs. literature” (Hollindale, 1986), “literature” and “literacy” (Yagelski, 1994), “literacy teaching” and “English teaching” (Davies, 1996), “poetic” and “transactional” (James Britton et al., 1978). For the purpose of the present study, Rosenblatt’s terms were used.
The central hypothesis made the assumption that much of the central difference in the teaching of English is manifested in choices between the use of literary, aesthetic texts and the use of non-literary, efferent texts. Thus, in the questionnaire the respondents were asked to choose between factors that represented the teaching of reading and writing aesthetic literature and factors that represented the teaching of reading and writing efferent literature. In the interviews, respondents were asked open-ended questions that elicited statements of beliefs about the teaching of aesthetic literature and the teaching of efferent literature.

Because previous studies on teachers and implementation have found a relationship between teachers’ backgrounds and implementation (Pike, 1981; Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Lortie, 1975; Rose and Medway, 1981; Pajares, 1992), the present study also examined the following secondary hypothesis:

**Teachers’ willingness to implement new curriculum is significantly related to their education and experience.**

In investigating the central hypothesis of this study, i.e. the relationship between beliefs and willingness to implement, beliefs about three aspects of educational implementation were investigated: pedagogy, teacher preparation, and characteristics of change. The sub-sections of these aspects are listed below, and were used as the basis for the interpretation of the results of the present study.

**Beliefs about pedagogy:**

1. Objectives of the course, identified as:
   - Most important contribution to students' cognitive development – aesthetic literature vs. efferent literature
   - Statements about objectives – emphasis on aesthetic literature vs. emphasis on efferent literature
   - Most important reason students learn to write – communication vs. self-reflection

2. Texts for the course: aesthetic, literary texts vs. efferent, non-literary texts

3. Utilization of classroom hours – hours for aesthetic literature vs. hours for efferent literature.
Beliefs about teacher preparation:
1. Courses teachers should have taken – literature courses vs. language/linguistics courses
2. Reading teachers should do – literary journals vs. non-literary journals.

Beliefs about the characteristics of the change:
1. Need - adequacy of the new curriculum and provision of skills for graduation
2. Clarity – awareness of the intent and knowledge of the Integrated Resource Package (IRP) for TPC12, instances of false clarity
3. Complexity – complexity in course content, culture of the subject
4. Quality/practicality – student feedback, availability of resources, need for assistance and support, need for collegial support.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Fullan (1991), Hargreaves (1989) and others have talked about the role of teachers’ understanding, perception of need, and subject loyalty in implementing educational change. As Hargreaves (1989) stated, “[teachers’] perception and understanding will depend on their patterns of thinking, belief and assumptions” (p. 28).

Based on Fullan’s and Hargreaves’ work, the present study aimed to find out if there is a relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their willingness to implement educational change. In doing so, the present study also examined the culture of a school subject, because the basis of beliefs about teaching a high school subject seem to come from teachers’ perceptions about the subject. There has been considerable academic discussion on the role of school respondents (Goodson, 1993), and on the role of English as a high school subject which encompasses the debate between Literature and Language (Davies, 1996).

Curriculum Implementation and Beliefs
The present study used Fullan’s description of ‘beliefs’ as “pedagogical assumptions and theories underlying particular new policies or programs” (1991, p. 37) to identify
respondents' statements about the personal pedagogies and theories they used in their teaching.

“What types of things would have changed if an innovation or a reform were to become fully implemented?” In answer to his own question, Fullan (1991, pp. 37, 66, 132) listed three dimensions that would need to be changed in the classroom:

1) curriculum materials
2) teaching practices
3) beliefs or understandings about the curriculum and learning practices.

These three dimensions are the basis of Fullan’s framework for implementation of educational change, as is seen in his models for both initiation and implementation. Drawing from Fullan’s framework, the present study focused on the relationship between implementation and ‘beliefs and understandings about the curriculum and learning practices’. A brief overview of Fullan’s theory of the role of beliefs in the initiation and implementation stages follows.

According to Fullan (1991), at the curriculum initiation stage, the dimension of beliefs is manifest in the first two of the three R’s (relevance, readiness, and resources). Relevance “includes the interaction of need, clarity of the innovation, practitioner’s understandings of it, and utility”, and Readiness “involves the school’s practical and conceptual capacity to initiate, develop, or adopt a given innovation” (p.63).

Using different terminology but referring to the same factors, Markee (1994) stated that the three dimensions of the innovation triangle of educational change are “the development and use by teachers of new materials, methodological skills, and pedagogical values” (p.1). Further, as Werner (1980) stated, “ideally, implementation at a minimum includes shared understanding among participants concerning the implied presuppositions, values and assumptions which underlie a program ...” (pp. 62-63).
At the curriculum implementation stage, the four characteristics of change listed by Fullan that affect implementation are perception of need, clarity in terms of understanding the change, complexity of the change, and quality and practicality of the change (Fullan, 1991, p. 68-73). In the present study, these factors were investigated through the questionnaire and through interview questions.

Based on Fullan’s theoretical framework for the initiation and implementation of change, this study looks at why change is implemented or not implemented by teachers, by examining the beliefs of teachers willing to implement new curriculum and the beliefs of teachers not willing to implement new curriculum.

**Curriculum Implementation and Teachers**

Examining the role of the teacher as one of the essential factors in curriculum implementation, Fullan (1991) repeatedly emphasized the psychological state of the teacher (p. 117). Teachers are one of the most important factors in implementing educational reform - it is they who translate a curriculum into what students are taught in the classroom.

Given the situation that teachers have to work in, what are the factors that they consider when faced with curriculum change? Fullan (1991, pp. 127-128) stated that “Change is a highly personal experience - each and every one of the teachers who will be affected by the change must have the opportunity to work through this experience in a way in which the rewards at least equal the cost.” He listed four main criteria that teachers consider in answering the question, “Why should I put my efforts into this particular change?”

1. Does the change potentially address a need? Will students be interested? Will they learn? Is there evidence that the change works, i.e., that it produces claimed results?
2. How clear is the change in terms of what the teacher will have to do?
3. How will it affect the teacher personally in terms of time, energy, new skills, sense of excitement and competence, and interference with existing priorities?
4. How rewarding will the experience be in terms of interaction with peers or others?
These four criteria correspond to Fullan’s four characteristics of change in curriculum implementation – need, clarity, complexity, and practicality/utility.

Discussing other factors that have an impact on teachers and their work, Fullan (1991, pp. 119-121) quoted Lortie’s 1975 study of teachers to list factors that influence teachers’ perception of change. Included in these factors were:

- Teacher training
- Sources of help and support for teachers
- Informal observations of student success as gauge for effectiveness of teaching
- Feelings of uncertainty in achievement of outcomes

Fullan (1991) also saw connections between curriculum implementation and teacher collegiality. He paraphrased the works of Rosenholtz (1989), Little (1990), Hargreaves (1990), and Huberman (1990) to explain that collegiality often emphasizes the culture of the school and the culture of the school subject, and leads to consensus. Collegiality often results in consensus about subject philosophy and subject pedagogy. Thus, especially “in situations where teachers are satisfied with their current program” they (teachers) may “conclude at the outset there is no need or time for interaction, and that no change is needed or possible” (Fullan, 1991, p. 133). On the other hand, “Consensus seeking may inhibit creativity and may result in the wrong solution” (Fullan, 1991, p. 137) functioning to discourage curriculum implementation.

The present study collected data on the four factors listed above, and, during the interviews, probed questions about collegiality, in order to determine the relationship between these factors and implementation of the new curriculum.

Curriculum Implementation, Teachers’ Beliefs, and the Culture of School Subjects
As elaborated in Chapter 2, the culture of a school subject impacts on teachers’ beliefs. Fullan (1991) also stated that “cultural change is the agenda” (pp. 142-143). Since the context of the present study was the discussion over the implementation of the TPC12
curriculum under the English Language Arts umbrella, and since BCTELA, the association of English teachers in the province, took a stand on this discussion (Jones, 1995), and respondents referred to the historical bases for the pedagogy of English, the present study made reference to the history and culture of English as a school subject.

Within its own culture, English as a school subject has acquired an ‘elite’ status, thereby giving its teachers a strong sense of community and sense of worth. The literature on school subjects and curriculum change has also affirmed the effects of collegiality in building the culture of high school subjects like English (Goodson, 1993; Hollindale, 1986; Davies, 1996).

The culture of English as a school subject has been built principally around the debate over the teaching of aesthetic literature and the teaching of efferent literature, with the teaching of aesthetic literature receiving favour over the teaching of efferent literature because historically, the teaching of aesthetic literature is believed to impart personal growth and cultural heritage, whereas the teaching of efferent literature is believed to impart literacy skills (Goodson, 1993; Hollindale, 1986; Davies, 1996).

BACKGROUND TO THE QUESTION
Ministries legislate changes in curriculum whenever they deem it expedient, but unless the individual teacher will accept these changes and then implement the changes in their classrooms with students, no real change in the content or process of education will take place.

In 1995/6, the BC Ministry of Education launched a restructuring of the K-12 curriculum. A major objective of the new curriculum was the Applied Academics focus. One consequence of this focus was the introduction of Technical and Professional Communications 12 (TPC12) as one part of Language Arts K-12.

The initial launch of TPC12 raised much discussion and concern among English teachers in British Columbia (Jones, 1995; Lord, 1996; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996). The BCTELA
vocalized the opposition to making TPC12 an alternative to the English 12 course. One of the more often stated concerns was, as then-BCTELA President Sylvia Jones (1995) stated, “Technical and Professional Communications will focus on non-literary texts associated with commerce and technology. There will be no cultural exploration and critique and no literature ... The writing will not be exploratory, imaginative or academic. The students will learn the forms of language associated with business and technology ... If Technical and Professional Communications remains an alternative to the wider, more literary and culturally based English 12, many students will leave grade 12 having read no literary texts since grade 11 and with a very narrow range of writing experiences. ... The humanistic, cultural, literary, imaginative and reflective aspects of English will be missing from this course, or much diminished, but students will be able to choose this course instead of English 12 for graduation purposes” (p. 1).

From this and other statements made orally at seminars, to this researcher in telephone conversations, in response to the pilot study, and in the press, it can be postulated that some English teachers believe that:

1) a language arts course carries the responsibility of providing “humanistic, cultural, literary, imaginative and reflective aspects”, and
2) that a course based on “forms of language associated with business and technology” will not provide these aspects.

Since then, some teachers in some school districts have taken on the responsibility of teaching TPC 12, and other concerns have surfaced. These include the availability of resources, collegial support, and teachers’ qualifications and experience.

THE 1995/6 LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM IN BC
In 1995/6, the BC Ministry of Education introduced a ‘new’ K-12 curriculum that restructured the curriculum of all subjects organized into “IRPs” (Integrated Resource Packages). A dominant goal was the real-life applicability of the curriculum. To achieve
this goal, subjects like Career and Personal Planning (CAPP) were made mandatory in the high school and the concept of applied academics promoted, with four specific applied academics courses offered as graduating options in Grade 12 - Technical Professional Communications, Applications in Mathematics, Applications in Physics, and Information Technology. “Collectively, these courses address essential, employability skills requirements for numeracy, technology, computing and literacy” (CFAA, 1998).

The emphasis was also on providing students with life-long skills for the workplace, as is evident in the Mission Statement (Ministry of Education, 1999, p.1):

The purpose of the BC school system is to enable all learners to develop their individual potential and to acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to contribute a healthy, democratic and pluralistic society and a prosperous and sustainable economy.

The English Language Arts 11 and 12 IRP initiated in 1996 has as its rationale the fundamental nature of language and its skilled use. The Rationale specifically focuses on workplace language, in its statement that “the skilled use of language in the workplace is becoming increasingly essential” (p.1).

The two principal areas of debate in high school English curriculum, literature and language, are identified in the curriculum as two streams of communications. The Rationale proposes to “provide students with the opportunity to study literary and informational (including technical) communications and the mass media and thereby experience the power of language” (MOEST, 1996, p.1).

For high school graduation, this IRP states that “In Grade 12, either English 12 or Technical and Professional Communications 12 will satisfy provincially prescribed graduation requirements.” It goes on to explain the focus of each course. “English 12 focuses on the expressive and functional purposes of language and its uses in a wide variety of contexts. Technical and Professional Communications 12 focuses more specifically on the functional uses of language in technical and professional contexts” (MOEST, 1996, p. 1).
Thus the 1995/6 BC English curriculum sought to establish language skills and informational communications on par with literary communications, and proposed to let students decide which stream they would like to graduate in. It seems to be because of this proposed equality of status for the two courses, English 12 and TPC12, that some BC English teachers (Jones, 1995; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996) are unwilling to implement the TPC12 curriculum.

Historically, the debate over the high school English curriculum has centered around the objective of the course: what is English as a subject providing its students? Proponents of aesthetic literature have emphasized the objectives of cultural heritage and personal growth based primarily on literary texts, whereas proponents of efferent literature have emphasized the objectives of literacy and communication skills (Davies, 1996; Pajares, 1994; Goodson, 1991; Yagelski, 1994; Hollindale, 1986, and others). Based on such previous academic discussion and research, the analysis of the open-ended responses to the questionnaire and the interview in the present study identified whether a respondent stated that the objective of an English course was to emphasize the objectives of cultural heritage and personal growth, or whether a respondent stated that the objective of an English course was to emphasize the objectives of literacy and communication skills.

Because TPC12 emphasizes literacy and communication skills, the present study hypothesized that teachers who believe that the objective of an English course is to emphasize cultural heritage and personal growth based primarily on aesthetic literature and literary texts, will not be willing to implement TPC12, whereas teachers who believe that the objective of an English course is to emphasize efferent literature, language use and communication skills, will be willing to implement TPC12.

“TEACHERS’ BELIEFS” AS A CONSTRUCT
For the purpose of this study, based on Fullan’s description of ‘beliefs’ as “pedagogical assumptions and theories underlying particular new policies or programs” (1991, p. 37), the term ‘beliefs’ is defined as “teacher beliefs about what is appropriate curriculum for a school subject.” The term refers to teachers’ “understandings about the curriculum and learning
practices” and “the means of achieving desired objectives” (Fullan, 1991, p. 66). To further specify, “beliefs” refers to English teachers’ beliefs about what are appropriate content and objectives for a Grade 12 English or Language Arts course. In the present study, statements made by various stakeholders about what the subject of high school English should consist of, were used as manifestations of beliefs.

As Rokeach (1968) stated, beliefs cannot be directly observed but have to be inferred from what a believer says or does. For the purpose of this study, teachers’ beliefs are inferred from their statements about what they think an English 12 course should provide students. Fullan (1991, p. 42) also recognized the deep-seated nature of beliefs when he stated “changes in beliefs are even more difficult: they challenge the core values held by individuals regarding the purposes of education; moreover, beliefs are often not explicit, discussed, or understood, but rather are buried at the level of unstated assumptions. And the development of a clear belief system is essential because it provides a set of criteria for overall planning and a screen for sifting valuable from not-so-valuable learning opportunities that inevitably arise during instruction.”

Two of the three factors that Fullan (1991) listed as needed for initiation, ‘relevance’ and ‘readiness’, depend on perception and the conceptual capacity to adopt an innovation. Practitioners’ understanding of the innovation is a factor in ‘relevance’. Perceiving a need for the innovation is a first step in ‘readiness’ (p. 63). Teachers’ perception and understanding will depend on their “patterns of thinking, belief and assumptions” (Hargreaves, 1989, p.26).

What are the roots of teachers’ beliefs and patterns of thinking? As Pajares (1996) stated, it is difficult to trace back to the origins of a belief. Hargreaves traced the roots of teachers’ culture and identity as being constituted by those “patterns of thinking, belief and assumptions” shared by teachers (Hargreaves, 1989, p.26). According to Hargreaves (1989), the “socialization of teachers into subject loyalty stretches back to their own experience as successful pupils, is reinforced through the specialist pattern of most undergraduate education, and is virtually completed with exposure to subject-divided and subject-biased
pattern of teacher training” (p.28). Werner (1991) added that “this identity is further reinforced through subject-based professional organizations, journals, conferences and workshops that define collegial affiliations” (p.4). Based on Hargreaves’ and Werner’s work, the present study reviewed previous discussion on the history and culture of English as a school subject, and predicted that the culture of a school subject contributes to the pedagogical values of the subject, which in turn have a bearing on implementation.

The history of the development of English as a school subject provides several clues about the basis of English teachers’ beliefs. Scholars like Goodson (1997) and Davies (1996) have gone beyond the basic structure of the subject to identify social and political reasons for the establishment of ‘liberal humanistic’ literature-centered learning outcomes in preference to ‘a radical cultural theorist approach’ that focuses on efferent literature and non-literary texts. This divide in English teaching beliefs and values, between aesthetic literature and efferent literature, seems to be at the heart of the differences between those who accept TPC12 and those who do not. Thus, it is central to the present study to examine the relationships between teachers’ beliefs as elicited through responses to the questionnaire, and their decision to teach or not teach TPC12.

ASSUMPTIONS

In the present study, beliefs about curriculum implementation were assumed to be articulated in statements about objectives and pedagogies. This assumption was based on Fullan’s description of beliefs as pedagogical assumptions and understandings (1991).

The belief statements on the Likert scales in the questionnaire were constructed from statements made by various individuals about what an English 12 course should be. For the purpose of the present study, it was assumed that beliefs about curriculum were manifested in statements made by various stakeholders about the optimal pedagogical values and teaching approaches for teaching English 12. This assumption was based on:

A) previous studies that discussed the objectives of English as a subject
(Yagelski, 1991; Protherough and Atkinson, 1992; Davies, 1996)
B) statements made by selected persons during telephone interviews who had demonstrated interest in the new curriculum by participating in the discussion surrounding its introduction (Lord, 1996; Archer, 1996; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996). Subsequently, a list of statements was constructed and tested in a pilot survey and with a panel of judges (See Chapter III).

NEED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY
As discussed in the theoretical framework for the present study, teachers’ beliefs and perceptions about the curriculum are crucial to what aspects of a curriculum are actually taught, regardless of what curriculum planners visualize as happening in the classroom. When new curriculum is mandated, as happened in BC in 1995-99, the success of implementation depends to a large extent on whether teachers understand, accept, and agree with the new curriculum. And teachers’ acceptance is rooted in their beliefs about curriculum.

A systematic study of the implementation of the BC curriculum introduced in 1995/6 was perceived as a need in the course of my observations of English teachers’ reactions to the new course. A preliminary examination of statements made both by stakeholders in favour of implementing the new course and stakeholders not in favour, revealed the value-loaded nature of beliefs implied by these statements (See Chapter III). Moreover, as outlined in the Literature Review (Chapter II), there is a paucity of studies on teachers’ beliefs about pedagogical values and implementation of change.

The present study was attempted to provide some answers to why English teachers in British Columbia would be willing to implement or not implement new curriculum.
DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING PROCEDURES
The data for the present study were collected through means of a questionnaire that was given to respondents (see Chapter III for details of distribution and collection) and through telephone interviews with respondents who volunteered to participate in such interviews.

Once the data were collected, the responses to the multiple-choice questions were converted into numerical data and entered onto a raw data table using the SPSS 8.0 for Windows software. From this table, independent sample t-tests were computed to determine the significance of relationship between respondents’ willingness to implement and the factors under study.

Data from the open-ended questions were categorized according to question type, and discussed. Data from the interviews was recorded and transcribed. The interview data were then categorized and analyzed according to the questions in the interview schedule.

DEFINITION OF TERMS
For the purpose of this study, key terms were defined as follows:

Teachers’ Beliefs
Teachers’ beliefs are manifested, among other ways, in statements made by teachers about what they think is the objective of a course, and what they think students should be learning in a course.

For the purpose of this study – the term ‘teacher’s beliefs’ is defined as English teachers’ beliefs as manifested in their statements about what the objective and content of an English 12 course should be.

Curriculum implementation
The term ‘curriculum implementation’ refers to the practice of curriculum in the classroom by teachers.

In the present study, the term ‘curriculum implementation’ is defined as the implementation of the new TPC12 curriculum that was introduced by the BC Ministry of Education in 1995-97.
DEFINITION OF TERMS continued

Willingness to implement  The term ‘willingness to implement’ refers to teachers’ agreeing to teach a course. In the present study – the term ‘willingness to implement’ is defined as a statement made by a teacher that he/she would like to teach TPC12.

The present study  The term ‘the present study’ is defined as the investigation into the implementation of TPC12 by English teachers in BC undertaken by the researcher and contained in this thesis.

The new course  The term ‘the new course’ is defined as the Technical and Professional Communications 12 course under the Language Arts umbrella that the BC Ministry of Education initiated in 1995 along with curriculum change across the K-12 system. TPC12 is one of the four courses initiated under the Applied Academics initiative.

The established course  The term ‘the established course’ is defined as the English 12 course being taught in the BC school system under the Language Arts umbrella.

The umbrella course  The term ‘the umbrella course’ is defined as the Language Arts K-12 curriculum, which includes English 12, TPC12, and Literature 12.

Knowledge of the new curriculum  The term ‘knowledge of the curriculum’ is defined as teachers’ awareness of the objectives and content of TPC12.

Educational background  The term ‘educational background’ refers to teachers’ post-secondary education and courses taken at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Experience  The term ‘experience’ refers to teachers’ work experience, both teaching experience and non-teaching work experience, as well as teachers’ writing experience.

Aesthetic literature  English literature which emphasizes the traditional literary canon, based on the term “aesthetic literature” (Rosenblatt, 1978).

Efferent literature  Technical professional communication and literature, including non-literary texts, based on the term “non-aesthetic or efferent” literature (Rosenblatt, 1978).
DEFINITION OF TERMS continued

Literary texts 'Literary texts’ are defined as the classical literary canon of English Literature, as well as other literary writings like novels, short stories, and essays.

Non-literary texts ‘Non-literary texts’ are defined as pragmatic, non-fiction, scientific, technical, and professional texts written to convey information.

DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Because social science research methodology has been largely drawn from research methods used in the physical sciences, various limitations occur when applying scientific methods to behavioural research. As Schumacher and McMillan (1993) state, “knowledge acquired through research is limited by the nature of both educational practice and research … ethical and legal considerations in conducting research on human beings, the public nature of education, the complexity of educational practices, and methodological limitations” (p. 25).

While a ‘limitation’ in a research study occurs when certain factors are beyond the control of the researcher, a ‘delimitation’ is built into the purpose of a study by the researcher, to narrow the focus and examine a particular aspect of the phenomenon in relation to the theoretical framework.

Delimitations:

One of the delimitations of the present study was the decision to focus on only one of the stakeholders in education: teachers. Various stakeholders are involved when curriculum change is implemented: the group proposing the change (often, a government ministry), the group formulating the change, the administrators, the implementers (teachers), the clients (students), as well as external groups from the community – parents, political groups, etc. Teachers were chosen as the focus of this study because they function on a day-to-day basis in the classroom to use curriculum for its essential objective – the furtherance of students’ education.
Another delimitation of the present study was that it examined only one of Fullan’s three
dimensions of change: beliefs (or pedagogical assumptions and theories). While the other
two dimensions, i.e., teaching materials and teaching approaches, are also essential
components of change, the situation used in the present study (implementation of Technical
Professional Communication 12 by English teachers in British Columbia) had as its focus of
debate the beliefs surrounding the validity of the new curriculum.

A third delimitation was that, because the present study looked at teachers’ beliefs and
curriculum implementation, it investigated just one of Fullan’s three categories for
implementation: the characteristics of change. (The other two categories, Local
Characteristics and External Factors, refer largely to non-teacher factors and therefore were
not investigated separately).

Limitations:
The major limitation of the present study, from the point of view of generalizability, was the
sampling procedure. A sample of convenience was selected from the population of English
teachers in British Columbia, principally because of the need to identify English teachers
potentially interested in implementing the new TPC12 curriculum, and the need to reach
English teachers willing to respond to questions on the topic. Also, although both rural and
urban teachers were included in the sample, the respondents did not represent a random
sample.

Linked to the necessity of selecting a sample of convenience was another limitation of the
present study, which was manifest in the low return rate of the questionnaire from
respondents. It is surmised that this was due to the nature of the situation studied. That is,
because much debate had preceded and was ongoing about the validity of the new curriculum
(TPC12), some teachers were reluctant to participate in the study, as reported by the English
department heads who were requested to distribute and collect the questionnaire.
Because of these limitations, the findings of the present study represent the views and potential behaviour of the selected sample only. Further research is necessary to establish the generalizability of findings of the present study.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Following this introduction, Chapter II presents the review of related literature and research, Chapter III describes the research methodology used in the present study. Chapter IV presents the data and the analysis of statistical results as well as a qualitative analysis of responses to the open-ended questions and the interviews. In Chapter V, the findings of the present study are interpreted and discussed, implications of the present study for educational planners are outlined, and some suggestions are made for further research.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Four major research strands on curriculum implementation have a bearing on the present study, and form the main sections of this chapter. The four strands are:

1. Research that emphasizes the need to study teachers’ beliefs in curriculum implementation
2. Studies on curriculum implementation and teachers’ beliefs
3. Research and discussion on the role of subject cultures in teachers’ beliefs and curriculum implementation

Because teacher beliefs in curriculum implementation have been studied only by a few researchers, this review of literature begins with a section on research findings that emphasize the importance of studying teacher beliefs, and includes definitions of beliefs that underline the importance of the concept. The second section presents research that has examined the relationship between beliefs and curriculum implementation, with particular reference to three areas that are the focus of the present study, i.e., beliefs about pedagogy, beliefs about teacher preparation, and beliefs about the characteristics of change. The third section looks at research on curriculum development and implementation of school subjects, and how values and beliefs have shaped implementation, with specific focus on the curriculum of high school English. In the fourth section, studies that have looked at the relationship between beliefs and teachers’ educational and work backgrounds are presented with reference to their impact on curriculum implementation.

The fifth section of this chapter reviews research methods used in previous studies. To conclude the chapter, a gap in the literature is identified, and the need for the study is explained.
THE NEED TO STUDY TEACHERS' BELIEFS

The present study made the assumption that teachers' beliefs are related to teachers' decisions to implement new curriculum, and therefore teachers' beliefs need to be examined methodically. Because the term is an abstract concept, researchers have found "beliefs" difficult to examine; nevertheless, the need to study beliefs about education has been emphasized by researchers. As Pajares (1992) found, "people are often loath to engage in discussions that touch on what they feel are their most deeply held beliefs ... but when they do, they usually manage to survive the ordeal with preconceptions comfortably in tact" (p. 317). Though beliefs are deep-seated and not easily manifested, over the years researchers have discovered that beliefs can in fact be studied methodically. Fullan (1991) listed beliefs and perceptions as one of three dimensions of curriculum initiation and implementation. The growing interest in the study of beliefs as related to implementation and teaching was pointed out by Fang (1996). Hargreaves and Evans (1997a) and Pajares (1992) discussed the importance of studying teacher beliefs in relation to teaching practice and implementation.

The present study was undertaken on the premise that teachers' beliefs needed to be investigated in relation to willingness to implement the new TPC12 curriculum in BC. Fullan (1991) pointed to the importance of teachers' thoughts, beliefs, and perceptions (p. 117), and stated "the nature of educational changes should be examined according to the specific values, goals, events, and consequences that obtain in concrete situations" (p. 28).

Beliefs also need to be studied to help teachers recognize how their beliefs affect their teaching practice. Olson and Singer stated that the gap between teachers' cognition and behaviour needs to be addressed, because they found that "teachers are often unaware how their beliefs about teaching affects the kinds of changes they might make. They do not always know how to begin to effect positive changes that are in line with their beliefs" (1994, p. 97).

There is growing interest in beliefs research, as Fang (1996) pointed out in the introduction to his study on teacher beliefs and teaching writing:
"Influenced by the cognitive revolution in psychology, the popularity of the qualitative research paradigm, and the conception of the teacher as a thoughtful professional, as well as the previous decade of research that identified the teacher as the most neglected stakeholder in education, teacher education researchers have, in the past decade or so, demonstrated growing interest in aspects of teacher thought processes (e.g., teacher planning and teachers' theories and beliefs) and their relationship to sound pedagogical practices in the classroom. This signals that research on teaching and learning have shifted from a unidirectional emphasis on correlates of observable teacher behaviour with student achievement to a focus on teachers' thinking, beliefs, planning, and decision-making processes (Clark and Peterson, 1986). This new line of research has generated findings that are of practical implications for teacher education (Ashton, 1990)" (p. 249).

Pajares (1992) argued that teachers’ beliefs can and should become an important focus of educational inquiry and stated, “beliefs can be ... the single most important construct in educational research” (p. 329). Pajares assumed “beliefs are the best indicators of the decisions individuals make throughout their lives ... beliefs teachers hold influence their perceptions and judgements” (pp. 307-308) and pointed to the extensive study of attitudes and values in social and personality research as precursors to the study of beliefs. Pike (1981) reiterated the need to study beliefs, stating that because beliefs are the underlying foundation of philosophies and policies, “examining beliefs and how they are held are important tasks for anyone who wants to understand curriculum implementation” (p. 110). Based on preliminary observation of the implementation of new curriculum in BC high schools in 1995/6, the present study made the assumption that teachers’ beliefs were a factor in teacher decisions to implement or not implement the new TPC12 course.

In the context of the present study, the implementation of the new TPC12 curriculum in BC high schools led to much discussion over its pedagogical objectives (Jones, 1995; Vance and Abraham, 1995; Lord, 1996; Archer, 1996; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996) which were seen as disparate from the objectives of English 12. This discussion reflected differing pedagogical...
beliefs, with several teachers and stakeholders expressing belief in traditional pedagogical values of English, and other teachers and Ministry planners expressing beliefs in the pedagogical values of the new course. In such a situation, as Hargreaves and Evans (1997a) stated, we need to get teachers re-thinking their established belief systems about what topics are worthy to be included in the curriculum, and to examine the needs of learners and address these needs. Was the culture of English as a school subject a factor in teachers’ pedagogical beliefs? Hargreaves and Evans quote Woodhead (1995) who said that the culture of teaching needs to have ‘a refusal to allow the working hypothesis to harden into the unexamined orthodoxy’. What was needed perhaps was a more questioning culture among school staffs, where teachers would reflect on their beliefs and practices in a process of continuous review.

Thus the present study focused on teachers’ beliefs, on the assumption that the held belief will determine what and how teachers teach, and therefore what types of curriculum teachers will accept or reject. As Pajares (1992) stated,

“... because they offer a limited glimpse into a much broader system and because understanding their connections and centrality is essential to understanding the nature of their effect, researchers must study the context-specific effects of beliefs in terms of these connections” (p. 326).

Definitions Of Beliefs
In order to study teacher beliefs, it is helpful to examine the various definitions that researchers have given to the term. Beliefs belong to a continuum of abstract mental states, and Pajares noted that “defining beliefs is at best a game of player’s choice. Beliefs have various alias – attitudes, values, judgements, opinions, ideology, perceptions, dispositions, preconceptions, etc.” (1992, p. 309). The following definitions of beliefs describe the term in the context of education and teaching:

- Rokeach (1968), one of the pioneers of beliefs as a psychological concept, stated that “beliefs are inferences made by an observer about underlying states of expectancy. ...beliefs cannot be directly observed but must be inferred as
best one can, with whatever psychological devices available, from the things the believer says or does” (p.2).

- Dewey (1933, p.6) emphasized the importance of belief, for “it covers all the matters of which we have no sure knowledge and yet which we are sufficiently confident of to act upon and also the matters that we now accept as certainly true, as knowledge, but which nevertheless may be questioned in the future”” (Pajares, 1992, 313).

- “Attitudes and beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person’s actions.... Although attitudes received considerable attention in teaching and teacher education between the early 1950s and early 1970s, ... beliefs have taken over as a major construct of interest in studying teachers’ ways of thinking and classroom practices” (Richardson, 1996, p.102).

- Goodenough (1963) described beliefs as propositions that are held to be true and are “accepted as guides for assessing the future, are cited in support of decisions, or are referred to in passing judgment on the behaviour of others” (Richardson, 1996).

- “Abelson (1979) defined beliefs in terms of people manipulating knowledge for a particular purpose or under a necessary circumstance ... Sigel (1985, p. 351) defined beliefs as “mental constructions of experience – often condensed and integrated into schemata or concepts” that are held to be true and guide behaviour. Harvey (1986) defined belief as an individual’s representation of reality that has enough validity, truth, or credibility to guide thought and behaviour” (Pajares, 1992, 313).
In the present study, teachers’ beliefs were inferred from respondents’ statements about what they thought the pedagogy of English should be. As Pajares (1992) said, “... beliefs cannot be directly observed or measured but must be inferred from what people say, intend, and do - fundamental prerequisites that educational researchers have seldom followed” (p. 314). To support this statement, Pajares referred to “Rokeach (1968) [who] suggested that this inference must take into account the ways that individuals give evidence of belief: belief statement, intentionality to behave in a predisposed manner, and behaviour related to the belief in question” (p. 315).

Because beliefs are not easy to observe, Pajares (1992) suggested a confusion between beliefs and knowledge. However, as Richardson (1996) stated, beliefs do not require a truth condition, which knowledge requires. Other terms have been used by researchers to study the concept of beliefs. Reflecting on teachers’ work in the classroom, Clandinin and Connelly (1987, 1996) coined the term “teacher’s personal practical knowledge” to define individual teachers’ pedagogies. According to Pajares, the term ‘teacher perspectives’ has been preferred by some scholars to ‘teacher beliefs’, because most research has focused on “a connected set of systematically related beliefs and ideas about what are felt to be the essential features of teaching .... a broad definition of the task and a set of prescriptions for performing it, all held at a relatively high level of abstraction” (Sharp and Green, 1975, p 29)” (Pajares, 1992, 315).

For the purpose of the present study, the definition of the term “teachers’ beliefs” is based on these definitions provided by Rokeach (1968), Dewey (1933), Richardson (1996), Goodenough, (1963), Sigel, (1979), and Harvey, (1985). In the present study, the term ‘teacher’s beliefs’ is defined as the beliefs of English teachers as manifested in their statements about what the objective and content of an English 12 course should be.

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION & TEACHER BELIEFS
The present study proposed to examine why English teachers were unwilling to implement a new course, and hypothesized that teacher beliefs was a factor. In examining the relationship between curriculum implementation and teacher beliefs, Sarason identified the
lack of awareness of the need to consider teacher beliefs when considering change; he stated, “those who attempt to introduce change seem unaware that they are asking teachers to unlearn and learn” (Sarason, 1996, pp. 231-232). Werner (1991) emphasized the need to study the role of teachers’ beliefs in curriculum implementation, and linked teacher beliefs to teachers’ role identification with the subject and their reluctance to change subject loyalties, and in an earlier study (Werner, 1980) found that “conflicting perceptions on the part of participating groups” can lead to discrepancies in implementation.

