1992

A Study of Domains and Subsystems in the Most Influential Textbooks in the Field of Curriculum 1970-1990

Linda S. Behar
Loyola University Chicago

A STUDY OF DOMAINS AND SUBSYSTEMS IN THE MOST INFLUENTIAL TEXTBOOKS IN THE FIELD OF CURRICULUM 1970-1990

by

LINDA S. BEHAR

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate School of
Loyola University Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
January 1992

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their guidance and encouragement. I am particularly indebted to my dissertation chairperson, Allan Ornstein, for his patience and support. More importantly, I wish to thank him for nurturing my curriculum curiosity, sharing his library and encouraging pursuit of an independent study of curriculum books, that unwittingly led to the conception of this investigation.

I am grateful to Barney Berlin for his candor and confidence, to Ron Morgan for constructive criticism and guidance, and to Robert Cienkus for continual support and encouragement.

I wish to thank Philip Carlin, Robert Cienkus, Mary Jane Gray, Steven Miller, L. Arthur Safer, Beverly Hides, and the teachers at Goethe School in Chicago for their assistance in developing the research tools for this investigation.

I also wish to acknowledge family and friends for expecting me to finish. Several individuals offered support that enabled me to bring this task to fruition. Richard Rotberg's foresight and resourcefulness guided the manifestation of dreams. His timely sense of humor put the trials and tribulations of academia in perspective.

Jane Ganet-Sigel, a mentor in the truest sense, provided encouragement, impetus, and faith. Jack Pierce

listened patiently and thoughtfully provoked the seemingly impossible. Jane and Jack endured a journey of compromises and surprises, yet continued to provide wisdom, and inspiration. This dissertation is dedicated to Jane Ganet-Sigel and Jack Pierce.

VITA

The author, Linda S. Behar, was born in Chicago, Illinois. She received a Bachelor of Arts in 1977 with a major in Psychology and a minor in Music from Lawrence University. In 1985, she received a Master of Arts with a major in guidance and counseling from Roosevelt University.

While attending Loyola University, she was awarded a Levie Educational Fellowship, affording the opportunity to complete her doctoral studies. She has taught at National-Louis University in Evanston, Illinois and Loyola University's School of Education in Chicago, Illinois. She is published in the Kansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Record.

Formerly principal of Southern Junior High, a therapeutic day school for severely emotionally disturbed and behavior disordered students in Chicago, Illinois, she is now the Director of Curriculum Development and Evaluation at Southern and Greenrose Schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

VITA iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

LIST OF APPENDICES ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Definition of Terms. 2
Significance of the Study. 14
Limitations of the Study 17
Statement of the Problems. 18
Hypotheses 18

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 20

Textbooks. 20
Textbooks and Social Values 20
Advantages and Disadvantages of Textbooks 25
How Textbooks Influence Learning. . . . 31
Selection and Adoption of Textbooks . . 34
Professional Knowledge Bases 42
Domains of Knowledge in Curriculum 44
Domains of Knowledge in Curriculum for this Investigation. 46
Curriculum Systems 47
Subsystems for this Investigation. 51

III. THE INSTRUMENT AND COLLECTION OF DATA. . . . 55

Description of the Pilot Study 55
Validity of the Instrument. 62
Reliability of the Instrument 66
Scoring and Weighting of the Instrument. 67
Sample 67
Open Ended Survey. 68
Responses to the Open Ended Survey. 69
Close Ended Survey 70
Responses to the Close Ended Survey. 71
Scoring and Weighting of Curriculum Practices for Domain and Subsystems . . 72
Parametric and Nonparametric Statistics. . . 74

IV. RESEARCH PROCEDURES. 79

Procedures for Ho 1a 79
Procedures for Ho 1b 82
Chi-Square test for Ho 1b. 84
Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for Ho 1b. 85
Procedures for Ho 2. 86
Curriculum Practices and Domains of Knowledge: Uncorrected Version. 88
Ratings of Importance 88
Ratings of Coverage 89
Curriculum Practices and Domains of Knowledge: Final Version. 90
Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge 95
Procedures for Ho 3. 98
Curriculum Practices and Subsystems: Uncorrected Version. 99
Ratings of Importance 99
Ratings of Coverage 100
Curriculum Practices and Subsystems: Final Version. 100
Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems 102

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA 104

Open Ended Survey. 104
Discussion of Chi-Square Results 107
Discussion of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Results . . 110
Importance of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge 114
Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge 114
Importance of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems 124
Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems 126
Summary and Analysis of Findings 129

VI. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 130

Background Information of the Study. 131
Professors of Curriculum Selection of Textbooks in the Close Ended Survey. 132
Summary of Findings Related to Items within the Domains and Subsystems 133
Implications of this Study 134
Limitations of this Study. 136
Recommendations. 137
Summary. 140

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 141

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	The Most Influential Textbooks in Curriculum in Order of Rank: Selected by the Professors of Curriculum.	81
2.	Final Instrument/Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge.	91
3.	Final Instrument/Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum.	101
4.	Mean Responses for Importance of Curriculum Practices and Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge by the Professors of Curriculum	115
5.	Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with the Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Items within the Domains of Knowledge.	118
6.	Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with the Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Subscales within the Domains of Knowledge.	122
7.	Summary of Frequency Responses to Most Influential Textbooks in Curriculum by Professors of Curriculum.	123
8.	Mean Responses for Importance of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum.	125
9.	Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with the Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Items within the Subsystems of Curriculum	127
10.	Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with the Coverages of Curriculum Practices by Subscales within the Subsystems of Curriculum.	129

APPENDICES

		Page
APPENDIX A	Investigator-designated Categories and Items for Pilot Study: Stage One. . .	150
APPENDIX B	Directions for the Pilot Study Stage One	155
APPENDIX C	Items Deleted as a Result of Pilot Study: Stage One	158
APPENDIX D	Cover Letter to Participants for Pilot Study: Stage Two	161
APPENDIX E	Pilot Study: Phase II Survey	163
APPENDIX F	Listing of Categories and Items for Pilot Study: Stage Two (Results of Pilot Study: Stage One).	169
APPENDIX G	Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for Pilot Study Stage Two	173
APPENDIX H	Cover Letter for Open-ended Survey Questionnaire	179
APPENDIX I	Listing Sheet for the Most Influential Textbooks in Curriculum	181
APPENDIX J	Close Ended Survey Cover Letter	183
APPENDIX K	Close Ended Survey.	185
APPENDIX L	Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge	189
APPENDIX M	Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge	193
APPENDIX N	Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum . .	197

Page

APPENDIX O — Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum . . 200

APPENDIX P — Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two - Sample Test. . 203

APPENDIX Q — Summary of Frequency Responses for the Rankings of the Importance of Curriculum Practices in the Domains of Knowledge and Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum (N=51) 205

APPENDIX R — Summary of Frequency Responses for the Ratings of the Coverage of Curriculum Practices in the Domains of Knowledge and Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum (N=51) 208

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study of the most influential textbooks in the field of curriculum was designed to determine if the Professors of Curriculum would select textbooks consistent with their viewpoints that they identified as being the most important, regarding domains of knowledge in curriculum and subsystems of curriculum. The Professors of Curriculum, considered to be the major academicians in the field of curriculum, are researchers, consultants, and program designers for schools and education agencies. Often these individuals prepare future leaders by teaching courses germane to their training. The domains of knowledge were divided into the following eleven areas of study: curriculum philosophy, curriculum theory, curriculum research, curriculum history, curriculum change, curriculum development, curriculum design, curriculum implementation, curriculum evaluation, curriculum policy, and curriculum as a field of study. Subsystems of curriculum were instruction, supervision, and evaluation.

A survey instrument consisting of a combination of open ended and closed ended components was administered to a

selected sample of the Professors of Curriculum. Fifty percent of the Professors of Curriculum were selected to participate in phase one of the study. An open ended approach was used to determine the most influential curriculum textbooks in the field between 1970-1990. Twelve books were selected. The closed ended portion of the survey, phase two, was administered to all of the Professors of Curriculum who are actively teaching and residing in the U.S. and Canada.

In the close ended survey, participants were given a list of the twelve textbooks identified as most influential. They were instructed to select one textbook and asked to: (1) rate the importance of curriculum practices and the extent to which curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge in curriculum were covered within the selected textbooks, and (2) rate the importance of curriculum practices and the extent to which curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum were covered within the selected textbooks.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Textbook - A textbook is a book used for the study of a particular subject. It is a book designed to explain basic information of a field, including theory, research, and practice.

2. Curriculum practice (item) - A curriculum practice

is a statement that describes activities within the (eleven) domains of knowledge and the (three) subsystems of curriculum.

3. Domains of knowledge - Domains of knowledge are ways of structuring the "knowledge base" of a field of study or a professional discipline. They are important content areas within a discipline that researchers and text authors examine in an attempt to further the field of knowledge.

4. Domains of knowledge in curriculum. These domains represent broad conceptualizations of curriculum that yield specific curriculum activities. The domains of knowledge for this study were eleven: (1) curriculum philosophy, (2) curriculum theory, (3) curriculum research, (4) curriculum history, (5) curriculum change, (6) curriculum development, (7) curriculum design, (8) curriculum implementation, (9) curriculum evaluation, (10) curriculum policy, and (11) curriculum as a field of study.

5. Curriculum philosophy is defined as a set of values, beliefs, and/or a particular orientation that determines an individual's broad view of a subject. It guides students, teachers, and schools in both teaching and learning. Inquiry into educational philosophy suggests a general view of students, society, as well as curriculum. Educational philosophy leads to a determination of educational theory, educational aims, and curriculum development and design.

Pertinent to the aims of curriculum philosophy are determining how conceptions of human nature, society, and values influence the views of education. This domain examines the quality of education, the meaning of equity in education and explores the standards, determined by personal, social, and national concerns that should be met by schools (Ornstein & Levine, 1989). Curriculum philosophy helps educators answer value-laden questions and make decisions among many choices.

The literature identifies five educational philosophies: (1) perennialism; (2) essentialism; (3) progressivism; (4) reconstructionism; and (5) existentialism (Doll, 1989; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

6. Curriculum theory is defined as a set of related statements that give meaning to a school's curriculum by highlighting the relationships among important elements and by directing its development, use, and evaluation (Beauchamp, 1981).

Curriculum theory uses techniques of science and logic to identify fairly stringent rules that present a systematic view of phenomena. It is an activity that involves theorizing and reflecting which can also be interpreted as a process of clarifying meaning and the use of language (Schubert, 1986). McNeil (1990) divides the curricular theorists into two camps, the soft and the hard curriculum theorists. The soft curricularists are concerned with

understanding and revealing the political and moral aspects of curriculum making. Soft curricularists do not study change in behaviors or decision making in the classroom. They are concerned with concepts of temporality, transcendence, consciousness, and politics as they relate to the process of education.

The hard curricularists assume that curriculum development occurs in response to an idea or vision of what ought to be taught. A series of logical choices or scientific justification determine the curriculum design. Empirical confirmation is the basis for justification.

7. Curriculum research is an activity used to: 1) advance conceptualizations and understanding of the field; 2) create new visions of what and how to teach; 3) influence curriculum policy; 4) question normative premises about curriculum; and 5) improve programs for learning (McNeil, 1990). Considered a mode of systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular curriculum problem, curriculum research analyzes the steps to be taken in solving a given problem, tries one or more actions in line with that analysis, and then observes whether actions brought the results that were predicted or anticipated in the analysis (Doll, 1989).

8. Curriculum history is the process of describing, analyzing, and interpreting past curriculum thought and practice. Like history, it is a chronicle record of past

events that may be represented by a narrative and/or an analysis of past events. By analyzing the past and the origins of curriculum, educators can better understand the present. A study of curriculum history can reveal insight and approaches to problems that relate to similar present day issues. An investigation of the forces that inhibited or promoted particular curriculum innovation, decisions, and action in the past can help educators analyze present conditions and plan future course of action (Schubert, 1986).

9. Curriculum change is an activity geared towards curriculum improvement. Curriculum developers are challenged with getting curriculum adopted at national, state, and local levels. Their plans must be accepted by textbook committees, curriculum commissions, boards of education, and others so that curriculum can be made available to teachers (Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis, 1981). Insuring that curriculum changes are properly implemented is another task. Some teachers might not be able to enact curriculum changes developed by others.

Implementing curriculum change should take into account the special knowledge and suggestions of those directly responsible for enacting the curriculum innovations (McNeil, 1990). For curriculum change to begin and endure, strategies for achieving cultural or institutional change are more significant than strategies for achieving

technological change (Doll, 1989).

10. Curriculum development is the process of deciding what to teach and learn, along with the considerations needed to make such decisions (Schubert, 1986). Integral to this effort is the identification of tasks, steps, roles, expectations, resources, time, and space, and the ordering of these elements into a system for carrying out the specified design to create a curriculum plan or document (Kimpston & Rogers, 1986). Curriculum development is an activity that determines how curriculum construction will proceed. The process addresses the questions of who will be involved in curriculum construction and what procedures will be used in this process.

11. Curriculum design, sometimes called curriculum organization is the arrangement of curriculum into substantiative entities. Generally, it consists of four components: (1) aims, goals, or objectives, (2) content, (3) learning experiences and (4) evaluation approaches. Sources for curriculum design are the learner, science, society, knowlege, and in some cases the external/divine. Specific design dimensions include scope, articulation, balance, integration, sequence, continuity, and interrelatedness (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

Curriculum design is a way of organizing curriculum ideas so they function in the real world of classrooms and schools. It might also be considered a carefully conceived

plan that takes into account what its creators want done, what subject matter will be used, what instructional strategies will be used, and how the designer will determine the success or feasibility of the design. Diagnosis of need, organization and selection of both subject matter and learning experiences are usually related tasks of curriculum design (Doll, 1989).

12. Curriculum implementation refers to the planning for and actual use of a curriculum in practice and concerns the process of putting into effect the curriculum that was produced by construction and development (Kimpston & Roger, 1986). Curriculum implementation by definition offers evaluative feedback to those in charge of the construction/developmental processes (Giroux, Penna & Penar, 1981).

Curriculum implementation can be defined as a system of engineering that takes design specifications through various channels to the teacher and the classroom. It can be an interpretation of how well teachers carry out instruction in a school district. Curriculum implementation can refer to the development of learning experiences based on knowledge derived from the continuous interactions with learners (Schubert, 1986).

13. Curriculum evaluation is the process of answering questions of selection, adoption, support and the worth of educational materials and activities (Scriven, 1967).

Integral to curriculum evaluation is an emphasis on improving the curriculum (Stufflebeam, 1971).

Tyler (1949) delineates the task associated with curriculum evaluation as: (1) determining the effectiveness of curriculum content; (2) measuring discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes; (3) providing information about students' needs and capabilities; (4) guiding program development for individual students; (5) providing information about the success or effectiveness of curriculum content; (6) determining if objectives have been met and what changes took place as a result of the curriculum; (7) identifying strengths of curriculum content; (8) offering suggestions for modification, and (9) specifying curricular changes that need to be made with respect to content, instructional strategies, or methods that might lead to more effective curricular implementation.

Curriculum evaluation serves several purposes: 1) it provides a periodic assessment about the effectiveness of the curriculum, indicating changes that will facilitate improvement; 2) it influences teaching and learning by offering data essential to guiding individual students; and 3) it can validate hypotheses upon which curriculum selection and implementation operate (Madaus and Stufflebeam, 1989).

Curriculum evaluation is a continuous process that ascertains whether the planning, monitoring, and reporting

of curricular activities regarding persons, procedures, and objects involved in actual situations have been achieved (Giroux, Penna & Penar, 1981).

14. Curriculum policy is usually a written statement of what should be taught and serves as a guide to curriculum development. It establishes ground rules, limits, and criteria that circumscribe the curricula of educational institutions within a given jurisdiction. Curriculum policy must be determined by a democratic process whereby the wishes of all concerned parties are considered prior to legalization. (Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis 1981).

An authoritative allocation of competing values, curriculum policy addresses issues regarding graduation requirements, mandatory curriculum, and frameworks outlining the content for a field of knowledge (McNeil, 1990). Curriculum policy also addresses the question of what groups should influence the curriculum and to what extent. A mandates decision to promote one goals over another is an example of curriculum policy (McNeil, 1990).

