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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The school curriculum is obviously one of the most widely discussed, argued and written about aspects of the American school system. Educators have dealt with the problems of how, when, where and probably most of all, what should be taught in the classroom since the educational process began. One needs only to glance at the guides to literature to see the innumerable books, articles and studies that have been conducted and written in the area of curriculum.

While administrators and other educational authorities expend a great deal of time and effort in deciding upon a suitable curriculum for the school, there seems sometimes to be a certain amount of lethargy, indecision or reluctance on the part of the teachers toward following a curriculum prescribed by the educational system of which they are an integral part. This indecision has, of late, come to the front as a major concern of school systems.

From the late 1800's until the more recent decades the "course of study" was the primary instructional guide that teachers followed. These instruments were usually proposed by the superintendents of schools with the expectation that the teachers would explicitly adhere to them at all times. In recent years courses of study have undergone a change in title as well as utilization by the teacher. Today courses of study are referred to as "curriculum guides" and probably the most outstanding change that has been made between the two, aside from the
title, is the factor of flexibility. Where the course of study was, for the most part, to be strictly adhered to by teachers, the curriculum guide presently is seen as mainly suggestions for the use of teachers.¹

Obviously, the situation differs from state to state, school to school and from department to department, but there tends to exist a large question or even disagreement as to what should be used from the guides or whether they should be used at all. It appears that too often the latter may be the situation in many schools.

When the task of compiling or modifying a curriculum for a particular school has been accomplished and curriculum guides are made available to teachers, at times these efforts are taken all too lightly by the teaching staff. When an educational problem is large enough to involve large portions of the time and efforts of administrators, counselors, department chairmen, and any others that may be included, one must assume that the end result is worthy of consideration. The situation is a serious one and should be given considerable attention.

Sometimes teachers put the guide aside and teach what they feel comfortable in teaching while others work under the misconception that what was taught them in school is what still should be taught. In these instances the curriculum guides may be a nuisance to teachers. Hopefully, it is true that more often than not teachers present material in the classroom that they feel will best benefit the students. However, when curriculum guides are available and represent the ideas

and efforts of the curriculum-making bodies within a school, the guide should at least be given consideration before definite and final teaching plans or units are developed.

In a large number of school systems the time of the counselor is at a premium. Therefore, through his participation in the curriculum organization process, the counselor can help meet the needs of many students that may never enter his office.

Since trends in social behavior and ramifications of our social system in general are constantly changing, these aspects can and should be inserted into the curriculum. Vocational trends, their changes and applications to the students' lives can be expressed in the classroom. And, maybe most important of all, rather than merely analyzing a person, story or situation presented in a classroom, the counselor, through the efforts of the teacher, can bring students to see and understand how others have attempted to solve problems that have confronted them.

The curriculum guide can be a valuable instrument. The degree to which teachers utilize the guide to the fullest advantages of the school is a question yet to be answered.

Evolution of the problem

For the three years prior to being accepted as a member of the 1967-68 Guidance Counseling Institute at Atlanta University, the writer was involved in a team-teaching situation in an Oregon high school. Team planning and organization was of utmost importance in enabling the team process to function adequately.

The team was organized on an experimental basis at first. At the outset of the first year the members were presented with a well
thought-out curriculum guide, compiled by a committee composed of the administrators of the school, counselors, deans of boys and girls and the department chairman.

The fact that the guide was referred to very sparingly by the team was an aspect which concerned the writer for two main reasons: (1) Being a first year teacher he would have liked at least to have made reference to a suggested guide and, (2) it was obvious that much effort had been put forth by presumably more knowledgeable persons than this writer to enhance the team process, and their efforts were largely ignored.

This thesis affords an opportunity to investigate the problem of curriculum guide utilization and hopefully to indicate possible improvements in the area of teacher adherence to curriculum guides.

Contributions to educational knowledge

It is hoped and expected that the findings of this survey will reveal worthwhile suggestions as to how the use of and adherence to curriculum guides by teachers can be facilitated within the secondary school.

Statement of the problem

The problem involved in this study is to determine to what extent Oregon teachers employ the use of curriculum guides offered them and if utilization of curriculum guides can be implemented in any way.

Limitations of the study

(1) The fears or insecurity of some respondents toward questions concerning their utilization of curriculum guides is recognized as a limitation. (2) The study was done in the State of Oregon and the
findings do not necessarily represent the opinions of teachers as a whole. (3) The limitations of the questionnaire method of gathering data are also recognized. Therefore, the writer endeavored to make the instrument as valid as possible.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to discover the degree to which English teachers in Oregon employ the curriculum guides made available to them and if improvements can be made which may help teachers utilize them to a greater advantage. More specifically, the study sought to find:

1. If teachers who participate in curriculum guide construction employ them more than teachers who are not involved in guide construction

2. If teachers follow the State Guide to Education, a prescribed guide within their school, or any guide at all

3. Whether the type of arrangement of the class affects the use of the guide? (i.e. The sophomore English level is often referred to as a "dumping ground," as no universal pattern is established in the course. However, on the junior and senior levels the literature is drawn wholly from American and English, respectively, and is placed in a chronological pattern. Consequently, these levels tend to lend themselves much more readily to a logical pattern or guide.)

4. Whether the number of years a person has taught have an effect on his adherence to a curriculum guide
5. If teachers have suggestions that may implement their use of guides

Definition of terms

1. Course of study: A term that referred to a teaching guide that was, in the past, usually proposed by a superintendent or personnel immediately under his direction. It was expected that the course of study would be followed explicitly by the teachers. Some persons still identify the course of study with the present curriculum guide, but there are obvious existing differences.

2. Curriculum guide: The modern course of study. The curriculum guide is a guide suggested by the school's administrative staff and is nearly always compiled by a group of persons including school administrators, counselors, department chairmen, and selected teachers.

Locale and period of the study

The study was conducted in State of Oregon during the school year 1968-69.

Method of research

The descriptive survey method of research, employing the use of random sampling and statistical analysis was utilized in this study. A questionnaire was sent to all randomly selected respondents.

Research procedure

1. Permission to carry out the study was obtained from the State Department of Education in Oregon.

2. Pertinent literature was reviewed and logically organized.
3. The questionnaire used in the study was completed and validated. The validation process involved the administering of the questionnaire twice to a sample group of English teachers.

4. In the spring of the 1968-69 school year, the questionnaire was administered to randomly selected teachers of English in the State of Oregon.

5. The results were carefully compiled and analyzed.

6. The thesis was completed in its entirety by including all valid implications, conclusions, findings, and recommendations resulting from this research.

Description of instrument

The instrument used in this survey was a questionnaire constructed by the writer and directed toward a random sample of teachers of English in terms of the extent to which they utilize curriculum guides.

Since the method of research decided upon to carry out this study is of the descriptive survey variety, employing random sampling techniques and statistical analysis, a questionnaire was needed to reach all randomly selected high school English teachers within the state of Oregon. Also, since a questionnaire was needed, validation processes were in order. The validation process was accomplished in the following manner:

The writer quite frequently called upon senior members of the Sweet Home High School English Department and a Dr. Henry F. Dizney at the University of Oregon Educational Research Department for assistance in completing the first and, obviously, unrevised edition of the questionnaire. When the first edition was completed to the dubious
satisfaction of the writer, ten copies were submitted to ten different teachers of English who were, at the time, or had been in the past, close associates of the writer. Suggestions were made by these people either orally or in written form and sent back to aid in the correction of vague or unclear items within the instrument.

These corrections were made, again with the aid of members of the English Department at Sweet Home High School, and were again sent to the ten teachers who had originally made comments. Again some questions were raised pertaining to items appearing on the questionnaire. These, fewer in number than the original, were corrected to the satisfaction of the persons involved, and the instrument was deemed ready to be sent to the potential respondents.

The questionnaire, when completed to the satisfaction of the writer, was three complete pages in length including the introductory paragraph which comprised one half of the first page.

There were, when the instrument was finalized, twenty-six questions. Three of these were open-ended, or asked the respondent to clarify or make additional comments with reference to the question asked.

The majority of questions on the instrument possessed from two to five potential choices from which to choose. In an effort to implement ease of response to these various questions, the respondent merely had to indicate his choice by making an X or a similar mark within the brackets provided for each potential response supplied the respondents.

The questionnaire was then subjected to validation tests utilizing members of the English Department at Sweet Home High School and
selected teachers of English in other high schools.

Description of the subjects

The subjects were randomly selected teachers of English in various Oregon senior high schools. The list of names was obtained from the Oregon State Department of Education, through the use of personnel directories compiled by the various school districts. These directories are then combined into one county directory which is, in turn, handed to the Oregon State Department of Education for their records.

Related literature

Curriculum guides, as educators know them today, have been contrived through a long and laborious evolutionary process. Through the years thoughts pertaining to their uses and values have been as varied as the people who have had specific dealings with the guides.

Apparently the latter part of the nineteenth century was the chronological setting for the first evidences of curriculum guide usage while the larger cities generally served as the geographical portion of the setting.¹

From this somewhat nebulous origin of the curriculum guide have come innumerable ramifications with which educators have had to contend. In surveying the literature concerning teacher employment of curriculum guides, one discovers that this is a problem of no little concern. While literature dealing directly with this specific situation seems somewhat limited, a number of writers have dealt more generally with it.

Krug and associates bring to light the difference between the

¹ McNally and Passow, School Programs, pp. 30-31.
terms "course of study" and "curriculum guide" as we know them today. They state:

The term 'curriculum guide' when used with reference to an instruction field is synonymous to some extent with the old term 'course of study.' Probably the major distinction is that a curriculum guide connotes more flexibility and less prescription than has been found in the course of study materials. Some curriculum guides, however, are organized around a major category of school objectives, such as health or citizenship, rather than around an instructional field. In some instances, curriculum guides center on features of the all-school program other than the classroom instruction, such as guidance, work experience or extra-class activities.¹

The authors considered questions concerning local and/or state guides to education. They felt state-wide curriculum guides were generally accepted to a large extent, but wide variability existed in the acceptability of the guides by local school districts, counties and cities. That is, the state curriculum guide should not be established as a panacea for all school curricula within a given state. The state guide should be one from which the various local school systems can "... stimulate reflective study rather than to secure acceptance and uncritical conformity."² This is a feeling expressed by more than one writer in dealing with the school curriculum area.