As discussed in Chapter I, Fullan’s theoretical framework identified beliefs as an essential dimension in curriculum implementation. Previous studies on curriculum implementation and teachers’ beliefs examined specific aspects of a curriculum; for example, basic pedagogical decisions teachers make about selection of texts for a subject (Holt-Reynolds and McDiarmid, 1994), practices in reading instruction (Richardson, 1991), writing in the mathematics classroom (Quinn and Wilson, 1997), and science teachers’ beliefs (Cronin-Jones, 1991). Fewer researchers have undertaken studies on pedagogical values; some of these are Sarason (1996), Markee (1994), and Werner (1980, 1989, 1991).

Based on the Question for the present study as outlined in Chapter I, the discussion of previous research on curriculum implementation and teacher beliefs is presented in sections on beliefs about pedagogy, beliefs about teacher preparation, and beliefs about the characteristics of change.

Beliefs about pedagogy
The present study predicted that teachers’ pedagogical beliefs are related to willingness to implement curriculum. As Fullan (1991) stated, teachers face the daily reality of curriculum implementation, and need to be able to relate their personal perceptions of curriculum with the officially stated pedagogical objectives.

Previous research has found that teachers’ values have a bearing on teaching behaviour. Pajares (1992) found that “teachers often teach the content of a course according to the values held of the content itself. This … can determine the energy that teachers will expend
on an activity and how they will expend it” (p. 309). Bandura (1986) reiterated the relationship between teachers’ values and teaching efforts, and stated that people often regulate their level and distribution of effort in accordance with the effects they expect their actions to have; as a result, their behaviour is better predicted from their beliefs than from the actual consequences of their actions. Werner (1991) found that unquestioned, taken-for-granted values are the basis for “the routine organization and smooth operation of school life ... as such, they [values] have significance for how curriculum changes are interpreted during implementation” (p.3). Teachers’ beliefs and values are thus related to their teaching practice and their willingness to implement curriculum, as the present study sought to determine.

Sarason (1996), Markee (1994), Tomlinson and Quniton (1986), and Werner (1980) discussed teachers’ beliefs and examined the relationship between classroom implementation and teachers’ pedagogical values. Sarason found that teachers who disagree with decisions complain in private and ignore the decisions in practice. He referred to such behaviour as ‘covert’, and advised,

“if we wish to change the overt regularities, we have as our first task to become clear about the covert principles and theories: those assumptions and conceptions that are so overlearned that one no longer questions or thinks about them. They are ‘second nature’, so to speak. If these assumptions and conceptions remain unverbalized and unquestioned, which is to say that thinking does not change, the likelihood that any of the overt regularities one wants to change will in fact change is drastically reduced” (Sarason, 1996, p.352).

The existence of such ‘covert’ thinking was demonstrated in Marke’s 1994 study. In her study of curricular innovation in ESL teaching at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Markee (1994) found that, in terms of changes in pedagogical values, although teachers may be intellectually committed in general terms (to the innovation), some of their specific beliefs concerning what constitutes good teaching may not necessarily be compatible with this syllabus".
Tomlinson and Quinton (1986) found that what a teacher assumes or says he or she is doing may be a good deal more optimistic, benign or respectable than what that teacher is actually doing. Therefore, they suggested we need to take into account a whole range of perspectives or orders of reality when considering value-related aspects of teaching.

Based on Fullan's theoretical framework, Markee (1994) stated that the values of what constitutes ‘good’ teaching are quite difficult to get at (let alone change) because they are often not clearly articulated and/or are so general as to be open to a host of contradictory interpretations. When we have a situation where teachers’ pedagogical values or beliefs are quite dissimilar to the values in the new curriculum, as in the present study, teachers’ beliefs about ‘good’ teaching will more likely be at variance with what is proposed.

Building on Fullan’s work, Markee (1994) examined the relationship between behavioural change (in teaching practices) and changes in beliefs. According to Markee, we should realize that “the relationship between behavioural change (e.g., teaching approach) and changes in beliefs is complicated. Logically, one might think of beliefs changing first, which, in turn, lead to new behaviour associated with the belief. Practically, however, there is considerable socio-psychological evidence to support the view that beliefs are learned through experience (Fullan, 1982b, p. 247)” (Markee, 1994, p. 2).

Markee constructed a three-dimensional graph, of which beliefs and pedagogical values were a significant dimension. This graph illustrated the interrelationship of beliefs and behaviour. Markee (1994) found that

“a change in belief can precede a change in behaviour; on the other hand, a change in behaviour can lead to a change in values. The relationships among these dimensions are, in fact, so complex that, as Fullan states, ‘perhaps it is sufficient for our purposes to recognize that the relationship between beliefs and behaviour is reciprocal – trying new practices sometimes leads to questioning one’s underlying beliefs; examining one’s beliefs can lead to attempting new behaviour’ (Fullan, 1982b, p. 247). But, as Fullan argues, the process of innovation is non-linear ... it must also engage teachers in the more
difficult business of developing their own methodological skills and changing their ideas about what constitutes good teaching" (pp. 2-3).

Markee’s finding that the relationship between beliefs and behaviour can be reciprocal is one possible explanation for the situation that prompted the present study; one of the relationships examined was that sample English teachers who were experienced in literary writing (behaviour) and who had taken several courses in English Literature at university (behaviour) believed in the teaching of aesthetic literature (belief).

When change is introduced that challenges underlying values, teachers rely on their established beliefs to question the change, as was the case in the situation examined in the present study. Pajares (1992) observed that “when a teacher encounters an entangled domain, …[and is] unable to use appropriate knowledge structures and cognitive strategies ….the teacher uses beliefs and belief structures, with all their problems and inconsistencies” (pp. 311-312).

Discussing how beliefs play a role in teachers’ unwillingness to implement new curriculum, Werner (1980) stated that an often-overlooked reason for failure of program implementation is that “everyone involved with programs does not hold and share the same beliefs and assumptions” (p. 55). According to Werner, “a program is much more than a listing of some teaching strategies and materials, but is also a set of beliefs, including underlying assumptions and implied roles, which often may not be stated, but which do have implications for the commitments teachers will give to a program” (1980, p. 57).

In his case study of a program implemented by Alberta Education, Werner (1980) found that belief discrepancies influenced implementation “Everyone utilized the terminology [of ‘mutualism’] but did not share the same beliefs, and hence perceived and interpreted the project differently. Considerable time had to be spent in sorting out the beliefs of the various groups” (p. 62). Similarly, in a study on science teachers’ beliefs and their influence on curriculum, Cronin-Jones (1991) found that overall, the teachers’ belief structures were
incongruent with the underlying philosophy of the intended curriculum, thus hampering successful implementation.

Though research studies have found that teachers’ beliefs influence their teaching practice, in some instances, teachers may not be able to practice what they believe in. Examining research literature in the field of literacy, Fang (1996) found that,

“While some studies indicate that teachers possess theoretical beliefs ... and that such beliefs tend to shape the nature of their instructional practices (Johnson, 1992; Mangano and Allen, 1986; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, and Lloyd, 1991; Rupley and Logan, 1984), others have suggested that because of the constraints of classroom life and social realities, many teachers are not able to provide instruction that is consistent with their beliefs (Davis, Konopak, and Readence, 1993; Duffy and Anderson, 1984; Kinzer, 1988)” (p. 250).

Preliminary observation of the situation in the present study led to the assumption that the teachers sampled were in a position to make decisions about implementing the new TPC12 curriculum.

**Beliefs and teacher preparation**

As part of its central hypothesis, the present study predicted that teachers’ beliefs about how they and their colleagues need to prepare themselves to teach reflect deeply held values that can affect their decisions to implement change. The two factors examined as aspects of teacher preparation were a) advice on courses that aspiring teachers should take, and b) regular professional reading that teachers should do.

When individuals become practising teachers, they are likely in a position to advise aspiring teachers about preparing to teach, and such advice may reflect the beliefs of the practising teachers. Teacher training has the potential to direct teachers’ beliefs by presenting philosophies and methodologies through the eyes of the trainers. Several studies have
suggested that teacher educators need to recognise the need to direct student teachers’ beliefs and pedagogical values.

Studies have examined the relationship between teacher preparation and beliefs. In their study on teacher beliefs and the culture of teaching, Brousseau, Book and Byers (1988) found evidence to suggest that the effects of the ‘teaching culture’ (in undergraduate teacher preparation programs) in shaping a teacher’s educational beliefs are pervasive enough to span school settings and gender differences. Holt-Reynolds (1999) critically examined the importance of subject matter expertise in the training of secondary school teachers, and recommended that teacher educators need to help prospective teachers recognize their expertise, because it was found that the prospective teacher studied was unable to make the link between her subject-expertise and her teaching. Similarly, Fox (1995) examined the relationship between secondary teachers’ conceptions of English and their instructional practices, and found that teacher educators need to provide beginning teachers with opportunities to examine and identify their beliefs about teaching. Marshall and Smith (1997) examined the influence university professors have on aspiring English teachers, and concluded, “university faculty are not just teaching literature in the end – they are teaching those who would teach, how they ought to teach” (p. 265). Thus, respondents in the present study were asked to advise aspiring teachers about which English courses to take, on the assumption that teachers who believed in aesthetic literature would suggest Literature courses, and teachers who believed in efferent literature would recommend language and linguistics courses. (The educational preparation of teachers is discussed in more detail later in this chapter in the section on teachers’ educational background).

The second factor in beliefs and teacher preparation in the present study was the regular reading of professional journals. A profession is identified by its research and academic publications, and professionals are traditionally expected to keep abreast of latest developments by regular reading of professional journals. Burhans, Jr. (1985) surveyed English teachers about their reading of contemporary materials, and found that “teachers in general and English teachers in particular do little professional reading … without regular professional reading, and without sharing new ideas and insights with colleagues and trying
them out in class, teachers will know little more than what they learned in an increasingly distant and outdated academic past” (p. 95). Respondents in the present study were asked to state what types of professional journals teachers should read regularly.

Beliefs about the characteristics of change

Fullan’s theoretical framework, on which the present study was based, identified four characteristics of change that influenced implementation decisions. These were: the need for the change, the complexity of the change, the clarity of the change, and the quality and practicality of the change. As Fullan (1991) found from his own studies and his examination of other studies, teachers’ beliefs and perceptions about how these characteristics are related to proposed curriculum are important factors in implementation. Philips (1998) based her research on the implementation of computers in elementary classrooms on Fullan’s change theory and characteristics of change, and found that the extent of implementation for each teacher was linked to perception of need, clarity of the innovation based on personal knowledge and training, complexity, and practicality/quality.

In the context of the present study, it was observed that English teachers in BC were questioning the need for the new course. As Fullan (1991) and Werner (1991) pointed out, the first question teachers ask about new curriculum is whether it fulfills a felt need. Quoting several other studies (Rosenblum and Louis 1979; Emrick and Peterson 1978; Louis and Sieber 1979), Fullan stated that teachers need to perceive the need for the proposed change, because often they (teachers) may be satisfied with their curriculum and not believe in the need for change (1991, p. 69).

It was also observed in the context of the present study that the clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality of the new curriculum (TPC12) was being questioned by English teachers in BC. Fullan (1991) recognized the issue of clarity in the implementation of new curriculum, and identified the notion of ‘false clarity’. Fullan also discussed how the complexity of the curriculum could assist or inhibit its implementation. Lortie (1975) also identified complexity as a factor contributing to uncertainty of self-effectiveness by teachers. Lortie’s and Fullan’s studies determined that the quality and practicality of new curriculum
are a basis on which teachers decide whether they will implement or not. In the present study, data on beliefs about the characteristics of change was collected from interview respondents to examine the relationship between beliefs and implementation.

Beliefs about the need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality of curriculum change have been found to be rooted in the backgrounds of teachers and the subject they teach. The following sections discuss previous studies on subject cultures and on teachers’ backgrounds.

TEACHERS’ BELIEFS, SUBJECT CULTURES, AND CURRICULUM CHANGE
Based on observations and preliminary interviews with stakeholders (Archer, 1996; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996) about the implementation of TPC12 in BC high schools, the present study made the assumption that one of the factors in teachers’ beliefs was their loyalty to the culture of their school subject, and that such loyalty was related to decisions about implementing new curriculum. Researchers who have studied curriculum implementation (Fullan, 1991; Werner, 1991) have found that the culture of school subjects is a factor in teachers’ decisions to implement new curriculum. Further, researchers who have studied the implementation of change in school subjects (Goodson, 1993; Davies, 1996) have discussed the existence of ways of thinking about the subject that constitute a ‘culture’ and establishes loyalties.

This section begins with a discussion on the relationship between curriculum implementation and teachers’ identities, principally based on Werner’s 1991 paper. Next, research on the culture of English as a school subjects is discussed, to establish how certain ideas and events have contributed to present-day beliefs about English. Linked to the development of English as a school subject is the unresolved debate between aesthetic and efferent literature; the brief discussion on this topic depicts how different beliefs about the pedagogy of English have affected the implementation of English curriculum.

Curriculum Implementation and Teachers’ Identities
An area relevant to the present study was teachers’ identification with the subject they teach. It was noted during preliminary observation of the situation surrounding the introduction of
TPC12 in BC high schools that English teachers were concerned about the identity of English as a subject (Jones, 1995; Shultz, 1996; Rodman, 1996). Werner’s (1991) paper on the relationship between curriculum integration and teachers’ identities provides several analogies and possible explanations for the context of the present study. Werner found that the relationship between subject matter boundaries and teachers’ roles is often taken for granted. According to Werner,

“curriculum reform is often based on a limited recognition of the conditions under which teachers work. .... [so,] proposals for change flounder when educators cannot harmonize the perceived implications for the norms and structures of their workplace. Change is sometimes resisted by teachers because it threatens the stability and predictability of school cultures” (1991, p.15).

Teachers’ beliefs about their loyalty to a subject culture become apparent when curriculum change that affects them is externally introduced. In the present study, it was seen that English teachers were wary of a new course that resembled a low status course. Werner succinctly explained such a situation:

“Teachers who define themselves in terms of a subject worry about what they will teach if their content specific roles are blurred. Those in a high status area are faced with the thought of aligning themselves with an area perceived to have less status, and this is to be resisted. Protectionist sentiments especially become evident among specialists who think they have the most to lose” (1991, p.5).

As was observed from interviews with teachers and other stakeholders prior to data collection for the present study, (Jones, 1995; Shultz, 1996; Archer, 1996), and as Werner stated (1991), “objections to curriculum change (that introduces subject integration) are usually couched in terms of one or more of four concerns:

1. concern for upholding quality teaching, assumed to be eroded through the use of generalist rather than specialist teachers
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2. concern that students will not gain the proper foundation necessary for further mastery of a subject
3. concern for protecting the integrity and rigour of a subject
4. concern for unique student benefits threatened through the loss of a discipline's special knowledge” (p. 6).

As was noticed in the discussion over the implementation of TPC12, concerns about implementing new, unfamiliar curriculum lead teachers to feel insecure about their established teaching practices and to voice concerns about the quality and practicality of the new course. Referring to findings from Doyle and Ponder (1978), McLaughlin and March (1978), and Fullan (1982), Werner (1991) stated that

“uncertainties about identity and status in turn raise doubts [in teachers] concerning their own professional competence and chances for success ... This is a point on which they vulnerable and experience considerable stress when faced with curriculum change ... Over time each one has honed a set of strategies that seems to ‘work’ for motivating and helping students learn ... Thus [curriculum change] opens the door to teaching content for which one feels inadequately prepared, and where perceptions of efficacy have not been established. This raises the fear of failure, with its associated feelings of guilt and tendencies towards conservatism (Sarason, 1982) ... Threatened are well-established routines and beliefs that help ensure efficacy ... It is little wonder that teachers try to protect their sense of efficacy by arguing for the continuance of current content and role identities” (p. 8).

Concerns about the continuance of the established course were voiced by BC English teachers when the Ministry implemented the new TPC12 curriculum. In the context of the present study it was likely that, because the subject culture has defined teachers’ values over time,

“teachers reach a threshold of change beyond which it is difficult to move .... The threshold represents a decision point at which a teacher or a group judges the perceived costs of implementing [the change] more extensively not to be
worth the perceived benefits for themselves or their students. Any change brings added costs for teachers and risks those things already working well for them. The exact location of this threshold differs across teachers and groups, depending upon the strength of those norms and structures that may conflict with the innovation and each one's willingness to take on the added costs of further implementation. As a result, variations in the nature and extent of implementation may be observed across a school or district [or province]." (Werner, 1991, p. 16).

The next section reviews previous research and discussion on the culture of English as a school subject, since in the present study teachers' loyalty to subject culture was identified as a factor in beliefs about curriculum implementation. Davies' 1996 question, "What is English teaching?" needed to be answered both by curriculum initiators and by English teachers themselves, to find out what English teachers in BC believe are the pedagogical values of their subject.

The Culture Of English As A School Subject
As outlined above, one of the assumptions of the present study was that the culture of English as a school subject was a factor in the beliefs of respondent English teachers. It is useful to consider the notion of the culture of English, because historically, English has acquired a high status among school subjects, thereby providing its proponents, especially English teachers, a strong community, sense of worth, and conviction that their teaching has a noble and far-reaching impact on the lives of their students (Goodson, 1993). Werner (1991) reiterated that indicators of status are tied to the type of subject matter with which one is associated; not all subjects are perceived to be equally important. As was presumed in the context of the present study, English teachers in BC believed in the high status of their subject, and identified with their subject, constituting what Davies (1996) termed "a social group [which] provides its members with a knowledge of trustworthy recipes for interpreting the social world and for handling things in order to obtain the best results ... such recipes are intended for both guidance and action, and as a source of ready-made explanations and justifications for
those actions which can be shared and recognized by all members of the social group”, (pp. 14-15).

In addition to such ‘recipes’ as guidance for action, beliefs also “provide personal meaning and assist in defining relevancy. They help individuals to identify with one another and form groups and social systems” (Pajares, 1992, 317). The present study assumed that the respondent English teachers identified with the established norms of their subject.

The deep-seated nature of beliefs in what constitutes the English curriculum was further demonstrated in Davies’ (1996) remark that “English teachers have often preferred deep conviction to cool analysis. … and unless one accepts the need for a more analytical approach, there is a real danger that the English subject paradigm (the ways its aims, content, purpose, boundaries, etc. are formulated) might just turn out to be more in the interests of the English teachers themselves – imbuing familiar and comfortable practices, knowledge and beliefs with a gratifying sense of legitimacy – than of the actual students” (p. 13).

In the context of the present study, it is necessary to identify the basis of statements made by BC English teachers about essential pedagogies of English. A brief review of the foundations of present-day English pedagogical values will help understand English teachers’ pedagogical beliefs. Davies (1996) and Hollindale (1986) examined the formation of the high school English curriculum, and found that:

1. Much of the present-day English curriculum was founded in the Dartmouth seminar of 1967 and the ideals of Dixon and Holbrook who shared “a passionate and confident belief that English teaching is centrally concerned with literature …” These two scholars also gave English the responsibility for “the cultural health of the whole nation” (Davies, 1996) and the “three models of literacy skills, cultural heritage, and personal growth” (Hollindale, 1986).

2. Holbrook also “re-applied a vision from university education to the very different context of the secondary school where non-academic children were educated” (Davies, 1996).
3. Holbrook also “encouraged English literature graduates to teach in secondary schools that were populated largely by children from the working classes” (Davies, 1996).

4. Holbrook offered a vision of profound importance to English teachers when he suggested that it was they alone who could provide the experience of certain kinds of texts and discourses – imaginative, symbolic, concerned with human emotions and life’s fundamental experiences, and essentially of a literary nature.

Dixon and Holbrook set the stage for ascribing a high status to the teaching of literature in high school English, investing aesthetic literature with the responsibility of the objectives of cultural heritage, personal growth, and literacy skills, and encouraging English literature graduates to teach high school English. Subsequent discussion on the need to teach efferent literature (Rosenblatt, 1978) and language skills (Yagelski, 1994) has been countered by the view that the teaching of aesthetic literature provides students with communicative and language skills as well as cultural heritage and personal growth (Jones, 1995; Archer, 1996; Shultz, 1996). In the context of the present study, it was observed that curriculum planners proposed a new English course (TPC12) to provide for the teaching of efferent literature, whereas English teachers demonstrated loyalty to the established English course which emphasized the teaching of aesthetic literature.

Discussion and research on what constitutes English curriculum has continued since 1967. Hollindale (1986) voiced concern when he stated that “… much of the apparent confusion and uncertainty in English teaching since the mid-1970s may flow from the effort to embrace all the ‘official’ purposes of English teaching without the aid of a coherent theory which notices and integrates their discrepant underlying values” (p. 33). O’Neill (1987) emphasized the need to redefine what is meant by growth in English and observed that “a wide gulf remains between an ideal theoretical curriculum and the ordered existence of the daily operational curricula in schools.” Grossman (1991) found that “beginning teachers draw upon a number of sources in
the construction of their curricular knowledge of English.” In a survey of professors’ beliefs and practices, Dilworth and McCracken (1997) reported ideological cross-currents in English education, and recommended fostering communication between disparate groups of English teachers.

The Debate Over Aesthetic and Efferent Literature in English Curriculum

Stemming from history (as outlined above), the debate over what constitutes high school English curriculum has been heard every time change has been proposed, because “beliefs are surrounded by an emotional aura that dictates rightness and wrongness” (Pajares, 1992, p. 312). Such debate is assumed to be the present in the context of the present study as well. This section reviews studies that have addressed the debate, and presents versions of the debate provided by Rosenblatt (1978), Hollindale (1986), Yagelski (1994), and Davies (1996).

Scholars have ascribed various reasons and justifications for the debate. Goodson, (1997), Medway, (1990), Ball, Kenny and Gardiner, (1990), and McCulloch (1997) determined that such debate was rooted in sociological factors such as economic status, eliteness, and middle-class values vs. working class’ educational and vocational needs. Hollindale (1986) stated that the debate was political, propagated by the New Left to challenge middle class values. Brooks’ (1980) discussed the romanticist (personal and expressive development) vs. rationalist (literacy skills) divide, and how this “left many students high and dry, and feeling short-changed.”

Examining the history of English teaching, it is seen that “English teachers … belong squarely in a tradition which can be traced back to Mathew Arnold….” (Davies, 1996, p.19). Because of the predominance of such tradition, “the burden of controversy has centred heavily on the value of literature” (Hollindale, 1986, p.34). Caroline St. John Brooks found that English teachers considered literacy skills as a means to an end, the end being a fuller and freer, more critical and more constructive, inner life for their students. This, they believe, can best be achieved in dialogue with minds of others, through the medium of literature (Brooks, 1980: 304)” (Davies, 1996).
However, Bancroft (1994) raised questions about the place of literature in the modern English curriculum. Bancroft’s study, and those of Larkin (1981), Hollindale (1986), Yagelski (1994), and others demonstrate that the debate between aesthetic and efferent literature in English curriculum is important to teachers. These studies point to the need for English to have a functional application in students’ lives. Bancroft (1994) discussed the need for literature-based English teachers to address the needs of students who may not need “abstract” notions … at this period of their education.” Holden (1981) also found that …most students remain ignorant of the interrelationship between language study and everyday communication. Beattie (1986) reiterated the need to consider developmental factors, because “most statements of the values of language learning overlook the limited experience of young learners and the difficulties they have in understanding abstractions” (p.122).

Terminologies for the debate
Various terms have been ascribed to the two ends of the debate: “aesthetic” and “efferent” literature (Rosenblatt, 1978), “transactional” and “poetic” (Britton et al., 1978), “language vs. literature” (Hollindale, 1986), “literature” and “literacy” (Yagelski, 1994), “literacy teaching” and “English teaching” (Davies, 1996).

The present study uses Rosenblatt’s terminology for the two types of English teaching proposed in the BC Ministry’s 1995/6 curriculum. Rosenblatt (1978) identified differences between “aesthetic” and “efferent” reading. According to Rosenblatt, “differentiation of the literary work of art from the other types of verbal expression or communication has been a perennial theoretical problem” (p. 23). Rosenblatt proposed an examination of reader motivation for reading a piece of text, and differentiated between ‘nonaesthetic’ reading (which she termed ‘efferent’) in which the reader’s attention is focused on the information acquired and actions to be carried out as a result of the reading, and ‘aesthetic’ reading during which the reader analyses the text and pays attention to the associations, feelings and ideas” that the text arouses within the reader (pp. 23-25). For the purpose of the present study, Rosenblatt’s terms have been adapted to define the debate between technical
professional communication and literature (efferent literature) and English literature based
the traditional literary canon (aesthetic literature).

Britton et al. (1978) conducted research to find “satisfactory means of classifying writings
according to the natures of the task and the nature of the demands made upon the writer” that
went beyond the rhetorical categories of narration, exposition, exposition, and argument (p. 3). Based on their study of the audience and function of writing, Britton et al. identified three
functions: “expressive” or “writing close to the self” (p. 141), “transactional” or “language
where the writer ... seeks outcomes in the actual world: to inform or to persuade” (p. 146)
and “poetic” or “language that exists for its own sake and not as a means of achieving
something else” (p. 90).

Hollindale (1986) referred to the terms “language vs. literature”, and stated,
“the whole ‘language vs. literature’ debate of recent years is unnecessary.
Participants in the controversy have almost all taken the view that literature
both is and is not ‘language’, but have attached radically different evaluations
to their sense of its distinctiveness. The expedient division of school English
into ‘Language’ and ‘Literature’ is one of the crudest, most divisive instances
of this artificial dichotomy. Literature is a qualitative sub-division of
language, with boundaries and definition that can never be precise” (pp.37-
38).

As Hollindale (1986) stated, although individuals of various persuasions may argue
strenuously for a single model of English teaching and a heavy emphasis upon it, the teacher
in the classroom will continue to link and blend a diversity of activities which he rightly sees
as contributing to the whole federation of English work. By doing so, the teacher will be
unintentionally setting out discrepant values that “perplexingly deny to him and to his pupils
any sense of unity and purpose in the subject” (p. 41).

Yagelski (1994) used the terms “literature” and “literacy”, and discussed the kinds of literacy
instruction that will help high school students learn to use language in ways that will enable
them to construct useful and fulfilling lives. Though Yagelski stated that he did not “mean to suggest here that we should throw Hemingway out and turn our language arts classes into resume-writing seminars or ‘life-skills’ workshops”, he did “believe that our traditional focus on – you might call it an obsession with – ‘great’ literature and our concomitant narrow conception of literacy do not adequately serve the needs of our students today, especially given the way that literature tends to be used in English classes” (Yagelski, 1994).

In his work, “What is English Teaching?”, Davies (1996) used the terms “literacy teaching” and “English teaching”, and said that “literacy teaching and English teaching have become hopelessly tangled up with one another, to the benefit of neither.” He stated that “English teaching and literacy teaching are distinct entities, distinct enterprises and will thrive once viewed as such” (p. 140). However, Davies also found evidence that suggested that the subject content that will serve the literacy needs of young people already exist in the English subject area, if only they can be given the recognition and priority they deserve.

In the present study, the situation surrounding the implementation of TPC12 in BC high schools was seen to be a product of the culture of the school subject to which English teachers belong and the ongoing debate over what type of literature teaching fulfills the goals of the subject. As Larkin (1981) has stated, English teachers should stop considering themselves unique, and should set out to teach “an integration of language and thought” (p. 36).

According to studies discussed in this section, the culture of school subjects is related to teachers’ beliefs; such culture has been seen to be a part of teachers’ background and contributes to teachers’ on-going decisions about their teaching. The next section looks at studies that examined the relationship between teachers’ background and curriculum implementation.

TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND TEACHERS’ BACKGROUNDS
The secondary hypothesis of the present study postulated a relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ backgrounds. In order to determine the relationship between teachers’
beliefs and curriculum implementation, we need to examine teachers’ backgrounds to identify the roots of beliefs, so that we can determine where and when (particularly, at what stage of a teacher’s education and experience) beliefs need to be changed. Pajares (1992) found that “beliefs are created through a process of enculturation and social construction” and quoted Van Fleet (1979) as stating that “this cultural transmission has three components: enculturation, education, and schooling” (p. 316). Pike (1981) also found that “teachers interpret the new curriculum in terms of what they were familiar with, because … at first … all that anyone knows is what they believe will be appropriate for their actions” (pp. 21, 69).

The two principal areas from which teachers’ beliefs have been seen to emerge are:

1. teachers’ educational background, in which studies have examined
   a) pre-service teachers’ beliefs and values (Richardson, 1996; Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Hollingsworth, 1989; Lortie, 1975) and
   b) educational backgrounds of English teachers (Fox, 1995; Holden, 1981; Clift, 1987)

2. teachers’ experiences in the classroom (studies that related teacher efficacy to beliefs are Ross, 1995; Hollingsworth, 1989; Rose and Medway, 1981).

TEACHERS’ EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
For the purpose of the present study, an examination of studies on English teachers’ educational background bears directly on the secondary hypothesis that predicted a relationship between beliefs and education. Though studies on pre-service teachers’ backgrounds are not directly connected to the topic of the present study, these studies are reviewed in this chapter because they discuss how beliefs are related to pre-service teachers’ backgrounds.

English Teachers’ Educational Background
In examining the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and curriculum implementation, the present study also questioned whether the types of courses and major subjects teachers choose to study at university are instrumental in shaping pedagogical values and beliefs. As seen in Holt-Reynold’s 1992 study of pre-service teachers, one reason for the importance of
teachers' educational background is the perceived need to prove that they are subject-matter experts. A few previous studies (Fox, 1995; Holden, 1981; Clift, 1987) have researched English teachers' educational backgrounds.

Individuals who choose English as a major at the undergraduate level often take several courses in English Literature. Such a preference for Literature courses in university could motivate English teachers to focus more on the Literature aspect of English 12 and consider teaching Language skills as less important.

Fox (1995) studied two practicum teachers to answer the question, “how is ‘English’ conceptualized or defined by novices? How are novices’ beliefs about teaching or orientations toward English influenced by their professional education or by their initial teaching experiences?” (p.17). Fox found that each of her ‘cases’ reported using different instructional strategies in their first year of teaching, with one individual relying on literature studies and the other focusing on textual and media studies. Fox concluded that “coming to terms about specific goals for teaching English may not be easy, even for veteran teachers” (p. 21).

What kind of courses should English teachers have taken at university? Holden (1981) pointed out that “very few of us were trained to teach grammar and composition. We got into English teaching for other reasons; we like to read, we wanted to write, we had enough credits in English. .... Poll your colleagues. How did they become English teachers? ... I entered because I was interested in writing – mine, not the students’ ” (p. 17).

In her examination of previous research on learning to teach, Richardson (1996) reported that Clift (1987) found significant differences in beliefs about teaching and learning among English majors not interested in teaching who saw the teacher as the authority on the interpretation of literature, and English majors interested in teaching who were much more constructivist in their interpretation of literature.
Based on Fox (1995), Holden (1981), and Clift (1987), it can be inferred that educational background of English teachers influences their pedagogical values in a variety of ways. Findings of the present study provide yet another conclusion about the relationship between educational background, English teachers' beliefs, and curriculum implementation.

Pre-service Teachers' Backgrounds
Researchers have examined the beliefs of pre-service teachers to determine how pedagogical beliefs are formed. As Pajares (1992) stated, "early experiences strongly influence final judgements, which become theories (beliefs) highly resistant to change. Due to this phenomena, the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter, for these beliefs subsequently affect perception and strongly influence the processing of new information" (p. 317).

Richardson (1996) examined the literature on learning to teach and identified three categories of experience described as influencing the development of beliefs and knowledge about teaching: personal experience, experience with schooling and instruction, and experience with formal knowledge (p. 105). Lortie (1975) discussed how pre-service student teachers arrive with a set of deep-seated beliefs about the nature of teaching based on their own experiences as students.

Holt-Reynolds' 1992 study of pre-service teachers bears resemblance to the present study in several ways. Holt-Reynolds examined student English teachers' beliefs and decisions they make about an instructional strategies course. Also, Holt-Reynolds chose to look at pre-service teachers' beliefs in a course to which resistance had already been documented, as in the present study, where resistance to the new TPC12 curriculum had been publicly discussed.

Holt-Reynolds' study (1992) presupposed that pre-service teachers bring a certain knowledge with them from their lives as students, which she labeled "personal history-based beliefs", which they used to make decisions about the value of the ideas they are taught in the teacher education program. Such 'beliefs' included lay beliefs about what constitutes good practice,
including subject-matter specific pedagogies. Drawing on personal experiences of schooling, home, and community, pre-service teachers had developed attributional beliefs about what teacher behaviours were causal to the successes, failures, and memorable incidents in their previous histories as students long before they arrived in the classroom. (Holt-Reynolds, 1992, p.331). Based on the findings of her study, Holt-Reynolds concluded that, if new teachers are expected to learn to use and endorse the beliefs that support rationales for specific instructional strategies, educators need to first clarify the rationales for themselves, and articulate clearly those rationales and beliefs across all course and field work. Such a conclusion can be postulated as an implication for educational planners in the context of the present study as well.

Hollingsworth’s 1989 study on pre-service teachers and their beliefs about reading instruction concluded that “students come to any learning situation with previously constructed ideas – or knowledge and beliefs – that help make sense of information … these perspectives serve as culturally based filters to help make sense of program content, [and] their roles as student teachers” (pp. 161, 163). Hollingsworth also found that “teacher education programs are traditionally designed in a manner that capitalizes on pre-existing knowledge of what schools and classrooms are like, thereby ensuring that pre-service teachers turn out to be very much like the existing teacher force (1989, p.163).

The present study also predicted a relationship between teachers’ beliefs and the university courses they chose to take, suggesting that these choices predispose future teachers to prefer to practice the pedagogies from their own educational backgrounds.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

“[Teaching] experience in the classroom is thought to shape beliefs and practical knowledge (Carter, 1990; Fenstermacher, 1994; John, 1991; Black and Ammon, 1992)” (Richardson, 1996, p. 111). As a part of its secondary hypothesis, the present study predicted that teachers’ experience was related to their beliefs about curriculum implementation. Previous research studied various aspects of teaching experience, including sources of teachers’ perspectives (Pike, 1981), years of experience (Brousseau, Book and Byers, 1988), teacher
In her study on teachers’ values, Pike (1981) identified sources of teachers’ perspective: “anticipation about what it will be like to use the curriculum in the classroom, hearing about the curriculum from colleagues or developers, and knowledge from previous experiences of introduction of new curriculum. Teachers (also) had beliefs about what was worth learning in the classroom, and how learning should be managed, and this affected their attitudes towards the new curriculum” (Pike, 1981, pp. 22, 70).