15. Curriculum as a field of study is the combination of curriculum, the curriculum system, and research and theory building activities (English, 1983). Curriculum is the substantive or content dimension of curricular planning, implementing, and evaluation.

Zais (1976) defines curriculum as a field of study as the range of subject matters with which it is concerned (the

substantive structure) and the procedures of inquiry and practice that it follows (the syntactical structure). The curriculum field may be described as the subject matters that are treated in schools and the processes (for example, curriculum development, and curriculum change) with which specialists are concerned (Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981).

According to Ornstein (1987), curriculum as a field of study, consists of its own foundations, domains of knowledge, research, theory, and principles.

16. Subsystems of curriculum - A curriculum system is a model for decision making and actions for curriculum workers that are integral to the operation of schools. The system has three fundamental purposes: (1) to produce a curriculum; (2) to implement a curriculum, and (3) to appraise the effectiveness of the curriculum system. (Beauchamp, 1981) The curriculum system provides a framework for deciding what will be taught in schools, how it will be taught, and how it will be assessed. A system is comprised of essential components, or subsystems.

Subsystems of curriculum are: instruction, supervision, and evaluation.

A. Instruction is an activity that subsumes the following tasks: (1) a procedure for organizing learning experiences; (2) a plan for implementing the curriculum; (3) the teacher's discretionary behaviors involved with making daily decisions about content, time on task, questioning,

classroom management, grouping, materials, pacing and sequencing of activities.

Tyler (1949) considers instruction to be a plan for teaching the curriculum and "the procedures for organizing learning experiences into units, courses, and programs". Tyler views curriculum and instruction as equally important activities, and as components of a recurrent cyclical process involving constant replanning and reappraisal (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988).

Taba (1962) views instruction as the specific activities introduced while teaching at various stages of the curriculum. She identified instruction as a distinctly different activity from curriculum. Bruner (1966) also defined instruction as an entity separate from curriculum, but considered them to have equal weight. Describing it as a subsystem of the total system of curriculum, Broudy and his colleagues further characterized instruction into five content areas called "study areas" (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1988, p. 19). Tanner & Tanner (1980) conclude that curriculum and instruction should be viewed as the synthesis of one problem and not analyzed as separate entities.

In simplistic terms, instruction deals with the "how" people learn including methods, materials, and media techniques. Curriculum is the "what" people learn (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Curriculum and instruction are interwoven in a continuous loop. Curriculum decisions influence

instruction and instructional decisions effect curriculum.

B. Supervision is an activity that focuses on the improvement of instructional planning and the quality of instruction. Tasks associated with supervision include: promoting student growth; coordinating educational efforts and materials to provide continuity in educational programs within grade levels and content areas; developing climates conducive to teaching and learning; and improving methods of teaching and learning (Sergiovanni, 1988).

Wiles and Bondi (1991) cite three basic tasks to be accomplished by supervision: (1) to help the teacher develop an intellectual understanding of the scholarly, psychological, and professional aspects of teaching, (2) to develop and apply the teaching skills to curriculum, and (3) to coordinate the delivery of the curriculum as it was intended by program planners. Another important aspect of supervisory behavior is to assist teachers in trouble shooting instructional problems (Wiles and Bondi, 1991).

Supervision involves conducting evaluation for the purposes of improving instruction, granting tenure, retaining an employee, or providing remediation. Other supervisory tasks include goal setting for a series of observations, planning for individual observation, and conducting feedback conferences.

C. Evaluation is an activity that consists of designing and implementing a plan to gather information

systematically: (1) to measure discrepancies between the curriculum and its implementation; (2) to assess the discrepanies between the intended and actual learning outcomes; (3) to judge the worth of a curriculum product; and (4) to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum process (Kimpston & Rogers, 1986).

Providing a description or judgment based on formal inquiry, evaluation determines whether a program should be maintained, improved, or discarded, provides relevant information to decision makers, reports summary data that is useful in selecting among alternatives, assesses whether an innovation is effective in achieving expressed objectives, and determines the extent to which programs' learning activities are actually being realized.

There is no agreed upon or final authoritative definition of evaluation because of a lack of consensus about the term. Evaluation must be separate from the purposes of evaluation versus what evaluation is used for. In the context of this study, evaluation is defined as "the act of rendering judgments to determine value, worth, and merit, without questioning or diminishing the important roles evaluation plays in decision making and political activities" Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 24).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

This study was designed to investigate the extent of

agreement among the Professors of Curriculum in their determination of the most influential curriculum textbooks.

The Professors of Curriculum conduct research and are consultants to schools and education agencies. Elected to membership by invitation, these professors are considered to be the major academicians in the field of education. They often prepare future leaders by teaching courses that are germane to their training. It would seem desirable to empirically determine the extent of their overall agreement in identifying the most influential curriculum textbooks. This determination might also be useful in clarifying the relative stability among the knowledge bases including: production, implementation, and appraisal systems within the field of curriculum.

Textbooks are both purveyors and powerful determinants of how curriculum is used and understood. They influence how the learner will interact, conceptualize, or interpret the subject matter. Textbooks demonstrate the degree of consensus or fragmentation within a discipline. They provide direction for the field as a subject matter entity, and are instrumental in guiding students' mastery of the fundamental structures of disciplines. Curriculum textbooks perpetuate ideas about curriculum content that might influence curriculum systems in local school districts. Textbooks analyze and sometimes advocate the ideas that practitioners espouse.

Towards this end, this study investigated the Professors' of Curriculum ratings of the importance of curriculum practices and extent to which curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum occurred in the most influential textbooks. This comparison adds another dimension that is useful in clarifying the amount of consensus and fragmentation in the field of curriculum.

No other study has been identified that examines the Professors' of Curriculum selection of the most influential textbooks, and simultaneously assesses the relationships among the Professors' of Curriculum ratings of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge in curriculum and the subsystems of curriculum.

A study of the type proposed here is timely. This study is an attempt to establish a knowledge base of curriculum practices within the field and a bibliography of important curriculum textbooks. Findings from this investigation might reveal basic data upon which to build improved programs for students seeking specialization in the field of curriculum. The ideas discussed and analyzed should be of some interest to the Professors of Curriculum. They might also be of some significance for researchers, and other professors in education responsible for studying, designing, and implementing programs in elementary, secondary, and higher education. Also, this study should

have relevance for curriculum leaders and specialists. Finally, it should be noted that the components investigated in this study are broad, abstract ideas that taken together may set the framework or direction for other fields in education.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Choosing an open ended survey to select the textbooks and identifying the time period 1970-1990 limited the identification of the most influential textbooks. If the open ended selection did not have an epochical parameter, then the identification of most influential textbooks might have been different than the listing that resulted for this study.

This study was limited by the components chosen for the investigation, domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum. These components will necessarily influence the results of the study. Similarly the definitions of the components discussed in Chapter I also formulated the basis for the items used in the survey questionnaire.

Finally all of the items listed in each category for both components in the survey questionnaire were taken from the context of the definitions section. Each item listed in each category for both components was assumed to be of equal weight for the purposes of statistical analysis.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

1a. To determine the extent to which Professors of Curriculum agree in their ratings of the most influential textbooks in curriculum.

1b. To determine the extent to which the Professors of Curriculum agree in their rankings of the most influential textbooks in curriculum in relationship to a) gender, b) doctorate specialization, c) year doctorate was earned, d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was awarded, and e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation.

2. To determine whether differences exist among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge.

3. To determine whether differences exist among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum.

HYPOTHESES

1a. There will be no agreement in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to their ratings of the most influential textbooks.

1b. There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regard to their rankings of

the most influential textbooks across a) gender, b) doctorate specialization c) year doctorate was earned, d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned and e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation.

2. There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge.

3. There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this investigation was to identify the most influential textbooks in the field of curriculum and attempt to establish a knowledge base of curriculum practices within curriculum textbooks. The purpose of this chapter is to present a review and discussion of literature regarding key terminology and concepts used by researchers. Towards this end, an overview of four topics will be presented: (1) textbooks, (2) professional knowledge bases, (3) domains of knowledge in curriculum, and (4) curriculum systems.

TEXTBOOKS

The purpose of this section is to: (1) provide an overview on textbooks and social values, (2) discuss advantages and disadvantages of textbooks, (3) describe how textbooks influence learning, and (4) explain the selection and adoption procedures of textbooks.

TEXTBOOKS AND SOCIAL VALUES

The function that textbooks serve and how they are

perceived by society is a basic consideration towards understanding their role in the process of education. Several authors and some research studies have investigated the relationship between textbooks and cultural values of society.

Textbooks have a basic and distinctive role in civilization (Cole & Sticht, 1981). They provide a fundamental source of instruction, transmit culture, reflect values, and attempt to promote the intellectual development of individuals and the nation. Consequently, they wield remarkable influence upon individuals, schools, communities and the nation (Warming, 1982). Textbooks have evolved over time in response to prevailing educational philosophy and curriculum reform movements. Throughout the twentieth century, they have been criticized by progressive educators for determining the curriculum. Some liberal critics have called for the virtual elimination of textbooks and preplanned curriculum. Conservative critics have sought to proscribe curriculum by censorship, so as to eliminate the treatment of controversial ideas and issues (Apple, 1988; Bowler, 1978).

Textbooks are generally chosen by a teacher or professor, a committee, or a commission in the state that is charged with the responsibility of textbooks selection. (Cole & Sticht, 1981). Textbooks offer prepackaged, homogenized knowledge to students, which has not always been

subjected to critical scrutiny. Publishers have been blamed for responding to the superficial interests of potential purchasers in matters of format and presentation, for maintaining superficial content with which teachers are familiar, and for failing to present controversial content that might invite critical thinking. Marketing practices have been criticized for their lack of critical dialogue that should accompany educational decisions and actions. (Schubert, 1986).

Textbooks were cited for denigrating emotionality and relatedness associated with "feminine thinking" and venerating "masculine thinking". They were criticized for the failure to promote higher level abilities that are necessary to acquiring the foundation of social responsibility necessary for active citizenry. An analysis of the content of social studies textbooks indicate the absence of concepts about prosociality as organizing theories. The study of human behaviors that demonstrate caring and compassion are noticeably absent. While the notion of self-interest is sometimes promoted, the concept of altruism is not evidenced (Scott & Oliner, 1987).

When a textbook content is consonant with the values of the parents and community at large where it is used, their usage is generally not questioned. In response multicultual needs, curriculum and textbooks have been revised to include an emphasis in humanism and more diverse modes of

instruction. However, these changes have incited controversy. (Cody, 1990; Woodward and Elliot, 1990; Warming, 1982).

Historically, disagreement regarding textbook content and issues such as evolution and creation have provoked national furor. Thompson (1987) describes how conflicting values between family and government systems precipitated parents bringing suit against two school boards in Tennessee and Alabama about textbook content. In the Tennessee textbook case, Mozert vs. Hawkins County Public Schools, 827 F2nd 1058 [1987] the judge ruled on behalf of the plaintiff who claimed that the Hawkins Court School District had violated the civil rights of parents whose children were required to read textbooks in the Holt, Rinehart, and Winston reading series. The families involved in the lawsuit interpreted the textbook as anti-Christian and found the topics of evolution, feminism, humanism, and witchcraft to be objectionable. The judge awarded the parents damages in the amount of $50,521.59 to cover their out of pocket expenses in arranging alternative reading instruction for their children in accordance with the "opt-out" provisions of Tennessee" education law. The parents contention were upheld: that they shouldn't be forced to chose between reading texts that offended their religous viewpoints and a free public education.

In the Alabama case, Smith vs. Board of School

Commissioners of Mobile County, 827 F 2nd 684 [1987], Smith successfully argued that the Home Economics textbook on an approved list (together with history and social studies texts) was advancing secular humanism, the only religion to have been constituted a religion by the opponents rather than the adherents. An appellate court later overruled the lower court's ruling in favor of the plaintiff, but the district court decision instilled a ripple throughout the entire educational system. The judge's decision was questioned by William Rasberry (1987), a Washington-based syndicated columnist. He raised the query that if the home economics textbook innovations were judged to be promoting secular humanism, then might not advocates of vegetarianism, humanism, environmentalism, and transcendental meditation also be members of a religion. Furthermore, if these educational innovations were to constitute religion, then the schools should be accorded the status akin to religious institutions and therefore be eligible for the same tax considerations and churches (Thompson, 1987)

Observably, at both the Tennessee and Alabama trials, was the absence of any expert witness who might have been considered an authority on the topic of textbooks. Furthermore, no one was called as a noted scholar on content analysis on home economics texts, nor was research or theory concerning the role-function of the textbook in the ecology of education cited (Thompson, 1987).

The State of California has been the site of several major lawsuits regarding science textbooks and the argument about creation versus evolution (Warming, 1982). Controversies about humanities texts and attempts at censorship have also occurred in Virginia, West Virginia, and Ohio. The essence of textbook protesters' dispute lay not in their desire to determine what should be taught, but in their perception that there is an incongruence between their system of values and the one set forth in the textbook. Their efforts to proscribe teaching of certain information or the use of pedagogical methods is a form of censorship. Protests by special interest groups can affect publishers by causing significant reduction in book sales. The censorship issues tests the notion of the democratic process. When textbooks are banned, students are denied the right to study controversial issues in order to form their own opinion. Simultaneously, they are denied the right to have information on which to base those decisions.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TEXTBOOKS

Textbooks reflect the dominant social, political, and moral values that pervade at the time of their selection and publication. How textbooks get selected, who selects them and for what purposes they are created is really not entirely democratic. Choosing a textbook requires a multitude of approvals that must satisfy many segments of

people simultaneously (Cole & Sticht, 1981).

Textbooks provide a level of content expertise in an organized and logical format that few teachers possess. They facilitate the teacher's instruction by mapping out the journey that the teacher and student will share. A companion teacher's guide that provides discussion questions, activities, worksheets, test items, and answer keys usually supplements the textbook. Textbooks allow teachers additional time to plan for instruction since they have already defined the aims and sequence of curriculum (Eisner, 1985).

Advantageous to both educators and students, textbooks provide: (1) a uniform mode for course study; (2) a synthesis of material in a systematic and organized forma; (3) visual presentations to facilitate understanding of the structures of a discipline; (4) an outline that teachers can use for planning courses, units and lessons; and (5) ready made curriculum that allows teachers more time for preparing course materials (Ornstein, 1990). Textbooks should be considered a central force in the process of acquiring knowledge whereby they form both the hub and link to other sources, hand-ons activities, supplementary materials, and experiences that will render the curriculum an active and relevant experience for all students. Curriculum must become a practical, kinethestic, auditory, and visual experience for students if it is to be relevant and

applicable.

Texbooks are a major factor in shaping instructional programs. Commerically published multigrade packages comprise a virtual national curriculum in public elementary and junior high schools (Woodward & Elliott, 1990). Woodward and Elliot (1990) claim that many present day teachers would have difficulty maintaining instructional programs in basic subjects without multigrade textbooks. Additionally, textbooks programs also serve as a training tools for novice teachers who lack instructional expertise in specific subjects areas. Textbooks are a dominant influence in the classroom; they seem to determine content and teaching practices (Tulley and Farr 1990).

Students need to learn to work with a wide range of instructional materials and teachers must utilize a variety of resource materials to meet students' comprehensive needs. Textbooks serve as a valuable instructional tool too, but they should not constitute the principal source of curriculum guides and lesson plans nor should they be the sole medium for instruction. Instead, they should serve as the catalyst for instruction (Tanner, 1988). In spite of the author's attempts to maintain objectivity, students might still be the recipients of the author's personal viewpoints and biases. Textbooks are written to generate profit and simultaneously meet educational needs of masses. Beecause of the need to appeal to large markets, texbooks

may fail to represent certain populations, may omit controversial, complex, or value-laden topics, and may demonstrate conceptual simplicity. They are often criticized for a lack of significant inquiry, depth and sophistication necessary to fully explain basic concepts, principles and ideas (Ornstein, 1990).

