

THE INFLUENCE OF PRIOR PERSPECTIVES, DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATORY ROLES, AND DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION ON VIEWS ABOUT CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY

RICHARD D. KIMPSTON, *University of Minnesota*
KAREN B. ROGERS, *College of St. Thomas*

A strong and growing expectation currently exists in the United States that school districts employ systematic procedures with a broader base of professional involvement in the curriculum planning decision. This expectation can be noted in even a cursory review of educational literature, job descriptions for curriculum leaders, state directives to school districts, and laws being passed by state legislatures. In this study, research literature on the involvement of teachers and administrators in curriculum planning is first reviewed. The review is then followed by a description of a longitudinal case study that focused on teacher and principal expectations, satisfaction, and attitudes toward curriculum planning and the relationship of the three to the resulting process and product.

A review of the literature on teacher and principal involvement in educational decision making reveals points of agreement, disagreement, and some unanswered questions. For example, several researchers have concluded that participation in decision making results in greater job satisfaction, higher productivity, lower costs, and greater commitment to and personal integration in an organization.¹ The question of whether teachers desire greater involvement appears to depend on the kinds of decisions, the amount of expertise they believe they bring to the process, and the degree to which they are required to participate.² Teachers have also voiced definite preferences for particular types of curriculum work, including (1) the translation of curricu-

¹Joseph A. Alluto and James A. Belasco, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 8 (Winter 1972): 44-58; Walter I. Garms, James W. Guthrie, and Lawrence C. Pierce, *School Finance* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975); Renis Likert, *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967); M. Scott Myers, *Every Employee a Manager* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

²Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel, *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (New York: Random House, 1982); Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman, "Participating in Decision-Making: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 14 (Winter 1978): 13-29; A. A. Ponder and J. W. Bulcock, "Friction Point Rating: A Blueprint for Selective Decentralization in School Systems," *The Canadian Administrator* 15 (March 1976): 1-6

lum into instruction³ and (2) the development of activities directly related to their individual classrooms.⁴ When participation in curriculum planning goes beyond the classroom level, skepticism about personal benefits and about the success of the efforts has resulted.⁵

However, some researchers have argued that teachers' perceptions of their active participation in curriculum development and the actual involvement of teachers in the development process significantly affect the successful implementation of the curriculum.⁶ Involvement of the school principal in curriculum planning is especially critical to successfully implementing the decisions made,⁷ particularly if the principal knows about the proposed educational change and has a clearly delineated role in that change.⁸

In general, teacher and principal attitudes toward participation in curriculum planning range from positive to apathetic to negative. Yet both professional groups do and must participate in curriculum decision making. Questions remain about participants' predispositions toward curriculum and curriculum planning and their effect on the curriculum process and product. Likewise, we need to understand the degree of participation and the type of participation in curriculum planning that will be perceived most favorably by teachers and administrators. Only as we more fully understand teacher and principal perceptions about curriculum and the two groups' involvement in its development will effective planning occur.

A large Midwest suburban district decided to assess and revise its current curriculum. A new superintendent with an extensive curriculum background had been recently appointed. She indicated some concern that the district had no written curriculum or documentation of the curriculum used in the various subject areas. Therefore, she developed a three-year curriculum study project.

Year 1 focused on the analysis phase of the curriculum study. In this stage, the process and expectations for the entire project were to be defined,

³Jean H. Young, "The Curriculum Decision-Making Preferences of School Personnel," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 25 (March 1979): 20-29.

⁴Dan C. Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

⁵Daniel L. Duke, Beverly K. Showers, and Michael Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 16 (Winter 1980): 93-106.

⁶Jean H. Young, "The Curriculum Decision-Making Preferences of School Personnel," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 25 (March 1979): 20-29, Michael Fullan and Alan Pomfret, "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation," *Review of Educational Research* 47 (Winter 1977): 335-397.

⁷Susan Loucks and Harold Pratt, "A Concerns-Based Approach to Curriculum Change," *Educational Leadership* 37 (December 1979): 212-215.