Brousseau, Book and Byers (1988) found that years of experience are significantly related to differences in teaching culture and beliefs about the curriculum.

Two studies that examined the link between teachers’ beliefs in their own efficacy and impact on students in the classroom were Ross (1995) and Rose and Medway (1981). Ross’ study proposed the hypothesis that changing teacher beliefs about their effectiveness will have a positive impact on students’ cognitive and affective achievement. Empirical tests produced mixed results (Ross, 1995). This study demonstrates that teacher beliefs are used as a parameter to explain teacher’s perceptions of their own efficacy.

Rose and Medway’s paper (1981) described the development, reliability, and validation of the Teacher Locus of Control Scale, an instrument specifically designed to measure elementary school teachers’ perceptions of control in the classroom. The study recommended that “staff development activities be aimed at enhancing teacher control beliefs prior to introducing them to innovative instructional methods” (Rose and Medway, 1981, p. 188).

Beliefs in efficacy are also tied in with subject status, and are conversely related to willingness to change. Werner (1991) found that “Subject boundaries define in part teachers’ role identity, status and criteria of efficacy ... These norms establish a threshold beyond which it is difficult for teachers to seriously integrate curriculum ... Most educators are
trained and hired to some degree as content specialists, and come to define themselves as teachers of ... language arts or some other area. This identity is further reinforced through subject-based professional associations, journals, conferences and workshops that define collegial affiliations” (Werner, 1991, p. 2).

The influence of in-service programs is dependent on previously held beliefs, as Richardson (1996) found in her survey of the literature on learning to teach: “several studies ...found that teachers participating in staff development programs that advocated and taught about a particular teaching method accepted the new practices only if their beliefs matched the underlying assumptions of the new teaching method (Rich, 1990; Sparks, 1988)” (Richardson, 1996, p.113).

According to the studies reviewed in the present study, previously-held beliefs (Pike, 1981), years of experience (Brousseau, Book and Byers, 1988), teacher efficacy (Ross, 1995; Rose and Medway, 1981), subject status (Werner, 1991), and in-service programs (Richardson, 1996) are conditionally related to teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and teaching experience.

As seen from the studies referred to in this section on teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ backgrounds, education and experience of teachers are important factors in the background to teachers’ beliefs. As Pajares stated, “beliefs reside in episodic memory with material drawn from experience or cultural sources of knowledge transmission. [Moreover,] teachers were influenced by guiding images from past events that create intuitive screens through which new information is filtered” (p. 310).

METHODS USED IN PREVIOUS STUDIES
In order to choose an appropriate research method and research tool for data collection and analysis, previous research studies were reviewed to examine methods and tools used by other researchers.

The term ‘belief’ has been identified as a socio-psychological construct (Rokeach, 1968), and previous studies have used social science research methods to study teachers’ beliefs.
Several studies used Likert-type scales to elicit responses to statements (Davies, 1996; Holt-Reynolds, 1996; Rose and Medway, 1981). Qualitative techniques like open-ended questions, interviews and observations have also been used (Hollingsworth, 1989; Pike, 1981; Markee, 1994; Fox, 1995).

Richardson (1996) reported that in the 1980s and 1990s, “the purpose of contemporary hermeneutic research is to explore the meaning constructed by individuals operating within a cultural tradition” (p.114). There has been a “considerable change in measurement strategies and methodologies, ... a paradigmatic shift from positivist research strategies to a more hermeneutic approach (Doyle, 1990) ... towards qualitative methodology ... interviews and observations are the two most widely employed data-gathering techniques” (Richardson, p. 107). Richardson stated that Likert-type scales and factor analytic techniques continue to be popular tools.

**Previous research that used Likert-type scales**

Early research on attitudes and values used forced-choice scales that were constructed for statistical analysis. The most popular of these has been the Likert-type scale, which incorporates statements about the factor being studied, and asks subjects to express agreement on a five-point scale. Research with objectives similar to those of the present study (i.e., previous studies that used Likert-type scales to examine beliefs and curriculum change) were reported by Davies (1996), Holt-Reynolds (1992), and Rose and Medway (1981).

Davies (1996) studied English teachers’ beliefs to investigate the kinds of subject paradigms secondary English teachers currently (i.e., in 1986) believed in and to identify differences between beliefs of recent university graduates and beliefs of experienced teachers. He used a Likert-type 5-point scale with 56 statements. The statements verbalized a range of beliefs and attitudes about different issues relevant to the teaching of English and were taken from sources like the Statement of Aims of English departments and the writings of leading figures in the field. The statements “were organized systematically to ensure adequate coverage of the two broad positions which seemed to characterize the main lines of thought in English
teaching at the time: the apparently mainstream ‘liberal humanist’, personal growth, literature-centred view of English, and a more radical cultural theorist approach” (p. 25). The results were analyzed in two ways, by means of factor analysis which revealed patterns of response not visible to the naked eye, and by simply counting straight response figures relating to individual questions.

Holt-Reynolds’ study (1992) combined a Likert-type scale with a series of interviews to examine the importance of subject matter expertise in the training of secondary school teachers. A Likert-type scale was constructed on which respondents rated 36 statements made by the professor in the classroom. The principal method of data collection was 6 interviews with each respondent, in which respondents discussed the Likert-type scale and rewrote the statements to fit their beliefs.

To measure teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy and willingness to adopt new techniques, Rose and Medway (1981) developed a 28-item forced-choice scale “designed to measure teachers’ generalized expectancies for internal-external control over student success and failure in the classroom. Validation studies indicated that the scale predicted teachers’ behaviour in the classroom, including their willingness to adopt new instructional techniques following in-service training” (p. 185).

Previous research that used the interview method
Examples of studies that used the interview method as the principal data-gathering technique are Hollingsworth (1989), Pike (1981), Markee (1994), and Fox (1995). In his overview of research on teachers’ beliefs, Pajares suggested that open-ended questions are one of the research methods that should be used to make accurate inferences about beliefs (Pajares, 1992, p. 327).

Hollingsworth (1989) used baseline interviews and observations to gather data on cognitive change in pre-service teachers. Fourteen pre-service teachers were interviewed and observed. The loosely structured interviews were intended to capture the teachers’
philosophies of education, educational experiences, current teaching, and managerial practices, role definitions, views of how children learn, and knowledge of reading instruction.

Pike (1981) interviewed 26 primary grade teachers who were experiencing curriculum change. The teachers were identified by supervisory personnel, and were selected on the basis of their “willingness to share their experiences” and their “ability to reflect easily upon their experiences in order to facilitate identification of beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and past experiences”. A series of three meetings with each teacher enabled the researcher to validate the interview transcriptions. Pike’s interview schedule consisted of open-ended questions, and was piloted before it was administered to the subjects.

Other studies have used the interview technique within the case study methodology. Markee (1994) studied a project in curricular innovation introducing task-based syllabus by ESL teachers at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Markee’s study interviewed teaching assistants and examined their responses on three dimensions of implementation, to construct a model of curricular innovation. Fox (1995) conducted in-depth interviews with two ‘novice’ teachers in a case study approach.

Based on the above review of methods and tools used in previous research, the present study developed a questionnaire that included a Likert-type scale on beliefs statements along with other multiple-choice questions. As a follow up to the questionnaire, telephone interviews were conducted to gather data for the present study.

GAP IN THE LITERATURE AND NEED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY
Because beliefs are difficult to identify, not many researchers have attempted to study their existence and influence in education. As Pajares stated, “researchers have not given teachers’ beliefs their due attention, but this is not surprising because beliefs do not lend themselves easily to empirical investigation” (Pajares, 1992, pp. 307-308).

Moreover, although teachers are at the grassroots of curriculum implementation, their beliefs and what they think has seldom been taken into account when planning for curriculum
change. Sarason found such a disregard of teachers’ thinking in his studies. Discussing the goals of change in the classroom, Sarason stated “a basic assumption ... is that the teacher will be the agent of change; the teachers will possess that way of thinking, as well as appropriately derived procedures and tactics, that will bring about the desired kind of classroom life.” Sarason also referred to Holt’s 1964 statement that “there is a remarkable blindness to the fact that one is confronted with the extremely difficult problem of how one changes how people think ... those who attempt to introduce a change rarely, if ever, begin the process by being clear as to where the teachers are; that is, how and why they think as they do. ... As a result, teachers react in much the same way that many children do, and this is with feeling they are both wrong and stupid” (Sarason, 1996, pp. 231-232).

The need to study teachers’ beliefs about pedagogy was further demonstrated in Davies’ remark that “English teachers have often preferred deep conviction to cool analysis. ..... and unless one accepts the need for a more analytical approach, there is a real danger that the English subject paradigm (the ways its aims, content, purpose, boundaries, etc. are formulated) might just turn out to be more in the interests of the English teachers themselves – imbuing familiar and comfortable practices, knowledge and beliefs with a gratifying sense of legitimacy – than of the actual students” (Davies, 1996, p.13).

Based on the literature review, it can be inferred that teachers’ beliefs have been studied in order to understand their behaviour in the classroom and their decisions about content and materials (Pajares, 1992; Fang, 1996; Werner, 1991; Hargreaves and Evans, 1997a). Various studies have also examined the roots of teachers’ beliefs, particularly looking at the relationship between education and work experience, and stated beliefs. However, only a handful of studies have specifically undertaken a survey of beliefs about the need for a change in pedagogical values, objectives and learning outcomes (Davies, 1996; Markee, 1994).

Literature reviewed for the present study also pointed towards the need to study curriculum change in English and English teachers’ beliefs, because English as a school subject has been the topic of discussion not only among English educators but also among other educational
experts examining the role and status of various subjects and subject departments (Goodson, 1993; Hargreaves and Evans, 1997b). Within English as a school subject, several scholars have documented the debate over curriculum, particularly the debate over the value of teaching literature versus the value of teaching language skills (Rosenblatt, 1978; Britton et al., 1978; Hollindale, 1986; Yagelski, 1994; Davies, 1996). This debate is particularly relevant to the situation that suggested the present study, i.e., the introduction and implementation of the new TPC12 curriculum as an alternative to English 12 in BC high schools.

There is a need to study the relationship between beliefs and implementation, because otherwise, “little will have been accomplished if research into educational beliefs fails to provide insights into the relationship between beliefs, on the one hand, and teacher practices, teacher knowledge, and student outcomes on the other” (Pajares, 1992, p. 327).
Chapter III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The objective of the present study was to determine whether teachers' beliefs are a factor in teachers' willingness to implement new curriculum. The study examined the relationship between teachers' beliefs about what is appropriate curriculum for a school respondent, teachers' backgrounds, and teachers' willingness to implement new curriculum externally imposed by the Ministry. The principal source of data was teachers, who reported on their beliefs and their willingness to implement the new curriculum.

The dependent variable in this study was teachers' willingness to implement new curriculum. The main independent variable was teachers' beliefs. Other variables taken into account as factors influencing teachers' willingness to implement new curriculum were: educational background of teachers, work experience of teachers, knowledge of the new curriculum, and availability of resources and support.

The principal research technique used in the present study was the survey method based on a questionnaire. "Surveys are used to learn about people’s attitudes, beliefs, values, demographics, behaviour, opinions, habits, desires, ideas ... if they are done correctly, sound information can be gathered from a small sample ..." (Schumacher and McMillan, 1993, pp. 279-280).

The questionnaire consisted of open-ended and multiple-choice questions and included a Likert-type scale. As Schumacher and McMillan confirm, "a questionnaire is relatively economical, has standardized questions, can ensure anonymity, and questions can be written for specific purposes. Questionnaires can use statements or questions, but in all cases the respondent is responding to something written" (1993, p. 238). As a secondary data-gathering technique, interviews were conducted.
Data gathered through the close-ended questions were analyzed using the SPSS 8.0 for Windows software package. Data from open-ended questions and the interviews were examined based on their content.

This chapter describes the population and sample, the construction of the questionnaire, the pilot survey, pre-analysis, and the method of analysis.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE
The population for this study consisted of teachers of English in BC. A number of efforts were made to identify school districts from which a sample could be drawn for this study. Because of the debate surrounding the introduction of TPC12, and because very few high schools in the province initially opted to offer TPC12 to their students, sampling was conducted in three stages. First, teachers attending an information session on TPC12 were mailed questionnaires. Next, in order to include teachers both ‘willing to implement’ and ‘unwilling to implement’, a convenience sample was drawn by approaching English Dept. Heads known to the principal investigator. Because this second stage of sampling yielded initially skewed results, a third sample was identified from a list of teachers presently teaching TPC12.

The final sample consisted of three groups of English teachers:

a) English teachers in selected schools in BC
b) English teachers who attended an information session for TPC12 at BCIT
c) TPC12 teachers in BC, listed by the Centre for Applied Academics

Respondents in category a) were drawn from the population of teachers of English in the province. Because of the debate surrounding the introduction of TPC12, and because very few high schools in the province opted to offer TPC12 to their students, the selection of schools and English departments for the purpose of sampling was done by approaching English Department Heads in four BC school districts known to the Principal Investigator, and by approaching the Assistant Superindent in one school district. In order to circulate the questionnaire to the respondents in category a), permissions were taken from the relevant
bodies: in the case of schools in the four school districts, permission was granted by principals of the schools, and in the case of one school district, permission was granted by the School District office. Depending on the numbers of English teachers in each school, between 9 and 20 questionnaires were given to Heads of the English Departments in selected schools who were requested to circulate the instrument among teachers in their departments.

For categories b) and c), purposive sampling was used to locate teachers who would be likely respondents, on the assumption that teachers who demonstrated some interest either in the new curriculum itself, or in the debate surrounding it, would be willing to respond to a questionnaire. These teachers were drawn from two lists of interested teachers. For the first list of interested teachers, seventeen teachers at the information session for TPC12 held at BCIT in January 1998 provided their names and addresses for the questionnaire to be mailed to them. For the second list of interested teachers, a list of the five teachers teaching TPC12 in the province was provided by the Centre for Applied Academics. In this second list, there was an overlap of three teachers who had attended the January 1998 information session. Of these, two teachers had changed schools. One of these teachers agreed to be interviewed and also provided the name of the teacher who had taken her place to teach TPC12 in her former school, and who agreed to participate in the present study.

The final total sample for the questionnaire consisted of 41 respondents. Of these, six respondents were teachers who had attended the information session, 33 respondents were teachers from eight schools in the Lower Mainland, and two were TPC12 teachers not reached earlier (See Table 1: Sample Size). Of the respondents who completed and returned the questionnaire, 15 respondents agreed to be interviewed over the telephone; 11 interviews were successfully completed.
TABLE 1: SAMPLE SIZE OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL/GROUP</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires circulated</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td><strong>English teachers in selected schools in BC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District I:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District II:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District III:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District IV:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District V:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td><strong>English teachers who attended an information session for TPC12 at BCIT</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td><strong>TPC12 teachers in BC listed by the Centre for Applied Academics</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The beliefs statements in the Likert-type scale were developed from statements made by various individuals about what an English 12 course should be. "A Likert scale is a five-point scale in which the interval between each point on the scale is assumed to be equal. This scale is used to register the extent of agreement or disagreement with a particular statement of an attitude, belief, or judgment" (Tuckman, 1978, p. 179).

To identify what direction teachers' views were taking with regards to TPC12, telephone interviews were conducted with selected persons who had demonstrated interest in the new curriculum by participating in the discussion surrounding its introduction. These persons were:
1. Donna Shultz, Department of Applied Science, UBC
2. Lillitha Rodman, Department of English, UBC
3. Lynn Archer, Vice President, BC Teachers of English Language Arts (1995)
4. Rick Lord, Provincial Coordinator, TPC12, Curriculum Branch, MOEST, BC

The views expressed by stakeholders at a special forum on applied academics and TPC12 held on April 6-7, 1995 (Vance and Abraham, 1995) were also taken into account while constructing the questionnaire for the present study.

The questionnaire was developed based on the following steps:

1. Based on research, statements made about what academicians and teachers think (believe) an English course should be were identified and put together in a five-point Likert-type scale.

2. A pilot survey was conducted to test a preliminary questionnaire. This questionnaire was circulated among English teachers attending sessions on TPC12 in various conferences in Vancouver and Victoria.

3. Based on the feedback received from the pilot survey, the questionnaire was revised and submitted to a panel of judges to check for its validity, and subsequently revised. The judges were:
   • Dr. Walter Werner, Professor, Department of Curriculum Studies, UBC
   • Valerie Collins, Provincial Coordinator, English Language Arts K-12, Curriculum and Resources Branch, MOEST, BC
   • Ron Basarab, Curriculum and Resources Branch, MOEST, BC
   • Dr. Kathleen Vance, Instructor, Communication Dept., BCIT

4. The questionnaire was then submitted to the UBC Ethics Review Committee. Once approval was received, the questionnaire was circulated to a sample of English teachers in BC.

(See Appendix A for the final Questionnaire used in the present study).
Two types of beliefs were incorporated into the ‘beliefs’ statements in the questionnaire (Questions C1 and C2). One set of statements stated that aesthetic literature and literary texts were the optimal pedagogical values in teaching English; the other set of statements stated that efferent literature, non-literary texts and technical, professional, pragmatic communications were the optimal goals in teaching English. Because the debate over the implementation of TPC12 demonstrated English teachers were inclined to believe in the value of aesthetic literature over efferent literature, it was decided to include more statements in favour of aesthetic literature and literary texts as optimal pedagogical values.

PILOT SURVEY
A pilot survey was conducted to find out if the questionnaire developed during the initial stages of the study contained questions that would elicit data related to the objective of this study. (See Appendix C for the questionnaires used in the pilot survey).

In order to reach a sample of individuals potentially interested in implementing the new curriculum, it was decided to distribute the questionnaire to teachers attending a session on TPC12 at a BCTELA provincial conference held in Burnaby on October 18, 1996, as well as to teachers attending information sessions on TPC12 organized by the Ministry in Victoria on November 4, 1996 and in Vancouver in December 1996.

The pilot questionnaire was administered as a before/after survey, attempting to capture differences in responses before and after teachers learned about the new curriculum in the session. A follow-up questionnaire was also distributed, with a request to mail it in on a given date two months after. In all three questionnaires the same Likert-type scale was administered, because the objective was to identify changes in responses over time. Respondents were also requested to provide open-ended comments to the structure of the statements in the Likert-type scale. (See Appendix C for a list of responses to the open-ended question in the pilot survey).

At the BCTELA conference, 15 teachers responded to the before/after questionnaire. At the TPC12 information session held in Victoria, 18 individuals filled out the before/after
questionnaires. At the Vancouver TPC12 session, six teachers filled out the questionnaires. Six respondents mailed in a follow-up questionnaire two months later.

The data from the pilot questionnaires were analyzed manually. For many of the questions, an overall move towards a more positive attitude was seen from ‘Before’ to ‘After’. Looking at the overall comparison, for the question “How do you feel about TPC12”, at the ‘Before’ stage there were 9 respondents at point 3, and at the ‘After’ stage there were 5 respondents at point 3 and 7 respondents at point 4 - a one-point improvement.

For question 2, the valuable-ness of TPC12 for careers, at the ‘Before’ stage there were 7 respondents at point 2, and at the ‘After’ stage 8 respondents at point 3. For question 3, “it is difficult to find significant literature for TPC12”, there were 6 respondents at point 4 at the ‘Before’ stage, and 6 respondents for point 2 at the ‘After’ stage. Thus, for many of the questions, there seemed to be an overall move towards positive attitude from the ‘Before’ stage to the ‘After’ stage.

The open-ended comments were found useful in the construction of the final questionnaire. Some respondents expressed concerns about the new curriculum, similar to concerns expressed elsewhere in the debate. For example:

“The literature must be challenging and interesting (in a creative as well as technical sense). Technical manuals will not be effective, for how can we expect students who do not profess interest in literature (novels, poetry, drama) to become interested in writing that has no artistic sense, and no story line?”

“My concern is that the program is based on the pragmatic informational level of lit, ignoring social and critical concepts.”

(See Appendix C for a complete list of responses to the open-ended question in the pilot survey).
Conclusions from the pilot survey
The pilot survey helped to identify weaknesses in the series of statements included in the Likert-type scale. The participating teachers responded to all the statements, and stated their concerns about statements they found irrelevant or confusing. These comments were taken into account when revising the statements for the Likert-type scale in the questionnaire used in the present study.

Based on the before/after responses, it was found that there was a lack of information about the new curriculum, and that with more information, teachers’ attitudes might become more positive. However, it must be noted that the respondents in the pilot survey had demonstrated initial interest in TPC12, as evidenced in their decision to attend sessions on the new curriculum.

Subsequent to the pilot, it was decided to include all English teachers in the population, so that responses would be elicited from those willing to implement as well as respondents not willing to implement the new curriculum. This decision was also influenced by the lack of response from secondary schools opting to offer the new course to Grade 12 students, which meant that the number of teachers willing to implement would be minimal.

Because all secondary school English teachers in BC were included now in the population, the before/after design was no longer useful, since the questionnaire would not be administered only in information sessions but instead would be distributed to teachers through English Department Heads in selected schools.

Final questionnaire
Based on the results of the pilot survey and the subsequent decision to include all BC English teachers in the population, the questionnaire was revised, and four main sections (A, B, C, D) constructed as follows:
• questions about secondary independent variables Education and Work Experience were maintained, and set up as Section A: Work Experience, and Section B: Education
• questions to elicit beliefs about implementing the new course were set up in Section C; the ‘beliefs’ statements included in the Likert-type scales (Questions C1 and C2) were refined based on feedback from the pilot survey
• questions on respondents’ awareness of and knowledge about TPC12 (TPC12 and You) was included, because the pilot survey revealed that several respondents had little information about this new curriculum.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
The questions in the interview schedule were designed to elicit data from interview respondents that would demonstrate their pedagogical values and beliefs about the purpose, objectives, resources and materials for English 12 and for the new course, i.e., Technical Professional Communications 12. Questions about the appropriateness of offering the new course TPC12 as an alternative to English 12 were also included in the interview schedule (See Appendix A for the list of questions in the interview schedule).

PRE-ANALYSIS
Once the questionnaires were collected from respondents, data were inputted as a series of variables on the SPSS 8.0 for Windows package. Frequencies were noted for the variable “willingness to implement TPC12”, and it was found that this variable needed to be refined and recoded, as described below.

“Willingness to implement TPC12”
Because this study examined possible differences in beliefs between teachers willing to implement TPC12 and teachers unwilling to implement TPC12, the two groups needed to be identified. The question about willingness to implement TPC12 (Question D8) contained three possible responses: a) willing to teach TPC12, b) already teaching TPC12, and c) not interested in teaching TPC12. The pre-analysis found that very few respondents selected
categories a) and b), while a large number of respondents chose category c). Hence it was
decided to combine categories a) and b), so that there were two groups, a) respondents
willing to teach and/or already teaching TPC12, and b) respondents not interested in teaching
TPC12. Even after recoding, the group consisting of respondents willing to teach and/or
already teaching TPC12 was smaller than the group consisting of respondents not interested
in teaching TPC12.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS
The present study collected both quantitative data (from the multiple choice questions in the
questionnaire) and qualitative data (from the open-ended questions, and the interviews). The
quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS 8.0 software package. The qualitative data
was analyzed by sorting the responses according to the questions asked.

Analysis of quantitative data
For purpose of quantitative analysis, the SPSS 8.0 for Windows package was used. Raw data
were tabulated, and the independent samples t-test was calculated. The independent samples
test was used because it has been found to be one of “the most common statistical
procedure[s] for determining the level of significance when two means are compared … [for
example] comparing attitudes … would utilize an independent samples t-test” (Shumacher
and McMillan, 1993, pp. 345-346). Confidence levels for significant differences between
groups reported by the statistical package were at the .05 level, the .01 level, and the .001
level for various relationships.

Levene’s test of equality of variances was calculated for each t-test table. In cases where the
differences between “equal variances assumed” and “equal variances not assumed” were
significant, the 2-tailed significance level for “equal variances not assumed” was considered
for analysis and interpretation of the t-test for Equality of Means. The small sample size of
one group (respondents willing to implement = 16) and unequal sample sizes of the two
groups (the two groups that constituted the basis of the emerged unequal in size comparison
i.e., respondents willing to implement TPC12 = 16, and respondents not willing to implement
TPC12 = 25) leads to the possibility of Type II error.
Tabulation of the data

Once the t-tests results were obtained from the SSPS 8.0 for Windows, the data were tabulated in order to identify the means scores, standard deviations, difference in means, t-test figures, and significance levels. Separate tables were laid out for each multiple choice question in the questionnaire. In two cases, factors from two questions were presented in one table. Table 11 combines responses to questions B2 and B3 (respondents' major and minor respondents at the undergraduate and graduate levels of university study), and Table 25 combines responses to questions D9, D10, D11, and D12 (respondents' report of amount of interest shown by students, colleagues, and parents).

For the purpose of focusing on data that yielded relevant results, factors for which there were three or less respondents in either group are not included in the tables in the main text of Chapter 4. For such tables, the complete tables are provided in Appendix D.

Analysis of qualitative data

The qualitative data from the open-ended questions and the interviews were analyzed by sorting the responses according to the questions asked. For each open-ended question and interview question, responses were classified and reported according to the two respondent groups.

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

To find out if the hypotheses postulated in the present study were upheld, the quantitative and qualitative data were interpreted based on the sections and sub-sections of the central question of the present study outlined in Chapter I:

Beliefs about pedagogy:

1. Objectives of the course, identified as:
   - Most important contribution to students' cognitive development – aesthetic literature vs. efferent literature
   - Statements about objectives – emphasis on aesthetic literature vs. emphasis on efferent literature
Most important reason students learn to write – communication vs. self-reflection

2. Texts for the course – aesthetic, literary texts vs. efferent, non-literary texts

3. Utilization of classroom hours – hours for aesthetic literature vs. hours for efferent literature.

Beliefs about teacher preparation:

1. Courses teachers should have taken – literature courses vs. language/linguistics courses

2. Reading teachers should do – literary journals vs. non-literary journals.

Beliefs about the characteristics of the change:

1. Need - adequacy of the new curriculum and provision of skills for graduation

2. Clarity – awareness of the intent and knowledge of the Integrated Resource Package (IRP) for TPC12, instances of false clarity

3. Complexity – lack of complexity in course content, culture of the subject

4. Quality/practicality – student feedback, availability of resources, need for assistance and support, need for collegial support.

In the interpretation, results of the quantitative analysis was reported in terms of whether the differences between groups were statistically significant or not significant on the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their willingness to implement the new curriculum. To interpret the qualitative responses, principal terms related to aesthetic literature and efferent literature were identified in relation to the context of the sentence in the response, i.e., whether the connotation was positive or negative in relation to the term used. The principal terms that were identified were “literature”, “literary canon”, “aesthetic literature”, “technical communications”, “literary texts”, “non-literary texts”, and related terms. The responses were then interpreted according to the group the respondent belonged to, i.e., respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement, and discussed in terms of whether and to what extent the responses supported the hypotheses.
Chapter IV
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

To collect data for the present study, two research tools were used – a self-administered questionnaire and telephone interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using the independent samples t-test on SPSS 8.0 for Windows, and qualitative data were analyzed by examining respondents’ statements. This chapter consists of two main sections: data presentation and analysis of responses to the questionnaire, and data presentation and analysis of responses to the interviews. The data have been presented in sequence of the questions in the questionnaire and the interview schedule. In Chapter V, the findings are discussed and interpreted based on the relationships investigated in the present study, i.e., the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and curriculum implementation, and the relationship between teachers’ backgrounds and curriculum implementation.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of four main sections. Sections A and B collected data on respondents’ backgrounds – work experience and education. Section C collected data on respondents’ beliefs about Grade 12 English. Section D collected data on what respondents knew about TPC12 (the new course), as well as respondents’ opinions about resources for the new course.

For the purpose of statistical analysis of the data, two groups were identified, those respondents willing to implement the new curriculum and those respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum. The basis of identifying the two groups was Question D8, which asked respondents to check one of three statements “that most closely represents your personal interest in TPC12”. The three statements were:

a. I am prepared to teach TPC 12 if the opportunity arises
b. I have taught, or am currently teaching TPC 12
c. I am not interested in teaching TPC 12
As seen in Table 2, frequencies computed for Question D8 revealed that of the total 41 respondents, six had taught or were currently teaching TPC12, and eleven respondents were willing to teach TPC12. That is, respondents in both these groups were willing to implement the new course. It was therefore decided to combine these two groups in order to obtain more equal groups for the purpose of comparisons between groups (Table 3).

**TABLE 2: FREQUENCIES FOR RESPONDENTS’ PERSONAL INTEREST IN TPC12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in teaching TPC12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have taught/currently teaching TPC12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared to teach TPC12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 3, combining respondents who had taught TPC12 and respondents who were prepared to teach TPC12 resulted in a group of 16 respondents willing to implement TPC12. There were 25 respondents unwilling to implement TPC12. These two groups were used in the t-tests to determine the relationship between the variable ‘willingness to implement’ and the variables ‘beliefs’, ‘awareness of TPC12’, ‘need for assistance’, and so on in Tables 4 to 27.

**TABLE 3: FREQUENCIES FOR RESPONDENTS’ WILLINGNESS TO IMPLEMENT TPC12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement TPC12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement TPC12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent samples t-tests were performed to assess whether these two groups differed on responses to the continuous variables represented by the questions. The SPSS 8.0 for Windows statistical package was used to compute the t-tests. For the purpose of focusing on data that yielded relevant results, factors for which there were less than three respondents in either group were not included in the tables in the main text of this chapter. For such factors, the complete tables are provided in Appendix D.
SECTIONS A and B: BACKGROUND DATA ON RESPONDENTS

Background information on respondents was collected about their work experience and their education. These two factors have been cited in several studies (Fullan, 1991; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Pike, 1981; Lortie, 1975) as having a relationship with the values, attitudes and beliefs of teachers.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Respondents were asked to report their teaching experience in the high school and at the post-secondary level. Several studies have found that teaching and work experience are related to beliefs and pedagogical values (Richardson, 1996; Brousseau, Book and Byers, 1988; Pike, 1981).

High school teaching experience

Question A1 asked respondents to report on the number of years they had taught various English courses in the high school. Because respondents could have taught a course for any number of years, or not have taught some of the courses listed in the questionnaire, numbers reported in Table 3 under ‘N’ do not add up to the total number of respondents in each group.

Teaching (work) experience for most respondents included some years of teaching high school English, though not all respondents were currently teaching English 12 at the time of the survey. All respondents had taught “other subjects”, i.e., courses other than English or courses related to Language Arts.

Table 4 shows that 32 (78%) respondents had experience teaching English 12, 17 (41%) respondents had experience teaching Communications 12, and all respondents (100%) had experience teaching other subjects. Nine (22%) respondents had taught Literature 12. Results for the complete list of factors reported by respondents are presented in Table 26 in Appendix D.

Inspection of Table 26 (Appendix D) shows that the t-test administered to determine the relationship between respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course
and types of high school teaching experience revealed no significant differences. Such a result is likely because the population for the present study consisted of English teachers who would likely have similar teaching experience, regardless of their beliefs about implementing TPC12.

One of the seven intended comparisons could not be made because no respondent unwilling to implement had in fact taught TPC12. Moreover, the numbers in some cells were much too small to expect statistical significance, e.g., QA1d and QA1e.

TABLE 4: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs teaching English 12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs teaching Comm 12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs teaching Literature 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs teaching other subjects</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College/post secondary teaching experience

Respondents were asked in Question A2 to report their post-secondary teaching experience by listing the courses they had taught, if any. Courses listed were categorized into subject groups, and reported in Table 27 in Appendix D. As Table 27 shows, few of the respondents had taught English at the post secondary level, and fewer had taught Social Sciences. None of the respondents reported having taught Technical English, Arts, Science, Engineering, or other Technical respondents at the post secondary level. Inspection of Table 27 shows that the t-test administered to determine the relationship between respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course and types of post-secondary teaching experience revealed no significant differences.
NON-TEACHING EXPERIENCE

To identify factors in respondents’ backgrounds that were likely to influence their willingness to implement new curriculum, respondents were asked to report their non-teaching work experience and their writing experience (‘writing experience’ was included as a factor because writing skills are an important component in the curriculum under study).

Non-teaching work experience

Respondents were asked to report their non-teaching work experience in questions A3 and A4. For purpose of entering raw data, two categories of non-teaching work in the high school were identified, i.e., work as Department Head, and work in other school administration. Three categories of work outside the school were identified, i.e., work in industry, work in research, and other non-school work.

In Question A3, respondents were asked whether they had done any work in the high school other than teaching. Fifteen respondents had administrative experience in the school, including positions as department heads. In Question A4, respondents were asked whether they had done any work outside the high school in industry or business, for example, “as a technician, manager, business person, or in other professional work”. Of the few respondents who had worked outside the school, 13 had worked in industry, three had worked in research, and ten had done other work.

Table 28 in Appendix D depicts t-test results for all five factors in Questions A3 and A4. Inspection of Table 28 in Appendix D shows that the t-test administered to determine the relationship between respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course and types of non-teaching work experience revealed no significant differences. However, further inspection of Table 27 reveals that respondents willing to implement were more likely to have non-teaching work experience (other school administration = 5, work in industry = 8, work in research = 3) than respondents unwilling to implement (other school administration = 0, work in industry = 5, work in research = 0).
Because two of the five factors in Questions A3 and A4 (i.e., A3b: experience in other school administration, and A4b: experience in research) were not reported by any of the respondents unwilling to implement, it was decided to further analyze questions A3 and A4 by:

1) grouping together all responses for each question (i.e., to not categorize responses), and
2) including blank responses as ‘no answers’.

Table 5 depicts differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement on non-teaching experience. (To construct this table, a score of ‘0’ was given to ‘no answer’ responses, [i.e. blank], and a score of ‘1’ was given to a response that stated the kind of non-teaching work done. This method was followed in order to include all respondents in the computation, so that the study could determine differences between respondents who reported non-teaching work experience and respondents who did not have other experience or chose not to report it).

Inspection of Table 5 shows that the t-test administered to determine the relationship between respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course and types of non-teaching experience revealed no significant differences between groups. However, further examination of the table revealed that the results approached in the direction of significance for work experience in school administration (.10) as well as work experience outside the school (.14).