Controversial issues are frequently defused or omitted by textbook publishers seeking a wide market. The nation's capacity for growth is a function of the amount of intellectual tolerance it affords those whose beliefs are inconsistent with the consensual viewpoints. Assessing the motives of texbook publishers should be open to analysis to decide whether they are profit-oriented, conformity-seeking, or designed to provide the broadest range of intellectual perspectives for our students (Eisner, 1987).

Publishers have been forced to write and adapt textbooks according to readability formulas (Bernstein, 1985). Readability formulas are estimates of readability. They tend to measure sentence and word length and in some instances uncommon words (Schmidt, 1981). Schmidt claims that readability formulas should not be the sole basis for selecting or rejecting textbooks. While readability levels are important factors in determining the appropriateness of materials for the grade levels at which they will be introduced, they are not the only means to assess the appropriateness of materials.

Criticism has been leveled against publishers for responding to demands for adherence to readability formulas (Bernstein, 1985; Keith, 1985). Such formulas have been cited for a decline in the use of prose and stylistic qualities that seem critical to students' motivation to read, and lend texbooks to comprehension. Readability formulas have also been cited as a contributing factor to students' decline in higher order thinking abilities (Bernstein, 1985).

One researcher offers a process-product model that relies on system analysis of the textbook universe. She used the concept of megasystems to explain the texbook writing process. Her model indicates that there is an interaction among varied autonomous, but interdependent "peer systems" including the family, government, knowledge production, school, and knowledge distribution systems (Thompson, 1987). Peripheral but influential "satellite systems" also affect textbooks. Among the systems are parent and teachers' organizations, religious bodies and self-constituted textbook critics.

In this connection, college texts are sometimes criticized for their lack of depth, omitting contemporary macro-level societal phenomena in favor of student interest and readability, not offering summaries and syntheses of research, not acknowledging controversy within the field, and the ambiguity in the knowledge base (Perrucci, 1982)

Contributing to the failure of excellence in textbooks are economic priorities of publishers, the existence of mass lecture sessions as the main teaching tool in large universities which are related to the use of comprehensive texts, and constraints on authors that are inherent in the publication of manuscripts. Perrucci (1982) reports that constraints on the authors include the pressure of producing a final manuscript on time, the author's ability to integrate critical reactions of reviewers to the first draft and dealing with one's own ego strength to endure appropriate criticism. Another factor contributing to textbook inadequacy is the need to create textbooks that cater to the growing number of students today who are unable to read at college level. Writing easier textbooks that compensate for alleged deficiencies of students means using short sentences, short words, many headings, numerous illustrations and undemanding content (Perucci, 1982).

Textbooks are influential vehicles for disseminating knowledge. Should they be held in such high esteem? Are instructors overly dependent upon the gospel of textbooks? Are current methods of assessment sufficient to ensure the adequacy and accuracy of content portrayed in textbooks?

A study published in 1983 examined ten introductory psychology textbooks and five social psychology textbooks (Bertilson, 1983). The findings of this study suggest the following: (1) growth of knowledge base confounds the

problems of accuracy and consensus; (2) the problem of validation of textbook accuracy may result from the absence of means to ensure accuracy; and (3) defining a concept without critical evaluation leaves a false impression that the concept is accurate or valid (Bertilson, 1983).

Inaccuracy sometimes occurs because of pressures from publishers for the completion of the final manuscript and the absence of controls that would ensure accuracy of textbook content (Bertilson, 1983). Attempts at broad coverage can create erroneous impressions when certain topics are treated superficially. Textbooks should strive for depth and breadth rather than providing superficial coverage of many topics.

HOW TEXTBOOKS INFLUENCE LEARNING

Textbooks define much of the content, sequence, and aims of curriculum. Eisner (1985) maintains that textbooks are responsible for influencing ways in which topics will be received by students, and determining the extent to which students will engage in content-related studies. The textbooks has a poignant effect on students' motivational level, willingness to study subject matter, and likelihood of learning structures of various disciplines (Eisner, 1985). Textbooks are instrumental in influencing what should be taught in schools. The influence of textbooks can not be underestimated; children's first experiences with

books may shape their attitudes toward reading for the rest of their lives (Bernstein, 1985; Keith, 1985).

By providing the nucleus around which much of what is taught, textbooks determine direct the nature and sequence of instruction. They have significant impact upon the learning experiences of students. They promulgate stress on the written word as a main mode of education. Many times, the textbook is the only perspective that students receive in a course (Ornstein, 1990).

Important purveyors of curriculum, textbooks influence curriculum and determine course content. Sometimes they constitute the course content. Content has become equated with material to be covered in the textbooks. Much of what students receive through their studies at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary level is contingent upon the textbooks selected for their studies. Textbooks discuss the basic syntax, tenets, foundation, and important areas of content within a given discipline. They assist students in acquiring the basic structures of knowledge, that otherwise remain unavailable through ordinary experiences and influence the way certain topics will be regarded (Eisner, 1987).

Scholars guide the construction of textbooks in subject areas because it is assumed they have the expertise to do so. (Schubert, 1986). They play an important role in conveying the basic structures of disciplines. Subject

matter takes for granted that curriculum is a matter of prespecification by relegating content solely to the disciplines of knowledge. Curricular content, namely the subject matter, is derived from the disciplines of knowledge. Textbooks remain the dominant mode of content delivery, accounting for up to 80 percent of subject matter to which students are exposed in a typical course of study (Schubert, 1986; English, 1980).

Researchers studying learning strategies have observed that textbooks often contribute to students' comprehension and learning difficulties. Making teachers aware of the qualities of inconsiderate and poorly written texts allow them to prepare students for difficulties they'll encounter in upcoming text passages and help them instruct students in ways that facilitate coping with difficult texts (Duin & Prenn, 1985).

Duin & Prenn (1985) suggests that teachers use the following four factors when evaluating texts: (1) structure - the arrangement of ideas and the relationships connecting them; (2) coherence - the smoothness of logic which ideas are woven together, or the flow of meaning; (3) unity - the degree to which the text addresses a single topic; and (4) audience appropriateness - the extent to which the text matches the reader's knowledge and interest.

By studying the students' use of textbooks, or the impact of influential textbooks, we are in fact studying

only one part of a system that has its own evolving history (Cole & Sticht, 1981). Sticht (1981) asserts that each new generation of teachers shapes the learning of students vis a vis teachers' experience as students. Each subsequent cohort of textbook authors writes with an implicit understanding of teacher and student audiences, with expectations of how teachers will utilize their writings, and how students will synthesize the content for their own cognitive and/or affective growth.

In order to fully appreciate the role of the textbook as an instructional tool, one must be aware of the complex system in which it functions. This necessitates inquiry into the students' use of texts which may also provide information about how to improve students' use of texts and make them more usuable. To some degree, the students' use of text, will be conditioned by the teacher's use of the text. The cultural environment also effects the text-teacher-student system in ways that are not fully comprehended.

SELECTION AND ADOPTION OF TEXTBOOKS

The selection and adoption of textbooks is a crucial concern for educators because textbooks are a primary instructional medium and they also provide students with an education lifeline (Bernstein, 1988; Keith, 1985). The particular practices that influence textbook adoption are

closely related to national conventions which influence the direction of curricula and teaching the different ends that nations seek as they direct and order the work of schools (Husen & Postlethwaite, 1985). Keith (1985) points out that there are no federal regulations mandating what a state is to teach, or not teach, or federal guidelines legislating the way public educational materials are to be selected. It is within the jurisdiction of each state to define how instructional materials will be selected.

Noncurriculum issues play an important role in textbook approval policies. These issues may be particular to the time when the textbook has emerged. Approval of textbooks may be contingent upon the availability of state funds and the physical durability of the textbook, or subject to state monitoring to assess the extent to which "appropriate" national concerns is being communicated. Approval may produce many "approved" textbooks or only one or two for each subject area (Husen & Postlethwaite, 1985).

Effective instruction depends greatly upon matching materials with the teaching styles of instructors and the cognitive styles of learning. Textbooks should be selected by teachers who will use them because they know their student groups best (Bernstein, 1988; Warming, 1982). However, it is the teacher's level of effective usage of the textbooks that may ultimately influence pupil achievement.

There are basically two types of textbook adoption

procedures in the United States, nonadoption or open territory states and adoption states (Bernstein, 1988; Keith, 1985; Tulley and Farr, 1985). In the twenty-eight nonadoption states, textbooks are selected by local school districts (Bernstein, 1988, Keith, 1985, Tulley & Farr, 1985). It is assumed that the nonadoption approach states minimizes controversy and allows maximum flexibility to school districts in identifying their choice of textbooks (Keith, 1985).

A state adoption system is operative in 22 states (Bernstein, 1988; Keith, 1985; Tulley and Farr, 1985). With the exception of California and Oregon, adoption states tend to be located in the South and Southwest regions of the country (Keith, 1985). There is diversity in the selection process and in the number of books that may be purchased with state funds in these states. The decisions relating to textbooks to be included in adoption usually rest with lay committees. Length of adoption time varies from two to six years and the adoption list for a basic series may vary from two to several choices.

Tulley and Farr (1985) cite three advantages continually thought to be associated with state level processes: (1) uniformity of curriculum; (2) reduction of textbook costs because of contractual agreements between states and publishing companies; and (3) periodic reviews and updating of textbooks.

The strengths of the adoption system lies in its diversity (Cole & Sticht, 1981). The system has an obligation to remove offensive material, but also is mandated to provide equal treatment of the sexes and full representation of minorities. The textbook adoption system should be sensitive to omitting bias from publication. Among the system's greatest weaknesses is that is not easily open to change nor does it demonstrate a willingness to innovate and experiment.

The impact of a few state adoptions in regards to curriculum and textbook content upon the nation is substantial. Texas, Florida, and California account for a sizeable portion of the national textbook market (Bernstein, 1988; Keith, 1985; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Textbook publishers are responsive to mandatory state curricula objectives as well as format and binding regulations. By incorporating the textbooks requirements of these three states and other large adoption states, constraints are imposed on the distribution of textbooks nationwide. The textbook industry is a highly competitive industry, but it is subject to the vicissitudes of the market, student demographics, and government regulations.

Textbook adoption and selection must balance the complexities between the written word, pedagogy, and subject matter and between desirable goals and regulations imposed by states.

Exploring the politics of curriculum decisions and how they are manifested through selection and adoption of textbooks in the state of Texas was the subject of a dissertation (Marshall, 1986). Using primary document, survey, and oral history data, he determined how state-level textbook decisions were made during the period 1969-1981. Marshall explored the actions of participants in three decision groups: the state textbook committee, the state board of education, the commissioner of education and his staff and their interactions with textbook publishers and petitioners (protesters). The results of Marshall's (1986) study indicated that while all three groups used the Texas guidelines as evaluation criteria, each group interpreted them differently. Publishers were most influential with the state textbook committee and least influential with the board of education. Petitioners were most influential with board members and less influential with the commissioner of education and his staff and with the textbook committee.

American publishers are not autonomous enterprises (Bernstein, 1988, Keith, 1985; Cole & Sticht, 1981). Existing in a symbiotic relationship with teachers, schools, textbook selection committees, educational researchers and curriculum specialists, publishers are subject to a complex systems of constraints and responsibilities (Bernstein, 1988, Keith, 1985; Cole & Sticht, 1981).

Textbooks serve as an indirect means for establishing

national educational standards for children, teachers, and school districts (Keith, 1985; Cole & Sticht, 1981). While schools may be locally and state controlled, textbooks are written for a national audience. Although publishers do not write curriculum, nor do they attempt large scale curriculum reform, they respond to changing requirements by providing new or revised textbooks that reflect changing priorities among school districts. Along with teachers, educational researchers and curriculum specialists, textbook selection committees constitute one of the most powerful forces for the influencing educational achievement.

The 1970s and 1980s were witness to vast changes in the selection procedures for textbooks. Enhanced by militancy and demands from teachers to participate in key instructional decisions, the selection process has progressed from using a small group of informed teachers and administrators through an ardous process of analysis toward greater involvement of many more individuals and a greater number of teachers (Cole & Sticht, 1981).

Changes in textbooks and instructional materials are clearly related to funds available for school expenditures. Textbook innovations can be financed only to the extent that they can be formatted within the context of available funds (Cole & Sticht, 1981). Komoski (1980) reports numerous problems with the textbook selection process. Based on a six year assessment of instructional materials used in the

United States, the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) concluded that the selection of textbooks and other materials currently practiced in most schools is producing an instructional mismatch of materials to learners' capabilities. Commercially marketed materials tend to structure and often define the classroom curriculum, a situation which does not guarantee instructional effectiveness.

EPIE testified to Congress, that 99 percent of the materials being bought by school had never been field tested or revised on the basis of learner feedback. A current EPIE REPORT, devoted to the aim of improving text materials through learner verification and revision, reports excellent efforts made by a few publishers to better fit learner needs through testing and revising their products. However, most publishers surveyed were not doing much about improving materials based on learner feedback. Schools continue to spend untold sums on untested, unimproved materials that are not matched to learner's needs.

Textbooks need to be evaluated by scholars and professional staff to ascertain whether they meet qualitative criteria as determined by the best available evidence in the professional literature (Tanner, 1988). Tulley and Farr (1990) recommend that: (1) textbook adoption be conducted at the local level rather than at the state level; (2) specific criteria be developed to guide

textbook review and; (3) individuals responsible for the selection of textbooks receive thorough training in review and evaluation procedures. Cody (1990) also concurs with the notion that school boards take a more active role in the textbook selection process.

Bernstein (1988) recommends that: (1) adoption state policy makers abandon the use of readability formulas as adoption criteria; (2) appoint people to serve on adoption committees solely on the basis of their knowledge and talents; (3) provide substantive training for adoption committee members; (4) hire teachers to serve on adoption committees; and (5) establish subject specific policy framework for curriculum review. In contrast to these views, Keith (1985) questions the merit of a textbook approach and suggests that the hegemony of the textbook as the dominant mode of content dissemination be reexamined. Tanner (1988) supports the notion that greater attention needs to be given in programs of preservice and inservice teacher education to the selection and uses of textbook. One of the principal criteria in evaluating a textbook must be the extent to which it interfaces with other studies in the total school curriculum. Textbooks should be adopted and used as though subject matter were interdependent, working harmoniously through an interdisciplinary network rather than as isolated entities and independent knowledge compartments.

PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE BASES

The field of education, particularly teacher education, is undergoing tremendous transitions, in an effort to identify a knowledge base. Knowledge bases that are pertinent to teacher education may be conceptualized in terms of classical topical categories, research domains, and paradigms of teacher education (Gideonse, 1989).

In teacher education, knowledge bases include different ways of knowing that are important for teachers and necessary for practice (Gudmundsdottir, 1991). To assist teacher education in defining a knowledge base, five attributes are defined: (1) a set of beliefs, (2) an organizing theme, (3) program outcomes and evaluation processes, (4) a bibliography of essential references, and (5) program models (Galluzo and Pankratz, 1990). A set of beliefs serves to guide program development. An organizing theme is the unifying concept that represents the essence of the set of beliefs. Program outcomes are descriptions of the knowledge skills and attributes that teacher education graduates should possess. The evaluation component functions as the process for student assessment and program evaluation. The bibliography should be comprised of collectively agreed upon source documents that contain essential knowledge to be learned by graduates of the program. This body of literature should summarize key concepts and principles from research, theory, and practice.

program models serve as graphical representation and/or verbal descriptions that show how conceptual elements form an integrated program Galluzo and Pankratz, 1990).

Knowledge bases provide a theoretical framework that is comprised of essential knowledge, established and current research findings, and sound practices to provide a structure for making informed decisions. A knowledge base must consist of a collectively held and systematically reinforced set of beliefs that guide program development and instruction. Central to the formulation of a knowledge base are the development of beliefs about the purpose of schools and the roles of teachers, educational philosophies, theories and research, social perspectives, educational practices, research on teaching, and contemporary societal concerns. (Galluzo and Pankratz, 1990).