⁸Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VIII. Implementing and Sustaining Innovations* (Santa Monica, Calif: Rand Corporation, 1978); Everett W. Nicholson and Sandra J. Tracy, "Principals' Influence on Teachers' Attitude and Implementation of Curricular Change," *Education* 103 (Fall 1982): 68-73.

the current district curriculum was to be documented, and the development activities for the second phase were to be planned. Phase 2, to begin in the second year of the curriculum study, was planned to focus on the development of new curriculums for each content area in the district curriculum (specifically, rationales, goals, objectives, and content outlines). The third phase of the curriculum study project, planned for year 3, was intended to develop a curriculum system for implementing and evaluating the newly developed subject area curriculums, districtwide.

The superintendent was convinced that, as the research indicates, curriculum planning for the district must be broad-based and that participants in the process must wish to become involved. At her request, we were called in to observe the process and to evaluate its ultimate effectiveness. We found a situation that might answer the questions of broad-based collaboration, the principal as instructional leader, and voluntary teacher participation on extra-classroom curricular concerns. With these concerns in mind, five questions were posed and a case study undertaken to answer them.

The intentions of the case study in the first phase of the district project, therefore, were to collect data on the following questions:

1. Do teachers and principals have similar initial predispositions about the curriculum process and product?
2. When engaged in a curriculum decision-making process involving several teachers and principals, can the two groups work collaboratively?
3. Do the initial attitudes of participating teachers and principals affect how they both rate the resulting curriculum process and product?
4. If the participants view the process of curriculum development positively, are they then inclined to view the resulting product in a more favorable light?
5. Will the participants, whose expectations for having chosen to participate were met, rate the participatory process more favorably than those whose expectations were not met?

The case study presented a unique opportunity to study the efforts of several teachers and principals in a collaborative, districtwide curriculum decision-making process.

STUDY METHOD

To measure the participants' perceptions of their roles and expectations, to document the actual process undertaken, and to evaluate the products of the curriculum documentation project, a series of research instruments were adapted or developed for use in the project: (1) the Teacher/Administrator Self-Analysis Inventory (TSAI), (2) the Hall Process Scale, (3) the Hall Product Scale, (4) the Expectations/Satisfactions Questionnaire (ESQ), and (5) the Product Checklist.

Teacher/Administrator Self-Analysis Inventory (TSAI). The TSAI was developed in 1970 by George Beauchamp⁹ to describe and measure teacher behaviors and attitudes toward curriculum. The inventory consists of 51 statements, which the respondent rates as accurate, inaccurate, more accurate than inaccurate, or more inaccurate than accurate. The items measure the respondents' perceptions of how their curriculum is used, whether or not the curriculum is self-sufficient, and what relationship exists between the curriculum and textbook. In a previous use of this instrument,¹⁰ the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .85. This level of reliability was consistent with that reported by Beauchamp.

Hall Process and Product Scales. The Process and Product Scales were developed by Hall in 1976 at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.¹¹ Using a seven-point Likert scale, the Process Scale allows the respondent to judge specific characteristics generically inherent in curriculum planning processes. The major components of process and the characteristics measured for each component are presented in Table 1.

Likewise, using a seven-point Likert scale, Hall's Product Scale allows the respondent to judge the specific characteristics inherent in the outcomes of a curriculum planning process, that is, the product. The major components of the product and the characteristics measured for each component are presented in Table 2. Validation of the instruments was secured from the authoritative opinions of curriculum and evaluation experts. Hall made no attempt to rigorously quantify the results obtained from the use of the Process Scale or the Product Scale; rather, the scales were used as an aid in describing and qualitatively evaluating the process aspect of each committee and the product or output phase of curriculum planning.

Expectations/Satisfactions Questionnaire. This instrument was developed by Richard Kimpston and Karen Rogers in 1984.¹² Besides demographic information about each study participant, the questionnaire measures each participant's expectations for participation, satisfaction in the actual participation, and dissatisfaction with the process.

⁹George A. Beauchamp, "Longitudinal Study in Curriculum Engineering," ERIC document reproduction service No. ED 088 173 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974)

¹⁰Richard D. Kimpston, "Effects of the Locus of Curriculum Decision-Making on Teacher Attitudes and Behaviors" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, March 1980)

¹¹Maud C. L. Hall, "An Evaluation of Curriculum Planning Processes and Products" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1976).