The low mean score for respondents unwilling to implement on school administration (2.54) and work outside the school (1.54) indicates that many of these respondents may not have experienced the need for technical and professional communication skills. For the factor “school administration”, subjects willing to implement had a mean score of 5.13, and for the factor “work outside the school”, respondents willing to implement had a mean score of 3.13 which indicates that respondents willing to implement had on average worked more years than respondents unwilling to implement. However, the high standard deviation for respondents willing to implement on work outside the school suggests a wide range of responses within the group.
Writing experience

In Question A5, respondents were asked to report on the different kinds of writing they had done, unpublished as well as published. This question was included on the assumption that writing is a large part of using the English language, and so teachers who liked to write would likely be interested in teaching English. The question attempted to find out whether there were any differences in willingness to implement TPC12 between respondents who have done transactional/non-literary writing and respondents who have done poetic/literary writing.

Respondents' responses to Question A5 were open-ended, i.e., they were asked to report in their own words what kind of writing they had done. These responses were organized into two categories, "transactional or non-literary writing" like reports and papers, and "poetic or literary writing" like short stories and poems. Within each category, two sub-categories were identified – unpublished writing and published writing (respondents were requested to put an asterisk [*] beside their published writing):

Table 6 presents the frequencies for the two categories and two sub-categories of writing identified. A total of 26 respondents responded to Question A5. An examination of Table 6 shows that the kind of writing most respondents had done was unpublished transactional writing. Within each group, 75% of respondents willing to implement and 52% of respondents unwilling to implement had done unpublished transactional writing, whereas 52% of respondents unwilling to implement had published transactional writing. For the other categories of writing, less than 50% of each sample group had done any one kind of
writing. It may be noted that respondents unwilling to implement had done more poetic writing (28% published, and 44% unpublished) than respondents willing to implement (12.5% published and 19% unpublished).

Thus, based on Table 6, the prediction was supported that respondents unwilling to implement are likely to have done more poetic writing that respondents unwilling to implement, and that respondents willing to implement had done more transactional writing than respondents unwilling to implement.

**TABLE 6 : FREQUENCIES FOR GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON CATEGORIES OF WRITING EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N (Total)</th>
<th>% of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A5a: Transactional/non-literary writing - published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>13 (25)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>7 (16)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A5b: Transactional/non-literary writing - unpublished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>13 (25)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A5c: Poetic/literary writing - published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>2 (16)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A5d: Poetic/literary writing - unpublished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>11 (25)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further analyze the relationship between types of writing done by respondents and their willingness to implement the new course, a t-test was administered to the two main categories of transactional/non-literary writing and poetic/literary writing, to determine the relationship between responses and respondents' willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course. As depicted in Table 7, results of the t-test revealed no significant differences between groups. The mean differences between groups for the two categories of writing were also not very large. However, the results of the t-test for differences between groups on poetic/literary writing approached significance, at .09.
TABLE 7: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF WRITING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A5ab: Transactional/ non-literary writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A5cd: Poetic/literary writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION

Section B of the questionnaire asked respondents to report on university courses they had taken. Question B1 asked respondents to report against a given list how many courses they had taken. All but one of the respondents had taken courses in English at the post-secondary, undergraduate level. Questions B2 and B3 asked respondents to report on their major and minor respondents at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. For 66% of the total respondents, English was the chosen major at the undergraduate level.

In order to reflect courses taken at university more accurately, separate tables were constructed for undergraduate courses and graduate courses. Table 8 presents results of the t-test on factors reported by three or more respondents in either group on undergraduate courses taken. Results for the complete list of undergraduate courses reported by respondents are presented in Table 29 in Appendix D. An examination of the raw data revealed that less than half of the respondents (20 = 48%) had graduate degrees. Results for respondents who reported having taken graduate courses are presented in Table 30 in Appendix D.

Inspection of Table 29 and Table 30 (see Appendix D) shows that the t-test administered to determine the relationship between respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course and courses taken at university revealed no significant differences between groups at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
Undergraduate courses

Examination of Table 29 reveals that 40 (98%) respondents had taken university courses in English Literature, and 29 (71%) respondents had taken courses in English Composition. Fewer respondents had taken the other courses listed: 20 (49%) had taken courses in English Language, 18 (44%) had taken courses in Linguistics, and 11 (27%) reported "other courses". Only 4 (19%) respondents reported having taken courses in Applied Communication, and no respondents reported having taken courses in Engineering Writing. There was large standard deviation for all factors in Table 29, from which it can be concluded that there was a variation in the number of courses each respondent had taken.

From the results of Table 29 (Appendix D), it can be inferred that individuals (both willing to implement new curriculum and unwilling to implement new curriculum) who teach high school English are very likely to have taken university courses in English Literature, and some may have taken courses in Linguistics and Grammar. It is very unlikely, however, that such individuals will have taken university courses in Applied Communication and Engineering Writing. The number of respondents who reported having taken courses in Linguistics was the same for both groups, i.e., 9, but there is a large standard deviation within the group of respondents unwilling to implement, and this may explain the t-test result approaching significance at .13. Also, though the mean differences between groups was large for courses in Linguistics, Applied Communication, and other courses, the Ns were small, and a Type II error is possible. A larger sample may result in significance differences between groups on these factors.

Table 8 presents results of the t-test on undergraduate courses reported by three or more respondents in either group.
TABLE 8: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF UNDERGRADUATE COURSES TAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q B1a: English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1b: English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1c: English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1d: Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table 8 reveals that in two instances, i.e., courses in English Literature and courses in Linguistics, the results approached in the direction of significance. For the factor university courses in English Literature, the results of the t-test revealed a significance level of .13, and for the factor university courses in Linguistics, the results of the t-test revealed a significance level of .13. These results could be explained by returning to the raw data to examine the number of courses reported by individual respondents. Table 9 presents the range of number of courses taken by respondents, to demonstrate that a few respondents may account for a large number of courses reported.

Table 9: RANGE OF UNDERGRADUATE ENGLISH LITERATURE COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of courses taken by individual respondents</th>
<th>No. of respondents unwilling to implement</th>
<th>No. of respondents willing to implement</th>
<th>Total no. of courses taken by respondents in the range</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents in the range (Total = 40) (%)</th>
<th>% of courses taken by respondents in the range (Total = 353)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11 (28%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12 (30%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As seen in Table 9, four (10%) of the 40 respondents who reported taking undergraduate courses in English Literature had each taken 20+ courses, or 26% of the courses in the total reported; this phenomenon is illustrated by the wide standard deviation for both groups on English Literature courses. Eighty percent of respondents willing to implement had taken 1-9 undergraduate courses in English Literature, whereas 88% of respondents unwilling to implement had taken 6-20+ undergraduate courses in English Literature.

Graduate courses
Examination of Table 30 (Appendix D) reveals that of the graduate courses taken, nine respondents reported having taken courses in English Literature. Eight respondents reported having taken courses in English Composition, four respondents reported having taken courses in English Language, five respondents reported having taken courses in Linguistics, four respondents reported having taken other courses, and one subject reported having taken courses in Applied Communication. It is interesting to note that at the graduate course level, mean score for English Literature courses taken by respondents willing to implement (6.50) was higher than the mean score for respondents unwilling to implement (3.57). However, only 2 respondents willing to implement and 7 respondents unwilling to implement had taken graduate courses in English Literature, i.e., 12.5% of the 16 respondents willing to implement, and 28% of the 25 respondents unwilling to implement. It should also be noted that the one respondent who took a graduate course in Applied Communication, was willing to implement the new course. No respondents had taken graduate courses in Engineering Writing.

MAJOR SUBJECT AT UNIVERSITY
Respondents were asked to report what subject they had majored in at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In order to determine differences between groups on undergraduate major taken, a blank score (i.e., a ‘0’ assigned where a respondent had not mentioned having majored in the specific subject) was included as a value in the t-test analysis. By using this method of tabulating data, all respondents in the present study were included in the computation of the t-test. In Table 10 and Table 11, in the second column, ‘N’ represents the
number of respondents who reported a major or minor subject in that category, and ‘(Total)’ represents the total number of respondents in the present study.

Undergraduate major and minor

Based on self-reporting of subject majors, the following were identified as broad subject categories of undergraduate majors reported by respondents: English, Social Sciences, Arts, and Sciences. None of the respondents reported an undergraduate major or minor in the Sciences. Table 10 depicts results of the t-test.

**TABLE 10 : DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR AND MINOR**

(Scale: ‘no answer’ (blank) = 0, and a check mark = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N (Total)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q B2a: Undergraduate Major in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>20 (25)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>7 (16)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B2b: Undergraduate Minor in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>6 (16)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B2c: Undergraduate Major in Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>3 (25)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>-2.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>8 (16)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B2d: Undergraduate Minor in Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>12 (25)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B2e: Undergraduate Major in Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B2f: Undergraduate Minor in Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

As seen in Table 10, the t-test administered to determine the relationship between undergraduate major and minor and respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course, revealed significant differences between groups for undergraduate major in English and undergraduate major in Social Sciences. Eighty percent of respondents
unwilling to implement and 38% of respondents willing to implement had majored in English, whereas 12% of respondents unwilling to implement and 50% of respondents willing to implement had majored in Social Sciences. There was a large variation within respondents willing to implement for the factor undergraduate major in Social Sciences. It can be inferred from these results that respondents unwilling to implement majored in English from which they were likely to have been familiarized with the traditional values of aesthetic literature. Previous studies (Marshall and Smith, 1997; Clift, 1987) also found that university education in a subject had an influence on aspiring teachers’ future pedagogies.

Graduate major and minor

Based on self-reporting of subject majors, Education, English, and Arts were identified as broad subject categories of graduate majors reported by respondents. Graduate minors were reported by four respondents (graduate minor in Education = 2, graduate minor in English = 1, graduate minor in Arts = 1); one respondent had a doctorate major in English and a doctorate minor in Education; another respondent was working on his doctorate in Education. The independent samples t-test results for graduate minor and doctorate major and minor are not reported. Table 11 depicts results of the t-test.

### TABLE 11: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON GRADUATE MAJOR

(Scale: ‘no answer’ (blank) = 0, and a check mark = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N (Total)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q B3a: Graduate Major in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>6 (16)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B3c: Graduate Major in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>0 (16)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B3e: Graduate Major in Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>0 (16)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 11, the t-test administered to determine the relationship between graduate major and respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course, revealed no significant differences between groups. These results could likely be due to the small
numbers of respondents who reported on the factor of graduate major. Further examination of Table 11 reveals that more respondents unwilling to implement (N = 14) reported graduate majors than did respondents willing to implement (N = 6).

SECTION C: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON GRADE 12 ENGLISH
Section C of the questionnaire contained a variety of questions that sought to find out what respondents believed about the objectives, texts, and teacher preparation for Grade 12 English, and whether there were significant differences between beliefs of respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement the new course.

BELIEFS ABOUT THE MAIN CONTRIBUTION OF GRADE 12 ENGLISH
Question C1 consisted of two statements, each of which began with “The most important contribution of the English 12 classroom to students’ cognitive development is …” Respondents were asked to agree/disagree with each statement on a five-point Likert-type scale. Statement C1a was worded pro-traditional English 12 and literary texts; i.e., “The most important contribution of the English 12 classroom to students’ cognitive development is what Mathew Arnold described as the best that has been thought and said.” Statement C1b was worded pro-technical communication and non-literary texts, i.e., “The most important contribution of the English 12 classroom to students’ cognitive development is the kinds of informational texts that professionals (such as engineers, lawyers, physicians, managers, administrators, and technicians) read.”

As Table 12 shows, the t-test administered to determine the relationship between statements and respondents’ willingness/unwillingness to implement the new course, revealed no significant differences between groups for either statement C1a and C1b. For statement C1a, results approached significance at .07. The mean score for respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 was 4.35, i.e., approaching towards 5.0 or “strongly agree”, while the mean score for respondents willing to implement was 3.81, i.e., between “neutral” and “agree”.
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Further examination of Table 12 reveals that the results for statement C1a approached in the direction of significance (.07). As predicted, respondents unwilling to implement the new course tended towards agreeing strongly with Mathew Arnold’s statement (C1a), and tended towards disagreement with the statement that informational texts contribute to the cognitive development of English 12 students (C1b). These scores reflect the prediction that respondents unwilling to implement believe in the teaching of aesthetic literature.

It is interesting to note that respondents willing to implement the new course tended to agree with statement C1a, (though not as strongly as those respondents unwilling to implement) and to disagree with statement C1b. That is, respondents willing to implement were more amenable to the Mathew Arnold statement (with a mean score of 3.81) than they were to the statement about informational text (with a mean score of 2.27).

The results from this table indicate that all respondents (those willing to implement as well as those unwilling to implement) believe that literary texts (“... what Mathew Arnold described as the best that has been thought and said”) are the most important contribution of English 12 to students’ cognitive development.

BELIEFS ABOUT THE OBJECTIVES OF GRADE 12 ENGLISH

Question C2 consisted of five statements, and respondents were asked to respond to each statement on a five-point Likert scale. Of the five statements, four (2a, 2b, 2c, 2d) were
taken from objectives that were pro-traditional English 12 and literary texts, while statement 2e was taken from an objective that was pro-technical communication and non-literary texts. It is interesting to note that all respondents (41) responded to each of the statements in this question. Such response indicates that all respondents believed strongly in one direction or the other about the objectives of Grade 12 English.

As Table 13 shows, the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement on beliefs about the objectives of English 12, revealed significant differences at the .001 confidence level for four statements (C2a, C2b, C2d and C2e) and a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for statement C2c. It can be inferred from these results that respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 believe in traditional objectives for English 12 as well as in the use of literary texts, while respondents willing to implement TPC12 believe that an English 12 course should have objectives that include technical communication and the use of non-literary texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q C2a: &quot;... focus on pragmatic texts will deprive students ...&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.75***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C2b: &quot;... if students' interest in the literary canon is not nurtured...&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C2c: &quot;... students should understand aesthetic literature&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C2d: &quot;... students ... can transfer skills to technical reports&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>3.84***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C2e: &quot;... students should have option to study non-literary texts&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-3.65***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 confidence level
***significant at the .001 confidence level
Further examination of Table 13 reveals that there was little variation within the group unwilling to implement (i.e., standard deviations >1.00) for the four-statements that were taken from objectives that were pro-traditional English 12 and literary texts (statements C2 a, C2b, C2c and C2d), reflecting homogeneity within the group. On the other hand, for the group willing to implement, the standard deviation scores for these four statements were <1.00, reflecting some amount of variety in responses within this group.

The mean scores for the respondents unwilling to implement were fairly high i.e. approaching towards the maximum score of ‘5’ = ‘strongly agree’, on statements that were pro-traditional English 12 objectives and literary texts, and tended towards disagreement with statement C2e which was pro-technical communication and non-literary texts. In can be concluded from these results that respondents unwilling to implement believe in the traditional objectives of English 12, i.e., teaching the reading and writing of aesthetic literature.

It should be noted that both groups, including respondents willing to implement the new course, agreed that students should understand aesthetic literature (see results in Table 13 for Q C2c). From the comparatively lower significance level for statement C2c (differences were significant at the .04 level) and an examination of the means for the two groups, it can be inferred that all respondents willing to implement tended towards agreeing with this statement, i.e., that students need to be able to understand and appreciate imaginative, aesthetic literature. This result may be explained by the teaching background of the respondents; all respondents, including respondents willing to implement, were English teachers and would be assumed to believe in the value of aesthetic literature. The significant difference between groups was due to stronger scores for respondents unwilling to implement, who tended to agree more strongly with this statement than respondents willing to implement. The statistical results for Question C2 indicate that respondents unwilling to implement had strong loyalties to the traditional objectives of the established English program, while respondents willing to implement were somewhat less strong in their loyalties to the traditional objectives, and this phenomenon is reflected in the greater variation of within the group.
BELIEFS ABOUT UNIVERSITY COURSES FOR ENGLISH TEACHERS

Question C3 was formulated to elicit beliefs about the training and education of English teachers. This question asked respondents to select, from a list of 10 courses, the four most important senior level university courses they would advise a university student to take, if that student’s career goal were to teach Grade 12 English.

As noted in previous research (Holden, 1981; Holt-Reynolds, 1992), teachers at the Grade 12 level often have some post-secondary specialization in the subject they teach. While subject expertise is not a formal requirement of BC public school teachers, many who opt to teach a Grade 12 subject have taken courses in that subject at university. In broad-based respondents like English, a variety of courses are available at the university level, which could lead to specializations that may or may not be relevant to the high school subject and its curriculum.

Because Q C3 asked respondents to choose four courses out of a list of ten, it was possible that some of the courses would not be selected by any respondent. Thus, because none of the respondents selected courses in Linguistics, First Nations literature, and Engineering writing, SPSS was not able to compute the t for these three courses. Moreover, the initial construction of a table (Table 31 in Appendix D) based on t-test results for factors in question C3 revealed no significant differences between groups, because the score was either ‘1’ (if a course was checked by a respondent) or ‘0’ (if a course was not checked by a respondent), and ‘0’ was treated as a missing value (see Appendix D, Table 31).

Because the t-test was not a useful tool to analyze responses to question C3, Table 14 was constructed to present data on which courses the respondents ranked as most important. Constructing this table to present the choices of the two groups (respondents unwilling to implement and respondents willing to implement) we find that respondents in both groups would recommend a course in Essay Writing to a university student whose career goal were to teach Grade 12 English, with respondents willing to implement recommending such a course a little more strongly (94%) than respondents unwilling to implement (80%). More (80%) of the respondents unwilling to implement would recommend a course in Canadian Literature than would respondents unwilling to implement (69%). Both groups of
respondents would recommend a course in Shakespeare (respondents unwilling to implement = 76%, respondents willing to implement = 75%). It is interesting to note that, contrary to the expectations of this study, 76% of respondents unwilling to implement would recommend a course in English grammar, while 69% of respondents willing to implement would recommend such a course.

TABLE 14: MEAN SCORES OF RESPONDENTS IN RECOMMENDING UNIVERSITY-LEVEL COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of course recommended</th>
<th>Respondents unwilling to implement</th>
<th>Respondents willing to implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (total = 25)</td>
<td>% of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Essay writing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Canadian Literature</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Shakespeare</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in English grammar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in non-fiction prose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Period course (various specified)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Pacific Rim Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BELIEFS ABOUT TEXTS FOR GRADE 12 ENGLISH

Question C4 addressed beliefs about resources used in implementing curriculum. Textbooks are one of the main resources in high school, and teachers spend considerable classroom time with the chosen text. In English, the text chosen for detailed study through the semester serves as a template for process, language, values, and culture. Works from the traditional literary canon have been popular in English curriculum; contemporary non-fiction has sometimes also been included in English curriculum.

What types of texts would respondents find appropriate for teaching Grade 12 English: traditional literary texts like Shakespeare’s “Henry IV” and Thomas Hardy’s “Mayor of Castorbridge”, or non-literary texts like Carl Sagan’s “Cosmos” and Stephen Hawking’s “A Brief History of Time”? Respondents were presented with a list of books and asked how appropriate (3 = very appropriate, 2 = somewhat appropriate, 1 = not appropriate) they considered each one to be, as a text for English 12.
This question was formulated to determine how respondents would rate a given list of literary and non-literary texts, and whether their ratings were related to their willingness to implement the new course. The hypothesis for this question was that respondents willing to implement the new curriculum would be more likely to find non-literary, efferent texts appropriate for English 12 than respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum, and that respondents willing to implement the new curriculum would be less likely to find literary, aesthetic texts appropriate for English 12 than respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum.

Inspection of Table 15 shows that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement on beliefs about the appropriateness of texts for English 12 revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on three of the twelve books listed i.e., for Carl Sagan’s “Cosmos”, Stephen Hawking’s “A Brief History of Time”, and John-Ralston Saul’s “The Unconscious Civilization”. Respondents willing to implement had higher mean scores for these three books than respondents unwilling to implement. These three books were in the category of efferent, non-literary texts. It can be inferred that, as predicted, respondents willing to implement are in favour of using efferent, non-literary texts for English 12, and respondents unwilling to implement are not in favour of such texts for English 12. Further, the results approached in the direction of significance for Thomas Hardy’s “The Mayor of Casterbridge”. However, for Hardy’s text, contrary to prediction, respondents willing to implement had a higher mean score than respondents unwilling to implement. For the other aesthetic texts: Shakespeare’s “Henry IV Part I”, Camus’ “The Outsider”, Bronte’s “Wuthering Heights”, and Steinbeck’s “Of Mice and Men”, t-test results revealed no significant differences between the groups. Because means scores for both groups were similar for these texts, it can be inferred that, contrary to expectation, respondents willing to implement believe in including aesthetic, literary texts in the English 12 curriculum.

Considering the small sample size, the phenomenon of significance scores slightly under significant levels might be attributed to a Type II error. If a larger sample size had been possible, these relationships may have revealed significant levels of difference.
Table 15: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEFS ABOUT APPROPRIATENESS OF TEXTS (Scale: 3=very appropriate, 2=somewhat appropriate, 1=not appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic, literary texts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4a: Albert Camus: <em>The Outsider</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4b: Shakespeare: <em>Henry IV Part I</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4c: Hardy: <em>The Mayor of Casterbridge</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4d: Bronte: <em>Wuthering Heights</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4e: Steinbeck: <em>Of Mice and Men</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efferent, non-literary texts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4f: Carl Sagan: <em>Cosmos</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-2.48*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-2.48*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4g: Martin Rees: <em>Before the Beginning</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4h: Bormanais: <em>Star Trek Science Logs</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC4 i: Olivotto et al: <em>Guide to Breast Cancer</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4j: John-R Saul: <em>The Unconscious Civilization</em></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-2.13*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-2.13*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4k: Gookin: <em>DOS for Dummies</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C4l: Hawking: <em>A Brief History of Time</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
BELIEFS ABOUT ALLOCATION OF CLASSROOM HOURS FOR SECTIONS OF ENGLISH 12

Question C5 asked respondents to state how important it is to allocate more than five classroom hours to different sections of Grade 12 English (on a scale of 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = very important).

Under the umbrella of the English curriculum, various sections of aesthetic and efferent literature are included. Some of these are poetry, Shakespeare, fiction, essay writing, non-fiction prose, and technical and professional materials. Teachers make decisions about how much time they will spend on each of these units. Previous research (Brooks, 1980; Davies, 1996; Hollindale, 1986) found that English teachers spend more time emphasizing literature-based aspects of English, like poetry, Shakespeare, and fiction, and spend little or no time on teaching about technical and professional materials. Thus it was predicted that respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum would choose to allocate more than five classroom hours to literature-based aspects of English 12 and fewer than five classroom hours to technical and professional materials.

On examining Table 16, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on beliefs about the need for more than five classroom hours for sections of English 12 revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on classroom hours spent on non-fiction prose, and a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence on classroom hours spent on technical and professional materials. That is, respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 believed that allocating more than five classroom hours for technical and professional materials was not important (mean score = 1.56), whereas respondents willing to implement TPC12 believed that allocating more than five classroom hours for technical and professional materials was very important (mean score = 2.47). There was very little deviation within groups. Similarly for ‘non-fiction prose’, respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 believed that allocating more than five classroom hours for non-fiction prose was only somewhat important (mean score = 2.68), whereas respondents willing to implement TPC12 believed that allocating
more than five classroom hours for non-fiction prose was very important (mean score = 2.93).

It is interesting to note that there was virtually no difference between groups in the allocation of hours for Shakespeare (mean scores = 2.80 and 2.64) which indicates that both groups (unwilling and willing to implement) felt that Shakespeare is an important unit of English 12 and deserves adequate classroom time. Further, for the factors ‘poetry’, ‘fiction’, and ‘essay writing’, the results of the t-test were in the direction of significance. Such a trend indicates that the question merits further investigation. The mean difference between groups on the allocation of more than five classroom hours for ‘fiction’ and ‘essay writing’ were small, and both were .16. Moreover, all respondents willing to implement assigned a score of ‘very important’ to units of both ‘fiction’ and ‘essay writing’. From these results, it can be concluded that respondents willing to implement believe it is important to spend more classroom hours for units on technical materials and for units on fiction and essay writing.

Table 16: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEFS ABOUT THE NEED FOR MORE THAN FIVE CLASSROOM HOURS FOR SECTIONS OF ENGLISH 12
(Scale: 1=not important, 2=somewhat important, 3=very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q C5a: 5+ hours for non-fiction prose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-2.18*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C5b: 5+ hours for poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C5c: 5+ hours for Shakespeare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C5d: 5+ hours for technical materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>4.31***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C5e: 5+ hours for fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C5f: 5+ hours for essay writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
***significant at the .001 level
BELIEFS ABOUT TYPES OF READING ENGLISH TEACHERS SHOULD DO

Question C6 asked respondents to rank the types of reading a teacher of Grade 12 English might do regularly (on a scale of 1 = lowest rank, 4 = highest rank). This question was formulated to find out beliefs about English teachers’ self-development and interests in the different aspects of English as a subject. Previous research has pointed to the need for teachers’ lifelong learning (Fullan, 1991) and need to read current professional journals (Burhans, Jr., 1985).

Inspection of Table 17 shows that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on beliefs about the types of reading English teachers should do, revealed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level on ‘reading technical texts’. Thus according to the statistical results, there is a difference between respondents willing to implement who ranked ‘reading technical texts’ at a mean score of 1.73, and respondents unwilling to implement who ranked ‘reading technical texts’ at a mean score of 1.13. However, for reading technical texts, respondents willing to implement had low mean scores (1.13) for TPC12, with a low standard deviation of .46. That is, contrary to expectation of the present study, this group ranked ‘reading technical texts’ lowest among the four choices in the question.

Moreover, respondents willing to implement gave ‘reading poetry’ the highest rank, as did respondents unwilling to implement. However, for the factor ‘reading poetry’, there was large standard deviation within respondents willing to implement, suggesting a wide range of ranking. For ‘reading literary criticism’, respondents willing to implement had a higher mean score than respondents unwilling to implement, though the difference was not significant – such a higher mean score is contrary to expectation that respondents willing to implement will rank the reading of technical texts as more important than the reading of aesthetic literature.

For the factor ‘reading current issues’ results approached significance, at .07 confidence level. As expected, respondents willing to implement had a higher mean score than respondents unwilling to implement.
Table 17: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEFS ABOUT THE TYPES OF READING ENGLISH TEACHERS SHOULD DO
(Scale: 1 = lowest rank, 4 = highest rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unwilling to implement</th>
<th>Willing to implement</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q C6a: <em>Reading technical texts</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-2.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C6b: <em>Reading poetry</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C6c: <em>Reading current issues</em></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C6d: <em>Reading literary criticism</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 confidence level

BELIEFS ABOUT WHY STUDENTS LEARN TO WRITE

Question C7 asked respondents to chose one of two statements that best reflected their beliefs about the most important reason students learn to write. The scores assigned were as follows: a score of 1 was given to the answer “to reflect on their responses to reading”, and a score of 2 was assigned to the answer “to communicate their ideas to others”.

As revealed in Table 18, there was no significant difference between groups in their beliefs about the most important reason students learn to write. The mean for respondents willing to implement was 2.00; i.e., all 16 respondents in this group believed that the most important reason that students learn to write is to communicate their ideas to others – this finding is as predicted. However, the mean for respondents unwilling to implement was 1.91 which is .09 away from 2.00. It is interesting to note that respondents unwilling to implement also believed that the most important reason that students learn to write is the communication-oriented goal of communicating their ideas to others, rather than the personal self-improvement goal of reflecting on their responses to reading.
Table 18: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEFS ABOUT THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON WHY STUDENTS LEARN TO WRITE
(Scale: To communicate ideas to others = 2, to reflect on their responses to reading = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QC 7: Reason why students learn to write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTIONS D: TPC AND YOU
Section D was constructed to find out how aware respondents were about the new curriculum. This section included questions about their willingness to implement the new course. Knowledge and awareness of new curriculum is a factor in Fullan's framework for implementation of educational change. Based on the theory, it was predicted that knowledge and awareness of new curriculum are positively related to willingness to implement the new curriculum.

Section D contained questions on the following factors:
- Knowledge about the intent of TPC12:
  - awareness of the official intent of the new course
  - knowledge of the combination of English courses that satisfies the requirement for BC post-secondary scholarships
- Knowledge of the TPC12 curriculum (IRP)
- Availability of resources at school and at home
- Need for assistance from others
- Awareness of others' (students, parents, colleagues) interest in TPC12
- Belief that TPC12 provides communication skills for graduation.
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE INTENT OF TPC12

The first two questions in Section D asked respondents 1) if they were aware of the official intent of the new course, and 2) if they knew the combination of English courses that satisfies the eligibility requirement for BC post-secondary scholarships.

Question D1 presented respondents with a choice of four answers, of which one was the correct answer ("c. to replace English 12"). For purpose of scoring the data, a score of 1 was assigned to an incorrect answer, and a score of 2 was assigned to the correct answer. Question D2 presented a statement about the three government-examinable respondents that students can present credits in to qualify for BC post-secondary scholarships, and asked respondents to determine whether the statement was true (score = 2) or false (score = 1). The correct answer for question D2 was that the statement is true.

Examination of Table 19 shows that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on knowledge about the intent of TPC12, revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. However, contrary to the expectation that respondents willing to implement are more aware of the intent of the new course than respondents unwilling to implement are less aware of its intent, it was found that respondents willing to implement had a lower mean score (1.06) than respondents unwilling to implement (1.29) for question D1, awareness of the intent of TPC12. The higher mean scores for respondents unwilling to implement may be explained by the circumstances of this particular new course, TPC12, for which considerable resistance had been built up among some BC English teachers because of its intent as an alternative (or "replacement") to English 12. Thus, it could be inferred that English teachers unwilling to implement TPC12 were ‘unwilling’ because some of them were aware that its intent was to replace English 12.

Table 19 reveals that there was no significant difference on knowledge about eligibility for scholarships between groups. This finding indicates that awareness about the details of the new course was low among all respondents at the time the survey was conducted.
Table 19: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE INTENT OF TPC 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D 1: <em>intent of TPC 12</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 2: <em>eligibility for scholarships</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 confidence level

KNOWLEDGE OF THE TPC12 CURRICULUM (IRP)

Question D3 asked respondents to check to what extent they had read the various sections of the IRP and supporting materials for the new course. Respondents’ check marks were scored as follows: ‘Have read carefully’ = 3, ‘Have skimmed’ = 2, ‘Have not read’ = 1.

On examining Table 20, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on knowledge of the TPC12 curriculum (IRP), revealed significant differences at the .05 level of confidence or better for all the sections except the In-service Resource. (However for the In-service Resource, the results of the t-test approached in the direction of significance, at .07).
Table 20: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON KNOWLEDGE OF THE TPC 12 CURRICULUM (IRP)
(Scale: ‘Have read carefully’=3, ‘Have skimmed’=2, ‘Have not read’=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D3a: Intro to English Language Arts 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>3.20**</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3b: Intro to Curriculum for TPC 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-5.58***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3c: Reading, Viewing, Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-2.91**</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3d: Writing, Representing, Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-2.67*</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3e: Communication and Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-3.37**</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3f: Appendix A: Prescribed Lrng Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>-4.27***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3g: Appendix B: Learning Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-3.27**</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3h: Appendix C: Cross-curricular Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>-3.93***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3i: Appendix D: Assessment &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-2.90**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3j: In-service Resource (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D3k: Applied Academics Web-site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-2.86*</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
**significant at the .01 level
***significant at the .001 level

From Table 20 it can be inferred that there is a significant relationship between having read or skimmed the IRP for the new course and willingness to implement. Examining the mean scores for each group in Table 20, it is seen that the mean scores of respondents willing to
implement are higher than the mean scores of respondents unwilling to implement. It can be inferred that respondents willing to implement had read the IRP for TPC12 carefully.

The sections of the IRP for which the results were significant at the .001 confidence level were the Introduction to the TPC12 Curriculum, Appendix A: Prescribed Learning Outcomes, and Appendix C: Cross-Curricular Interests. The sections for which the results were significant at the .01 level of confidence were the Introduction to Language Arts, Appendix B: Learning Resources, and the IRP sections on Reading, Viewing Listening and on Communication and Collaboration. It can be inferred that respondents willing to implement found these sections useful in their planning and thinking about implementing TPC12.

**MOST USEFUL PARTS OF THE IRP**

In Question D4, respondents were asked to list the parts of the TPC12 IRP they found most useful. These responses were categorized according to the subject’s group (based on Question D8: prepared to teach, have taught, not interested in teaching).

**Responses of respondents prepared to teach TPC12**

Of the ten respondents prepared to teach TPC12, four did not answer Question D4. One had ‘only skimmed the draft copy’, and another said the question was not applicable because s/he had not taught the course. One pointed to the mandated goals and objectives, and another to the appendices. One subject said all the sections ‘were interesting’, while another said “I read the entire IRP and thought it was long overdue”.

**Responses of respondents who had taught TPC12**

Of the six respondents who had taught TPC12, one subject did not answer Question D4. Of the five who responded, one did not fully understand the question. The others listed the learning outcome, learning resources, cross curricular interests, and inclusion of technology.

**Responses of respondents not interested in teaching TPC12**
Of the twenty-five respondents not interested in teaching TPC12, thirteen did not answer Question D4. Of the respondents who responded to this question, four stated they had not read the IRP, and one “had not received copies”. The others said they did not remember what they had read (since it was a while ago), that don’t know much about the course. One subject identified a section s/he thought most useful “scope and sequence”.

The open-ended responses to question D4 confirm the findings of the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on knowledge of the TPC12 curriculum (IRP), i.e., that respondents willing to implement had read the IRP for TPC12 carefully, and had found several sections useful. On the other hand, respondents unwilling to implement had not read the IRP or had just skimmed through it.

AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

Question D5 asked respondents about the resources available to them to teach TPC12, both at school and at home. It was predicted that respondents who had available resources were more likely to be willing to implement the new course than respondents who did not have any available resources. For purpose of clarity in reporting the findings, two tables have been constructed to depict the results for Question D5, Table 21 for the availability of resources at school, and Table 22 for the availability of resources at home. For the purpose of scoring for this question (which respondents either checked or left blank), ‘no answer’ (blank) = 0, and a check mark = 1.

Availability of resources at school

On examining Table 21, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on availability of resources at school, revealed significant differences at the .05 confidence level on the availability of books on technical writing, computers, and internet access at school. Results approached significance (at .16) for other resources at school, with non of the respondents unwilling to implement reporting any other resources at school. There were no significant differences between groups for books on technical professional literature and technical professional audio-visual materials at school; mean scores on this factor were low for both groups. From
this finding it may be inferred that these two resources may not be widely available to English teachers in BC schools.