Caswell feels that the curricula of well-administered schools should be undergoing constant improvement to keep in step with the changing environment in which we live. He relates a brief and interesting historical background of the many facets of curriculum study that evolved from the late 19th Century to the time the book was

---


² Ibid., p. 46.
In chapter three of their book, McNally and Passow deal directly with curriculum improvement and, as Caswell did, present a brief history of the growth of curriculum dilemmas that seem evident to varying degrees from one educational system to another.

This writer will deal somewhat generally with the earlier history of the curriculum developmental process (approximately up to 1950) and more specifically with the last eighteen years. Considering the early history of curriculum guides and courses of study, McNally and Passow said:

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, courses of study began to appear in the larger cities and some of the states. Most of the early issues were prepared by the superintendent himself or by members of his staff under his immediate direction. Gradually small committees composed of selected subject specialists, supervisory and administrative staff, and a few teachers became the channels for producing and altering courses of study.

The 1890's saw the beginnings of what has been since described as a generation of curriculum making by national committees... The Committee of Ten (on secondary education) and the Committee of Fifteen (on elementary education) in 1893....

The National Committees were probably the dominant influence, but other streams of activities affected program development....

Until the close of WWI, the major influences on curriculum making were largely outside the school system. The national committees, the textbook writers, the college professors and university researchers, the school survey and laboratory school personnel - all made recommendations which determined, to a greater or lesser extent, local practices. ... In most instances, a product of some kind - syllabus, guide, book, report, test... was seen as the end goal of curriculum activity.

---

The courses of study were seen as the prime means by which the classroom performance of the teacher could be guided, the method by which teachers could know what should be taught and how. Faith in the written word was strong. ... and activities mirrored the courses of study that blocked out subjects with little or no consideration of the broad curriculum. The courses of study, together with the graded textbook - both influenced by national committee reports - set the general pattern as well as the day by day activities.1

Apparently, there is no definite gap between educational practices of today as compared with those of the past. However, with the end of World War I an unusual abundance of curriculum work began to appear. McNally and Passow commented on this idea as follows:

Piecemeal revision, narrow and spasmodic, gave way to serious efforts to define overall curriculum objectives and to integrate the various subjects. ... The recognition that courses of study and syllabi, prepared by administrators and supervisors for the most part, were not used effectively by teachers led to the inclusion of teacher representatives in course-of-study preparation and revision as a means of attracting other teachers to the finished publication. ... The shift from production of courses of study by a small central office staff to widespread teacher activity led to the organization of committees. ... Gradually, the courses of study came to be viewed as source materials for teachers' guides, not prescriptions. ... National committees, textbook writers, supervisors, and other curriculum-making instruments now play supporting, not leading roles in revision efforts.2

Krug feels that the most significant argument in support of curriculum guides is that objectives, set prior to the time when the academic year or a particular teaching unit is put into motion, can be more easily met. He concluded:

We may say that international understanding is an objective of education, but we must go beyond this and try to make specific provisions for doing something about it. One

---

1 McNally and Passow, School Programs, pp. 32-33.
2 Ibid., pp. 34-37.
way is to include considerable emphasis on international understanding in the social studies field, in the teaching of science and in the student activities program. To leave international understanding up to education in general is not enough. In some part of the school program, some people, teachers and student - must at some times and in some places give attention to this area of need. Good curriculum guides in the various phases of the school program can here make an important contribution.

Another important reason for preparing curriculum guides in the subject fields is that this kind of activity contributes greatly to the morale of many participants in curriculum development. Some teachers and administrators view this as the meat of the curriculum development process. They will identify themselves with a curriculum program only if it gets 'down to earth.' Nor should this be thought of as merely a concession to weakness. Definite guidelines in the subject fields make it possible for maximum value to be achieved through the teaching of these subjects. They provide the greatest possible interrelationship of the subject fields and the major objectives which constitute the function of the school.1

When teachers find themselves in a newly adopted course, they usually turn to something or somebody to assist them in organization and structure. Quite often, when a curriculum guide is not available for a particular course, the teacher will turn to any form of structure he can obtain, such as an outline, a booklet of questions and answers pertaining to the subject, or a person already involved in teaching the course within another school. These resources may or may not be worthwhile, but the major concern here is that in all cases it is highly unlikely that the information obtained is in coordination with the educational philosophies of the school in which the particular teacher is employed. Consequently, curriculum guides assist the teacher in effectively teaching subject matter in terms of meeting

---

predetermined goals and at the same time operating within the philosophical background of the school system of which he is a1 part. Further, Krug goes on to mention the advantages of a state outline or guide - one from which the county and/or city school systems can draw their basic ideas for teaching a particular course or courses and still be working completely within the philosophy of a specific school. "They / The teachers / should have some state-wide, county-wide, or city-wide outline to use as a point of departure, modification or criticism."2

That curriculum guides are morale builders for neophyte teachers is a contention of Krug also. He feels that new teachers do not appreciate being told, "Do anything you want to do." Nor do they feel any more secure or appreciative when told specifically what to do by the administration. What they do appreciate is a guide to at least look at and follow to begin their career in a manner that makes them feel a worthwhile part of the total educational picture. The responsibility of the school administrator in this area was emphasized by Krug when he said:

It is the responsibility of the local curriculum leader to see that materials of this kind are called to the attention of teachers and made available for use... All the way along the line, superintendents, principals, supervisors and teachers in leadership roles must help teachers make maximum effective use of guides and outlines in the instructional fields.3

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 113.
3 Ibid., p. 114.
Krushner favors curriculum guides and the adherence of teachers to them. He relates how many times teachers are notified that in the near future a curriculum guide will be presented to them but, invariably, the teacher will file said guide with the multitude of other printed matter contained in his desk and very seldom, if ever, even look at the contents of the newly published guide.

The author feels that there are a number of factors contributing to this situation. First, the guide is seldom properly introduced and explained to the teacher when it is distributed. Secondly, much of the prefaces that precede the actual content of the guide are "mere window dressing" and it is distasteful to teachers to have to wade through this material when so much daily work has to be done. Thirdly, an attractive overall physical appearance is desirable, but seldom achieved in the guide construction process.\(^1\)

Friedman is also of the opinion that a curriculum guide should be followed. However, he believes equally as strongly that a guide is just what the name implies and no more. That is, curriculum guides should be used as a framework and not a blueprint to be followed as some would follow a textbook; the teacher should be free to teach in the manner which is most effectively employed by him in making classroom experiences a success. However, rather than attempting to cover too much material during a year and doing a poor job of it or finding oneself critically short of time at the end of the year, Friedman suggests that a curriculum guide be followed to aid in alleviating this

---

\(^1\) Maxwell Kushner, "Curriculum Guides, Used or Abused?", *Education*, LXXVIII, No. 2 (October, 1957), pp. 90-93.
In 1937 Pickens Harris wrote:

Our teachers have long understood the course of study to be a sort of dictator of sequences of material to be taught the young in specified periods of time. If they are specifically told they need not so regard a particular production, many will probably do little or nothing at all about it, and a few may attempt flexible adaptations of it. Teachers do not in general take intelligent advantages of new arrangements and suggestions simply by having them thrust into their hands, any more than our people as a whole take advantage of their privilege of making intelligent choices of their official representatives in government simply by being accorded the right of sovereignty.2

The suggestions made by Harris are outgrowths of the beliefs stated in the above passage. He states that "to provide at the outset the sort of guidance which would cause new and more personal formulations to grow up with the teachers themselves" would be a more profitable endeavor, "thus avoiding the absolutism reflected in bringing something to the teacher from the outside."3

Further, Harris believes that when guides are constructed they should be presented merely as suggestions to the teachers rather than anything that would represent a figure of authority or absolutism - more specifically, courses of study. When a course of study was presented to a teacher the name or title itself caused the contained material, worthwhile as it may have been, to "slip back into a context of attitude and association which prevents flexibility of use."4

---


3Ibid.

4Ibid.
The preciseness with which some teachers feel they must follow courses of study was obviously the aspect Harris was not in favor of. He states that "the idea of limitations in course of study construction is thoroughly inconsistent with proper participation on the part of teachers and children."\(^1\)

Almost thirty years later in 1966, Douglas W. Houck expressed his views furthering the notion that these guides cannot be completely or strictly adhered to in order to supplement a good teaching program. The changes that are occurring so rapidly within our society and, consequently, within our schools are the focal point around which Houck's theme evolves. He feels that since the society is constantly undergoing vast changes, the schools must be ready, willing and, most of all, able to change with it--therefore, the necessity of curriculum flexibility. Houck states, "...it has become an almost understood cliche of modern education that the only unchanging thing about the future will be change."\(^2\)

The author gives an almost reluctant approval of curriculum guides when he says, "From a practical point of view, there is undoubtedly a need for some sort of syllabus within the majority of our school systems."\(^3\) He continues by relating to factors to be considered when using the guides set forth for teacher implementation, such as personal individual differences of teachers and students, the voluminous jargon

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 458.


\(^3\)Ibid.
that can strangle a school's curriculum program, and, probably most noteworthy of all, the wide scope of differences of teacher approach to presentation of material. "What worked for Hemingway did not seem to work for Faulkner, and the whole world is a bit richer because of the difference."¹

Therefore, Houck views the curriculum guide from a standpoint of these criteria:

...it must be flexible so that it can be changed; and it must be general so that it can apply to a multitude of situations. It should contain the objectives of the curriculum, it should list the available sources and it should tell the teacher where supplementary procedures can be found.²

Again going back in time over more than twenty-five years, Franklin Bobbitt writes concerning curriculum guides usage:

The individual curriculum of one child is not a pattern to be applied to any other child; nor is the generalization of such a pattern. Neither can be a guide for pupil or teacher... .