¹²Richard D. Kimpston and Karen B. Rogers, "Expectations/Satisfactions" (unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1984)

Table 1. Components and Scale Characteristics Measured by Hall's Process Scale

<i>Process goals and tasks</i>	
Scale 1.	Clarity
Scale 2.	Agreement
Scale 3.	Source
<i>Process participation and communication patterns</i>	
Scale 4.	Equality
Scale 5.	Consideration
Scale 6.	Openness
Scale 7.	Group versus Individual Direction
Scale 8.	Relevance
<i>Process leadership</i>	
Scale 9.	Formality
Scale 10.	Democratism
Scale 11.	Skillfulness
Scale 12.	Sensitivity
Scale 13.	Authority
<i>Process structure and atmosphere</i>	
Scale 14.	Regularity
Scale 15.	Stability
Scale 16.	Orientation
Scale 17.	Solidarity
Scale 18.	Tone
Scale 19.	Flexibility
<i>Process results</i>	
Scale 20.	Closure
Scale 21.	Satisfaction
Scale 22.	Implementation

Table 2. Components and Scale Characteristics Measured by Hall's Product Scale

<i>Product goals</i>	
Scale 1	Direction
Scale 2	Explicitness
Scale 3.	Congruence
Scale 4.	Effectiveness
<i>Product documents</i>	
Scale 5.	Comprehensiveness
Scale 6.	Significance
Scale 7.	Substantiveness
<i>Product decisions and ideas</i>	
Scale 8.	Relevance
Scale 9.	Feasibility
Scale 10.	Appropriateness
Scale 11.	Creativity

Product Checklist. This evaluation instrument was developed by Richard Kimpston and Karen Rogers in 1984.¹³ The instrument evaluates both the nature of the product and its purpose. A four-point Likert scale was designed to measure 15 specific characteristics of each course outline produced in the documentation process and also to measure 7 general purposes by which the outlines might be judged.

Despite the numerous strengths and interesting findings in this case study, its limitations must also be mentioned. First and foremost, it is important to remember the difficulty of generalizing case study data, despite the amount of data collected and the size of the study sample. Second, there is always the potential for inaccuracy when collecting data based on self-reports. We believed, however, that the close contact and frequent discussions with district personnel helped to verify the accuracy of the trends measured by the multiple instruments used and the correlations found among those instruments.

PROCEDURE

The study was carried out in one large suburban school district consisting of 15,000 students and 750 teachers. In the first year of the study, the district had decided that its entire curriculum in every subject area should be assessed and a system developed for its revision and maintenance. In this phase of the three-year project, the current district curriculum was to be documented and the development activities for the second phase were to be planned.

A Curriculum Steering Committee was formed, composed of 18 teachers who were content specialists and 16 administrators. The primary tasks of the Steering Committee were (1) to plan and organize the documentation process, (2) to lead the actual documentation process, and (3) to organize the second and third phases of the study project. A Curriculum Documentation Team was also formed at this time, composed of 114 teachers and 16 administrators. The primary tasks of this team were (1) to collect data on current programs, (2) to define the goals and topics covered by current programs, and (3) to document these programs.

During the first phase of the curriculum study project, the involvement of the two groups varied a great deal. Both groups received an all-day orientation on the process of curriculum development, curricular components, and individual responsibilities of the respective groups. Then the Curriculum Steering Committee met separately to plan the documentation process in which the Curriculum Documentation Team would participate. Several weeks later, the Steering Committee members assumed leadership of the documentation effort for 1 of the 16 curriculum areas. A two-day release from teaching duties was provided for all Curriculum Steering Committee and Curriculum

¹³Richard D. Kimpston and Karen B. Rogers, "Product Checklist" (unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1984).

Documentation Team members while the two groups jointly described the goals and content topics for each course in the district, from "Third-Grade Reading" (a year-long course) to "Architectural Drawing I" (a trimester course). Table 3 displays the course-outline format used in the documentation process, with an example of one middle school course in science. During the documentation process, 470 separate course outlines were produced, with a total of 1,336 pages.

The TSAI was administered during a full-day orientation/training session to all members of the Curriculum Steering Committee and the Curriculum Documentation Team. A 99 percent response rate was received.

