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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to examine how elementary classroom teachers respond to the task of implementing the 1985 B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum Guide in one urban elementary school. This research examined what motivates teachers to engage in an implementation process. Two questions guided this study:

1. In a setting where conditions appear to be optimum for implementation of the new art curriculum, what significant factors appear to influence the implementation process for the fifteen participating teachers?

2. With respect to the identification and management of factors which might suggest reasons that influence the extent of the implementation process, what similarities and differences appear among the fifteen teachers?

The researcher identified information that suggested how and why implementation occurred in this setting, through a case study format using triangulated research methods that entailed the following: the interaction of data from pre- and post-implementation interviews, classroom observations of the teachers' art classes by the researcher, observations of separate art lessons by an independent observer, an analysis by an independent rater of a level of use of the new art curriculum, the principal's diary notes, and school records. The data gathering time entailed one school year. The data gathering was followed by the analyses of the data to establish patterns and relationships which might suggest what did
influence the implementation process for the teachers in this setting.

Three groups of implementers emerged from this research: full implementers, partial implementers, and non-implementers. The findings suggest three main reasons that seem to account for the way that teachers coped with the art curriculum implementation. They are: (a) the teachers' philosophical stance as to why art education is important, (b) the teachers' sense of personal efficacy, and (c) the synergy among the implementing teachers. The teachers who implemented shared a common philosophy as to why art education is important, one which was compatible with that in the new art curriculum guide. They also shared a sense of personal efficacy directed towards the implementation and a form of synergy that encouraged cooperative planning and a sharing of ideas. The major conclusion is that to increase the likelihood of full implementation, the implementation process must do more than simply address the factors identified by the teachers as being crucial to successful implementation. The art curriculum implementation process needs to have as its focus a rationale for elementary school art, the "why of art education" as well as ways to increase the synergy among the teachers and the sense of efficacy among the individual teachers. The research suggests that implementation is incremental and therefore that to increase the likelihood that more teachers will implement, the implementation process needs to be extended to two years for the partial implementers and three years for those who tend to be non-implementers.
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Chapter I

This research examines how fifteen elementary classroom teachers of art responded to the implementation of the 1985 B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum in one large urban school in which the environment appeared to be conducive to the art curriculum change. There is general agreement in the educational change and school effect literature reviewed that school context and how individual teachers function in that context significantly influence the direction of educational change. Currently there is a paucity of data grounded in the reality of school life relative to specific teacher and school characteristics that may positively or negatively impact curriculum change. Observations and interviews were conducted during one school year to try to uncover those factors which seemed to influence the art curriculum implementation for the teachers. The assumption is made that a better understanding of how individual teachers respond to the implementation of an art curriculum in one elementary school in which the environment appears to be supportive of the change, may provide some insights pertinent to how and why curriculum change, particularly of an elementary art curriculum, occurs.

This chapter is organized into the following seven sections:
(a) background of the general problem and the 1985 Fine Arts Curriculum Guide,
(b) the research problem,
(c) rationale and justification for the study,
(d) summary of main elements of the research,
(e) purpose, and
(f) research questions and the organization of the
dissertation.

Background of the Problem

Schools are a part of the socio-political and economic structure. As such they are expected to make a contribution to that structure. Society expects schools to socialize new members and to have them gain and expand the knowledge required to become responsible and contributing citizens. To perform this function schools should be responsive to the issues and events precipitating social change.

As a result of events and issues in society, schools are expected to change in areas, such as bureaucracy, technology, programs and curriculum. Pressures to change come from within the school system, from Ministries of Education, local school boards, and educators themselves. Pressures to change also come from special interest groups and from individuals and groups responding to various socio-political and economic changes such as economic recession, immigration, and technological advances.

Although society expects schools to change in a number of areas, it is the school curricula and curricular programs that are the primary instrument for serving societal expectations and the basic resource schools have to do their job. Curricula and school curricular programs reflect what students should know to take their place in society.
In Canada, education is a provincial matter. The Ministries of Education are responsible for school curricula. The local school boards and individual schools are given various degrees of autonomy to introduce locally developed programs, such as Decisions, an alcohol and drug abuse program, and to monitor the implementation of both the Ministry-introduced curricula and the locally-developed programs.

In eight prescribed subject areas, curriculum documents introduced by the B.C. Ministry of Education are reviewed and revised on an ongoing basis, but at irregular intervals. The areas are: language arts; mathematics; social studies; science; physical education; and fine arts (art, drama, and music). Periodically, in response to various emerging events and issues in society, the B.C. Ministry of Education introduces additional curriculum areas such as the Family Life Education Curriculum (1987).

The major difference between Ministry-introduced curricular changes and school district-introduced programs is that Ministry-introduced curricular changes are always mandated. Similar expectations are imposed on all teachers of the subject area to implement the curriculum within the specified time lines. The implementation of school district-introduced programs are generally more flexible and frequently optional. The 1985 Elementary Fine Arts Curriculum Guide is an example of a curriculum change mandated by the B.C. Ministry of Education. The expectation is that all elementary teachers of art will implement the Ministry curriculum change within the specified guidelines.
The new *Fine Arts Curriculum Guide* is a response by the B.C. Ministry of Education to perceived changes about the artistic understanding and knowledge that should be developed in young people. The curriculum is based on the assumption that society should be informed about the arts as well as about other Ministry-mandated curriculum areas such as mathematics and social studies. Although art, music and drama are separately allocated only 60 minutes each per school week (less than any other prescribed subject area), the Ministry of Education expects that teachers not only allocate the appropriate number of minutes per school week to fine arts, but also implement the prescribed curriculum changes. The development, dissemination, and implementation of the new Fine Arts Curriculum are similar to other Ministry-prescribed curriculum changes.

The art component of the 1985 *Fine Arts Curriculum Guide* is the result of several years of persistent effort on the part of various individuals. Dissatisfied with the dated art curriculum document and concerned with the quality of elementary school art programs, art teachers, art coordinators, university art educators, and art associations began to pressure the curriculum branch of the B.C. Ministry of Education to undertake a revision of the current art curriculum guide. Music and drama educators were also lobbying for change. Numerous discussions took place among arts educators. Articles were written and reports such as the 1979 *B.C. Committee on Arts and Education Report* were compiled in the hopes of initiating change and influencing the direction of the change. In 1980, in response to years of pressure and collective action taken by
art, music, and drama educators, the Curriculum Development Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Education conducted a needs assessment survey. As a result of the survey, the Ministry decided to develop an interrelated arts curriculum. An Elementary Fine Arts Curriculum Committee was struck to study the proposed changes and to make recommendations. The committee was composed of one university art educator, coordinators from the Curriculum Development Branch of the B.C. Ministry of Education, and a cross section of music, art and drama teachers and administrators.

Between 1980 and 1984 several members of the Elementary Fine Arts Committee ceased to work on the revision task. A small group of committed art educators completed the final version of the art component of the new Fine Arts Curriculum. During the spring of 1984, a draft of the new art curriculum was made available. One year later the final version was issued to the B.C. public schools. This was the first major elementary art curriculum revision undertaken in British Columbia in over thirty years. New elementary art curriculum guides were issued in 1964, 1968 and 1972; however, the changes were so minor that the new documents were simply reprints of the original 1952 version (Appendix 1). It was not until 1985 that a completely revised art curriculum document was issued to the B.C. elementary schools. The implications of this protracted process lead one to believe that opportunities for studying this particular change phenomenon will not be repeated in the near future.

The majority of past educational change efforts, whether mandated or optional, have not succeeded in making a long-term
impact on classroom practice (Fullan 1982; Common, 1983a, 1983b; McNeil, 1978). This suggests that changes in curricula and past strategies to implement them have not been sufficient to alter practice.

Research related to educational change is relatively recent. During the past two decades some understanding has been gained of the educational change process. Fullan states, "Intensive research has produced enough evidence for us to be fairly confident about what factors have the most influence" (1982, p. 55). Fullan lists fifteen factors which influence the direction of educational change (1982, p. 56). These include the "clarity" of the change, principals' level of support of the change and teacher relationships. This information, however, has not been sufficient to change classroom practice. Fullan (1982, p. 392) notes that "despite a great deal of very good research on factors related to school improvement, we do not have much specific knowledge about how and why improvement occurs." The conditions which foster change for teachers are not clear.

How teachers respond to and experience change is recognized to be influenced by the context in which they work. In view of this, several researchers have called for specific case studies to examine how teachers implement new curricula or programs within a variety of school settings (Fullan, 1982; Goodlad, 1983b; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; McLaughlin & Thomas, 1984).

There is a scarcity of information related to school-based conditions that encourage teachers to implement new curricula. Little attention has been devoted to gaining a better understanding
of these conditions in the natural school setting. The literature reviewed suggests that a range of impediments to implementation emerge in individual schools and classrooms, and that specific data grounded in the school experience are needed to help understand why teachers have resisted the vast majority of educational change efforts. Therefore, because additional descriptions of implementation processes may assist educators in removing some of the impediments, this study has been designed to provide needed descriptive data.

The Research Problem

The literature reviewed suggests that the nature of the school environment and teacher characteristics play a primary role in positively or negatively influencing educational change. What specific school environmental and teacher characteristics appear to support curriculum implementation, especially art curriculum implementation, is not clear.

The outcomes of an implementation are contingent on how teachers respond to the many factors that teachers confront inside the classroom and inside the school during the implementation process. Therefore, to add to the knowledge base of how and why curriculum change occurs, data are needed which are grounded in the school experience as teachers engage in the process of translating a curriculum document into classroom practice.

Elementary school art programs have been particularly resistant to change (Chalmers, 1979; Efland 1976b; Eisner, 1978; Gray, 1980). Since the new art curriculum document is the first
major revision in British Columbia in over thirty years, research related to the implementation of this new curriculum may be of interest not only to art educators, but also to individuals involved with provincial educational agencies, and with educational change efforts in general.

The problem this study is designed to address is best expressed as a question; namely, "What are the positive or negative influences evident in a mandated art curriculum implementation process undertaken in an elementary school?"

Rationale and Justification for the Study

The assumption that a mandated curriculum change will be translated into classroom practice does not seem warranted. In reality, factors related to the school environment and to individual classroom teachers impact upon implementation negatively or positively. Educational change research has frequently ignored how classroom teachers respond in their natural school setting to the complexities of translating a curriculum document into practice and why they respond the way that they do. What school environmental and individual teacher characteristics impede or enhance curriculum implementation and how and why these characteristics impede or enhance curriculum implementation, particularly art curriculum implementation, in a certain direction is only vaguely understood. Case studies of teachers engaged in the implementation task in different school settings may augment the understanding of how curriculum implementation does or does not occur.
Justifications for this assumption have been derived from a review of literature citing a need to build on the knowledge base provided by Fullan and others of how and why implementation occurs, by focusing research on the actual implementation process inside the natural setting of the school.

Conclusions in the literature are that implementation can be better understood by studying teachers engaged in the actual process of implementing curriculum change within their school and classrooms. Teachers have the primary responsibility for implementing new curricula. What teachers actually do in practice to thwart or enhance the implementation of new curricula needs to be examined directly.

A case study of fifteen elementary teachers engaged in the implementation of the art component of the new B.C. Ministry of Education 1985 Fine Arts Curriculum in one large urban elementary school was conducted. The research is a field study in a natural school setting during one school year. Of special significance is the focus of this research because it provides an opportunity to study a Ministry-mandated curriculum change in an area that has been particularly undirected and therefore unstudied in respect to change. The research provides a unique opportunity to gain insights into art curriculum change in a setting in which all teachers have agreed to participate in a study of the implementation process and in which the principal is known to be supportive of the implementation and knowledgeable about the curriculum area. These conditions may be of positive value when trying to achieve educational change.
The 1979 B.C. Committee on Arts and Education suggested that a revised elementary art curriculum guide would be the catalyst needed to change the orientation of elementary school art programs. This research was an opportunity to investigate the impact of the new Ministry-mandated art curriculum change in one particular elementary school setting and in so doing, to provide evidence about possible justification for the sanguine hopes of the curriculum document writers.

During one school year (1984-1985), through direct interactions with, and observation of, the teachers responsible for implementing the new art curriculum, implementation was documented.

For the purposes of this research, implementation is defined as "fidelity" (Fullan, 1982, p.31) in practice relative to the goals and content areas specified in the 1985 B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum Guide.

By shedding light on the process that teachers go through to implement, and by identifying factors that appear to emerge as primary in influencing the extent of the implementation for the individual teachers in one school setting, the way may be opened to the development of strategies that will make implementation of future educational change more feasible in similar contexts. It is assumed that the findings will have implications for other curriculum areas as well.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to examine how elementary classroom teachers of art respond to the process of implementing a new art curriculum in one urban elementary school. Specifically, this research represents an attempt to understand who implements and why, by providing a descriptive account of what teachers in one particular school say and do as they engage in the art curriculum implementation process during the first year of its implementation.

It is here claimed that the data collected from pre- and post-implementation interviews, classroom observations of the teachers' art lessons, informal conversations and school records will combine to form a picture that may yield insights as to why teachers choose "to implement or not to implement."

Curriculum implementation is a process problem. Currently there is a paucity of data grounded in practice regarding specific school environmental and teacher characteristics which facilitate or impede the process. What motivates teachers to implement is not clear. Fullan notes "innovations are rationally sold on the basis of sound theory and principles, but they turn out not to be translatable into practice with the resources at the disposal of teachers" (1982, p. 115). By obtaining first-hand feedback from the teachers based on their current personal involvement with the new art curriculum implementation, and by means of direct observations of the teachers during the actual implementation process, data were gathered which may provide insights about the specific factors which appear to impede or facilitate art curriculum implementation in this urban elementary school.
The research may also provide the data to generate additional research questions about curriculum implementation. In so doing it can contribute to improved approaches for future educational change efforts. It stands, therefore, as a contribution to the process of developing constructive research hypotheses.

Research Questions

Since the purpose of this case study was to describe how elementary teachers of art respond to the implementation of the new elementary art curriculum, and specifically to examine what happens during an actual implementation process to motivate teachers to implement, the following two questions guided this study:

1. In a setting where conditions appear to be optimum for implementation of the new art curriculum, what significant factors appear to influence the implementation process for the fifteen participating teachers?

2. With respect to the identification and management of factors which might suggest reasons that may influence the extent of the implementation process, what similarities and differences appear among the fifteen teachers?

Literature Review and Organization of the Study

In Chapter II, the literature review establishes the need to focus on the real world of the teachers in their natural school setting in order to build on the knowledge base of how and why implementation occurs. The literature reviewed recognizes that previous research findings do not appear to have been useful in
promoting successful activities directed toward having the bulk of recommended curriculum theory translated into classroom practice.

The educational change, school effect, and art education literature was reviewed for implications to further understanding of factors that influence the direction of curriculum change for the classroom teacher. Two broad philosophical positions emerged. The first position argues that improved educational change is a matter of improved planning and organization by individuals in various levels of the educational hierarchy. This position suggests that an increased understanding of how teachers manage the various factors affecting change in the context of their school and classroom setting is needed in order that individuals in the various levels of the educational hierarchy may function with an improved knowledge base to better plan and manage the implementation of new curricula and programs.

The second position argues that improved educational change is more likely to occur if classroom teachers are given more autonomy to manage their own educational change efforts. This position suggests that an increased understanding of how teachers manage factors affecting change in their natural classroom and school setting is needed in order to provide the classroom teachers with the knowledge base to take responsibility for planning and administering their own program change and curriculum change.

The art education literature reviewed has been concerned mainly with the best content, or approaches to be implemented, rather than how to implement the content or approach. Numerous elementary art program models have been advocated, but very few
have been implemented (Lanier, 1981; Nadaner, 1984b). The preoccupation with finding the best model or approach (Andrews, 1980) appears to assume that elementary classroom teachers of art share common premises with the advocates of the various models and approaches, and that teachers, regardless of circumstance, have the capability of translating the recommended theoretical positions into classroom practice. The teachers' background and the realities of the teachers' day-to-day world seem to be ignored.

Several art educators acknowledge that the preoccupation with identifying the best model or approach has not resulted in changing elementary school art programs (Chalmers, 1979; Efland 1976; Nadaner, 1984a; Rafferty, 1987). These researchers are calling for a closer examination of what happens to art programs in the reality of the classroom and school setting in order to increase our knowledge of what influences teachers of art to implement change.

The literature reviewed recognizes that factors affecting the direction of educational change for teachers are context bound; therefore, more research based in the natural school setting needs to be done to gain a better understanding of what influences the direction of curriculum change for teachers.

Chapter III discusses the design of the inquiry. Chapter IV presents the data with respect to the extent of implementation. Chapter V presents the data to determine factors that influence the implementation process for the teachers. Chapter VI summarizes the factors that appear to impede or enhance the art curriculum implementation, discusses the similarities and differences that emerge among the teachers, and presents the research findings.
The conclusions and limitations of the study and recommendations are presented in the last chapter.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

Introduction

In order to contribute to our understanding of the conditions that encourage teachers to implement or to not implement art curriculum change, this review of literature establishes the need to focus on the practical circumstances faced by the elementary classroom teachers of art in their efforts to implement new curricula. The educational change, school effect and art education literature was reviewed for implications relevant to the topic.

The bulk of the literature was selected from works published since 1970. Literature directly related to the topic was not extensive prior to that date. Prior to 1970, educational change literature focused primarily on curriculum development and evaluation rather than on the implementation process. However, during the 1970s and 1980s, researchers became increasingly aware of the failure of educational change proposals to be implemented into practice (Sarason, 1971; Fullan, 1982). In 1971 Sarason (p. 22) commented that there exists a "marked discrepancy between the number of proposals to change the system and the number of proposals actually implemented." With this increased awareness, a concern arose among school practitioners and researchers to find ways to improve this situation. Researchers shifted their focus to the change process. The bulk of the educational change literature published between 1970 and the present focuses on school improvement and school effect (Goodlad, 1983a; Mann, 1978;
Mortimer & Sammons, 1987; Rutter, 1979), and specifically on the implementation of educational change efforts (Fullan, 1982; Kimpston, 1985). From the literature related to both school improvement and the implementation of educational change arose a call for a closer examination of the school and classroom context during the actual change process. Fullan (1982, p. 391) notes, "Despite a great deal of very good research on factors related to school improvement, we do not have much specific knowledge about how and why improvement occurs." Fullan (1982, p. 4) recommends that in order to improve future educational change efforts, case studies of "how people actually experience change" in their school and classroom contexts are needed.

Two broad positions related to the management of factors that appear to influence the direction of educational change also emerged from this literature. The first position is that improved implementation will result from more effective centralized control, and from planning and management of the factors influencing the change process on the part of the central administration. The second view is that more successful implementation will occur if individual school staffs are given more autonomy to manage their own change. Both positions state that research needs to focus on the school context during the actual implementation process in order to gain a better understanding of specific factors that may impede or enhance the change effort in various school and classroom situations.

The issues that emerge from the literature related to educational change are also relevant for art education. In art
education, however, the change process associated with the implementation of new curricula has been relatively unexamined. The remainder of this chapter is organized into four parts: past change efforts and recommendations for research grounded in the reality of change process in varying school and classroom contexts; factors that appear to influence curriculum implementation specifically; management of factors affecting curriculum change; and factors that appear to have a bearing on the nature of elementary school art programs.

Past Change Efforts and Recommendations for School-Based Research

Currently there is insufficient information related to the conditions that will foster implementation of new curricula. Loucks and Lieberman (in Kimpson, 1985, p. 185) note: "It is not yet known what should be done to successfully implement new curricula. Relatively few ideas make it behind the classroom door." It is well documented that attempts at implementing educational change efforts have not been very successful (Fullan, 1982; 1986; McNeil, 1978; Sarason, 1971). Fullan (1982, p. 6) similarly observes that "the short history of implementation research is not pleasant. It shows that planned change attempts rarely succeed as intended. McNeil (1978, p. 23) mentions "the best of curriculum technology has not been implemented"; and Sarason (1971) states

The content of curricula changed, new activities appeared, and what people said and talked about took on a different content and quality - but life in the school and classroom...did not change very much, if at all (p. 213).
The dissatisfaction with past efforts to implement curriculum change has resulted in a call for a closer examination of what happens to change effort in practice. Boberg (1985) suggests that the bulk of past curriculum implementation efforts have failed because those individuals responsible for the implementation are either reluctant or unable "to readily apply current theory to practice" (p. 67). She adds that this in turn has resulted in theory being presented in "the course of a one-shot workshop" (p. 68) with little awareness of the realities of the teachers' day to day world. Boberg suggests that, in order to more successfully translate theory into practice, research needs to be done to gain a better understanding of the realities faced by the teachers during the process of implementing change.

Boyce (1983) examined teachers' perspectives in one particular school as teachers were introduced to a new social studies curriculum. Boyce observed that teachers held a somewhat contemptuous attitude towards individuals involved in curriculum development and implementation and resisted change because they felt that these "outside" individuals were unaware of the pressures of the "real world of teaching and the day to day needs of students" (p. 453). He suggests that researchers pay closer attention to the realities faced by classroom teachers when implementing change.

Common (1983a,b) argues that the history of educational innovation has not been successful because of the differing perceptions and roles of the policy makers and classroom teachers who are expected to implement the innovations. According to
Common, the policy makers view the innovation as a good thing that would improve the learning situation, and assume that the curriculum or innovation could be implemented as planned if the teachers simply followed the guidelines. Common suggests that teachers resist change because of the power struggle that results from these two differing perspectives. She notes that "the metaphor" they (the policy makers) employ, describes teachers as agents of their policies and consumers of their products (the innovations) while teachers view themselves as "free actors on an exciting stage influencing and caring for children" (p. 4). Common states that it is this clash that "lies at the root of implementation failure" (p. 4). Common recommends that the key to effective educational implementation procedures in the future is through research that focuses on gaining an understanding of "what it is to be part of the everyday classroom world" rather than "solely the search for a better strategy" (p. 5).

Doyle and Ponder (1977) state that there has been a "consistent failure to change curriculum practice" (p. 27). They note that "there is a marked discrepancy between what curriculum proposal means to its designers and what it means to teachers who are being asked to use it" (p. 27). The researchers (p. 33) suggest that new curriculum areas would "have a greater chance of impacting practice" if "greater attention" were paid "to the contexts in which curriculum practice occurs."

Freiberg, Buckley and Townsen (1980) in their discussion of the role of in-service in promoting educational change, suggest that in-service education has not been effective in having "newly
acquired abilities" transferred into classroom practice because the "organizational context is rarely taken into account" (p. 1).

Goodlad (1983a) in his massive study of school effectiveness focused on innovation and improvement in 1016 classrooms. He attempted to investigate why schools have remained relatively impervious to change. Goodlad states that "if school improvement continues on its present course, our schools will remain very much as they are" (p. 470). He adds that more educators are now realizing that "fundamental redirection is necessary" and that in order to determine the strategies for school improvement, research needs to focus on gaining a better understanding of "the interactions of individuals and other elements in and around schools" (p. 466).

Further to this McNeil (1978, p. 223) argues that "the best of curriculum technology has not been implemented" because decision makers at all levels fail to relate curriculum proposals to the realities of schooling. In addition Norman and Hopkins (1982) in their study related to in-service education, caution that it is unlikely that in-service education will have major impact until the "context of the local environment" is considered (p. 12).

Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlage (1982) conducted a four-year study of six elementary schools to assess the extent to which the new "Individually Guided Education Program" was implemented. They concluded that the ideas proposed by the theorists were significantly modified in practice. The researchers called for school-based case studies to investigate "what conditions within and outside the school influence the modifications of the reform efforts" (ix).
Rubin (1978) looked at the failure of in-service education to effect curriculum change. He recommended that in order to improve future change efforts, research pay closer attention to the real world in which the teachers function and the "educational and social values that the teachers embrace" (p. 8). Several years later Tompkins (1981) focused on in-service education. He argued that "research has tended to be of little value because it has not been undertaken from the school's perspective, rather it has been undertaken from the perspective of researchers, policy makers and administrators" (p. 5).

Wideen (1984) in his investigation related to school cultures and in-service education notes that "school improvement efforts are unsuccessful in terms of having any long-term effect" because they "typically do not attend to the characteristics of schools as they are. . . but as they would like them to be" (p. 1-2). He recommended that the "unique culture in the school. . . must be taken into account by those who plan and carry out in-service education if their efforts are to have any lasting effects upon the school" (p. 17).

Art educators have similarly called for research to examine the day to day circumstances faced by the classroom teachers of art in their endeavours to implement. Rafferty (1987) looked at the practical circumstances that influence the art teaching task for the elementary classroom teacher. She advocates "studying classroom conditions that teachers must confront" in order to build on the knowledge base needed to bridge "the gap between theory and practice" (p. 7). She states that "lack of awareness of the audience for whom the curricula are intended has resulted in a deficiency in
clarity of purpose and conceptual meaning in making the orientations operational" (p. 20).

Factors that Appear to Influence Curriculum Implementation

Research has not succeeded in revealing why the bulk of curriculum change efforts meet implementation resistance. There is agreement in the literature, however, regarding general factors that influence the direction of educational change. Fullan (1982) states "research has produced enough evidence for us to be fairly confident about what factors have the most influence" (p. 55). Fullan notes that although it is known that these factors influence the direction of change, it is not known how change occurs in practice. Fullan adds that because these factors are often perceived differently by the developers and the users of the change, research needs to generate more information regarding the practical circumstances faced by the teachers and administrators in their natural school setting during the implementation process.

Fullan groups the factors influencing the implementation of educational change into four broad categories: "characteristics of the change" itself; "characteristics at the school district level"; "characteristics at the school level" and the role played by the ministries of education (p. 56). Fullan's four categories are used as a framework to discuss what the literature has to say about the factors influencing curriculum implementation.

Fullan states that the characteristics of the change entail factors such as the perceived need and clarity of the change and the quality and practicality of the learning materials. The perceived
need for a particular change effort on the part of teachers and administrators appears to be an important factor in positively influencing the implementation of educational change efforts (Common, 1983a,b; Fullan, 1982; McLaughlin & Thomas, 1984).

Although it is recognized that a clear and practical curriculum document and supporting materials are an important starting point in any curriculum change effort, (Fullan, 1982; McLaughlin & Thomas, 1984) the content of new curricula and supporting materials do not emerge as a major factor in influencing implementation success. Several researchers argue that it is not the content of programs and materials that are significant; rather the significant factor in relation to content concerns is whether or not teachers have the skills or desire to translate the content into practice. Doyle and Ponder (1977) suggest that although the content of the change is important from a philosophical perspective, it may not be a critical factor in determining the effectiveness of the implementation itself.

Eisner's (1979) Stanford Kettering Project was an attempt to improve art programs by attempting to develop materials that would be readily understood and accepted by the teachers without having to resort to implementation in-service. The objectives of the project were not met. Eisner concluded that teachers with a minimal art background do not have skills required to implement change. Following the Kettering Project, Eisner became increasingly convinced that developing new curriculum materials and making program revisions were not sufficient to bring about changes in the school art programs. He suggests that the focus needs to be turned
to improving teacher qualification. He states "to believe that it is possible to develop artistically significant art programs without artistically competent teachers is to believe in what never was and what never will be" (1973, p. 12).

Similarly, other researchers have suggested that although teachers express concerns about the practicality of the curriculum document or program materials and indicate a preference for concrete, step-by-step programs and guides, it is the teachers' understanding or commitment to gaining an understanding of the curriculum content and implementation strategies that make the difference (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Fullan, 1982).

**Characteristics at the School District Level**

The literature suggests that "central administrative support" (Fullan, p. 56) is of primary importance in influencing the direction of curriculum implementation. Central administrative support includes budget allocations for in-service, for release time for teachers to attend workshops, for the purchase of supplementary materials, and for the appointment of curriculum coordinators, as well as verbalized support for the specific implementation process.