The only thing that can properly guide education is science applied to the nature and needs of the individual child.

It has long been assumed that a general curriculum can be laid out in the form of printed courses of study for a uniform guidance of pupils en masse. The assumption was a natural outgrowth of the conception that education is a mass implantation of prepared subject matter that can be managed more or less mechanically by a system of regimentation. The courses of study and the textbooks, perhaps mostly the latter, laid out the detailed plan for the pupils and teachers to follow. The human factor could not be entirely circumvented, and this made necessary some amount of leeway or 'flexibility' in the adherence to the plans. But as textbooks and workbooks were made more and more elaborate, and as highly searching standardized tests were made an organic portion of the plan,

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
the flexibility was reduced to the least possible.¹

The education profession now realizes this type of education is all pre-scientific and as unjustifiable as uniform mass treatment of patients in a hospital.²

Consequently, schools have turned toward the education of the individual and the development of as many physical and mental capacities as possible within the realm of the educational system that we possess. Therefore, we do not construct a curriculum and attempt to fit the individual rigidly within it. Bobbitt states that, "Curriculum 'making' belongs with the dodo and the great auk" and that "curriculum discovery" will ultimately prevail over a rigid curricular construction.³

Bobbitt supplies his answer to a question that may frequently be aired in response to such feelings: Can teachers logically be held responsible for not personally following an applied curriculum guide? He replies: "They [teachers] are to be fully professionalized persons. Their professional science, applied to the needs of the pupils entrusted to them, is to guide their labors."⁴

McNeil, on the other hand, is more defensive of the position of the curriculum guide.

No board of education member, principal or teacher can proceed too far without intelligent plans for schooling until what is to be taught is agreed upon. Teachers, textbooks, buildings, equipment, organizations and methods are appropriate only in the light of the objectives of instruction. Unfortunately, some persons prize artifacts of


²Ibid., p. 298.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 300.
instruction without justifying these artifacts in terms of instructional purpose.¹

Leese, Frasure and Johnson express views similar to those stated by other authors: Stated objectives and goals contained in curriculum guides are "mere window dressing." However, they contend that the construction of these guides presents an honest and actual result of the people who compile them, but the people involved and the guide itself have little to do with what happens thereafter - especially to the teacher that teaches the textbook and lets it go at that. Or the reverse may occur, and teachers may (if they are new to teaching in general or are beginning to teach a course never taught by them before) try to adhere closely to the curriculum guide if one exists.² These writers see the curriculum guide as "a general examination of what is involved in accomplishing a series of objectives having a relatively close relationship."³

The authors conclude that a curriculum guide is something that is offered to the teacher who, upon being confronted with it, can accept or reject any part or parts he may wish. The teacher, being a professional and, most of all, a person, will usually have his own methods of attacking the problems at hand in his classroom and these will generally be of a more germane nature, in terms of the classroom situation,


³Ibid., p. 184.
than those prepared in the curriculum guide that is available.¹

Goodlad points out that if decisions concerning curriculum are not made to give directions to teachers, the educators are left on their own to employ the resources that are available to them. In some cases these resources may be quite meager. He definitely believes that the teachers should not be left entirely on their own to make all of the decisions that are necessary in developing a self-actualizing individual. Goodlad suggests that a framework is needed to prevent the "anarchy that results in a harumscarum curriculum in which learners are directed first one way and then another."²

Surprisingly, in a survey conducted by Goodlad that involved school principals ranking in order the resources used in developing the school program, textbooks... outranked all other resources as aids in developing the instructional program. Next in order and not far behind the text books, came curriculum materials prepared by state departments of education, school system, or local faculties.³

An article by Johns H. Harrington deals directly with the problem of the unintelligible curriculum guide in respect to teacher's usage of them. This author's work is obviously directed toward administrators, or at least curriculum committees, as he states: "Consider what your teachers go through when they try to read - and apply - similar

¹ Ibid.
³ Ibid., p. 65.
material in your curriculum guides.\textsuperscript{1}

This...bad writing, compounded by poor design and slipshod production - is precisely why so many curriculum guides are never used in the classroom the way they are meant to be used, if they are used at all.\textsuperscript{2}

Johns Harrington, an employee of the Los Angeles School System, is also the editor of all curriculum guides used in the system. His job is one of insuring that these guides and other materials are, (1) clearly written and structured, (2) effectively designed from both a visual and an economic standpoint and, (3) professionally printed and assembled. Harrington emphasizes these points by stating: "this is an important function that every school district would be well advised to recognize."\textsuperscript{3}

A study by Harap and Merritt revealed: (1) general tendencies in curriculum development and, (2) significant trends within subject areas. There were 796 guides that were studied, representing all regions, types of schools, and popular groups. The survey was for the triennium 1951-53 and results were compared to a similar study done for the years 1949-50.\textsuperscript{4}

One of the significant findings was that 52 per cent of all guides surveyed employed the word "guide" in the title, and the use of the term "suggested program" had risen from three per cent in the 1949-50

\textsuperscript{1}Johns H. Harrington, "Do Your Curriculum Guides Make Sense?" School Management, II (March, 1966), pp. 106-108.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 108.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid.

study to ten per cent in the more recent survey. "Course of study" was utilized 22 per cent of the time in the 1951-53 survey, "manual or handbook" appeared ten per cent of the time and "others" were represented in six per cent of the guides that were used as samples. Also, the overall output of guides increased in the amount of 46 per cent from the 1949-50 survey to the 1951-53 findings.¹

The authors concluded that "there was too little evidence that, generally speaking, the production of a course of study was a by-product of a continuous program on instructional improvement."²

They believed that the larger schools were, for the most part, developing a long-range curriculum plan as were the smaller schools that employed a curriculum director. "It appeared that the school systems of the country were in the midst of a second cycle of revision of the curriculum guides which were produced since the end of World War II.³

In his doctoral dissertation, Herbert Edgar Sallinger conducted a survey that was concerned with the investigation of kinds of curriculum guides used in the areas of science and social studies. The survey was of Napa County (California) teachers of grades one through six inclusive. This survey was to determine three main factors: (1) clues that could be used in further curriculum development; (2) changes in the teacher use of curriculum material over an eight-year period

¹Ibid., p. 38.
²Ibid., p. 39.
³Ibid.
(1957-65); and (3) teacher curriculum guide preference in relation to changing emphasis in the development of guides.¹

In his section on "Findings," Salinger concluded that teachers used curriculum guides to get ideas for units, with sections on activities and experiences being rated most helpful. He went on to point out that the teachers who were more in favor of using the guides were those who were encouraged to use them rather than being told by the administration that strict adherence in the use of the guides was mandatory.

One of the more outstanding or interesting implications that arose from Salinger's study was that people involved in curriculum development need to devise better methods of: 1. Introduction of the guide to the teaching staff; 2. Implementation of the curriculum guide; 3. Follow-up in terms of what the guides have done for the overall school program.²

The curriculum guide in the modern sense is much more flexible. However, this flexibility may vary with the course being taught. A curriculum guide for a course in Algebra would probably be less flexible than one in History, for example, due to the fact that mathematics must follow a more logical or "fixed" sequence than History. The train of thought and concentration must be more rigidly applied in mathematics than in various other courses.


² Ibid.
However, the method of teaching the subject for which the curriculum guide is utilized is only suggested. Furthermore, it is not mandatory that all material within the guide follow a logical order, so long as the subject matter decided upon by the curriculum group be included in the course at some point during the academic year. The American Association of School Administrators states:

The guide may reflect that customs, cultures, recreation, . . . types of people, and population factors will all be considered in studying Western Europe. They need not be studied in that order or as separate entities. Each element is a part of the other. The circumstances at the time, the nature of the groups, and the purposes of the study are factors that influence the treatment of a topic.¹

Through a survey conducted in three eastern communities concerning the use of curriculum guides, Nault found that much time was devoted to improve each school's curricula. However, it was also discovered that only a limited amount of effort was expended to determine the use or effectiveness of curriculum guides.

Due largely to the findings of the survey, Nault dealt principally with teacher involvement in the development and utilization of the curriculum guide. Obviously, Nault denoted that people concerned with education felt very strongly that teacher involvement in the preparation of curriculum guides was of utmost importance.²

The role of the principal in curriculum development emerged as one aspect that teachers felt very important. Teachers felt that a


principal with full knowledge of the curriculum and the curriculum
guides would be an excellent resource person when an important question
arises concerning the school curriculum.¹

In the study done for his doctoral dissertation, Heusner found
that in recent years much emphasis has been placed on teacher partici-
pation in the continuing of curriculum guides.² Obviously, his find-
ings complement those of Nault which have been previously stated.

Heusner says that concern is evident as to whether or not the
teacher's time is well-spent in curriculum revision, as the degree of
subsequent utilization and quality of curriculum guides is question-
able.³ His study is directed toward discovering how valid the argument
for teacher participation is in the formulation of curriculum guides.

Heusner is of the impression that the local school system could
benefit by conducting periodical check-up or supportive activities as
well as setting itself up as an in-service center. This, he feels,
would tend to bring together teachers and principals into a close
working relationship and thus would tend to "significantly influence
the utilization of curriculum guide materials."⁴

Obviously, curriculum construction is as old as education itself.
While educators will never completely agree upon all aspects of the

¹Ibid., p. 414.
²Henry C. Heusner, "A Study of the Utilization of Curriculum
Guides as Related to Selected Factors in Their Planning and Construc-
tion" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, School of Education, Wayne
State University, 1963).
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
educational process, there is, however, a semblance of agreement to the effect that educational guidelines should be available to teachers. The past few decades have, for the most part, seen the departmental curriculum guide evolve as the most widely accepted teaching guide.