The Hall Process and Product Scales and the ESQ were separately administered to the two different committees. All three instruments were completed during a group planning session of the Steering Committee four months after the project began. A 99 percent response rate was obtained. These three instruments were mailed to Documentation Team members, with a corresponding response rate of 86 percent.

Table 3. Partial Example of a Course Documentation Outline for One Middle School Science Course

*Scope and Sequence
Curriculum Study Worksheet*

Course Title: Life Science
Program: Science
Subprogram/Grade Level: Grade 7
Outline Prepared By: _____
Objectives of Course:

The student will

1. develop a proficiency in simple biological science laboratory techniques;
2. develop a proficiency in collection, organization, and presentation of data;
3. express an understanding of life as it relates to its value;
4. acquire habits in critical thinking;
5. gather and provide evidence that students are learning in the classroom situations;
6. develop knowledge in terms, concepts, principles, and generalizations that help the students interpret their environment;
7. develop attitudes of curiosity and involvement with phenomena in nature;
8. develop intellectual processes of inquiry by which scientific problems are explained;
9. develop the ability to handle and manipulate materials and equipment in a productive and safe manner.

Course Outline: Systems of measurement (one week)
Goal: To gain a working knowledge of the various methods of international measurements and to apply these methods to everyday use.
Objectives:

The student will

1. explain and compare the units of the metric system of measurement;
2. use the metric system to measure mass, length, and volume;
3. be able to convert metric units within the system;
4. distinguish between different scientific instruments used for making measurements.

Course Outline: Microbiology (10 weeks)
Goal: To gain an understanding of the nature of cells and tissues and their role in life activities.

The Product Checklist was completed independently by the two researchers for each course outline produced by the Documentation Team. The checklist was developed to serve as an objective, external evaluation of the course outlines produced by the documentation process.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In Table 4, the expectations the participants cited as reasons for their voluntary participation are ranked. The expectations are shown in order of their mean score on a seven-point scale. The frequencies and percentages of participants rating an expectation as "true of me" (scale points 6 and 7) are of interest.

The participants' reported satisfaction with the curriculum documentation process are presented in Table 5. Again, the mean scores on a seven-point Likert scale have dictated the rank order, but the extraordinarily high frequencies and percentages of participants rating the various items as "true of me" (scale points 6 and 7) should be noted.

In Table 6, the ranked means and standard deviations for the participants' evaluations of the curriculum documentation process are presented. The subcomponents are rank-ordered for each of the five process structures identified by the Hall Process Scale.

Table 7 provides the rank order of the means and standard deviations for the participants' evaluations of the actual curriculum documents produced. The subcomponents are rank-ordered for each of the three product structures identified by the Hall Product Scale.

Then, analyses of variance were run on (1) the differences between teachers and administrators in their responses on the TSAI, the ESQ, and the Process and Product Scale ratings and (2) the differences between Steering Committee responses and Documentation Team responses on these same

Table 4. Expectations of Participants in the Curriculum Documentation Process

Expectation	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Percentage
To become knowledgeable about the district development process	5.82	1.41	64	51.7
To become intellectually stimulated as a result of participating as a committee member	5.62	1.51	56	45.1
To have a voice in determining the curriculum to be taught	5.42	1.92	61	49.2
To increase personal prestige in the district as a result of participation	3.63	1.97	17	13.9

Table 5. Participants' Reported Satisfaction with the Curriculum Documentation Process

Satisfaction	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Percentage
Exposure to different points of view	5.68	1.26	58	46.8
Interaction with others	5.61	1.24	56	45.2
Acquiring new ideas and information	5.56	1.46	63	50.8
Being part of the action	5.24	1.68	52	41.9
Discovering how curriculum planning occurs	4.85	1.76	40	32.2
Increased self-esteem	4.29	1.79	22	17.8

instruments. Several statistical differences were found among groups of teachers involved in the development project by grade level:

1. The middle school and elementary teachers more strongly believed that a curriculum is useful in helping to select supplementary instructional materials and in providing for the individual needs of students.

2. The middle school and high school teachers more strongly believed that a textbook is most useful for developing lesson plans, planning instructional activities, developing test questions, and long-range planning.

3. The high school teachers differed significantly from middle school and elementary teachers in their belief that the textbook is useful in helping to select supplementary instructional materials.