A knowledge base is developed from source documents. The domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum selected for this investigation represent a potential knowledge base of curriculum practices. Classical topical categories were systematically selected from references that serve to undergird their inclusion. The domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum were selected from bibliographic sources that promulgate essential knowledge in the areas of theory, practice, and research. The bibliographic sources from which the domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum were derived represent a

potential bibliography.

Curriculum is the umbrella that guides teacher education. It influences design and delivery of effective professional education programs. Programs must be grounded by a knowledge base that forms an authoritative structure which offers a platform of concepts, facts, and principles that guide development and inquiry of a given discipline. Knowledge arises from processes of design, decision, intuition, and empirical inquiry (Gideonse, 1989). Knowledge bases serve to define purpose. Purpose is a key organizing principle and a primary consideration before any type of instruction can take place.

DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE IN CURRICULUM

There appears to be scarcity of research studies that have investigated domains of knowledge in curriculum. However, a few researchers alluded to the relationship, and the importance of it.

Rogan and Luckowski's (1990) investigation analyzed nine of the leading textbooks in the field of curriculum to determine if there were common domains of content knowledge. Their study revealed that there is no dominant textbook in curriculum which establishes a format for other textbooks to follow because there is no consensus on what content knowledge is important for curriculum study. This investigation used domains of content knowledge, a component

similar to the domains of knowledge used this study. However, the domains selected for the Rogan and Luckowski (1990) study and this present research are different. The criteria for selecting domains of content knowledge in Rogan and Luckowski's (1990) work are not clearly articulated. The authors utilized two criteria for selecting textbooks: (1) books in print published before 1970, and (2) books in authors' estimation to be the most widely used. Domains of knowledge were selected and defined by the investigator's synthesis and research of curriculum textbooks published since 1970.

Rosales-Dordelly and Short's (1984) descriptive study sought to investigate the degree of similarity among 95 General Curriculum Professors in the U.S. and Canada in indicating three things about 36 selected curriculum references: how the professors understood and classified knowledge into various domains of curriculum; in what contexts they utilized curriculum knowledge in their academic work; and what qualitative descriptors they applied to the references used in their study. They did not attempt to attribute causal relationships among their findings (Rosales-Dordelly & Short, 1984).

The conceptual framework for their investigation identified eight domains of curriculum knowledge (policy-making, development and evaluation, change and enactment, decision making modes, a field of study or an activity,

forms of inquiry, languages for inquiry, questions directing inquiry), four contexts of use (teaching, program planning, research, consulting), and four descriptors (uniqueness, contemporary relevance, conceptual clarity, subject to criticism) (Rosales-Dordelly & Short, 1984).

The domains of knowledge adopted for the Rosales-Dordelly & Short (1984) study were taken from a manuscript paper written by Short (1984). The contexts chosen for the study were based on conventional responsibilities of professors in any academic field or department. The rationale for selecting the descriptors used in the study were that they permitted the respondents to make judgments about the quality or values of selected curriculum references and also afforded the 95 General Professors of Curriculum an opportunity to reflect their own set of values, beliefs, and knowledge (Rosales-Dordelly & Short, 1984).

DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE IN CURRICULUM FOR THIS INVESTIGATION

The domains of knowledge in this study were divided into the following eleven areas of study: (1) curriculum philosophy, (2) curriculum theory, (3) curriculum research, (4) curriculum history, (5) curriculum change, (6) curriculum development, (7) curriculum design, (8) curriculum implementation, (9) curriculum evaluation, (10) curriculum policy, and (11) curriculum as a field of study.

There were selected by the investigator's synthesis and identification of topical categories within curriculum textbooks between 1970-1990. The domains of knowledge represent broad conceptualization of curriculum that describe specific curriculum activities.

CURRICULUM SYSTEMS

Beauchamp (1981) is one of a few academicians in the field of education who has written about the meaning of curriculum systems. He defines curriculum in three ways. The first use of the word pertains to the curriculum as a cubstantive entity, or a plan of some kind. The second use of the word curriculum defines it as a curriculum system. The curriculum system consists of three interactive elements: personnel involved in curriculum making, organizational procedures needed to produce a curriculum, implement, evaluate and modify it and the curriculum product and maintenance necessary to keep the curriculum system functional. The third use of curriculum refers to it as a total field of study (Beauchamp, 1981). This investigation is mainly concerned with the second usage of the word curriculum.

The notion of the curriculum system implies a governing of the cluster of relationships that guide human engineering in the process of curriculum development and curriculum usage. The curriculum system has several tasks that are

inherent in explaining its structure and function. When the relationships among these tasks are outlined, the phenomena of curriculum development, curriculum use, and curriculum evaluation have been defined (Beauchamp, 1981).

The tasks involved in a curriculum system are: (1) the choice of setting (the individual school, the school district, the state, or the nation) for curriculum decision making; (2) the selection and involvement of persons in curriculum planning; (3) the organization for and techniques used in curriculum planning; (4) the actual writing of a curriculum; (5) implementing the curriculum; (6) evaluating the curriculum; and (7) providing for feedback and modification of the curriculum (Beauchamp, 1981).

The curriculum system is a part of the total operations of schooling. It is a process for decision making and action with respect to curriculum functions. The curriculum system has three primary goals: (1) to produce a curriculum; (2) to implement the curriculum; and (3) to appraise the effectiveness of the curriculum and the curriculum system (Beauchamp, 1981).

The persons charged with the responsibility of making the curriculum system functional in schools are superintendents, principals, curriculum directors, and outside educational consultants. These individuals have the duty of organizing and managing the tasks and operations that are requisite for curriculum to be planned and

implemented in teaching, evaluated and modified in conjunction with data accumulated from program evaluation (Beauchamp, 1981).

The curriculum system provides a framework for deciding what shall be taught in schools and for developing instructional strategies. The curriculum system is composed of three essential components: () a body of input data; (2) necessary content and processes for the maintenance of the system; and (3) the output of the system (Beauchamp, 1981).

The input data is analogous to the fuel needed to keep a generator running. The various political and social forces that contribute to the intellectual and personnel power needed for the continuity of the systems are the educational foundations, relevant community characteristics, human personalities involved, experiences of schools with curriculum affairs, the body of knowledge stored and categorized in the disciplines and other school subjects or relevant social and cultural values (Beauchamp, 1981).

The content-process component includes a choice of arena for the curriculum, selection of personnel, establishing implementation procedures and procedures for appraising and revising the curriculum, the selection and execution of working procedures for determining curriculum goals, selection of curriculum design, planning, and writing (Beauchamp, 1981).

The output component consists of a planned curriculum,

a visible product. Other possible manifestations of the output are increased knowledge by the participants, changed attitudes, and a committment to act (Beauchamp, 1981).

Ornstein (1986) makes reference to systems and subsystems discussed herein, but he calls them components. His discussion centers around an attempt to clarify the relationship between curriculum, instruction, and supervision, claiming that the description of each is unclear.

Ornstein (1986) suggests that: (1) deliberating whether curriculum, instruction, or supervision are major or minor systems and/or subsystems is a futile; (2) the relationship between the components is contingent on the professors' educational background and perspective of the relationship; (3) the exact interaction between these components is difficult to determine because of their dynamism; and (4) trying to complete planning and organizing in the absence of a component renders the process incomplete because each of the components is mutually interdependent.

In this same connection, Ornstein (1986) supports the premise that curriculum, instructional, and supervisory decisions are related. He suggests that supervisory decisions making is the foundation for curriculum and instruction and that the relationships among and between all three components should be of concern to educators.

SUBSYSTEMS FOR THIS INVESTIGATION

The subsystems chosen for this study include: instruction, supervision, and evaluation. These subsystems were chosen after careful consideration of Beauchamps's (1968) model and in accordance with object of analysis, namely the textbooks.

Instruction relates to Beauchamp's input component. Instruction identifies appropriate learning experiences in consideration of student and teacher behaviors, social and political forces that influence the process of learning. Similar to the content-process or maintenance component, supervision is the activity that establishes procedures for curriculum implementation and assessment, quality of instruction, determining educational objectives, and selecting curriculum materials. Evaluation is the process that appraises the visible product of a planned curriculum and is closely aligned with Beauchamp's output component.

These subsystems represent a framework for the function of curriculum in educational settings and are closely aligned with three essential components of the curriculum system: input, content-process, and output.

The essence of this study is an attempt to establish a knowledge base of curriculum practices within textbooks. Given the influential role of curriculum, attempting to establish a professional knowledge base for the field seems to be a timely consideration: it coincides with attempts in

teacher education to define its purposes, practices, and paradigms. A knowledge base of curriculum practices might provide educators with a focus for thinking about curriculum and instructional techniques.

Establishing a knowledge base will necessarily instigate controversy. The essence of a knowledge base requires that choices be made and judgments exercised. The sources of knowledge are also potential sources of error. In short, there can be no unassailable prescriptive set of beliefs resulting from a knowledge base. Evidence, conflicting conceptions and logical propositions must be weighted, selected, and synthesized into a coherent framework that renders the knowledge base usable for practice. By providing a systematic set of beliefs, knowledge bases also suggest ways of examining what is not yet discernible. The development of a knowledge base is therefore an evolutionary process that will be influenced by continuing reflection and as dispositional and empirical sources of knowledge emerge.

One might expect that the professors would pick a textbook that advocates the curriculum practices that they identified as being most important. Similarly, one would expect there to be a high correlation between the professors' ratings of the importance of curriculum practices and their ratings to which these practices were covered in the textbooks they selected. In order to

establish a professional knowledge base in curriculum textbooks, a set of collectivelly agreed upon practices was established for this study.

This study differs from prior studies in at least several ways. It investigates domains of knowledge and subsystems of curricuum, hereafter called categories or subscales that have not been examined before. A selected sample chosen from the population of the Professors of Curriculum were participants in an open ended survey and asked to select the most influential textbooks in curriculum. Based on their selection, twelve textbooks were identified.

These twelve textbooks were the representative list in the close-ended survey. A researcher-constructed survey instrument was developed through a two-stage pilot study and evaluated for validity and reliability. The close ended survey instrument comprised of a listing of statements that were designated as curriculum practices (items). In the close ended survey, the Professors of Curriculum were asked to select one book from the identified list of influential textbooks with which they were most familiar. They were also asked to rank the importance of all of the items referred to as curriculum practices in each category and were asked to rate the extent to which all of the items (curriculum practices) were covered within the one textbook they selected. The participants in the close-ended portion

of the questionnaire were all of the Professors of Curriculum who were actively teaching and resided in the United States and Canada. Finally, the study was limited to curriculum textbooks published between 1970-1990.

CHAPTER III

THE INSTRUMENT AND COLLECTION OF DATA

In an effort to fully describe the methods and procedures used in this study, this section begins with a review of the pilot study which was conducted by the investigator to help formulate the design of the survey instrument. A discussion of instrumentation, including validity and reliability issues a description of the population subjects, and the scoring and weighting of the close ended survey instrument is presented. This chapter concludes with a discussion of parametric and nonparametric methods.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT STUDY

The pilot study was conducted in two stages. In stage one, five professors at Loyola University of Chicago's School of Education were contacted and asked to meet as a group. Two professors in the department of curriculum, two in the department of supervision and administration, and one foundations person participated in these activities. The first task was to categorize the items listed under domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum into appropriate

categories. (See Appendix A) Three out of five professors or raters had to agree in their categorical identification of an item, otherwise, the item was deleted from the survey. Using the expertise of these raters, this procedure was conducted to assure adequate and appropriate definitions of domains and subsystems and thus enhance content validity of the instrument.

The categorization process for the domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum was broken down into two groups, each consisting of seven discretely defined categories. It was assumed that classifying items into fourteen categories would present a cumbersome task. If offered too many options among which to chose and could have resulted in the elimination of many relevant items and categories. For example, selecting among fourteen categories yielded a one in fourteen chance that an item would be categorized correctly. By dividing the rating task into two parts consisting of seven categories each, the probability was increased to one in seven that the item would be correctly categorized.

In the first task, the five professors (acting independently) were given two piles of items on 3 X 4 index cards. They were instructed to divide the first pile (white index cards) into one of the following seven categories: 1 = curriculum philosophy; 2 = curriculum research; 3 = curriculum change; 4 = curriculum design; 5 = curriculum

evaluation; 6 = curriculum as a field of study; 7 = supervision. The raters were asked to write the number (1 - 7) in the lower right hand corner of the index card that best identified the category to which they believed the item belonged (See Appendix B).

They were then instructed to divide the second pile (multicolored index cards) into one of the following seven categories: 8 = curriculum theory; 9 = curriculum history; 10 = curriculum development; 11 = curriculum implementation; 12 = curriculum policy; 13 = instruction; and 14 = evaluation. Once again, the five raters were asked to write the number (8-14) in the lower right hand corner of the index card that best identified the category to which they believed the item belonged (See Appendix B).

It should be noted that the professors were provided with one or two sentence definitions for each of the categories (See Appendix B). They were instructed to work independently on the task and were told that if they had items they couldn't categorize that they should temporarily set them aside into a "don't know" pile and return to them later. For items placed into the "don't know" pile, the professors were instructed to work as a group in order to reach a consensus. However, all raters were able to complete the task individually, without assistance from their colleagues.

The professors were also asked to modify the wording of

phrases in cases where they felt they could make the phrase less ambiguous or more perspicuous. At least three out of five professors had to agree on the wording of an item. If a consensus of the three could not agree on the wording, then the item was eliminated from the questionnaire. The investigator told the raters they could reword phrases prior to the categorization task and repeated this instruction after it was observed that they had completed the categorization task. The raters did not reword any of the prior categorized items.

Each category had to have at least three items. If a category resulted in less than three items, it was eliminated from the survey. Seventy-nine of the original 120 items remained at the conclusion of stage one of the pilot study. In two categories, however, only one item remained. These two categories and the corresponding items were also eliminated. See Appendix C for a complete listing of items deleted as a result of stage one of the pilot study. As a result of this phase of the pilot study, twelve categories (nine domains and three subsystems) and seventy-seven items remained. Using a table of random numbers, these items were arranged in random order for stage two of the pilot study.

The 77 item questionnaire was administered to a group of sixty-five teachers in the Chicago Public School System. Each of the respondents were sent a cover letter attached to

the survey that explained the purpose of and instructions for completion of the questionnaire (See Appendices D and E). Using a five-point Likert scale, the participants were asked to rate the importance of the intermixed randomly arranged items. The categories to which individual items belongs were unknown to the participants (See Appendix F). Fifty-two of the participants or 80 percent of the sample returned the survey questionnaire. Three of the surveys were incomplete and were not incorporated in the pilot data. Additionally one survey was deleted from the pilot study because it appeared to represent a confounded response set. In sum, forty-eight of the 65 surveys, 74% of the sample, were included in the final pilot data.

Item total correlations and alpha correlation coefficients were calculated. By using this procedure, it was possible to identify the degree of agreement: (1) item-total correlation between each item and the subscale and (2) the internal consistency for each subscale, (e.g., the extent of homogeneity of items within a subscale). This procedure permitted the identification of those items that best agreed with each subscale as indicated by the item-total correlation score. It also evidence the degree of internal consistency for each item within a subscale as indicated by the alpha if item deleted score, and the degree of internal consistency for each subscale as an entity as indicated by the alpha correlation coefficient. The item

analyses revealed a strong internal consistency with alpha correlation coefficients ranging from .73 to .93. All item-total correlation scores were above .25 which was the established low end item inclusion cut off score (See Appendix G).

It was expected that as a result of findings related to the pilot study the originally established item pool would be reduced in selected categories. If there were an insufficient number of items to represent a category, then this category would have been deleted from the questionnaire. If as a result of the pilot study, there were less than three items in a particular category, then that category would have been eliminated. An analysis of the pilot data set from the second stage of the pilot study evidenced that a reliable survey instrument (including all twelve categories) had been established. Using teachers as respondents in the second stage and expert judges in the first stage of the pilot served to enhance the content validity of the research instrument. As a result of findings related to the second stage of the pilot study, all of the items were retained.

Item analysis procedures are intended to maximize test reliability-Maximization of test reliability is accomplished by determining the relationship between individual items and the test as a whole. It is important to ensure that the overall test is measuring what is supposed to measure

(Thorndike, Cunningham, Hagen, & Thorndike, 1991).