Curriculum guides have undergone vast and numerous changes since the development of the "course of study" in the late 1800's. Still, while it appears to be generally agreed upon that they should be available to teachers, many questions surrounding these guides remain nebulous and unanswered.

A review of the literature indicates strong support for construction of guides at the local school level. However, the small amount of work done in this area is not voluminous enough to prove beyond a doubt that this concept is generally accepted.¹

This writer, being an educator of some experience, believes that curriculum guides should exist within the local school systems and that in their final form they must reflect the efforts of all personnel concerned with the school curriculum. Administrators, counselors and teachers must feel the need for working as a unit, not only to construct the guides conscientiously, but to keep them up-dated, to devote time to logical introduction of them to teachers, and to implement the use of them in every way possible.

¹ Ibid.
CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

With the consent of Dr. Loren Steiner of the Oregon State Department of Education, the writer was given permission to procure the names of all ninth through twelfth grade English teachers within the state of Oregon. The names were taken from county personnel directories and the listing of all teachers of English within the state; the sum of which totalled 1223 names.

These names were then typed and placed in alphabetical order. Every fifth name was selected as a subject of this study and became a recipient of one of the questionnaires sent by the writer. A total of 244 names was arrived at when every fifth name was selected. Addresses and school districts were then matched with the names chosen and the instrument, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope, was sent to the selected persons.

A period of two weeks time was allowed to pass, during which 178 responses were received by the writer. This seemed to be a reasonably respectable sample in its own right, supplying a 73 per cent return of the questionnaires. However, to those prospective respondents who failed to return the completed questionnaire, a follow-up or reminder letter was sent. The later returns brought the total to 203 respondents who returned the questionnaire. Of the questionnaires sent, 83 per cent were returned.
Of these 203 returned questionnaires, six of them were returned stating that the teachers to which the instrument was originally sent were no longer in the position described for them in the county directory. That is, these people had apparently been moved to other positions such as reading instructor, co-ordinators, or administrators. One of the questionnaires was returned with the simple statement that the intended respondent was no longer with the school system. Therefore, with these seven uncompleted questionnaires, the final working percentage of return fell to 80 per cent; 196 were received and usable from the 244 sent. The results of these statistics are as follow:

Table 1 shows the student enrollment of the school in which each of the various respondents teach English.

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT OF RESPONDENTS' SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The enrollment of your school is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-300</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obviously, the number of responses were quite well distributed in terms of the enrollment of the schools from which they came. The largest number of responses from one particular school size, or classification by enrollment, across the state of Oregon was sixty, or thirty per cent of the responses. This distribution is encouraging from the standpoint of enabling the writer to establish a more precise sample of the English-teaching population.

Whether or not a realistic cross-section of teaching experience was established, in terms of years in service, was the purpose of the results represented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**

**NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENTS HAVE TAUGHT ENGLISH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have taught (Including this year):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quite a large number of first-year English teachers were contacted, in proportion to others having more years of experience in teaching. Possibly, the fact that these people were first-year teachers and, characteristically, quite eager to advance the plight of their
profession, boosted the percentage of return from this particular group.

Question number three inquired of teachers the grade level or levels at which they taught English. Since many of the respondents taught at more than one level, with some of them indicating all four levels, a percentage or statistical analysis of these figures would be virtually useless. There were 102 respondents that checked the ninth grade as one of their teaching responsibilities, 90 that checked the tenth grade level, 81 at the eleventh grade and 67 marked the senior year as their teaching level. One hundred and ninety six questionnaires were returned and the total of responses to this question came to 339. Therefore, percentages at different grade levels would be of no value.

When asked at which level they felt a guide would be most beneficial, teachers responded as is apparent in Table 3.

Nearly one half of the total persons responding to this question indicated that they felt no need for a guide at any one particular grade level any more so than another. Ninety-three persons responded in this manner for a percentage of forty-seven.

The second largest group, forty in number and equalling twenty per cent of the returned questionnaires, were those that felt the ninth grade was in greatest need of curriculum guides, followed closely by the tenth grade level. Thirty-one teachers felt guides were particularly needed at this level, constituting sixteen per cent of the return. The decrease in the number of positive responses toward the question of guide necessity at grades eleven and twelve is marked.

Presumably, teachers feel less need for guides at the eleventh and
### TABLE 3
GRADE LEVELS AT WHICH TEACHERS FEEL CURRICULUM GUIDES MOST BENEFICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At which level do you think that a guide would be most beneficial to teachers of English? Please, very briefly indicate why you believe this to be the case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None any more so than another</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

twelfth grades due to the fact that these classes are aligned with the specific teaching of American Literature and English Literature, respectively. The textbooks lend themselves to a chronological pattern of literature to follow during the course of the year.

With this in mind, possibly those people involved in curriculum work should consider guides for more comprehensive use at the ninth and tenth grade levels. However, the majority must be considered and the definite majority feels that guides are not more beneficial at one grade level than another. Therefore, if time and emphasis must be placed in a certain area, it should be placed at the ninth and tenth grades, but the situation most satisfactory to all concerned would be
to emphasize guides equally at all levels.

The second part of question number four reads, "Please, very briefly indicate why you believe this to be the case." The compiled results of the responses to this portion of the question are as follow:

Of the forty respondents that felt guides most beneficial at the ninth grade level, twenty-four stated that the right start or introduction to high school English was extremely important and that guides would help very much in accomplishing this task.

Those thirty-one teachers that indicated curriculum guides were most beneficial at the tenth grade level had a quite common thought in terms of the design of the tenth grade class. That is, eighteen of these respondents felt the fact that there is no chronological pattern of literature to follow, of anything else readily available to adhere to by way of clearly defined organizational procedures in the sophomore year, would be cause enough to have guides readily available at this level.

As Table 3 reveals, only seventeen respondents designated the eleventh and twelfth grade levels as needing curriculum guides to follow. However, eleven of those that did indicate the eleventh grade as needing guides to adhere to, felt it would be beneficial to have material available or suggested to them that would complement the study of American Literature and History at the junior year in high school.

Those few teachers that felt curriculum guides would be essential at the twelfth grade level (thirteen), were nearly unanimous in their reason(s) for believing this way. Ten respondents indicated that they felt the difficulty of the transition between high school and college
English warranted guidelines to follow so as to better prepare the twelfth grade student for higher education.

Eighty-one teachers indicated that curriculum guides were offered by the school's English Department in which they worked. This number comprised forty-one per cent of the returns for this question, obvious in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

SCHOOL DISTRICTS OFFERING CURRICULUM GUIDES TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your school or school district offer you a curriculum guide to follow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered by the Department of English</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None offered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second largest group responding to question five, were those selecting "other" as their choice. This group was sixty-seven in number and made up thirty-four per cent of the overall returned responses to the question.

Those that selected "other" were asked to very briefly clarify their reason for making the choice they did. Only fifty-one teachers
took the time to respond to this portion of question five, and the answers varied from "self-made guides" to "periodically published guides or suggestions." However, twenty-three teachers, or forty-six per cent of those indicating "other," reported that the State Guide to Education was the guide most referred to when they felt a guide of some type was necessary.

Apparently, the number of schools or school districts that do offer guides to teachers is a considerable one. At the same time, however, there is a combined total of forty-one responses that indicate another source of curriculum guidance is used, or that none at all is available to these teachers. Schools might take a look at these particular situations and evaluate what they have to offer their teachers from the standpoint of curriculum guidelines.

In answer to question number six, dealing with the frequency which teachers refer to the State Guide to Education, seventy-eight teachers indicated that they "never" referred to this publication. This is forty per cent of the sample population and was the largest group of responses for any one possible selection.

Fifty-one teachers, or twenty-six per cent of the respondents, reflected that they "seldom" referred to the State Guide, this being the second largest portion of responses to a particular item. Table 5 bears out this analysis.

Also apparent in Table 5 are the results of the totals of those selecting "sometimes" as their choice. Forty-two teachers, or twenty-one per cent of the sample group, felt this more closely described the extent of their usage of the guide.
### TABLE 5
FREQUENCY OF REFERENCE TO STATE GUIDE TO EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you find it necessary to refer to the State Guide to Education for assistance in presenting material in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A marked decrease in amount of selections is noted between the choices "sometimes" and "often." Where the former has a twenty-one per cent response and is the third most selected item, the fourth most popular choice, "often," shows only a six per cent total of choices. "Always," the least selected of the five possible choices, registers merely three per cent of all votes.

Of the persons returning the questionnaire, only thirty-six, or eighteen per cent, had been involved in the construction of the curriculum guide offered to them.

Fifty-one per cent said absolutely "no" they had not been involved in curriculum guide construction, and nineteen per cent of the
TABLE 6
PARTICIPATION IN CONSTRUCTION OF DEPARTMENTAL GUIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is a guide available in your school, were you on the committee that constructed your departmental guides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None offered</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents stated that no guide was offered them.

The large number of persons not responding to this item could possibly be due to the wording of the question (twenty-three, or twelve per cent of the sample population, did not respond to this question). Presumably many of the readers of question number seven read, "If there is a guide available in your school," and read no further, assuming it was not directed toward them if they, indeed, had no guide available to them. However, it should be noted that this condition did not reveal itself during the validation of the questionnaire.

The statistics for question number eight of the instrument were based upon the thirty-six respondents indicating that they had been involved in the construction of their curriculum guides. Due to the wording of this question, this appeared to be the only feasible way to handle the material gained through this question.
TABLE 7
WHETHER OR NOT PARTICIPATION IN GUIDE CONSTRUCTION CAUSED CLOSER ADHERENCE TO IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If your answer to question seven was &quot;yes,&quot; did your participation in the construction of the guide cause you to adhere to it more closely than if you had not helped in the construction of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation would not matter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon being asked if their participation in the construction of the guide had any positive effect in terms of the usage of it, thirty-three per cent said yes, it would, eleven per cent said no, it would not, and fifty-three per cent felt that the participation in guide construction would have no bearing on teachers' employment of it in the classroom. One of the thirty-six chose not to respond to this question.