4. The middle school teachers reported greater satisfaction with the curriculum documentation study process.

Significant differences were also found in the general attitudes of the administrators:

1. The district administrators reported less certainty about the adequacy of the district curriculum and believed more strongly that it should be changed.

2. The administrators believed more strongly than the teachers that a textbook, well-chosen, precludes the need for supplementary materials and is useful for developing lesson plans, planning instructional activities, developing test questions, and selecting supplementary instructional materials.

3. The district administrators believed more strongly than the participating teachers that the curriculum can provide the topics for instruction, does provide for the individual needs of students, and adequately provides for the teaching of basic skills.

Table 6. Participant Evaluations of the Curriculum Documentation Process

Process structure	Scale	Mean	Standard deviation
Goals and tasks	Agreement (1 = disagreement) (7 = agreement)	5.28	1.27
	Clarity (1 = unclear) (7 = clear)	5.05	1.42
	Source (1 = external imposition) (7 = internal formulation)	4.19	1.83
Participation and communication patterns	Openness (1 = closed communication) (7 = open communication)	6.19	1.11
	Relevance (1 = tangential communication) (7 = goal-related communication)	5.68	1.03
	Direction (1 = individual-directed) (7 = group-directed)	5.66	1.40
	Consideration (1 = minority opinions ignored) (7 = minority opinions considered)	5.52	1.23
	Equality (1 = lopsided participation) (7 = equal participation)	5.46	1.56
Leadership	Sensitivity (1 = insensitive) (7 = sensitive)	5.82	1.28
	Skillfulness (1 = unskillful) (7 = skillful)	5.68	1.28
	Democratism (1 = autocratic) (7 = democratic)	5.36	1.56
	Authority (1 = leader-centered) (7 = group-centered)	4.99	1.39
	Formality (1 = formal) (7 = informal)	4.07	1.92
	Structure and atmosphere	Tone (1 = hostile atmosphere) (7 = friendly atmosphere)	6.46
Stability (1 = erratic attendance) (7 = stable attendance)		6.27	1.01
Solidarity (1 = conflict) (7 = unity)		5.51	1.30
Regularity (1 = sporadic meetings) (7 = regular meetings)		5.43	1.51

Table 6 (continued)

Process structure	Scale	Mean	Standard deviation
Structure and atmosphere	Orientation (1 = task-oriented) (7 = process-oriented)	3.95	1.62
	Flexibility (1 = structured) (7 = unstructured)	3.90	1.59
Results	Satisfaction (1 = dissatisfied) (7 = satisfied)	5.74	1.33
	Closure (1 = unfinished task) (7 = finished task)	5.24	1.94
	Implementation (1 = will not be implemented) (7 = implemented)	5.14	1.49

4. The administrators perceived a much more extensive reliance by district teachers on commercial packages and supplementary materials for the development of learning activities than was actually reported by the teachers themselves.

Differences between Steering Committee and Documentation Team perceptions of the participation experience and the resulting documentation product were also found through analyses of variance. The significant differences were as follows:

1. The Documentation Team members perceived the goals as more clearly understood and stated, agreed upon by all group members, and less externally imposed on group members than did the Steering Committee participants.

2. The Documentation Team members perceived the leadership of the project as less formal.

3. The Documentation Team members believed more strongly that the working atmosphere and the structure of the documentation process were flexible, cohesive, and free of conflicts and problems.

4. The Documentation Team members reported stronger perceptions that their task was finished and that they were greatly satisfied with the results produced than did the Steering Committee members.

5. The Documentation Team participants more strongly perceived the actual curriculum documents produced as highly effective.

6. The Documentation Team members rated the produced curriculum documents higher in feasibility for implementation, appropriateness, and degree of originality.