Berman and McLaughlin (1976), in a review of federally funded programs, state that "teachers may not put in the extra effort and emotional investment necessary for successful implementation" if they feel that the change effort is not a district priority. Berman and McLaughlin emphasize that "the attitudes of administrators in effect tell the staff how seriously they should take project objectives" (p. 340).
Cavenagh and Styles (1983) suggest that the implementation of educational change will be facilitated if the central administration considers the following when planning and organizing curriculum change efforts:

(a) recruitment of consultants by "leadership officials,"
(b) presentation of new curriculum area to trustees,
(c) establishment of "board-wide curriculum committees,"
(d) identification of criteria to evaluate new programs, and
(e) direct intervention by board officials and principals of teachers who impede implementation process.

Cavenagh and Styles state that one reason implementation does not occur is because teachers impede the process by complaining of: a paucity of resources, lack of practical curriculum content, and lack of time. The authors recommend that "leadership officials" respond to these teacher concerns as follows: In response to teachers' concerns about the paucity of resources to effect change, Cavenagh and Styles recommend "fund-raising projects"; in response to teachers' concerns about more practical and less theoretical curriculum materials, the authors suggest that teachers need to accept theoretical components of the curriculum document as a good thing because "the introduction of clearly stated objectives leads to more sharply focused instruction and more precise measurement of what has been learned" (p. 10); and in response to teachers' concerns as to whether the time they invest in attempting to implement the new curriculum will prove to be worth their while, the writers suggest that the teachers should be willing to invest this time because "the 'pay-off' in terms of improved
student learning must be perceived as worth the cost in time and effort" (p. 10).

Dow and Whitehead (1983) administered a questionnaire to randomly selected Ontario public school teachers, consultants and principals. One of the purposes of the study was to identify barriers that block educators from effectively implementing new curricula. The researchers identified the following organizational aspects that fall under the jurisdiction of school board administrators as factors influencing the implementation of educational change: provisions for long-term in-service; release time for teachers to become familiar with the curriculum document, to attend in-service and to do cooperative planning; more adequate classroom resources to supplement the new curriculum; the provision of more information about the new guide to the teachers and principals prior to the implementation; and clearly articulated roles for various individuals responsible for the implementation process.

Fullan (1982) suggested that more successful educational change is essentially a problem of improved planning and organization. He recommends a centralized approach to educational change. He sees district-based administrators as playing the crucial role in facilitating change. They are seen as taking the primary responsibility for planning, organizing and evaluating the change process. The principal is viewed as playing a similar role at the school level.

Fullan states that

The chief executive officer and other key central administrators set the conditions for implementation to
the extent that they show specific forms of support and active knowledge and understanding of the realities of attempting to put a change into practice (p. 65).

Fullan emphasizes that "implementation is an organizational process with all that that entails both within the school and in relation to external contacts." Fullan does not view the teachers as having the time or expertise to bring about change on their own. The change for Fullan is a matter of improved planning and organization on the part of individuals in various positions of power, rather than an attempt to address the varying teacher characteristics and needs.

An empirical study conducted by Fullan and associates in 1986 confirms Fullan's earlier position. In an attempt to determine what procedures are used by school boards to facilitate and monitor curriculum change, Fullan conducted interviews with superintendents and a randomly selected cross section of consultants, principals and teachers in four Ontario Boards of Education. The following central administration-controlled factors emerged as facilitating curriculum implementation: district focus on curriculum; strong leadership by superintendents, principals and coordinators; district allocation of money for in-service, release time and the implementation process in general; and a high value placed on the implementation by the director of instruction. He concludes that the answer to more effective implementation of change lies in an "organizational or systems approach to program improvement" (p. 319).

The Rand Research Study (1984) sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts identified the following central administration-controlled factors as influencing implementation: a
prescriptive curriculum, adequate budget allocations, central administrative support, assistance and program monitoring by expert consultants and specialists, long-term concrete in-service, and school-based model programs to provide guidance for other district schools.

An example of a highly centralized, bureaucratic approach to a form of effective implementation comes from Finland. A research study related to art curriculum implementation in Finland suggests that centralized compulsory in-service programs facilitate implementation by increasing the teacher's comfort with the subject area. Kauppinen (1980) investigated the implementation of the basic art objectives within the Finnish comprehensive school system. The findings, measured on the basis of test scores, indicate that the students achieved the basic art objectives. Kauppinen concludes that the required comprehensive in-service education given by the Finnish National Board of Education resulted in positive teacher attitudes towards the implementation and a thorough understanding of the comprehensive school art curriculum.

Kimpston (1985) conducted research to determine relationships among the degree of congruence between a planned and actual curriculum (p. 195). Kimpston found that one major constraint to implementation was "the absence of an established process in the district for carrying out the task" (p. 195).

McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) in their discussions related to staff development suggest that in order to facilitate implementation, district administrators need to promote and organize long-term in-service.
Leithwood (1986) concurs that improved planning and organization of curriculum implementation efforts under the umbrella of the central school district administration is needed to facilitate educational change. To assist administrators, curriculum coordinators and supervisors and others responsible for overseeing the change effort, with this task, Leithwood presents an organization system to manage and monitor the curriculum change.

Minsky, Wideman, and Dilling (1984) conducted a survey of principals' perceptions of their role in curriculum implementation. One-hour interviews related to principals' perception of their role in the implementation process were conducted with 24 Ontario elementary school principals. The principals identified the following central office-controlled factors as impeding change efforts: lack of clearly articulated school board policy regarding specific implementation, lack of time to read and absorb curriculum guides, lack of support services available to assist with implementation, too much time spent on developing programs and guides and too little time on implementation, absence of coordinators directly involved at school level, lack of a specific implementation plan formulated by Board, absence of in-service for principals, overload of new guides that must be addressed, and lack of money allocated to the implementation. The principals felt that it was the lack of leadership, organization, planning and support on the part of the central office administrators that was the primary cause of implementation failure.

Walter Werner (1983) and his associates note that in order for effective implementation to occur, the district needs to give prior-
ity to the following: the appointment of "advocates within the
district and within the school" (p. 120), adequate time for imple­
mentation, skilled district and school-based curriculum coordina­
tors; low turnover of staff during implementation, adequate funding,
classroom follow-up, and a focus on one curriculum area at a time to
avoid "implementation overload" (p. 13). The principal as head of the
school needs to oversee and support the implementation process.

Characteristics at the School Level

Characteristics at the school level include factors such as
principal support, teacher attitude and involvement, and staff
interactions.

Beattie (1982) suggests that negative attitudes of teachers
toward policy makers is the primary reason the majority of educa­
tional change efforts have failed. She feels that educational change
is possible but that it must be initiated by the teachers themselves.
She suggests that the role of outside educators and Ministry person­
nel should be to support teachers and to assist them to meet their
perceived needs rather than to initiate change or act as leaders.
Beattie is critical of Fullan's centralized approach to implementa­
tion. She states that it "leaves teachers little autonomy" and consid­
ers "the teacher's individual characteristics as... insignificant" (p.
100). Beattie is also critical of province-wide implementation
schemes. She suggests that such schemes are wasteful and unneces­
sary. Her recommendation is to give teachers "maximum school
autonomy" and to reduce "administrative bureaucracy" (p. 102) to a
minimum. Beattie recommends that administrators play the role of "helpful partners" and not educational leaders.

Boberg (1985) notes a lack of commitment towards educational change efforts at all levels of the administrative hierarchy. She suggests that because of this lack of commitment, school-based change efforts may hold more promise. Boberg notes that to effect meaningful integration of theory and practice in schools, every effort must be made to understand the school as an organization and the ways people behave in it (p. 69).

Ben-Peretz and Avi-Itzhak (1986) examined leadership styles used by principals when initiating curricular change. On the basis of questionnaires completed by 69 principals, the researchers categorize principals as initiators, responders and managers. Initiators seek change on the basis of long-range goals. Responders respond to change on the basis of immediate needs. And managers respond to change in response to external pressures. The study suggests that the initiators are the most effective in dealing with curriculum change. Ben-Peretz and Avi-Itzhak's research confirmed findings from earlier studies by Hall, Rutherford, Hord and Huling (1984).

In a study of successful high schools implementing individualized programs, Daresh (1982) notes that the most important intra-organizational factor supporting implementation appears to be the principal's interactions and leadership inside the school and the superintendent's outside the school. The nature of the interactions was not specified. The study also found that centralized curriculum
seemed to facilitate implementation. Special funding was not considered necessary.

Among the findings that emerged from Dow and Whitehead's (1983) research related to barriers that impede curriculum implementation, Dow and Whitehead noted that the public school principal emerged as a key figure in the implementation process. The principal was considered an important link in facilitating the central office-organized implementation process by timetabling adequate release time for teachers, by keeping the teachers informed of the change and related resource materials, and by being generally supportive of teachers' concerns related to the change.

Fullan (1982) views the principal as a key figure in the implementation process. He states that "the administrator affects the quality of implementation to the extent that he or she understands and helps to manage the set of factors and the processes described" (p. 65). Fullan adds "whether it is direct or indirect, the principal plays a fateful role in implementation and continuance of any change" (p. 140). Fullan notes that the building principal can play a key role in promoting teacher confidence in the new curriculum and in facilitating teacher involvement in the implementation. Fullan emphasizes "it should be self-evident that the principal as head of the organization is critical regarding any proposed change (p. 146).

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts engaged the Rand Corporation to identify "school art programs that reflect a discipline-based approach" (Day, Eisner, Wilson & Wilson, 1984, p. iv). The researchers were asked to describe the characteristics of a discipline-based art education program and to respond to the
question, "What factors make administrators and teachers willing and able to initiate and maintain such a program?" (p. 6). The report notes that only two of the seven districts studied delivered discipline-based programs in a consistent manner. The report states that at the sites studied, the quality of the art programs "varied according to the principals' interests and assumptions about art education" (McLaughlin et al, 1984, p. 10). The researchers emphasize that

Principals set the climate and expectations for instruction in their schools. Teachers take cues for their own performance accordingly. Teacher choices about what to emphasize and notions about acceptable practice reflect those of their school principal. (p. 41)

In their research related to school effectiveness, Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) state that "In the search for factors that influence school effectiveness, the role of the elementary school principal has emerged as critical" (p. 309). They note that at the school level "the principal sets the climate of communication, support and decision making which can foster or inhibit change in practice" (p. 309).

Loucks and Hall (1979) studied the implementation of the science curriculum in 80 elementary schools in Colorado. One of their findings is that the actions taken by building principals to support or inhibit a change effort have direct effect on how teachers feel about and ultimately use a new program.
Sarason (1971) recommends school-based change that takes "into account the feelings and opinions of those who must implement the changes, i.e. the teachers" (p. 221). He (1971) noted that

different schools in the system can be depended on differentially to respond to or implement the proposed change, and that they, the sources, implementers of change, do not have the time adequately to oversee this degree of change; [yet those in charge of the change assume that] it should be spread as wide as possible as soon as possible. (p. 213)

He added

I make the assumption that with any complicated social organization not all starting points are equally effective in leading to a widespread change in that complicated setting. I regard this statement as a glimpse of the obvious but equally obvious is the fact that it is not obvious to many others who are in the business of changing schools (p. 216).

Skilbeck (1975) argues that teachers have resisted new curricula because they have felt no ownership of the new curriculum or recommended implementation process. He suggests that more effective curriculum change can be realized if we focus on school-based curriculum change.

A literature review by D. Smith (1982) attempted to determine the desired role of the elementary school principal as it relates to curriculum implementation. In his review he states "inadequate administrative support is frequently cited as a common cause for the rejection of an innovation" (p. 17). Smith notes that implementation may be enhanced if the principal places an increased emphasis on "creating an educational organization that is receptive to change"
(p. 76) and "views curriculum implementation as an ongoing process" (p. 77). Smith suggests that if principals "cannot devote substantially more time to curriculum implementation, it may be necessary to re-examine and possibly alter the typical administrative structure of an elementary school." He suggests that if current responsibilities are "too many for one person to manage, it may be necessary to create, for example, department heads, coordinators, etc., at the elementary level" (p. 78). Smith adds that in order for the teachers to implement the change, they must perceive the principal as being supportive and as someone who "accepts the shared responsibility for successful implementations" (p. 80).

Stenhouse (1977) argues that "no curriculum policy can be right the first time"; therefore, innovations need to be implemented through a process of trial and error over an extended period of time. He recommends that curriculum innovations entail a process of formulating alternate models, implementing these models in a variety of experimental schools in which teachers have indicated a receptiveness to implement and then gradually improving the content and practice as "errors and failures" are eliminated and new insights are accumulated.

Pravica and McLean (1983) studied the implementation of a new grade six mathematics curriculum in six schools in one district. They observed a positive relationship between principal participation and student performance. Continual support and involvement by the principal was noted as having a positive influence on pupil achievement in mathematics. Pravica and McLean also note that consultants are utilized more in schools where the principal is
actively involved in the change. To evaluate the principals' support and involvement in the implementation, teachers' responses to three questions related to the perceived participation at implementation meetings and the extent to which the principals respond to teachers' concerns were used. Some recent literature also suggests that the principals' knowledge of the curriculum area may play a role in facilitating the implementation (Nicholson & Tracy, 1982; Moore, Wideman & Dilling, 1984).

Moore, Wideman and Dilling (1984) studied the levels of use of the grade one and five social studies curriculum guides using a five-point self-report scale administered to teachers. The researchers found that the teachers regarded the principals' knowledge of and attitude towards the curriculum guide a crucial factor in the implementation process.

Nicholson and Tracy (1982) administered a questionnaire to 20 elementary school principals and 191 teachers. The results suggest that the principals' knowledge of the content of the change had a positive relationship to the success of the implementation. Dow and Whitehead (1983), on the other hand, found that the principals' lack of knowledge about new curricula was not considered a barrier to implementation.

Role Played by Ministries of Education

At one point Ministries are responsible for mandating curriculum change. Beyond that fact, they do not appear to influence directly the implementation process at the school level. Fullan (1982) suggests, however, that Ministries can influence implemen-
tation indirectly to the extent these Ministries support and coordinate policies and programs with the school district. Fullan identifies policy change, financial or material resources and technical assistance as "factors that indirectly influence the implementation of change."

**Factors Affecting the Implementation of School Art Programs**

The bulk of the art education literature focuses on the development and presentation of various art program models to improve current practice; on the discussion of various rationales related to specific approaches to teaching art; and on discussions related to why elementary school art programs have resisted change. Factors related to the implementation of school art programs are generally discussed in relation to specific art program approaches or models.

The literature suggests that the vast majority of elementary school art programs do not conform to any recommended model. Chalmers (1979, p. 2) refers to what goes on in elementary school art classes as "standardized 'make-it and take-it' projects completed in one period." Chapman (1982, p. 3) dismisses many elementary school art programs as "a sham" because "they require minimal skill, little or no knowledge, the least possible effort and practically no investment of time," Day, cited in Dobbs (1979, p. 125), refers to elementary school art as "a myriad of stereotypical projects," "manipulation of art materials with no expressive intent" and "'one shot' experiences that will not be repeated and which lead
nowhere either intellectually or artistically." Feldman (1983, p. 9) states that elementary school art programs are preoccupied with "demonstrating tricks and exchanging recipes" and are conducted as "play" or as "little more than a technical exercise."

Goodlad, in his study A Place Called School (1983a, p. 220) summarizes his observation of elementary art programs by saying "the impression I get of the arts programs in the schools studied is that they go little beyond coloring, polishing and playing." Gray (1980) referred to "art education in the elementary school" as "not lost but certainly hard to locate." McLaughlin and Thomas (1984, p. 45) in their examination of art programs in seven school districts concluded "policy makers, administrators, teachers and consumers have traditionally regarded art classes as entertainment or therapy". Nadaner (1983, p. 8) labelled elementary school art programs as "Friday afternoon miracles" that attempt to develop "creativity and self-expression" through "step-by-step instruction in tie-dying, batik. . .and numerous additional media."

It has been well documented in the literature that elementary school art programs have resisted change (Chalmers, 1979; Chapman, 1982; Eisner, 1976, 1979; Efland, 1970; Rand Research Study sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1984; Gray, 1980; Nadaner, 1984a; Rafferty, 1987). The literature reviewed suggests that four major factors have contributed to this resistance.

1. School art programs have traditionally been given a low priority. Hawke (1980, p. 299) in his research related to a beginning high school teacher of art observes that non-art teaching colleagues
and administrators hold the value of art in an educational situation in relatively low esteem. McLaughlin and Thomas (1984) note that "art education is a non-issue in most school districts" (p. 48). In their summary of the research related to discipline-based art programs in seven school districts they conclude that "it is not evident that central actors - school board members, teachers, administrators or parents have much interest in a strong art education program" (p. 3).

The B.C. Ministry of Education Core Curriculum (1977) provides an example of the low status delegated to art education. The original core curriculum issued to British Columbia public schools did not include the arts except for a brief mention under the "Healthful Living" section of the guide. Strong protests from university and public school art educators pressured the B.C. Ministry of Education to issue an addendum to the core curriculum as to the importance of the arts in education.

The literature provides other examples of the secondary status delegated to school art programs. Eisner (1976) mentions that high school graduation and university entrance does not require art, and Nadianer (1984a, p. 8) observes that elementary art periods are frequently held at the end of the day or on Friday afternoons when children are too tired to focus on what many teachers perceive to be more important subjects.

2. Historically, there has been little agreement as to what school art programs should accomplish. Feldman (1970) notes "our problem is this: even lovers of art do not know what art education is meant to accomplish. And we are not so sure ourselves" (p. 6).
Almost a decade later Chalmers (1979, p. 2-3) repeats Feldman's concern when he suggests that if we want effective change to take place, an important first step would be to articulate why we want to do the things that we want to do and what steps need to be taken to effectively implement change. Lanier (1980, p. 18) similarly notes "as long as art education has no single coherent and powerful sense of purpose and a rough agreement on how to achieve it, it is unlikely that change would take place". McLaughlin et al. (1984, p. 4) in their research related to discipline-based art education programs concur with the previous art educators when they state "we really know very little about the present status of art education or about exactly what a discipline-based sequential program should look like."

Since the beginning of elementary art education in British Columbia in 1875 with art as skill in drawing, art educators have been justifying art and art related activities as fundamental components of education and recommending approaches that they felt would best support their views. The justifications have changed as the political and social fabric of society has changed, but the impact of the changing theories on classroom practice has been minimal. The 1979 analysis by Dobbs of the status of art education and its prospects is as significant going into the nineties as it was going into the eighties. He noted that:

Arts education through the years has often been organized around targets of opportunity, those rationales and trends which at the time had substantial social and political support in public education. (Dobbs, 1979, p. 8)
Numerous rationales for teaching art education and accompanying models have been recommended. They range from models that are primarily aesthetic in focus (Efland, 1970; Feldman, 1980; Hurwitz & Madeja, 1977; Lanier, 1981) to those that are primarily studio-based, (Dorn, 1978; Michael, 1980) to those that are primarily concerned with addressing specific areas such as promoting cross-cultural understanding (Andrews, 1980; Grigsby, 1979; McFee and Degge, 1977; McIntosh, 1978). However, the literature reviewed suggests that none of the recommended models has made any significant long-term impact in the elementary classrooms.

3. The popularization of the child-centred view that artistic ability is inborn and therefore children cannot be taught how to create, they can only be encouraged, has had a pronounced effect on elementary school art programs. The popularity of the writings of Freud and Jung encouraged art educators to borrow from psychology. Art came to be viewed as a vehicle to tap the subconscious mind of the child. Dewey's *Art as Experience* (1934), Reed's *Education Through Art* (1958) originally published in 1943, Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* (1975) first published in 1947 and Schaefer-Simmern's *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity* (1948) popularized art education as a vehicle to promote psychological and social maturation, self-expression, creativity, good citizenship and an improved society. Teachers were encouraged to concern themselves with the process rather than the product of art. Cole (1940, p. 23) wrote "the teacher should remember the growing process is more important than the product." Teachers were advised to provide only encouragement, support and appropriate materials in
a stimulating environment and not to interfere with the natural unfolding process. Schaefer-Simmern (1948, p. 8) argued "art education must be based upon the natural unfolding and development of artistic abilities." Nadaner (1983, p. 6) noted that "painters like Klee and Kandinsky validated this link between psychology and art".

During the 1950's and early 1960's, the child-centred approach continued to be prevalent. The 1964 B.C. Ministry of Education's Elementary School Art Curriculum Guide emphasized "creative expression" and cautioned "never demonstrate." The guide asked teacher to:

Guard against using conventional stereotyped projects such as Halloween witches and pumpkins and eliminate the archaic and conventional such as artificial crepe paper flowers. . .distortions of Easter rabbits. (p. 3)

Although during the latter part of the 1960s a shift occurred in the art education literature to a subject-centred approach, the legacy of the child-centred approach to teaching art remained firmly entrenched in the majority of elementary art classes. Art educators such as Barkan (1962), Eisner (1973) and McFee and Degge (1977) argued that the predominant focus in art education must be the subject matter of art. These subject-centred advocates felt that art can be learned like any other subject and that learning in art is not simply a process of maturation. In 1972 Eisner wrote "the subject-centered approach. . .lays emphasis upon the integrity of the subject matter, its uses in human experience and understanding, and its intrinsic value." In the classrooms, however, "creative expression" and the various justifications advocated by art educa-
tors continued to be cultivated through the production of conventional objects and craft-related activities.

Nadaner (1976) discusses the impact of this movement.

Creative self-expression approach to art education established itself in the educator's and public's mind, and has remained firmly embedded there. When the discourse of school art is dominated by terms like 'creativity' and 'self-expression' but the practice of school arts is directed toward making conventional art objects for exhibition, then something is amiss. Through a remarkably effective process of cultural transmission, every parent, teacher and child seems to know that creativity and self-expression (as well as the exercise of 'talent' to produce beauty) are the purposes of art. (p. 7)

This predominant focus on developing "creative self-expression" through the production of "things" is discussed by other art educators. Day (1979) states "the belief that art in public schools is commensurate with making is so pervasive teachers are selected solely on their studio experience." Dobbs suggests that this has resulted in elementary art programs that frequently focus on "craft-related projects and their resultant products" (p. 170). Dobbs adds that "the non-art projects are justifiably questioned by those who are concerned with real learning in the schools (and) correctly judged to be of little value" (p. 126). Efland (1970) suggests that short of a social revolution it is unlikely that much change would take place in elementary school art programs because the production of things is necessary to maintain the facade that schools are promoting freedom of expression.

4. The realities of the day to day classroom and school context make it difficult for teachers to implement change. Hawke (1980) in
his study, *The Life World of a Beginning Teacher of Art*, points out the frustrations faced by a beginning teacher of art as various day to day conflicting pressures make it difficult for him to implement the type of program he has anticipated. Hawke notes that the many non-teaching tasks confronting the new teacher "collectively conspired to be the single greatest threat to survival in the initial period of teaching" (p. 292). Rafferty (1987, p. 72) suggests that the problem is not so much that teachers do not understand what should be taught in elementary art education as it is that teachers have difficulty trying to carry out the task in their current school context. Rafferty suggests that teachers of art often select art activities that do not disrupt "the organizational structure of the school" such as 'seasonal events' (p. 69). They also select on the basis of considerations such as the children's ability to get the work done effectively and on time. Rafferty adds that production activities such as the use of "tracers" are viewed as legitimate means to motivate or build self-esteem in children. Although every subject area shares classroom disruptions, the literature (McLaughlin & Thomas, 1984; & Rafferty, 1987) suggests that elementary school art programs are subjected to a disproportionate share because of the low status given to elementary school art.

**Summary**

Implementing institutional change is difficult. Implementing a new art curriculum is especially difficult because of the low priority generally given to art education, the lack of consensus as to what elementary school art programs should accomplish, the
historical legacy of the child-centred approach to teaching art that has translated to a focus on production experiences, and the day to day disruptions faced by the classroom teachers in their attempts to carry out their art programs.

From the educational change, school effect and art education literature reviewed, four factors emerged as having a significant impact on curriculum implementation. They are:

(a) teachers' perceived need of the new curriculum area being implemented;

(b) a current practical and prescriptive curriculum document and resource materials;

(c) school principal support of new curriculum area and principal involvement with implementation process;

(d) central administration support in terms of budget allocations for: long-term in-service; release time; curriculum coordinators; materials to supplement new curriculum and an articulated district focus on curriculum area being implemented.

These factors are relevant for all subject areas.

Two approaches to the management of these factors were put forth in the literature. The first position advocates more centralized control over the factors affecting educational change efforts; the second position advocates less centralized control.

Although research has succeeded in identifying factors that influence the direction of educational change efforts and has suggested approaches to the management of these factors, there continues to be a paucity of information related to the contextual
factors that influence elementary classroom teachers of art to implement or not implement new curricula.

The literature in the three areas reviewed: educational change, school effect and art education, support the view that because the factors affecting the direction of educational change for teachers are context-bound, more research based in the natural school setting needs to be done to gain a better understanding of what influences the direction of curriculum change for teachers. A review of the literature leads to the conclusion that what happens inside the school and classroom during the process of implementing educational change is only vaguely understood; therefore, what specifically influences teachers during this process needs closer examination. It is the purpose of this research to address this knowledge gap in the literature.

Chapter III discusses the design of this research and the choice of methods selected to answer the research questions.
Chapter III
Design of the Inquiry

Case Study, Ethnographic Methods and Triangulation

The literature reviewed suggests that factors affecting the direction of curriculum change for teachers are context bound, therefore, case studies of teachers engaged in the process of implementing curriculum change may contribute to understanding how and why curriculum implementation occurs. A case study format using ethnographic methods was utilized for this research. Ethnographic methods were used on the basis that one can safely assume that the teacher's actions are influenced by the context in which they work. To uncover how and why implementation occurs, it is necessary to examine what the teachers say and do during the process of implementing the curriculum change. The case study format using ethnographic methods provides a means to examine the teachers' day-to-day experiences with the art curriculum implementation in manageable components as well as from a holistic perspective.

Borg and Gall (1983, p. 489) identify four kinds of case studies: historical, observational, oral histories, clinical and situational analysis. This research represents a situational analysis of teachers engaged in the process of implementing an art curriculum change extended over one school year. Borg and Gall note that "in this form of case study a particular event is studied from the viewpoint of all the major participants." They add that "when these views are pulled together they provide a depth that can
contribute significantly to understanding the event being studied" (489).

Borg and Gall also identify three levels of participant observation: full participant, partial participant, and observer. The researcher in this study conducted herself primarily as an observer of the teachers engaged in the implementation process. Because the researcher at the time was also the principal of the school in which the research was conducted and also a specialist in the subject area being implemented, she functioned also as a passive participant (Spradley, 1980) to the extent that she attempted to facilitate the process for the teachers by the organization of workshops, the acquisition of supplementary materials and giving assistance to teachers if requested.

Methods to reflect the complexities of the teachers' responses and actions during the implementation of the art curriculum change over an extended period of time were needed. Ethnographic methods are applicable to the study of individuals in action.

Triangulated research methods are used to strengthen the validity of the research, that is using multi-dimensional methods for obtaining multiple kinds of data and making multiple comparisons focusing on a specific problem (Denzin, 1970). Triangulation entails data from different sources, different people and different situations. The interaction of data was examined from pre- and post-implementation interviews, classroom observations of the teachers' art classes by the researcher and observations of separate art lessons by an independent observer, a level of use of
the new art curriculum analyses by an independent rater, the principal's diary notes, and school records. The analyses performed on these multiple sources of data attempt to provide information for the reader as to how and why implementation occurs in this particular context.

Educational change is the result of interactions that take place in particular settings under particular circumstances. To gain an understanding of the conditions in which implementation is more likely to take place, specific information grounded in practice is needed. A case study format using ethnographic methods is deemed appropriate to provide a picture of significant elements and activities associated with attempts to achieve curriculum change.