One could conclude from Table 7 that it may be wise for administrators to poll the faculty, of persons working within the various departments to see who would be interested in working on the curriculum committee. It would seem that a reasonable percentage of teachers would feel more compulsion to utilize a guide had they been involved in its construction.
From the information gained through the questionnaire, it was discovered that the majority of curriculum guides had been constructed or revised within the last two to four years. When asked how long ago their guides had been constructed, fifty-one teachers, or twenty-six per cent of the sample population, indicated the same figures: within the last two to four years.

**TABLE 8**

**LENGTH OF TIME PRESENT GUIDES HAVE BEEN IN USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately how long ago was the guide that you now use constructed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not Sure&quot; write-ins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-per cent stated that their guides were between one and two years old, while twenty-seven persons, or fourteen per cent of the sample population, reported guides in use that were from four to six years old.

Newly constructed guides, or those in use less than one year at
the time of distributing the questionnaire, accounted for only six per cent of the total age distribution of guides.

The large number of "not sure" write-ins and "no response" choices by the recipients of the instrument may indicate the persons that do not refer to guides at all, or those that refer to the State Guide to Education.

The majority of respondents took possession of the guides offered them by merely picking them up at their leisure. This becomes apparent when one looks at Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**TEACHERS' INTRODUCTION TO CURRICULUM GUIDES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How were you &quot;introduced&quot; to the guide? Was it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through an organized in-service program centered around the guide?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handed to you with a brief explanation of its uses?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given to you with little or no explanation of how the guide should or could be used?</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to you to pick up the guide at your leisure?</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-five per cent of the teachers contacted indicated that they were given no introduction whatsoever to the curriculum guides
that were available to them. Also, the next largest percentage responding to a particular item, represented twenty-seven per cent of the sample population. These persons said guides were "given to them with little or no explanation of how the guide could or should be used."

Sixteen per cent were given a brief introduction to the guide and thirteen per cent of the respondents were involved in a more formal in-service program for the purpose of curriculum guide construction.

It would appear that very little emphasis is placed upon the importance of guide introduction to teachers, even after the time and money was spent by school districts or the State Department of Education to publish such an instrument.

This observation is even more interesting in view of the results that arose in compiling the responses to question eleven. Table 10 relates these results.

Sixty-nine respondents, comprising thirty-five percent of the questioned population, related that they would rather be introduced to their curriculum guides through an organized in-service program. Twenty-five per cent felt that they would at least like to be given a brief introduction to their curriculum guides by a member of the curriculum-constructing body, or a member of the administration that could be of assistance.

Table 10 gives the implication that, for the most part, teachers are at least a little bit concerned about the manner in which curriculum guides are made available to them.

The items, "Handed to you for use at your own discretion with no
TABLE 10
TEACHER PREFERENCE OF INTRODUCTION TO CURRICULUM GUIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you prefer to have guides &quot;introduced&quot; to you as a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized in-service programs.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief introduction to them by a member of the administration or curriculum-making body.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handed to you for your use at your own discretion with no orientation.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have them available for use at your option.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

orientation," and "Have them available for use at your option" in question eleven received only a combined total of thirty-one per cent of the responses; further indication that the majority of teachers would appreciate a more formal introduction to the guides.

Once the curriculum guides are distributed, no matter what the procedure may be, it is interesting to note the degree to which teachers refer to guides offered them. The results shown in Table 11 aid in discovering this.

Forty-three persons indicated that they "always" referred to guides for assistance or guidance in the classroom. This number comprised twenty-two per cent of the sample population, while eighty-one
TABLE 11
FREQUENCY OF REFERENCE TO THE CURRICULUM GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you refer to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

persons, or forty-one per cent of them, "frequently" referred to guides offered them.

It would seem that the total percentage between these two selections is quite high in view of the fact that many teachers were dissatisfied with the way in which the guides were introduced to them.

In reference to the frequency of guide usage, the question items "seldom" and "never" received a combined total of twenty-six per cent. This total could possibly be reduced if guide introduction and usage techniques were improved within the schools.

Whatever teachers may feel about curriculum guides it is apparent, when one looks at the results compiled in Table 12, that the majority of them feel that guides should at least be available to them.

Of the 196 persons polled, 148 respondents indicated an absolute
TABLE 12
AVAILABILITY OF GUIDES TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that teachers should have guides available to them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would help, but not be too important.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for guide at all.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"yes" when they were asked if they felt curriculum guides should be available to them. This number represented seventy-five per cent of the sample population and the second choice offered, "It would help, but not be too important," was second in frequency of selection also, with thirty-eight or nineteen per cent of the respondents. Only two per cent of the teachers felt absolutely no need for curriculum guides.

From the results of question number thirteen indicated in Table 12, one must assume that, for the most part, teachers appreciate guides and deem them useful and helpful instruments.

Teachers' feelings toward curriculum guide introductory methods having been somewhat determined, the writer was also interested in teachers' feelings toward the possibility of follow-up procedures in regard to the guides. Table 13 demonstrates teacher feeling in this area.

Responses were quite evenly divided between the first and second
TABLE 13
FEELINGS TOWARD A FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that a follow-up program by the administration or curriculum committee would be useful to you in terms of how advantageously guides are being used and what could be done to implement their use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up program would be valuable to all English teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up program would be valuable to teachers at specific grade levels</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up program would probably not serve any valuable purpose</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

choices offered teachers in regard to question number fourteen. Eighty-three respondents felt a follow-up program would be valuable to all English teachers, while seventy-two considered follow-up at specific grade levels more important. These figures represent forty-two and thirty-seven percent of the 196 persons polled, respectively. Only fourteen per cent felt that a follow-up program would not be necessary for any purpose.

Again, this would tend to indicate that teachers are not only interested in having guides available to them, but most are concerned with the proper utilization of them as well.
Questions fifteen through eighteen represent somewhat of a change of pace in the questionnaire and deal more with the purposes of the guide themselves and application to student needs than the mechanics of the guide such as follow-up programs and introductory techniques.

**TABLE 14**

**WHETHER GUIDES CAUSE AWARENESS TO STUDENT NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do your curriculum guides attempt to make you aware of student needs other than in subject matter areas, such as overcoming personal problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite attempt is made</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attempt to do so is often noted</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes this is done</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom is this noted in the guides</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attempt to do so is not noted in the guide</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not sure&quot; write-ins</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential items to which one could respond in question fifteen, were divided into two more choices than the three questions immediately following. This was done due to the fact that it is a more general question than the others dealing with student needs, and the writer felt that respondents could be more specific in their answering if a
larger number of responses were offered.

When asked if their guides showed any evidences of attempting to make teachers aware of student needs in general, nine per cent said a definite attempt to do so was made, eighteen per cent said that this was often the case and ten per cent said this sometimes was apparent in the guides. Also, thirty-seven respondents, or nineteen per cent of the persons responding, indicated that seldom was an attempt made to make students aware of the possibilities of their overcoming personal problems.

The largest number of teachers responding to a particular part of question number fifteen totalled sixty-six and represented thirty-four per cent of the sample population. This was the largest group reacting to question fifteen and, interestingly enough, the item to which they responded indicated that no attempt to make students aware of the possibilities of overcoming personal problems had been made.

Over fifty per cent of all teachers answering question fifteen, felt that an attempt to aid students in overcoming their personal problems, assuming that they exist in some of the students at least, was not present in their guides. Possibly counselors and administrators involved in curriculum and curriculum guide construction could take this fact into consideration when it is decided that curriculum revisions are due to be made.

Becoming more specific in terms of awareness to student needs, teachers were asked if their guides appeared to assist them in aiding students to become aware of vocational trends and possibilities.

Thirty-six per cent of the respondents said definitely no attempt
TABLE 15

AWARENESS OF STUDENT NEEDS -- VOCATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do your curriculum guides attempt to make you aware of student needs in the area of vocational trends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was made to do this, twenty per cent stated that this was sometimes done and only fifteen per cent felt that this was definitely a situation found in their curriculum guides.

The number of "not sure" selections in this question and also number sixteen were quite disconcerting to the writer and he could only guess as to the reason for this. Possibly the lack of proper introduction to guides accounts for some of these responses as this feature may be included in the guide to some extent, but teacher awareness to it could be lacking. Also, it is possible that teachers hated to state a definite "yes" or "no" and the "not sure" response seemed a relief from the obligation of answering in such a definite manner. The response "sometimes" may also have seemed a stronger response than they felt necessary.

This phenomena appears in Table 16 as well.
TABLE 16

AWARENESS OF STUDENT NEEDS -- SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the guides attempt to make you aware of social adjustment processes among students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen per cent of the respondents felt that their guides definitely attempted to make teachers aware of social adjustment problems among students, eleven per cent said this was "sometimes" the case and thirty-six per cent answered an unqualified "no" to the question.

Again, the "not sure" choice was indicated quite often (fifty-six times for a percentage of twenty-nine) and the speculation on the reasons for this have been previously mentioned.

At first glance, question number eighteen appears to be a duplicate of the preceding number fifteen. However, the difference lies in the fact that question fifteen deals with the possibility of guides making teachers aware of students' personal problems, whereas question eighteen asks specifically whether the guide touches upon the possibility of personal aids in this area.
TABLE 17

AWARENESS OF STUDENT NEEDS -- OVERCOMING PERSONAL PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the guides touch upon the possibility of aiding students in overcoming personal problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty per cent of the responses to this question stated that there is nothing in their guides that specifically suggest possible aids to defeating students' personal problems. And, while thirty-four per cent of the respondents believe that their guides "sometimes" aid in this manner, only eleven per cent of the English teachers polled say that their guides do, without doubt, deal specifically with students' overcoming of personal problems.