In this study, methods of item analysis were used for the purposes of selecting the best items available for the final test form and highlighting structural or content deficits in the test (Payne, 1974). There are three main elements in item analysis: (1) determining the discriminatory power of each item; (2) examining the difficulty level of each item; and (3) in the case of multiple choice or matching questions, examining the effectiveness of distractors (Payne, 1974). For the purposes of this study, only the first procedure was considered.

Methods of item analysis yield three statistics for each item, an item of discrimination index; the number and/or percentage of respondents marking a choice to each item; and item mean and standard deviation. The item discrimination shows the extent to which each item discriminates among the respondents in the same way as the total score discriminates. The item discrimination index is calculated by correlating item scores with total scale scores (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990).

One way of interpreting the size of the item discrimination index is to eliminate ones with an index below .20 (Thorndike, Cunningham, Hagen & Thorndike, 1991). Additional support for the selection of this criterion is cited by Payne (1974) and Nunnally (1970). However, other

researcher state that each item should correlate at at least .25 (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990). Therefore, the lowest acceptable criterion for accepting an item was .25. If an item correlated at less than .25, it was eliminated.

Validity of the Instrument

Content validity relates to the test score and all of the factors including clarity of directions and adequacy of scoring procedures that may affect it (Thorndike, Cunningham, Hagen, & Thorndike, 1991). Demonstrating content validity is primarily a subjective process and because the kind of evidence desired depends on the projected use of the results, there is no single agreed-upon way to estimate validity. Validity is an inference that is to be made from the test scores derived from the test instrument (Payne, 1974). Content related evidence is not usually stated in numerical form (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990).

The adequacy of content can be assured by defining the universe appropriately and representing the universe fairly in the test. The definitions should include: (1) kinds of tasks, stimuli, or situations over which the universe ranges, (2) kinds of responses that the observer should count, and (3) injunctions to the subject. It is not possible to defend any one universe as correct (Cronbach, 1984). Sampling is best guaranteed by systematically

mapping out subdivisions of the universe and collecting the desired number of items for each subdivision (Cronbach, 1984). Critical to content validation is the form of the task itself. A person should not miss scoring an item correctly because of verbal difficulties. Therefore, the form of the items influences the score (Cronbach, 1984).

To ensure content validity, it is recommended that irrelevant difficulties be excluded. Wherever an example can be simplified without making it a false example, it should be simplified. The task of content validation is to ensure adequate representation of the universe (Cronbach, 1984). Dropping poorly constructed items that all within the same content area might result in reducing the representativeness of the test. The goal of statistical analysis with respect to content validity is to point out ambiguities (Cronbach, 1984).

Examining content validity requires judging whether an item and the distribution of items as a whole covers what the test is reported to measure. This judgment, however, rests more on the test taker than on the author. How close a correspondence should be demanded is subjective (Cronbach, 1984). Content validity is the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content. It is guided by investigating whether the items of a given test or instrument is representative of the content or the construct that is being measured (Kerlinger, 1987).

Every educational construct has a theoretical universe that consists of all things that can be used to define a construct. The members of the universe, U, are called items (Kerlinger, 1987). The universe for the component domains of knowledge is defined by all of the items listed in each of the categorical subheadings: curriculum philosophy, curriculum theory, curriculum research, curriculum history, curriculum change, curriculum development, curriculum design, curriculum implementation, curriculum evaluation, curriculum policy, and curriculum as a field of study. The universe for the component subsystems of curriculum is defined by all of the items listed in each of the categorical subheadings: instruction, supervision, and evaluation.

It is not possible to completely satisfy the definition of content validity. Content validity relies upon judgment, alone, or with others. In either case, one judges the representativeness of the items (Kerlinger, 1987). The items of a test must be studied and each item must be weighted for its presumed representativeness of the universe. Competent or expect judges should appraise the content of the items. The universe of the content must be clearly defined; judges must be furnished with specific directions for making judgments and specifications of what they are judging. When these procedures are adequate, then some method pooling independent judgments can be used

(Kerlinger, 1987). The five judges helped to determine content validity by categorizing each item in stage one of the pilot study.

Useful types of empirical or statistical evidence can be used to appraise content validity (Thorndike, Cunningham, Hagen, & Thorndike, 1991); methods of item analysis are recommended. For the purposes of this investigation, item discrimination was used to assess the validity of the items examined in the pilot study. Cronbach's alpha, an internal consistency measure of reliability (which measures homogeneity) was used. Cronbach's alpha is employed when measures have multiple scored items or utilize Likert scales. The established low end item inclusion cut off score was .25. If an item correlated at less than .25, it was eliminated because that item was not contributing to what the instrument was trying to measure.

If test items are heterogeneous, that is the test items measure more than one construct, then the reliability index computed by coefficient alpha will be lowered. Conversely, if the items are homogeneous, and tend to measure one construct, then the reliability index computed by coefficient alpha will be higher (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990).

Cronbach's alpha is expressed as follows:

$$a \text{ or } r(xx) = \frac{k}{K - 1} \quad \frac{(Sx)^2 - (E\ Si)^2}{(Sx)^2}$$

where K = number of items on the test

$(E\ Si)^2$ - sum of the variances of the item scores

$(Sx)^2$ = variance of the test scores (all K items)

The variance of all the scores for each item must be determined. Each of these variances across the items will be totaled to get $E(Si)^2$ (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990).

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability can be defined as the consistency of measurement with an evaluation instrument. It provides the consistency that makes validity possible and indicates how much confidence can be placed in the results (Gronlund & Linn, 1990). There are several procedures that can be used to calculate reliability, including alternate form reliability, split-reliability, Kuder-Richardson reliability, and the test-retest reliability (Tuckman, 1988).

A test for reliability was not conducted for the open-ended survey instrument. This decision was based on the fact that there existed little likelihood that Professor's of Curriculum responses would be significantly different in one short period of time to necessitate conducting a procedure of this nature or that their responses would be influenced by factors known to effect reliability such as: (1) familiarity with the particular test form, (2) fatigue, (3) emotional strain, (4) physical conditions of the room in

which the test is given, (5) health of the test taker, (6) amount of practice or experience by the test taker of a specific skill being measured, (7) fluctuations of human memory, or (8) specific knowledge that has been gained outside of the experience being evaluated by the test (Tuckman, 1988). While reliability is a important, it is not a sufficient condition for validity. It provides the consistency that makes validity possible. Even a high reliability does not insure that a satisfactory degree of validity will exist (Gronlund & Linn, 1990). Conducting a reliability assessment for the open ended survey instrument would have necessitated an increased sample size or replication of the survey.

It should be noted that a formal reliability assessment was conducted for the close ended instrument. Alpha correlation coefficients were calculated for each of the curriculum practices and subscales for both the domains of knowledge and subsystems. For a complete description of these procedures refer to pages 86-88 and 98-99.

Scoring and Weighting of the Instrument

Sample

An open ended questionnaire was used for the first portion of this study and was mailed to a selected sample (50% or N = 88) of those Professors of Curriculum who were currently affiliated with a college or university. A close

ended approach was used for the second portion of the data collection and mailed to all of the Professors of Curriculum who were affiliated with a college or university teaching (N = 132).

Open Ended Survey

The first sample consisted of approximately 170 individuals who belonged to a professional organization called the Professors of Curriculum. Individuals are admitted to the Professors of Curriculum by nomination on the basis of academic accomplishments and prestigious contributions to the field of curriculum. Given the importance of this professional group, it seems desirable to determine their overall agreement with respect to identifying what they consider to be the most influential curriculum textbooks. This determination might also be useful in clarifying the amount of consensus or fragmentation which exist in the field of curriculum.

The sample population for the open portion of the survey included fifty percent of the 1990-91 Professors of Curriculum membership directory. It was observed that emeritus professors (N=17 or 19%) represented a sizeable portion of the sample. Upon reflection, it was assumed that perhaps some emeritus professors would not be current with respect to curriculum textbooks published between 1970-1990, because they were no longer actively teaching. Therefore,

it was decided to eliminate the emeritus professors from the sample list.

In an attempt to add to the truncated list of potential respondents, the first institutionally affiliated professor that had not been selected in the first potential sample was chosen. The balance of the professors' names were selected from the alphabetized Professors of Curriculum Membership Directory until seventeen more names were selected to replace those names that were eliminated. In total there were 88 respondents. Each of the selected respondents were sent a cover letter explaining the overall purpose of the investigation and the survey questionnaire (See Appendices H and I). A return response was requested within ten days. a follow-up cover letter and survey instrument was sent to those who did not respond to the first mailing.

RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED SURVEY

Forty-seven responses were received, yielding a 53% return from the sample population for the open ended survey. In total all of the respondents cited a total of 280 books. The mean number of books selected by each respondent, irrespective of sex groups was 7.58 textbooks.

Of the 47 professors who responded to the open ended survey, nine declined to list books for reasons listed below: four because they felt unqualified to do so, two because of a tight traveling schedule, two because they

didn't feel any textbooks impacted the field of curriculum, and one because of retirement.

Professors who declined to list books constituted 19.14% of the returned surveys and represented 10.23% of the sample population who were contacted to participate in the open ended survey. These surveys were excluded from further analysis. The remaining 38 surveys, 43.2% of the sample population, were statistically analyzed.

Close Ended Survey

A second sample was selected for the close ended portion of the survey. This second sample included all of the Professors of Curriculum in the U.S. and Canada who were actively teaching and conducting research (N=132). Thirty-four of the members of the one hundred and sixty-six Professors of Curriculum were retired and once again, since they were emeritus, they were omitted from the sample survey for reasons already discussed.

The close ended survey was mailed with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope to the remaining one hundred thirty-two Professors of Curriculum. Each respondent was sent a cover letter, explaining the purpose of the investigation and a copy of the close ended survey (See Appendix J and K). A response within ten days was requested. The respondents were instructed to select the one textbooks with which they were most familiar, rate the

importance of the curriculum practices (or items) based on their opinion, and to rate the extent to which each curriculum practice (or item) was covered within the textbook they selected.

A follow-up cover letter and survey instrument was sent to those who did not respond to the first mailing. A third cover letter and survey instrument was sent to those who did not respond to either the first or second request.

RESPONSES TO THE CLOSE ENDED SURVEY

After an initial mailing and two follow-up mailings, 86 responses or 65.15% were received. However, fifty-one of the respondents (38.64% of the sample population) completed the survey. Several respondents, N = 35 or 26.52%, returned the survey and declined to complete it for one of the reasons shown below:

1.	Retired	N = 6
2.	Didn't feel qualified	N = 6
3.	Didn't care to participate	N = 6
4.	Didn't agree with the survey	N = 4
5.	Didn't respond to these type of research studies	N = 3
6.	Health prohibited participation	N = 3
7.	Didn't agree with textbook selections	N = 3
8.	Unable to locate respondent due to travel	N = 3
9.	Respondent is deceased	N = 1

Four respondents disagreed with the survey.[1] Of the three respondents who disagreed with the textbook selection, two stated that they had not used any of the books listed in the survey. Six professors declined to complete the survey on the basis of a lack of grounding in the basic textbooks, indicating that they didn't feel qualified to respond. Perhaps this says something about the nature of the field, or this has implications about who gets elected to the Professors of Curriculum. Six professors indicated they were retired, three declined to participate for health reasons, and one professor was reported to be deceased. Professors who declined to participate because they lacked expertise, were retired, unable to participate due to health, death, or travel totaled 19, and represented 14.39% of the sample population (N = 132). Those that either disagreed with the textbook selection, or the survey, totaled 7, or 5.3% of the sample population (n = 132).

Scoring and Weighting of Curriculum Practices for the Domains and Subsystems

The following procedures describe the scoring and weighting of items in the close ended survey instrument for

---

[1] The harshest criticism was from a midwestern professor ho maintained tht she: (1) was unable to grasp the meaning of arious terms, e.g., curriculum practice, influence; (2) felt the tudy was potentially biased; and (3) felt the investigator made roblematic assumptions about curriculum professors knowledge and se of curriculum texts.

hypotheses 2 and 3. For the purposes of statistical analysis, items in the domains of knowledge in curriculum and subsystems of curriculum were assumed to be of equal weight.

Each of the domains, (curriculum philosophy, curriculum theory, curriculum research, curriculum history, curriculum development, curriculum design, curriculum evaluation, curriculum policy, and curriculum as a field of study) was represented by four or more items. Curriculum change and curriculum implementation were eliminated in the pilot study due to an insufficient number of representative items. The domains were not identified by name and the items of each domain were intermixed. The professors were asked to rate importance of items (curriculum practices) within the domains of knowledge without knowing which items fell under this subheading using a 5 point Likert rating scale ([5] very important, [4] fairly important, [3] some importance, [2] fairly unimportant, [1] very unimportant).

The professors were given a list of twelve textbooks identified as being the most influential in the open ended portion of the survey (Refer to Appendix J). They were instructed to select one textbook with which they were most familiar and asked to rate the extent to which each of the items are covered within the textbook they selected. A five point Likert rating scale was used ([5] very great extent, [4] great extent, [3] some extent, [2] little extent, [1]

very little extent). Subscales for the domains of knowledge in curriculum were calculated for use in other statistical analysis.

Each of the subsystems (instruction, supervision, and evaluation) were represented by four or more items. Without knowing which items fell under which subsystems, the professors were also asked to rate the importance of the curriculum practices on a five point Likert scale ([5] very important, [4] fairly important, [3] some importance, [2] fairly unimportant, [1] very unimportant).

The professors were given the same list of twelve textbooks identified as being the most influential in the open-ended portion of the survey (Refer to Appendix J). They were instructed to select one textbook with which they were most familiar and asked to rate the extent to which each of the items (curriculum practices) listed were covered in the textbook they selected. The ratings system used a five point Likert scale ([5] very great extent, [4] great extent, [3] some extent, [2] little extent, [1] very little extent. Subscales for the subsystems for curriculum were calculated for use in other statistical analysis.

PARAMETRIC AND NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS

This section describes the conditions which determine the application of parametric and nonparametric statistics. It concludes with a rationale for selecting nonparametric

methods.

Using parametric statistical tests depends upon a number of assumptions about the population from which the sample used in the study is drawn. There are no assumptions as to the forms of the sample population or the values of the population parameters for using nonparametric or distribution free statistical tests. In order to use **parametric** tests, the following conditions must be satisfied.

(1) The normally assumption cannot be vitiated, that is, the sample from which data is drawn must be normally distributed (Kerlinger, 1987). When in doubt about the normality of the population, nonparametric tests should be used.

(2) Homogeneity of variance must be present. In analysis of variance, the variances within the groups must be statistically the same, that is homogeneous from group to group within the bounds of random variation (Kerlinger, 1987). Unless there is good evidence to believe populations are seriously non normal and that variances are heterogenous, it is unwise to use a nonparametric test in place of a parametric one.

(3) Measures to be analyzed need to be continuous with equal intervals (Kerlinger, 1987).

(4) Independence of observations or statistical independence must exist. In research, it is assumed that

observations are independent and that making one observation does influence the making of another observation. This assumption applies no matter what kind of statistical test is used, because violating it invalidates the results of most statistical tests of significance (Kerlinger, 1987).

Nonparametric tests should be implemented when the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) When the sample size is small, there may be no applicable parametric statistical procedure. Unless the nature of the population distribution is known exactly, non parametric methods should be used (Siegel, 1988).

(2) Nonparametric tests make fewer assumptions about the data and may be more appropriate for a particular situation. A hypothesis tests by nonparametric methodology may be more suitable for the research investigation (Siegel, 1988).

(3) Data that are inherently measured in ranks, can be categorized as plus or minus (more or less, better or worse), and who numerical scores have the strength of ranks should be analyzed by nonparametric tests (Siegel, 1988).

(4) Nonparametric procedures are available to analyze data which are categorical such as nominal data. There are no parametric techniques available that apply to such data (Siegel, 1988).

(5) Nonparametric statistical tests can be implemented to treat samples made up of observations from several different populations. Parametric techniques typically can not handle

data without requiring unrealistic assumptions or cumbersome computations (Siegel, 1988).