The Principal as Change Agent and Researcher

This research must account for the principal in a leadership and facilitator role as she works directly with teachers to implement a mandated, externally initiated curriculum change, inasmuch as the principal in this study is also the researcher and a previous school district art coordinator. At the outset, one must acknowledge a possible research limitation, that there are concerns associated with using the principal as researcher. For example, teachers may tell the principal what they think she wants to hear, and act in a way that they feel would please her. As a previous district art coordinator, the researcher may be expected by the teachers to be a strong advocate of the forthcoming art curriculum change, and therefore, they may respond in a manner which they feel
would be viewed as being supportive of the new art curriculum. Also, the principal, as a researcher, may selectively choose the data either to make herself look better as an administrator, or to construe data in such a way as to support a professionally justified view or bias.

Although using the principal as researcher has drawbacks, it has advantages. It is unlikely that an outsider would be able to obtain the richness of data available to the researcher as principal. As the building administrator, the principal had direct access to all facets of the teachers' professional lives, was aware of the external and internal factors that affect the school setting, and had immediate access to all relevant records. The researcher also had the opportunity to be involved in all aspects of the teachers' professional lives with minimal research intervention. The researcher could also cross-check much of the data provided by the teachers, thereby making it less likely that they would greatly alter or exaggerate responses to the interview questions. In this particular case study, none of the teachers was concerned about tenure and all indicated a receptiveness to taking part in the research. Because the principal was also involved with the staff socially, she had access to a more rounded picture of the staff members. Also, the researcher's position as the school principal and a colleague may have had the advantage of encouraging the interviewees to elaborate their responses and to reveal information that they may not have revealed to an independant researcher. The researcher's position might also have influenced the subjects to implement the new art curriculum to a greater extent than they
would have otherwise. Using the principal as researcher provides a unique opportunity to conduct an in-depth study of the implementation process in a school where it is known that the principal is supportive of the arts and the new art curriculum implementation. To guard against inaccuracies in the principal's self-reports, staff feedback, and observations of the staff, triangulated research methods were used. The extent of implementation analyses was also verified by the teachers.

Data Gathering Methods

The following data gathering methods were used to respond to the research questions that guided this study: pre- and post-implementation interviews (Appendix II), classroom observations (Appendix VI), principal's diary notes and school records.

The purpose of administering pre-implementation interviews to the fifteen teachers of art was to assess their receptiveness and support towards the forthcoming art curriculum implementation, and to elicit responses related to their perceptions of the factors which influence implementation. The purpose of administering the pre-implementation questions to the non-art teaching staff members was simply to assess their support towards the forthcoming art curriculum implementation and to provide a picture of the context in which the teachers were attempting to implement. An examination of school records and the principal's diary notes also sought to provide a picture of contextual factors which may have contributed to impeding or enhancing the art curriculum implementation.
The purpose of the post-implementation interviews was to elicit the teachers' responses related to their perceptions of factors which may have influenced the implementation process for them.

Classroom observations conducted by the researcher and an independent observer sought to estimate the extent to which the new art curriculum was being implemented in the classroom.

**Figure 1**

**Schedule for Data Gathering**

**September 1984-June 1985**

**Sept. Wk. 1**
- Written consent of all teaching staff members obtained

**Sept. Wk. 2-4**
- Taped pre-implementation interviews administered to 15 teachers of art and 5 non-art teaching staff members
- Diary notes made
- School records collected

**Oct. Wk. 1-2**
- Pre-implementation interview tapes transcribed and typed
- Transcripts checked for accuracy by each of the 15 teachers of art and each of the 5 non-art teaching staff members
- Diary notes made and school records collected

**Nov. - Dec.**
- School records collected
- Diary notes made

**Nov. Wk. 4**
- Copies of B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum distributed to staff
Jan. Wk. 1-4 a. Classroom observations of teachers' art lessons by researcher and completion of Extent of Implementation Checklists during each of the lessons observed by researcher. Lessons taped
b. Classroom observations of teachers' art lessons by an independent observer and completion of an Extent of Implementation Checklist during each of the lessons observed by the independent observer
c. Diary notes made and school records collected

Feb. Wk. 1-4 a. Transcripts of January observations by researcher typed and checked by each of the teachers for accuracy
b. Researcher's and independent observer's Extent of Implementation Checklists verified by teachers for accuracy
c. Diary notes made and school records collected

Mar. Wk. 1-4 a. Classroom observations of teachers' art lessons by researcher and completion of Extent of Implementation Checklists during each of the lessons observed by researcher. Lessons taped
b. Diary notes made and school records collected

April Wk. 1-4 a. Transcripts of March Observations typed and checked by teachers for accuracy
b. Researcher's March Extent of Implementation Checklists verified by teachers
c. Diary notes made and school records collected

May Wk. 1-3 Classroom observations of teachers' art lessons by researcher and completions of Extent of Implementation Checklists during each of the lessons observed by researcher. Lessons taped. Transcripts typed as observations completed

May Wk. 4 May observation transcripts and Extent of Implementation Checklists verified by teachers
May Wk. 1-4  a. Classroom observations of teachers' art lessons by an independent observer and completion of an *Extent of Implementation Checklist* during lesson observed  
  b. Verification of independent observer's *Extent of Implementation Checklists* by teachers  
  c. Diary notes made and school records collected  

June Wk.1-2  a. Taped post-implementation interviews administered to 15 teachers of art  
  b. Transcripts typed following completion of interview  

June Wk. 3  Transcripts of post-implementation interviews checked by 15 teachers of art for accuracy  

June Wk. 4  Copies of transcripts of post-implementation interviews and May classroom observations given to an Independent Rater to complete a *Levels of Use of a New Curriculum Rating Scale* for each of the 15 teachers

**Methods of Analysis**

The analyses of data to determine whether implementers and non-implementers emerged, entailed the following: *Extent of Implementation Checklist* (Appendix V); *Levels of Use of an Innovation Rating Scale* (Appendix VII); comparison of the extent of implementation categories that emerged to the teachers' response to the post-implementation questions, "In what ways have you found the new *B.C. Ministry of Education Curriculum* helpful or not helpful?", "Has the new art curriculum satisfied your initial expectations?" and "Have you found the implementation process helpful?" and verification of the categories that emerged with the teachers themselves.

To assess what factors emerged to impede or enhance the implementation for the teachers content analyses of the pre- and post-implementation interviews were conducted. The interview
transcripts were also examined for opinions about whether or not teachers or central administration should have primary responsibility for managing factors which influence the direction of the art curriculum implementation. The factors were then categorized on the basis of similarity of response in an attempt to find patterns that may suggest why teachers choose to implement or not implement.

Also, to provide the readers with a picture of the context in which the teachers were attempting to implement the new art curriculum, a content analysis was performed on the principal's diary notes, school records and the non-art teaching staff members' response to two pre-implementation interview questions. The latter dealt with the teachers' receptiveness to the forthcoming art curriculum implementation.

Figure 2
Schedule for Data Analysis
July 1985 - November 1985

Analyses to determine the extent to which the fifteen teachers of art implemented

July & Aug.  a. Analyses of researcher's and independent observer's Extent of Implementation Checklists to estimate extent to which 6 goals and 4 content areas were met
b. Analysis of independent raters Levels of Use of an Innovation Rating Scale to determine extent to which new art curriculum was being used
c. Establishing the extent to which teachers implemented
d. Comparison of the extent of implementation categories with the teachers' responses to 3 post-implementation questions related to whether they found the new curriculum and implementation process helpful and whether they felt that they implemented the art curriculum

Aug. - Sept. a. Confirmation of the Extent of Implementation categories with the 15 teachers of art

b. Analyses to determine factors that influence the implementation process for the 15 teachers and identification of similarities and differences that emerge among the teachers to suggest reasons they choose to support the implementation

Sept. - Nov. Content analyses of principal's diary notes, school records and pre-implementation interviews of non-art teaching staff members to establish a picture of context in which teachers were implementing.

Pre- and Post-Implementation Interview Questions
An open-ended pre-implementation interview schedule, Schedule I, and an open-ended post-implementation interview schedule, Schedule II (Appendix II) were used. Open-ended questions were deemed more appropriate than structured questions because it is unlikely that the researcher could anticipate the range of responses that the questions would generate.

Items for interview questions were based on the literature review related to: educational change, school effect, and art education; analysis of the art section of the draft of the 1984 B.C. Ministry of Education Elementary Fine Arts Curriculum Guide, and the researcher's own personal experience. The questions were lengthy and repetitious to encourage the teachers to elaborate on their responses. The questions attempted to generate responses
related to the broad factors influencing the direction of educational change as identified in the literature reviewed, but particularly by Fullan (1982).

Several revisions of the questionnaire were made as a result of: a pilot of the preliminary questionnaire conducted with the entire teaching staff in a similar school to that of the current study; pilot interviews with three district personnel; and discussions with university consultants.

The pre-implementation questionnaire was administered to the 15 classroom teachers of art in September and early October, prior to the distribution of the *B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum Guide*. The questions in Schedule I sought to elicit responses related to the teachers' perceptions of factors that might impede or enhance the implementation process for them.

The post-implementation questionnaire was administered to the subjects in June, following the implementation process. The questions in Schedule II sought to elicit responses about the teachers' perceptions of the factors which might have impeded or enhanced the art curriculum implementation which they had recently gone through, and the extent to which they perceived they had implemented the new curriculum, and the extent of their involvement in the process.

The written consent of each subject was obtained before the interviews. To ensure anonymity, the teachers' names are deleted from the transcripts. (see sample transcript in Appendix III.) Each of the interviews was approximately 30-40 minutes in duration.
The sequence for the selection of the subjects for the pre-implementation interview was determined by the availability of the teachers. The post-implementation interviews followed the same sequence so that the time span between the two interviews was approximately the same for each of the subjects. All questions were read exactly in the same order and used the same probes for all of the respondents. The interviews were taped and transcribed.

The non-art teaching staff members were asked to respond to two pre-implementation questions to assess their support of and receptiveness towards the forthcoming art curriculum implementation. The questions were: "How do you feel about the forthcoming change?" and "Do you have any suggestions as to what steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new art curriculum?" The purpose of this information was to provide readers with a picture of the context within which the teachers were attempting to implement the art curriculum change.

**The Preliminary Study**

The following criteria were used to select the location for the preliminary study: ease of gaining entry, the cooperation of the school administration and staff, and the proximity and similarity of the school to the current research setting. Both schools were in the same school district and had students with similar socio-economic backgrounds.

The purpose of the preliminary study was to test the effectiveness of the research methods and specifically the interview questions to be used for the planned major investigation.
Through taped open-ended interviews, classroom observations and descriptive accounts of the day-to-day life in the selected elementary school over a five-week period, the nature of the current art programs for the twelve teachers in the preliminary study and the factors they identified as impeding or enhancing the forthcoming implementation were examined.

The teachers in the preliminary study indicated that they wanted to have effective art programs and were looking forward to seeing the new art curriculum, but they were frustrated by the divergent expectations placed on them, and the lack of time and absence of support to help them effect these changes.

The preliminary study pointed out the need to narrow the research questions and to limit the methods; however, much of the data collected during the five-week study had no direct relevance to the main study, since the teachers had not yet been introduced to the new art curriculum.

Classroom Observations in the Major Study

Three observations of the teachers' art lessons were conducted by the researcher with each of the 15 teachers. All of them indicated that they would prefer that the visits were not prearranged; therefore, all visits were conducted at the researcher's convenience. The purpose of the observations was to estimate the extent to which the new art curriculum was being implemented. The observations took place in January, March, and May. A protocol for each of the observations was made. An independent observer with recognized professional expertise was engaged to conduct two
observations of each of the fifteen teachers' art lessons, one in January and another in May.

Principal's Diary Notes and School Records

The principal's diary notes, staff meeting minutes, teachers' previews and school accounts were examined for contextual factors that may have contributed to impeding or enhancing the art curriculum implementation. This information, along with the non-art teaching staff members' response to the two pre-implementation questions, related to their receptiveness and support of the art curriculum implementation is presented to provide a picture of context in which the teachers were to implement.

Extent of Implementation Checklist and Levels of Use of An Innovation rating Scale

The analyses to determine whether implementers and non-implementers emerge entailed the following four steps:

(a) _Extent of Implementation Checklist;_

(b) _Levels of Use of An Innovation Rating Scale;_

(c) Comparison of the extent of implementation categories that emerge to the teachers' responses to the post-implementation interview questions: "In what ways have you found the new _B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum_ helpful or not helpful?", "Has the new art curriculum satisfied your initial expectations?" and "Have you found the implementation process helpful?" and
(d) A validity check of the extent of implementation categories by the teachers themselves.

The Extent of Implementation Checklist (Appendix V) attempted to assess the extent to which the six goals and four content areas outlined in the new art curriculum were being met in the observed art lessons. The checklists were completed by the researcher in January, March, and May, and by an independent observer in January and May. The teachers were categorized into "extent of implementation categories" based on the total number of goals and content areas adhered to in the January and May art lessons observed by the researcher and observer. The March lesson was observed by the researcher only and is used for comparative purposes. The total possible goals and content areas the teachers could meet is 20. This analysis uses the following scale of implementation categories: 15-20 full implementation, 10-14 partial implementation, and 0-9 no implementation.

For the purposes of the extent of implementation analyses, a fidelity approach is used. Fullan (1982, p. 31) discusses two approaches to curriculum implementation, a "fidelity" approach and an "adaptive" approach. Fullan states that

The fidelity approach to change . . . is based on the assumption that an already developed innovation exists and the task is to get individuals and groups of individuals to implement it faithfully in practice . . . as intended by the developers.

Fullan notes that the adaptive approach to change is the "result of adaptations and decisions taken by users" while working toward "mutually determining the outcome." Measuring the extent to which
the new curriculum is being implemented using an adaptive approach would be extremely difficult since this approach is open-ended and encourages continual change and variation. The fidelity approach, on the other hand, looks at conformity to goals specified by the program developers.

The *Extent of Implementation Checklist* has limitations. Since the goals and content areas are broad, it is possible that teachers may be following some of the goals and content areas and in fact, not be implementing the new art curriculum. Therefore, an adaptation of Hall and Loucks' *Levels of Use of An Innovation Rating Scale* was also used.

Hall and Loucks (1977, p. 263) state that their *Levels of Use of An Innovation Scale* permits an operational cost-feasible description and documentation of whether or not an innovation of treatment is being implemented. They used an eight-point scale to assess the extent to which the teachers used an innovation. A protocol of a twenty-minute interview was used by two independent raters to assess the levels of use.

For the purposes of this research, post-implementation interview transcripts (Appendix IV) and the protocols of observation three (Appendix VI) were analyzed by an independent rater using an adapted version of the Hall and Loucks' *Levels of Use of An Innovation Scale* (Appendix VII). Although the wording of the scale was modified to suit the art curriculum implementation, the levels of use were the same. To facilitate the comparison of results from this scale and from the *Extent of Implementation Checklist*, the
following categories were used: 0-2 non-use, 3-4 partial use, and 5-7 full use.

The teachers' responses to the post-implementation questions "In what ways have you found the new B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum helpful or not helpful?", "Has the new curriculum satisfied your initial expectations?" and "Have you found the implementation process helpful?" were utilized for comparative purposes. The teachers' responses to these questions were compared to the extent of implementation categories that emerged. It is assumed that teachers who had not found the process or curriculum helpful or who had not read the new curriculum did not implement fully.

To verify the extent of implementation categories that emerged, the teachers were asked to check the data related to their extent of implementation analyses and to confirm their extent of implementation category.

Content Analysis and the Framework for the Assessment of Implementation Factors

To respond to the first research question, a content analysis of the pre- and post-implementation transcripts was made for words and phrases that might suggest factors that influence the teachers to implement or not implement. To provide a framework to facilitate the content analyses of the interview transcripts, Fullan's (1982, p. 56) four broad categories of factors influencing an education change process were used. The same method was used to
examine what the teachers had to say about the management of factors affecting curriculum implementation.

Content analysis as described in the General Inquirer (1966) was deemed inappropriate for purposes of this research. The General Inquirer defines content analysis as "any research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics within texts" (p. 5). This present research used a form of content analysis to identify and categorize commonalities of themes related to how teachers respond to and cope with the art curriculum implementation. Following repeated and refined readings of the transcripts, a descriptive account was presented to reflect commonalities of themes that in turn revealed factors that appeared to impede or enhance the implementation process for the teachers. Borg and Gall (1979, p. 514) state that one of the aims of content analysis is to "produce descriptive information". Because this research did not begin with a hypothesis and because the initial categories had to be sufficiently broad to permit unexpected responses, computer analysis was deemed inappropriate. Also, because we are not certain as to how or why teachers respond to the implementation of art curriculum change, there was a concern that narrow pre-specified category construction might exclude unexpected responses. There was a concern that by focusing on pre-specified isolated components, the investigator might miss an overall picture. Fullan's (1982) four broad categories of factors were used as a starting point for content analysis, with an additional category developed to account for unexpected responses. To ensure that this adapted form of content
analysis was suitable for drawing inferences, a similar procedure was used by the independent rater for his *Levels of Use of the New Curriculum Analyses*. Also, the results of the analyses were verified by all subjects.

In order to respond to the second research question, the descriptive accounts that emerged from the pre- and post-implementation interviews to suggest reasons why the teachers chose to implement or not implement, were grouped into the extent of implementation categories. The categorized accounts were then examined for commonalities of themes to suggest factors that may have influenced the teachers to implement or not implement.

**Setting and Subjects**

This particular research setting was considered appropriate because it represents a school similar to other large urban elementary schools in British Columbia and a situation where conditions may be optimum for an art curriculum implementation.

The assumption is made that in a school where the principal is openly supportive of and knowledgeable about the new art curriculum and all teachers have agreed to participate in the change process, conditions may be optimum for the implementation of the new art curriculum. The literature suggests that elementary teachers have resisted changing their art programs, but research has not examined such a situation. It is assumed that in such an environment the possibilities for art curriculum change to take place may be significantly enhanced.
In addition, the following enhancing conditions are presumed to have existed in this setting:

1. The researcher had the freedom for intensive situational contact with all the teachers during the school year to observe how the teachers experience and respond to the art curriculum change.

2. The setting provided the researcher with the freedom to be involved with all aspects of the teachers' professional life and freedom of access to all school records such as teachers' evaluation reports, staff meeting minutes, teachers' previews. This enabled the researcher to cross-check much of the information provided by the subjects during the interviews and observations.

3. The setting enabled the researcher to have freedom of access to all facets of the school district staff priorities that might have had a bearing on the art curriculum implementation.

The Context Studied

The research setting was a school with 450 students and 21 teaching and 8 non-teaching staff members. In addition, there were approximately 150 parent volunteers assisting the students, teachers and secretary with a variety of tasks such as monitoring the computer room, checking student absentees, tutoring students and organizing fund raising. The socio-economic status of students represents wealth in one part of the school area and welfare support
in another part of the catchment area. The student population was predominantly white anglophone with approximately ten percent of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The 21 teaching staff members ranged from the late twenties to the late fifties. In addition to those trained in B.C., some staff members were trained in Paris, the Prairies, Ontario and Quebec and had certifications ranging from the lowest level, E.B. (Elementary Basic) to the highest, P.A. (Professional Advanced).

The Subjects

All fifteen classroom teachers of art were used as subjects for the entire study. Code names were used to protect teachers' identities. The teachers signed consent forms agreeing to participate in whatever phases of the research were deemed relevant by the researcher (Appendix I).

The non-art teaching staff, who were music, P.E., learning assistance and grade seven teachers and a counsellor were interviewed as well, because it was considered that their receptiveness to the forthcoming implementation could yield data relevant to the study. For example, if some of the teachers were antagonistic or indifferent towards the implementation of the art curriculum and felt that school-based workshops planned during non-instructional days could be better spent on areas other than art, or that school funds should be used in areas other than the new art curriculum, then this may have had implications for the implementation of the new art curriculum. In this district, teachers
have traditionally had a say as to how they wish to have their four non-instructional days and the school funds utilized.

Chapter IV presents the analyses of the data and reports the findings.
Chapter IV
Results I: Extent of Implementation

Introduction

This chapter reports the analyses performed on the data and the findings obtained from: pre- and post-implementation interviews, the classroom observations, the principal's diary notes, and the school records. These are provided as responses to the research questions that guided this study. (Note time frame for data gathering presented in Figure 1, and the time frame for data analyses presented in Figure 2.)

This data analysis entails three phases. The first phase presented in Chapter IV expected to determine the extent to which the fifteen teachers of art implemented the art curriculum; the second phase, presented in Chapter V, expected to deal with the two research questions and the third phase also presented in Chapter V was designed to present to the readers additional information related to the art curriculum implementation drawn from the principal's diary notes, school records, and brief pre-implementation interviews with the non-art teaching staff members regarding their receptiveness to the forthcoming implementation. This additional information was offered to provide the reader with a more comprehensive picture of the context in which the teachers attempted to implement the new art curriculum.
The analyses to determine the extent to which the fifteen teachers implemented, entailed a four-step process in which the researcher conducted the following:

1. Analysis of the *Extent of Implementation Checklists* used to determine the extent to which the four content areas and six goals outlined in the new art curriculum were met (Appendix V).

2. Analyses of the *Levels of Use of An Innovation Rating Scale*, to determine the extent to which the new art curriculum was being used (Appendix VII).

3. Comparison of the extent of implementation categories that emerge from the teachers' responses to the post-implementation interview questions, "In what ways have you found the new *B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum* helpful or not helpful?"; "Has the new curriculum satisfied your initial expectations?" and "Have you found the implementation process helpful?" It was assumed that teachers who had not read any of the new art curriculum and had not found the process helpful, had not implemented fully or partially.

4. Confirmation of the final extent of implementation categories with each of the fifteen teachers.

**Analyses of the Extent of Implementation Checklist**

The *Extent of Implementation Checklist* attempted to assess the extent to which the four content areas and the six goals were being met in each of the art lessons observed. Observations were
conducted in January, March and May by the researcher. A protocol of each of the three lessons observed was made and is presented in Appendix VI. An independent observer (I.O.) also completed an Extent of Implementation Checklist for each of the fifteen teachers based on observations conducted in January and May (Note Appendix V2). Only two observations were conducted by the I.O. because of time constraints on the part of the observer and because two observations were considered sufficient for purposes of comparing the researcher's and observer's findings. This particular observer was deemed suitable by the researcher for the following reasons:

1. The I.O. held a district position that entailed visiting all elementary schools on a regular basis. Her district position was helpful in that she was a familiar face in the school and less obtrusive than an outsider.

2. She was familiar with the new art curriculum and had conducted district-based art workshops.

3. The independent observer is fluent in French. Since the school had a large French immersion component and since the observations were not pre-arranged and not the same as the researcher's, it was less of an interruption for the French immersion teachers to have someone who spoke French conduct the observations.
The January and May observations conducted by the independent observer entailed a thirty minute visit to each of the fifteen classrooms to observe the teacher's art lesson.

Although some discrepancies between the analyses of the independent observer and researcher emerged there were sufficient similarities to categorize all but five of the teachers into similar extent of implementation categories.

Teacher Groupings: Extent of Implementation

Table 1 compares the researcher's and observer's assessment of the total number of goals and content areas addressed during the January and May art lessons. The total number of content areas and goals adhered to in the lessons observed by the researcher and observer suggests three categories; those that apply to teachers who can be called: implementers, partial implementers, and non-implementers. Table 2 groups the fifteen teachers under these categories. Although these categories are somewhat arbitrary the assumption is made that with the possibility of showing adherence to 4 content areas in each of 2 lessons and to 6 goals in each of 2 lessons (a total of 20 possibilities), the new art curriculum could not be implemented fully unless at least 15 of the 20 possibilities were adhered to, or partially unless between 10 and 14 of the 20 possibilities were adhered to since fidelity to the content areas and goals was used as the criteria for assessing the extent of implementation. In formulating these initial implementation categories, it is also assumed that it is possible for a teacher to be
adhering to some of the goals and content areas and, in fact, not be following the new art curriculum.

Three extent of implementation groups emerged from this initial analysis. For the purposes of this research, the following extent of implementation categories are deemed appropriate: 15-20 Full Implementers, 10-14 Partial Implementers, and 0-9 Non-Implementers.

Table 2 notes discrepancies between the researcher's and observer's categories for subjects 7, 8, 10, 13 and 14.

Table 1
Comparison of Assessment by the Observer and Researcher of the Extent to Which Teachers are Adhering to the Goals and Content Area Outlined in the New Art Curriculum in Each of the Lessons Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
<th>Jan.</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Total¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 O</td>
<td>(Researcher only)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 O</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 O</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 O</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 O</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>Jan. 1</th>
<th>March 2</th>
<th>May 3</th>
<th>Total¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 O</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Q: Independent Observer
- R: Researcher
- 15-20: Full Implementation
- 10-14: Partial Implementation
- 0-9: Non-Implementation
Table 1 continued

Totals for lessons 1 and 3

Table 1 summarizes the researcher's and independent observer's January and May observation assessments. The table indicates the following:

1. Independent Observer:
   - 40% or 6 of the teachers adhered to 75% or more of goals and content areas
   - 33% or 5 of the teachers adhered to 50-65% of goals and content areas
   - 27% or 4 of the teachers adhered to 30-35% of goals and content areas

2. Researcher:
   - 53% or 8 of the teachers adhered to 80% or more goals and content areas
   - 33% or 5 of the teachers adhered to 50-75% of goals and content areas
   - 13% or 2 of the teachers adhered to 35-45% of goals and content areas

Step 3 discusses this analysis further and Table 2 summarizes the similarities and discrepancies.
Table 2
Comparison of Categorization of Assessment by Observer and Researcher of the Extent to Which Teachers Are Implementing the New Art Curriculum Based on Total Number of Content Areas and Goals Adhered to by Individual Teachers During January and May Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,8,10,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,11,13,14</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1,2,3,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,7,8,10,11</td>
<td>6,9,13,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table summarizes the similarities and differences that resulted from the researcher's and independent observer's assessments of the extent to which the goals and content areas outlined in the new art curriculum were being met during the January and May observations. This table notes the same categories for 5 Full Implementers, 3 Partial Implementers and 2 Non-Implementers. Five subjects were assessed differently by the researcher and independent observer. This suggests that additional measures are needed to categorize these 5 subjects.

Table 3
Comparison Between the Data Collected by the Research and Observer During the May Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,7,10,11,12,15</td>
<td>4,8,9,13,14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,10,11,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,8,13,14</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A separate analysis of the May observations (Table 3) yielded discrepancies between the researcher's and observer's categories for subjects 5 and 9. Also, both the researcher and observer note in the May analyses that subject 11 is a Full Implementer rather than Partial Implementer as suggested from the joint January and May observations analyses. Both 7 and 10 move to Full from Observer's Partial in January and May; 8 moves to Partial from researchers' Full in January and May and both 13 and 14 move to Partial from observer's Non-Implementers in January and May.

The following may account for the discrepancies between the researcher and observer:

1. The lessons observed by the observer and researcher were not the same, although both observations took place during the same month.

2. As the principal of the school in which the research was being conducted and as an art specialist, the researcher may have had a vested interest in having the art curriculum implementation succeed. On the other hand, it is possible that the teachers were, in fact, adhering to the goals and content areas outlined in the new art curriculum to a greater extent than they were during the independent observer's visits.

Both the researcher and observer rated the May lessons higher than the January art lessons. It would be expected that the lessons observed later in the school year would be more apt to adhere to the goals and content areas outlined in the curriculum since the teachers would have had more time to familiarize themselves with
the content and to participate in art curriculum implementation workshops. This suggests that implementation may be incremental. Figure 3 illustrates that the extent of implementation for all fifteen teachers participating in this study increased during the implementation year.