Table 7. Participant Evaluations of the Actual Curriculum Documentation

Product structure	Scale	Mean	Standard deviation
Goals	Effectiveness (1 = ineffective completion) (7 = effective completion)	5.81	1.33
	Direction (1 = no direction) (7 = direction)	5.60	1.30
	Explicitness (1 = inexplicit formulation) (7 = explicit formulation)	5.52	1.31
	Congruence (1 = incongruence) (7 = congruence)	5.34	1.22
Documents	Significance (1 = trivial information) (7 = significant information)	5.81	1.49
	Comprehensiveness (1 = noncomprehensive) (7 = comprehensive)	5.57	1.42
	Substantiveness (1 = nonsubstantive reporting) (7 = substantive reporting)	4.32	1.80
Decisions and ideas	Appropriateness (1 = inappropriate relation to original goals) (7 = appropriateness)	5.81	1.19
	Feasibility (1 = unfeasible for implementation) (7 = feasible)	5.59	1.31
	Relevance (1 = irrelevant to education concerns) (7 = relevant)	5.37	1.34
	Creativity (1 = uncreative ideas) (7 = creative, innovative)	4.78	1.56

In general, there were no significant differences between Documentation Team and Steering Committee members in their initial role expectations and in their actual satisfaction with the curriculum study project. There were, however, significant differences in the Steering Committee's dissatisfaction with leadership and timeliness, as reported on the ESQ.

The second procedure for data analysis was computing the correlations among items on the five instruments. Variations in the correlations between Steering Committee and Documentation Team members were found among item responses related to expected roles, satisfaction, and actual evaluations of the process and products. In Table 8, the differences in these correlated variables are presented.

Variations between Steering Committee and Documentation Team members were also found in the correlations among the various items of the

Table 8. Comparative Correlations Between Satisfaction and Expectations for Selected Process and Product Variables

	Steering Committee members	Documentation Team members
Expectations to process results	-1.00**	.54
Expectations to process participation	.20	.92*
Expectations to product decisions	-1.00**	.66
Satisfaction to product decisions	0	.92*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

process and product evaluations. In Table 9, the correlations among process variables are presented; in Table 10, the correlations for product and process relationships are shown.

No significant differences in expectations, satisfaction, and evaluations of process and product were found in analyzing the data by sex, but a general, significant trend was discovered in relation to the ages of the participants. In general, the older participants evaluated their satisfaction with the process results and with the documents produced significantly higher than did the younger participants. A difference was also found between participants who served on either the Steering Committee or Documentation Team and participants who served in both capacities. The dual-role participants evaluated the process leadership and results significantly more favorably than did the single-

Table 9. Comparative Intercorrelations among Evaluations for Process Variables

	Steering Committee members	Documentation Team members
Process goals to process structure	.58*	.33**
Process goals to process results	.60*	.50**
Process goals to process participation	.25	.53**
Process goals to process leadership	.27	.45**
Process structure to process results	.56*	.40**
Process leadership to process results	-.59*	.48**
Process goals to product document	-.25	.53**
Process goals to product goals	-.52	.54**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 10. Comparative Intercorrelations and Correlations among Evaluations for Product and Process Variables

	Steering Committee members	Documentation Team members
Product decisions to product document	.92**	.75**
Product decisions to product goals	.55	.65**
Product decisions to process goals	-.37	.54**
Product decisions to process participation	-.44	.49**
Product decisions to process leadership	.57*	.58**
Product decisions to process structure	-.16	.44**
Product decisions to process results	.23	.63**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

role participants. Evaluations by both groups, however, were generally favorable.

An analysis of the actual curriculum documents produced revealed 442 out of a total 470 course outlines with acceptable-to-excellent ratings of goal and topic descriptive characteristics. An interrater reliability coefficient of .92 was achieved when the individual documents were independently rated by the two researchers using the Product Checklist. Table 11 presents the ratings by subject area. Of the total 44 unacceptable ratings given, 18 were due to omission of course goals, and the remaining 26 were due to failure to develop a course outline.

DISCUSSION

In summary, the documentation phase of the three-year district curriculum planning project described in this case study was successfully completed. Widespread participation of teachers and principals resulted in a process highly rated by all participants. The documentation product, as evaluated by the participants and external evaluators, was deemed comprehensive, accurate, and of high quality. The project provided a successful model for broad-based, collaborative curriculum planning. The model was proven to be feasible and practical, and all the participants appeared satisfied with the project, in general.