For this investigation, the normality assumption is not in doubt. The homogeneity of variance in not in question either. The variances within groups do not differ so widely that averaging becomes questionable. The effect of widely differing variances would result in inflating the within groups variance. The measures to be analyzed are continuous measures with equal intervals. All of the measure are statistically independent.

The data for hypothesis 1b are categorical and nominal. There are no parametric tests available to assess nominal data. The data for hypotheses 2 or 3 ordinal and are tabulated as frequencies. The numerical scores have the strengths of ranks. The hypotheses and data in this investigation indicate that nonparametric rather than parametric procedures are more appropriate tests to use for data analysis.

For the purposes of rating the importance and the extent of text coverage given to the items within the domains of knowledge and the subsystems of curriculum, the Likert scale, a method of summated ratings, was chosen. Five response categories were utilized so that the weighing of both scales were equal. The statements in the questionnaire were arranged in random order so as to avoid any possibility of a response set on the part of the

professors (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990). The items listed in each category for both components in the survey were taken from the content of the definitions section. All of the items in each category for both components were assumed to be of equal weight for the purposes of this study.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Research procedures are conducted in order to make statistical inferences about testing hypotheses. They are a tool for the advancement of knowledge and help the investigator confirm or disconfirm hypotheses (Kerlinger, 1987). Procedures of statistical inference suggest some of the necessary conditions for data collection and determine whether the investigator can have confidence in conclusions drawn from the data (Siegel, 1988). In this section a description of the null hypotheses and the procedures used to analyze the data collected from this investigation is presented.

Procedures for Ho 1a

Ho 1a. There will be no agreement in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to their ratings of the most influential textbooks.

The professors were asked to simply list textbooks published between 1970 and 1990 which they believed have had the most impact in the field of curriculum. The respondents were asked to list up to ten textbooks without indicating

any kind of rank order (Refer to Appendix I). Those books selected in the top twelve rankings from the total pool of open ended respondents were listed as a most influential textbook for the close ended portion of the survey. The textbooks selected were ranked according to frequency of response given for each textbook cited (See Table 1).

Because the assumption of normality was invalidated, and the data to be analyzed did not constitute continuous measures with equal intervals, measuring agreement could not be statistically defined. The selection of the most influential textbooks could not be correlated nor could it be ranked either parametrically or nonparametrically. Descriptive statistics were used to assess the results. The frequency of textbooks selection was described in terms of percentages. After the frequencies were tallied, textbooks selections were also rank ordered. The mean number of books cited by each respondent was calculated.

The original criterion for selecting a textbook as most influential was designated as 20%. However, only 8 textbooks met this criterion. Four textbooks were cited by 15.8% of the respondents and tied for rank order ten. Since one aspect of this study was an attempt to establish a professional knowledge base of curriculum practices within textbooks, the dissertation committee recommended that the list be extended to 12 textbooks. Also there was a greater likelihood that respondents would see one book that they

Table 1

The Most Influential Textbooks in Curriculum in Order of Rank: Selected by the Professors of Curriculum

Author	Textbook Title	Votes	Percent	Rank
Schubert, William	Curriculum: Perspectives Paradigm and Possibility	25	65.8	1
Eisner, Elliot	The Educational Imagination	23	60.5	2
Tanner, D. & Tanner, L.	Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice	20	52.6	3
Zais, Robert	Curriculum: Principles and Foundations	12	31.6	4
Eisner, Elliot & Vallance, Elizabeth	Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum	11	28.9	5.5
Pinar, William	Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists	11	28.9	5.5
Apple, Michael	Ideology and Curriculum	9	23.7	7
Kliebard, Herbert	The Struggle for the American Curriculum (1893-1958)	8	21.1	8
Giroux, H. Penna, A. Pinar, W.	Curriculum and Instruction	6	15.8	10
Goodlad, John	A Place Called School	6	15.8	10
Goodlad, John	Curriculum Inquiry	6	15.8	10
Pinar, William	Contemporary Curriculum Discourse	6	15.8	10

were most familiar with and be more inclined to respond to the survey when presented with a list of twelve textbooks rather than eight.

It should be noted that textbook authors were not necessarily omitted from the sample population for the open ended survey. However, one author who participated did not list his own work as one of the most influential textbooks. Four of the textbooks in Table 1 were cited by their author.

seven of the authors cited in Table 1 were not participants in the open ended survey. It should be noted that a book could only be cited once by any given respondent. In actuality, 5 of the 12 textbooks authors listed in Table 1 were respondents in the open ended survey.

Procedures for Ho 1b

Ho 1b. There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regard to their rankings of the most influential textbooks across a) gender, b) doctorate specialization c) year doctorate was earned, d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned, and e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation.

The Spss-x Nonpar Tests, Crosstabs, and Frequency programs, Chi-square statistics and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for two independent samples were used to test Ho 1b (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990, and SPSS-X, 1988).

The Spss-x Crosstabs program was used to assess the potential significance differences in responses related to the selection of the twelve most influential curriculum textbooks across to: a) gender, b) doctorate specialization (curriculum and/or instruction) or other), c) year (in ten year intervals) doctorate was earned, d) geographical region of the institution (northwest, northeast, southwest, southeast, or midwest), where the doctorate was awarded, and

e) geographical region of the professors' current institutional affiliation (northwest, northeast, southwest, southeast, or midwest), (SPSS-X, 1988).

It should be noted that when calculating Chi-square statistics using 2 by 2 contingency tables, it is necessary that the occurrence of cell frequencies with values less than five not exceed 20% of the total number of cells. Because of the small number of frequencies within cells, it was necessary to collapse categories within variables. The geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was awarded and the Professors of Curriculum current institutional affiliation were originally divided into five categories: northwest, northeast, southwest, southeast, and midwest. Since no professors earned their degree at institutions located in the northwest or southwest a decision was made to omit these categories. The northeast and southeast (east) were designated as category 1; the midwest was designated as category 2.

In reference to the Professors of Curriculum current institutional affiliation, the data for the northwest, southwest, and midwest were combined into category 1 or west. Northeast and southeast were collapsed into category 2, or east. Categorical comparisons were made for the west (including the midwest) and the east.

The year (in periods of ten year intervals) in which the doctorate was awarded was originally coded into six

categories: Before 1941, 1941-1950, 1951-1960, 1961-1970, 1971-1980, and 1981-1990. None of the respondents received their doctorates prior to 1951. Individuals receiving their doctorate between 1951 and 1970 were recorded into category one. Those receiving doctorates between 1971 to 1990 were recoded into category 2.

Chi-Square Test for Ho 1b

The Chi-square test of independence was employed to find the significance of differences between males and females in their selection of each of the twelve most influential textbooks. The Chi-square statistic was used because the following were met: (1) observations must be independent; subjects must be randomly and independently selected; (2) the categories were mutually exclusive; and (3) the observations were measured as frequencies.

The Frequency program was utilized to count and record the percentages of males and females who chose the most influential curriculum textbooks, to indicate how many individuals received their doctorates in curriculum and instruction as opposed to another field in education, to reveal what year Professors of Curriculum earned their doctorates, and to demonstrate how many professors received their doctorates at institutions located in the east and the Midwest, and the regional location of the institutions where the professors were currently teaching west (including the

Midwest) and east (SPSS-X, 1988). Two by two contingency tables were computed for each analysis. Pearson and the phi statistics were calculated for each analysis.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Ho 1b

The Nonpar Tests were implemented in order to utilize the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) two sample test subcommand. The maximum positive, negative, and absolute differences in relationship to the professors' gender, doctorate specialization, year the doctorate was earned, geographic region where the doctorate was earned, and the geographical region of the current institutional affiliation, the K-S (Z), and a two-tailed level of probability (p) was computed for each test.

The K-S two sample test is a measure of whether two independent samples have been drawn from the same population. The 2 tailed test detected any kind of differences within the distribution from which the two samples were drawn. This test is concerned with agreement between the distribution of a set of sample values and some specified theoretical distribution. If two samples have been chosen from the same population distribution, then the cumulative frequency distribution of both samples may be expected to be fairly close, devoid of any large deviations in the cumulative frequency distributions between the two samples. If large deviation between the two sample

cumulative frequency distributions are demonstrated, it suggests that the samples are drawn from two different populations. A large enough deviation between the two sample cumulative frequency distributions is evidence for rejecting the null hypothesis (Siegel, 1988).

With respect to hypothesis 1b, this procedure determined level of disagreement among the Professors' of Curriculum selection of the most influential textbooks across the aforementioned demographic variables. A K-S (Z) value of zero indicated total agreement and a nonsignificant relationship among the professors in their selection of the most influential curriculum textbooks in relationship to the variables under investigation. A K-S (Z) of value that was positive or negative demonstrated disagreement. The observed deviation would have to be large enough to result in significance.

Procedures for Ho 2

Ho 2. There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge.

As a further test of reliability, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each respondent's score for the ratings of the importance of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge (subscales) and the ratings of the extent to which

the curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge were covered within the textbook the Professors of Curriculum selected (SPSS-X, 1988). By using this procedure, it was possible to identify the degree of agreement, item-total correlation between each item and the subscale, as well as the internal consistency for each subscale, that is the extent of homogeneity within subscale. This procedure also identified those items that best agreed with each subscale as indicated by the item-total correlation score, the degree of internal consistency for each item within subscale as indicated by the alpha if item deleted score and the degree of internal consistency for each subscale as an entity as indicated by the alpha correlation coefficient. This particular test did not analyze the textbook chosen by the participants in relationship to the correlation coefficient being calculated.

The low end item inclusion cut off for this second reliability assessment was .20. The item cut off score was decreased from .25, which was the criterion used in the pilot study for the following reasons: 1) to prevent the lost of too many curriculum practices; 2) to prevent diminishing the contribution of subscales to the overall meaning of the instrument (Cronbach, 1984); and 3) because using .20 as a low end item inclusion cut off score was supported in the literature (Thorndike, Cunningham, Hagen, &

Thorndike, 1991; Payne, 1974; Nunnally, 1970). Deleting items with insufficient alpha coefficients increased the overall reliability of the respective subscales.

Curriculum Practices and Domains of Knowledge: Uncorrected Version

Ratings of Importance

Appendix L shows the alpha coefficients for each subscale and for curriculum practices within the subscales for the importance of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge. The alpha coefficient that would have resulted if a particular item were deleted is also indicated.

Based on the low end item inclusion cut off score of .20, the following curriculum practices (items) were eliminated: curriculum evaluation (item 2); curriculum policy (items 18 and 25) and curriculum development (items 27, 38 and 46).

Regarding the rankings of the importance of curriculum practices, subscales within the domains of knowledge that evidenced high alpha coefficients (greater than + or -.75) were: curriculum philosophy (a = .84), curriculum evaluation (a = .84), and curriculum design (a = .85).

Subscales that revealed mid range alpha (+ or -.50 to .75) coefficients were: curriculum research (a = .73) curriculum history (a = .69) curriculum theory (a = .70),

curriculum policy (a = .53), and the curriculum as a field of study (a = .65) A low alpha (+ or -.25 to .50) coefficient was demonstrated in the curriculum development (a = .39) subscale.

Ratings of Coverage

Appendix M shows the alpha coefficients for the coverage of curriculum practices within domains of knowledge. Two curriculum practices (items) did not meet the low end inclusion cut off score criterion. Those items that were eliminated include: curriculum history (item 75), and curriculum as a field of study (item 39) and items eliminated in the assessment of alpha coefficients for the importance of curriculum practices with the domains of knowledge, including: curriculum policy (items 18), and curriculum development (items 27 and 38).

As for the ratings curriculum practices coverage within the domains of knowledge, the subscales that evidenced high range alpha coefficients (greater than + or -.75) included curriculum evaluation (a=.84) and curriculum design (a=.83).

Alpha coefficients in the mid range (+ or -.50 to .75) were: curriculum philosophy (a = .73), curriculum theory (a = .70), curriculum policy (a = .58), curriculum history (a = .69), curriculum research (a = .63), and curriculum as a field of study (a = .56). Curriculum development (a = .39) revealed an alpha coefficient in the low range (+ or -.25 to

.50).

Curriculum evaluation, and curriculum design demonstrated a high level of homogeneity in both importance and coverage of curriculum practices. Perhaps the concrete and definitive nature of the curriculum practices in these two subscales was the reason for their high levels of internal consistency. Curriculum development was the only subscale to evidence a low level of internal consistency for both the importance and coverage of curriculum practices. Curriculum theory, curriculum research, curriculum history, curriculum policy, and curriculum as a field of study demonstrated a mid-high level of internal consistency for both importance and coverage of curriculum practices. Curriculum philosophy showed a high range of internal consistency for the importance and mid range level of internal consistency for coverage of curriculum practices. The findings related to curriculum philosophy suggest that the items in this subscale demonstrated greater homogeniety when ranked for importance than when rated for the extent of coverage they received in textbooks selected by Professors of Curriculum.

Curriculum Practices and Domains of Knowledge: Final Version

Table 2 shows the final version and corrected instrument for curriculum practices within the domains of

Table 2

Final Instrument/Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge

Domains of Curriculum

Curriculum Philosophy		Importance		Coverage	
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	.7025	.7929	.2923	.7195
5.	Determines the ends of education.	.4880	.8041	.5602	.6106
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	.6799	.7993	.3149	.6983
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	.5323	.8318	.5070	.6437
51.	States the purposes of education.	.6428	.8070	.5420	.6256
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	.7101	.7937	.4952	.6489
		Alpha coefficient = .8450		Alpha coefficient = .7294	

Curriculum Evaluation					
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	*	*	.3360	.8394
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	.3264	.8312	.5392	.8245
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	.4984	.8194	.4839	.8285
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	.4540	.8235	.3659	.8378
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	.2716	.8354	.5154	.8277
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	.2727	.8333	.3211	.8380
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	.4624	.8214	.3834	.8352
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	.6907	.8039	.5576	.8229
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	.6040	.8117	.4501	.8307
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	.6923	.8061	.6704	.8145
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	.7697	.7988	.7604	.8076
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	.6328	.8104	.5721	.8228

Table 2 (cont'd)

Curriculum Evaluation (cont'd)		Importance		Coverage	
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	.5908	.8139	.4254	.8323
		Alpha coefficient = .8483		Alpha coefficient = .8401	

Curriculum Design		Importance		Coverage	
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	.6288	.8337	.6552	.8025
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	.7463	.8157	.7764	.7780
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	.6173	.8363	.6359	.8030
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	.7389	.8161	.5562	.8182
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	.4871	.8536	.4839	.8267
20.	Integrates careful planning.	.7631	.8145	.7608	.7811
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	.3492	.8657	.2068	.8546
		Alpha coefficients = .8505		Alpha coefficient = .8257	

Curriculum Theory					
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	.6467	.5350	.6159	.5656
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	.4298	.6448	.5007	.6213
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	.4969	.5983	.4748	.6252
33.	Identifies how students learn.	.4237	.6391	.4957	.6356
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	.2630	.7012	.2235	.7258
		Alpha coefficient = .6974		Alpha coefficient = .7036	

Curriculum Policy					
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.	*	*	*	*
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	*	*	.2241	.5859
55.	Mandates school goals.	.5309	.6847	.5109	.4167

Table 2 (cont'd)

Curriculum Policy (cont'd)

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
56.	States what ought to be taught.	.6497	.5029	.5782	.3974
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	.4942	.6970	.3209	.5443
		Alpha coefficient = .7350		Alpha coefficient = .6394	

Curriculum History

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	.4127	.6698	.5049	.5875
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	.7323	.4521	.8000	.3987
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	.5725	.5597	.4349	.6299
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.*	.2322	.7580	.1937	.7722
		Alpha coefficient = .7580		Alpha coefficient = .6883	

Curriculum Development

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
27.	Develops curriculum guides.	*	*	*	*
38.	Develops school grants.	*	*	*	*
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	.1988	.8221	.2398	.6927
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	*	*	.4242	.5747
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	.4917	.4240	.5509	.4710
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	.6499	.1813	.5064	.5213
		Alpha coefficient = .6236		Alpha coefficient = .6413	

Curriculum Research

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	.4059	.7169	.4163	.5263
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	.5783	.6543	.4728	.5082
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	.4473	.7001	.2463	.6041
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	.5201	.6744	.2968	.6194

Table 2 (cont'd)

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
Curriculum Research (cont'd)					
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	.5243	.6706	.4542	.5034
		Alpha coefficient = .7340		Alpha coefficient = .6303	
Curriculum as a field of study					
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	.2080	.7092	*	*
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	.4157	.5586	.4675	.3312
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	.6225	.4468	.3939	.4211
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	.4805	.5077	.3151	.4691
		Alpha coefficient = .7092		Alpha coefficient = .6134	

* eliminated

knowledge excluding items that were deleted as a result of having Cronbach alpha correlations of less than .20; corrected reliability information is also shown. The homogeneity for the corrected subscales within the domains with alpha coefficients ranging from .63 to .85.