**Figure 3**

**Process of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTERS OBSERVATIONS</th>
<th>GOALS &amp; CONTENT AREAS</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Implementers:</strong> 1, 2, 3, 10, 12, 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTERS OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS &amp; CONTENT AREAS</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTERS OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS &amp; CONTENT AREAS</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTERS OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS &amp; CONTENT AREAS</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHERS**

**Non-Implementers**

6, 9, 13, 14

**Partial Implementers**

4, 5, 7, 8, 11

**Full Implementers**

1, 2, 3, 10, 12, 15
To summarize, both the researcher's and observer's analyses suggest that subjects 1, 2, 3, 12 and 15 could be categorized as Full Implementers, subjects 4, 5 and 11 as Partial Implementers and 6 and 9 as Non-Implementers. The categorizations for 7, 8, 10, 13 and 14 remained unclear. Further analyses were needed to confirm categories. Therefore, two additional measures were used to assess the extent to which the teachers implemented the new curriculum: an adapted form of Hall and Loucks (1977) Levels of Use of an Innovation Scale (Appendix VII) and the teachers' response to the post-implementation interview question; "In what ways have you found the B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum helpful or not helpful?" The assumption was that teachers who did not implement would respond negatively to the question.

The final categories for extent of implementation were verified by the teachers in informal followup meetings.

**Levels of Use of New Art Curriculum**

To determine the extent to which an innovation is being used Hall and Loucks formulated their *Levels of Use of an Innovation Scale* (1977). The researchers state that the "Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoU) permits an operational, cost-feasible description and documentation of whether or not an innovation or treatment is being implemented" (p. 263). An eight-point LoU Scale attempts to assess the extent to which the teachers are actually using the innovation in their classroom. A protocol of a twenty-minute interview of the subjects' responses is used by two independent raters to assess the LoU of the innovation.
For the purposes of this research, the researcher's post-implementation interview transcripts (Appendix IV) and the researcher's protocols of observation 3 (Appendix VI (3)) were analyzed by an independent rater using an adapted version of the LoU scale. The independent rater was a graduate student with a background in social research. Although the working of the adapted LoU scale has been modified to suit the art curriculum implementation, the LoU are the same.

The first step in assessing the extent to which the new art curriculum is being implemented using the adapted Hall and Loucks *Levels of Use of An Innovation Checklist* was for the independent rater to circle all the statements on the post-implementation interview transcript and the protocol of observation 3 that reflect the extent to which the new art curriculum was being used by the individual teacher.

After carefully reading the statements the researcher determined, using the 8-point LoU scale, which category best applied. To make it possible to compare the results obtained from this scale with the researcher's and independent observer's extent of implementation results, the following ratings were used:

- **Full Use: 5-7**
- **Partial Use: 3-4**
- **Non-Use: 0-2**

The *Levels of Use of an Innovation Scale* readily fall into these three categories.

An example of the analyses for subject S3 is provided. The independent rater identified the following pertinent excerpts from
subject S3's interview transcripts as indicators that this teacher's level of use of the new art curriculum is full implementation.

1. I have familiarized myself with the curriculum and the actual outline.

2. It has given me a basis to start out with so we can talk about images and how to develop images and from there take it into the use of materials and the processes to actually develop these images and then to promote the children's aesthetic and artistic development.

3. I've shared some ideas with S12 (another teacher on staff) and that's been helpful coordinating some units. We're not doing the same thing, but just talking about it has been helpful.

4. (The new curriculum) has broadened my horizons.

5. I have found the conceptual model guideline the most helpful. It has helped me think of an idea after thinking of an image first and trying to work from that.

6. It has given me more ideas in the way of art ideas. I haven't really found anything frustrating at this point. Also, the lesson format and scope and sequence and using art work by artists (has been helpful).

7. I feel very satisfied (with present program). I feel that through the year, I have expanded my own horizons and I have been examining how I approach things and I think I've learned a great deal. I'm feeling good about it.

8. Also, I think I discussed some of this already like following the sample lesson format and the scope and sequence and integrating the art and bringing in art work by artists. So I'm doing things quite differently.

9. Also, what I've learned from the new curriculum and from you is that they also need to become more knowledgeable about artists and art around them.
10. Having read through the new art curriculum I feel there hasn't been the time to do everything in the whole curriculum in the time I've been trying to implement, but I certainly think that after having now gone through the whole curriculum, it will now serve as an important teaching tool for me and now I know where I am going and I'm feeling really good about it and I guess I see more of a relevance to art now. It's been really helpful too to have a sort of implementation plan organized where you've organized the workshops and how you introduced the curriculum and come in and helped and things like that.

The following statements were identified by the independent rater in S3's Observation 3 protocol.

11. I like the way the sample lesson is laid out. I'm using that format and I find it really useful. What I find really helpful though is your assistance.

12. I mean I could do that myself. It's just that when you have so many different things to contend with you really need some extra support or you tend to let things slide if they're not areas you feel really comfortable with.

The next step in assessing the level to which the teacher was using the new art curriculum entailed a content analysis of the identified statements. The process entailed an examination of statements for indicators that would suggest to the rater the LoU of the new art curriculum.

The Statement listed previously as 3 indicates that S3 was collaborating with colleagues regarding the new art curriculum. All of the statements 1-12 collectively suggest that the teacher was routinely using the new art curriculum and adapting it to suit her classroom context.
Statements 1 and 2 indicate that the teacher had read the new art curriculum and was familiar with it. Statements 2 and 5 indicate that the teacher is following the four content areas recommended in the new curriculum guide. Statements 4, and 6-12 suggest that the teacher had changed her art program content and teaching approaches as a result of the new art curriculum.

Based on the discussed analyses of the content of the identified statements, the rater categorized S3 at LoU level 6 (Note Appendix VII).

Table 4
Summary Analyses of the LoU of New Art Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Non-Use</th>
<th>Partial Use</th>
<th>Full Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9, 14, 6, 13</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 8, 11</td>
<td>1, 2, 10, 15, 3, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three categories emerged from the Levels of Use of the New Art Curriculum Rating Scale. Teachers 6, 9, 13 and 14 emerge as non-users; teachers 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 as partial users; and teachers 1, 2, 3, 10, 12 and 15 as full users. The levels of use were then compared to the extent of implementation analyses and are here presented as Table 5.
Table 5
Comparison of LoU Categories and Extent of Implementation Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Implementer</th>
<th>Partial Implementer</th>
<th>Non-Implementer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Use Partial Use</td>
<td>Non-Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,8,10,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,11,13,14</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1,2,3,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,7,8,10,11</td>
<td>6,9,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater LoU</td>
<td>1,2,3,10,12,15</td>
<td>4,5,7,8,11</td>
<td>6,9,13,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analyses of the Extent of Implementation and the LoU Checklists suggested that the elementary teachers in this study would be classified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Implementers:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1,2,3,10,12,15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Implementers:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4,5,7,8,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Implementers:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6,9,13,14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher 10 was categorized as Full Implementer, 7 and 8 as Partial Implementer, and 13 and 14 as Non-Implementers although the data analyses did not yield complete agreement. Teacher 10 was categorized as Full Implementer because both the independent rater and the researcher concurred. Teachers 7 and 8 were categorized as Partial Implementers and teachers 13 and 14 were categorized as Non-Implementers because the independent rater and Independent Observer concurred. The March assessment by the researcher supported a Non-Implementer category for teacher 14.
Analyses of Teachers' Responses to Post Implementation Questions Related to Whether They Have Read the New Art Curriculum or Whether They Have Found the Curriculum or Implementation Process Helpful.

The following provides a summary of the analyses to three post-implementation questions:

(a) In what ways have you found the new B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum helpful or not helpful?
(b) Has the new curriculum satisfied your initial expectations? and
(c) Have you found the implementation process helpful?

The assumption is made that teachers who have not read the new art curriculum or who respond in a very negative manner towards the entire implementation process have not implemented the new art curriculum.

Teachers 6, 9, 13 and 14 respond that they have not found the document helpful. The following comments by S6 and S9 provide two examples of their responses:

S6: I brought it home over the holidays but I didn't spend much time looking at it, so I'm not sure I can answer that.... Well, I did look at it, but I haven't really applied it. I find it difficult to get something in front of me and be expected to apply it in the classroom. I like to see how it's used first. I need to see some practical ideas in the curriculum book and at workshops and how I can use these ideas in the classroom.

The curriculum is very theoretical so I find it hard to translate it into the classroom. So it's hard for me to get motivated enough to spend the time to study it in any depth and I'm not sure I would understand it anyway unless I see practical examples.
S9: I haven't found it helpful. I don't really find it much different from the old one. Lots of theory and very few practical ideas. It hasn't satisfied me, but then I wasn't really expecting anything. It's just more theory and I don't find that helpful.

Teachers 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 respond that they have found the new art curriculum somewhat helpful. The following comments by S4 and S8 provide two examples.

S4: Just the curriculum by itself I wouldn't have understood it and as far as I can see from the new curriculum, it hasn't really been any more helpful than the old one. It arrived in the same old way from the Ministry. Here's a book, here's the new art curriculum. Read this and implement it in your classroom. It's not the most effective way for me to learn how to use and implement a curriculum; so I can't see how it's much different. What has been helpful is the encouragement from yourself to help me understand a little bit more what the curriculum is all about and from the people who have come in, that's been a help, but the actual curriculum itself hasn't really helped me at all. All the changes that I have made in my art program are because you and the people who have come in have explained the curriculum to me.

S8: I found it helpful, particularly for grade 4 because it gave me an outline of things I should be doing in art such as relating it to the new Social Studies program and it was also helpful in directing me for grade 5, the grade 5 lessons as well. It gave me ideas how to organize the lessons and materials and how I should approach things. It was helpful to read what other people have to suggest and recommend, but I found I was relying a lot on my own resources and ideas to find sources for activities throughout the year. I guess I would have liked something more specific, more concrete. The feeling that I've accomplished some of the objectives set out is satisfying.
Teachers 1, 2, 3, 10, 12 and 15 noted that they had read the curriculum and had found both the new curriculum and the implementation process helpful.

S1: It's (the new art curriculum) been helpful because it gives me a clearer purpose and some kind of framework around which to operate and perhaps my own personal style of teaching doesn't necessarily need a rigid style to follow and the curriculum does not expect that, so it's been helpful because it's given me a framework to follow.

In response to the question, "Have you found the implementation process helpful?" S1 responded:

"Yes, within the context of how much I've involved myself with the curriculum. The more I involve myself, the more I get out of it."

It's been very good focusing on different aspects of the curriculum and having the philosophy clarified. I find that much more useful than a hands-on workshop in an area such as working with clay because you still would not understand what the students are expected to achieve in art.

I've enjoyed meeting people who have a strong background. Um ... gaining a deeper understanding, becoming more enthusiastic about art, becoming personally involved with the process. Having enthusiastic, knowledgeable people giving workshops did more to promote implementation than anything else. I've found the workshops helpful and the focus.

S2 was somewhat critical of both the new art curriculum and the implementation process but nonetheless found both helpful.

The whole approach has been helpful. The workshops too, but it's the whole approach that's been helpful but not the content. I think it's still lacking a sequential. ... I'm still not sure of the
content, I know how to approach it and I'm teaching everything in the model but I'm not sure of the skills and it's the whole content part. The whole philosophy I grasp but what I'm not sure of is the content ... what it is that I'm supposed to be teaching. It would be nice to have the art curriculum laid out like the new S.S. so you know what you should be teaching at each grade level with lessons laid out and lots of supplementary books, but I guess the money's spent in the areas that they consider a priority.

I find that for a document that size there isn't very much that I can get out of it. It's not really very helpful in terms of once you know the approach. I'm still not very sure what I'm supposed to teach.

The workshops were a good idea. I still think that the ones I've seen this year, the two or three, they're still a bit of a showcase of what other people do. It's so limited. Again, what comes across from those workshops is the whole process how to approach art, but not so much what to do and what I've done this year is to approach art this way but I'm still shaky on what I should teach and how it should be sequenced throughout the year and the grade level and not to do something that's going to be too hard for the kids.

To summarize, the analyses of the post-implementation interview questions, as exemplified by the foregoing comments dealt with the teachers' perceived satisfaction with the new art curriculum and implementation process and whether teachers had read the new art curriculum. Their comments support the final classification for extent of implementation classifications. Teachers 1, 2, 3, 10, 12 and 15 indicated that they had read the new art curriculum and were satisfied with the process; teachers 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 indicated that they had looked at the new curriculum and were somewhat satisfied with the process; and teachers 6, 9, 13
and 14 had either not read the new curriculum or not found it helpful.

**Confirmation of the Final Extent of Implementation Categories With Each of the Fifteen Teachers.**

The final step in determining whether implementers and non-implementers emerge was to confirm the extent of implementation categories with the individual teachers. The teachers were asked to look over the analyses related to the *Extent of Implementation Checklists* and the *Levels of Use Checklists* and their responses to the post-implementation questions related to their perceived satisfaction with the new curriculum and implementation process and to verify their final extent of implementation category. All of the teachers agreed that the categories they were assigned to was reasonable. Although S2 was critical of the new art curriculum and the implementation process because it does not provide lesson plans for specific activities that should be covered for the entire year, he nonetheless suggested that he was implementing the approaches recommended in the new curriculum.

The four-step analysis described was conducted to determine the extent to which the teachers implemented and whether or not they could reasonably be classified as six Full Implementers, five Partial implementers and four Non-Implementers.
Chapter V
Results II: Factors that Influence the Implementation Process for Teachers

The data analyses performed and reported in this chapter attempted to respond to the research questions: "What significant factors appear to influence the implementation process for the fifteen teachers participating in this research" and "What similarities and differences appear among the fifteen teachers as to the identification and management of these factors to suggest reasons why they choose to support the implementation process?"

Phase II entailed a content analysis of the pre- and post implementation interviews for statements that suggest factors that may influence the implementation process for the teachers. The factors that emerged from the content analyses were organized into categories on the basis of similarities and differences that emerge among the teachers to suggest reasons that influence them to support the implementation process.

To provide a framework for a content analysis of the interview transcripts, Fullan's (1982, p. 56) four categories of factors influencing the implementation process were used.

Factors Related to the Characteristics of the Change Itself

The first step in the analyses was to examine the content of interview transcripts for factors related to the characteristics of the change itself. The following familiar factors emerged: (a) perceived need for and receptiveness towards the change and
importance placed on the quality and practicality of the art curriculum document and resource materials, and (b) the priority placed on art as a subject area.

1. Perceived Need for and Receptiveness Towards the Change and Expectation Related to Curriculum Content

In order to establish comparative data, Pre- and Post-Implementation Interviews are presented as they reflect ideas expressed by three distinct groups that emerged from the extent of implementation analyses discussed in the previous chapter: Non-implementers, Partial Implementers, and Full Implementers.

The non-implementers 6, 9, 13, and 14 were either neutral or receptive towards the anticipated art curriculum implementation and had expectations that the new curriculum guide would provide easy-to-follow practical lesson plans. For example:

S9: No feeling (regarding forthcoming curriculum change). I think for any new curriculum personally I would like to have someone come to the school and tell me exactly what steps to take rather than be given a curriculum package or book and be expected to decipher it myself or attend district workshops that generally conflict with something else important. I would like to be told specifically what to implement for my particular grade level of children. I'd like a sequence of lessons, like we have in math or reading, supplementary units or books that progress from the simple to more difficult so I know exactly what I should be covering at my grade level.

S13: I think it actually will be quite good because I found that some of the programs that have come into the schools recently have been very well organized and therefore easy to follow and they seem to be considering
the way things are for the teacher in the classroom situation more so than they used to. There seems to be a lot of input from actual teachers so they seem to be reasonable and consider how long it takes you to organize an art project. What the materials are, if they're easy to obtain. I hope the curriculum will be divided into segments that you can start from the basics and work your way up, so I actually think it will be really good. I'm looking forward to it.

The partial implementers, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11 were receptive towards the forthcoming implementation and expected practical lesson plans to guide them.

S4: As far as thinking about change coming, I'm interested to know what they have to say and how they're going to be changing things so I'll be interested in reading it. I'm looking forward to it.

I found the last curriculum was very wordy, and it spent a lot of time on theory and maybe this new one will be more concrete and a bit clearer as to what is expected at each grade level and how to teach the activities.

S8: Well, if it's going to help me organize my art lessons then I would welcome it. I'd like a well-organized curriculum, where I can easily read and understand what is expected of the teacher and the student.

I'd like some examples like pictures of students' work to give me some ideas of what to do in art and I'd like to know what methods or areas I have to cover or what materials I have to use, but I would really like to see lots of examples: what can I do with tapestry; what can I do with collages and things like that. I'd also like to see some supplemental books like they're getting in social studies that would help.

I can't say that I'm very familiar with the implementation of the new curriculum. I guess I would have to say examples...giving teachers new ideas; how
you can integrate art with other subjects; suggestions for themes, lots of practical ideas.

The full implementers, 1, 2, 3, 10, 12, and 15 were receptive to the new curriculum change. The full implementers, like the partial and non-implementers were expecting the new art curriculum to provide them with practical ideas for their art programs; however, the full implementers were also concerned that the new art curriculum should provide a theoretical framework to follow.

S2: I expect it to answer the questions I have about teaching art. That there is a scope and sequence I would be interested in seeing what their rationale, their philosophy, is for teaching art and I would try to match it with what I've done. I also want something concrete. I think we need a concrete base to start with and then we can move to something more abstract. That's what I've been doing this year, looking through books so I can have something concrete to start with. I'd like to see some very directed activities or programs on units and then when we have a feel for it we can move to another level. We need some fairly structured and detailed units so teachers can develop a feeling for art. Maybe it's not the way to go. Maybe we should have an art specialist in each school just as we have for P.E. and music. I'll be interested in seeing what the new curriculum has to offer.

S12: I'm excited about it (the art curriculum change). I'm excited about it for a few reasons. One, being that it stimulates a person's thinking and gets them motivated to come up with new ideas. Two, the old one has been around a long time so we need some new ideas. This is my 36th year of teaching and it's been pretty similar since I can remember.

I'm expecting new ideas. I'm hoping to integrate it with the language arts program. It's like the creative
ideas from art to extend into other areas in language arts. . .into oral expression, illustrating stories and so on. I'd also like to see the whole approach to teaching art clarified. That's important.

The post-implementation interviews were examined for factors related to the teachers' perceived need for, and receptiveness towards the art curriculum change and expectations related to the curriculum content during and after the actual implementation process.

The analyses of the post-implementation interview transcripts suggest that the non-implementers place a low priority on the art curriculum implementation. They continue to express a desire for practical curriculum content.

S6: Well, I did look at it, but I haven't really applied it. I find it difficult to get something in front of me and be expected to apply it in the classroom. I like to see how it's used, first. I need to see some practical ideas in the curriculum book and at workshops and how I can use those ideas in the classroom. The curriculum is very theoretical so I find it hard to translate it into the classroom. So it's hard for me to get motivated enough to spend the time to study it in any depth and I'm not sure I would understand it anyway unless I see practical examples.

S13: I'd like to see projects outlined that can be done without too much extra work on the teacher's part. I'd like everything outlined quite clearly. I think then it will be quite helpful, but as I say, I haven't actually read it yet. Maybe if it had activities that were easy to follow and there were all the supplies ready so you wouldn't have to hunt around for them, then it would be easier to implement.
The partial implementers continued to indicate receptiveness to the change but also indicated that they have other more immediate curriculum priorities. The partial implementers, like the non-implementers, continued to express a desire for practical curriculum content.

S5: Yes, I would say it was helpful. . .but when it comes to have more concrete stuff I would like some other materials and examples. That would help. . .you know, to find ideas that takes more time. It's hard to know where to get new ideas, I know I have lots of ideas and books, but other principals can't help. But the curriculum, it's well detailed.

S7: Well, I can't really answer that properly yet, because I haven't really gone through it tooth and nail. Um. . .I guess I could say in some ways it (new art curriculum) has satisfied expectations. I know what I'm supposed to be aiming for now. I guess I was expecting some more specific direction and I guess that's what I got, but as I said more specific activities units at the grade levels would have been helpful.

The full implementers continued to express receptiveness to the change and indicate that the new art curriculum was indeed meeting a need. Only S2 suggested a need for practical curriculum content.

S2: The whole approach has been helpful. . .but not the content. I think it's still lacking a sequential [sic] and I'm still not sure of the content. I know how to approach it and I'm teaching everything in the model, but it's the whole content part. the whole philosophy I grasp, but what I'm not sure of is what it is that I'm supposed to be teaching. It would be nice to have the art curriculum laid out like the new social studies so you
know what you should be teaching at each grade level with lessons laid out and lots of supplementary books, but I guess the money is spent in areas they consider a priority.

S10: I found it helpful in the sense that it now helps me to do more of a unit plan rather than just using art as a reflection of language arts or a craft activity. It has helped me to see a progression. That's also related to the workshops and all the other things we've been involved in.

I've not had the time to find flaws in it. I've mainly been concerned with picking up what I can and applying it to this year.

Yes, the curriculum with the amount of inservice (has satisfied expectations).

In just the way I said that it now gives me a chance to work through some sort of progression.

It's helped me to realize I can now take a theme and sort of experiment in different ways with different materials and it's also given me some clues as to some lead up activities to develop skills like how to mix colours or create movement.

Distinct differences appeared among the implementers, partial implementers and non-implementers as to their receptiveness towards the art curriculum change and their satisfaction with the quality and practicality of the art curriculum document. During and following the implementation process, all the non-implementers suggested that they were satisfied with their current art program and did not view the new art curriculum as a priority. They continued to express a desire for concrete, practical curriculum materials that can readily be translated into classroom practice.

The partial implementers continued to indicate a receptiveness towards the art curriculum change but did not view it
as their immediate priority. They also expressed a desire for concrete, practical lesson aids.

The full implementers, with the exception of S2 suggest that the new curriculum is a practical document for their purposes. S15 expresses this when she states:

Well, I found it all helpful in that it lays down exactly what the expectations are. I think it's very clear cut. It tells you where you are going and what is expected of you. Before it didn't provide a scope and sequence for the grades and an easy to understand approach for developing units. Yes, I think the whole curriculum is quite helpful. The curriculum is an outline, an approach. It's up to the teachers to adapt the content.

To summarize, the need for, and receptiveness towards the curriculum change and the quality and practicality of the curriculum document emerged as two important factors influencing the direction of the curriculum change for all of the teachers in this study, however, these factors were perceived differently by the implementers, partial implementers and non-implementers.

2. Priority Placed on Art as a Subject Area

All of the non-implementers indicated art is important but with the exception of S9, rated art along with music and P.E. at the bottom end of the scale. S9 rated music, science, socials and P.E. of less importance than art.
S6: Language arts number 1, math number 2. I'd have to lump the rest together, P.E., art, music. They are important because they broaden experiences and not just. I don't know.

It's (art) important. It's something that can enhance the child's creativity. It helps the child to express himself whereas in other areas he may not be able to. It's an area where a child can feel successful in whatever he does. It's individual. Art is very individual. It's very important.

I mean that the child should express himself freely in drawings, paintings as long as you do not force him to do anything, so he has the freedom to do what he wants.

S14: Language arts, arithmetic, probably social studies, and science is important, music and P.E. Oh, I see what I've done! Oh, I forgot art.

S4, S7 and S11 rated art along with music and P.E. of least importance. S8 rates art along with social studies, science, music and P.E. next to reading and writing and math. The other partial implementers rated art as important as the other subject areas. All of the partial implementers indicated art is important.

S4: I think the language arts, which involve speaking, reading and writing and then it's a toss up between math and social studies. Social studies are important because it makes us aware of the community and ourselves and learning to get to know people and what's involved in the community. That's very important. And math is something that I'm wondering if computers are going to make a big change in that. With computers and calculators I'm wondering if the basic math skills are going to be needed that much, but it's still important to get the logical thinking going. After that I see P.E., music and art, their importance for the physical and cultural aspects. I see music as an art so I will lump the two together.
S8: That's very difficult. Probably reading and writing because if you can't read and write you can't follow instructions or understand, but I certainly feel fine arts should play an important role as integrated in the language arts program. All the areas are important - social studies, science, all of them.

S11: Well, I give them all equal value... now anyway. It's impossible to separate them.

S1 and S2 rated art, as important as other subjects. S3, S12, and S15 rated art as important as social studies, science, music and P.E., next in importance to language arts and math. S10 rated art the least important of all subjects.

S2: Oh, art is first. No, just kidding! This is something I've never done. I'm not sure I would put them in order. I hate the question. I really can't do it. I can't answer the question. I integrate all my subjects. There is no one subject that's the most important. They all have their own importance, so I can't rate them. On what terms would I rate them. I can't do it.

S10: Language arts number 1, math number 2. Actually I'd rate them both the same. Social studies number 3, Science number 4. What else have we got. P.E. is very important as well. Number 1 I think language arts and math come first, then physical education and then social studies and science and then music and then drama and then art.

Prior to the formal implementation all of the teachers indicated art was an important subject area. Two full implementers and one partial implementer rated art as important as other subjects and two teachers, one full implementer and one non-implementer rated art the least important subject.
During the post-implementation interviews the non-implementers continued to indicate that art is important and rated art higher later than they did prior to the implementation. Teacher S14 continued to indicate that art was of least importance and S6 continued to rank art, P.E. and music at the bottom; however, S13 suggested that art is as important as other subjects and S9 continued to rate art next to language arts and math.

S13: I think all the subjects are important, but if I had to choose then reading and math would have to be first before the cultural things, but for a well-rounded person the cultural things are important to have. So to have a well-rounded curriculum you need all of these things in it somewhere.

S14: Well, I think the basics first of all, language arts, arithmetic, social studies are important, then science, and art. Although I put art at the bottom as far as importance, I do include art as a part of the subject areas.

Partial implementers S4 and S11 rated art higher later than they did prior to implementation. The other partial implementers' ratings of art were unchanged. All partial implementers continue to view art as important.

S4: For me language arts I consider a large area which involve the writing and reading of words and I don't know after that. I think most things are close second. I'd put science and math and social studies, art and P.E. together. My general impression is that they belong together and they're all important but generally at the end.
S8: Oh dear. Well, I guess the basic subjects you have to deal with come first, reading, writing and math, and then all those other areas, art, P.E. and so on are equally important.

As a group, the full implementers rated art much higher during the post-implementation than they did during the pre-implementation interviews. S12 placed language arts first, and S15 placed language arts first and math second, and both S12 and S15 rated all the other subjects of equal importance.

S1: Gosh! I find that very hard to break. I don't think it's necessary to structure learning into separate parcels. I see all subject areas as being interrelated and I think there should be a greater emphasis put on that. All learning is important. I can't rank them. They're all important. Do you mind if I don't rank them?

S10: Oh, I don't think I could do that (rank subjects). I have my preferences, but I don't think I could do that because in an elementary school we're here to give children a rounded education so I can't do that.

During the post-implementation interviews the full implementers, as a group, rated art higher than either the partial or non-implementers. The ranking of art for the partial implementers was similar to the non-implementers.

All of the teachers indicated that art is important; however, distinct differences emerged among the three groups as to their perception of why art is important and how they felt that art should be structured. To exemplify this, consider the following components:

The non-implementers appeared to view art as a hand-maiden to other subject areas as indicated in these transcribed opinions:
S6: (Post-implementation) I think the kids learn a lot from what we do in art. It's really useful too because I teach a lot of vocabulary through art and it's fun for them and it's great for language development.

S14: (Pre-implementation) Sometimes I feel it's good to have art separate, but sometimes I feel it should be integrated and not have it or teach it as a separate subject area because that will free more time for the other areas.

S14: (Post-implementation) In that sense (as a supplement to other subjects) it's (art) important because it is useful for illustrating aspects of the other subject areas.

The partial implementers acknowledged the value of art mainly as a vehicle for skill development and creative self-expression.

S5: (Pre-implementation) It's very important because it's the part of the child where he extends himself, creates, manipulates things through different media and learns, 'It's me. I did it myself. It's different from the others but it's O.K. It's good because it's me!''

S5: (Post-implementation) I think that allowing the child to create with something in his hands, it could be just a pencil or colouring crayons or chalk, or whatever, but to actually create, express something that he's seen or he would like to see is important. It's a way to actually make more concrete his imagination or creativity. I like to give them time and possibilities of making drawings and now to look around at things and see different art.