Table 21: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AT SCHOOL
(Scale: ‘no answer’ (blank) = 0, and a check mark = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5a1: <em>Books on technical professional writing at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-2.40*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5b1: <em>Books on technical professional literature at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5c1: <em>Technical professional audio-visual materials at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5d1: <em>Computers and software at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-2.32*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5e1: <em>Internet and web access at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-2.04*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5f1: <em>Other resources at school</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

Availability of resources at home

On examining Table 22, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on availability of resources at home, revealed a significant difference at the .05 confidence level between respondents willing and unwilling to implement and the availability of computers at home. Coupled with a similar finding for computers and software at school, it can be inferred that the availability of computers and software as resources is a factor in willingness to implement TPC12.
It is interesting to note that t-test results approached significance (at .13) for differences between groups on availability of books on technical professional writing at home. The mean score for respondents willing to implement (.44) was higher than the mean score for respondents unwilling to implement (.20), indicating that respondents willing to implement are likely to have some course-specific books available at home.

Table 22: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AT HOME
(Scale: ‘no answer’ (blank) = 0, and a check mark = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5a2: Books on technical professional writing at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5b2: Books on technical professional literature at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5c2: Technical professional audio-visual materials at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5d2 Computers and software at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5e2: Internet and web access at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 5f2: Other resources at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

Examining results across Table 21 and Table 22, it is seen that there are significant differences between groups for the availability of three resources at school (books on technical professional writing, computers and software, and internet and web access), whereas for the availability of resources at home, there was a significant difference between groups only for one resource, i.e., computers and software. While results approached
significance for differences between groups on availability of books on technical professional writing at home (as discussed in the previous paragraph), there were no significant differences on the availability of internet access at home, though the mean score for respondents willing to implement (.56) was slightly higher than the mean score for respondents unwilling to implement (.40). From this result it can be inferred that respondents willing to implement are more likely to have a computer and software at home than respondents unwilling to implement. However, respondents willing to implement likely avail of all other resources at school, including internet access.

NEED FOR ASSISTANCE

Question D6 was formulated to find out what types of assistance respondents believed were needed in order to teach the new curriculum. The types of assistance listed in this question included assistance from the various other policy makers and players in the high school system – the teachers’ association, the Ministry, school board, principal, department head, funding, and in-services. For purpose of scoring, respondents had a choice of three answers for each factor: ‘essential’ = 3, ‘helpful’ = 2, and ‘not needed’ = 1.

On examining Table 23, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on need for assistance, revealed significant differences at the .05 level of confidence on need for the school principal’s assistance and need for in-services. For these two factors, the mean scores of respondents willing to implement (2.47 and 2.87 respectively) were higher than the mean scores for respondents unwilling to implement (1.84 and 2.50 respectively).

Further examination of Table 23 revealed that the t-test results for two of the factors approached in the direction of significance: for the factor ‘Ministry assistance’ the significance level was .15, and for the factor ‘Funding for resources’ the significance level was .16.

It should be noted that mean scores for both groups were above 2.0 for most of the factors listed in Table 23 (except for the means score for respondents unwilling to implement based
on school principal’s assistance), ranging from 2.07 to 3.0. From this observation it can be inferred that respondents in both groups considered assistance from the sources listed in D6 either helpful or essential. Results that reveal significant differences between groups lead to the conclusion that respondents willing to implement considered some of the sources of assistance more essential than did respondents unwilling to implement.

Table 23: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON NEED FOR ASSISTANCE IN TEACHING TPC12
(Scale: ‘essential’ = 3, ‘helpful’ = 2, ‘not needed’ = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6a: BCTELA assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6b: Ministry assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6c: School Board assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6d: School Principal’s assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-2.40*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6e: Dept Head’s assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6f: Funding for resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6g: Other funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q D6h: In-services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-2.26*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

It can be inferred from these findings that support from the school principal, and in-services are considered essential types of assistance by respondents willing to implement new curriculum, and that a recognition of the need for Ministry assistance and funding for
resources may also be related to willingness to implement. The BC Ministry of Education has been actively promoting the implementation of the new course (TPC12) among English teachers in the province, and has organized a number of workshops and in-services. Respondents willing to implement are likely to have attended these workshops and received further information from the Ministry.

It is interesting to note that respondents unwilling to implement had higher mean scores than respondents willing to implement for assistance from BCTELA, the school board, and other funding. The higher mean score for respondents unwilling to implement on assistance from BCTELA should be particularly noted because officials of BCTELA were among the voices who expressed concern about the implementation of TPC12 (Jones, 1995).

PERSONAL INTEREST IN TPC12
As explained in the introduction to this chapter, responses to Question D8 formed the basis for constructing the two groups of respondents for purposes of comparison in the present study. Respondents who were prepared to teach (D8a) and who had taught TPC12 (D8b) constituted one group titled 'respondents willing to implement', and respondents who were not interested in teaching TPC12 (D8c) constituted the other group titled 'respondents unwilling to implement'. See Table 2 and Table 3 for details of the two groups.

Besides responding to the multiple-choice in Question D8, respondents were asked to 'give reasons' why they checked a, b, or c in Question D8 (See Appendix E for a detailed list of responses). A summary of these responses are reported below for each group: respondents prepared to teach, respondents who have taught, and respondents not interested in teaching.

Responses of respondents prepared to teach TPC12
Ten respondents said they were prepared to teach TPC12. The responses of these respondents fell into two broad content categories: one category consisted of reasons related to the respondent's self-improvement, and the other category consisted of reasons related to students' needs and the value of the new course.
Four respondents gave reasons related to the respondent's self-improvement. These included the opportunity to expand one's teaching abilities, to keep up with technology, and to grow professionally. One of the respondents stated, "as a business teacher, technical writing is a natural". Six respondents gave reasons related to students' needs and the value of the new course. Reasons included the value of the course in giving students survival skills for the 'real world', the preparation of students for specific areas of post-secondary study, improvement of students' chances for success at university and the workplace, and that all persons "must learn to write clearly and precisely".

Responses of respondents who had taught TPC12
Six respondents said they had taught or were teaching TPC12. The responses of these respondents also fell into the two categories of self-improvement and students' needs.

Three respondents in this group made statements about the benefits of the course to students as well as to themselves. Benefits to students included statements like, the course was "of great use to grade 12 students heading into the real world of communicating", that students "felt they learned far more than they ever did in a regular English course", that "it is relevant and challenging to the learners". Benefits to themselves included statements like, "it helps me become a better communicator and teacher", "it is challenging to ... myself", and "I enjoyed teaching it".

One respondent said that graduating students need the "in-depth contact with technical professional contexts". Another respondent said, "English objectives that are similar to TPC are not often taught because there is not enough time to cover the entire curriculum". Another respondent said simply, "I taught it last year successfully ... I think it is a good course".

Responses of respondents not interested in teaching TPC12
Twenty-five respondents said they were not interested in teaching TPC12. Of these, three left the space for "give reasons" blank. On examining the respondents' statements, the following categories of reasons were constructed:
TPC12 cannot replace English 12

- respondent is interested in teaching other courses
- respondent is not familiar with TPC12

Nine responses fell into the category, “TPC12 cannot replace English 12”. Reasons included, ‘it undermines English 12’, that it lacks units that produce good citizens, that it is purely functional and non-literary whereas English education is a humanizing process, that students need an understanding of literary heritage and opportunities to develop interpretive thinking skills. These respondents also stated that universities do not accept TPC12 as an equivalent credit, and that the course should not replace English 12.

Seven responses were categorized as, “respondent is interested in teaching other courses”. Respondents who made such statements were interested in teaching lower grades, or developing and teaching other courses like Law, Drama 12, and English 9-12. Three respondents said they were not familiar enough with TPC12 to be interested in teaching it. One respondent was worried that the government may discontinue TPC12. Another respondent stated that TPC12 was “boring”.

It is to be noted that several of the responses of respondents in this group contained positive references to “literature”. For example, “Good writing comes from good literature”, “we do a grave disservice to students by depriving them of literature”, “a course that has no literature does not interest me”, and “my field of expertise is literature”. Thus literature formed the parameter by which these respondents decided what type of English course they believed in.

AWARENESS OF OTHERS’ INTEREST IN TPC12

Questions D9 to D12 asked respondents to report on their awareness of other stakeholders’ interest in the new course. Questions D9, D11 and D12 asked respondents if they were aware of the interest of students, colleagues, and parents respectively, possible answers being ‘yes’ (=2), ‘no’ (=1), and ‘don’t know’ (=0).
Question D1.0 asked respondents to circle (from a given list of numbers) the approximate number of students who had expressed interest in the new course. As seen in Table 24, scores for question D10 could be greater than 1.0, because they represent approximate continuous numbers of students interested in the new course. The low mean score of .96 for respondents unwilling to implement indicates that respondents in this group reported very small numbers of students interested in the new course. From the comparatively higher mean score of 17.19 for respondents willing to implement it can be inferred that respondents in this group identified students interested in the new course, and may have encouraged students' interest with positive information about the new course.

On examining Table 24, it was found that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on awareness of others' interest in TPC12, revealed a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence on students' expressed interest in the new course, and significant differences at the .01 confidence level for the number of students interested, as well as for awareness of colleagues' interest in TPC12. Thus it can be inferred that respondents willing to implement the new course are aware of students' and colleagues' interests in the new course, whereas respondents unwilling to implement felt that their students and colleagues are not interested in the new course.

Though both groups did not report much parents' interest in the new course, resulting in no significant difference between groups, the mean score for respondents willing to implement (.75) was higher than the mean score for respondents unwilling to implement (.48).
Table 24: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON AWARENESS OF OTHERS' INTEREST IN TPC12
(Scale; ‘yes’ = 2, ‘no’ = 1, ‘don’t know’ = 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D 9: Awareness of Students' interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>-3.64***</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 10: Number of students interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-16.23</td>
<td>-3.56*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 11: Awareness of Colleagues' interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-3.07*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q D 12: Awareness of Parents' interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .01 confidence level
***significant at the .001 confidence level

BELIEF THAT TPC12 PROVIDES COMMUNICATION SKILLS FOR GRADUATION
Question D13 asked respondents whether they felt ‘that TPC12 provides high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate’. This question echoed the beliefs’ statements in Question C1 and C2. It also served as a precursor to the open-ended Questions D14 and D15, which asked respondents to comment on why they felt one way or the other in Question D13.

Inspection of Table 25 shows that the t-test administered to determine the differences between groups willing and unwilling to implement based on the belief that TPC12 provides communication skills for high school graduation, revealed a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence. Thus it can be inferred that there is a difference in beliefs about the new course between respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement, with respondents willing to implement believing fairly strongly (mean score = 1.92 where the maximum score is 2.00) that TPC12 does provide language and communication skills and respondents unwilling to implement not believing as strongly (mean score = 1.32).
Table 25: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEF THAT TPC12 PROVIDES COMMUNICATION SKILLS FOR GRADUATION
(Scale: yes=2, no=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q D 13: Belief that TPC12 provides language and communication skills for graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-4.75*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .001 level

REASONS WHY TPC12 PROVIDES LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS NEEDED TO GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL

In the questionnaire, questions D14 and D15 provided respondents the opportunity to respond 'openly'. Question D14 asked respondents to comment why they had said yes or no to the Question D13, “Do you feel that TPC12 provides high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate?” Question D15 asked respondents to state what gaps and omissions they felt there were in TPC12, if any. For the most part, respondents who answered “yes” to Question D13 acknowledged that the new course gave students the writing, communication, and technical skills they needed, whereas respondents who answered “no” to Question D13 pointed to the lack of critical thinking skills based on the study of literature.

Of the 19 respondents (out of a total of 41) that responded to Question D14, 8 respondents recorded positive statements about TPC12, and 8 respondents expressed views on how TPC12 did not provide students with language and communication skills. One respondent responded with a positive statement about TPC12 but felt strongly about students’ need for literature. Two respondents interpreted the question differently and offered statements about other aspects of the new course.
POSITIVE STATEMENTS

The five respondents who answered Question D13 with a "yes" (i.e., they agreed that TPC12 provides high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate) indicated they recognized the need for the new course:

- it would give a student entering the technical field adequate knowledge. It may be more useful to them than studying the Classics
- it helps with their communication skills, as does any course where they're writing
- this is an important component in communication skills and provides students with practical skills for employment as well as developing specific writing skills – perhaps it should be required as a portion of all English classes – business writing
- if you read the IRP you will note that this is a very intensive and well-rounded course
- it is important that students be able to analyze non-fiction, whether it is biographical or philosophical or technical. Students also need to learn how to present such information in a way that can be readily understood: concise, clear communication
- it is great for the student going on to a science program or a technical field. It is also adequate for the students who are sick of poetry and drama.

The positive responses echoed the official goals of the new course and thus demonstrated clarity and understanding of the innovation; i.e., the new course would provide students with technical skills, communication skills, practical skills for employment, and an ability to analyze non-fiction and technical materials.

Five respondents pointed out gaps and omissions in the new course pertaining to its quality/practicality factor: "it is not intellectually challenging", and "students will be missing out on reading and writing for enjoyment", and gaps in resources – "quality viewing materials". One respondent said the "biggest problem with implementing TPC12 will be
finding suitably trained teachers. After all, our English degrees are entirely based on literary studies”.

A few of the respondents in this group made cautionary statements about TPC12. One respondent cautioned “you have to be sure the students have ample opportunity for critical thinking skills” because “you don’t want this to be just a linear course”. Another respondent stated that TPC12 is not “a replacement for the student who is going on to post secondary in the Humanities”. One respondent stated, “I feel very strongly … that students who take English 12, a course where most of their communication revolves around Literature, are much more adept at technical writing skills than students who have learned nothing but technical and professional types of communication”. Another respondent felt that students need both (literary and non-literary approaches), and so, TPC “needs to be married with the existing English 12 literature-based course”.

NEGATIVE STATEMENTS
Respondents who answered Question D13 with a “no” (i.e., they did not agree that TPC12 provides high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate) pointed out various aspects of an English course they felt were not provided in the new course. In these responses, there was an overlap of the factors of need, utility/quality, and understanding about the new course.

These respondents first stated their understanding about what an English course needs to provide its students, and then stated how the new course fell short. The respondents saw English education “as something much more important and profound than decoding for information”; “English education properly taught is a humanizing process; TPC is not – (it is) purely functional in the most narrow sense”.

These respondents pointed towards four aspects of an English course that they believed the new course did not provide: study of literature, critical thinking skills, emphasis on culture, and personal skills.
The study of literature was seen by these respondents as being integral to an English course. According to them, the study of Literature provided students with critical thinking skills:

- Literature-based study and training in skilled communication prepares students to make active, thoughtful and critical choices in life
- Literature probes and dissects, analyzes and ponders human motivation … it invites you to think, not just locally, but globally. Will TPC do that?
- if students have the language and analytical skills acquired from reading good Literature and well-written prose, they will be able to apply these skills to pragmatic writing
- I’m not sure if (the new course) allows students to further develop critical thinking skills, the kind that you can get from discussions, analysis and writing based on Literature or issues

The study of literature was also seen as providing students with personal skills:

- students must experience literature and general communication skills to become ‘interesting people’ (which is in demand for corporate personnel directors)
- fiction is an important part of being a balanced person. Too much non-fiction dulls pleasures of the mind, leading to the development of a Gradgrindian take on the world
- the pre-supposition that students should graduate from high school without having read literature in Grade 12 is a sign that post-modern deconstructionist thought on the meaninglessness of literature is finally digging its poisonous residue into the lower levels of curriculum
- students will be missing out on reading and writing for enjoyment.

Respondents who emphasized the lack of personal skills in the new course stated that “students might miss opportunities to work with the more personal aspects of language and communication” and that imagination needs to be unlimited and not confined to technical manuals.
Other respondents pointed out the need for students to have a general knowledge of their cultural heritage and the significance of culture in language and communication. Two respondents stated that the new course "was not intellectually challenging" and suggested that university-bound students could benefit from both English 12 and TPC12, "but not enough of the traditional components are present in TPC12 for it to be taken on its own".

Clarity/understanding of the innovation (or the lack of) as a factor in implementation was evident in the responses of two respondents who answered questions D14 and D15 differently from the others. One respondent saw the new course as a replacement of Communications 12 (which it is not) and analyzed the need for the new course in these terms. Another respondent analyzed the ability of teachers to teach the new course, and stated that the present teachers of the new course lacked an adequate background in composition, grammar, and non-fiction literature.
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS

Telephone interviews were conducted with willing respondents, in order to elicit statements that would identify issues and concerns not covered in the questionnaire. The rationale for the interview schedule used is explained in Chapter III.

In the cover letter that accompanied the questionnaire, respondents were asked if they would consent to a telephone interview. Fourteen respondents returned the interview consent form with a positive response. Of these, interviews were successfully completed with eleven respondents. (Two respondents who had initially agreed to participate were not available during the period when the interviews were conducted. One respondent who agreed initially when contacted on the telephone, did not subsequently call back to confirm agreement).

The telephone interviews were recorded (with the consent of the respondents), and subsequently transcribed. The transcribed responses were then examined question by question. In the analysis, key words and phrases are presented to represent the various categories. A more detailed presentation of the data is found in Appendix E.

SAMPLE GROUPS
For the purpose of analysis, two groups were identified:

- Respondents willing to implement
- Respondents unwilling to implement

Respondents willing to implement:
The group “respondents willing to implement” consisted of those respondents who stated they were willing to implement the new curriculum, i.e., they were prepared to teach TPC12 or had taught/were currently teaching TPC12. This group consisted of a total of six respondents - five respondents who stated that the new course is a suitable alternative to the established course, and one subject who stated that the new course is not an alternative but rather that students should take both the new course and the established course, but said that
he would be willing to teach the new course (in reply to Question 8: “Would you teach this new course TPC12?”)

Respondents unwilling to implement:
The group “respondents unwilling to implement” consisted of those respondents who stated they were not willing to implement the new curriculum, i.e., they were not interested in teaching TPC 12. This group consisted of five respondents who stated that the new course is not a suitable alternative to the established course. (However, in reply to Question 8: “Would you teach this new course TPC12?”, one of the respondents in this group stated that he would be willing to teach the new course if it had a literature component).

It should be noted that the respondents who constituted the interview sample were almost evenly divided between the two groups, unlike the respondents in the questionnaire sample, where only 16 of 41 respondents stated that they were willing to implement the new curriculum.

PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS
Interview respondents were asked to state their undergraduate and graduate majors, number of years in teaching, and non-teaching work experience if any. Table 32 and Table 33 in Appendix E list respondents by these variables. An examination of these tables reveals that respondents in both groups had varied number of years of teaching experience, ranging from 2 to 29.

There were differences between groups in terms of majors, graduate degrees, and non-teaching work experience. Half the respondents willing to implement had undergraduate degrees in the Humanities and three had degrees in English Literature, whereas all five respondents unwilling to implement had degrees in English Literature. None of the interview respondents unwilling to implement had any non-teaching work experience, whereas three respondents willing to implement had work in on-teaching environments. Thus, it can be inferred that respondents unwilling to implement were more homogenous in their subject loyalty to English Literature and teaching than respondents willing to implement who
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reported a variety of teaching and non-teaching work experience, as well as a variety of university majors. Details for each group are reported below.

Respondents willing to implement
Of the six interview respondents who stated they were willing to implement TPC12, three had majored in English/English Literature at the undergraduate level, and three had majored in other Humanities respondents. One subject had a graduate major in Educational Administration. Three respondents reported “some” to two years of working in non-teaching environments like business and consulting.

Respondents unwilling to implement
All five respondents unwilling to implement had majored in English Literature at the undergraduate level. Three of these respondents had graduate degrees, two in English Literature and one in Educational Administration. None of these respondents reported having any non-teaching work experience.

Question 1:
WHAT COMES FIRST TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT WHAT A STUDENT OF ENGLISH 12 SHOULD BE LEARNING?

The first question of the interview was intended to get respondents thinking about the needs of students, to answer Fullan’s question “Is there a need for the new curriculum?” (i.e., what are students’ needs in such a course) as well as to discover respondents’ perception and understanding of the established course that the new curriculum was positioned as an alternative to.

This question was also formulated because of the situation surrounding the new course, wherein some English teachers had opposed the new course because it was presented as an alternative to an established course (English 12). As elaborated in Chapter 2, English as a high school subject has a history of strong community and elitism: English teachers believe strongly in the learning outcomes of their subject, and feel that English provides students with skills unavailable in other courses (Davies, 1996; Hollindale, 1986; Yagelski, 1994).
Thus, this question’s intent was to establish respondents’ beliefs about the outcomes of English 12, before preceding to ask respondents about their beliefs about the outcomes of the new course.

Below, respondents’ responses are reported. As the first responses were not very elaborate, respondents were probed for further responses. Therefore, this analysis is divided into two sections: respondents’ very first response and their subsequent responses.

FIRST RESPONSE
The very first skills mentioned by respondents willing to implement the new course were ‘strong writing skills’, ‘report writing’, ‘essay writing’, ‘ability to communicate in the real world’, and ‘analytical skills’.

The first responses of respondents unwilling to implement the new course were skills for ‘communicating with a variety of people in different circumstances’, ‘learning things to make students fit for life’, ‘simple literary criticism’, ‘literacy’, and ‘ability to organize thoughts’.

SUBSEQUENT RESPONSES
Respondents across groups seemed to have similar beliefs about the outcomes of English 12, with individuals from both groups emphasizing a variety of skills. However, more respondents willing to implement the new course emphasized communication and analytical skills, whereas more respondents unwilling to implement the new course emphasized skills based on the study of Literature – for example, “use language with finesse”, “ability to read a poem”, “ability to structure one’s thoughts”, “citizenship skills”. (see Appendix E for a detailed list of subsequent responses to Question 1).
Question 2:
WHAT COMES FIRST TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT WHAT A STUDENT IN A TECHNICAL PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION COURSE SHOULD BE LEARNING?

The objective of the second question in the interview was to find out respondents' understanding of what the new curriculum provided students, or what such a curriculum should be providing students. This question addressed Fullan's implementation factors of perception and clarity about the new curriculum.

As in the case of the first question, respondents were asked to respond at length to this question, i.e., to go beyond “what comes first to mind”. Therefore, this analysis is divided into two sections: respondents' very first response and their subsequent responses.

FIRST RESPONSE
Respondents willing to implement emphasized the following skills in their first responses to this question: "basics of writing", (Skills that are) “more directly relevant to the workplace”, “same thing as English 12” (three respondents stated this), and “technical aspects of language”.

Respondents willing to implement emphasized the following skills in their first responses to this question: “career training”, “learning about models of technical and professional communication”, “writing good clear business correspondence” (in practical terms), “process learning’, “areas that require a literal clear thinking style”.

SUBSEQUENT RESPONSES
The subsequent responses of respondents to the second question demonstrated overlaps of abilities and skills across the two groups. Some respondents attempted to specify what type of students would take a technical professional communications course – those students destined for technology courses, students probably not going on to university, kids that will go into technical courses who are not as strong at English/not as motivated.
When asked what skills the new course provided students with, respondents willing to implement stated that TPC12 provided the same skills as English 12 did, and included communication and writing skills, business communication skills, computer skills, grammar and spelling, and reading and writing skills. Respondents unwilling to implement provided a more narrow list referring directly to the work world. They stated that TPC12 provided communication skills, career training, practical writing and process learning – this list had some similarities with the skills listed by respondents willing to implement, but words and phrases used were slightly different: for example, 'career training', 'process learning', 'practical writing'. (See Appendix E for a detailed list of responses).

Question 3:

DO YOU THINK TPC12 IS OR IS NOT A SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE TO ENGLISH 12? WHY?

This question directly addressed the factor of perceived 'need' for the new curriculum, because it asked respondents whether they agreed with the stated purpose of the new course – i.e., to serve as an alternative to an established course. In this question, respondents were provided the opportunity to agree or disagree directly with the value of the new course, and the differences in beliefs between respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement were evident in the responses to this question:

Responses of respondents willing to implement:

All but one of the respondents willing to implement agreed that the new course is a suitable alternative to English 12. The one subject who answered differently maintained that the new course is a Grade 12 course, and that students should take both the new course and the established course (English 12). The main reasons given why the new course is a suitable alternative to the established course were that:

1. TPC12 is an alternative to having to study literature
2. TPC12 provides students the chance to study other types of English
3. TPC12 opens up opportunities for certain kinds of students.
TPC 12 is an alternative to having to study literature: Respondents willing to implement felt that TPC 12 is an alternative to having to study literature because for several students, literature has limited appeal and relevance. TPC 12 “provides technical writing skills because the work students go into might not have anything to do with literature”. Moreover, “students are given poetry, prose Shakespeare and Canadian Literature in Grades 9 through 11” (so now they have the chance to focus on other types of writing).

TPC 12 provides students the chance to study other types of English: Respondents willing to implement felt that TPC 12 provides students the chance to study other types of English “that will become directly relevant to their career choice, whether business, college, or university”, with “the writing skills they need”.

TPC 12 opens up opportunities for certain kinds of students: Respondents willing to implement felt that TPC 12 opens up opportunities for certain kinds of students: “students who are more analytical”, “bright students who are headed for the technical field”, and “students who would not be successful in English 12 which has advanced curriculum and expectations”.

One of the respondents in this group stated that students wanting to go into “high level professions” like medicine and law need to take English 12 because English 12 provides the critical thinking skills, whereas the critical thinking skills in TPC 12 “are not as deep as they are in English 12”, and that students “can transfer skills from English 12 into doing technical writing and communicating well”.

Two of the respondents in this group stated that students need to take both the new course and the established course. One of these agreed that the new course is an alternative to English 12, while the other did not agree because he believed that students needed both English 12 and TPC12. (See Appendix E for a detailed list of responses).
Responses of respondents unwilling to implement:
The five respondents in this group stated that the new course is not a suitable alternative to the established course. The main reasons given why the new course is not a suitable alternative to the established course were that:

1. TPC12 should be an elective
2. English 12 provides skills that TPC12 does not
3. TPC12 leans towards business training.

TPC12 should be an elective: Respondents unwilling to implement felt that TPC12 should be an elective because “it has a specific purpose” and “is the other side of the pendulum from Literature 12 which is also an elective but not an alternative to English 12”.

English 12 provides skills that TPC12 does not: Respondents unwilling to implement felt that English 12 provides skills that TPC12 does not, like “stretching their minds in more imaginative and subtle ways”, “literature or narrative”, “literary canon and cultural background”, and “the skill than thinking interpretively and in terms of metaphorical language”.

TPC12 leans towards business training: Respondents unwilling to implement felt that TPC12 leans towards business training because “it is career training, streaming”.

One subject in this group said that students need both TPC12 and English 12, and that TPC12 “is a very practical course for people who are clear about the kind of work they want to do, and it is very essential in a lot of fields”. Another subject in this group said that “TPC12 was not an alternative (to English 12) the way it is taught right now, but it has the potential to be, provided it broadened its goals”. (See Appendix E for a detailed list of reasons).

Thus, respondents willing to implement stated TPC12 was a suitable alternative because it offered students the opportunity to learn practical language skills different from literature-based skills, whereas respondents unwilling to implement stated that TPC12 was not a suitable alternative because the study of literature provided abstract critical thinking skills,
cultural knowledge, and opportunities to enjoy literature and the arts. Some respondents in both groups (4 in total) stated that students should take both English 12 and TPC12 because each course provided different but essential skills.

Question 4:
WHAT DOES ENGLISH 12 OFFER STUDENTS THAT TPC12 DOES NOT?
Given the broad-based agenda English 12 has been invested with since the Dartmouth Conference, and given the publicized criticism of the new course TPC12 by some BC English teachers, the question “What does English 12 offer students that TPC12 does not?” was asked to find out whether the respondents felt a need for the new curriculum or not, as well as whether they believed that English 12 (i.e., the established course) served the needs of students or not.

All respondents responded to this question; however, differences were evident in the responses of respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement TPC12. (See Appendix E for a detailed list of responses).

Respondents in both groups stated that English 12 provided students with literature-based skills. Respondents willing to implement the new course stated that English 12 provided skills in literature, the moral aspects, issues in humanistic relationships, and analysis within a literary context. Respondents unwilling to implement pointed to literacy skills, intellectual skills, cultural information, and general social and citizenship skills. Thus, respondents unwilling to implement indicated that English 12 provided a wide range of skills, while respondents willing to implement indicated that English 12 provided a narrow range of literature-based skills.
Question 5:
WHAT KINDS OF SUPPORT AND RESOURCES WOULD A TEACHER OF TPC12 NEED?

One of Fullan’s three factors at the initiation stage for new curriculum is “resources”. If resources and support for teaching new curriculum are available to teachers, they are more likely to initiate and implement change.

In response to this question, respondents who had taught TPC12 and were willing to implement the new course talked about the resources they used, while respondents who had not taught TPC12 and were unwilling to implement offered some suggestions about the resources they believed would be needed to teach TPC12.

For the purpose of reporting the data from the interviews, the following categories were identified:

Textbooks Other materials Teacher Initiative
Collegial support Technology Other school departments
Web-site Other support

Textbooks:
Respondents who had taught the course listed the texts they used. Ron Blicq’s “Technically Write” was mentioned by two respondents. Other texts mentioned by respondents included “The Writer’s Handbook/Companion”, “Technical Writing” by Diana Reeves, “Technical Writing” by Markel and Holmes, “Writing for the Workplace”, “Success in Speaking”, and “The Canadian Writer’s Handbook”.

Respondents who had not taught the course suggested using a range of texts and not specifying one particular text for all schools. Some of these respondents suggested using texts from Business Education, along with grammar texts. They also suggested a book on readings “equivalent to what Literature has – like ‘Adventures in English Literature’”. 
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Other materials:
Respondents suggested a range of other materials for use in TPC12. One of the respondents who had taught the course used articles from current magazines for critical reading, and also made students do independent research. Respondents unwilling to implement suggested materials like videos, resources for technical reading materials, newspapers, magazines, journals, materials on meetings, information on multi-media literacy and different media systems, model essays, vocabulary, critical terms, speakers' lists, and lists of sites for field trips.

Teacher initiative:
The need for a teacher to take the initiative to develop materials and locate resources for a new course was mentioned by some of the respondents willing to implement. This was considered “quite a big task the first time through it” because “teachers need time to get materials”. According to these respondents, “a teacher needs to have a great deal of creativity to come up with scenarios and situations that Grade 12 students can handle” as well as a willingness to do the extra legwork.

Teacher/collegial support:
There was a variety of statements about the need for collegial support. While one subject felt “you don’t need a lot of collegial support as long as people are not antagonistic …”, another felt “the biggest asset would be somebody who’s done TPC and believes in TPC”. Others also felt the need for collegial support and the opportunity to work in a group to develop materials.

Technology:
Two respondents willing to implement and one subject unwilling to implement mentioned the need for technological resources like computers and Internet access. One of the respondents stated “(I) use technology to enhance presentations, with computers or photography or something else … a school should have a technical equipment base”.
Web-site:
The Applied Academics web-site launched by the Centre for Applied Academics, which periodically offers new materials and suggestions, was mentioned as a resource by four respondents.

Other departments:
Some of the respondents said they received support from other school departments like the Business Ed Department, the Science Department, and the Computers Department. In some of the schools where TPC12 was offered, students had the opportunity of doing joint projects with their other courses. One respondent mentioned that she was in discussion with the Art Department at her school for a joint project on graphics for the workplace.

Other support:
Other support and resources mentioned included “meeting students who have taken TPC”, “the start-up kit that is put out by the CFAA”, “the curriculum”, and “community resources, people who are using language in their professions”. (See Appendix E for a detailed list of reasons).

As seen above, textbooks were the resources most frequently mentioned by respondents in both groups. Respondents unwilling to implement mentioned other materials more than respondents willing to implement. Respondents who had taught the course mentioned the value of collegial support as well as the need for individual teacher initiative in finding materials and resources.

Question 5A:
WHAT KINDS OF MATERIALS AND SUPPORT DO YOU USE/NEED TO TEACH ENGLISH 12?
Question 5A developed during the course of the interviews, when respondents said that they knew nothing or very little about the new course, but offered to talk about the materials and support they use in teaching English 12.
Textbooks:
Respondents mentioned a variety of texts, “both literature-based prose and poetry and grammar ... most of these are recommended by the Ministry”. Some of these were ‘Othello’, poetry sections from ‘Themes on a Journey’, Kurt Vonnegut’s ‘Slaughterhouse 5’, Joy Kogawa’s ‘Obisan’, ‘All Quiet on the Western Front’ ‘Brave New World’ and some South American poets like Pablo Neruda and Garcia Lorca. They also mentioned texts like ‘Story and Structure’, ‘The Art of Writing’ ‘The McGraw Hill Handbook’, and said that they “always do Shakespeare, e.g. ‘Hamlet’, and .... some non-fiction essays.” One of the respondents said that English 12 needs to consider “making the texts more modern and more accessible for students”.

Technology:
Respondents used a wide range of technology to support their teaching: a/v equipment, films, video, as well as computers and internet access for research purposes”. Shakespeare films and stories that were made into movies were some choices for student viewing, “and there is an essay attached to the viewing of the movie”. One of the respondents mentioned the need for the Ministry to provide a web-site for English 12 and on-line support, because otherwise teachers had to sift through “thousands of web-sites” to find specific resources.

Community Support:
Some of the respondents mentioned having regularly used support from the community, like “all kinds of business and professional people to speak to our students ... about their jobs, how they got them and how they keep them, what possibilities are opened up for them because of their jobs” as well as “other supports like community theatre ... a speakers’ list is provided by the universities from which we can invite professors to speak to the students”.

Other areas covered:
Other resources mentioned by some of the respondents were units they did with their students and teacher-initiated projects like “a Grade 12 writing program” and “a week of grammar and writing skills”, “a project to deal with literature ... like a compare-contrast of three essays”,
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“speech making and (a) look at some of the classic speeches”, “media analysis”, “a style guide for plagarism and quotations”, and several others.

(See Appendix E for a detailed list of reasons).

From the above data, it is seen that English 12 teachers use a variety of resources. From the textbooks listed by respondents, we can infer the use of a variety of literature-based texts – drama, novel, short story, poetry - which are supplemented with audio-visual aids if available.

**Question 6:** WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE PROVINCIAL EXAMS FOR TPC12? HOW SHOULD THE PROVINCIALS BE STRUCTURED FOR TPC12?