The overriding reason that teachers and principals volunteered to participate in the curriculum documentation process was their desire to become more knowledgeable about curriculum planning in the district. This reason suggests that teachers may be genuinely interested in curriculum work extending beyond specific classroom concerns. In this project, teachers volunteered to document curriculum, a process that would give them no direct, personal benefits other than more knowledge of how curriculum planning is carried

Table 11. Goal and Topic Outline Ratings of Curriculum Documents by Subject Area

Subject area	Goals				Topic outlines			
	U	A	G	E	U	A	G	E
Art	1	14	—	—	3	11	1	—
Business education	1	26	18	—	9	23	12	1
Communications	2	53	7	—	1	21	34	6
Foreign languages	—	18	2	—	—	6	14	—
Guidance	2	6	1	—	—	7	2	—
Health	—	4	1	—	—	1	4	—
Home economics	—	27	—	—	1	20	6	—
Language arts	7	11	4	1	1	17	2	3
Industrial education	1	61	—	—	4	50	8	—
Mathematics	—	42	5	3	5	7	36	2
Music	—	13	—	1	—	7	7	—
Physical education	—	52	1	—	1	37	12	3
Reading	2	2	1	—	1	3	1	—
Science	1	12	8	4	—	7	13	5
Social studies	1	50	1	3	—	20	33	2
TOTAL	18	391	49	12	26	237	185	22

Note. U = Unacceptable, A = Acceptable, G = Good, E = Excellent.

out. Likewise, they reported enjoying the experience. Their greatest satisfaction resulted from participating and interacting with others during the process, even though their expectation to learn about curriculum procedures in the district was not wholly fulfilled. This finding suggests that district administrators need to more effectively communicate the relationship of the specific process to long-term district goals, thereby meeting the volunteers' expectations more effectively. Even so, teacher participants in this study did not resent the time spent on the project.

In general, all the participants rated the various components of the process favorably. The teachers, however, did seem to want more input on the project goals and tasks, more shared decision making, and more formal leadership. Other areas of concern included the need for more orientation about and flexibility in the tasks of the committees. The teachers' evaluations of the curriculum documentation products were very positive. But the participants were concerned with the substantiveness of the product and the lack of creativity in its development. This concern was to be expected, however, in view of the project's documentary scope in its first year.

On the ESQ, the Steering Committee indicated some dissatisfaction with leadership and with timeliness. This concern resulted from an announcement from the district office, just before the ESQ was completed, that the curriculum design and development phase for year 2 of the project and the implementation and evaluation phase for year 3 were to be consolidated into a single year. The Steering Committee members' dissatisfaction with this modification most likely directly affected their questionnaire responses and may not reflect a more general dissatisfaction with the project. This explanation for the negative perceptions of the process's timeliness seems likely, since the participants who served in both Steering Committee and Documentation Team roles perceived all aspects of the process more favorably than did the single-role participants.

The results of this case study revealed several insights about the participants and provided at least partial answers to the questions initially posed. For the first and third questions concerning the influence of the participants' initial predispositions and attitudes on the perceptions of the newly developed process and product, the answer was negative. Although teachers and principals differed significantly in their initial attitudes toward the district curriculum and how it was used, no significant difference was found between the two groups in their perceptions of the final product. It was almost as if the misunderstandings principals had of how teachers use a curriculum were cleared away as the two groups worked together on describing the curriculum they shared as a district. It is almost certain that the teachers and principals working together on this project had the chance to get to know each other better and to understand each other's instructional philosophy to a greater extent because of the project.

Whether or not the two groups' initial attitudes toward curriculum matched (a concern voiced in the third of the five general questions addressed in this study), as a group the teachers reported a higher degree of satisfaction with the collaborative process. We hope that, as this study continues into phase 2, we will be able to help pinpoint which initial attitude differences may have led to the differing perceptions of the process. However, both groups had generally favorable initial attitudes toward curriculum plans and, likewise, rated the participatory process and its product favorably.

The second question of concern in this case study was how well teachers and principals can collaborate in a documentation process. Underlying this concern might be the inhibiting effect administrators impose on a group process. As shown in the ratings of the process, teachers and principals highly rated (1) the agreement on goals and tasks; (2) the openness, consideration, and equality of participation and communication patterns, (3) the sensitivity and democratism of leadership; and (4) the friendly, unified atmosphere of group meetings. Thus, we may assume from the high satisfaction of both groups with the process results that true collaboration did indeed take place in this project.