The full implementers appeared to value art as a subject in its own right. The full implementers suggested that art needs to provide opportunities for the children to learn about the contributions of art in history and in society in general.
S1: I try to make it (art) exciting for the students and to stress that art is very much a part of life. I mean civilization as we know it could not exist without art. Art has to be viewed as of basic importance.

S15: I guess I realize that art is very important, and in a way it's always been an important part in my classroom. Now I'm studying famous artists as well, appreciation of art functions, of art contributions; that's another change.

Factors at the School District Level

All of the teachers indicated that the central administration needs to play a supportive role in facilitating the implementation process. However, differences emerged in the perceptions of the implementers regarding the nature of this support. The pre-implementation interviews were examined for factors related to the teachers' perceptions of the role that the central administration should play in facilitating the art curriculum implementation.

Although the non-implementers indicated that they expected the central administration to organize implementation workshops and to be willing to respond to concerns as they arise, their responses suggested that the central administration should play more of a support role rather than a leadership role in the implementation process; namely that "central administrators should be the ones handing out guidelines"; and that "they might do a few workshops."

In contrast, the partial implementers suggested that the central administration should not only support the curriculum
implementation but should take some leadership for it. Teacher S4 states:

Making us aware of it (the new art curriculum) and if it is something new perhaps a workshop or a quick introduction to the basic, the major points in the curriculum. That way they have made an effort to make us aware of what the new curriculum is and then if the teacher chooses not to use it, then at least the administrators have made the effort to make them aware of it. The district people should be responsible for the workshops. I think a lot of teachers when they see change come along they are either accustomed to their own way of doing things and the change means a lot of extra work. It does build stress so a lot of them may put things aside.

The district people should take it upon themselves. . . .to organize the workshops and inform the teachers and take the leadership for that.

S11: I think they should be exposing teachers to the curriculum and making sure that materials are available for them. I think that they should be providing workshops or contacts and resources for the curriculum. And I think they should be providing an expert in that field. I don't see any reason why someone that's an English major should be asked to try and evaluate and organize an art workshop because the art curriculum is coming in. Also, I think that they should be using specialist teachers as resource people in the district. And allowing teachers time for implementation is the important thing and budgeting for it. The district should be budgeting for an art coordinator and specialist teachers and have them coming in to do lessons and show exactly what can be done.

The full implementers agreed that the central administration should play a leadership role and provide a strong support structure for the teachers in order to facilitate the implementation.
S1: You can't have district-wide change without district support. There has to be someone who takes charge of coordinating and monitoring the implementation process. You also have to have knowledgeable people to assist teachers and provide school-based inservice during the implementation process. Teachers also need to be given time from their classroom duties to attend workshops, otherwise they are not going to take the process as seriously. So the district has to provide leadership, workshops in the individual schools; keep us informed. There also has to be ongoing communication, someone you can contact when you run into problems. There has to be someone at the district level to provide you with the answers, or at least someone who can refer you to the right sources for assistance.

S2: They are the ones who should organize the workshops and go into the schools and explain the curriculum. They should also make sure that the resources are available and that we're not expected to cover too many areas in one year. I think one or two new areas a year is all that the teacher has time for. Also, there should be a supervisor who knows the areas so you can contact them if there is a problem.

Prior to the art curriculum implementation the non-implementers indicated that the central administration should provide support in terms of organizing workshops and responding to needs as they arise. The partial implementers expressed the same feelings but also indicated that central administration should take responsibility for organizing implementation workshops and for budgeting for: an art coordinator, release time for teachers, and for resource materials. The full implementers concur with the view that the central administration should provide a strong support structure for the teachers; but in addition, the full implementers
suggest that the central administration should take the leadership for the entire implementation process.

The post-implementation interviews were examined for factors related to the teachers' perceptions of the role that the central administration should play in facilitating the art curriculum implementation. The selected statements are from responses to post-implementation question 9.

All but one of the non-implementers continued to indicate that they would want the central administration to provide support in terms of workshops and to respond to needs as they arise. S14, however, stated in the post-implementation interview that the central administration should not play a role unless they feel a need to monitor that the art curriculum is being implemented. S14 states: "As far as I'm concerned I don't think they (central administration) have a role unless they feel we are not using the curriculum and they feel strongly that we need to; that it's that important to check."

During the post-implementation interviews, the non-implementers, except for S14, indicated that the central administration in addition to organizing workshops should take responsibility for providing: an art coordinator; release time for teachers to attend implementation workshops; and supplementary resource materials and supplies. Lack of time emerged as the critical factor for the non-implementers. Teacher S9 provided an example where she stated:
I think they (central administration) have to take responsibility to provide concrete help and clarification of the curriculum. Money has to be spent on materials, on resource materials, on supplies, on release time and they can't try to implement more than one or at the most two areas in one year. It's impossible to find the time for more than that. We really haven't had any help from the district. I really don't feel they are doing much of anything with the art curriculum. I don't think they really care about it.

Another example is provided by S14:

I think they should be available for questions. I think they should be sponsoring workshops, and I think if you feel you have a need or want someone to come in and do a lesson for you there should be someone who can come in and actually do that for you. So you have to have a coordinator. The most important thing though is for them to budget for release time because that's the only way a lot of teachers can get to workshops out of the school and they need to have several workshops not just one so there is some followup. And I guess the coordinator would tie into the budget too, but time's the thing.

All of the non-implementers except S14 indicated that the central administration needs to take responsibility for organizing implementation workshops; however, none of them attended the district organized art curriculum implementation workshops organized by the Art Teachers' Association in November and February, and only one of the non-implementers attended both school-based implementation workshops offered in March and May. On this important topic, the opinions are clear:
S6: I wasn't here for the first workshop and I didn't get a chance to attend the district ones. I would like to see more workshops, but obviously I've missed 3 out of the 4 so that's not really a fair statement for me to make.

S13: The workshops outside the school, I find that unfortunately with workshops outside the school that I'm either doing something else that I have to or then maybe I have another thing I'm going to. I think in my initial interview I said I like workshops a lot but I think if they're in the school they're much better for me and I don't believe we've had any other ones here. Oh, we did have that other one with "A".

S14 completely rejects district-based workshops, stating: "I don't go to workshops outside the school." In the post-implementation interviews, the partial implementers continued to identify central administration leadership and support as an important factor in influencing the direction of the implementation for them. For them this entails budgeting for an art coordinator, for resource materials, and for implementation workshops. Time is also mentioned as a factor influencing the direction of the implementation.

S4: I think (central administration can provide support by) helping the classroom teacher, myself, my concerns that I've had earlier, finding out what are the concerns and having practical workshops and mainly some kind of coordinator coming in to help with the concerns I have about implementing the program. If they want the program to be implemented properly, I think the Board has to take an interest and pursue those interests by helping the classroom teacher implement it in any way they can.
Later S4 added:

Yes, I'd like to see specific lessons. More supplementary materials like the new social studies are needed. Textbooks that come automatically without having to be ordered separately grade by grade. I'm finding that more useful; clear materials and lots of resource materials and people at school who can help you.

S11: I think they need to be really supportive; to help teachers find materials; to answer questions; to help demonstrate and clarify areas the teachers may not understand; to provide practical workshops.

Like the non-implementers, the partial implementers requested district-organized workshops but did not attend them. Unlike the non-implementers, the partial implementers did not justify their failure to attend the district-sponsored workshops.

S8: I like to see a coordinator who gives practical workshops. I understand we had a practical workshop here at the school, but I missed it and I didn't attend the district ones. I would like to see someone who is available to provide help to the teachers when needed, right.

Lack of time to implement was mentioned as a factor in influencing the direction of implementation by all the partial implementers. None of the partial implementers specifically mentioned release time, which falls under central administration control. Lack of time appears to be more of a problem of not placing the art curriculum as a priority.
S11: I think it's just a matter of time for me until I'll be able to spend more time on the art curriculum. As you know, I'm in the process of implementing another curriculum as well. I guess I'm sounding a bit negative, but it's been a lot this year. Also, now I realize how much more needs to be done in art so it's a bit frustrating.

To implement two curriculum areas in one year is just impossible. You can't do a good job implementing both.

The full implementers continued to identify central administrative leadership and support as an important factor in influencing the direction of the art curriculum implementation. The specific factors mentioned during the pre-implementation interviews were again identified in the post-implementation interviews. They are: appointment of a coordinator, more workshops, release time for teachers to attend workshops or more time to implement, and additional curriculum resources. In the post-implementation interviews S1, S3 and S15 also suggested that the central administration needs to play a leadership role in the art curriculum change in order to change negative attitudes related to art education.

S1: The way of doing it would be to have an art contact person, a supervisor, a coordinator, someone who oversees the programs at a district level and a specialist in the school who could act as a resource person for the teachers in the school. The district person would provide the necessary inservice, support, all the things needed to nurture a cadre of activities. The district person should set up a network of people who would support and promote the arts at the school level.
Yes, a coordinator should provide services to the school contact people. That would be a more effective way to reach everyone. It's done in P.E. and in music. The art is left on the sidelines because we do not have a district person.

Earlier, in response to question 5, S1 emphasized the need for strong central administrative leadership to help change negative attitudes towards art education.

S1: I guess more direction from the Board is needed to give the process credibility on the part of the teachers. It takes strong direction from the Board to change deeply ingrained attitudes.

S3 similarly noted:

I think they have to be aware of what is being implemented in the way of art because I feel that sometimes art is not given the due justice in our curriculum and I think it is the district personnel's responsibility to know how much importance it does play. I think the superintendent should make some kind of statement that he supports the implementation.

S3 and S15 suggested that providing release time to assist teachers with the implementation would help to impress upon the teachers that the implementation process needs to be taken seriously. Teacher S3 stated: "And some release time should be provided for teachers so they get a feeling it's important." S15 noted:

The workshops need to be at the school or release time has to be provided if they're elsewhere, otherwise people will not attend especially the ones who don't have an interest in the area.
The other full implementers did not specifically mention release time, but simply expressed frustration at not having more time to spend on the art curriculum implementation.

S2: The most helpful is actually seeing what other people have done. The most frustrating is actually finding the time to do unit planning which I find very difficult without an actual overview before the school year starts.

The full implementers, like the partial and non-implementers requested that central administration organize workshops, but as a group the full implementers attended more workshops than the partial or non-implementers and two of the full implementers were the only teachers to attend all four implementation workshops.

Each of the three groups of implementers mentioned the following requisites for implementation: curriculum coordinator, more workshops, release time for teachers to attend workshops, more time to implement in general, practical assistance, and more resource materials. However, there are differences as to how the three groups account for these factors.

The non-implementers suggested that the district should address these requisites because this would make the implementation process simpler for them so that the least possible investment of personal time and energy would need to be expended. None of the non-implementers viewed the art curriculum implementation as a priority for them. All indicated satisfaction with their current art program during the post-implementation
interview, and expressed irritation at having to put extra time and effort into changing their art program. The following post-implementation conversation expresses this frustration:

S9: I would have liked some practical ideas and I'd like to know exactly what units we are expected to teach at each grade level. I'd like to have someone from the district come and walk us through the curriculum and give us sample units and materials to carry the units out. I'd like some concrete help and release time if I'm expected to change my program.

The most frustrating thing is being given a book and being expected to change something you're already very comfortable with. Also it's frustrating because there isn't the time to read the curriculum, let alone try to understand what they're saying.

The partial implementers did not view the art curriculum implementation as a priority and therefore they appeared to be investing their energies in other curriculum areas. However, none of them was completely satisfied with their current art programs and were looking to the district for assistance so that they can improve their art programs without compromising on the time needed to maintain and improve other curriculum areas that they view as more important. Unlike the non-implementers, who expected the district to provide them with the means if it expected them to implement the art curriculum, the partial implementers accepted much of the responsibility for their failure to implement.

The full implementers viewed the art curriculum change as being either a priority or as important as other curriculum areas,
and viewed the role of the district as providing strong leadership and clear direction in order to establish the legitimacy of the art curriculum change. Although the full implementers were able to implement without this leadership they felt that the implementation would not be long-term without the district leadership since school administrators and priorities change.

Differences among the non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers also emerged regarding their experience with previous district-wide curriculum implementation efforts. The non-implementers suggested that their experience with previous district-wide implementation efforts was negative.

S9: Well, they've sort of been dumped upon us. Like there's the new program and we are now going to use it. For some of them there has been help and for some of them they've just been dumped upon us. In general they haven't been particularly effective.

S13: Well, I think some (implementation of curricula) of them are done too quickly. They (central administration) seem to give very little information. The book has been given to me, just handed out. I haven't had time to digest it, so I find they expect you to do it too quickly. Some of the things they set up were not realistic. They were done by people who haven't been in the classroom for some time.

Very little support in the past. I think more is needed to be able to have someone you can ask questions about the curriculum. You really haven't known who you could go and ask if you didn't know something. It really hasn't been helpful. I'm not sure how much things will change.
The partial implementers' perceptions of previous curriculum implementation efforts varied from negative to positive. S4 and S11 have negative implementation histories and S5, S7 and S11 have positive histories. The following comments illustrate these variations.

S4: Well, the curriculum arrives in the form of pieces of paper, a booklet and that's it. It's up to me to take the curriculum home and read it and interpret it and understand how to use it and if I think it would fit my classroom, but mostly the interpretation is up to me. Well, I think the whole process is really bad. Half of the time I'll put it aside and don't bother looking at it again for a long time because, I don't have the time and if I have a free weekend, sometimes I'll take it home and look at it, but I still don't understand it.

S5: I think this district is really doing their best at letting the teachers know that there is a change and organize workshops and meetings. The kindergarten and social studies curricula are done like this.

With the exception of S10 the full implementers suggest that to a large extent what the teachers get out of the implementation process depends on their involvement in it.

S1: I think very often the curriculum on paper looked fine but it all boils down to the involvement of the teachers, of the teacher with the subject whether the teacher is willing to understand the direction or take a new direction if the curriculum implies a new direction. That's going to be very hard. You can't teach an old dog new tricks, or it's harder to teach a dog who's been through the same kind of tricks who's had success with them. If you try to tell them "No, that's wrong. What you've been doing is, has been shown according to
the researchers, to be ineffective" it's going to be almost impossible to implement.

S2: It seems to me looking around that people tend to carry on their old programs as long as they can and it takes a long time to change. But if I'm going to get something out of it I need to get involved.

Characteristics at the School Level

In the pre-implementation interviews, the teachers identified principal support and teacher involvement as key factors at the school level in influencing the direction of implementation for them. These two factors are discussed separately.

The non-implementers viewed the principal as someone who provides support, encouragement and assistance when needed; for example S9 stated: "I think they should be there when we need help" and S14 similarly noted: "She can be there to support or give help if the teacher wants it. That's all."

Like the non-implementers, the partial implementers expect the principal to be supportive of the implementation and responsive to the teachers' needs. In addition, they expect the principal to participate in workshops, monitor the implementation and assist teachers to obtain resources. One partial implementer suggested the principal provide release time.

S5: I think they (principals) should be aware of the curriculum and participate in the workshops, support the teachers with resources. That's all. That is all they can do because most principals do not know art.
S8: In any situation the principal has to take a leadership role in setting the priorities for the school providing support, monitoring the implementation and helping the teacher to find resources. Sounds like a lot but it is the principal who plays the most important role in making it happen or not happen by either supporting or not supporting the area. In our school I can guarantee that nothing at all would have been done if you hadn't initiated and monitored and supported it. In some schools they won't even be able to find the new curriculum guide very soon. They will probably have it mislaid in the files or shelves somewhere.

Teacher S11 viewed the principal as providing support for the implementation by taking over the teachers' class or by providing release time in some other ways.

S11: Well, considering that my main focus for curriculum implementation is time, I think that the principal could help by allowing the teachers time, either relief teaching or some other way internally to have time to go to extra workshops or just to sit and talk to other teachers about how to do this instead of trying to cram it into your recess.

During the pre-implementation interviews, the full implementers indicated that the principal should be supportive of the implementation and be willing to assist the teachers with the process. None of these full implementers elaborated as to the principal's role.

S2: Just to perhaps talk about it with teachers and to perhaps visit classrooms to see how it's going, show an interest in it, but nothing really more than that.
The non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers all indicated that the principal needs to play a supportive role during the implementation process. The partial implementers elaborated more than the other two groups regarding what this support should entail.

During the post-implementation interviews the non-implementers continued to indicate that the principal needed to be supportive and responsive to the teacher's needs. All of the non-implementers added that they do not expect the principal to be a curriculum expert in the area and that they expect the district to provide this expertise. They also express some discomfort asking the principal for assistance because of her busy schedule. The following comments provide examples:

S6: Well, I don't know how they (principals) could help, exactly. I mean they are important, but I don't think they could help with the actual implementation except to maybe try to motivate teachers to get involved and be supportive. That's pretty critical. If they are not supportive, chances are that people will not pay much attention to the new curriculum at all, but at the same time principals can't be expected to be experts in the area and even if they were, teachers are reluctant to impose on busy principals. There is always the feeling that you should have done your best to try it first, but you can always ask an art coordinator or art supervisor for help because that's his job to help. That's what they are supposed to do.

S9: Nothing much if you don't have art as a district priority . . . not much they (principals) can do. Principals don't set the district priorities and they
can't be expected to be specialists in the area. I suppose it's important for them to try to answer questions and be supportive, but the implementation itself is really up to the district and art hasn't been a district priority, so I haven't done anything much with the curriculum and I've already talked about that, but if the district decided to do something with art then it still would be difficult to do much at school without principal support, so it's important, and I suppose even now your encouragement has made the difference between filing the whole thing and having it sit on the shelf.

The partial implementers continued to view the principal as a key figure in providing leadership and support at the school level.

S4: Oh, the principal is a key figure, as I was saying, because the atmosphere of your school will make a difference in the enthusiasm teachers show towards a program so that if the principal is helping by being enthusiastic, of course it sets a trend for the rest of the staff in the school, but the principals can't be enthusiastic about everything. There are too many new areas coming in and art isn't generally of that much concern to most principals or to the Board, I think. In my case though I would not have done anything if it wasn't for the principal being familiar with the art curriculum. I wouldn't have known what to do. If there hadn't been the help and the feeling that I had to address it, I would have put my priorities somewhere else.

S7: I would like in general, the principals, of course, to be involved in art as far as how the school looks and things like that and to be supportive and help teachers to get supplies and maybe organize workshops, but I don't think they can be expected to be an expert in the area and do it themselves. Principals need to set it as a priority, but that's hard if it isn't a priority with the district and very often if it isn't a
district priority, teachers may not feel it's a priority for them because the district will offer workshops in the other areas. Like this year, they really haven't done anything in art.

During the post-implementation interviews the full implementers were much more verbal as to their expectations of the principal's role in the implementation process. They indicate that the principal needs to take a leadership role in creating an atmosphere conducive to the implementation of the new curriculum.

S1: Well, I see the principal as a sort of all around supporter. The principal must create the atmosphere in the school that makes it understood that this is an important area that has to be addressed and create the expectation that the new curriculum area must be implemented and will not be ignored. The principal needs to monitor the implementation process. People can pay lip service to the process, but not actually implement it.

S15: Well, I suppose interest is always the key factor in any implementation. I always feel very good and very motivated when you come by and say, 'Oh, I like that bulletin board' or you come in and say to the children, 'I was noticing you did such and such and what a lovely job.' It's very important to have someone who is very meaningful to the teachers to come and say to the children I really like what you're doing, It gives everyone a boost to want to do bigger and better things. It's the same with the principal as it is with the Board personnel. It's up to the principal to give the implementation process an air of priority to convey to the staff that the implementation is a priority and to supervise the process. I doubt that anyone would have done anything with the new art curriculum if you hadn't done that and I guess the same goes for all the new curriculum areas. It's not that teachers aren't dedicated or conscientious. It's just that there never is enough
time and you tend to use up your time in other areas until there is some pressure for you to address something. So the principal is really the key figure.

The non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers all concurred that the principal needs to be supportive of the implementation and responsive to the teachers' needs. However, differences among the three groups do emerge. The non-implementers suggested that if the implementation is not a district priority, it is not necessary to take the implementation as seriously as they would if it were a priority. The partial implementers were more emphatic than the non-implementers in expressing their feelings that the principal is a key figure in the implementation process. They suggested that although it is difficult for a principal to facilitate the implementation of a curriculum area that is not a district priority, it is possible, and that without this support it is unlikely that the new curriculum would be implemented. The full implementers view the principal as a crucial figure and suggested that regardless of district priorities, the principal is the key in determining the failure or success of the implementation. To summarize, although the non-implementers view the principal as an important figure in facilitating the implementation, the central administration is seen as more important. The partial implementers view the principal as a key figure in making it possible for the implementation process to take place; whereas the full implementers view the principal as the primary figure, critical for the success of the curriculum change.
The non-implementers suggested that they want practical assistance to aid them with their art programs but failed to take advantage of the workshops offered. Practical supplementary materials and implementation workshops were mentioned as a top priority. However, the non-implementers did not read the new art curriculum completely in order to properly assess how practical it may be, nor did they seek practical supplementary resource materials or attend all the supplementary resource materials or attend all the implementation workshops. Furthermore, they did not actively solicit school or district-based administration assistance and indicated reluctance to attend art curriculum workshops, especially those that are not school-based.

During the pre-implementation interviews two of the non-implementers indicated that involvement at implementation workshops would facilitate the art curriculum implementation. Teacher S6 wanted these workshops to provide "practical materials" and "something concrete" and S13 requested "hands on" workshops with "actual samples and sample units." Teachers S9 and S14 indicated a disinterest in attending art curriculum workshops. Teacher S9 stated she wasn't interested in attending art workshops "that generally conflicts with something else important." S14 suggested that she wasn't receptive to becoming involved in workshops or group planning when she stated "I do my own thing" and "I haven't really attended any workshops or anything."

The partial implementers by their responses suggested a receptiveness to becoming involved in implementation workshops
that provide "practical suggestions" and in getting together to do cooperative planning.

S5: I'd like a kind of workshop with somebody who knows something about art and the art curriculum. Some concrete things I can use in the classroom. Also, all the teachers of grade 1 or grade 2 or whatever, get together and they can look through the curriculum and decide things they can try and work at and I think this would be very good; but we have to actually do something to look at the curriculum. Otherwise, we'll just take it and put it in a file somewhere.

S7: I think a lot of workshops working with staffs, maybe not as a whole but you know, maybe by grade level and we could all meet and . . . find . . . what worked really well, like with the social studies, the new one last year. When they brought it out, it was all introduced to us there and laid out with the materials so that everyone was quite clear that you didn't have to do everything and it saved a lot of time you know by going through it step by step and ah...we had school time and followup during your own time and I think most people were then prepared to spare that amount of time to just go down to a workshop one evening or something and even if it was a series maybe three followups. You know, 'cause it is hard to cram it in from 3:45 - 5:15. But ah . . . I find that worse.

S11: I think that teachers remember more of things if they get involved and see things than if they read in a book. I think that teachers need more time to share and become involved with other people that are using the curriculum and I don't think our district set up for allowing non-instructional days and things are not set up for implementing an art curriculum.

The full implementers suggested that teachers need to give the art curriculum a sufficient priority so as to become involved in the implementation process. Although some of the full implementers
suggested that teachers need to involve themselves in workshops or cooperative planning, the full implementers appear to be more concerned with involvement per se than with the specific nature of the involvement.

S1: I think very often the curriculum on paper looks fine, but it all boils down to the involvement of the teachers. I think more grass roots involvement from teachers is needed.

S12: Well, actually I have found that whenever I needed help, there was always help there; but because we always get bogged down with things going on we don't always ask for the help, but I do believe the help is there. I've seen many cases where people have called for help and received wonderful help so I would say implementation procedures have been very good for those who have looked for help. It's really a matter of how much of a priority it is for you.

S15: If teachers reach out and say well, I will make time and go there (workshops) and do it, I think it's really quite fantastic but again I don't myself even take that much advantage of it because of the time. You read what's being offered and you think, wonderful and then that day comes and you get so wrapped up in your own classwork that you don't attend. I put the blame right back on the teachers. I think the district has a lot to offer.

During the post-implementation interviews the non-implementers indicated that none of them had been involved in district-based workshops and only one attended both school-based workshops. S6 and S9 indicated a degree of receptiveness to becoming involved in further art curriculum workshops if they are school based and provide "specific lesson plans", "hands on"
activities and are "preferably during school time." S9 was more resistant but suggested that if she is expected to become involved in implementing the new art curriculum then she needs "concrete help" and something practical to take back to the classroom." S14 continued to be disinterested in becoming involved with the implementation process but suggested that for the next year she would look at the new curriculum and "try some new things."

During the post-implementation interviews the partial implementers continued to express a need to involve themselves in workshops that provide practical suggestions. All of the partial implementers suggested that one-to-one involvement with an art curriculum specialist is needed to facilitate the implementation, and that the more they are prepared to become involved in the implementation process, the more comfortable they will feel about the new art curriculum.

S4: I enjoy workshops where people actually do 'hands on show me' things. Reading from a curriculum guide or when it's written, in a written form, the real meaning escapes me. It's just the way I learn. I learn better by actually seeing and doing things than by reading a book. Ah, so for me it would be a workshop or some practical ideas of how to implement the art program. As I said before everything I've learned so far has been from being involved in workshops or from you explaining and showing me what to do.

I need that one-to-one. It's the most helpful to me. It's like a golf lesson. If I'm standing with a large group of 20, the instructor is going to come by and help me a little bit, but not as much as he could if it were one to one and being one-to-one it forces me to bring out any concerns that I might have, whereas, I could sit quite
possibly in the back and listen to everyone else's concerns and not express mine so I need the one-to-one.

Later S4 added:

When I become more familiar with the art curriculum and work on it as an area that I need to improve on in my classroom which I will have to do, I think things will change.

The following comments by S13 also express similar concerns for concrete help.

S13: Individual teachers might try something in their classroom and at a further session come back and say what they like or didn't like and give feedback to their staff. It would be kind of like using different recipes. You try it and see what you like or didn't like and you talk about it because I think if I tried one thing and someone else tried another thing we would both get some information from each other and in that way, would have had hands on and see how it's relating to our classroom. That way I need to do only one project and get information on, let's say, ten of them. but even to do that is a problem of time.

The full implementers again suggested that teachers become involved whether it be in workshops or cooperative planning or just spending time becoming informed about the new art curriculum.

S1: Art is a difficult thing to teach. You need to get involved and unless you have a really good understanding and feeling for it you will not be able to do a good job. This takes time and involvement.

S10: I would certainly like to see more inservice. Probably, also some sharing among the staff to see what different things people use throughout the school at any level and just sort of brainstorming and that sort of thing. Lots of involvement. Whatever it entails.
The main difference that emerged among the three groups of implementers was their degree of actual involvement in the implementation workshops. The full implementers as a group attended more workshops than the partial and non-implementers, while the non-implementers attended the least. Also, whereas the non-implementers appeared to be the most resistant to becoming involved in the art curriculum implementation, the full implementers appeared to have developed a positive *esprit de corps*.

Differences among the non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers in their degree of perceived satisfaction with the implementation process also emerged. The full implementers were more involved in the process and expressed the most satisfaction with it, while the non-implementers indicated the least satisfaction with the art curriculum implementation.

The non-implementers viewed their experience with the current implementation process as being less than favourable. They expressed a desire for concrete suggestions that could be readily applied to classroom practice.

Teachers S6 and S9 spoke on the subject of school-based workshops.

**S6:** It was much too abstract for me. I need specific lesson plans. I haven't experienced much satisfaction with the process or curriculum and, as I explained, I need to see examples and it's frustrating to have to change a program that I'm already happy with.

**S9:** I can't think of anything that's been particularly helpful. What I'd like are some new practical ideas for classroom projects. We've had two workshops (school-based). I couldn't attend the first one
but the second one had nothing in it for me. It was just a show and tell. It gave me nothing practical to take back to my class. I'm happy with my program, but I'd like some practical ideas and not more theory.

The partial implementers were all somewhat satisfied with the implementation process, but indicated that they need more concrete help and time to implement.