Because the new course is offered as an alternative to one of the main examinable and graduating courses in high school, one of the tasks facing teachers is preparing students to write the provincial examinations. A new curriculum includes guidelines on the structuring of the examinations. The administration of the examinations and the success of students at the examinations also impact on the successful implementation of a new course.

In answering this question, four respondents who had taught TPC12 were able to comment on the provincial examinations held so far. Of the other respondents, two respondents declined to comment on this question, two respondents offered opinions about what they felt should be in the examinations for TPC12, and two other respondents explained how they prepare their students for the English 12 provincial examinations.

**TPC12 provincial examinations held in the past:**

The four respondents who commented on the TPC12 examinations stated overall that the exams were ‘fairly decent’, though the first one was ‘way too easy’, and the second one was ‘better than the first’. The first exam ‘a student could pass with a certain degree of common sense and a good grounding in spelling and grammar’. According to these respondents, the exams ‘reflect what is being covered’ and provide ‘a real variety in the sense of expectations of students’.
One of the respondents who had not taught the new course but had seen the provincial examination stated that "it is a good summative evaluation of what the students are capable of doing".

**Suggestions for TPC12 provincial examinations:**
According to one subject, the provincial examinations 'depend upon what is the big question for the differentiation of ability levels ... in TPC it all comes down to the big report or memo". Another subject stated that the provincial examination for TPC12 "would be very much the way it is with English 12, i.e., it is skill-based, doesn’t have to be content-based".

**English 12 provincial examinations:**
Two of the respondents preferred to talk about the provincial examinations for English 12. One subject stated that "we don’t exactly teach to the exam – our teaching is content based and then the exam is mainly on language assessment". Both respondents stated that they "give students practice with past exams".

**Question 7:**
WHAT KIND OF BACKGROUND (EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE) WOULD AN ENGLISH TEACHER NEED IN ORDER TO TEACH TPC 12?
In this study, the education and work background of respondents were considered factors in their willingness to implement the new curriculum. Teachers’ expertise and skills influence their decision to teach particular courses. It is their subject training and education that often determines what higher level course an individual chooses to teach in the secondary school system.

The choice of elective courses at the university is often based on a preference for that subject, and a belief in the value of that subject. Along with university education in an elective comes the conviction that the chosen elective has certain qualities that benefit students. Electives/majors often determine choice of work and profession.
This question elicited responses about two aspects of teachers' backgrounds – their education, and their work experience. For the purpose of analysis, responses of respondents have been categorized according to group (willing/unwilling to implement).

EDUCATION:
Both respondents willing to implement as well as respondents unwilling to implement, stated that a teacher of TPC12 needed an education in language skills like spelling, grammar, and writing skills, and in technical professional communications. Respondents in both groups stated that a degree in English Literature would not be of much help in teaching TPC12. At least one subject in each group suggested that the university education of future TPC12 teachers should include language studies and/or courses in technical professional communications.

Respondents willing to implement:
Respondents willing to implement stated that a TPC12 teacher “should have a solid grounding in spelling and grammar”, “good writing skills”, “training in technical writing”, and “some real life experience where they have done the kinds of activities we talk about in TPC”. Teachers should also “have an open mind” and “feel for the kids who have the ability but don’t get turned on because they don’t see the relevance”. Some of these respondents also emphasized the need for word-processing and computer skills. One subject articulated the fear of technology and stated that teachers should “not run away from it (technology)”. In terms of formal post-secondary education, some of the respondents willing to implement said that a teacher did not need “more English at university”, while others stated they had taken several courses in English Literature. Respondents underscored the need for future TPC12 teachers to take college-level courses in technical professional communications (though not necessarily as their major). One subject stated, “I should have taken more language-based courses like grammar and structure” and went on to suggest that for teachers, “… there should probably be more requirements to do more English language courses … may be through teacher education there should be an emphasis on language skills”. Other respondents pointed to the need for “a broad range of courses under your belt”. 
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Respondents unwilling to implement:
Some respondents unwilling to implement were skeptical about whether any English teacher would be willing to teach TPC12 (“from what I hear I don’t think you will find any English teacher willing to teach this course”). They suggested that the “newest teacher” or the “younger teachers” would have to teach TPC12.

In terms of educational background for a teacher of TPC12, these respondents said that “some background in language or composition for the grammar and structure and mechanics would be a wise idea ... you need a mix but more the composition and the mechanics than the literary background ...” An ideal combination of education would be “both English and Business Ed”. Some of the respondents didn’t see the relevance of a degree in English Literature for the purpose of teaching TPC12. One subject implied the need for more emphasis on taking courses with different kinds of writing, and said that “it is up to the Ministry and the universities to indicate that there are better methods of preparation for a teacher teaching a senior course like TPC12”, because for teaching Grades 11 and 12, “you need specialists”.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
In terms of teaching experience, respondents willing to implement said that a teacher should have “enthusiasm for the course”. One subject unwilling to implement stated that “while English teachers are well prepared to teach literature, they are not especially well prepared in teaching language and they often do not have the work experience”; on the other hand, Business Ed teachers would be ideal, “but they tend not to have the writing orientation”.

NON-TEACHING WORK EXPERIENCE:
Both respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement stated that TPC12 teachers should have “some experience in industry and a business-type environment or a technically-oriented environment”, “some areas where people could have acquired business proficiency, for example working in real estate, medical research”.

(See Appendix E for a detailed list of reasons).
Question 8:

WOULD YOU TEACH THIS NEW COURSE TPC 12? IF YES, WHAT WOULD
MOTIVATE YOU TO TEACH IT? IF NO, WHY NOT?

Teachers have various reasons why they decide to implement or not to implement new curriculum. Asking respondents about what ‘motivated’ them to implement or not implement elicited a variety of reasons. Of the eleven respondents interviewed, seven said that they would/probably would teach the new course if given the opportunity. Four respondents said they would not teach the new course; of these four, two respondents gave reasons, while two respondents did not elaborate on “why not”.

**Respondents willing to implement:**

Respondents who said that they would teach the new course cited the enthusiasm of students, the potential for student improvement, and the practical nature of TPC12 as some of the main reasons why they felt motivated.

*Student enthusiasm* was identified as students being there by choice, and getting excited about the course. Moreover, some respondents liked the manner in which students at risk were motivated to participate in the course.

Respondents who had taught TPC12 referred to the value in being able to notice *student improvement in writing and communication skills*. One subject pointed out that “the time component in English 12 leaves very little or no time for the writing and grammar skills, so that’s why I got interested in it”.

Respondents willing to implement pointed to the *practical nature of the course* and its hands-on approach. Some of them explained that English does not teach real-life communication skills: “Macbeth’ isn’t really going to help you write a report, discussing Moliere isn’t really going to help you on how to handle yourself at a business meeting”, and “I know I didn’t get business writing skills either in high school or in university despite being an A student”.
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Two respondents referred to teaching and course content considerations. One said that the class size was ideal for teaching writing. The other said s/he would teach the course "provided we have an opportunity to have a literature component, a series of interesting readings and activities to complement the writing aspect".

**Respondents unwilling to implement:**
The two respondents who gave reasons why they would not teach the new course, both stated that the course could be a part of English 12, "but not a separate whole course".

Each of these two respondents gave different reasons why s/he would not teach the new course. One said she liked to teach Literature and the love of reading, and the other said "there is no intellectual content (in TPC12). (See Appendix E for a detailed list of reasons).

**OTHER STATEMENTS:**
During the course of the interviews, respondents made other comments about the new course. These have been categorized as follows:

1. Positive statements about TPC12
2. Negative statements about TPC12
3. University acceptance of TPC12
4. Statements about English 12

**Positive statements about TPC12:**
The three respondents who made other positive statements about TPC12 pointed out the practicality of the course, the inevitability of it being introduced in schools, and the need for equipping teachers to teach it. These respondents were from the group willing to implement the new course.

**Negative statements about TPC12:**
Other negative statements about TPC12 were made by two respondents willing to implement and three respondents unwilling to implement the new course.

**Respondents willing to implement:**
Two respondents willing to implement stated their assumption about others’ views about the TPC12. One subject said that English teachers may see grammar as really boring and don’t
know how to make it interesting. The other subject stated that TPC12 may be seen “as a Communications 11 option … counselors will put kids that have poor communication skills” (into this course). However, this subject was willing to implement because “… I get excited about seeing kids incorrectly tagged as Communications 11 who see relevance in TPC and do phenomenal things”.

Respondents unwilling to implement:
Two of the three respondents who made other negative statements about TPC12 stated that they did not want TPC to be a replacement for English 12 because “they are two very different courses and two very distinct outcomes”. The other subject voiced concerns about the Ministry’s decision to change curriculum and also concerns for ESL students. This subject stated that the Ministry should realize something is lacking in the course because it is not being accepted by English teachers: “… the Ministry should rethink how they give credit for senior English, maybe provide for three distinct courses”. These two respondents also stated that TPC12 does not contain sections which English 12 provides. One of these two also pointed to the possible political reasons for the new course: “it is quite a political reason why they floated it; I think the emphasis on applied academics is why they floated it”.

One of the respondents voiced concerns about the way in which the Ministry had attempted to implement curriculum change. She said that “the government has done this to teachers so many times, the whole way in which the Year 2000 was presented for example … they don’t do this with any kind of professional respect or apology … they say you’re not being consulted; we will just tell you … there has been an unfortunate history of this type of approach … the Ministry backed off with the Year 2000 only when the universities said they would not accept it as a replacement for English 12 … if the teachers hate it they will try everything they can to find a reason why they don’t want to teach it”.

University acceptance of TPC12:
Three of the respondents made specific statements about university acceptance of TPC12 as a pre-requisite for admission. Two of these were willing to implement and one was unwilling to implement.
Respondents willing to implement:
The two respondents willing to implement who commented about university acceptance of TPC12, made positive statements. One of these respondents admitted that it is “a bit of a deterrent” that universities have not accepted TPC12, “because it is hard to sell the course to hardworking students and then tell them the universities don’t recognize it”. This subject had heard that science and engineering faculties were informally asking students to take the course. He also said “it is perhaps useful that the colleges will accept it, so it will continue to attract those students” (headed for colleges).

The other subject willing to implement stated “I think it is just a matter of time” before universities accept TPC12: “they are just waiting and seeing ... I just can’t believe they are going to ignore this completely ... when students start going to BCIT I hope the universities will start seeing the calibre of students, and I hope they will come on board”.

Respondents unwilling to implement:
The one subject unwilling to implement who commented on university acceptance of TPC12 said “the more capable science students in particular are not going to look at it as long as the universities are not prepared to look at it, so the Ministry needs to pay some attention to this”. (It is interesting to note that this is the one subject in the unwilling to implement group who said that she would implement if the Ministry would include Literature in the course).

Statements about English 12:
One subject willing to implement TPC12 made a positive statement about English 12: “TPC is a little bit different from English 12 in terms of the creative and critical thought that is required to pull apart Shakespeare and some of the more detailed essays”. One subject unwilling to implement made a negative statement about English 12: “in English 12 there really isn’t any emphasis given [to things that TPC12 emphasizes] there just isn’t time enough”.
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Chapter V
SUMMARY, INTERPRETATION, AND CONCLUSION

Chapter V summarizes the purpose, methodology, and results of the present study, interprets the findings, outlines implications for educational planners, and makes suggestions for further research.

SUMMARY
The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their willingness to implement new curriculum.

The present study was prompted by the situation arising around the introduction of a new course, Technical Professional Communications 12, in the English Language Arts K-12 curriculum in British Columbia in 1995/6. Several BC English teachers voiced concern about the intent to implement TPC12 as an alternative to English 12 and questioned the pedagogical objectives of TPC12. Preliminary observation of this situation prompted the hypothesis that deep-seated beliefs about the English curriculum were related to implementation concerns.

Fullan’s 1991 theory on curriculum implementation is the framework on which the present study has been structured, particularly Fullan’s emphasis on beliefs as an integral factor in implementation and his definition of the four characteristics of change – need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality. Related literature and previous research were reviewed to provide support to the hypotheses and to make comparisons with the present study.

The method used to collect data was the survey method in which a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of English teachers in British Columbia. To further probe the question, telephone interviews were conducted with a sub-sample of consenting respondents. The quantitative data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using the independent samples t-test in the SPSS 8.0 for Windows software package. The qualitative
data collected through open-ended questions in the questionnaire and the interview schedule were analyzed by categorizing the responses according to questions asked. Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that respondents’ beliefs are significantly related to their willingness to implement new curriculum. Significant differences in beliefs about aspects of pedagogy and teacher preparation were found between the two groups of respondents, i.e., teachers willing to implement the new curriculum, and teachers unwilling to implement the new curriculum. Significant differences between groups in beliefs about the need and clarity of the change were also found.

Thus in answer to the question, “Are teachers’ beliefs related to curriculum implementation?” the hypothesis was upheld that

Teachers who are less willing to implement the TPC12 curriculum believe that teaching English should be principally based on reading and writing aesthetic literature whereas teachers who are willing to implement the TPC12 curriculum believe that teaching English should be based on reading and writing efferent literature.

Because this study examined the implementation of curriculum change in a specific school subject (English Language Arts K-12), and because the main hypothesis defined “beliefs” as the debate between the use of aesthetic literature and efferent literature, (which has been a central debate in English as a school subject), respondents were asked to agree or disagree with statements and lists of items that contained examples of the two sides of the issue, i.e., emphasis on literary texts and emphasis on non-literary texts. From the statistical results as well as from the interview responses, it can be concluded that respondents’ beliefs about curriculum implementation are rooted in the culture of the school subject.

The results of the present study did not uphold the secondary hypothesis that

Teachers’ willingness to implement new curriculum is significantly related to their education and experience.
There were no significant differences between groups in terms of education and work experience. Several factors are likely to have contributed to this phenomenon, and are discussed below.

**INTERPRETATION**

In Chapter IV, the data has been presented in sequence of the questions in the questionnaire and the interview schedule. In this section, the findings of the present study are discussed and interpreted based on the two hypotheses introduced in Chapter 1 as the central questions:

1. Are teachers' beliefs related to curriculum implementation?
2. Are teachers' backgrounds related to curriculum implementation?

**ARE TEACHERS' BELIEFS RELATED TO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION?**

Throughout his 1991 work, Fullan reiterates the vital role of psychological change in implementing new curriculum. In the introductory chapter, he states, "put in terms of the theme of this book, real change involves changes in conceptions and role behaviour, which is why it is so difficult to achieve" (p. 38). His three dimensions of change include the alteration of beliefs along with the use of new materials and the use of new teaching approaches. The three dimensions function in a dynamic interrelationship. "Beliefs guide and are informed by teaching strategies and activities; the effective use of materials depends on their articulation with beliefs and teaching approaches" (p. 41).

Teachers' beliefs about teaching English were assessed in Sections C and D of the questionnaire as well as in the open-ended responses and the interviews. For the purpose of discussing this hypothesis, three sections were identified: beliefs about pedagogy, beliefs about teacher preparation, and beliefs about the characteristics of change.

The interpretation of the findings of the present study is based on the sections outlined in the statement of the Question in Chapter I:
Beliefs about pedagogy:

1. Objectives of the course, identified as:
   - Most important contribution to students’ cognitive development – aesthetic literature vs. efferent literature
   - Statements about objectives – emphasis on aesthetic literature vs. emphasis on efferent literature
   - Most important reason students learn to write – communication vs. self-reflection

2. Texts for the course – aesthetic, literary texts vs. efferent, non-literary texts

3. Utilization of classroom hours – hours for aesthetic literature vs. hours for efferent literature.

Beliefs about teacher preparation:

1. Courses teachers should have taken – literature courses vs. language/linguistics courses

2. Reading teachers should do – literary journals vs. non-literary journals.

Beliefs about the characteristics of the change:

1. Need - adequacy of the new curriculum and provision of skills for graduation

2. Clarity – awareness of the intent and knowledge of the Integrated Resource Package (IRP) for TPC12, and instances of false clarity

3. Complexity – complexity in course content, and culture of the subject

4. Quality/practicality – student feedback, availability of resources, need for assistance and support, and need for collegial support.

BELIEFS ABOUT PEDAGOGY

The act of teaching involves, among other things, carrying out objectives, using texts, and deciding how to allocate classroom time to the various units of a course. The present study found that the relationships between beliefs about objectives, use of texts, and allocation of classroom hours and teachers’ willingness to implement new curriculum was statistically
significant in ten out of twenty-six comparisons, and five comparisons approached significance.

Beliefs about pedagogy: 1) Objectives of the course
The most important beliefs in any program are the underlying goals and objectives – the theories and pedagogical assumptions upon which the program is based, and which give direction to the program. As noted earlier, Fullan described ‘beliefs’ as “pedagogical assumptions and theories underlying particular new policies or programs” (1991, p. 37). Pedagogical values were one of the three dimensions of Markee’s innovation triangle (Markee, 1994). Further, as Werner (1980) stated, “ideally, implementation at a minimum includes shared understanding among participants concerning the implied presuppositions, values and assumptions which underlie a program…” (pp. 62-63). Therefore, differences between groups about objectives would imply the existence of deep-seated differences that are often difficult to reconcile. The following findings confirm the relationship between pedagogical values and curriculum implementation:

1. Objectives of English 12: Differences between the groups about the objectives of English 12 were statistically significant. Respondents willing to implement the new course, which differed in its objectives from the established course it was proposed as an alternative to, were not in agreement with three statements of objectives that supported the established course (questions C2a, C2b, C2d), and were in agreement with the one statement of objective that supported the new course (question C2e). However, respondents willing to implement were in agreement with the fourth statement (question C2c) that supported the established course; but, the strength of the mean score for respondents unwilling to implement resulted in a statistically significant difference between the groups. On the other hand, respondents unwilling to implement the new course were in agreement with the four statements that supported the established course, and were not in agreement with the one statement that supported the new course.
2. **Main contribution and main purpose of English 12**: While there were no statistically significant differences between groups about the main contribution (question C1) and main purpose (question C7) of the established course, results approached significance. While all respondents willing to implement believed that the main reason that students learn to write is to communicate their ideas, most of the respondents unwilling to implement also believed that the main reason students learn to write is to communicate their ideas, and just a few of the respondents unwilling to implement believed that students learn to write to be able to reflect on their responses to reading. Similarly, the significance level between groups in agreement with the statement that the most important contribution of English 12 to students' cognitive development was "what Mathew Arnold described as the best" (question C1a) was .07, indicating some difference between groups.

3. **Skills for high school graduation**: Statistically significant differences in beliefs about the objectives of English 12 were also revealed in responses to the question on whether the new course gave students skills for high school graduation. These differences were supported by statements made by the respondents in the open-ended questions. For example, in accordance with the traditional objectives of English 12 that emphasize the use of literary texts, respondents unwilling to implement stated: "'Good literature must ... do some good to the reader: must quicken his perception ... sharpen his discrimination ... and mellow the rawness of his personal opinions.' TPC won't do that." (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

4. **Objectives of the new course**: Interview statements that were in agreement with the objectives of the new course were made principally by respondents willing to implement. These respondents emphasized that
students need to be able to analyze non-fiction and to present information “in a way that can be readily understood”. (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

Beliefs about pedagogy: 2) Texts for the course
One of the essential resources for high school teachers is the textbook, from which they derive “curriculum in use” (Fullan, 1991, p. 275). Teachers usually select textbooks from lists provided by the curriculum developers; thus, they are able to exercise a certain amount of choice in the content of the course. Change in curriculum usually includes changes in the prescribed and recommended texts because the texts reflect the objectives of the course. For example, because the new TPC12 curriculum emphasized the use of all kinds of texts including non-literary texts, the IRP and supporting materials like the in-service document “Enhancing Student Literacy in Secondary Schools (1996)” contained lists of suggested texts, literary and non-literary. The results of the present study revealed statistical differences between groups for the appropriateness of non-literary texts but not for literary texts.

Statistical analysis revealed significant differences between groups over the appropriateness of non-literary texts like Carl Sagan’s “Cosmos”, Stephen Hawking’s “A Brief History of Time”, and John-Ralston Saul’s “The Unconscious Civilization”, with respondents willing to implement the new curriculum rating these texts moderately to very important, and respondents unwilling to implement rating these texts as not important to moderately important.

However, for the literary texts listed in Question C4 like Shakespeare’s “Henry IV Part I”, Emily Bronte’s “Wuthering Heights”, John Steinbeck’s “Of Mice and Men”, and Albert Camus’ “The Outsider”, there were no significant differences between groups, indicating that both respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement rated these texts similarly. A possible explanation for these results could be that all respondents, including respondents willing to implement, had taught English during their teaching experience and believed in the inclusion of both literary and non-literary texts.
Moreover, there were no significant differences between groups for some of the other non-literary texts listed, for example, Gookin's “DOS for Dummies” and Olivotto et al's “The Intelligent Patient’s Guide to Breast Cancer”.

Differences in beliefs about appropriate texts for English 12 were also seen in statements made by the interview respondents. The following example of a statement made by a respondent unwilling to implement emphasizes beliefs in traditional English 12 norms:

I always cover poetry and poetic devices and we apply them not just to poetry but to a study of rhetoric and to do some speechmaking and look at some classic speeches ... we use famous speeches – Martin Luther King, Henry the Fifth ... we always do Shakespeare ... we read novels, we usually do All Quiet on the Western Front ... Brave New World ... Joy Luck Club ... Catcher in the Rye ...

Respondents unwilling to implement stated that they used a variety of texts including grammar texts. One of the respondents mentioned the need to rethink status of the McGraw Hill Handbook because “something more modern than that, that is to say more accessible for students, is required ...” Interview respondents who had taught the new course listed process learning texts as the main kinds of texts they used in the classroom. (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

Beliefs about pedagogy: 3) Utilization of classroom hours
The reality of curriculum change has to take place in the classroom. Fullan (1991, pp. 32-33) refers to descriptions of the “subjective reality of teachers” by Huberman (1983) and others, and especially to Huberman's “classroom press” that exerts daily influences on teachers. Given such a situation, “teaching decisions are often made on pragmatic trial-and-error grounds ... they must get through the daily grind ... they constantly feel the shortage of time” (Fullan, 1991, p. 33). Therefore, teachers often base their decisions on how to utilize classroom hours for various units of a school subject on their “experiential knowledge necessary for day-to-day coping, to the exclusion of sources of knowledge beyond their own classroom experience” (Fullan, 1991, p. 34).
The decision about how many hours to devote to a particular unit of a subject is based on past experience as well as on the accepted norms within the school subject’s community of teachers. It is likely linked to beliefs about what objectives are more important and what objectives are less important (Sarason, 1996; Markee, 1994). In the present study, it was predicted that teachers who believe that teaching English should be principally based on aesthetic literature are likely to allocate more hours to poetry and Shakespeare and fewer hours to technical materials.

The present study found significant differences between groups in the allocation of more than five classroom hours for technical materials (significance level = .001) and for non-fiction prose (significance level = .04). The main differences were based on a rejection of the importance of technical materials and non-fiction prose by respondents unwilling to implement and an affirmation of the importance of technical materials and non-fiction prose by respondents willing to implement. For units of poetry, essay writing, and fiction, the results of the t-test approached significance. However, it is interesting that for fiction and essay writing, mean scores of respondents willing to implement were higher than mean scores for respondents unwilling to implement. It should also be noted that the mean scores for both groups were close in their allocation of more than five classroom hours for Shakespeare. From these results, it can be concluded that respondents unwilling to implement do not believe in allocating more than five hours for the teaching of technical materials, while respondents willing to implement believe in allocating more than five hours for technical materials. However, respondents willing to implement also believe in allocating more than five hours to literary units like poetry, fiction, and essay writing.

Data collected in interviews supported data from the questionnaire. One of the interview respondents unwilling to implement suggested that TPC12 could be taught in half a term. Another interview respondent unwilling to implement referred to the lack of time in the English 12 teaching period for emphasizing technical materials. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).
BELIEFS ABOUT TEACHER PREPARATION

The present study collected data on respondents' beliefs about two aspects of preparation to teach high school: 1) subject courses aspiring teachers need to take during general education at the post-secondary level, and 2) regular reading of professional journals for on-going self-development. Based on previous research, it was presumed that choice of post-secondary courses reflected beliefs in the value of those courses (Holt-Reynolds, 1999; Fox, 1995), and that choice of reading for self-development reflected beliefs in the philosophies promoted in the selected journals and books (Burhans, Jr., 1985).

Beliefs about teacher preparation: 1) Courses teachers should have taken

Fullan (1991, p. 292) noted that “general education” was one of the three components in pre-service education identified by Zeichner and Gore in 1990. Though “there is a trend towards academic subject-matter preparation” for beginning teachers, “there is lack of empirical data about the impact of these academic courses on students relative to teaching” (Fullan, 1991, p. 292).

In the present study, respondents were asked to report which of the courses on a given list they would recommend to an individual planning to teach English 12. Results revealed no significant differences between groups. Respondents from both groups reported they would recommend courses in essay writing, Canadian Literature, Shakespeare, and grammar. It should be noted that both respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement chose courses that emphasize language skills – essay writing and English grammar, as well as courses that emphasize aesthetic literature – Canadian Literature and Shakespeare. From these results, it can be inferred that respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 and respondents willing to implement TPC12 believe that both aesthetic literature and efferent literature are essential components of English as a high school subject.

Beliefs about teacher preparation: 2) Readings teachers should do

Once a student teacher becomes a full-fledged teacher, the preparation should ideally continue. Fullan stated the need for teachers to be life-long learners (1991, p. 326). He referred to Rosenholtz’s 1989 study which provided an example of a ‘typical’ teacher
comment: “You never stop learning … I’m always on the search for new ideas (p. 80)”. However, Fullan found that most of the research in this area has been on in-service development opportunities for teachers. Individual initiative and seeking of information from sources like journals have not been studied much (Hargreaves, 1994).

The present study revealed that differences between groups in their beliefs about what English teachers should read were generally not statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference between groups in ranking technical texts, from which it can be inferred that respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 are not likely to recommend reading technical texts. That respondents unwilling to implement believe in the importance of literary texts is further inferred by their choice of poetry and literary criticism in first and second place respectively. However, while respondents willing to implement ranked reading current issues over reading literary criticism, they ranked reading poetry as the first priority for English teachers, and reading technical texts in fourth place. From this apparent contradiction it can be inferred that respondents willing to implement believe in reading both literary texts like poetry and literary criticism and non-literary texts like current issues and technical texts. In other words, respondents willing to implement have broader reading interests than respondents unwilling to implement.

BELIEFS ABOUT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CHANGE
In the present study, Fullan's four characteristics of change – need, clarity, complexity, and practicality/quality – have been used as a framework to discuss interview respondents' reasons for their willingness or unwillingness to implement the new curriculum.

From statements made by interview respondents, it can be inferred that teachers' beliefs about the need for change and teachers' beliefs about the practicality and quality of the new curriculum are related to their willingness to implement the new curriculum. In assessing the need for the new curriculum, some respondents suggested there was a lack of clarity and complexity in the new curriculum, while other respondents suggested the new curriculum contained clarity and complexity.
Differences between interview respondents’ beliefs about the need for the new curriculum were reflected in their responses to the question on whether or not the new course is a suitable alternative to the established course. The six respondents willing to implement agreed that the new course is a suitable alternative, while the five respondents unwilling to implement said that the new course was not a suitable alternative. It should be noted that three interview respondents willing to implement stated that both the traditional course and the new course were needed in the curriculum, as they each served separate needs of students.

Respondents who saw the new course as a suitable alternative made positive statements about the need for emphasis on non-literary, pragmatic texts. One of them stated the need for an alternative to studying literature, while two respondents referred to the need for students to study other types of English that were provided in the new course. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

Four of the six interview respondents willing to implement TPC12 had previously taught the new course as well as the established course (English 12) and were able to understand how it fit into Grade 12 learning outcomes. As Fullan (1991, p. 69) stated, “early rewards and some tangible success are critical incentives during implementation … People involved must perceive both that the needs being addressed are significant and that they are making at least some progress toward meeting them”. Respondents who had taught the new course were enthusiastic and stated they were willing to teach it again.

On the other hand, several respondents did not see a need for the new course. Fullan (1991) noted that “many innovations are attempted without a careful examination of whether or not they address what are perceived to be priority needs. Teachers, for example, frequently do not see the need for an advocated change.” (p. 69). Fullan (1991) quotes several studies to substantiate this statement – Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Emrick and Peterson, 1978; Louis and Sieber, 1979. Interview respondents who did not see a need for the new TPC12 course were also those who stated they were unwilling to teach it, and who were likely to emphasize
the importance of literary texts in the English 12 curriculum. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

From the above paragraph it can be inferred as Fullan (1991) notes that, “in many circumstances teachers may ... conclude at the outset there is no need or time for interaction, and that no change is needed or possible. This outcome will occur in situations where teachers are satisfied with their current program ... Not attempting to change may be the most appropriate response in some situations, if there is a disagreement about the innovation” (p. 131).

In their interview statements, three respondents expressed a need for both the new course and the established course. These respondents saw each course serving different needs of students. The two respondents who were willing to implement stated that all students need to have the choice of doing both courses, while the one respondent unwilling to implement suggested that the new course be an elective, with the established course continuing as the required course for high school graduation. Respondents willing to implement saw the new course as providing both the bright students and the average students with needed language and thinking skills including students “crawling through English because they hated poetry and drama so much”. The respondent unwilling to implement saw the new course opening up other opportunities by providing language skills for students who “wouldn’t probably be going on to university, they’d be looking for applied language work”.

CLARITY

As Fullan (1991) stated, “lack of clarity ... represents a major problem at the implementation stage”. In the present study, lack of clarity was manifested in the degree of respondents’ awareness of the intent of the new course and knowledge of the curriculum.

Awareness of the intent of the new course was found to have a statistically significant relationship with willingness to implement. It is interesting to note that respondents unwilling to implement had a higher mean score than respondents willing to implement on their awareness of the intent of the new course. This is a situation where the intent of the
new course was the main reason for unwillingness to implement it, because its intent was to replace an established course that English teachers believed in and did not want to see replaced.

Because the resistance of some teachers to the new course had been publicized in the media, awareness of the intent of the new course was presumably high among teachers. This may be a case of "false clarity", where teachers who believed in the established course and did not know much about the new course made assumptions about its objectives and content. For example, one respondent stated, "a number of the learning outcomes that are in the TPC12, they’re valid but … many of those outcomes are found elsewhere, in the English curriculum, even in the Career and Personal Planning curriculum". As Fullan stated, "new or revised provincial guidelines may be dismissed by some teachers on the ground that ‘we are already doing that’" (1991, p. 70). (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

The false clarity expressed by respondents unwilling to implement may be rooted in a lack of knowledge of the new curriculum (IRP). The present study revealed significant differences between groups about knowledge of the new curriculum. For all sections of the curriculum (except for the in-service resource), there were statistically significant differences between groups. Respondents unwilling to implement were less likely to have read the various sections of the TPC12 IRP than respondents willing to implement. This lack of knowledge about the content of the new curriculum may have contributed to false clarity about its objectives and content. (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

A second aspect of false clarity that Fullan discussed occurs when the change is interpreted in an oversimplified way. "Guidelines may be used in a literal way without the realization that certain teaching strategies and underlying beliefs are essential to implementing the guidelines effectively" (Fullan, 1991, p.70). In the present study, two respondents willing to implement cautioned about such "literal" interpretation, because they feared too much emphasis on technology. For example, one respondent stated that "TPC12 [is] an English course, the computer skills and graphics is only a tool". (See Appendix F for full text of related statements).
Other evidence of false clarity in the present study came from some of the respondents who stated that the new course was a replacement for a low status course, i.e., for Communications 12. (See Appendix F for examples of related statements).

**COMPLEXITY**

Lack of clarity, or false clarity, could result from complexity, which Fullan (1991) described as “the difficulty and extent of change required” (p. 71). If the change is complex and requires changes in beliefs, it may require “a sophisticated array of activities, structures, diagnoses, teaching strategies, and philosophical understanding if effective implementation is to be achieved”. On the other hand, Lortie’s 1975 study of teachers identified complexity as one of the factors that contribute to uncertainty of effectiveness as one of the predominant feelings of teachers (Fullan, 1991, p. 121).

In the present study, interview respondents unwilling to implement saw lack of complexity as one of the disadvantages of the new course when compared with the established course. These respondents stated that “Students would be missing out on reading and writing if they only took TPC12”, and “may miss opportunities to work with the more personal aspects of language and communication”. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

Such concerns about the new course could be explained by the inference that teachers’ beliefs are rooted in the culture of the school subject. The long-standing debate within English departments about the importance of aesthetic literature versus the importance of efferent literature and literacy skills (Davies, 1996; Hollindale, 1986; Yagelski, 1994) was underlined in respondents’ open-ended statements about what they believed to be the primary objectives of English and how these objectives should be accomplished, as well as their concerns about the new curriculum.

Respondents’ criticisms that pointed to the lack of adequate complexity in the content of the new course could also stem from teachers’ loyalty to their subject. Especially if the
established course is perceived as high status and subject departments have provided a strong sense of community among subject teachers, as is the case with English teachers, previous studies showed that such teachers will dismiss externally proposed change that proposes to replace the established course (Holt-Reynolds and McDiarmid, 1994; Goodson, 1993; Hollindale, 1986).

An interesting finding of the study was that respondents willing to implement new course believed in some of the basic values of the established course. This is reflected in the mean scores for this group. For example, when asked to state their level of agreement with beliefs statements on a Likert-type scale (Questions C1 and C2), the mean score (3.81) for respondents willing to implement represented a direction towards agreement (4 = “Agree”) with the traditional statement that the most important contribution of English 12 to students’ cognitive development was what Mathew Arnold described as “the best that has been thought and said”(QC1a). Further, these respondents tended to disagree (more than those unwilling to implement) with the next statement (QC1b) which claimed that “informational texts that professionals read …” were the most important contribution of English 12 to students’ cognitive development. Again, for statement C2c in Question C2, which says that “one of the most important aspects of English 12 is that students be able to understand and appreciate imaginative, aesthetic literature that provides insights into the human condition”, the mean score for respondents willing to implement was 4.06 (4 = “Agree”). From these examples, it can be concluded that respondents willing to implement agreed that teaching the reading and writing of aesthetic literature was an important objective of English 12.

QUALITY/PRACTICALITY

The fourth characteristic of change that Fullan listed as a characteristic of change in implementation was the quality and practicality of the change. Fullan reiterated the connection between quality/practicality and beliefs in his statement that “it is what people develop in their minds and actions that counts. People do not learn or accomplish complex changes by being told or shown what to do. Deeper meaning and solid change must be born over time” (1991, p.73).
Quality
In the present study, respondents referred to the quality and effectiveness of the new and established courses in response to open-ended questions and interview questions.