The focus of question 4 was to measure the relationship between satisfactory participation in the curriculum planning process and the degree to which the participants favorably perceived the product. For the Documentation Team, significantly positive correlations were found between the participants' agreement with the goals of the process and their perception that the goals were clear and the degree to which they found the product significant, comprehensive, and substantive (Table 9). The correlations did not hold for the Steering Committee members, however, who experienced a change in their expected outcome or product on the same day that they reported their satisfaction with the process.

A significantly positive correlation for the Documentation Team participants and a significantly negative correlation for the Steering Committee were also found between perceptions of the process goals as clear and mutually agreed upon and the degree to which each participant found the product goals to be effective, explicit, and congruent with the original intentions of the project. Although these findings might suggest that a greater degree of participation does not necessarily produce a higher degree of satisfaction with the process or product, the findings are not clear in this study. In fact, those participants who served in a dual role (i.e., as members of both the Documentation Team and the Steering Committee) did rate most aspects of the process and product more favorably than did the single-role participants. It will be important to investigate this question further in the second phase of the case study.

The fifth question of concern in this study dealt with measuring the relationship between the participants' expected roles and their reported satisfaction with these roles after the process. The Documentation Team members had significantly positive correlations between their *expectations* for (1) becoming more knowledgeable about district curriculum processes, (2) becoming intellectually stimulated through participation, (3) having a voice in determining the curriculum to be taught in the district, and (4) increasing their personal prestige as a result of participation and their *perceptions* of the appropriateness, feasibility, relevance, and creativity of the final product (Table 8). Likewise, team members had significantly positive correlations between their *satisfaction* with (1) being exposed to different points of view; (2) interacting with others; (3) acquiring new ideas and information; (4) being part of the action; (5) discovering how curriculum planning works; and (6) increasing their self-esteem and their *perceptions* of the appropriateness, feasibility, relevance, and creativity of the final product.

For Steering Committee members, the relationship between their expectations and their perceptions of the product resulted in a negative correlation, there was no correlation between their satisfaction with the product and their perceptions of the product. Thus, no definitive answer to the fifth question can be given at this point. We hope that further studies of the process and the product as the district enters phase 2 will result in a stronger measured

relationship between expectations, satisfaction, and perceptions of the product.

In conclusion, one strength and unexpected contribution of this case study was the depth of description about curriculum planning processes and products that the five instruments were able to provide. Correlations were high among items on the various instruments concerned with the same aspects of the curriculum process or product (e.g., goals, leadership, atmosphere, and feasibility of results). Thus, the significant relationships measured between participation and perceptions of the process and product were doubly validated. The method used to observe this planning process and its subsequent product may prove to be viable for a variety of curriculum planning processes.

The results of this study confirmed a belief that the participants in this systemwide curriculum development project brought to the process certain attitudes and beliefs that influenced their views of the process and the resulting product. We believe that the results of the study will be further validated in the second and third phases of this curriculum development project.

RICHARD D. KIMPSTON is Associate Professor of Education, Curriculum Systems, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

KAREN B. ROGERS is Instructor, Graduate Studies in Education, College of St. Thomas, 2115 Summit Avenue, P.O. Box 5017, St. Paul, MN 55105.

Smith, W. John. *Reflection-in-Action*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press, 1986, 118 pp., \$A12.50.

An analysis of reflection-in-action, starting with Schon's work, relates Dewey's ways of thinking with Habermas's technical, practical, and critical levels of reflection and Kemmis's definition of reflection as social and political. Six phases of critical reflection by Comstock are tied to the clinical supervision process. Readings of Smyth, Fay, and Bullough and others are included in this source book for Deakin University's EED 432, *Educational Leadership in the Schools*. This volume is one of six monographs in a series on educational leadership.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. *The Principals'hip: A Reflective Practice Perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1987, 361 pp.

Sergiovanni uses Schon's reflection-in-action conceptualization of professionals' work to describe what principals do on the job. Sergiovanni asserts that reflective principals are in charge of their professional practice, they take the "messy situations" presented by the varied expectations and demands of teachers, supervisors, and students and attempt to make sense of the situations. Sergiovanni proposes "mindscapes" to explain the differing frames of reference with which principals approach their efforts.

—Robert J. Vadella

Copyright © 1987 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.