The total amount of responses per each item asked in questions fifteen through eighteen should, and somewhat do, correlate. That is, for example, it would seem that guides that do attempt to deal with student social, personal and vocational problems would tend to deal with all of these and not merely in one area, forsaking one for the other.
However, this could quite possibly vary with the area from which the questionnaire was returned. Again, for example, the guides from Eastern Oregon, where farming and ranching are the very most predominant ways of life, vocational interest may possibly be emphasized more than the social adjustment aspect and the situation would quite possibly be the reverse in a metropolitan area such as Portland, Oregon.

In any case, the results compiled in questions fifteen through eighteen would suggest that the curriculum-making bodies, whoever may comprise them, should consider the student and his personal needs for the specific grade or age level at which the guides are directed.

Table 12 strongly indicated that teachers felt they should have guides at least available to them and Table 18 indicates, almost as strongly, the amount of emphasis teachers feel should be placed on guide usage.

One hundred and twenty-one respondents indicated that they would like to see a major emphasis on curriculum guides. This is sixty-two per cent of the total population that returned the questionnaires. Also, forty-seven teachers said they would be happy to see guides emphasized more than they are now, this being twenty-four per cent of the total return.

This again points up the interest that teachers have for teaching guides of some type. Rather than taking many different stands on the issue of curriculum guide construction and utilization, possibly teachers should band together and decide what they want in their guides, and what they feel is necessary in terms of acceptance or omissions. When sixty-two per cent of the teachers polled would like to see a major
### Table 18
### WHAT TEACHERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE CONCERNING CURRICULUM GUIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You would like to see:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major emphasis on the use of curriculum guides</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides emphasized more than they are now</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides available for use at teachers' discretion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feeling toward this situation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

emphasis on guides and twenty-four per cent want to see more emphasis on guides than now exists, these results seem significant enough to work with the problem more than is being done at present.

Three years appears to be the maximum length of time that most English teachers feel guides are ultimately useful as is apparent in Table 19.

When asked how soon they felt curriculum guides were out-dated, eighty-five respondents, representing forty-three per cent of the sample population, stated three years was the maximum amount of time for most advantageous usage. Fifty-eight, or thirty per cent, of the teachers from whom questionnaires were returned, felt two years would be sufficient time to get worthwhile material from guides before they
TABLE 19
LENGTH OF CURRICULUM GUIDE USEFULNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How soon do you feel that guides are out-dated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

should be revised and up-dated, and nine per cent thought guides are out-dated after one year of use.

When one looks at the figures at the bottom of Table 19, he sees that fourteen per cent of the respondents thought four years would be sufficient time to employ the guides before a revision was necessary, while four per cent felt five years was an appropriate period of usage.

Apparently teachers again agree, for the most part, to the extent that guides should not be in use longer than two or three years. Those that selected two and three years as being the greatest maximum efficiency period for a particular curriculum guide, totalled a combined number of 143 and represented seventy-three per cent of the population polled.

Therefore, once again it becomes obvious that teachers do have
feelings toward guide utilization. Administrators and the curriculum-making body possibly should not attempt to design guides that would be suggested for use for a period longer than two or three years at the most.

When it is decided that curriculum guides are to be initially constructed or that an out-dated guide is to be revised, the problem of contracting persons to perform this task becomes a prominent one. Feelings vary as to who should be involved in this function and whether or not the personnel involved in doing so should be rotated or alternated each time work is to be done on the guides. Teachers expressed their feelings toward the latter situation and these are apparent in Table 20.

### TABLE 20

**PERSONS INVOLVED IN GUIDE CONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should the same people be involved in constructing the guides each time they are to be revamped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't matter</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty-four per cent of the respondents were in agreement that the same persons should not be involved in the construction of guides each time this is to be done. This percentage represented 105 persons indicating this feeling.

Thirty-two respondents, or sixteen per cent of the sample population, said "yes," that the same persons should be involved each time guides are to be constructed or revised. At the same time, twenty-eight per cent felt that it didn't matter if personnel was changed with each guide revision or not.

The results of the figures compiled in Table 20 would imply that administrators may do well to selectively appoint persons to work on curriculum guides when the task of guide construction or revision becomes necessary. It seems that this would satisfy the feelings of the large majority of teachers if this were done.

Question number twenty-two asked the respondents to number, in order of importance, (one being most important, two, second most important, etc.) the items they felt to be of most value in curriculum guides. The choices offered to them were as follows:

1. Attractive Appearance
2. Bibliography
3. Vocabulary Suggestions
4. Suggested Supplementary Materials
5. Suggested Activities
6. Choice of Topics Covered--listening, writing, speaking, etc.
7. Selection for Teachers' Notes in the Guide.
8. Guide is Easily Understood and Followed.
9. Good List of Objectives.
10. Consideration Given for Different Levels of Ability.
12. Unit Evaluation Techniques.

Respondents were asked to indicate at least three of the items of their choice to enable the writer to establish a pattern of preferences. Some took the time and effort to number all twelve of the offerings in order of preference from one through the least preferred twelfth choice. Most, however, marked no more than five items and the majority of these indicated only the three asked for in the question.

In an attempt to interpret the results of the responses to this particular question in a manner that would be easily presented and understood, a point system was ascribed the numbers indicating the preferences. That is, if an item was given a one rating by a respondent, this would be worth six points. A two rating would be worth 5.5 points, a three worth five points and on down to a rating of twelve which would be worth the lowest number of points possible; .5.

"A good list of objectives" was the item most indicated by respondents as being the greatest asset in curriculum guide construction. Sixty-seven persons selected this as a first choice and, including all choices of this item, a total of 878 points was accumulated for this item through the use of the ascribed point system.

According to teachers' responses, the item selected as the second most important in curriculum guides was "Consideration given for different levels of ability." This selection accumulated a total of 683 points on the point scale and was selected as a first choice by fifty-three respondents.
The third most popular selection, in terms of responses given and total points ascribed to these responses, was the last one on the list; "Unit evaluation techniques." This selection was given thirty-four number one choice selections and totalled 551.5 points on the point scale.

The item that collected the next, or fourth largest number of points, was "Choice of topics covered" and the fifth most popular choice was, "Good guidelines for discussion." After this, however, a very little point difference prevailed between the possible selections, as few respondents indicated more than five choices.

The implications of the results drawn from question twenty-two seem somewhat self-explanatory. Along with the other possibilities previously suggested, it seems that worthwhile considerations for persons dealing in curriculum construction should definitely be the three most chosen herein.

A great majority of English Teachers feel that their guides are easily understood by all instructors, whether veteran teachers new to the district or department, or a first-year teacher. One merely has to look to Table 21 to see that this is true.

Twenty-six per cent of the respondents felt that their guides were not easily understood by all teachers. This percentage represented the fifty-one persons that indicated the "no" choice in answering question twenty-three.

However, from a more positive standpoint, there were 128 persons signifying that they felt their guides were easily understood and this group was equal to sixty-five per cent of the sample population.
One must assume that while teachers feel a need for improvements and possibly additions in regard to various other aspects of curriculum guides, they do, for the most part, seem to feel that they are easily understood and put to use.

Teachers that feel this is not the case may make suggestions or ask questions of the administration or curriculum-making bodies in order to clarify these when guide revision takes place.

Continuing in this same vein of thought, question twenty-four asks whether or not guides appear to be adequately up-dated with each revision. The assorted responses to this question are tabulated in Table 22.

Only eighteen of the returned questionnaires indicated that teachers believed their guides to be appropriately up-dated with each revision. Also, twenty-four per cent of the respondents felt that their guides were properly revised with each attempt to do so and thirty-two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the guide written in a manner that would be clearly understood by all teachers whether new to the district or veteran instructors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21
CLARITY OF CURRICULUM GUIDE CONSTRUCTION
TABLE 22
UP-DATING OF CURRICULUM GUIDES WITH EACH REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the guide appear to keep up with trends in the educational field, i.e., become obviously up-dated with each revision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

per cent of the teachers returning questionnaires stated that guides were "sometimes" modernized with revision.

Twenty-six persons, or thirteen per cent of the sample group, felt guides were "seldom" up-dated with revision, and ten per cent stated "no," guides were not aided through revision processes.

Apparently there is not a strong feeling among the English teaching ranks that curriculum guide revision brings about an appreciable improvement or remnovation in guides in terms of bringing them up to date. Teachers, administrators and any personnel involved in guide publication may profit from integrating ideas as to how these instruments can best be brought up to date. Maximum efficiency should be striven for if these guides are to be used in teaching students in the
classroom.

The majority of teachers polled, indicated that the guide, or guides, that they employed were designed for the "average" ability student.

As one can readily see in Table 23, thirty-five per cent of the respondents felt their guides were constructed for use at the "average," or "C student" level. While this figure represents the largest number of respondents at sixty-nine, the percentage for each of the remaining choices are remarkably evenly distributed.

**TABLE 23**

THE LEVEL FOR WHICH CURRICULUM GUIDES ARE DESIGNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At which group of students would you say that your curriculum guide(s) is/are aimed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the &quot;low ability&quot; student</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the &quot;average&quot; student</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the &quot;high ability&quot; student</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material is aimed equally at all levels of achievement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guide is offered for the various levels of ability</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifteen per cent of the sample population said their guides seemed to be aimed at "low ability" students and twelve per cent felt theirs to be designed for the "high ability" student.

Only sixteen per cent of the English teachers utilized guides that contained material diversified enough to meet all levels of achievement. The more fortunate teachers who were offered a guide at the various levels numbered thirty-four and represented seventeen per cent of the population.

The latter seems to be a rare situation and, consequently, is seldom seen within a school system. The meeting of individual needs within the classroom appears to be an important factor to teachers, as it well should be and, again, persons dealing with curriculum and curriculum guide development should definitely give this aspect some consideration.

Completely unplanned by the writer, the responses to question number twenty-six coincide with the thoughts previously expressed. This question asks for any additional comments concerning teachers' use of guides. While only sixty-three persons took the time to respond to this question, there were two distinct thoughts that emerged from this total number.