One of the frequently quoted measures of effectiveness and source of pride for teachers is student feedback, as Lortie’s 1975 study found: “Effectiveness of teaching is gauged by informal, general observations of students” (p. 120). In the present study, respondents who had taught the new course referred to positive feedback from students. For example, a respondent who had taught TPC12 reported that “It’s very rewarding to teach the course because … the students are … motivated to be there”. Another respondent reported that “many of them [students] found their language skills and the use of language being better enhanced with textbook materials that made more sense to them”. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

A possible reason for the perceived inadequate quality of new curriculum could be that the change has been externally initiated for political reasons. In the present study, some respondents referred to such a reason for the new course. As Fullan stated, “inadequate quality and even the simple unavailability of materials and other resources can result when adoption decisions are made on grounds of political necessity, or even on grounds of perceived need without time for development.” (1991, p.72). One respondent unwilling to implement said, “I seem to be thinking that it’s quite the political reason why they’ve floated it [TPC12]”. Another respondent unwilling to implement stated that the new curriculum “is focused entirely on the capitalist economic system … it provides opportunities in a very narrow scope”. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

Practicality
In terms of the ‘practicality’ characteristic, the present study investigated respondents’ views about the need for resources and assistance, and found statistically significant differences between groups on availability of certain kinds of resources and need for assistance and support. The need for collegial support was mentioned by five of the six interview respondents willing to implement TPC12.
Availability of Resources
Respondents willing to implement were more likely to have books on technical professional writing, computers, and internet access available at school, and were more likely to have computers at home. Statistical results revealed significant differences between groups on the first three resources at the .05 confidence level and for home computers at the .01 confidence level. For the other resources listed, though the results were not statistically significant between groups, respondents willing to implement had higher mean scores than respondents unwilling to implement for other resources at school, and for books and materials on technical professional writing and technical professional literature at home.

Interview respondents stated the need for technological support in the classroom, and the opportunities that opened up when the course was offered in a computer managed learning system. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

Interview respondents also said that because resources often have to be created afresh for a new course, teachers sometimes have to find the resources themselves. For example, “teachers need time to get into the materials” and “there’s a lot out there which has not yet been developed … many teachers are … putting their own style into it and figuring out the resources”. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

Need for Assistance and Support
All respondents perceived the need for assistance from various sources, as is evident by the mean scores for both groups for the sources of assistance listed in the questionnaire. Statistically significant differences between groups were found at the .05 confidence level on need for assistance from the school principal and from in-services, while results on the need for assistance from the Ministry and from funding for resources approached significance, at confidence levels of .15 and .16 respectively.

Fullan saw support from the principal as “the most powerful potential source of help or hindrance to the teacher” (1991, p.143). Fullan also stated that “the impact of professional
development depends on a combination of motivation and opportunity to learn” (1991, p. 326). It can be inferred from the significant differences between groups on need for assistance from the principal and in-services, that respondents willing to implement had greater motivation seek out assistance from principals and in-service seminars on the new course than respondents unwilling to implement.

*Need for Collegial Support*

As Lortie found in his 1975 study, the most effective source of help for teachers tends to be fellow teachers. Fullan also confirmed that “the degree of change was strongly related to the extent to which teachers interact with each other … Within the school, collegiality among teachers, as measured by the frequency of communication, mutual support, help, etc., was a strong indicator of implementation success” (1991, p. 131).

In the present study, while interview respondents who had taught the new course stated the need for collegial support, they also reported that they had to seek support from outside their own department, because English teachers were by and large not in favour of its implementation. (See Appendix F for examples of statements).

**ARE TEACHERS’ BACKGROUNDS RELATED TO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION?**

The secondary hypothesis of the present study claimed that teachers’ willingness to implement new curriculum is significantly related to teachers’ education and experience. However, statistical analysis of responses in the present study did not support this hypothesis. Several factors may explain this.

The present study identified its population as English teachers. It follows that the main teaching experience of respondents would be in teaching English, and that English teachers would believe in the objectives of the established course, i.e., English 12. Further, subject teachers at the high school level often have taken several university level courses in the subject they choose to teach and may have majored in that subject at university. Thus, respondents’ experience and education across the two groups were similar.
EXPERIENCE
There were no significant differences between groups in terms of secondary teaching experience, post-secondary teaching experience, non-teaching work experience, and writing experience. For example, 80% (20) of respondents unwilling to implement and 75% (12) of respondents willing to implement had taught English 12. All respondents had taught a variety of “other courses”, including courses in creative writing, journalism, drama, and law.

In two instances, results approached in the direction of significance between groups. These were
1) school administration, which combined department head positions and other administrative positions, where respondents willing to implement were more likely to have had experience in school administration (mean score =5.13) than respondents unwilling to implement (mean score=2.54), and
2) poetic writing, unpublished as well as published, where respondents unwilling to implement were more likely to have experience in poetic writing (mean score = .72), than respondents willing to implement (mean score = .31).

It can tentatively be inferred that experience in school administration and experience in poetic writing are factors in willingness to implement the new course.

EDUCATION
There were no significant differences between groups in terms of their post-secondary education. All but one of the respondents had taken several courses in English Literature at the undergraduate level. However, there was considerable variation for all the courses listed, pointing to a variety in the number of courses taken by respondents. It is also interesting to note that results approached in the direction of significance for English Literature and Linguistics, which can be said to represent the major debate in English curriculum, i.e., the Literature vs. Language debate.

All respondents were inclined to prefer English Literature as a subject of study at university. Previous research found that beliefs about the objectives of a school subject can be implanted in the early years of subject study, and strengthened through repeated preference for the
subject (Davies, 1996; Fox, 1995; Pajares, 1992; Larkin, 1981). From the homogeneity of the sample across groups in terms of their educational background, it can be inferred that all respondents, both those willing to implement the new course and those unwilling to implement the new course, believe in the traditional pedagogical assumptions of high school English.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNERS**

“Policy-makers must temper their desires for immediate and total change with an understanding of the complexity of the change process” (Wilson and Corcoran, 1988, p. 159, as quoted by Fullan, 1991).

When change is externally imposed, as was the case for the subject investigated in the present study, it is likely that there will be considerable questions from the internal stakeholders, especially from the teachers who will face the daily reality of implementation in the classroom. As respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum in the present study did, teachers will question the need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality of the new curriculum and pedagogical objectives that do not match their own. For example, an interview respondent stated, “I don’t think everyone needs the technical but I do think everyone needs the more abstract”. Planners therefore need to assess the beliefs and perceptions of teachers, or else, false clarity may prompt teachers to assume “we are already doing that” as four interview respondents stated, or that “it is career training” which three interview respondents felt was not the mandate of English 12.

Moreover, Fullan found that including some teachers in the change process does not ensure that all teachers will accept the change. “One of the great mistakes over the past 30 years has been the naïve assumption that involving some teachers on curriculum committees or in program development would facilitate implementation, because it would increase acceptance by other teachers … once again there was a failure to distinguish between the change and the change process” (1991, p. 127). As Fullan emphasized, “people must be able to attach personal meaning to the experiences regardless of how meaningful they might be to others” (1991, p.31). Interview respondents in the present study who were unwilling to implement
the new curriculum stated “when we (teachers in the English Department at the respondent’s school) came up with this TPC course we took a look at it and nobody wanted to do it”, and “we’re not especially keen on it at our school because we don’t like the idea of replacing English 12”. To ensure successful implementation, educational planners need to gauge the potential reaction of the whole community of teachers, and persuade all teachers about the advantages of the new curriculum.

While it is virtually impossible to involve all teachers in the initiation of change, educational planners need to build in a longer time span for successful implementation. As Fullan emphasized, “change is a process, not an event” (1991, p.49). Moreover, planners need to consider changes in the total process, or at least at related junctures in the process. The more deep-seated the expected change, the further the starting point: if teachers are expected to change their beliefs, the new beliefs need to be implanted not in the middle of their careers, but further back in time, during teacher training, or even further back in their high school and university education. As an example from the present study, aspiring English teachers need to be encouraged to take university courses in language and communications if they are expected to give appropriate emphasis to language study in the high school classroom.

A barrier to long-term planning is often the political nature of educational change, when ruling party philosophy guides the initiation of new curriculum. Fullan (1991) recognized that the initiation process is “beset with political and ideological difficulties” (p. 273). Interview respondents unwilling to implement mentioned that the new curriculum had been initiated due to political motives. Interview respondents said TPC12 “is focused entirely on the capitalist economic system”, and is “the brainchild of somebody out there who has got the ear of the government”. Data for the present study were collected one year after the TPC12 curriculum was introduced in the province; one year may not be sufficient time for successful implementation of a controversial curriculum. The need, perhaps, is for more time.

Curriculum change that spans across a provincial educational system is usually externally imposed by government ministries, as was the TPC12 curriculum in the present study. However, as the present study has shown, and as Fullan and others have cautioned,
educational planners need to provide for considerable time if they want proposed change to succeed, mainly time for teachers to accept new ideas and changed pedagogies, and time for an effective infrastructure to be set up.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
While the present study researched one aspect of curriculum implementation, its scope did not include several related questions that arose from the context of the study. A few suggestions for further research have been listed in this section.

The present study could be repeated with a larger sample size, because results from a larger sample size may reiterate or refute the findings of the present study. In the present study, the small sample size may be a cause for several of the t-test results approaching in the direction of significant differences between groups but not depicting clear significant differences.

Other areas of possible investigation that emerged from the present study and are related to implementation of new curriculum were:

1. Beliefs of the planners – why the Ministry launched this course, which may be linked to the stated belief in Applied Academics – why the Ministry (MOEST, BC) believed in Applied Academics. The new curriculum in the present study was externally initiated change; respondents unwilling to implement did not see the need for the change. An investigation of the beliefs and values of the planners may help teachers and other stakeholders understand reasons for changes in curriculum.

2. The debate between teaching aesthetic literature and efferent literature in high school English – investigate the importance of different types of literature in providing students with cultural background and critical thinking skills. In the present study, respondents willing to implement felt that the new curriculum provided students with skills that were not available in the established course, whereas respondents unwilling to implement the new curriculum felt that the established course provided students with essential skills.
Further investigation can help identify the kinds of literature high school students need to be taught.

3. Linked to the above topic is the discussion about why universities are unwilling to accept TPC12 as an entrance pre-requisite for English – the ‘elite’ nature of aesthetic literature studies versus the low status of efferent literature and language studies. As observed in the context of the present study, one of the main deterrents to teachers’ acceptance of the new curriculum is the refusal of universities in the province to accept TPC12 as an adequate pre-requisite for university entrance. A study of university professors’ beliefs may help educational planners understand why TPC12 is considered an inadequate alternative to English 12.

4. Feedback from employers in business and industry about their expectations of language and communication skills in their employees. In the context of the present study, employers were supportive of TPC12 (Vance and Abraham, 1995). Investigation into the expectations of employers will help throw light on how English 12 can provide students with employable skills. Further investigation can be carried out on whether the objective of English 12 is to provide employable skills, or to provide skills that make students “global citizens” (as a respondent unwilling to implement stated).

5. Feedback from other stakeholders in the educational system – parents, students, and school administrators – about their expectations of the objectives of English 12. In the present study, respondents reported on interest in the new course shown by students and parents; differences between groups were statistically significant for students’ interest in the new curriculum. Three interview respondents who had taught the new course reported that their students demonstrated enthusiasm for the new curriculum. Further research on students’, parents’, and school administrators’ interest in implementing new curriculum could provide useful insights on implementation.
CONCLUSION
The present study investigated the influence of beliefs on a sample of teachers' decisions to implement one course in a new curriculum. The context of the present study was the initiation and implementation of the TPC12 curriculum under the English Language Arts umbrella in BC high schools. Preliminary observation of the situation noted reluctance by several English teachers to implement the new course. From statements made by these teachers it was inferred that deep-seated beliefs about the teaching of English were the cause of unwillingness to implement the new course. Results of the present study upheld this inference: respondent English teachers who believed in the use of aesthetic literature were unwilling to implement TPC12, whereas respondent English teachers who believed in the use of all texts including efferent literature were willing to implement TPC12.

The present study also concluded that the education and experience of teachers are not related significantly with willingness to implement; however, this conclusion may have been influenced by the delimitation of the present study which focused on English teachers as its population, i.e., a homogenous population in which individuals were likely to have similar backgrounds in education and experience. This homogeneity may also have resulted from English teachers' loyalty to the culture of their subject and its pedagogical values; as reported, beliefs of all respondents, both those willing to implement and those unwilling to implement, were in agreement with the traditional objectives of English 12. From this, it was further inferred that beliefs can be traced to the culture of school subjects.

From the results of the present study, we can conclude along with Fullan that "the 'psychological state' of some teachers leads them to resist change" (1991, p.141). Initiators of change need to be aware of teachers' beliefs about pedagogy and perceptions of the need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality of proposed new curriculum. Moreover, planners need to include teachers in the decision-making process. Implementation of new curriculum "means a radical change in the culture of schools and the conception of teaching as a profession ... Cultural change requires strong, persistent efforts because much of the current
practice is embedded in structures and routines and internalized by individuals, including teachers … cultural change is the agenda” (Fullan, 1991, pp. 142-143).

As the present study found, the English teachers sampled believe in the pedagogical values and culture of their school subject. For curriculum implementation that requires a change in beliefs, initiators of change need to introduce changes in teachers’ cultures over a considerable period of time before they can expect results.
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1. What Grade 12 courses do you teach? Please check, and state number of years taught:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>AM TEACHING THIS YEAR</th>
<th>HAVE TAUGHT IN PAST YEARS</th>
<th>NO. OF YEARS TAUGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPC 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/s (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you have taught at the post-secondary level, please list the courses you have taught, and circle the relevant category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION</th>
<th>NO. OF YEARS TAUGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/Technical school/University/Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/Technical school/University/Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/Technical school/University/Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/Technical school/University/Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you have held/or presently hold any administrative position in the school, (including department head) please list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION</th>
<th>NO. OF YEARS IN THIS POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please list any experience you have had as a technician, manager, business person, or in other professional work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NO. OF YEARS IN THIS POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. WORK EXPERIENCE: continued

5. Please list any type of writing you do/have done, e.g., reports, journalistic writing, short story, non-fiction articles, technical writing. Please star (*) any that you have published.

B. EDUCATION:

1. Please state the number of university courses you have taken in the following subjects. Please state if the courses were full year (Y), semester (S), trimester (T), or Quarter (Q):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>Number of Undergraduate courses</th>
<th>Number of Graduate courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Writing or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What was your undergraduate major? Minor?

3. What was your graduate major? Minor?
C. YOUR VIEWS ON GRADE 12 ENGLISH:

The following statements represent a range of beliefs about the philosophy and content of the English 12 curriculum for secondary schools. Please state to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement, by circling the point on the scale which most closely resembles your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1. Please chose the statement that best reflects your beliefs: The most important contribution of the English 12 classroom to students' cognitive development is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Mathew Arnold described as “the best that has been thought and said”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kinds of informational texts that professionals (such as engineers,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawyers, physicians managers, administrators, and technicians) read.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please state if you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, by circling a number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 12 students whose reading is focused on pragmatic, informational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texts will be deprived of social and critical concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 12 students whose interest in the traditional literary canon is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not nurtured will not be interested in authoring texts that have artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense and story line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the most important aspects of English 12 is that students be able</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand and appreciate imaginative, aesthetic literature that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides insights into the human condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because good literary texts are intellectually challenging, students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who are taught to read them can be expected to develop skills which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they can transfer to texts like technical reports and user manuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In English 12, students should have the option of studying non-literary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texts such as legal documents, medical papers, socio-economic theses,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical reports, and user manuals, in place of a broad approach to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetic literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you were advising a university student who intends to teach Grade 12 English, please choose the four most important senior level university courses for this student, and give an ‘A’ to the two more important courses, and a ‘B’ to the two next important courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A course in English grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Canadian literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Shakespeare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in essay writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pacific-Rim literature course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A First Nations literature course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in Engineering writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course in non-fiction prose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A period course (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. YOUR VIEWS ON GRADE 12 ENGLISH: continued

4. Please check how appropriate each of the following texts would be in a Grade 12 English course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Moderately Appropriate</th>
<th>Not Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Albert Camus: <em>The Outsider</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Carl Sagan: <em>Cosmos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) William Shakespeare: <em>Henry IV, Part 1</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Martin Rees: <em>Before the Beginning</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Andre Bormanais: <em>Star Trek Science Logs</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Thomas Hardy: <em>The Mayor of Casterbridge</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) John-Ralston Saul: <em>The Unconscious Civilization</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Gookin: <em>DOS for Dummies</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Stephen Hawking: <em>A Brief History of Time</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Emily Bronte: <em>Wuthering Heights</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) John Steinbeck: <em>Of Mice and Men</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please check how important it is to allocate more than five classroom hours to each of the following in English 12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-fiction prose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shakespeare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technical &amp; professional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Essay writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The following statements describe the kinds of reading a teacher of Grade 12 English might do regularly. Please rank them from 1 = highest, to 4 = lowest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Technical texts such as computer instructions, reports on scientific and medical advances, and specialist journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Poetry, fiction, and drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>works on current issues such as ecology, sociology, politics, and economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>literary criticism and exegesis of text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please choose the statement that best reflects your beliefs (please choose only ONE):

The most important reason students learn to write is

a) to reflect on their responses to reading
b) to communicate their ideas to others
D. TPC 12 AND YOU:

1. Please circle what you think the intention of TPC 12 is (please circle only ONE response):
   a. to replace Communication 12  
   b. to replace English Literature 12  
   c. to replace English 12  
   d. none of the above

2. Please check if the following statement is true or false:
   'High school students are required to present credits in three government-examinable subjects to qualify for BC post-secondary scholarships. The combination of English 12, English Literature 12, and TPC 12 will satisfy these requirements'. True / False

3. Please check to what extent you have read the following parts of the TPC12 IRP and supporting materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTIONS OF THE TPC 12 IRP</th>
<th>Have Read Carefully</th>
<th>Have Skimmed</th>
<th>Have Not Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to English Language Arts 11 and 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Curriculum: Technical and Professional Communications 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general introduction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Viewing, and Listening : Comprehension, Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, Research I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing, Representing, and Speaking : Products and Presentations I &amp; II, Planning and Drafting, Revising and Editing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Prescribed Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Learning Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Cross-Curricular Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Student Literacy in Secondary Schools – An In-Service Resource for English Language Arts 11 &amp; 12 (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Web-site on Applied Academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What parts of the TPC12 IRP and supporting materials have you found most helpful? Please list:
5. **Which of the following resources are available to you for TPC 12?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>AT SCHOOL</th>
<th>AT HOME (your personal property)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and professional writing books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and professional literature books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and professional Audio-visual materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and/or software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and/or web access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **To be able to teach TPC 12, which of the following do you need?** Please check the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>ESSENTIAL</th>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from the BC Teachers of English &amp; Language Arts Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from the Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from your School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from your Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from your Department Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for other purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service – Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Please check the ONE statement that most closely represents your personal interest in TPC 12:**

   a. I am prepared to teach TPC 12 if the opportunity arises, because (please give your reasons):
   
   b. I have taught, or am currently teaching TPC 12, because (please give your reasons):
   
   c. I am not interested in teaching TPC 12, because (please give your reasons):

9. **Have any students in your high school expressed an interest in taking TPC 12?**

   Yes / No/Don’t Know

10. **If yes, please circle the approx. number of students who expressed an interest in TPC 12:**

    5  10  15  20  25  30  35+
D. TPC 12 AND YOU: continued

11. Have any of your colleagues expressed an interest in teaching TPC 12?  
   Yes / No / Don’t Know

12. Have students’ parents expressed an interest in their children taking TPC12?  
   Yes / No / Don’t Know

13. Do you feel that TPC 12 provides high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate?  Yes/No (please circle)

14. Please comment on why you consider that TPC 12 does or does not provide high school students with the language and communication skills they will need to graduate:

___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

15. What gaps or omissions do you believe there are in the TPC 12 curriculum?:

___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Nargis Abraham.
Thank you very much for agreeing to do this interview.

1. What comes first to mind when I ask you about what an English 12 student should be learning? Why?

2. What comes first to mind when I ask you about what a student in a technical professional comm course should be learning? Why?

3. Do you think the new course (TPC12) is or is not a suitable alternative to English 12? Why?

4. (If no) What does English 12 provide students that TPC12 does not?

5. What kinds of support and resources would a teacher of TPC12 need? In school, outside the school?

6. What kinds of textbooks and materials would be needed for TPC12? (If say I don’t know – ask same Q about English 12)

7. How would you suggest the provincials be structured, for TPC12?

8. For an English teacher to be prepared to teach technical communication, what would that teacher need as background? Educational background? Particular courses?

9. If you were given the opportunity to teach TPC12 would you? Why? What would motivate you to be interested in teaching TPC12?

A couple of Questions about your background:

1. What was your undergraduate major? Graduate major?

2. How many years have you been teaching?

Thank you very much for taking the time to do this interview.
methods of teaching do you use in teaching English 12? What texts do you use for English 12?

Selection and Description of sample: The questionnaire will be sent out to a sample of high school English teachers in BC. It will include teachers currently teaching TPC12, teachers who have attended workshops and discussion groups on TPC12, and a random sample of teachers from BC School Boards.

Outcome criteria and Measurement Procedures: The proposed outcome of this study is to establish some of the teacher-based factors that contribute to the implementation of new curriculum. The data will be analyzed using statistical measures as well as through qualitative analysis of the open-ended questions and the interviews.
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APPENDIX C
PILOT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

BEFORE/AFTER QUESTIONNAIRE

TECHNICAL & PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION 12 LITERATURE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleague,

I would appreciate your response to the following questions about Technical and Professional Communications 12. I would like to use the data I gather as part of my Master's research at UBC.

The survey is planned to be longitudinal: to find out if there are any changes over time. I request you to respond to the questions before the presentation today, and again at the end of the presentation. I will also give you a self-addressed, stamped envelope, if you would be willing to respond and mail a third questionnaire about December 1, 1996.

I also hope to have one more follow-up questionnaire in January 1997, for those who are willing to participate.

Thank you.

Nargis Abraham
Graduate Student, UBC Faculty of Education.
October 17, 1996.

TECHNICAL & PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION 12 LITERATURE QUESTIONNAIRE

For each of the following statements, please circle the number closest to your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you feel about TPC12?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TPC12 will be as valuable to students pursuing careers in the arts and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanities as it will be to students pursuing careers in business,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering, and health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers are not sure exactly what is to be taught in TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In TPC12, students will develop focused inquiry questions related to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topics or issues in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Magazines such as Popular Mechanics and Consumer Reports will form a</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant portion of the reading students will do in TPC12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>TPC12 students will be expected to cite evidence from their readings to support generalizations.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The ethical use of language will be a significant part of TPC12.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>TPC12 is based upon Business and Technical Communication.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In TPC12, students will be taught to assess the reliability, currency, and objectivity of secondary source material.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>TPC12 literature will be similar to the literature read by students in Communications 12.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Students who take TPC12 will leave Grade 12 having read no literature since Grade 11.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The literature of professions such as Medicine and Law will form a segment of the literature studied by students in TPC12.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>TPC12 provides students with the theory they need to apply their language skills to both academic studies and workplace practices.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>English teachers are not trained to teach TPC12.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In TPC12, students will learn to analyze various types of non-fiction prose text.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>TPC12 will provide students with skills they will not get anywhere else in the school.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any other concerns you have about the literature component of TPC12.
Education:

Please circle degrees held:

Please state your area of academic specialization:

________________________________________

Please list diplomas and/or certificates you hold: (for e.g., BC College of Teachers)

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Work Experience:

Please list your teaching experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades taught</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In non-teaching jobs: please list non-teaching positions you have worked in, in a school or elsewhere:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
**TECHNICAL & PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION 12 LITERATURE QUESTIONNAIRE**

*For each of the following statements, please circle the number closest to your opinion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you feel about TPC12?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TPC12 will be as valuable to students pursuing careers in the arts and humanities as it will be to students pursuing careers in business, engineering, and health.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers are not sure exactly what is to be taught in TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In TPC12, students will develop focused inquiry questions relating to topics or issues in society.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Magazines such as Popular Mechanics and Consumer Reports will form a significant portion of the reading students will do in TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TPC12 students will be expected to cite evidence from their readings to support generalizations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The ethical use of language will be a significant part of TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TPC12 is based upon Business and Technical Communication.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In TPC12, students will be taught to assess the reliability, currency, and objectivity of secondary source material.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TPC12 literature will be similar to the literature read by students in Communications 12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students who take TPC12 will leave Grade 12 having read no literature since Grade 11.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The literature of professions such as Medicine and Law will form a segment of the literature studied by students in TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TPC12 provides students with the theory they need to apply their language skills to both academic studies and workplace practices.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. English teachers are not trained to teach TPC12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In TPC12, students will learn to analyze various types of non-fiction prose text.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. TPC12 will provide students with skills they will not get anywhere else in the school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list any other concerns you have about the literature component of TPC12.


Education:

Please circle degrees held:

Please state your area of academic specialization:


Please list diplomas and/or certificates you hold: (for e.g., BC College of Teachers)


Work Experience:

Please list your teaching experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades taught</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Experience:
In non-teaching jobs: please list non-teaching positions you have worked in, in a school or elsewhere:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Personal Reading preferences:
A. What journals do you read?
   Regularly:______________________________________________________________________
   Occasionally:___________________________________________________________________

B. What types of books do you read outside of school? List some books you have read recently.
   Fiction:______________________________________________________________________
   Non-fiction:__________________________________________________________________

On the following page, please reflect on any changes in your attitude to TPC12 between the Conference on October 18, and December 1.
Thank you very much for your time.
**Responses to the Open-Ended Question in the Pilot Survey**

*(Please list any other concerns you have about the literature component of TPC12)*

**BEFORE**

1. To answer the questions one would need to be totally familiar with the course. I am not therefore my comments are largely neutral. I recommend rephrasing the questions.

2. I really don’t know until I have a chance to teach this course.

3. Don’t know enough to respond to any of these questions except #2.

4. The literature must be challenging and interesting (in a “creative”, as well as technical sense). Technical manuals will not be effective, for how can we expect students who do not profess interest in literature (novels, poetry, drama) to become interested in writing that has no artistic sense, and usually no story line?

5. Based on Appendix B, it’s very difficult to tell that there is a significant literature component - I think this is the English teachers’ largest concern.

6. Concern is with the ‘lack’ of literature. For some Grade 12 English is the last time they are introduced to literature that deals with society, ideas, philosophies, etc. They should not miss out on this. TPC 12 is a course that is taught at tech institutions!

7. My concern is that the program is based on the pragmatic informational level of lit, ignoring social and critical concepts.

8. Universities won’t accept students with this course as their Grade 12 English requirement. Literary aspects of English 12 will be lost.

9. A concern is who will teach this course. My suspicion is the ‘career prep types’ who wouldn’t know a piece of literature from a hacksaw. Another concern is the TPC in lieu of Eng. 11 and 12. Unless we simply accept that the ‘bottom line’ is all that matters and a civilizing or culturalizing function no longer has value.

10. That literature used will only be that which is current. That literature will not be easily available. That CORE lit. will not be identified. That the poor reader and less motivated student, and those severely reading disabled will not be suitably served. Throwing out COMM 12 for these people will deny them “grad” status.

11. The TPC 12 course itself is a great idea to add to the existing English programs offered, but should not be completely replacing Communications 12. These two courses do not seem to have the same objectives and students who would have been encouraged to take Communications because of English skills that are too weak for the English 12 course will still have problems coping with TPC12.
AFTER

1. What is the definition of literature? (referring to Q 11 on the Likert-type scale: “Students who take TPC12 will leave Grade 12 having read no literature since Grade 11”).

2. If TPC12 is going to be a choice, so should be Lit 12 - or something else that combines the purposes of both.

3. (my answers to the Likert-type scale are) based on the presentation. However - Is this the reality?

4. I still question why? I don’t’ believe there are very many with the skills or interests to take this course. Even a dolt can cry at Hamlet’s death. He won’t understand a word of some of the examples used in the workshop.

5. Who will teach? Where will you find those with passion for this course?
**APPENDIX D**

**TABLES SUPPORTING THE DATA PRESENTATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**TABLE 26: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A1a Yrs teaching English 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1b Yrs teaching Comm 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1c Yrs teaching TPC 12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1d Yrs teaching other Comm courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1e Yrs teaching other English courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1f Yrs teaching Literature 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A1g Yrs teaching other subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty

**TABLE 27: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF POST-SECONDARY TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A2a Yrs teaching Post-Secondary English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A2b Yrs teaching Post-Secondary Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 28: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON CATEGORIES OF NON-TEACHING WORK EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q A3a: Yrs experience as Dept Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A3b: Yrs experience in other school administration*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A4a: Yrs experience in industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A4b: Yrs experience in research*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q A4c: Yrs experience in other work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*t cannot be computed because at least one of the cells is empty

### TABLE 29: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON TYPES OF UNDERGRADUATE COURSES TAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q B1a: English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1b: English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1c: English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1d: Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1e: Applied Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1f: Engineering Writing*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1g: Other courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q B1a: English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1b: English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1c: English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1d: Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1e: Applied Communication*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1f: Engineering Writing*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q B1g: Other courses*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty
TABLE 31: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS WILLING AND UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT ON BELIEFS ABOUT RECOMMENDING UNIVERSITY ENGLISH COURSES TO ASPIRING ENGLISH TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in English Grammar:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in Canadian literature:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in Linguistics: *</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in Shakespeare:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in Essay writing:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A Pacific Rim literature course:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A First Nations literature course: *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in Engineering writing: *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A course in non-fiction prose:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q C3 A period course (specify):</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to implement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
DETAILED PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW DATA

TABLE 32: PROFILE OF INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS WILLING TO IMPLEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent No.</th>
<th>Undergraduate major/s</th>
<th>Graduate major/s</th>
<th>Non-teaching work</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>History, International Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>“Some”</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Science, English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>English, History</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 33: PROFILE OF INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS UNWILLING TO IMPLEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent No.</th>
<th>Undergraduate major/s</th>
<th>Graduate major/s</th>
<th>Non-teaching work</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sociology, Economics, English Literature</td>
<td>Classical literature and philosophy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Classics and English Honours</td>
<td>Educational Administration, English Literature (Master’s and doctorate)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1:
WHAT COMES FIRST TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT WHAT A STUDENT OF ENGLISH 12 SHOULD BE LEARNING?
The following skills were mentioned by respondents as ‘subsequent responses’ to Question 1:

Respondents willing to implement:
• Analytical skills, research skills, logical presentation of ideas
• Proper communication skills, ability to communicate in the real world, communicating in the workplace (meetings, memos)
• Ability to write well in all walks of life, technical writing, writing skills for everything after school
• Ability to read critically, technical reading
• Shakespeare and Canadian Literature (because literature is integral to critical thinking skills), appreciation for literary interpretation.
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Respondents unwilling to implement:
- Interpretive skills for literature, research skills
- Articulating thoughts, communicating ideas to people
- Writing skills, ability to structure one’s thoughts in writing
- Use language with finesse, understand the appropriate use of written and spoken language, acquire sophisticated language skills
- Ability to read a range of materials and to respond, to enjoy reading, ability to read prose
- Ability to read a poem once in a while, enjoy going to the theatre, learning philosophical and thoughtful approaches to narrative
- Citizenship skills - produce citizens with a humanitarian life view
- Ability to decode media.

Question 2:
WHAT COMES FIRST TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT WHAT A STUDENT IN A TECHNICAL PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION COURSE SHOULD BE LEARNING?
In their ‘subsequent responses’ to Question 2, respondents listed the following skills as those provided in a technical professional communications course:

Respondents willing to implement:
- Effective communication strategies
- Proper grammar and spelling
- Read and write really well
- Becoming good writers
- Structuring writing, especially business writing: context-audience-purpose
- Business communication - meetings
- Computer skills and graphics.

Respondents unwilling to implement:
- Communicating through various media
- Technical ways of approaching the world
- Career oriented objective
- Report forms and styles
- Intellectual content and ideas presented in the technologies, engineering, law
- Applied language for work.

Question 3:
DO YOU THINK TPC12 IS OR IS NOT A SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE TO ENGLISH 12? WHY?

Responses of respondents willing to implement:
The main reasons given why the new course is a suitable alternative to the established course were:

1. TPC12 is an alternative to having to study Literature:
   - The new course provides an alternative for students “who have just had it with poetry, drama, short stories”
   - “students are given poetry, prose Shakespeare and Canadian Literature in Grades 9 through 11” (so now they have the chance to focus on other types of writing)
   - “English 12 has a limited appeal and is for those students going on to a Bachelor of Arts program of English education or philosophy, but for the rest, they should be taking TPC12”
   - “the analysis of Literature had no relevance to my future as an educator or as an entrepreneur”
   - “it provides technical writing skills because the work students go into might not have anything to do with Literature”.

2. TPC12 provides students the chance to study other types of English:
   - The new course gives students “the type of English that will become directly relevant to their career choice, whether business, college, or university”
   - “for students headed into the technical field”
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• "it provides opportunity to learn good technical and professional reading and writing" (which English 12 does not emphasize)
• "it would provide students with the writing skills they need"
• "it provides lots of experience in writing beyond essays, for example, in writing proposals"
• "people need to know how to write reports and read manuals".

3. TPC 12 opens up opportunities for certain kinds of students:
• The new course was "for students who are more analytical"
• "for bright students who are headed for the technical field"
• "for students who would not be successful in English 12 which has advanced curriculum and expectations".

One of the respondents in this group, stated that students wanting to go into "high level professions" like medicine and law need to take English 12 because English 12 provides the critical thinking skills, whereas the critical thinking skills in TPC 12 "are not as deep as they are in English 12", and that students "can transfer skills from English 12 into doing technical writing and communicating well".

Two of the respondents in this group stated that students need to take both the new course and the established course. One of these agreed that the new course is an alternative to English 12, while the other did not agree because he believed that students needed both English 12 and TPC 12.

Responses of respondents unwilling to implement:
The five respondents in this group stated that the new course is not a suitable alternative to the established course. The main reasons given why the new course is not a suitable alternative to the established course were:

1. TPC 12 should be an elective:
• "it is a good elective, like Writing 12 and Journalism 12, it has a specific purpose"
• "TPC 12 is the other side of the pendulum from Literature 12 which is also an elective but not an alternative to English 12"
• "it is a good idea as an additional course, but not as a replacement”.