S4: I've found workshops, like I say, like you, they've helped to explain things, as I said earlier, helped to clarify things - the curriculum, but the curriculum without all that wouldn't have helped. I feel I need more. This is speaking from the point of view of someone who knows nothing.

I need something concrete . . . specific lessons with illustrations . . . nothing theoretical yet because it means nothing to me. I'm not there yet.

You know, philosophy and stuff like that - goals and objectives and things like that.

S5: Satisfaction for me is quite a big word. You know, an exciting word and I didn't find anything really exciting with this implementation. I am teaching art differently, and it has been helpful, but not exciting.

I would like to see a type of workshop where we focus on a grade and where the teachers get together and really share their experiences and their activities too. Also, just kind of brainstorm together as to what we can do to implement or focus on such and such a thing. More concrete, okay.

I like the way that it was (the scope and sequence) laid out. It was fine, but I would like more concrete examples. Here at this school, we can come to you for concrete ideas because you have a whole library of things, but in other places teachers need a concrete base to begin.
The full implementer's opinions ranged from somewhat satisfied to very satisfied with the current curriculum implementation process.

S1: I've enjoyed meeting people who have a strong background, gaining a deeper understanding, becoming more enthusiastic about art, becoming personally involved with the process. Having enthusiastic, knowledgeable people giving workshops did more to promote implementation than anything else. I've found the workshops helpful and the focus.

S10: They (implementation workshops) were very helpful in the sense that the people who held them didn't go too deeply into the document itself. They explained the overview or the rationale behind an art program and then they showed examples of how they approached the curriculum which is very effective.

Factors at the Ministry of Education Level

The literature reviewed suggests that the Ministry of Education does not appear to directly influence the curriculum implementation process at the school level; but that it can influence the implementation process indirectly to the extent the Ministry provides support and services to the districts.

In this study, differences did not emerge among the three groups as to their perceptions of factors influencing the implementation at the Ministry level. The teachers suggested that the Ministry should play a role in the implementation; however, they do not consider Ministry support a factor in facilitating the implementation of the new art curriculum.

Teacher S9, a non-implementer, commented:
I don't think it really matters. I have been teaching for 15 years and have yet to attend anything initiated by the Ministry. We're not getting a new art curriculum because they're all of a sudden taking an interest in art. They're expected to revise the curriculum every so many years. If they really cared about the implementation they would put some money into it.

The following comments by a partial implementer also suggested that the Ministry has not played an important role in implementation.

I don't think we should have province-wide change. I think it should be school-based or district-based. The change can't be a priority with every district at the same time. But if we have to have province-wide change then the Ministry should regulate the number of new areas we are expected to implement and put some money into it.

The full implementer, like the partial implementer, suggested that although the Ministry has not appeared to play a supportive role in facilitating the art curriculum implementation, the Ministry can facilitate change by budgeting for implementation and by regulating the number of new curriculum areas teachers are expected to address. This opinion is expressed by S1 when he states "You're not going to have effective implementation of an art curriculum when we have a provincial government that continues to undermine the arts."
Chapter VI
Summary of Factors that Appear to Influence The Art Curriculum Implementation for Teachers

In response to the first research question, "In a setting where conditions appear to be optimum for implementation of the new art curriculum, what significant factors appear to influence the implementation process for the fifteen participating teachers?", the following eleven factors are identified:

A. Characteristics of the Art Curriculum Change
1. Perceived need for and receptiveness towards the art curriculum change.
   The teachers' pre- and post-implementation interview responses suggest that their receptiveness towards the art curriculum change influenced the direction of the art curriculum implementation for them. The teachers' responses indicated that a perceived need for the change and receptiveness towards the change go hand in hand.

   Only the full implementers, with the exception of S2 viewed the new curriculum as a practical document.

3. Priority placed on art as a subject area.
   As a group the full implementation rate art higher than the partial or non-implementers.
4. Perceptions related as to why art education is important and how teaching art should be structured.

As a group the full implementers rated art higher than the partial or non-implementers. Distinct differences related to how the teachers structured their art programs emerged among the three groups of implementers.

B. Factors at the School District Level
1. Central administrative support and leadership.

All of the teachers viewed central administrative support and leadership as a key factor influencing implementation. They specifically mentioned the following:
   (a) curriculum coordinator,
   (b) more implementation workshops,
   (c) release time for teachers to attend workshops,
   (d) more time to implement,
   (e) more resource materials, and
   (f) practical assistance.

2. History of previous implementation efforts.

C. Characteristics at the School Level
1. Principal support and leadership.

Perceptions of principal support and leadership is identified as a major factor by all three groups of teachers.

2. Teacher involvement.

Although this case study was not designed initially to examine peer relations, teacher involvement with the implementation
process did emerge as a factor influencing implementation. Teacher involvement entailed group interactions with peers at workshops and collaborations with each other regarding the new art program.

3. Teacher satisfaction with implementation process.

This case study suggests a direct relationship between teacher satisfaction with the implementation process and extent of implementation. In addition to demonstrating a satisfaction with the implementation process, the implementers displayed a "sense of efficacy", a "sense of confidence that the program can and will work" (Fullan, 1982, p. 72) and a synergy. Synergy, in the context of this study, is defined as an "esprit de corps", a force that knits the group together. It is a cooperative, dynamic effort which entails positive social and professional interactions among the group focused on making the implementation successful. This synergy and sense of efficacy was less evident among the partial implementers, and not evident among the non-implementers.

D. Characteristics at the Ministry Level

1. Budget for Implementation.

2. Regulation of the number of new curriculum areas.

The teachers in this case study noted that the Ministry has not made a direct impact on the curriculum implementation process at the school level, and to improve future implementation efforts the Ministry needs to allocate funds for the implementation process. The teachers in this study do not identify improved communication between the Ministry and school districts as a factor influencing implementation, but they do state that the ministry needs to
regulate the number of Ministry-mandated curriculum changes in order to alleviate "implementation overload."

The teachers in this case study identified eleven factors as influencing the implementation process for them. Although the factors that emerge from this case study are similar to those identified by Fullan (1982, p. 56) there are two important differences. The first difference is that Fullan does not identify the teachers' current program structure as a factor influencing implementation. How teachers in this case study structure their art programs appears to have a direct relationship to the teachers' perceptions of why art education is important and the priority that they give to art as a subject area.

The teachers who structured their art programs mainly as a supplement to other subject areas viewed school art as therapy, a reward for doing well in "academic areas", a means to develop eye-hand coordination and an opportunity to illustrate themes related to seasons, special occasions or other subject areas. To implement the new art curriculum would mean a major shift in the thinking of these teachers since their views towards art as a subject area are not compatible with those discussed in the new curriculum guide. This philosophical gap suggests an important reason for the resistance of these teachers to the implementation of the new art curriculum.

On the other hand, the partial implementers who viewed art mainly as an opportunity for creative self-expression and skill development already held views partially compatible with those outlined in the new curriculum. Similarly the teachers who viewed
art mainly as a way to gain knowledge and understanding of the historical, cultural and social contributions of art held views compatible with the new art curriculum, therefore, little or no change in philosophical position towards the teaching of art is required.

The second difference is that "community characteristics" identified by Fullan are not mentioned as a factor influencing the direction of this art curriculum implementation. On this point the non-implementers, partial implementers, and full implementers suggested that the community is not particularly concerned about the school art programs. Their comments prior to and following the implementation are similar. The following illustrates the opinion of a non-implementer.

S13: I think they (community) think of it (art education) as something you add on, something nice to look at, to enjoy but not really a basic. But interestingly, at open house that's the main thing they look at, the art.

A partial implementer's comments are similar.

S4: I've never talked to anyone about it (community perceptions of art education) but I would guess they would say it's a time to finger paint and draw something. I don't think they care whether we get a new curriculum or not. I don't think they would even notice it if I didn't teach art all year. I never got any art to speak of and no one seemed to notice or care.

A full implementer's comments concur with the partial and non-implementers.
S2: As a supplement (community perceptions of art education), as something the children can do with their hands to decorate the home or school. I don't think they think it's important and I don't think they care if the content or approach of the art curriculum changes or stays the same; but I think they would be upset if we removed it because they feel the children need the diversion from the academics.

Whether or not the art curriculum implementation would be facilitated with community support or is impeded without it does not emerge as a factor in this study. Leadership and support by the central administration and the principal emerged as the most frequently mentioned concerns for all fifteen teachers engaged in the implementation. However, how the teachers responded to these factors varies among the non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers. These differences are addressed in the responses to the second research question,

With respect to the identification and management of factors which might suggest reasons that influence the extent of the implementation process, what similarities and differences appear among the fifteen teachers?

**Similarities and Differences That Suggest Reasons That May Influence the Extent of the Implementation for the Fifteen Teachers**

Although factors perceived to impede or enhance the implementation for the fifteen teachers in this study are similar, distinct differences related to how teachers cope with these factors emerged among the non-implementers, implementers and partial implementers. Figure 4 summarizes these differences and
illustrates the different approaches taken by the three sets of implementers in their dealings with the identified factors influencing the art curriculum implementation.

What emerges as important from the previous data analyses summarized in Figure 4 illustrates that the same identified requisites for implementation in this school context were not acted upon by the teachers in the same way. For example, the teachers all wanted practical art implementation workshops, but in fact the non-implementers did not attend them, and although all teachers wanted a supportive principal, the non-implementers did not solicit her help and rejected help when it was offered.

Background Information

Background information related to the art curriculum implementation process drawn from the principal's diary notes, school records, and brief pre-implementation interviews with the non-art teaching staff members is presented to provide the readers with a more comprehensive picture of the context in which the teachers attempted to implement the new art curriculum.

Principal's Diary Notes and School Records

The following provides a summary of interactions and activities drawn from the principal's diary notes and the school records. The school records include staff meeting minutes, school and district bulletins, and staff memos.
Similarities and Differences That Emerge Among the Non-Implementers, Partial Implementers and Full Implementers to Suggest Reasons That Influence Them to Implement or Not Implement

A. Characteristics of the Art Curriculum Change

1. Perceived need for an receptiveness towards the art curriculum change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Implementers</th>
<th>Partial Implementers</th>
<th>Full Implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Neutral or receptive</td>
<td>a. Receptive but very receptive</td>
<td>a. Receptive or very receptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Art curriculum change not a priority because teachers are satisfied with current art program and therefore resistant to changing it.</td>
<td>b. Art curriculum implementation not a priority although teachers acknowledge their art programs need improving.</td>
<td>b. Art curriculum change a priority or of equal priority to other change efforts. Teachers acknowledge need to improve art programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Implementers</th>
<th>Partial Implementers</th>
<th>Full Implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Curriculum perceived to be not practical.</td>
<td>a. Curriculum perceived to be somewhat practical, but a more practical document or concrete lesson aids wanted.</td>
<td>a. Curriculum perceived to be practical, but practical lesson aids to supplement curriculum requested to assist teachers who need additional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Quality of curriculum document determined by how easily curriculum can be translated into classroom practice.</td>
<td>b. Quality determined mainly by how readily curriculum can be translated to classroom practice.</td>
<td>b. Quality determined mainly by theoretical framework and approach provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theoretical component not appreciated.</td>
<td>c. Theoretical component somewhat helpful.</td>
<td>c. Theoretical component considered important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Implementers</th>
<th>Partial Implementers</th>
<th>Full Implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Priority placed on art as a subject area and</td>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Perceptions related to why art education is important and how teaching in art should be structured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Important, but viewed as a handmaiden to other subjects.</td>
<td>a. Important. Viewed mainly as an opportunity for creative self-expression, and skill development.</td>
<td>a. Important. Viewed mainly as a way to gain knowledge and understanding of the historical, social and cultural contributions of art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-implementers, except R9, rate art at bottom end of subject priority scale.</td>
<td>b. Partial implementers rate art higher than non-implementers.</td>
<td>b. All but R12 and R15 rate art of equal importance to other subjects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Factors at the School District Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Central administration leadership and support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Curriculum coordinator, more implementation workshops, release time for teacher to attend workshops, more time to implement, more resource materials and practical assistance viewed as central administrative controlled factors that would facilitate the art curriculum implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Partial implementers suggest that the art curriculum implementation would be facilitated if these factors were taken into account because then they would have the time to improve their art programs without having to compromise time they are investing in other curriculum areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Implementers  Partial Implementers  Full Implementers

c. Non-implementers suggest that the art curriculum implementation would be facilitated if these factors were taken into account because it would decrease the personal time and effort that they would need to put into the art curriculum change.

d. Non-implementers suggest that the central administration needs to provide support and leadership; otherwise the message is conveyed to the teachers that the central administration does not take the implementation seriously. The non-implementers suggest that if the central administration does not take the implementation seriously, then the teachers need not take it seriously either.

d. The partial implementers suggest that central administration needs to provide leadership and support, otherwise the teachers will need to spend additional time and energy in the art curriculum implementation process, and that this is difficult because the teachers' time and energies need to be invested in other curriculum areas as well, that are deemed to be more of a priority.

d. The full implementers suggest that although they can implement the new art curriculum without central administrative leadership and support, this leadership is necessary if the art curriculum change is going to be district-wide and long-term.
Figure 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Implementers</th>
<th>Partial Implementers</th>
<th>Full Implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. History of previous implementation efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Except for R10, full implementers did not respond to question directly; rather they suggest that what one gets from an implementation process depends on the extent to which the teacher is prepared to get involved in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>histories</td>
<td>histories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Characteristics at the School Level

1. Principal leadership and support

| Principal leadership and support important if teachers are expected to implement, but central administrative leadership more important. | Principal leadership and support necessary for implementation. | Principal leadership and support is a critical factor in facilitating the art curriculum change. |
## Figure 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Implementers</th>
<th>Partial Implementers</th>
<th>Full Implementers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Teacher involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The least involved in implementation process. Non-implementers attended the least number of workshops and no district-based workshops.</td>
<td>a. Attended more workshops than non-implementers. Only one partial implementer attended a district-based art implementation workshop.</td>
<td>a. The most involved in implementation. Attended the greatest number of implementation workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Prepared to become more involved if given release-time to do so.</td>
<td>b. Would like release-time to facilitate involvement, but prepared to become more involved with art curriculum change with or without release-time.</td>
<td>b. No request for release-time to attend implementation workshops; however, a suggestion is put forth that release-time would help convey the message that the district considers the art curriculum implementation a priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Teacher satisfaction with implementation process.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. View implementation process as less than satisfactory.</td>
<td>a. Somewhat satisfied with implementation process.</td>
<td>a. Somewhat to very satisfied with implementation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Want concrete suggestions that can readily be applied to classroom practice.</td>
<td>b. Want more concrete help and time to implement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. Characteristics at the Ministry Level

No differences emerge among three groups. Non-implementers, partial implementers and full implementers suggest that the Ministry needs to budget for implementation and to regulate number of new curriculum areas. None of the teachers suggest that the Ministry has played a facilitating role in curriculum implementation.
1. During the opening day staff meeting, all staff members unanimously agree to participate in the proposed research.

2. The principal reads the central administrative professional development priorities for the forthcoming year. Teachers are told that during the forthcoming year the school-district workshops and support services are to focus on math, reading, primary social studies and gifted programs.

3. The principal is asked by some teachers to inquire whether the district is planning to organize workshops to assist the teachers with the implementation of the new art curriculum.

4. At a subsequent meeting the principal reports that the school district is not planning inservice related to the new art curriculum implementation at this time but the Art Teachers' Association is planning to organize a curriculum implementation workshop, and that she (principal) would be prepared to organize some school-based implementation workshops as well.

5. The teachers agree to have the principal organize some school-based workshops to assist them with the implementation of the new art curriculum. Most of the principal's time is spent on general organization of school activities and functions, parent, teacher and district staff communications and meetings, student discipline, organization of gifted and computer programs, classroom supervision and teaching.
October
1. Numerous fine arts related noon-hour and after-school programs and activities offered at school.
2. Halls framed with student art work.
3. The bulk of the principal's time is spent at meetings, workshops, paperwork, supervising in the classrooms and routine matters. Also, school-wide activities such as Open House, Terry Fox Run, Fund Raising (e.g. Chickens, Bake Sale, Hamburgers, Hotdogs), assemblies and Halloween occupy time. Organization of gifted and computer programs continue to occupy the principal's time.

November and December
1. Time continues to be spent on gifted and computer programs.
2. Month busy with a variety of school-wide activities such as Christmas Concerts (4 performances), Book Fair, Traffic and Safety presentations, Awards Assembly and Fund Raising.
3. Principal mentions an art workshop at neighbouring private school. None of the staff is able to attend.
4. Art Teachers' Association offers district-based art curriculum implementation workshop.

January and February
1. Grade 6 and 7 students have visiting artist discuss and demonstrate silk-screening.
2. Some students to participate in a hands on silk-screening workshop at the Emily Carr Printmobile. This promotes enthusiasm among participating students and some staff members. Because the silk-screening workshops and speakers are initiated and sponsored by the Board, some staff members suggest that the Board may have
decided to take some leadership in facilitating the implementation of the new art curriculum.

3. School-wide puppetry workshops (making puppets, drama, music) to promote arts. All students in attendance participate.

4. Full-day "Carnival" to promote awareness of French-Canadian culture and arts.

5. Art Teachers' Association sponsored art curriculum implementation workshops held.

6. Inservice activities continue to focus on gifted programs, computers, reading and social studies.

7. Principal spends a considerable amount of time at meetings, interviewing substitutes, and at advisory meetings.


**March and April**

1. Several teachers participate in the Dental Poster Contest and take exception to the comments in the new art curriculum related to art competitions.

2. Curriculum implementation in art workshops held at school.

3. Principal spends many hours per week in classroom observing instruction and providing feedback.

4. Parks and Recreation noon-hour art programs receive good response.

**May and June**

1. All-afternoon curriculum implementation workshops held at school.
2. Several of the students participate in the *Arts Alive in the Schools* exhibition at the local art gallery. This promotes considerable enthusiasm and discussion.

3. The many school-wide activities interrupt regular programs (Skipping Demonstration, Guitar and Singing Performance, Kindergarten Orientation, Sports Day, Outdoor Education Program, Talent Shows, Awards Assembly, Staffing and Year-End Procedures).

Four implementation workshops were offered to the teachers. Of these, two were school-based and two were district-based. The school-based workshops took place in March and May and the district-based in February and November. One workshop was offered during one of the teachers' non-instructional days and the remaining three were offered after school. One of the school-based workshops was conducted by a one-time district art resource teacher, and the other by a key art educator. The district-based workshops were organized by the *Art Teachers' Association*. None of the workshops entailed involvement of the central administration. Although these art curriculum implementation workshops were offered, most of the school-based and district-based inservice activities were related to gifted, computer, reading and social studies. School-wide events, extra-curricular activities and special inservice sessions such as the *Effective School* sessions and the *Let's Talk About Schools Review* also occupy much of the teachers' non-instructional time.

The principal spends much of her time dealing with crisis situations (e.g., injured children, concerned individuals, leaking roofs, broken windows, personnel matters, organizing activities, meetings, responding to phone calls, paperwork, discipline,
supervising and assisting teachers, teaching, organizing school programs, extra-curricular activities, and school functions.

**Receptiveness of Teachers Not Teaching Art**

The non-art teaching staff, music, P.E., learning assistance and head teacher and counsellor were interviewed and asked to respond to two pre-implementation questions to assess their support of and receptiveness towards the forthcoming art curriculum implementation. The questions were: "How do you feel about the forthcoming change?" and "Do you have any suggestions as to what steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new art curriculum?"

The teaching staff with no art teaching assignments appeared supportive of the forthcoming implementation. The following are three of the comments:

1. "I haven't really thought about it because I've been concentrating more on the social studies, language arts and science . . . but obviously people such as myself as resource persons should make myself aware of it."

2. "It really doesn't matter to me because I don't teach art . . . but if it's going to happen, the teachers need to get really involved."

3. "I really don't feel anything. The new one doesn't mean much to me because I'm not familiar with the old one. Um . . . I'd like to see it."

The receptiveness of the non-art teaching staff members needs to be considered because all staff members have input as to how the four non-instructional days allocated to each school and the
school funds are going to be utilized. The responses of the non-art teaching staff members suggest that they would do nothing to impede the implementation and that they are prepared to support the implementation process.

Summary

Although all of the teachers in this case study identified similar factors as being conducive to implementation, distinct variations as to the extent that they implemented the new art curriculum emerged from this research. Three characteristics of the teachers individually and as a group seemed to influence the extent of implementation for them. They are: (a) the teachers' philosophical stance as to why art education is important, (b) the teachers' sense of efficacy, (c) the synergy among the teachers as it relates to the implementation.

(a) The teachers who viewed art mainly as therapy and a supplement to other subject areas suggested art was important to illustrate concepts in other subject areas and as a reward for completing work in "academic areas." To implement the new art curriculum would appear to mean that a major shift in their thinking toward the values of the new curriculum would be required of these teachers. On the other hand, these teachers who viewed art mainly as "an opportunity for creative self-expression and skill development" suggested that art is important because it develops the child's self-concept and provides the child with skills to pursue art as a leisure activity. For these teachers to move from partial implementation to full implementation would also require a shift in
their thinking as to why art is important so that their views are more compatible with those expressed in the new art curriculum. This suggests that the implementation process needs to focus more on the "why of art education" to increase the likelihood of the non-implementers moving to partial implementers and the partial implementers moving to full implementers.

The teachers who viewed art mainly as a subject with a unique content, indicated that art was important because it provided a way for students to develop knowledge and understanding of social, cultural and historical contributions of art. Because their views appear to be compatible with the new art curriculum, little or no change in their philosophical stance as to why art education is important is required. The current art curriculum implementation process simply clarified their views as to why art education is important and was sufficient for them to implement.

(b) A distinct relationship between the extent of implementation and teacher efficacy became evident from this research. The teachers with a high level of efficacy shared a sense of the possible and a belief that they can make the implementation work. They suggested that most of the factors that they identified as being conducive to implementation were present in the school during the implementation year and that the success of the implementation should be mainly up to them rather than outside variables.

(c) The teachers who implemented were part of a positive group dynamic which involved cooperative planning and sharing of ideas. There was a synergy, a pulling together of energy to make
implementation work. It was not the purpose of this study to assess what may create this synergy or efficacy since it was not possible to pre-determine what characteristics would emerge as important in facilitating implementation. However, it seems that since a total of 73% of the teachers in this case study implemented the new art curriculum either fully or partially during the first year of implementation, this would suggest that this school environment may have been conducive to promoting this synergy and efficacy that appears to have encouraged teachers to approach the art curriculum implementation in a positive way.

Although four teachers did not implement, they all shared some involvement in the implementation process and three of them made statements to suggest that they may move to partial implementation in the future. Three of the non-implementers indicated that they plan to read the curriculum over the summer and implement some aspects in the fall.

This case study confirms the validity of findings in the literature reviewed that the success of an educational change effort is influenced by the context in which the change takes place. However, the findings from this present study suggest that teachers working in the same school context are not influenced by the environment or the factors influencing implementation in that environment in the same way and consequently do not implement new curricula in a uniform manner. There were 27% of the teachers who did not implement at all, 33% implemented partially and 40% implemented fully.
What emerges as a primary finding in this case study is that the same environment and the same factors identified by the teachers as facilitating curriculum implementation were not acted upon by the teachers in the same way. Three teacher characteristics, the teachers' philosophical stance as to why art education is important, individual teacher efficacy, and collective synergy, appear to be key components in determining how teachers deal with the factors affecting the art curriculum implementation.

This suggests that the general assumption that everyone will implement in a uniform manner over a similar time period is not reasonable. If the art curriculum implementation plans were designed to be handled in three stages the needs of the three groups of implementers, more teachers might be inclined to implement because a form of this synergy among the implementers might, over time, draw in the non-implementing staff.

Since the philosophical stance of the non-implementers as to why art education is important was the least compatible with that in the new art curriculum, more emphasis during the implementation process should be given to the "why of art."

Although this study focuses on the art curriculum change, the similarity of factors identified by the teachers in this study, to those identified in the literature related to educational change, suggests that the findings may be applicable to other curriculum areas as well. However, other case studies in subject areas other than art are needed to verify the validity of these findings. The findings suggest that if curriculum change is going to take place in all the classrooms, then implementation needs to be a three phase
process, preferably over a three year period; the first year to capture the full implementers; the second year to capture the partial implementers; and the third year to capture the non-implementers. Since all of the 15 teachers participated in the implementation process to some extent and since all but one of the non-implementers indicated that they were planning to implement in the future, it is reasonable to assume that if the factors identified by the teachers as influencing implementation were addressed, and if the implementation were a three year process, at least partial implementation for the majority is possible and full-implementation is not impossible.
Chapter VII
Conclusions, Implications, Limitations, Recommendations

Curriculum implementation is a process problem. Currently there is a paucity of data grounded in practice regarding specific conditions which facilitate or impede the process for teachers. What encourages teachers to undertake implementation is not clear. This descriptive account attempts to form a picture which may suggest to the reader reasons for the degree of support the teachers choose to give to implementation. By obtaining first-hand feedback from the teachers based on their current personal involvement with the implementation of the new art curriculum this research provides empirically derived details as to what facilitates or impedes implementation in this setting.

The problem as it was presented in Chapter I notes that the majority of recommended curriculum and instructional changes have not been implemented or transformed into classroom practice and that the practical circumstances of the teachers' day to day world seem to get in the way of implementing this change. Rafferty (1987) suggests that this is especially true of elementary school art programs. On the basis of a literature review it has been suggested that because elementary art programs have been particularly resistant to change and because the outcomes of an implementation are contingent upon many factors that emerge for the teachers inside the classroom and school during the process of implementing change, data grounded in the reality of the school experience as
teachers engage in the process of translating an art curriculum document into classroom practice is needed to add to the knowledge base of how and why art curriculum change in elementary schools occurs. It is to this knowledge base this case study expects to contribute, and in so doing, the findings that emerge from this case study may have implications for other curriculum areas as well.

The findings suggest that the practical circumstances of the teachers' day-to-day world do not impact the teachers in a uniform way in the same school setting. The extent to which the various circumstances influence the teachers to implement or not implement the art curriculum depends on how the teachers respond to and cope with the factors that emerge to influence the direction of the implementation.

In this setting three distinct groups of implementers emerged. Each of the three groups responded to and managed the factors affecting implementation differently. How they responded to and coped with these factors determined their readiness to implement.

The single most important reason for the teachers responding to the implementation in the way that they did was their philosophical stance as to why art education is important. The second reason that seemed to account for the way teachers responded to the implementation was their sense of personal efficacy; and the third reason was the synergy among the implementing teachers. These three reasons, that seem to account for the way the teachers coped with the art curriculum implementation are primary in order for teachers to implement. The teachers who implemented, shared a common philosophy as to why
art education is important which was compatible to that in the new art curriculum. The implementers shared a sense of personal efficacy directed towards the implementation and a synergy that encouraged cooperative planning and a sharing of ideas. The teachers who implemented partially, shared a philosophy as to why art education is important that had only some commonalities with the new art curriculum. They were unsure about their abilities to implement successfully and minimal time was spent working with other teachers in a collective effort to implement. The teachers who did not implement, shared a philosophy of why art education is important that was only minimally compatible to that in the new art curriculum. They were disinterested in implementing during the current year and did not participate in any cooperative planning or group sharing related to the art curriculum implementation.

To increase the likelihood of teachers implementing it is not sufficient to simply address the factors identified by the teachers as being crucial to successful implementation. This is important because all of the teachers identified similar factors, yet all of the teachers did not implement to the same extent. In order for the teachers to deal positively with the factors they identify as important to successful implementation the art curriculum implementation process must have as its focus the "why of art education" and how to translate that into practice. This in turn could positively influence the teachers' sense of personal efficacy and the synergy among the teachers because if the teachers accept a philosophical stance of why art education is important that is
compatible with that in the new art curriculum guide then the teachers are more apt to place a priority on the implementation. Once the teachers place a priority on the art curriculum implementation they will be more apt to deal with the factors identified as influencing implementation in a positive way.