Twenty-five of the persons answered to the effect that they wanted to see more emphasis placed upon meeting the individual needs of the students in the classroom. This appears to be quite consistent with feelings expressed in question twenty-two.

Seventeen teachers stated that too much "window dressing" or impertinent material appeared in their guides and in order to obtain the
worthwhile or desired information, one had to spend too much time filtering out unnecessary verbage.

These thoughts were the two that distinctly stood out as being foremost in the minds of teachers in regard to curriculum guide improvement. Obviously, these two ideas are overlapping of those expressed elsewhere in this study, but this fact may serve to help point up the importance of considering these facts when working with curriculum.

The remaining twenty-three responses to question number twenty-six were quite varied, with no obviously common thoughts emerging as did the two previously mentioned. These remaining twenty-three statements often repeated one of the selections made available in question number twenty-two.

In cross-referencing the responses to questions number two and twelve of the questionnaire, one discovers the degree to which the number of years in teaching affects adherence to curriculum guides.

There appears to be no great difference in terms of curriculum guide utilization with an increased number of years in teaching. The percentages of first-year teachers indicating that they used the guides "always" or "frequently" were, understandably, higher than those who had taught for a longer period of time. The more experienced teachers, however, appeared not to completely refuse the material within the guide. An appreciable percentage of veteran teachers did indicate that they referred to their guides quite often.
CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Recapitulation of research design

This study seeks to ascertain the degree to which teachers adhere to and utilize curriculum guides. Also, suggestions for the improvement of their guides were asked of the respondents.

The persons to whom questionnaires were sent, were randomly selected teachers of English in various Oregon high schools.

The sample population was obtained by selecting every fifth name from an alphabetized list of secondary English teachers. These names were obtained from the Oregon State Department of Education.

Data were collected through the use of a questionnaire constructed by the writer and subjected to validation techniques. Responses to the twenty-six items on the questionnaire are shown in tabular form in Chapter II. The per cent of the sample population responding to each item was used for interpretation of the data.

Summary of related literature

In reviewing the literature pertinent to this study, it is discovered that the thoughts expressed by those who have concerned themselves with this situation do not vary to any great degree.

It would appear, however, that the literature dealing very specifically with curriculum guides per se, is somewhat limited while, on the other hand, there is a reasonable amount of literature available that deals with the construction and revision of curriculum materials in general.
According to McNally and Passow, curriculum guides, or courses of study, as they have been commonly called in the past, had their beginnings around the latter part of the nineteenth century. From this time forward, steady progress has been made in the area of curriculum guide construction and utilization.

There seems to be a general agreement among those dealing in curriculum construction that guides are a vital part of the educational process in terms of disseminating materials in the classroom. Beginning teachers, or those new to a school district, are felt to have a need of something upon which to rely in attempting to get a school year off to the right beginning. Also, these guides serve to aid in acquainting those teachers new to a district with accepted policies and procedures of the school in which they will be working.

There is expressed within the literature, a felt need for orientation or introduction of curriculum guides to teachers. Also, along these same lines of thought, Salinger feels that a comprehensive follow-up program should be conducted.

It is obvious that the literature pertinent to this study indicates strong support in favor of curriculum guide usage at the local school levels. Ideas and philosophies obviously vary, but the writers tend to come to the same general conclusions: That guides should definitely be available to teachers, that these guides should be kept up to date and free of unnecessary verbage, and that they should be used as a guide, as their title would suggest, rather than as a mandatory pattern to follow completely and explicitly.

Findings

In view of the collected and compiled data found in Chapter II,
the writer feels that the following are the more prominent findings emerging from the study.

1. Most teachers feel that guides are beneficial at all grade levels rather than at specific levels.

2. The large majority of curriculum guides are directed toward the "average" or "C" students.

3. Meeting the individual needs of students is a problem of concern to a large number of teachers.

4. Teachers feel guides should deal with material they consider more functional rather than being cluttered with frills through which the user must filter the pertinent matters.

5. Most teachers feel that their guides are somewhat updated with each revision of them.

6. Generally, teachers feel that the curriculum guides offered them are reasonably easy to understand.

7. Teachers don't feel that the same people should be involved in curriculum guide work each time a revision or new guide is to take place.

8. Teachers would appreciate more of an emphasis upon guides than now exists.

9. From two to three years is the maximum amount of time that the large majority of teachers feel a guide is valuable to its fullest extent.

10. In terms of specific individual differences, it appears that curriculum guides do seldom attempt to assist
students in facing personal situations that may exist, such as social problems, personal problems, and vocational plans.

11. An overwhelming majority of English teachers feel that guides should definitely be available to them.

12. Teachers are evenly divided in terms of how follow-up programs should be handled:
   a) The slightly larger majority feels that a follow-up program would be valuable at all levels of English instruction, and
   b) A somewhat smaller percentage of teachers feel that the follow-up would be more beneficial at specific grade levels than at all grade levels.

13. The majority of teachers would appreciate a more formal introduction to their curriculum guides than they now receive, and the largest majority would like to receive introduction to the guides through an organized in-service program.

14. Teacher adherence to curriculum guides does not necessarily wane with an increased number of years in the teaching profession.

15. A teacher's participation in curriculum guide construction generally does not affect his usage of it to any appreciable degree.

16. Teachers feel that their guides have, for the most part, outlived their maximum usefulness after two years.
17. The State Guide to Education is rarely used as a guideline by teachers within the classroom.

18. Most teachers are merely handed the curriculum guide for their particular subject or grade level with little or no explanation of the potential within the guide.

19. The larger school districts develop guides more readily than the districts with smaller enrollments of students.

Conclusions

From the material introduced to this point, the following conclusions can readily be drawn:

1. A majority of teachers use curriculum guides, but the physical make-up of these guides varies from those personally organized by a particular teacher to the general guides set up by the State Department of Education.

2. Smaller school districts involve themselves in the operation of curriculum development less than others.

3. To enhance teacher utilization of curriculum guides, proper modernization techniques should be applied to these guides at regular intervals.

4. Teachers generally feel curriculum guides worthwhile teaching aids and would like to see them in use more than they are.

5. Three years is the maximum amount of time that a teacher feels a curriculum guide is effective to its fullest potential.

6. Follow-up techniques are deemed as a valuable part of
curriculum guide administration.

7. A more extensive introduction to curriculum guides is desired by teachers.

8. The more extensive curriculum guide efforts are found in the larger school districts in Oregon.

9. An increase in years of teaching experience does not necessarily indicate a decrease in reliance upon guides among teachers.

10. School districts and specific departments within schools who offer guides to their teachers are definitely in the majority.

11. A very small percentage of teachers in Oregon are involved in the effort of putting together curriculum guides for their departmental use.

12. A majority of teachers feel that their guides are organized explicitly enough that they could be understood by all persons that would possibly have anything to do with these publications.

13. The "average" student is the recipient of most of the benefit offered through curriculum guides.

14. Most teachers feel that their guides are worthy of the reliance put upon them.

15. The large majority of teachers would like to have guides available to them.

16. Approximately fifty per cent of the guides now being employed by teachers are older than the two years maximum
usefulness limitation that teachers would ideally like to see.

Implications

In reviewing the preceding material, it is assumed that the following implications can be drawn:

1. Teachers would like to know what to expect of their students from year to year in terms of what material they have been exposed to at the preceding grade levels.
2. Utilization of curriculum guides begins to wane after the instrument has been in use over three years.
3. Much more could be done within the classroom to aid students in personal problem identification and offer possible solutions to them. Teacher assistance in doing so could be greatly implemented through use of carefully thought out curriculum guides.
4. At present, it appears that teachers do not feel their guides do enough to bring about the meeting of students' individual academic needs.
5. The State Guide to Education meets very few of the needs of teachers in Oregon.
6. Curriculum guides should be constructed for all grade levels regardless of the type of material that is germane to a particular grade level curriculum.
7. It would appear that a more intensive introduction would tend to induce teachers to utilize curriculum guides to a greater and more comprehensive degree.
8. Larger school districts have monies available to them more so than do the smaller school districts with which to involve themselves in curriculum guide construction.

9. Very little is done by schools in the way of preparing teachers for use of the guide. When the publication is completed, seldom do teachers get any formal introduction to it.

10. The more precise and concise that a curriculum guide is, the more use it will experience at the hands of teachers.

11. Different personnel should be chosen each time guides are to be constructed or revised.

12. After guides are introduced to teachers and these have been put into use, a follow-up program would be looked upon very favorably by teachers.

13. Long-range curriculum planning can be done more easily through the use of curriculum guides by the teachers.

14. Membership on curriculum-making bodies should be determined on the basis of interest and ability rather than merely upon the office held. Definite considerations should be given to whether or not teachers can follow their guides with little difficulty.

Recommendations

In view of the material that has been surveyed and compiled herein, some recommendations by the writer would appear as follow:

1. That curriculum guides be constructed at all levels and material should supplement that to be taught at grade
levels forthcoming.

2. Administrators see to it that guides are brought up to date within at least three years of the inception of them, or their last revision.

3. All counselors become directly involved in the construction of the guides with specific suggestions to aid in meeting, generally, the problems of students.

4. Guides could be divided into tracks or levels of ability from which teachers could draw material they felt best suited the needs of the individual students.

5. Administrators and those concerned specifically with curriculum and curricular ramifications should be certain that comprehensive guides be constructed for all levels of ability within their schools.

6. If they are going to offer their teachers guides, administrators must see that the material is worthwhile or time and money spent is to no advantage.

7. As many teachers' ideas as possible should at least be considered when guides are being revised or originally constructed.

8. Smaller districts could attempt to appropriate funds, if at all possible, to enable them to construct comprehensive curriculum guides.

9. Schools should make an honest attempt to bring guides up to date through revision at regular intervals or through complete reconstruction.
10. All schools that employ the use of curriculum guides to any degree should organize a formal introduction to them whether through an in-service program or any other that would aid in familiarizing teachers with the enclosed material.