2. English 12 provides skills that TPC 12 does not:
• "it (TPC12) is limited in some ways, it can’t offer students a way of stretching their minds in more imaginative and subtle ways”
• “not everyone needs the technical but everyone needs the abstract otherwise they won’t be able to pick up on humour and satire, and those are very important”
• “TPC12 lacks literature or narrative of any type”
• “it says nothing about the literary canon or cultural background”
• “it needs to broaden its goals, needs a reading component, an oral component, a speaking component – it needs broadening so that it can be useful to students not continuing school who want to have had a senior language and literature experience as well as for students who want to go on to some form of post-secondary”
• “this is a different kind of skill than thinking interpretively and in terms of metaphorical language”.

3. TPC 12 leans towards business training:
• “it is career training, streaming”
• “it is focussed entirely on the capitalist economic system which is a very short-sighted idea”
• “it sounds like the business community has said the kids need this and don’t need the other thing – this is not what we think is progress”.

One subject in this group said that students need both TPC12 and English 12, and that TPC12 “is a very practical course for people who are clear about the kind of work they want to do, and it is very essential in a lot of fields”. Another subject in this group said that “TPC12 was not an alternative (to English 12) the way it is taught right now, but it has the potential to be, provided it broadened its goals”.
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Question 4:
WHAT DOES ENGLISH 12 OFFER STUDENTS THAT TPC12 DOES NOT?
All respondents responded to this question; however, differences were evident in the responses of respondents willing to implement and respondents unwilling to implement TPC12.

Responses of respondents willing to implement:
Respondents willing to implement TPC12 pointed out the Literature-based skills provided by English 12:
- "the emphasis (in English 12) is more on Literature and the assumption that the students can do editing on their own"
- "(English 12 provides) the literary base, the moral aspects, the figurative point of view, metaphorically speaking, the analytical kinds of things that take place within a literary context, issues in humanistic relationships"
- "the only thing that English has to offer is poetry, prose, Shakespeare, Canadian fiction".

Two of the respondents willing to implement TPC12 said that English 12 provides "deeper critical thinking skills ... English 12 is a denser course" and that it provides "higher level stuff ... a really advances packed curriculum with higher expectations". However, another subject said that though "the concepts are slightly more difficult, it is not everything", and another stated that "English 12 has a limited audience appeal".

Responses of respondents unwilling to implement:
Respondents unwilling to implement TPC12 pointed out the abstract skills, thinking skills, cultural skills and literacy skills provided by English 12:
- "English 12 furthers the literacy level, and can be applied to intellectual skills and students’ ability to sustain … it gets students to read longer text at a more difficult level, to take students up to a certain level and get them to think, for their intellectual and social development – nothing else can replace that”
- "(English 12 provides) the opportunity to present a historical view of Western culture, and a modern social view of multi-culture …"
- "(English 12 is) “a way of stretching students’ minds in more imaginative and subtle ways …”
- "(English 12 provides) “all kinds of agenda – oracy, thinking, listening … a much broader ranger of literature both fiction and non-fiction”
- "(English 12 is) “the last bastion of general information… it is the last chance of creating global citizens”.

Question 5:
WHAT KINDS OF SUPPORT AND RESOURCES WOULD A TEACHER OF TPC12 NEED?
In response to this question, both respondents who had taught TPC12 and respondents who were willing to implement the new course talked about the resources they used, while respondents who had not taught TPC12 and were unwilling to implement (statements made by respondents unwilling to implement are marked with an asterisk below) offered suggestions about the resources they believed would be needed to teach TPC12.

For the purpose of reporting the data from the interviews, the following categories were identified:

Textbooks:
- "I’m using ‘Technically Write!’… it is a good book but it is geared to the self-directed learner in the workplace – you need to know the basics of business and business jargon to use the book”
- "all a teacher really needs is a good set of textbooks; we use ‘Technically Write!’ and ‘The Writer’s Handbook/Companion’ (unsure of the title) … the students loved ‘Technically Write!’ and wanted to keep personal copies … it is full of practical information… I have ‘Technical Writing’ by Diana Reeves, and the book on bibliographical formats, for my own references texts … a CFAA grant helped us purchase textbooks”
- "we have about five textbooks … the start-up kit evaluated a variety of textbooks … we have a handbook on communication skills put out by Gage, which has the basic rules and regulations, stuff that would be in an office management course … we have a technical writing workbook … there are some critical reading and current things … it is thematic kind of approach in terms of resources, not just one textbook"
• "I have used four different texts in one course ... Technical Writing by Markel and Holmes (which now has a high school-level text) ... Writing for the Workplace which has a lot of the technical aspects of language, the Canadian Writer's Handbook, and a text on speaking: the Canadian edition of Success in Speaking ... students found their language skills enhanced through the use of these books .. could use only the first two texts if the cost factor doesn't allow using four texts"
• "would use similar grammatical resources as English 12 ... in addition, technical writing resources on strategies on how to write ... technical writing texts"
• * "there is a range of materials in terms of actual textbooks, ... shouldn't specify the particular textbook for every school ... Business Ed may have a lot of textbooks that would be helpful ... except for grammatical texts and formatting texts, the English Department may not have helpful texts"
• * "teachers would want a list of books to cover the important issues of the course like editorial practices, for example, Canadian Writer's Guide by Diana Hacker ... some sort of book of readings (equivalent to what Literature 12 has: Adventures in English Literature)".

Other materials:
• "reading in terms of research requires extensive amount of reading ... for critical reading, we take articles from current magazines or periodicals that may be controversial and look at them in terms of the logical presentation of ideas and what the fallacies are...”
• * "videos"
• * "the Ministry now lists video support in the IRPs"
• * "need a greater variety of resources for technical reading materials ...”
• * “needs a range of materials – newspapers, magazines, journals”
• * “because of the component on the workplace, need for materials on meetings, information on multi-media literacy and different media systems”
• * “technical support for the readings – model essays, vocabulary, critical terms”
• * “speakers’ list, and a list of sites for field trips (to involve the community)”.

Teacher initiative:
• "teachers of TPC12 are putting their own style into it and figuring out the resources they need"
• "when planning lessons if I come across something for which I need certain resources, then I create the resources, so it’s quite a big task the first time through it”
• "plus you need a teacher who is willing to do a little legwork to get documents and technical journals"
• "teachers need time to get materials"
• "a teacher needs to have a good grasp of the technical aspects of language, looking at it as a tool rather than as a literary based, making English dynamic within any context ... teacher needs to have a great deal of creativity to come up with scenarios and situations that Grade 12 students can handle ...”

Teacher/collegial support:
• "there is a need for a group of educators to look at the technical writing IRPs”
• "you don’t need a lot of collegial support as long as people are not antagonistic ... I was left very much on my own because a lot of the English department didn’t like the course ... not hostile, but not positive either”
• "I’m working with a couple of teachers who are a little curious about TPC”
• "the biggest asset would be somebody who’s done TPC and believes in TPC”
• "there are so many things that I have learned from teachers who have looked at or are currently teaching TPC”
• "we need some kind of organization, some kind of sitting down with other teachers”
• "definitely need collegial support ... as many opportunities to work with other teachers to develop materials and so on”.

Technology:
• "... money put into computers (by the school) also helped”
• "I offer the course in a computer-managed learning system ... we are now looking at offering it over the internet ... we also use the internet and the world wide wed for applied academic lessons”
Technology continued:
- "(I) use technology to enhance presentations, with computers or photography or something else ... school should have a technical equipment base"
- * "either directly internet materials, or how to use the internet".

Other departments:
- "I received a lot of support from the Computer Department ... they thought it was wonderful that the English department was broadening itself again ... the Science department helped out ... one of the members was tutoring me on computer skills ... the Business department helped a bit, some of the students did their project on their entrepreneurial course ... if I taught TPC12 again there are a lot of links that could be made with other departments ... an Art teacher is interested in typing up graphics for publications"

Web-site:
- "Applied Academics (CFAA) has a web-site and they have put out some items here and there"
- "(there is) great support in the web-site".

Other support:
- "teachers would benefit from meeting students who have taken TPC ... a dialogue is necessary"
- "teachers need the start-up kit that is put out by the CFAA"
- "I found the curriculum very helpful, it helped me think of ideas"
- "(the course would) need community resources, people who are using language in their professions".

Question 5A:
**WHAT KINDS OF MATERIALS AND SUPPORT DO YOU USE/NEED TO TEACH ENGLISH 12?**

Textbooks:
- "in my class we did 'Othello', a poetry section using 'Themes on a Journey'" and some South American poets like Pablo Neruda and Garcia Lorca ... we also do an in-class novel, for example Kurt Vonnegut's 'Waterhouse 5', and Joy Kogawa's 'Obisan' ... a series on short stories 'Story and Structure' ... a prose essay book 'The Art of Writing'"
- "always do Shakespeare, e.g. Hamlet ... we went to see the production of Hamlet at the Stanley Theatre this year ... we read novels, e.g. All Quiet on the Western Front ... we do a short story collection ... we've done Brave New World, Joy Luck Club, some non-fiction essays"
- "English 12 needs to rethink the status of the McGraw Hill Handbook in terms of making the text more modern and more accessible for students"
- "I use a huge amount of textbooks both literature-based prose and poetry and grammar ... most of these are recommended by the Ministry".

Technology:
- "I use some a/v equipment, some films ... I include a Shakespeare movie or a story that has been made into a movie, and there is an essay attached to the viewing of the movie"
- "We have a huge computer access and internet, we use it for research purposes"
- "some sort of on-line support would be useful because the rest of the province doesn't have the resources that are available in the Lower Mainland ... there are thousands of websites and people have to search madly, so the Ministry should look at a website for English 12"
- "film and video".

Community Support:
- "we invite all kinds of business and professional people to speak to our students (our department devotes one day in the week devoted to career and personal planning) ... the guest lecturers talk about their jobs, how they got them and how they keep them, what possibilities are opened up for them because of their jobs"
- "other supports like community theatre ... a speakers' list is provided by the universities from which we can invite professors to speak to the students".
Other areas covered:
- “I run a Grade 12 writing program through the semester … start and end the semester with a week of grammar and writing skills … assign a project to deal with literature themselves, for example, do a compare-contrast of three essays”
- “I always cover poetry and poetic devices and apply them to the study of rhetoric … do speech making and look at some of the classic speeches e.g. Martin Luther King, Henry the Fifth … rhetorical and propaganda devices at a fairly sophisticated level … some media analysis … end the year with lots of language and grammar review… different types of assignments on the novel – response logs, journals, visual essays, oral presentations, compare-contrast assignments, different types of writing … give a style guide for plagiarism and quotations”.

Question 7:
WHAT KIND OF BACKGROUND (EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE) WOULD AN ENGLISH TEACHER NEED IN ORDER TO TEACH TPC 12?

EDUCATION:
Respondents willing to implement:

 Abilities and aptitudes:
- “a teacher should have a solid grounding in spelling and grammar”
- “for education, just be an English teacher, have an open mind “
- “not a teacher who’s stuck in academia … some real life experience where they have done the kinds of activities we talk about in TPC … also a teacher who feels for the kids who have the ability but don’t get turned on because they don’t see the relevance”
- “many non-English teachers are being forced to teach English, but they don’t have the background to realise what is it they are supposed to teach … to teach a technical professional communication course an English teacher would need probably more of the grammar and structure as well as good writing skills”
- “a teacher needs to have some sort of training with the idea of technical writing and having had experience in the field where the components were technical communications … teachers should go through learning the production process, not just the product of writing”

Post-secondary education:
- “I have not thought I should have done more English at university” (in order to teach TPC12) … my background is in History, International Politics, and a minor in Economics … I was at Royal Roads Military Academy”
- “to teach high school English you need to have a broad range of courses under your belt …a teacher should have a normal English degree … you usually have a lot of literature courses like Canadian Literature, English Literature, American Literature, poetry, and you end up with an English degree with kind of a focus but people don’t become specialists until they do their master’s … or you could have a bachelor of education with an English focus … it certainly would not hurt to take a course like Arnie Keller’s, but not a major in technical writing”
- “what we ideally need is for teachers to have taken a technical professional communication course, I don’t think that’s going to happen”
- “the education you take through university is adequate in terms of the English courses … a science teacher however may not be as flexible as the English teachers … English Literature is a wonderful course, if you’ve got the time, take it … it is probably the best course you’ll ever take”
- “I had a lot of Literature-based courses which was great, it was my focus … but I should have taken more language-based courses like grammar and structure … there should probably be more requirements to do more English language courses … may be through teacher education there should be an emphasis on language skills … so it needs to be offered at the undergraduate level, and if you want to go into teaching then somebody can guide you to taking more language courses”
- “courses at the college-level in technical professional communications are vital, it is something every university student should take … one of the two needs to be there, either the education or the background work experience, if not it should be a requirement for teachers to take some post-secondary program”.
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Skills in Technology:
• "they should definitely have a working knowledge of computers or a sincere desire to know more about computers"
• "have rudimentary computer skills, be able to word-process"
• "lots of English teachers are frightened by technology, but everything will change so we need to embrace it and not run away from it".

Respondents unwilling to implement:

English background for TPC teachers:
• "insisting on asking for an English background for a teacher of TPC12 may be a bit moot ... from what I hear I don’t think you will find any English teacher willing to teach this course ... some background in Language or Composition for the grammar and structure and mechanics would be a wise idea ... you need a mix but more the composition and the mechanics than the literary background ..."
• "probably somebody who’s not very interested in English ... the newest teacher will have to teach it".

Background in other subjects:
• "having a Business Education background is ideal, and there are a number of teachers in the system that have both English and Business Ed ... very few people who graduated with degrees in English Literature have either the interest or the background to be able to help students with this type of learning, it is just a very different orientation"
• "I don’t see how a degree in English Literature would help"
• "technical writing courses at university are not taken generally by the English teachers ... the English department (at UBC) has not put enough emphasis into developing more courses in that area ... UVic course deals with different kinds of writing other than just Literature and we need to encourage people who want to teach English in secondary school to take at least one such course ... generalists in two majors are alright for Grades 8, 9, 10 but for 11 and 12 you need specialists ... it is up to the Ministry and the universities to indicate that there are better methods of preparation for a teacher teaching a senior course like TPC12"
• "maybe some of the younger teachers who may have done language studies rather than Literature studies (would be willing to teach TPC12) ... it might be a business course but not everyone in Business has the language background ... at the Grade 12 level you need somebody who really has the background for it".

TEACHING WORK EXPERIENCE:

Respondents willing to implement:
• "need for enthusiasm for the course, otherwise the teacher is in danger of putting students off"
• "I was teaching English 9 before this (teaching TPC12) and Law 12".

Respondents unwilling to implement:
• "while English teachers are well prepared to teach Literature, they are not especially well prepared in teaching language and they often do not have the work experience"
• "we do have Business Ed teachers but they tend not to have the writing orientation ... we need to beef up the standards for the teachers, besides beefing up the course itself".

NON-TEACHING WORK EXPERIENCE:

Respondents willing to implement:
• "some experience in industry and a business-type environment or a technically-oriented environment"
• "an English teacher would need a bit of a business background"
• "teachers should have a working background"
• "some real life experience where they have done the kinds of things we talk about in TPC"
• "experience with the Forces and banking have been of help to me to be able to give students an appreciation of the environment they will be writing in".
Respondents unwilling to implement:
- "practical business experience, their strength would come from being out in the actual business world ... someone from the business department would have a better understanding of how this would fit into things"
- "some areas where people could have acquired business proficiency, for example working in real estate, medical research".

Question 8:
WOULD YOU TEACH THIS NEW COURSE TPC 12? IF YES, WHAT WOULD MOTIVATE YOU TO TEACH IT? IF NO, WHY NOT?

Respondents willing to implement:
Respondents who said that they would teach the new course cited the enthusiasm of students, the potential for student improvement, and the practical nature of TPC12 as some of the main reasons why they felt motivated:

Student enthusiasm:
- "it is very rewarding because in many ways it is like an elective, the students are there by choice, they are motivated"
- "what convinced me was how excited the students were about it"
- "it is what will get students turned on especially students at risk".

Student improvement:
- "I found it interesting to see the development of students’ writing and communication skills"
- "I’m just really interested in writing period, in developing writing skills in students, creative writing and essay writing and giving them the skills"
- "it is taken for granted that students have the skills in Grade 12, and the time component in English 12 leaves very little or no time for the writing and grammar skills, so that’s why I got interested in it".

Practical nature of the course:
- "it is the most relevant course ... I work in an adult learning centre, and the students couldn’t get the English 12 course because they hated it, and I had a real hard time justifying it to them ... from my own personal experience in business, I know I didn’t get business writing skills either in high school or in university despite being an A student"
- "I really sense that we have to change gears now ... because I am in business too, I see it coming ... there may not be time any more to spend on plays etc. ... learning Macbeth isn’t really going to help you write a report, discussing Moliere isn’t really going to help you on how to handle yourself at a business meeting ... I see the future as more of a blend"
- "the hands-on approach, the practical aspects of the skills ... in English we didn’t have the context like there is in math or in the sciences to be able to stress the language use".

Teaching and course content considerations:
- "I have an ideal class size, 23 students, ideal for teaching writing"
- "I would teach it particularly if the Ministry said that the IRP covers only a small portion of the course and we encourage teachers to go beyond ... and if there is additional technical support because that is where the course could become quite interesting ... I would be interested in trying something new, I think a number of people would provided we have an opportunity to have a literature component, a series of interesting readings and activities to complement the writing aspect".

Respondents unwilling to implement:
The two respondents who gave reasons why they would not teach the new course, both stated that the course could be a part of English 12:
- "could teach it as a unit in English 12, but not a separate whole course"
- "there is an appropriate place in the English curriculum, but not to use students’ time for a whole year or a whole semester on such a course".
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Each of these two respondents gave different reasons why they would not teach the new course:

- "because it is not what I like to teach, I like to teach Literature ... I want to teach reading, to teach children to love books and make them a part of their lives"
- "there is no intellectual content (in the new course) ... if the business world want to have people who know how to write in that style, they should pay for it" (as specialized courses for their employees).

OTHER STATEMENTS:

Positive statements about TPC12:
The three respondents who made other positive statements about TPC12 pointed out the practicality of the course, the inevitability of it being introduced in schools, and the need for equipping teachers to teach it. These respondents were from the group willing to implement the new course:

- "in TPC you have the ability to really pick apart the audience and choose your words extremely carefully ... employers are paying $3,000.00 a head for the course, and we have the opportunity to offer it to our public school students" (for free)
- "it is a brilliant idea and I think we are going to get to it sooner than we think"
- "I'd sure like to see it continue to develop ... I'd sure like to see post-secondary institutions realize where this is going and that we need to have teachers equipped to provide the teaching for it".

Negative statements about TPC12:
Other negative statements about TPC12 were made by two respondents willing to implement and three respondents unwilling to implement the new course:

Respondents willing to implement:
The two respondents willing to implement stated what they thought were others' views about the TPC12. One subject said “English teachers may not teach because they say grammar is really boring and I don’t know how to make it interesting”. The other subject stated fears that TPC12 may be seen “as a Communications 11 option ... counselors will put kids that have poor communication skills” (into this course) “on the other hand I get excited about seeing kids incorrectly tagged as Communications 11 who see relevance in TPC and do phenomenal things”.

Respondents unwilling to implement:
Two of the three respondents who made other negative statements about TPC12 stated that they did not want TPC to be a replacement for English 12. The other subject voiced concerns about the Ministry’s decision to change curriculum, and also concerns for ESL students.

The two respondents who did not want TPC12 to be a replacement for English 12 stated that “they are two very different courses and two very distinct outcomes” and that “the Ministry should realize that it is not being accepted so obviously something is lacking ... the Ministry should rethink how they give credit for senior English, may be provide for three distinct courses”.

These two respondents also stated that TPC12 does not contain sections which English 12 provides: “in TPC there is no narrative and I think being able to understand narrative is a part of being able to build and recognize culture”, and “as long as it is just focussing on forms it is not going to get very far with the really bright students ... we’re not trying to create some dubbed-down course”.

One of these two also pointed to the possible political reasons for the new course: “it is quite a political reason why they floated it, I think the emphasis on applied academics is why they floated it”.

One of the respondents voiced concerns about the way in which the Ministry had attempted to implement curriculum change “the government has dome this to teachers so many times, the whole way in which the Year 2000 was presented for example ... they don’t do this with any kind of professional respect or apology ... they say you’re not being consulted we will just tell you ... there has been an unfortunate history of this type of approach ... the Ministry backed off with the Year 2000 only when the universities said they would not accept
it as a replacement for English 12 … if the teachers hate it they will try everything they can to find a reason why they don’t want to teach it”.

**University acceptance of TPC12:**
Three of the respondents made specific statements about university acceptance of TPC12 as an acceptable prerequisite for admission. Two of these were willing to implement, and one was unwilling to implement.

*Respondents willing to implement:*
The two respondents willing to implement who commented about university acceptance of TPC12, made positive statements.

One of these said “I have heard that some science faculties (in universities) have said that we don’t accept the course at university but we want you to have it … may be some universities faculties like business or engineering or science want students to have this course, then they will bite the bullet”. This subject also said that it is “a bit of a deterrent” that universities have not accepted TPC12, “because it is hard to sell the course to hardworking students and then tell them the universities don’t recognize it”. However, this subject resumed a positive note when he said “it is perhaps useful that the colleges will accept it, so it will continue to attract those students” (headed for colleges).

The other subject in this group stated “I think it is just a matter of time” before universities accept TPC12, “they are just waiting and seeing … I just can’t believe thy are going to ignore this completely especially when we have people like Crawford Killian on side … when students start going to BCIT I hope the universities will start seeing the calibre of students, and I hope they will come on board”.

*Respondents unwilling to implement:*
The one subject from this group who commented on university acceptance of TPC12 said “the more capable science students in particular are not going to look at it as long as the universities are not prepared to look at it, so the Ministry needs to pay some attention to this”. (It is interesting to note that this is the one subject in the unwilling to implement group who said that she would implement if the Ministry would include Literature in the course).

**Statements about English 12:**
(positive statement by a subject willing to implement)
“TPC is a little bit different from English 12 in terms of the creative and critical thought that is required to pull apart Shakespeare and some of the more detailed essays”.
(negative statement by a subject unwilling to implement)
“in English 12 there really isn’t any emphasis given” (to things that TPC12 emphasizes) “… there just isn’t time enough”.
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APPENDIX F
EXAMPLES OF RESPONDENTS' STATEMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS IN CHAPT. 5

BELIEFS ABOUT PEDAGOGY

Beliefs about pedagogy: 1) Objectives of the course

For example, in accordance with the traditional objectives of English 12 that emphasize the use of literary texts, respondents unwilling to implement stated:

"Students must experience literature and general communication skills to become 'interesting people'."

"A.E. Housman: 'Good literature must ... do some good to the reader: must quicken his perception ... sharpen his discrimination ... and mellow the rawness of his personal opinions.' TPC won't do that."

"If they (students) have the language and analytical skills acquired from reading good literature and well-written prose, they will be able to apply these skills to pragmatic writing."

"English 12 students have to learn simple literary criticism, to have the ability to respond in fairly fluent paragraphs ... first and foremost ... they have to have the fairly simple skill of responding to literature in paragraphs"

(TEP12 is not a suitable alternative to English 12 because) "it says nothing about the literary canon or cultural background ... or anyone's cultural background"

An English 12 student should be learning things that make them fit for life ... they should also be reading and learning about philosophical and academic and thoughtful approaches to ... I would like to say literature but that sounds too bombastic ... I prefer to say narrative ... something they can relate to ... the goal is to produce a citizen that is accepting or tolerant and reasonably intelligent, a humanitarian life view"

(English 12 students should) "be able to interpret literature and enjoy literature – to develop critical thinking especially interpreting literature ... to be able to read something and be able to look beyond the text and have some appreciation for that sort of thing"

Statements that were in accordance with the objectives of the new course were made principally by subject willing to implement. Some examples of such statements were:

"It is important for students to be able to analyze non-fiction, whether it is biographical or philosophical, or technical. Students also need to learn how to present such information in a way that can be readily understood: concise, clear communication."

"This is an important component in communication skills and provides students with practical skills for employment as well as developing specific writing skills – perhaps it should be required as a portion of all English classes ..."

"TEP12 provides graduating students with: an understanding of the elements of effective communication, the requirements for effective oral and written communications, the ability to evaluate and analyze information given its context, message, audience and intended purpose, confidence in their ability to communicate effectively in a wide range of situations."

Beliefs about pedagogy: 2) Texts for the course

Differences in beliefs about the texts for English 12 were also manifested in statements made by the respondents in the interviews. A typical example in accordance with the traditional norms for English 12 that emphasize the use of literary texts, that one of the respondents unwilling to implement stated they used in teaching English 12 was:
“I always cover poetry and poetic devices and we apply them not just to poetry but to a study of rhetoric and to do some speechmaking and look at some classic speeches ... we use famous speeches – Martin Luther King, Henry the Fifth ... we always do Shakespeare ... we read novels, we usually do All Quiet on the Western Front ... Brave New World ... Joy Luck Club ... Catcher in the Rye ...”

Respondents who had taught the new course listed process learning texts as the main kinds of texts they used in the classroom. For example, “I use Technical writing by Markel and Holmes ... I use Writing for the workplace, which tends to have a lot of the technical aspects of language that most students would encounter problems with ... Canadian Writer’s Handbook ... Success in Speaking ...”

A respondent willing to implement listed similar textbook resources: “As far as actual textbooks go, I think there’s a range of material ... I don’t think you could specify for every school what particular textbook they should have ... I think it takes a range of materials, all the way from newspapers and magazines to journals, and I’m sure that Business Ed has a lot of textbooks that would be helpful; I’m not sure that the English Dept. has, except in the case of grammatical texts and formatting texts”

Beliefs about pedagogy: 3) Utilization of classroom hours
One of the respondents unwilling to implement suggested that TPC12 could be taught in half a term: “Look at the time involved in asking students to read a novel or any longer piece. The majority of readings that they are suggesting in TPC12 themselves are not that long, so what you get is a repetition ... not to put the course in a different light but it could probably be a more efficient and more enjoyable course for both teacher and student at a shorter length”

Another respondent unwilling to implement referred to the lack of time in the English 12 teaching period for emphasizing technical materials, as well as the perceived needs of the students: “One of the difficulties is that there just isn’t time enough. We have so many students who have English as a second language, that it’s just a huge challenge to help these kids just learn the fluency ... so these specific skills there’s very little time for that; and the kids also most of them are university bound and they want to have sophisticated language ...”

BELIEFS ABOUT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CHANGE
In their statements about reasons for being willing or unwilling to implement the new curriculum, respondents referred to the four characteristics of change – need, clarity, complexity, and practicality/quality.

NEED
Need for the new TPC12 curriculum was seen by respondents who saw the new course as a suitable alternative because they believed in emphasis on non-literary, pragmatic texts. Some of then stated the need for an alternative to studying Literature: “I think that English 12 has a limited audience appeal ... I took four years at university which was the analysis of Literature and yet that had absolutely no relevance to my future as an educator or as an entrepreneur later in life.”

Other respondents referred to the need for students to study other types of English, that were provided by the new course: “People are just going to know how to write reports and read manuals”

“I think students in TPC12 tend to write perhaps even more than they do in English 12 ... it’s a mistake to say to students that they only thing English has to offer is poetry prose Shakespeare ... it’s good that we’ve given them those skills pretty much every grade ... by the time we get them to grade 12 they should really have a
choice. We offer students a chance to focus themselves and develop their talents in terms of what they take for their grade 12 studies.”

On the other hand, several respondents did not see a need for the new course. Excerpts from their statements verify their belief in the need for English 12:

“Kids who choose that (TPC12) and don’t take English 12 they’re missing that global perspective ... so it’s too restrictive in its scope ... there is no use of narrative and I think being able to understand narrative in the simplest form is a part of being able to build and recognize culture”

“I don’t think everyone needs the technical but I do think everyone needs the more abstract”

(The new course does not fulfill a need because) “it is very focused and says nothing about the literary canon or cultural background”

(The new course does not fulfill a need because) “if students are going into the field of technical professional communications they should be learning far more than just writing memos and manuals”

CLARITY
Statements that represented false clarity were made by respondents unwilling to implement, who likely believed in the established course and did not know much about the new course made assumptions about its objectives and content. Some statements that demonstrated beliefs that parts of the new course had been a part of the established course were:

“A number of the learning outcomes that are in the TPC12, they’re valid but ... many of those outcomes are found elsewhere, in the English curriculum, even in the Career and Personal Planning curriculum”

“Given all the effort that we’ve put into Career and Personal Planning and integrating it into the English 11, when we come up with this TPC course we took a look at it ... and nobody wanted to do it”

“We have second language speakers, and there’s a lot of feeling that they need to get English, and not sort of opt into something technical”

“The objectives that TPC has are a very short list of some of the goals that are included in the English 11 and 12 IRP”

Some statements that upheld the low awareness levels about TPC12 among respondents unwilling to implement were:

“I don’t know entirely, but it’s one word, I mean who knows it might be in the title that put me off, is the word ‘professional’, it leads me to think that it is career training”

“I’ve never taught that (TPC12) ... I’ve only seen overviews, I’ve heard varying reviews on the course ... we’re not especially keen on it at our school because we don’t like the idea of replacing English 12”

“Technical writing requires a lot of process learning ... and I really don’t know very much about it”

A second aspect of false clarity that Fullan discussed occurs when the change is interpreted in an oversimplified way. In the present study, two respondents willing to implement cautioned about such “literal” interpretation, because they feared too much emphasis on technology:

“I always maintain TPC12 was an English course, the computer skills and graphics is only a tool, and now there are a lot of teachers ... that are so excited about TPC but ... it’s almost as if they’ve discovered the computer”
“TPC12 has a lot of things that English 12 doesn’t, you know, you get into the ... computer part of it ... the graphics ... but again if you go too far into that, if you build the course too much around those then suddenly it isn’t an English course”

Other evidence of false clarity in the present study came from some of the respondents who stated that the new course was a replacement for a low status course, i.e., for Communications 12:

“It seems to me that the kids that will go into a technical communications course are not as strong at English, that’s the understanding isn’t it ... I think it’s still important that they learn the basics in writing, they might not need the high level stuff the English 12 students learn but they can come out with a basic understanding of good writing skills ... I think technical writing would be a better fit (than Communications 12)”

“From what I have seen, the course is quite difficult and could not replace Communications 12 which is offered for weaker/non-academic students”

“It was a lot of confusion last year, there were students who took TPC who thought it was Communications 12 and there were others who shied away from it for that reason ... so we’ve made a point this year and I went around to all of our grade 11 English classes and told them exactly what the course is about”

COMPLEXITY
In the present study, some respondents saw the lack of complexity as one of the disadvantages of the new course when compared with the established course. Representative statements were:

“Students would be missing out on reading and writing if they only took TPC12”

“They (students) will have a strong background in one area of language skills, but may miss opportunities to work with the more personal aspects of language and communication”

“It is not intellectually challenging and this misrepresents the expectations of the workplace (and further studies) related to technical studies”

“There is little in-service and no anthology of appropriate readings”

QUALITY/PRACTICALITY
One of the frequently quoted measures of effectiveness and source of pride for teachers is student feedback. In the present study, respondents who had taught the new course referred to positive feedback from students. Some examples were:

“It’s very rewarding to teach the course because ... the students are there by choice ... generally they’re motivated to be there for one reason or another ... and I’ve just found it so interesting to see the development of the students in terms of their writing and communication abilities”

“One of the boys who just loved the course, a total fanatic you know, he was a real flag-waver for TPC12, bright kid, very articulate, he went on to Camosun and I called him (recently) and asked him, did TPC12 prepare him enough, because he was going to take English at Camosun, and he said, oh yes it was fine, it gave him everything he needed”

“I worked this year with a class of eighteen (students) and many of them found their language skills and the use of language being better enhanced with textbook materials that made more sense to them”

A possible reason for inadequate quality of new curriculum could be that the change has been externally initiated, due to political reasons. Some of the respondents’ statements were:

“It is focused entirely on the capitalist economic system .. it provides opportunities in a very narrow scope, and once again that scope is business economic industrial oriented”
"And then you get another course like the TPC being shuttled into the system without any sort of true consultation going on, as if it were some brilliant brainchild of somebody out there who has got the ear of the government and said you know these students are not properly prepared for the business world ... they say this is what we're proposing we're going to eliminate all these other communications courses ... this will eventually replace English 12, and English teachers are going oh my gosh not again ... you're not consulted you're just told this is what you're going to be teaching, so that does not go down well"

"I seem to be thinking that it's quite the political reason why they've floated it (TPC12) and I think the whole emphasis on applied academics is probably one of the reasons why they floated this one ... it sounds very much (like) it answers a call for a ... productive citizen, a money-making citizen"

"I'd really like to see the Ministry take some leadership ... they were determined to have it as an option to English 12 and they should look at what's happening, it's not being accepted so obviously something is lacking, and they might want to rethink how they give credit for senior English"

### Availability of Resources

The following are some typical respondents' statements about the availability of resources:

"The next thing would be the opportunities to put it in the technical aspect when we look at being able to use technology to enhance the presentations"

"I offer it (TPC12) in a computer managed learning system ... and we're now looking at offering it over the internet ... and in addition we obviously use the internet, we use the world wide web of applied academic lessons"

For a new course, resources often have to be created afresh, and teachers sometimes have to find the resources themselves. The following statements point to this:

"I think the teachers need time to get into the materials ... they definitely need the start up kit that's been put out by Applied Academics"

"Certainly in terms of resources there's a lot out there which has not yet been developed, given the fact that it's (TPC12) still in its infancy and many teachers are ... putting their own style into it and figuring out the resources ... when I'm planning ... I create the resources that I need as I'm going through the teaching"

"To start off with they need to have computer labs with some programs to work with to keep learning how to put together publications, reports, and pamphlets, and documents to give presentations and so on"

### Collegial Support

The following statements made by respondents exemplify the need for collegial support and feedback from students:

"Probably the biggest access for them (teachers teaching TPC12) would be to meet with somebody who's done TPC and who believes in TPC ... I think it would be great for them to meet the students"

"We need some kind of organization, some kind of sitting down together with other teachers and saying this is how things should be, and then you also need to pilot it to see if the kids are going to like it, they may hate it"

However, in the present study, respondents who had taught the new course found that they had to seek support from outside their own department, because English teachers were by and large not in favour of its implementation:

"I was left very much on my own in the beginning, a lot of the English department didn't like the course ... so I really received a lot more support from the computer department ... and then the science department helped me out"