Forty-seven of the fifty-five curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge were retained. Three of the domains of knowledge had only three items and this should be considered a limiting feature of the instrument. Once again, it should be noted that two subscales, curriculum change and curriculum implementation were eliminated in the reliability assessment of the pilot study.

Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge

The Spss-x program Nonpar Corr was used to compute the Spearman rho correlation coefficient. A (p) value was calculated for each of the subscales under the domains of knowledge. The textbooks selected are not an item for analysis in the Nonpar Corr test (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990).

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient is a measure association beteeen two variables that ranks objectives or individuals into two series. This procedure requires that both variables be measured in ordinal scales. The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used to rank of of the respondents on their rankings of importance (Xi) for each of the items within the nine subscales (categories) listed under the domains of knowledge and compare their relationship to the rankings of the ratings of the extent to which all of the items within the subscales (categories) were covered (Yi) with textbooks. If the ratings were perfect Xi=Yi each person would have the same rankings on the data pairs of each subscale.

Di=Xi - Yi indicates the disparity between the two sets of rankings. Since the researcher was interested in the total magnitude of the disparity between the rankings, rather than the sign (positive or negative) of all the differences between the rankings of the two variables

importance and coverage Di^2 was employed so that the index of disparity was displayed as the total magnitude. The value of EDi^2 is the sum of squared differences for the N pairs of data.

The formula for the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient is:

$$r(s) = \frac{(EXi)^2 + (EYi)^2 - (EDi)^2}{2\ (EXi)^2\ (EYi)^2}$$

where r(s) = ranks

$(EXi)^2$ = sum of the squared scores for variable Xi

$(EYi)^2$ = sum of the squared scores for variable Yi

$(EDi)^2$ = sum of the squared differences between Xi-Yi

and

$$r(s) = \frac{1 - 6\ (EDi)^2}{N3 - N}$$

where

N = the number of pairs of data.

The Spearman rho correlation was utilized to measure the degree of association of importance of items and the extent to which items within the domains (subscales) of knowledge were covered in the most influential textbooks. For each domain (subscale), the scores for all the items were totaled and divided by the number of items within the domain. A correlation of zero indicated a level of perfect disagreement between the rankings of importance and the ratings of the extent to which items within the categories were covered within the most influential curriculum

textbooks. The value of (p) would demonstrate a nonsignificant relationship.

For this study, a correlation of + or -.25 to .50 would reveal an acceptable correlation, but a small degree of agreement between the rankings of importance and the extent to which items within the domains were covered within the most influential textbooks. The value of (p) would demonstrate that agreement between importance and coverage did exist. A correlation of + or -.50 to .75 was considered a mid-range correlation. Correlations of + or -.75 to 1.00 were considered high correlations.

Since the Professors of Curriculum were given the option to freely choose one of the twelve textbooks identified as being the most influential, the assumption of normality was invalidated and the data to be analyzed did not constitute continuous measures with equal intervals. In regards to the textbooks, it was not possible to correlate the results of ratings of the extent to which the most important curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge were covered by using either parametric or nonparametric methods. Therefore, the results regarding the textbooks were assessed by using qualitative methods. Frequency of textbook selection was cited. Descriptive statistics were used to discuss the results of the rankings of the degree to which items were covered within the various textbooks. The procedures described were used to assess the

importance of the curriculum practices and the extent to which curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge were covered.

Procedures for Ho 3

Ho 3. There will be no significant difference among the Professors' of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum.

To test Ho 3, items of the three subsystems of curriculum (instruction, supervision, and evaluation) were not identified by name and the items of the subsystems were intermixed. As a further test of reliability, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each respondent's score for the rankings of the most important curriculum practices listed under the categories for the subsystems of curriculum (subscales) and for the ratings of the extent to which the curriculum practices listed under subsystems of curriculum were covered within the textbook the Professors of Curriculum selected (SPSS-X, 1988). By using this procedure it was possible to identify the degree of agreement (or item-total correlation between each item and the subscale), as well as the internal consistency for each subscale (or the extent if homogeneity within subscales). This procedure also identified those items that best agreed with each subscale as indicated by the item-total correlation score,

the degree of internal consistency for each subscale as indicated by the alpha if item deleted score, and the degree of internal consistency for each subscale as an entity indicated by the alpha correlation coefficient.

The low end item inclusion cut off score for this second reliability assessment was .20. The item cut off score was decreased from .25, which was the criterion used in the pilot study for the same reasons given for the domains (see p. 86).

Curriculum Practices and Subsystems: Uncorrected Version

Ratings of Importance

Appendix N shows the alpha coefficients for each subsystem and for the importance of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum. The alpha coefficient that would have resulted if a particular item were deleted is also indicated. A high level of homogeneity was evidenced by all of the subsystems (subscales) within the subsystems of curriculum on the reliability assessment for the importance of curriculum practices. All of the curriculum practices met the criterion for the item inclusion. Two subsystems evidenced high alpha coefficients (greater than + or -.75): supervision (a = .80), and evaluation (a = .77) The subsystems that evidenced a mid range alpha coefficients (+ or -.50 to .75) was instruction (a = .71).

Ratings of Coverage

Appendix O shows the alpha coefficients for each subsystem and for each curriculum practice for coverage of curriculum practices. All of the items met the criterion for the low end item inclusion cut off score. Each of the subsystems evidenced high alpha (greater thatn + or -.75) coefficients for the rankings of the coverage of curriculum practices. The alpha coefficients for the coverage of items within the subsystems of curriculum were: instruction (a = .85), supervision (a = .87), and evaluation (a = .80).

Supervision and evaluation demonstrated a high alpha coefficient for both the importance and coverage of curriculum practices. Instruction evidenced a mid range alpha coefficient for the importance of curriculum practices and a high alpha coefficient for the coverage of curriculum practices.

Curriculum Practices and Subsystems: Final Version

Table 3 shows the final version and corrected instrument for curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum excluding items that were deleted as a result of having Cronbach alpha correlations of less than .20. All twenty-two curriculum practices for the subsystems of curriculum were retained in the final instrument. The homogeneity for the subscales within subsystems of curriculum for the final instrument was generally strong

Table 3

Final Instrument/Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum

Instruction		Importance		Coverage	
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning	.5752	.5477	.6506	.7886
59.	Focus on sequencing learning experiences.	.4213	.6083	.7275	.7612
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	.5144	.5662	.7019	.7651
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	.5111	.5784	.6724	.7780
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	.2238	.7548	.4639	.8602
		Alpha coefficient = .7128		Alpha coefficient = .8464	
Supervision					
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	.6293	.7612	.5974	.8593
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences.	.5152	.7612	.6321	.8569
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	.6804	.7832	.7202	.8426
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	.6536	.7498	.8273	.8259
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	.6369	.7530	.7298	.8412
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	.3489	.8050	.5335	.8670
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	.2789	.8144	.5127	.8693
		Alpha coefficient = .7959		Alpha coefficient = .8699	
Evaluation					
Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	.2856	.7628	.2086	.8066
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	.4704	.7300	.4692	.7701
40.	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	.4533	.7304	.5561	.7566
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	.2559	.7566	.2241	.7932
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	.4752	.7310	.5081	.7629
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	.4597	.7306	.4294	.7730
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	.4101	.7370	.7097	.7438
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	.5031	.7220	.6070	.7489

Table 3 (cont'd)

Item		Importance: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Importance: Alpha if item deleted	Coverage: Corrected Item-total Correlation	Coverage: Alpha if item deleted
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	.4947	.7232	.6323	.7459
77.	Measures student outcomes.	.4730	.7268	.3540	.7832
		Alpha coefficient = .7668		Alpha coefficient = .7956	

with alphas ranging from .71 to .87.

Importance and Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems

The Spss-x program Nonpar Corr was used to compute the Spearman rho correlation coefficient. A p value was calculated for each of the curriculum practices under the subsystems of curriculum. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was used to compare the rankings of the importance with coverage. The methods and formula for using this procedure were already indicated (see pages 95-97).

A correlation of zero indicated a level of perfect disagreement between the rankings of importance and the ratings of the extent to which items were covered within the most influential textbooks within the subsystems of curriculum. The value of (p) would demonstrate a nonsignificant relationship. The same correlational ranges were used to show agreement between the rankings of importance and coverage of the curriculum practices for each subsystem as in the domains; + or - .25 to .50 was an

acceptable correlation. A correlation of + or -.50 to .75 was considered a mid-range correlation and + or -.75 to 1.00 were considered high correlations.

As with the domains of knowledge, the Professors of Curriculum were given the option to freely chose one of the twelve textbooks identified as being most influential. Thus the assumption of normality was invalidated and the data did not constitute continuous measures with equal intervals. Therefore, the results regarding the frequency of textbook selection were assessed with qualitative methods. The importance of the curriculum practice within subsystems of curriculum and the amount of text coverage given to curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum were assessed by the aforementioned procedures.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSES OF DATA

The overall purpose of this study was to identify the most influential textbooks in the field of curriculum and to help establish a knowledge base of curriculum practices. This chapter presents the findings and an analysis of the data.

The statistical procedures specified in Chapter IV were used to determine whether to reject or fail to reject the null hypotheses. First, an analysis of the data set for the hypotheses regarding the open ended survey are discussed. Secondly, an analysis of the data set for the hypotheses regarding the close ended survey was discussed in an attempt to address the research questions of interest.

OPEN ENDED SURVEY

Hypothesis 1a. There will be no agreement in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to their ratings of the most influential textbooks.

A minimum of 20 percent was needed for a book to be included in the listing of influential curriculum textbooks. In total, 8 books met this criterion. However, 4 textbooks

cited by 15.8% of the respondents and tied for rank order 10 were included in the listing. Table 1 lists these books and the number of votes that each received in rank order.

Schubert's Curriculum: Perspectives Paradigm and Possibility received 25 votes and was cited by 65.8% of the respondents; Eisner's The Educational Imagination received 23 votes and was selected by 60.5% of the respondents; Tanner and Tanner's Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice receive 20 votes and was cited by 52.6% of the respondents. Zais: Curriculum: Principles and Foundations earned 12 votes by 31.6% of the respondents. Eisner and Vallance's Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum and Pinar's Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists both were given 11 votes by 28.9% of the respondents. Apple's Ideology and Curriculum earned 9 votes by 21.1% of the respondents.

An examination of Table indicates that there was considerable agreement in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to their ratings of the most influential textbooks. Based on the listing of the most influential textbooks and in accordance with the definition of agreement, null hypothesis 1a was rejected.[2] **Hypothesis 1b.** There will be no significant differences in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to

---

[2] Based on consultation with Drs. Jack Kavanagh and Ron rgan, who teach advanced statistics and research at Loyola iversity of Chicago, it is agreed that there was no statistical st to determine the veracity of falsity of null hypothesis 1a.

their ratings of the most influential textbooks across a) gender; b) doctorate specialization, c) year doctorate was earned, d) geographical region of the institution in which their doctorate was awarded, and e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation.

Descriptive statistics for the open ended survey indicated that the sample was comprised of 71.1% males, (N=27) and 28.9% females, (N=11). Demographic data revealed that four individuals or 10.5% received their doctorate between 1951-1960. Most of the respondents, that is 42.1% or (N=16) completed their doctorate between 1961-70. Thirteen individuals or 43.2% earned their doctorate between 1971-80. Between 1981-90, 13.2% or (N = 5) earned their doctorate. None of the respondents were awarded their doctorate before 1950.

Those receiving doctorates at institutions in both the northeast and midwest were equal, N=15 or (39.5%). Eight individuals or 21.1% were awarded the doctorate at institutions located in the southeast. None of the respondents completed doctorates at institutions located in the northwest or southwest.

Ten respondents or (26.3%) were actively teaching in institutions located in the midwest, 13 in the southeast or (34.2%), 7 in the northeast (18.4%) or 6 in the southwest or (15.8%), and 2 in the northwest or (5.35%).

Thirty-four or 89.5% of the respondents had a degree in

curriculum and/or instruction. Four individuals or 10.5% had a doctorate in another field of education.

Overall, the sample population was comprised of mostly male, curriculum and instruction professors who completed their doctorates between 1961 and 1980 at eastern or midwestern and western universities, 20 taught at eastern universities.

Discussion of the Chi-Square Results

Chi-square statistic were used to evaluate the potential of significant relationship between textbooks and the aforementioned demographic variables and partially address the following:

1. Was there was a significant difference in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and gender?

2. Was there a significant difference in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and doctorate specialization?

3. Was there a significant difference in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and the geographical region of their current affiliation?

4. Was there a significant difference in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and the geographical region of

the institution where they received their doctorate?

5. Was there a significant difference in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and the year they earned their doctorate?

The same complement of 27 (71.1%) males and 11 (28.9%) females was used to assess the potential of significant relationships among females and males' rankings in their rating of the most influential textbooks in the field of curriculum revealed both nonsignificant Pearson and the phi statistic at the .78 level. This means that gender did not significantly influence the selection of the most influential textbooks. The null hypothesis concerning gender was not rejected.

Analyzing the potential of significant relationships among the professors' doctorate specialization (curriculum and/or instruction or other) in relationship in their rankings of the most influential textbooks revealed both a nonsignificant Pearson and phi statistic at the .30 level. The professors' doctorate specialization did not appear to significantly influence the selection of the most influential curriculum textbooks. The null hypothesis concerning the ratings of the most influential textbooks and the field of the professors' earned doctorate was not rejected.

In assessing the relationship between the geographical

region of the Professors of Curriculum current affiliation and their ranking of the ratings of the most influential textbooks, the Pearson and the phi statistical values were found to be nonsignificant at the .54 level. The findings demonstrate that the graphical region of the Professors of Curriculum current affiliation did not significantly influence the professors of rankings of the ratings of the most influential textbooks. Thus, the null hypothesis about professors' rankings of the most influential textbooks and the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation was not rejected.

Analyzing the potential of a significant relationship between the geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned with respect to the rankings of the most influential textbooks demonstrated both a nonsignificant Pearson and phi statistic at the .08 level.[3] The results indicate that where professors earned their doctorates did not significantly influence their selection of the most influential textbooks. Thus, the null hypothesis that states that there will be no significant differences in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks and the geographical region of the institution

---

[3] As previously described, the five categories originally designated for the geographical region of the institution where the professors earned their doctorate was collapsed into two categories, midwest and regions other than the midwest.

where the doctorate was earned was not rejected.

Assessing the relationship between the year the professors earned their doctorate with respect to their rankings of the ratings of the most influential textbooks evidenced both nonsignificant Pearson and phi statistic at the .32 level.[4] The results demonstrate that the year in which professors earned their doctorates did not significantly influence the selection of the most influential textbooks. Consequently, the null hypothesis concerning the professors' ratings of the most influential textbooks and year their doctorate was earned was not rejected.

Discussion of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Results

The Spss-x Nonpar Corr program was implemented in order to utilize the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test. The following research questions were addressed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in an effort to assess the level of agreement between the Professors of Curriculum selection of textbooks and the demographic variables. Were there significant differences in rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks across: a) gender; b) doctorate specialization,

---

[4] As previously described, the six categories originally designated for the year in which professors earned their doctorates were collapsed into two categories, 1951 to 1970 and 1971 to 1990.

c) year doctorate was earned; d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned; e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation?