In order to increase the likelihood that more teachers will place a priority on art education that is compatible with that in the new art curriculum guide, the implementation process needs to entail a two-year process to capture more of the partial implementers and a three-year process to capture more of the non-implementers. If implementation is incremental, as this research suggests, then it is reasonable to assume that during the second year of implementation more of the partial implementers will move to full implementation, and more of the non-implementers will move to partial implementation.

This case study suggests that successful art curriculum change is possible provided that the implementation process is based on an understanding of the differing needs of the teachers in varying school settings. However, the findings suggest that implementation procedures may be reaching only those teachers who are most inclined to implement. The current bureaucratic system for implementing government-mandated curriculum change during similar time periods does not recognize that the implementation process and timelines for teachers vary. Government-mandated implementation procedures need to make allowances for these different groups. The implementation procedures and expectations cannot be the same for everyone. Although common sense tells us
that degrees and rates of implementation will vary according to a
dozen or so factors depending on given contexts, few studies have
been conducted under optimum conditions so that reasonable
estimates could be derived with regard to the three degrees of
implementation established by this case study. For example, to the
extent that the teachers in this elementary school are typical, one
could formulate a "thirty-three percent principle", or rule of thumb.
That is to say, that 33% of a staff will implement successfully
within the first year; 33% within the second year of an
implementation program and 33% by the end of the third year of an
implementation year. For example, one could estimate that in like
school settings and conditions, one could plan to provide during the
first two years, approximately four school-based workshops and
four district-based workshops with a focus on the "why of art
education and how to translate that into practice." There also needs
to be perceived central administration and principal support and
leadership. This would move 33% of the teachers from being partial
to full implementers and approximately 33% of the teachers from
being non-implmenters to partial implementers.

One must acknowledge that there is always the possibility
that some of the teachers will revert after a few years. There is
some evidence in the literature that after five years it is difficult
to tell who has implemented. The teachers mutualize the document
(Connelly & Clandinin, 1984). Periodic inservice and a curriculum
coordinator may decrease the likelihood of this happening.

The importance of these figures as limited as they may be, do
provide information that may assist those who are interested in the
implementation of the new art curriculum. The new art curriculum is the culmination of years of effort, so it is important to determine during the early stages what procedures may enhance the implementation.

In summary, this case study has pointed out that successful curriculum implementation depends on the school environment and how teachers cope with and respond to the factors affecting implementation in the particular school in which they work.

Government-mandated curriculum changes are expected to be implemented within government imposed timelines and are uniform for all teachers teaching the particular subject area. However, we know that teachers do not implement the new curricula in a uniform manner, and we know how teachers manage the day to day pressures and factors influencing curriculum implementation varies. District and school-based support for government-mandated curriculum change does not appear to make distinctions for the three groups of implementers that emerge from this study. It is suggested that unless the government agencies and the central school district administration adjust their implementation procedures and timelines to address the varying implementation needs of these three groups, the curriculum change effort will not be successful. It is further suggested that unless the central and school-based administration place a priority on the art curriculum implementation and offer leadership and support over an extended period of time, the art curriculum implementation will not materialize, because the partial implementers, non-implementers,
and the full implementers may turn their efforts to other curriculum areas.

There is a lack of research related to how change occurs in elementary school art programs. The procedure for implementing this art curriculum change is based on the assumption that all teachers are capable of implementing the change and coping with the change process in a uniform manner. The study indicates that not everyone is able or prepared to implement the curriculum change in the same way.

The findings from this case study are important because they underscore the fact that implementation procedures currently followed do not appear to be sufficient to implement the new art curriculum. One can reasonably assume that the implementation procedures are not reaching teachers who need more support and practical guidance, who tend to be less involved and less receptive, and who take the new art curriculum less seriously.

If the teachers studied in this research are reasonably typical, then the current implementation procedures and the curriculum document published by the Ministry of Education appear to be addressing the short-term needs of only a small group of teachers, not the majority of teachers, most of whom need more practical help and assurance that the new art curriculum should be taken seriously.

Rafferty (1987) in her research dealing with the efforts of elementary teachers to teach successful art programs similarly suggests that major efforts to change elementary school art programs are unlikely because of the pressures on teachers to conform to the "organizational structures and management routines"
that predominate school life and that get in the way of carrying out recommended art education objectives. The research being reported acknowledges that although the pressures to conform to the school organizational structures and management routines are expected, these do not arise as major factors in influencing the art curriculum implementation for the teachers in this study. What is significant is that the teachers who implemented shared a philosophical position as to why art education is important which is compatible to that in the new art curriculum document, a subject-centred orientation to teaching art, a high level of personal efficacy and a synergy directed towards the implementation. The teachers who implemented partially held a child-centred view of art education that encouraged self-expression and developing self-concept as well as illustrating concepts in other subject areas. They were unsure about their abilities to implement and spent a minimal amount of time working with others in implementation-related activities. The teachers who did not implement held an orientation that was neither subject-centred nor child-centred. They viewed art as therapy as a reward for completing academic work and as a means to develop skills such as eye-hand coordination. They were not interested in implementation and had a negative view of the process and put no effort into cooperative planning.

For these three groups of teachers, implementation timelines need to vary and need the direction and support of the central and school-based administration.

When one looks at the literature it is reasonable to understand why implementation is fraught with problems that militate against
full success. Researchers such as Fullan (1982) point out factors that influence curriculum implementation but how and why these factors have influenced the direction of the implementation have remained unclear. This research helps to fill this gap by documenting how and why the teachers deal the way that they do with the factors they identify as influencing implementation. Despite the complexities of implementing curriculum change, the findings developed in this research give rise to optimism. If implementation procedures address the varying needs of the three groups of implementers, then Ministry-mandated curriculum change can be implemented by all teachers, at least partially.

This case study provides a picture of how art curriculum change occurs in a particular large urban elementary school. Further case studies are needed of art curriculum change efforts in other settings if one seeks to develop useful generalizations. This study points to a relationship between the philosophical stance held by the teachers as to why art education is important, the efficacy and synergy of the teachers and the extent to which they implement. This suggests that there should be case studies that probe into the matter of how and why this synergy and efficacy can be promoted.

The uncovering of information grounded in the practice of teachers engaging in an actual implementation process in the natural setting of their own school provides information where presently little exists. This research provides evidence related to what happens to one curriculum area in the real world of the teachers as they engage in the implementation in that one school. It is expected
that this study will be useful in guiding future research regarding curriculum implementation in other areas.

The following recommendations seem appropriate in light of the fact that Ministry educators, school boards, school administrators, university educators, and art teachers all wish to provide the best possible educational opportunities for children. The eight recommendations are that:

1. Members of the central administration solicit collective input from individual school staffs before formulating school-district implementation support plans and policies.

2. Teachers be given release time to engage as team members in work such as cooperative planning, peer coaching and workshops.

3. Central administration make every effort to avoid implementation overload, whereby teachers are expected to implement more than two areas per year.

4. Central administration plan for three-year implementation cycles and provide on-going support in the form of a curriculum coordinator.

5. Care be taken to ensure that the energy source; that is, the key person in a school implementation project, is not removed during implementation.

6. Implementation be teacher-focused with a strong administrative support structure

7. Central and school-based administration make known that they support the implementation and be visible during the process.
8. The central administration and Ministry explore ways to provide incentives for teachers to upgrade their knowledge and understanding of art education.

Because teachers are required to teach art, but are not required to have an art education background, there is an obligation to assist teachers to increase their knowledge base in art education. Because it has been a long time since many teachers have taken university courses, ways need to be found to make the re-education process less intimidating for them. Some options are: paid Saturday workshops, paid summer institutes, district-based mini-university courses, vouchers to pay part of tuition fees for university-based courses, more opportunities for educational leaves, and on-going cooperative efforts to tap expertise from universities to assist districts with workshops, course instruction, and advise with implementation efforts.

If the Ministry is serious about expecting curriculum changes to be implemented then it needs to support the art curriculum implementation process by working with the universities and school boards in cooperative efforts to provide workshops that reach out to those teachers who are less likely to implement. Implementation plans need to recognize and address the fact that how teachers cope with change differs. If we want more teachers to implement, then we need to account for their differing needs. We need to take the teachers from where they are standing and give them the support they require. Evidence has been presented which indicates that implementation efforts have all too often concentrated on those
teachers who are most apt to implement, while neglecting others who need special attention.

Recently (November 1988) the B.C. Ministry of Education established the "Educational Program Implementation Branch" to assist school districts with the implementation of provincial programs. How this may impact future curriculum implementation efforts can give rise to other forms of research. Certainly this present study contains findings relevant to any planned, formal implementation project.
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APPENDIX I

COMPARISON OF THE 1952 AND THE 1985 CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS
In addition to providing more specific direction to teachers in planning their art programs, and in evaluating student progress, the 1985 B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum Guide differs from the 1952, 1964, 1968 and 1972 curriculum guides in four essential respects.

1. The new guide emphasizes a balance between appreciation and creation, while the old guides focus primarily on creation.

2. The new guide interprets appreciation as responding to one's own work and the work of others in order to develop knowledge and understanding of art in general, as well as art history, and the social and cultural implications of art. The old guides define appreciation from an aesthetic perspective. The guides state, "appreciation means creating an interest in, or an awareness of the art and beauty which are present in our daily activities and surroundings of the child" (1985 guide, p. 35; 1972 guide, p. 9).

3. The new guide focuses on image development rather than simply creative expression. The old guides state "avoid imposing ideas, beliefs, and standards of adults upon the creative expression of the child. Never demonstrate, paint, or construct for the child" (1952, p. 309; 1972, p. 3). The new guide, on the other hand, emphasizes that image-making is "an important language" and "a way of knowing", and suggests that students should be encouraged to evaluate and re-think their images (p. 28).

4. The old guides use production as a starting point for art lessons. The new guide suggests that any use of four content areas can be used as a starting point. They are: developing images, materials and processes, elements and principals, and responding to art. The old guide does include art appreciation and "art techniques", but not as a starting point or a major focus. The old guide states that it is permissible "to give guidance in the simple art techniques, but it is preferable to give aid in a manner which will enable the child to help himself rather than give direct help" (1952, p. 311).
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SUBJECT RESEARCH CONSENT FORM
APPENDIX I

SUBJECT RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

September 4, 1984

I hereby agree to participate in the research project, "A Study of Teacher Perceptions and Responses to the Implementation of the B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum", during the 1984 - 1985 school year. The purpose of this project is to look at how individual teachers react to innovation and change. The study focuses on the individual responses of teachers to the implementation and in-service procedures related to the new B.C. Ministry of Education Fine Arts Curriculum. Data are collected through ongoing observations, conversations, school records, and two interviews, one during the fall and another during the spring. The two interviews are the only direct time commitment requested of me as a subject. There will be no monetary compensation for participating in the study.

I understand that the researcher will be prepared to answer any inquiries concerning the research and that the names of the subjects, the school, and the district will be changed to protect my anonymity. If I decide to withdraw from the study or refuse to participate in aspects of the study, such actions will not jeopardize my position.

I consent to the above and acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

Name ______________________________ (Please Print)
Signature ______________________________
Position ______________________________

As researcher I agree to abide by the above conditions.
Signature ______________________________
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OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEW SCHEDULES
APPENDIX III (a)

Open-Ended Interview
Prior to Implementation

Interview Questions

1. Are you familiar with the present B.C. Ministry Art Curriculum? Are you aware that a B.C. Ministry Art Curriculum exists? Have you found it helpful? In what way? Why not?

2. How did you first find out that a change in the art curriculum was forthcoming?

3. How do you feel about the forthcoming change?

4. What are you expecting from the new curriculum?

5. Do you have any suggestions as to what steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new curriculum?

6. What timelines do you see as appropriate to effectively implement the new curriculum?

7. Do you feel the same curriculum can be implemented in a similar manner throughout B.C.? What role does context play in implementation (students, school, community)? (Is the curriculum equally suited to the students in this district as it is to the students in other districts?)

8. What role do you see the district personnel playing in curriculum implementation (superintendents, coordinators, supervisors)? What about the principal? What about the Ministry?

9. What is your perception of past implementation procedures?

10. How should educational innovations be initiated? (Who should initiate change? teacher, Ministry, supervisors?)

11. Have you attended any workshops that you feel were particularly helpful? (What did you find helpful, not helpful? Is there one that really stands out in your mind?)
12. Are you satisfied with your present art program?

13. If you were to describe your role as a teacher of art in terms of a metaphor what comes to your mind (artist, game keeper, gardener, etc.)?

14. How would you rate school subject areas in order of importance?

15. What is your perception of art as a separate subject area in the public school system?

16. What do you feel the community's perception is of art as a separate area in the public school system?

17. What do you perceive to be the most important area to be covered in the art program?

18. Is it necessary to be a specialist to teach art effectively?

19. What qualities should an effective teacher have? Teacher of art?

20. Why teach art in education?

21. Do you have a philosophy of teaching you can articulate?

Personal Background Information

22. Tell me about your educational background.

23. How long have you been teaching?

24. What would you consider your greatest personal strength?

25. What are your main interests outside school?

26. Would you like to tell me something about your family background?

27. Has your personal style of teaching changed since you began teaching?
28. Where do you see yourself in 10-15 years?

29. Is there anything else that you would like to add?
APPENDIX III (b)

Open-Ended Interview Following Implementation

Interview Questions

1. You have now had the opportunity to pilot the new *B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum*. In what ways have you found it helpful/not helpful?

2. Has the new curriculum satisfied your initial expectations? In what way? Why not?

3. Have you found the implementation process helpful? In what ways? Why not?

4. What kinds of satisfactions have you experienced with the implementation process?

5. Do you have any suggestions as to what further steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new curriculum?

6. What have you found the most helpful/frustrating during your implementation?

7. What timelines do you see as appropriate in order to implement the new curriculum as specified?

8. Do you feel the new curriculum can be implemented in a similar manner throughout B.C.? What role does context play in implementation (students, school, community)? Is the curriculum equally appropriate to the students in this district as it is to the students in other districts?

9. What role do you see the district personnel playing in curriculum implementation (superintendents, coordinators, supervisors)? What about the principal? What about the Ministry?

10. Have you attended any workshops related to implementation of the new art curriculum? In what way were they helpful/not helpful?
11. How are you feeling about your present art program?

12. If you were to describe your role as a teacher of art in terms of a metaphor what comes to your mind?

13. How do you feel the new art program has met/not met your needs? Discuss what you are doing differently now.

14. How would you rate the subject areas in order of importance?

15. How do you feel the community perceives art as a separate subject area in the school system?

16. What do you feel is the most important area to be covered in the art program? Why?

17. Is there anything else you would like to add?
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Interview Transcript I

Prior to Implementation

Interviewer: R.
Interviewee: S.

1. R. Are you familiar with the present B.C. Ministry of Art Curriculum?

2. S. No, but I feel a curriculum should be based on the acquisition of skills and...ah...outlooks developed over the years and I don't see that being followed very much. So, in teaching art one has to assess where a particular group of children are and then develop skills which seem important. Now in talking with you earlier, I made up my own curriculum, if you like, which is based on graphic skills and gaining a better idea of perception, of being able to see...develop appreciation. I do that in a variety of ways using visual aids, and so forth, and I try to diversify to some three-dimensional appreciations, but I don't know...

3. R. Are you aware that a B.C. Ministry Art curriculum exists?

4. S. Yes.

5. R. How did you first find out that a change in the art curriculum was forthcoming?

6. S. From you.

7. R. How do you feel about the forthcoming change?

8. S. If I knew a bit more about what the changes were then I could tell you, but I don't know what the changes are.

9. R. What are you expecting from the new curriculum?

10. S. That a greater emphasis is put in developing art education in school. I mean, there is no point in putting a curriculum into effect if it's not followed. Presumably we're looking at some
kind of developmental process through the school, and if that's not followed . . . and if that doesn't give children a real concrete art education . . . if that isn't followed, then it's fairly pointless.

11. R. Do you have any suggestions as to what steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new curriculum?

12. S. I think the first thing has to do with the education of teachers as to what art is.

13. R. What timelines do you see as appropriate to effectively implement the new curriculum?

14. S. Well, it depends if the art curriculum is a school and district priority, then two years, but that's not going to happen especially not with our present political climate. I don't know. I guess for the art curriculum to be fully implemented it would take 7 years to really evaluate the extent of the change. I mean it would take 7 years for the students to be fully exposed to the new curriculum.

15. R. Do you feel the same curriculum can be implemented in a similar manner throughout B.C.?

16. S. I think that would be an incredibly ambitious target and if that was the main goal then I think in achieving that goal it would detract from a lot of the nature of art and art education. I would have thought . . . but, who knows?

17. R. What role do you feel context plays in implementation?

18. S. Could you repeat the question?

19. R. What role do you feel context plays in implementation?

20. S. Ah, yes! Well, especially with art, one is drawing from the children . . . one is drawing on the child's interests and that goes with anything . . . writing. You're not going to get anything if the child isn't interested, so if you try and impose a set of fixed and rigorous expectations on, say, culturally different groups, then you're missing out on a tremendous wealth of material that might be there. I think any curriculum
has to be very flexible to take into account cultural differences and area differences . . . you know. Trying to get kids who have never seen the mountains to draw mountains from their own experience, for instance, might be rather disappointing . . . so do you see my point? Okay!

21. R. What role do you see the district personnel playing in curriculum implementation? And the Ministry?

22. S. You can't have district-wide change without district support. There has to be someone who takes charge of coordinating and monitoring the implementation process. You also have to have knowledgeable people to assist teachers and provide school-based in-service during the implementation process. Teachers also need to be given time from their classroom duties to attend workshops, otherwise they are not going to take the process as seriously. So the district has to provide leadership, workshops in the individual schools, keep us informed. There also has to be ongoing communication . . . someone you can contact when you run into problems. There has to be someone at the district level to provide you with the answers, or at least someone who can refer you to the right sources for assistance. But more important, is provincial government support. You're not going to have effective implementation of an art curriculum when we have a provincial government that continues to undermine the arts.

23. R. What about the principal?

24. S. He or she should be supportive. Basically that.

25. R. What is your perception of past implementation procedures?

26. S. I think very often the curriculum on paper looked fine but it all boils down to the involvement of the teachers . . . of the teacher with the subject . . . whether the teacher is willing to understand the direction or take a new direction if the curriculum implies a new direction. That's going to be very hard. You can't teach an old dog new tricks, or it's harder to teach a dog who's been through the same kind of tricks . . . and who's had success with them. If you try to tell them "No, that's wrong. What you've been doing is . . . has been shown
according to the researchers, to be ineffective" it's going to be almost impossible to implement.

27. R. How should educational innovations be initiated?

28. S. Initiated?

29. R. Who should initiate the change?

30. S. Anyone. It doesn't really matter who initiates the change. It's the input and what's done with the change that's important. At present, committees of teachers do provide input into curriculum change, but I think more grassroots involvement from teachers is needed . . . but then again, it's the problem of time . . . there just isn't enough time to get involved in everything.

31. R. Have you attended any workshops that you feel were particularly helpful?

32. S. Yah! I find most workshops offer something. I can't think of any specific one that stands out.

33. R. Are you satisfied with your present art program?

34. S. My art program?

35. R. You are teaching grade 7 and . . .

36. S. I'm teaching grade 7, grade 5 and grade 6. I feel like I'm starting from scratch in many ways . . . Well, these are my goals . . . to increase the child's . . . aah . . . to improve the child's perception of the world and how he or she can present it visually on . . . in . . . whatever artistic medium we use; to expand the child's conscientiousness of imagery and the importance of it; to free the child from, perhaps, a structured series of images with which they may have grown up and have not been challenged; for instance, last art lesson I took . . . I asked all the children to draw the sun and the image of the sun they drew is the same as of my daughter who is three draws, and . . . aah . . . they have never been challenged in that image, so when they are asked to draw a sun they draw a circle with a face on it and lines coming out of it and if they're not happy drawing a circle they'll arc in a corner of the paper and for
many of them to be told that that is not what the sun looks like and why do they draw it like that, is an eye opener for them, if it's done constructively and not putting them down or anything, but challenging them to look at the world in a different way.

37. R If you were to describe your role as a teacher of art in terms of a metaphor what comes to your mind?

38. S. Aah, explorer, I think! It's because . . . I say explorer because I'm . . . the first thing that came to my mind is leader in that I'm leading these children through different experimental situations, however, very often the teaching of art is so much fun in that you go over new ground. Every child has a different perspective of the world and so if you can join the child in an exploration of that, of that new ground . . . aah sounds a bit arty, farty, but it seems like that. Aah . . . it also makes it more enjoyable. It challenges me.

39. R How would you rate the subject areas in order of importance?

40. S. Pragmatic, I guess. Well, this is from what I've taken into account of the parameters . . . political . . . public expectations and so forth. I'd say writing . . . umm . . . I'd say . . . aah . . . Gosh, that's hard to rank them! You see, I find it hard to visualize things into subject areas and so when I say writing I could take into account aspects of art. I'd rate them all pretty well the same. I'm going to say if you . . . I think . . . it's hard to load it, but if you . . . Yah, I find that an almost impossible question, but I'd say from public expectation I would not be doing my job in the public's eyes if the kids didn't come out of school being able to write, to read, or to form mathematical computation, but in that, mixed in that, in their skills, would be a good concrete understanding of the basis of a scientific understanding of the world, the basis of the understanding of the interrelationships of the people in the world and society, the beginning of an understanding of society, and in mentioning that would be the development and appreciation of an aesthetic appreciation and an appreciation of the child's own individual skills, abilities as a . . . potential, as an artist. We're all writers and we're all artists. I think that's what schools should be producing, writers and artists.
41. R. What is your perception of art as a separate subject area in the public school system?

42. S. Art needs to be considered a separate subject in the sense that math and social studies are separate areas in the curriculum, otherwise it may be completely ignored, but whether it's integrated or taught separately depends on your focus. I tend to integrate most areas.

43. R. What do you feel the community's perception is of art as a separate subject area in the public school system?

44. S. Busy work. I think that I read somewhere of the worst list of Christmas presents in bad taste, and one of them was school produced art projects. To give someone a school produced art project was in very poor taste. Very often there is very little one can do with a pen holder made of popsicle sticks or whatever the art project was. Okay?

45. R. What do you perceive to be the most important area to be covered in the art program?

46. S. Well, there again I've taken this direction from you without really thinking about it, but I'm very happy with it, because I think it's a tangible skill and that is to develop skills in drawing, to be able to present things on paper using a variety of media to create the concept to be able to interpret the concept on paper with a bit of variety. I would say that covers a lot, but I would say developing those skills are very important because it also has spin offs in other subject areas too. It's something the child is expected to do . . . to draw, to write a poem and draw a picture, and so if one can tie in the writing of the poem with the drawing of the picture and developing the skills of drawing . . . aah . . . and being able to represent ideas rather than symbols then I think . . . aah . . . then this is the most personal and accessible form of presenting personal imagery, I think, but then you can go on to photography and so forth.

47. R. Is it necessary to be a specialist to teach art effectively?

48. S. I don't think you necessarily have to be a specialist, but you . . . there are conditions on teaching art effectively and that is that you have to have an empathy with art and appreciate its
value in society and to have a value and appreciation of art is almost a prerequisite. If that means you're an expert then you have to be an expert, but I don't . . . a specialist rather . . . but I don't think that's necessarily the case. I think that to have someone who is a brilliant artist is not necessarily a . . . a pre . . . aah . . . a necessarily of having . . . of being a good art teacher.

49. R. What qualities should an effective teacher have?

50. S. I think . . . one important thing . . . I'll say only important things . . . empathy for sure . . . ability to . . . ability to understand and feel for children as people and people with special needs. I think the teacher's role is an important one in society and there is . . . the teacher can have a tremendous effect on the child and so the teacher must be caring . . . ah . . . must be intelligent. I don't think it is helpful to have teachers who are not capable of higher cognitive skills and I think that teachers should . . . um . . . there has to be a quality there . . . yah . . . the caring. Sorry, that's very confused.

51. R. Teacher of art?

52. S. A teacher of art has to be . . . a teacher of art has to know and love art, so there is an intelligence there of what art is and its role in society. It would help for the teacher to be dexterous, being able to create, to demonstrate, but I don't think that's essential . . . aah . . . I think the . . . a thorough . . . ah . . . good grounding in the . . . in the skills and approaches associated with art and that's tied up with what art is . . . the importance of art. I think there are certain skills that have to be taught by the . . . ah . . . there are certain skills that can easily be taught by someone who knows what they are doing and I think those are important.

53. R. Why teach art in education?

54. S. Why art in education? Um . . . Art is a . . . art is of prime importance in a . . . I perceive art as being of prime importance in the evolution of society and to . . . and to isolate the evolution of . . . the growth of society from art is almost impossible . . . and taken that as a . . . as a sort of a . . . an observation, the understanding . . . the greater the individual's understanding of the artistic process . . . yah . . . of the values
of art, the purposes of art, widens the child's perception of his or her life. Art represents intangible representations of values . . . it represents feelings. It represents a means of . . . it's an extension of writing. It's almost like saying why study literature. Art is a record of man's . . . people's interpretation of the world. Each artistic creation is an interpretation of an experience of the world and to . . . to open children's eyes to that resource . . . material of understanding the world and society and history, and so forth is . . . expands . . . it is part of what I was saying earlier about education being a leading out process.

55. R. Do you have a philosophy of teaching you can articulate?

56. S. Um . . . Well, I suppose my philosophy . . . the reason I went into teaching . . . I hope this doesn't sound too over glorious . . . was the fact that . . . ah . . . I really . . . in England especially . . . it was very clear, the social differentiations based on education is very clear. Education . . . um . . . money buys you education . . . buys you power in society, in a general sense, so I felt that there was . . . if I was to be socially active . . . one of the ways I could be socially active and work towards a reformed society was through education. this was during the late sixties and early seventies and the political activity of the university I was in was quite intense. I think we would all be locked up as terrorists in this day and age. In that era . . . um . . . our meetings and our freedoms were greater but it's very much tighter now; for instance, we held a demonstration against Hume. He was a Minister of England at that time . . . and, I mean, we could have swamped the man. I mean . . . ah . . . our demonstration almost got out of hand and that kind of thing couldn't happen now. I mean we would . . . any kind of plan . . . any kind of organization would have been nicked in the bud. this was 1970. Anyway, I felt that any kind of education should not be constricted. It should lead out, a classical education, I think we structure and channel students too much. I think one of my weaknesses is that I'm not organized. My structure comes from my own gestalt, my own understanding of society. I rely on kids picking up things from me by osmosis so, I like to lead kids out, although I would work in the confines of, let's say, the parameters of a body of knowledge as defined, or a body of skills, or whatever a set task is defined by a political organization like a Ministry of Education. I think it is counter productive and totally unnatural to
structure education too much but I realize there must be a balance. Does that answer your question?

57. R. Thank you.

58. R. Tell me about your educational background.

59. S. Aah! Elitist private school education . . . boarding school until I was ten. Then I went to a high-powered academic high school in England and . . . ah . . . resisted that fairly effectively and had to re-take my university matriculation, my university entrance exams. Then I went to study genetics . . . started studying agriculture at Leeds and then changed to genetic zoology, which is a fairly new subject, and then after waffling my way through that, did a year of post-graduate teacher's training at Leeds, England. Aah . . . I spent a year working in a slum school which was identified as special needs. It was 85% West Indian . . . um . . . immigrants, and the rest were Asian. There were very few ethnics. I spent a year there developing . . . put a lot of energy into it . . . then I got the opportunity . . . then I was offered a job as a bee keeper in Ontario, so I came to Ontario, but the bee crop failed, and so I looked around. I got two opportunities, one was a research assistant at Kingston, Queen's University, and the other was a high school teacher in Quebec. I went and worked in Quebec because the pay was 50% more and I didn't see myself as a permanent settler in Canada, and the research project was . . . I don't know . . . the research project had difficulties. It wasn't clear cut, so rather than sort of hanging around Kingston for two years, I decided to earn a lot of money and travel. Then I came out West and . . . ah . . . settled here while we had our first child. I worked in a group home with emotionally disturbed children for two and a half years and then worked . . . Does this interest you?