11. All persons involved in curriculum processes should concern themselves with promoting the use of curriculum guides.

12. Administrators would do well to make a definite attempt to organize a follow-up program for those teachers employing curriculum guides offered them.

13. Persons involved in curriculum organization should involve themselves more deeply in constructing guides that would be clearly understood by anyone who may happen to be called upon to utilize the contents.

14. Guides could be constructed at least two different levels of ability and, ideally, at three levels to better meet the needs of the individual student at his level.
APPENDIX I

Questionnaire For Teachers
The following questionnaire has been sent to over 200 teachers of English throughout the state of Oregon. It deals with curriculum guides or courses of study. The few minutes necessary to complete the questionnaire (usually only a check is required) will provide vital information for a study that I am conducting. Your time used in completing the questionnaire is appreciated.

The information you give will be kept in strict confidence. The data compiled will be used in a study done in connection with the School of Counseling and Guidance at Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, and it will become the property of Atlanta University.

You need not sign the questionnaire. Since your accurate responses will form the basis of the study, let me thank you for sharing it with me. I appreciate your time and cooperation.

JAMES L. MECHALS

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

NOTE: The term "guide" or "curriculum guide" will appear throughout the questionnaire. More specifically, what this refers to, is any form of teaching aid or guide that is available to you through the State Department of Education or your particular school or school district in terms of material to possibly be presented in the classroom throughout the year.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

CHECK ONE:

1) The enrollment of your school is:

( ) 0-100 ( ) 100-300 ( ) 300-600 ( ) 600-1000 ( ) over 1000
2) You have taught (including this year):
   ( ) 1 year ( ) 2-5 years ( ) 6-10 years ( ) over 10 years

3) At which grade level(s) do you teach English?
   ( ) 9th ( ) 10th ( ) 11th ( ) 12th (If more than one level, indicate this)

4) At which level do you feel that a guide would be most beneficial to teachers of English?
   ( ) 9th ( ) 10th ( ) 11th ( ) 12th ( ) None any more so than another. Please, very briefly, indicate why you believe this to be the case.

5) Does your school or school district offer you a curriculum guide to follow?
   ( ) offered by the Dept. of English ( ) school district ( ) other
   ( ) none offered (If other would you please very briefly clarify this choice.)

6) How often do you find it necessary to refer to the State Guide to Education for assistance in presenting material in the classroom?
   ( ) Always ( ) Often ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

7) If there is a guide available in your school, were you on the committee that constructed your departmental guides?
   ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) None offered

8) If your answer was "yes," did your participation in the construction of the guide cause you to adhere to it more closely than if you had not helped in the construction of it?
   ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Participation would not matter

9) Approximately how long ago was the guide that you now use constructed?
   ( ) Less than one year ( ) 1-2 years ( ) 2-4 years ( ) 4-6 years
   ( ) Over 6 years

10) How were you "introduced" to the guide? Was it:
    ( ) Through an organized in-service program center around the guide?
( ) Handed to you with a brief explanation of its uses?

( ) Given to you with little or no explanation of how the guide should or could be used?

( ) Up to you to pick up the guide at your leisure?

11) How would you prefer to have the guides "introduced" to you as a teacher?

( ) Organized in-service programs.

( ) Brief introduction to them by a member of the administration or curriculum-making body.

( ) Handed to you for your use at your own discretion with no orientation.

( ) Have them available for use at your option.

12) How often do you refer to the guide?

( ) Always ( ) Frequently ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

13) Do you feel that teachers should have guides available to them?

( ) Yes ( ) It would help, but not be too important ( ) No need for guide at all.

14) Do you feel that a follow-up program by the administration or curriculum committee would be useful to you in terms of how advantageously guides are being used and what could be done to implement their use?

( ) Follow-up program would be valuable to all English teachers.

( ) Follow-up program would be valuable to teachers at specific grade levels.

( ) Follow-up would probably not serve any valuable purpose.

15) Do your curriculum guides attempt to make you aware of student needs other than in subject matter areas such as overcoming personal problems?

( ) Definite attempt is made.

( ) An attempt to do so if often noted.

( ) Sometimes this is done.

( ) Seldom is this noted in the guides.
( ) An attempt to do so is not apparent in the guide.

16) Do your curriculum guides attempt to make you aware of student needs in the area of vocational trends?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Not sure

17) Do the guides attempt to make you aware of social adjustment processes among students?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Not sure

18) Do the guides touch upon the possibility of aiding students in overcoming personal problems?

( ) Yes ( ) Sometimes ( ) No ( ) Not sure

19) You would like to see:

( ) A major emphasis on the use of curriculum guides.

( ) Guides emphasized more than they are now.

( ) Guides available for use at the teacher's discretion.

( ) No feeling toward this situation.

20) How soon do you feel that guides are out-dated?

( ) 1 year ( ) 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years ( ) 5 or more years

21) Should the same people be involved in constructing the guides each time they are to be re-vamped?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Doesn't matter

22) Please indicate which items that you think are most important in the guides: (Please indicate at least three of these in order of preference or importance. e.g. 1. most important 2. second most important, etc.)

( ) Attractive appearance

( ) Bibliography

( ) Vocabulary suggestions

( ) Suggested supplementary materials

( ) Suggested activities
( ) Choice of topics covered—listening, writing, speaking, etc.
( ) Section for teachers' notes in the guide
( ) Guide is easily understood and followed
( ) Good list of objectives
( ) Consideration given for different levels of ability
( ) Good guidelines for discussion
( ) Unit evaluation techniques

23) Is the guide written in a manner that would be clearly understood by all teachers whether new to the district or veteran instructors?

( ) Yes ( ) No

24) Does the guide appear to keep up with trends in the educational field i.e., become obviously up-dated with each revision?

( ) Yes ( ) Most of the time ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) No

25) At which group of students would you say that your curriculum guide(s) is/are aimed?

( ) At the "low ability" students
( ) At the "average" students
( ) At the "high ability" students
( ) Material is aimed equally at all levels of achievement
( ) A guide is offered for the various levels of ability

26) Briefly, any additional comments concerning English teachers' use of curriculum guides would be appreciated. Use the reverse side of this sheet if necessary.
APPENDIX II

Follow-Up Letter To Teachers
Dear

Approximately two weeks ago a questionnaire was sent to you dealing with curriculum guides and teachers' use of them. Quite a number of these have been returned to me via the self-addressed, stamped envelope that was included. However, I do not feel that the number of responses that I have received will be quite enough for an adequate representative sampling of the State of Oregon.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take the time to fill out the questionnaire sent to you. This would contribute greatly to the study that I am conducting.

Thank you very much.

Yours,

James L. Mechals
APPENDIX III

Excerpts From Published Materials
The following excerpts were taken from a pamphlet entitled *The Role of the Secondary Counselor*, published by the American School Counselor Association in 1964. Obviously, some of the material has been deleted but the thoughts presented herein appear in their entirety with no additions or deletions to insure that the thoughts are not slanted in any way.

The School Counselor-- What He Does:

4) He collects and disseminates to pupils and their parents information concerning:

--School offerings.

--Opportunities for further education.

--Careers and Career training opportunities.

8) He serves as a consultant to members of the administrative and teaching staffs in the area of guidance by:

--Sharing appropriate individual pupil data with them (again with due regard for the pupil's desire for confidentiality).

--Helping them to identify pupils with special needs and problems.

--Participating in the in-service training programs.

--Assisting teachers to secure materials and develop procedures for a variety of classroom group guidance experiences.

9) He conducts or cooperates with others in conducting local research related to pupil needs and how well school services are meeting these needs by:

--Contacting graduates and dropouts.

--Comparing scholastic aptitudes with achievement, selection of courses of study, and post high school experiences.

--Studying occupational trends in the community.

--Evaluating the school's counseling and guidance services.
The following are excerpts from a pamphlet entitled *Principals and Counselors Work Together*, published by the American Personnel and Guidance Association in 1968.

The pamphlet was divided into, and directed at, three main areas of concentration. Selected items under each one of the headings were deemed pertinent to this thesis and these follow:

**To Principals and Counselors:**

Guidance is a cooperative process. Meeting the needs of pupils can be accomplished only when all members of the staff are involved in the development and implementation of the guidance program.

The full understanding, support, and participation by the school staff in the guidance program is essential for effectiveness. All members of the staff must be continually aware of the problems as well as the developmental functions and values of guidance services.

**To Principals:**

Do you have a planned program for helping the faculty understand the values, purposes, and functions of the guidance program?

Do you, in curriculum planning, use the counselor's knowledge of the effects of the school program on pupils?

Is the atmosphere in your school conducive to innovation and experimentation in guidance?

**To Counselors:**

Do you contribute to the in-service training of the school staff?

Do you keep the principal informed about the degree to which pupils' needs are being met by the school's offerings?
The following material is borrowed from a booklet entitled The Role of the School Counselor, issued by the Oregon State Department of Education in the spring of 1966. The committee compiling this list of thoughts was headed by Dr. Anna Meeks of the Department of Education at Oregon State University and thirty-two selected Oregon Counselors participated in the construction of this booklet. Within the introductory statement is included the statement that, "This statement is intended to serve as a basic philosophy and as a guideline for those concerned with school guidance programs."

How much real value will accrue to children and youth as a result of having a counselor in the school environment?

4) The counselor will be involved in curriculum work as an interpreter of the changing needs of children and youth.

6) The counselor is a coordinating member of a pupil personnel team in improving learning.

How does the counselor contribute to the goal of total school involvement and of development?

1) The counselor as a member of the educational team works with children and youth, individually and in groups, to reinforce curriculum experiences. He helps pupils to:

a) Look at learning and the school experiences in a positive way.

b) Look at self in a positive way.

c) Use the classroom as a laboratory for human relationships.

d) Develop attitudes leading to understanding regarding the meaning and responsibility for self in education and the world of work.

e) Grow in the ability to make wise choices.
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