60. R. Yes.

61. S. Ah . . . I worked . . . um . . . after that I worked three and a half years at the Youth Detention Centre, and that was an interesting experience. I wouldn't do that again. I've been in the elementary education system ever since.

62. R. How long have you been teaching?
63. S. Let's see... It's been so interrupted... hm... one year in England, two in Quebec... six, I think, here yah!... about 9 years.

64. R. What would you consider your greatest personal strength outside of school?

65. S. Empathy, sense of adventure... I care.

66. R. What are your main interests outside of school?

67. S. Hm. Well, I focus a lot on my family, so a lot of my interests focus on my family... um... but the things we do... I'm... I get... I do a lot... I have to spend a certain amount of time outside, so most of my activities are centered around sailing, climbing, skiing, caving, once in awhile... those sort of things.

68. R. Caving?

69. S. Yes. Once or twice a year... once a year we go down a cave. It's good.

70. R. Go down a cave?

71. S. Yes! Got lost in a cave once... it was interesting.

72. R. Exploring caves?

73. S. Exploring caves. Yes.

74. R. Would you like to tell me something about your family background?

75. S. My family background? Yes. Okay... Um... starting at grandparents... All my grandparents died or were dead by the end of the war, Second World War. My mother's parents died when she was three and my father's parents died during the war... just the beginning of the war. My father... my grandfather was a country gentleman in the Counties. Liked to hunt, but a very intelligent man, a doctor who retired early. My older two brothers went to a prestigious private school, Harrow. You may have heard of it. It's similar to Eton... Harrow and Eton, and so that was the kind of atmosphere. My
father was an eye specialist, but he wasn't interested in his work. He had been in the navy during the war. He had had his fill of medicine. Many people of his generation were badly affected by the war. He was interested in archaeology so we used to spend a lot of time digging up Celtic and Roman ruins as children. My father died when I was ten. My mother is alive. My mother is... was a teacher... well she was a nurse, went back to Cambridge to do a teaching degree. She didn't actually finish it... interesting! I don't know why. She was doing very well. She was offered a job after her second year.

76. R. Has your personal style of teaching changed since you began teaching?

77. S. In that I have... um. I don't know if it has actually. I would say that I'm perhaps willing to accept more structure. I had a couple of years where... at least one year where I was very structured... ah... and it was certainly easier than the more multi-directional approach I usually take. So, I see the value, Yah, so I'd say I've become more structured.

78. R. Where do you see yourself in 10-15 years?

79. S. Presently my game plan is to build a large sailboat by then and take some time out to do some educational learning in a different scope. In the meantime I'd like to try a head teacher position, district coordinator... a district position of some sort... principalship.

80. R. Is there anything else you would like to add?

81. S. I don't think... well.

82. S. I don't see a lot of art being taught but that's my perception and maybe people will look at me and say I'm doing the same and not anything different, but at least I'm willing to question what I'm doing.
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Interview Transcript II

Schedule II

Following Implementation

Interviewer: R.
Interviewee: S.

1. R. You have now had the opportunity to pilot the new B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum. In what ways have you found it helpful/not helpful?

2. S. I have familiarized myself with the curriculum and the actual outline where, you know, where it talks about the image being the central point of all the arts, the art work, and it has helped me in that it has given me a basis to start out with so that even at this level I can . . . so we can talk about images and how to develop images and then, you know, from there take it into the use of materials and the processes to actually . . . um . . . develop those images and then I have been able to . . . my goal has been to actually help promote the children's aesthetic and artistic development. And the scope and sequence chart - that's been helpful. I've shared some ideas with G (teacher) and that's been helpful coordinating some units. We're not doing the same thing but just talking about it has been helpful.

3. R. Has the new curriculum satisfied your initial expectations? In what way/Why not?

4. S. It has broadened my horizons. It has certainly helped me to look at art from more than just one point of view.

5 R. Have you found the implementation process helpful?

6. S. I have; perhaps I can only say at this stage I have been able to implement only so many aspects of it; for example, the sample lesson format, as I mentioned before, has been really helpful and the scope and sequence and integrating it with other areas like social studies and language arts. And it's been helpful to have all the discussions about the curriculum with you.
7. R. What kinds of satisfactions have you experienced with the implementation process?

8. S. I think it is the fact that starting out with an image and developing the image has helped the children, and I have developed, and I have been providing experiences where they can actually expand their own knowledge on how to express themselves through the various materials. And I would never have thought before of bringing in other artists' works and using them to motivate the children at such a young age. You were really helpful there. I mean I saw that in the guide, but until you actually got me to do it, I had my doubts that it would work.

9. R. Do you have any suggestions as to what further steps need to be taken to effectively implement the new curriculum?

10. S. I do not feel I have had enough time yet for myself in the implementation and so I would perhaps be more justified in giving an answer after I have had the time. I think perhaps the most important thing might be just to have periodic workshops at the school and you coming in and seeing how things are going, otherwise things get so busy and it's easy for something else to come along to take up your time.

11. R. What have you found the most helpful/frustrating during your implementation?

12. S. I think I have actually found the conceptual model guideline for myself the most helpful. It has helped me often, you know, just have the materials and you think of an idea after looking at the materials but thinking of an image first and trying to work from that base has given . . . I think it has helped me. It has given me more ideas in the way of art ideas. I haven't really found anything frustrating at this point. Also, as I said the lesson format and scope and sequence and using art work by artists.

13. R. What timelines do you see as appropriate in order to implement the new curriculum as specified?

14. S. I would say at least another year.
15. R. Do you feel the new curriculum can be implemented in a similar manner throughout B.C.?

16. S. Yes, but of course the themes and things you use for motivation vary not just in B.C. but in every school and class.

17. R. What role do you see the district personnel playing in curriculum implementation (superintendents, coordinators, supervisors)? What about the principal?

18. S. I think they have to be . . . they should be aware of what is being implemented in the way of art because I feel that sometimes art is not given the due justice in our curriculum and I think it is the district personnel's responsibility to know how much importance it does play. I think the superintendent should make some kind of statement that he supports the implementation. And some release time should be provided for teachers so they get a feeling it's important. There should also be someone assigned at the district level who can oversee the implementation.

19. R. What about the principal?

20. S. I feel that the principal plays a similar role in being aware of what . . . what the art program really does for the child. I think it's really important that the principal lets the staff know that he thinks that it is important to implement the curriculum and I think he needs to take charge or assign someone to take charge or it probably won't happen, especially in art because people find it really difficult to know what to do.

21. R. How are you feeling about your present art program?

22. S. I feel very satisfied. I feel that through the year I have expanded my own horizons and I have and I've been examining how I approach things and I think I've learned a great deal. I'm feeling good about it.

23. R. Have you attended any workshops related to implementation of the new art curriculum? In what way were they helpful/not helpful?
24. S. I attended ... ah ... one workshop you organized that was actually carried out at the school and that definitely helped put the whole art, new art curriculum into perspective for me.

25. R. Which one was this?

26. S. With ... ah ... S.

27. R. S.

28. S. S. That's right.

29. R. What about the one with L?

30. S. Oh, that's right, the one with L ... the bird, the bird unit. I found that very exciting, actually. I thought that really made me look at art from a totally different point of view. I perhaps had made it more restricted and now I can see the different avenues that it offers. It was really helpful.

31. R. If you were to describe your role as a teacher of art in terms of a metaphor what comes to your mind?

32. S. Hmmm ... a guide, I guess. I guide the children.

33. R. How do you feel the new art program has met/not met your needs? Discuss what you are doing differently now.

34. S. I think I am looking at the children's capabilities as well as expanding on what they already have, what backgrounds they come from; I'm trying to incorporate their or what they come to school with, with the resources that are available to us and in that way the child is growing both aesthetically and artistically. Also, I think I discussed some of this already like following the sample lesson format and the scope and sequence and um ... integrating the art and bringing in art work by artists and looking at functions of art. So, I'm doing things quite differently.

35. R. How would you rate the subject areas in order of importance?

36. S. Ah ... well, I feel language arts, math, art, P.E., ah ... social studies, are all of equal importance. I don't rate them.
37. R. How do you feel the community perceives art as a separate subject area in the school system?

38. S. I think the general view that parents usually reflect is that art is something that calms a child down or it's often viewed as a play, a form of play, but I try and educate my parents that that's just as important as any other subject area.

39. R. What do you feel is the most important area to be covered in the art program?

40. S. I think the most important thing is that the child can express him/herself through the different materials, express their feelings and in the beginning of this level a lot of their art is symbolic; it's what they think of, it's what they want to express, but they can't, it's often just in a symbolic fashion rather than realistically, and then I think as they grow older they will look at it more realistically. They need to develop skills to express themselves imaginatively. Also what I've learned from the new curriculum and from you is that they also need to become more knowledgeable about artists and art around them.

41. R. Thank you very much. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

42. S. Um... all I'd like to say is that having read through the new art curriculum I feel there hasn't been the time to do everything in the whole curriculum in the time I've been trying to implement, but I certainly think that after having now gone through the whole curriculum, it will now serve as an important teaching tool for me and now I know where I am going and I'm feeling really good about it and I guess I see more of a relevance to art now. It's been really helpful too to have a sort of implementation plan organized where you've organized the workshops and how you introduced the curriculum and came in and helped and things like that.
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ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATIONS
The Extent of Implementation Checklists were used by the researcher during the January, March and May observations of the teachers' art lessons and by the Independent Observer during her January and May observations to assess the art lessons' fidelity to the content areas and the goals outlined in the (1985) B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing personal images. Topic: My Dog - Texture</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'd like you to draw and paint a kind of a dog you like.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbings</td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I want you to decide what kind of tree you want to make and what kind of texture you want.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clown Unit</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Now think about the type of clown you would like.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with materials and processes.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Student use crayons, paint, glue, etc.&quot; &quot;Draw your dog.&quot; &quot;Make some squiggly lines.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Take a crayon and .. paper ... and create texture. This is called a 'rubbing'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Paint a clown.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Responding to art (describe, interpret, judge).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;How can we make your dog look like he has fur?&quot; &quot;Tell Mrs. X. how you made that wonderful straight fur.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Discussion of the different types of trees the children would find in their own yards.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;What do you remember of Van Gogh's colours?&quot; &quot;A friend of mine painted this. What does it remind you of?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Elements and principles.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We can make some squiggly lines.&quot; &quot;Many different textures&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Who can tell me what we mean by texture? &quot;rough, smooth, bumpy&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher in this sample followed all four content areas listed in the new art curriculum during each of the lessons observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foster enthusiasm through involvement</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of questions, e.g., &quot;Do you remember ... ?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of involvement, e.g., &quot;come and draw your dog.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of enthusiasm and student involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive involvement - questions, participation, drama, music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop child's ability to explore, express, interpret, create.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Does your dog have fur?&quot; &quot;You can use a toothbrush or ... ?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You used a toothbrush to create texture.&quot; &quot;Close your eyes . . . Does it feel . . . ?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop child's skill and technical ability</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Now I want you to surprise me and think of your very own clown and create it on paper.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop child's skill and technical ability</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;How can we make your dog look like he has fur?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop child's skill and technical ability</td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Things you can use to create textures .... This is called a 'rubbing'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop child's skill and technical ability</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Now if you were to paint a clown using colours like Van Gogh did and some of the textures he did, what would you do?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop capacity for critical and sensitive response to art.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Let's look at the dogs and see how many dogs you can pick with . . . &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop capacity for critical and sensitive response to art.</td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Discussion of the different types of trees ... &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop capacity for critical and sensitive response to art.</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;What do you notice about the colours?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Analysis of Content Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Encourage appreciation for interrelatedness of arts (to music and drama).</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some integration with language arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;While you're working I'm going to play a record about the most famous clown of all. His name was Pagliacci.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advance child's knowledge of ways arts influence and are influenced by society and environment.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>No focus on drawing, painting, creating texture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |              | 2 Mar | | "Clowns ... small people who entertained the king." "Clowns, acrobats and jugglers" led to "circus."
|      |              | 3 May | | |

Total possible for each observation is 4
6.
Jan
Mar
May

The teacher in this sample followed four of the six goals outlined in the new art curriculum during the January and March observations and all six goals during the May observation.
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ANALYSES OF OBSERVATIONS

EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

Observer

Subject: S.12

The Extent of Implementation Checklists were used by the researcher during the January, March and May observations of the teachers' art lessons and by the Independent Observer during her January and May observations to assess the art lessons' fidelity to the content areas and the goals outlined in the (1985) *B.C. Ministry of Education Art Curriculum*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>What/How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing personal images. Topic: Making clay dish for pet Circus</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Creating their own personal pet dish with various textures with their own selection of objects for textures. Children painting or colouring their own circus pictures of clowns, acrobats, animals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working with materials and processes.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>- clay, various objects for textures - pinch pots. Paint, crayons, creating bright colours, textures, lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responding to art (describe, interpret, judge).</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elements and principles.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total possible for each observation is 4.</td>
<td>Jan 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher in this sample followed all four content areas listed in the new art curriculum during the independent observer's January and May observations.
## Extent of Implementation

**Researcher**

**Subject: R12**

**To what extent have the 6 goals in the new curriculum been met?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foster enthusiasm through involvement.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children are excited about creating their own pet or personal dish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circus created a great deal of excitement. Entire class converted into circus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop child's ability to explore, express, interpret, create.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children creating pinch pots with texture. Discussing functions of pots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children creating exciting circus pictures and discussing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop child's skill and technical ability.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How to work with clay and make pots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing, painting, collage, colours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop capacity for critical and sensitive response to art.</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lots of discussion about function of pots and textures to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage appreciation for interrelatedness of arts (to music and drama).</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Entire class was converted to circus with music and plays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advance child's knowledge of ways arts influence and are influenced by society and environment</td>
<td>1 Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Children discussed role of circus performers and why they dress the way they do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total possible for each observation is 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher in this sample followed four of the six goals outlined in the new art curriculum during the independent observer's January observation and all six goals during the May observation.
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INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>S12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>My Dog Unit (Drawing &amp; Painting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Recess - Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>1. Do you remember my funny friend, Don? (Students respond &quot;yes&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>2. Was Don the Postman? (Students respond &quot;no&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Who was Don?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor:</td>
<td>4. He was your dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>5. What letter does &quot;dog&quot; begin with? (Hands go up). Darren, come and write the letter on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Is that correct class? (Students respond &quot;yes&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Darren, what sound does the letter make?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren:</td>
<td>9. D-d-d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>10. What other words made a &quot;d-d&quot; sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>12. What about Don? (Students respond &quot;yes&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12.</td>
<td>13. Can you remember what funny Don looked like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn:</td>
<td>14. He has a black circle around his eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine:</td>
<td>15. He has white fur and it's sort of prickly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hung: 16. He's got a black paw and the end of his tail is black.

Jarm: 17. He likes to eat chocolates. (Teacher holds up a picture of a terrier).

S12. 18. Does this look like Don? (Students respond "yes").

S12. 19. How many of you have dogs? (Three students raise their hands).

20. Marnie, what kind of dog do you have?

Marnie: 21. It's a police dog. His name is Benji.

S12. 22. That's a big dog.

Marnie: 23. No, it's a pup.

S12. 24. Would you like to come and draw your dog on this piece of paper? (Teacher has large sheet of manilla mounted on easel. There are several jumbo wax crayons on table beside easel. Student agrees to draw her dog.)

S12. 25. Draw as big as you can. (Marnie takes about five minutes. Students watch.)

S12. 26. Does your dog have fur?

Marnie: 27. Marnie laughs and responds "yes".

S12. 28. How can we make your dog look like he has fur?

Marnie: 29. We can make some squiggly lines like this.

S12. 30. Yes, that's very good.

S12. 31. We can also do this. (Teacher dips tooth brush into some brown paint and applies it to dog.) Would you like to try that Marnie? Marnie appears delighted.
Could we glue things on that looked like fur?

Yes.

On the table here, I have different things - like string and cotton that you can use for fur or you can use the tooth brush or whatever you would like.

I'd like you to draw and paint any kind of dog you like. It can be your dog, your friend's dog, a dog you would like to have, or my friend Don. Take your time. I'd like you to think of a name for your dog.

Tomorrow we'll talk about your dogs. Students proceed to create their dogs on the manilla paper that has been previously placed on their desk. Students use crayons, paint, glue, etc. Teacher assists individual students. At 1:40 teacher has students clean up and gather on carpet for a "Dog" story.

Next Day.

(Teacher has students' dog pictures mounted around the room. Students are seated at their desks.)

We certainly have some interesting looking dogs with many different textures. Let's tell Mrs. X (researcher) about our wonderful dogs and how you created their special textures.

Let's start with Jeremy. Jeremy find your dog and tell Mrs. X how you made that wonderful straight fur.

(Jeremy gets up and gets the toothbrush from the table and demonstrates how he created the appearance of fur on his dog. He appears proud of his accomplishments. The procedure continues with 5 more students.)
S12. 40. We now have a pretty good idea how we made these interesting looking furs. Let's look at the dogs and see how many dogs you can pick with straight fur.

(Teacher continues process and has students pick fuzzy, long and short fur. She then asks 2 students to tell a brief story about their dog. The lesson again concludes with a "Dog" story on the carpet.)

Students are dismissed for lunch.

Researcher 41. What are you planning to do next?

S12. 42. Well, I'd like to continue with the textures. I was thinking that I would get them to make a dish for their dog or themselves and use different textures to decorate it.

S12. 43. I asked Howard (Janitor) if we had any clay. He brought up a box but it was awfully hard. The little ones wouldn't be able to work with that, so I think I'll try something else.

Researcher. 44. If you're interested in doing the clay unit I'll check out the clay and help you set it up.

S12. 45. Oh no, I can do that myself.

Researcher. 46. I would be happy to do that . . .
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Date: March
Teacher: S12
Observation: 2
Topic: Rubbings

S12. 1. Who can tell me what we mean by "texture"?

Elaine: 2. It has stuff on top to make it feel sort of rough.

S12. 3. Think of your dogs and clay pots. What were some of the words we used to describe how they felt?


Richard: 5. My pot felt bumpy.

S12. 6. How did you make it feel bumpy?

Richard: 7. With the end of my pencil.

S12. 8. Remember when we used the toothbrush and some paint to make some of your dogs look like they had fur. (Some yeahs).

9. When you put your hand on your dog did it feel smooth or rough?


S12. 11. Yes, Jeremy, but you used cotton balls. I'm talking to people who used the toothbrush and paint.

12. Reiko, you used a toothbrush and paint to create texture. When you put your hand on your dog, did it feel smooth or rough?

Reiko: 13. It felt a bit rough.

S12. 14. Did it feel flat or did it feel furry?
15. It felt furry.
   (Teacher is getting a bit frustrated).

S12. 16. Reiko, I'd like you to go over to your dog.
      (Reiko goes and stands beside her painting.)

17. Close your eyes and put your hand over your dog.

18. Does it feel flat or bumpy?

Reiko: 19. Flat.

S12. 20. That's right. It feels flat but it looks rough. So,
         using the toothbrush you were able to make
         something look rough even though it felt like a
         flat piece of paper.

21. Today we're going to talk about some other ways
    we can make texture and still have the paper
    feel flat. (Teacher has visuals of different
    types of trees on chalk ledge).

22. Let's look at this tree (oak tree). Billy, come
    and put your hand on this tree.

23. How does it feel?


S12. 25. But how does it look like it would really feel?

26. The trunk probably feels rough.

S12. 27. And the top part, the leaves.

28. Crunchy and smooth. (Teacher follows similar
    process with other trees, and asks students to
    describe textures).

S12. 29. On your desk are some thick crayons and 2
         pieces of white paper. (Teacher walks over to a
         table.)
30. On the tables here I have placed many things you can use to create many different textures, bumpy, rough . . . (Teacher picks up a piece of corrugated paper.)

31. I want you to decide what kind of tree you want to make and what kind of texture you want for the trunk and the top, and what colours you are going to use.

32. Then you take a crayon and the white piece of paper and place it over the material you're going to use to create the texture. Like this. Then take your pencil like this and go back and forth. Not too hard or you'll make a hole. This is called "rubbing".

33. All right. This is going to be my trunk.

34. Now for the top, I'll take this green crayon and put this board behind the white paper. Now isn't that interesting?

35. Now I'll cut out a trunk, like this.

36. And then the top like this. Now I'll paste it on another piece of paper.

37. There we are.

38. Now when you've finished painting your tree, I'd like you to draw your own yard in the background.

39. Work in your groups. (There are 5 groups and 5 tables with various textured materials on each table.)

S12. (Students appear enthusiastic.)

40. (To researcher) I've probably overdone this whole texture thing - from dog hair to clay pots to trees.
Researcher 41. I think your units have been very effective. You've certainly covered all aspects of the conceptual model and suggestions in the scope and sequence chart. You've obviously spent a lot of time studying the new curriculum.

Billy: 42. Mrs. B, I was using that board and Hung took it. (Teacher goes over and settles problem.) Teacher assists individual students.

Lesson concludes on carpet with a discussion of the different types of trees the children would find in their own yard, on their way to school and in the school yard.
At the beginning of the year, you learned "C" said "K" in clown, but with "CI" it says "s-s" as in "circus" and "circle" and "Cindy".

Today we're going to talk about clowns and the circus. Yes, well that's what we're going to talk about - the circus and clowns.

I love clowns. They're my favourite. There have been clowns for a long, long time. Long, long ago in Roman times there were clowns. They were small people who entertained the king. They were not called clowns in those days. They were called jesters.

In France, they called these clowns or jesters "fou". The very first clown in France was called Pierrot. Pierrot had a white face. Pierrot was the very first clown to have a white face. (Teacher holds up a picture of Pierrot.)

How many of you have seen a clown that looks like Pierrot? (A few hands go up.)

The French clowns or "fou" didn't think they should look too much like people so they dressed up in big blouses, big pants, and big shoes. Then the clowns decided to have other people join them to entertain people.

So what do you think happened then when there were clowns, and acrobats and jugglers?

Then there was a circus.

Yes, very good.
9. So the first clown was a jester. (Teacher holds up a picture of the jester.) Then the second was "fou" with his white face (teacher points to Pierrot). Then we got the hobo clown who always looked sad. (Teacher holds up hobo clown.) But when sad clowns laughed, everyone laughed.

10. The we got clowns who did silly things. They were called slapstick clowns.

11. So we had jester clowns way back long ago, then the French clowns, then the hobo clowns who looked sad but were happy inside and then the slapstick clowns.

12. So what do you notice about all the clowns?

Marcie: 13. They're all funny.

S12. 14. Yes, and they're all different. Every clown is different. No two clowns are the same. There is a law that no two clowns can look the same. There are some things they do to look different. What are they?

Carlie: 15. Their hair is different.

S12. 16. How is it different?

Carlie: 17. It's a different colour. His is red and his is black, and his is brown.

S12. 18. What else is different about their hair?

Zoltan: 19. Some have curly hair and some have straight hair and he has no hair on top and straight hair on the sides.

S12. 20. That's right. What else is different? What about their clothes?
Reiko: 21. They have different hats. He has a pointy hat and he has a little hat with a flower and he has a round hat.

William: 22. And they have different pants. He has shiny black pants, and he has checkered pants, and he has patches on his pants.

S12. 23. So the clothes are different, their hair is different. What about the textures?


Richard: 25. His hair is fuzzy looking and his hair is smooth.

S12. 26. What do you notice about the colours?

Hugh: 27. There are lots of colours.

S12. 28. Yes, what do you remember about Van Gogh's colours?

Francis: 29. They were bright.

S12. 30. Yes, they were bright, bold, strong colours. Are the clowns wearing bright, bold, strong colours? (Students "yes").

31. Now, if you were to paint a clown using colours like Van Gogh did and some of the textures he did, what would you do?

Gregory: 32. I'd use the tooth brush.

33. Yes, you could do that. What colours would you use?

Gregory: 34. Red and blue and black.

(Teacher holds up a picture of a clown painted in bright bold brush strokes).
A friend of mine painted this. What does it remind you of?

It looks like Van Gogh's face.

Very good. Why do you say that?

Because it's a bit messy and has a lot of bright colours.

( Teacher holds up a shirt with straight yellow and blue lines.)

Who do you thing might have designed this?

Chagal 'cause he used straight lines and yellow and blue.

(Teacher holds up striped clown pants.) Think of what shirt might go with these pants. Don't tell me just think about it.

(Teacher holds up a checkered pair of pants.) What about these pants? Don't tell me just think about it.

Clowns plan their outfits very carefully so that everything goes together.

Now I want you to think about the type of clown you would like - a jester clown, a Pierrot clown, a hobo clown, or any kind of clown at all.

Now, I want you to surprise me and think of your very own clown and create it on paper. Think about it very carefully before you start.

While you're working I'm going to play a record about the most famous clown of all. (Teacher holds up a picture of the clown.)

His name was Pagliacci. He was an Italian clown.
48. Now, while you're working I'm going to play a record about Pagliacci. Pagliacci means clown in Italian. (Students are all sitting on carpeted area in a circle. Paints and paper have been set up by teacher.

Researcher: 49. (To teacher) That was a powerful lesson. You put an incredible amount of preparation into that. I was amazed that the students could come up with the names of artists like Chagal and Van Gogh.

S12. 50. It really wasn't that much preparation. You know I've been involved with the opera, so I'm familiar with the clowns. And when I did that self-portrait unit we talked a lot about Van Gogh and his colours and style. Actually, I was surprised how interested the students were and how much they were capable of learning.

Researcher: 51. What about Chagal. When did you discuss Chagal with your students?

S12. 52. At the same time. We were looking at different ways the artists use colour and their different styles. The paint was to encourage them to use their imaginations and not to feel that there is one right way to do things.

(Students work very quietly and independently. The clowns are diverse and thoughtfully done. Teacher hangs them to dry on clothes line.)

S12. 53. (To Researcher) Tomorrow I'll get the students to write a story about their clowns. Then they can share their stories.

Researcher. 54. I thoroughly enjoyed that. Thank you. Thank you boys and girls. I'll come back and listen to some of your stories.

S12. 55. I plan to continue the clown theme and will carry on and create a whole circus.
APPENDIX VIII

ANALYSIS OF TRANSCRIPTS OF OBSERVATION 3 AND INTERVIEW II
### APPENDIX VIII

**ANALYSES OF TRANSCRIPTS OF OBSERVATIONS 3 AND INTERVIEW II**

Rating Scale Used by Independent Rater

Adaptation of Halls & Loucks (1977)

Levels of Use of an Innovation

Subject: S3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Use of New Art Curriculum</th>
<th>Observation 3 (Statement #s)</th>
<th>Interview II (Statement #s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Nonuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher is acquiring information about curriculum and is exploring its application to the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher has decided to begin to implement the new art curriculum and has set a date to begin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher has just begun to use the new art curriculum. The teacher is focusing on lesson to lesson application of the new curriculum rather than planning units or long term planning. Disjointed superficial use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Routine use. New curricula is being used on a regular basis with little adaptation. The implementation is mechanical rather than based on planning and adaptation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Levels of Use of New Art Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observation 3 (Statement #s)</th>
<th>Interview II (Statement #s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Curricula is routinely used with adaptations made to suit particular context. Changes are based on an understanding of implications for students. Teacher solicits individuals' ideas from others.</td>
<td>24; 25</td>
<td>2; 4; 12; 22; 34; 40; 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Same as 5., but user is collaborating with colleagues regarding new curricula, rather than simply soliciting specific ideas.</td>
<td>24; 25</td>
<td>2; 4; 12; 22; 34; 40; 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. User seeks major modifications to curricula to achieve increased impact on students. User explores new developments in art education.</td>
<td>24; 25</td>
<td>2; 4; 12; 22; 34; 40; 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>