The results demonstrated nonsignificant p values for each of the aforementioned questions. The probability levels related to the demographic variables a -e were < .999, 1.00, 1.00, .510, and .989 respectively (See Appendix P for details).

Analyzing the level of agreement between the professors textbook selection and gender, resulted in a K-S value of .377 and $p \leq .999$. This indicated that both samples were homogeneous groups.

Curriculum and/or instruction and doctorate specialization in another field were two samples used in the analysis to assess the level of agreement between the professors' textbook selection and doctorate specialization. A K-S value of .250 and $p \leq 1.000$ revealed that both samples were homogeneous.

The period of 1951 to 1970 and 1971 to 1990 were the two samples used to analyze the level of agreement between the professor's textbook selection and the year the doctorate was earned. A K-S value of .445 and $p \leq .989$ indicated that both samples were homogeneous.

Regions other than the midwest and the midwest were the two samples utilized to investigate the level of agreement

between the professors' textbook selection and the geographical region where the professors earned the doctorate. A K-S value of .821 and a $p \leq .510$ evidence that both samples were homogeneous.

West, including the midwest and east constituted the two samples analyzed to determine the level of agreement between the professors' textbook selection and the geographical region of their current affiliation. A K-S value of .274, and $p \leq 1.000$ demonstrated that both samples were homogeneous.

It is notable that the resulting p values for determining the level of agreement between the Professors of Curriculum selection of the most influential curriculum textbooks and doctorate specialization, and the Professors of Curriculum selection of the most influential textbooks and year they earned their doctorate were a high probability score of ≤ 1.00 (See Appendix P). Assessing the level of agreement between the Professors of Curriculum identification of the most influential textbooks and gender evidenced a high probability score at the $\leq .999$ level. Determining the level of agreement between the Professors of Curriculum selection of the most influential textbooks and the geographical region of their current affiliation resulted in a high probability score at the $\leq .989$ level. The level of agreement between the Professors of Curriculum selection of the most influential textbooks and the

geographical region of the institution at which the doctorate was earned demonstrated a probability score in the mid-high range at the $\leq$ .510 level (See Appendix P).

Taken as a whole, the results of the K-S test demonstrate that there were no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks by gender, doctorate specialization, year doctorate was earned, geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned, the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation. Therefore the null hypothesis stating that there will be no significant differences in rankings among the Professors of Curriculum in their ratings of the most influential textbooks by a) gender; b) doctorate specialization; c) year doctorate was earned; d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned; and e) the geographical region of their current institutional affiliation was not rejected. Finally, it should be noted that the findings related to the K-S test demonstrate that the two samples analyzed for all five comparisons were taken from the same population and were homogeneous groups.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of the curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge.

Fifty-five items corresponding to the nine subscales

within the domains of knowledge were randomized within the survey; however, for the purposes of analysis, survey items that deal with this question are listed within their respective domain (Refer to Table 4). Table 4 shows the mean responses of the Professors or Curriculum for importance and text coverage for each item within its respective category.

Importance of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge

Mean scores in the range of 1-2, denoted that items were very unimportant. Ranges of 2-3, denoted that items were fairly unimportant; scores in the range of 3-4 indicated that items were of some importance, and items with mean scores greater than 4 demonstrated that items were fairly important, as per the Likert scale. In terms of importance, eight mean curriculum practices were ranked as fairly unimportant; thirty-two were ranked of some importance, and fifteen were ranked as fairly important. For a complete summary of frequency responses for the ratings of the importance of curriculum practices in the domains of knowledge of curriculum, see Appendix Q.

Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Domains of Knowledge

Mean scores in the range of 1-2, denoted that items were covered very little extent. Mean scores in the range of 2-3, denoted that items were covered little extent,

Table 4

Mean Responses for the Importance of Curriculum Practices and the Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge by Professors of Curriculum

	Domains of Curriculum	Importance	Coverage
Curriculum Philosophy			
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	4.0588	3.9412
5.	Determines the ends of education.	3.9412	3.9608
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	4.3529	4.4902
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	4.3922	4.2745
51.	States the purposes of education.	4.1176	4.1961
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	4.1961	4.4510
Curriculum Evaluation			
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	4.0980	3.5490
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	3.7451	2.7647
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	3.2745	2.7647
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	3.4706	2.9412
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	3.7647	3.2745
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	2.4510	2.1373
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	3.1765	2.6667
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	2.9412	3.2157
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	3.5098	3.1569
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	3.3922	3.1765
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	3.1765	2.7843
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	3.6667	3.0588
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	3.7451	3.5490
Curriculum Design			
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	3.5882	3.2353
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	3.4118	2.7059
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	3.6667	3.2549
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	3.7059	3.4118
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	4.3529	4.2157

Table 4 (cont'd)

20.	Integrates careful planning.	3.6853	3.2549
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	2.7843	2.4902
	Curriculum Theory		
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	3.9608	3.9020
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	3.4314	3.1373
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	4.1569	3.9412
33.	Identifies how students learn.	3.4902	2.8039
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	3.7843	3.7843
	Curriculum Policy		
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.	3.9608	3.7059
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	3.0196	2.6863
55.	Mandates school goals.	2.4706	2.5098
56.	States what ought to be taught.	2.7647	2.8431
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	2.5882	2.3529
	Curriculum History		
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	4.2745	4.3725
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	3.8627	4.1176
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	3.7059	3.7059
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.	4.0196	3.827
	Curriculum Development		
27.	Develops curriculum guides.	2.4510	1.9804
38.	Develops school grants.	2.0784	1.6078
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	3.4510	2.9216
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	3.9804	3.6471
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	3.9608	3.5294
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	3.8824	4.1373
	Curriculum Research		
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	3.7451	3.6275
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	4.1765	4.1373
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	3.2157	3.0980
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	3.2941	3.1373

Table 4 (cont'd)

69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	4.2157	3.9804
Curriculum as a field of study			
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	3.6863	3.4706
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	4.1765	3.9608
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	4.3137	4.0196
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	4.0392	3.9608

Notes:

Importance	Coverage
5 = very important	5 = very great extent
4 = fairly important	4 = great extent
3 = some importance	3 = some extent
2 = fairly unimportant	2 = little extent
1 = very unimportant	1 = very little extent

scores greater in the range 3-4 indicated that items were covered to some extent. Items with mean scores greater than 4 demonstrated that items were covered to a great extent, as per the Likert scale.

As for coverage, two curriculum practices were rated to be covered very little extent; fourteen were rated covered to a little extent; twenty-nine were judged to be covered some extent; and ten were rated covered to a great extent. For a complete summary of frequency responses for the ratings of the coverage of curriculum practices in the domains of knowledge of curriculum, see Appendix R.

Each of the curriculum practices were assessed by nonparametric correlational techniques to measure the strength of association between the ratings of importance of curriculum practices and the extent to which the curriculum practices were covered in the selected textbook. Table 5

Table 5

Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Items within the Domains of Knowledge

Curriculum Philosophy

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	.4526	48	.001***
5.	Determines the ends of education.	.7049	49	.001***
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	.5911	48	.001***
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	.4487	50	.001***
51.	States the purposes of education.	.7251	50	.001***
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	.4399	50	.001***

Curriculum Evaluation

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	.3076	47	.05*
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	.4082	47	.01**
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	.4835	47	.001***
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	.6033	47	.001***
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	.5981	48	.001***
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	.6841	50	.001***
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	.5012	49	.001***
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	.6196	48	.001***
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	.6979	49	.001***
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	.3765	48	.01**
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	.5050	48	.001***
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	.4335	49	.001***
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	.5789	49	.001***

Curriculum Design

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	.4870	48	.001***
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	.6428	48	.001***
13.	Selects subject and learning experiences.	.5743	47	.001***

Table 5 (cont'd)

15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	.6986	47	.001***

Curriculum Theory

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	.7194	47	.001***
20.	Integrates careful planning.	.5302	48	.001***
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	.5126	50	.001***
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	.6695	49	.001***
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	.4417	46	.001***
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	.6097	48	.001***
33.	Identifies how students learn.	.2799	50	.05*
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	.5780	48	.001***

Curriculum Policy

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.	.8301	48	.001***
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	.5489	50	.001***
55.	Mandates school goals.	.5897	47	.001***
56.	States what ought to be taught.	.5695	49	.001***
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	.5276	48	.001***

Curriculum History

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	.7001	48	.001***
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	.6873	50	.001***
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	.7038	50	.001***
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.	.7661	49	.001***

Curriculum Development

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
27.	Develops curriculum guides.	.6286	49	.001***
38.	Develops school grants.	.5903	49	.001***
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	.6773	50	.001***
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	.6206	50	.001***
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	.5430	48	.001***
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	.3629	48	.01**

Table 5 (cont'd)

Curriculum Research

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	.3848	49	.01**
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	.3757	50	.01**

Curriculum Theory

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	.5778	50	.001***
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	.8349	47	.001***
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	.6519	49	.001***

Curriculum as a field of study

Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	.6715	49	.001***
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	.5639	49	.001***
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	.7305	50	.001***
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	.6669	49	.001***

Significance < .05*

Significance < .01**

Significance < .001***

shows the correlation coefficients computed for each the curriculum practices and representative subscales within the domains of knowledge.

Table 5 indicates that there were significant levels of agreement between the ratings of the importance of curriculum practices and coverage of the corresponding curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge. Forty-eight items evidenced a Spearman correlation coefficient significant at < .001 level. Two items were significant at the < .01 level. Five items were significant at the < .05 level. Table 6 shows the correlation coefficient computer for each subscale with the domains of knowledge. As indicated in Table 6 there were significant levels agreement between the ratings of the importance and coverage of the corresponding subscales within the domains of knowledge. In fact, the Spearman correlation coefficients for each of the nine subscales were significant at the < .001 level.

Based on the results of the Spearman correlation coefficients that hypothesis that states there will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge can not be rejected.

For the purposes of hypotheses 2 and 3 and with respect to the textbooks selected in the close ended survey, Table 7

Table 6

Spearman Correlation Coefficient for the Importance of Curriculum Practices with the Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Subscales within the Domains of Knowledge

Domains of Knowledge	Coefficient	N	Significance
Curriculum Philosophy	.7571	50	.001***
Curriculum Evaluation	.5689	50	.001***
Curriculum Design	.6050	50	.001***
Curriculum Theory	.7247	50	.001***
Curriculum Policy	.6571	50	.001***
Curriculum History	.8348	50	.001***
Curriculum Development	.5746	50	.001***
Curriculum Research	.6505	50	.001***
Curriculum as a Field of Study	.7264	50	.001***

Significance < .05*
Significance < .01**
Significance < .001***

Table 7

Summary of Frequency Responses to Most Influential Textbooks in Curriculum by Order of Rank: Selected by Professors of Curriculum

Author	Textbook Title	Votes	Percent	Rank
Schubert, William	Curriculum: Perspectives Paradigm and Possibility	13	25.5	1
Tanner, D. & Tanner, L.	Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice	9	17.8	2.5
Zais, Robert	Curriculum: Principles and Foundations	9	17.8	2.5
Goodlad, John	A Place Called School	6	11.8	4
Pinar, William	Contemporary Curriculum Discourse	5	9.8	5
Eisner, Elliot	The Educational Imagination	4	7.8	6
Eisner, Elliot & Vallance, Elizabeth	Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum	3	5.9	7
Goodlad, John	Curriculum Inquiry	1	2.0	8
Apple, Michael	Ideology and Curriculum	0	0.0	10
Giroux, H. Penna, A. Pinar, W.	Curriculum and Instruction	0	0.0	10
Kliebard, Herbert	The Struggle for the American Curriculum (1893-1958)	0	0.0	10
Pinar, William	Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists	0	0.0	10

presents a descriptive summary regarding the most influential textbooks in curriculum. Schubert's Curriculum: Perspectives, Paradigms, and Possibilities was selected by 13 respondents, or 25.5%. Both Tanner and Tanner's Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice and Zais' Curriculum: Principles and Foundation were selected by 9 or

17.8% of the respondents.[5]

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum. The subsystems of curriculum were: instruction, supervision, and evaluation.

Twenty-two items corresponding to the subsystems of curriculum were randomized within the close-ended survey. Table 8 shows the mean responses of the Professors of Curriculum for Importance and extent covered for each item, within the respective categories.

Importance of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems

As with the domains of knowledge, mean scores of 1-2 indicated that curriculum practices were very unimportant. Ranges of 2-3 denoted that items were fairly unimportant; scores in the range of 3-4 indicated that items were of some importance; and items with mean scores greater than 4 demonstrated that items were fairly important. With respect to importance, seven curriculum practices were ranked fairly unimportant; fourteen were ranked of some importance; and one was ranked fairly important. For a complete summary of frequency responses for the ratings of the importance of

---

[5] One respondent who completed the survey failed to lected a textbook. This accounts for 2% of the possible book lection votes.

Table 8

Mean Responses for the Importance of Curriculum Practices and the Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum

	Subsystems of Curriculum	Importance	Coverage
Instruction			
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	2.1765	2.0000
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	2.7843	2.5490
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	3.0000	2.9020
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	3.5820	3.2745
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	4.0392	3.7643
Supervision			
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	3.1569	2.8431
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences.	3.0392	2.5490
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	3.5294	3.0392
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	3.6276	3.1176
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	3.1371	2.6078
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	2.4314	2.0980
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	2.8824	2.1569
Evaluation			
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum	3.7451	3.6667
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design	3.8235	3.5294
40.	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	3.6863	3.1569
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	2.9608	2.4902
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	3.5294	3.0392
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	3.1765	2.4510
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	2.9216	2.4510
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	3.6667	3.0784
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	3.0392	2.7647
77.	Measures student outcomes.	2.9216	2.3330

Notes:

Importance	Coverage
5 = very important	5 = very great extent
4 = fairly important	4 = great extent
3 = some importance	3 = some extent
2 = fairly unimportant	2 = little extent
1 = very unimportant	1 = very little extent

curriculum practices in the subsystems of curriculum, see Appendix Q.

Coverage of Curriculum Practices: Subsystems

Mean scores in the range of 1-2 indicated that curriculum practices were covered to a very little extent. Mean scores in the range of 2-3, denoted that items were covered to some extent; scores in the range of 3-4 indicated that items were covered to some extent; and items with mean scores greater than 4 demonstrated that items were covered to a great extent, as per the Likert scale. In connection with coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems, thirteen scores were rated covered a little extent and nine were judged covered to some extent. For a complete summary of frequency responses for the ratings of the coverage of curriculum practices in the subsystems of curriculum, see Appendix R.

Each of the curriculum practices were assessed by nonparametric correlational techniques to measure the strength of agreement between the ratings of importance of curriculum practices and the extent to which curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum were covered in the selected textbook. Table 9 shows the correlation coefficients computed for each the curriculum practices for the subscales within the subsystems of curriculum. As indicated by Table 9 significant levels of agreement between

Table 9

Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Items within the Subsystems of Curriculum

Instruction Item		Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	.5705	49	.001***
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	.6360	48	.001***
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	.5233	47	.001***
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	.6834	48	.001***
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	.5511	42	.001***
Supervision Item		**Coefficient**	**N pairs**	**Significance**
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	.3593	49	.01**
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback.	.5135	48	.001***
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	.3979	48	.01***
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	.6600	47	.001***
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	.5472	48	.001***
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	.7454	50	.001***
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	.4366	50	.001***
Evaluation Item		**Coefficient**	**N pairs**	**Significance**
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	.6898	47	.001***
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	.5443	50	.001***
40.	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	.5279	49	.001***
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	.6419	50	.001***
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	.5404	49	.001***
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	.7173	50	.001***
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry our instruction.	.4810	50	.001***
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	.4563	48	.001***
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	.4272	48	.001***
77.	Measures student outcomes.	.6201	49	.001***

Significance < .05*
Significance < .01**
Significance < .001***

the ratings of the importance and coverage of the corresponding curriculum practices for all of the items within the subsystems of curriculum were evidenced. Twenty items evidenced Spearman correlation coefficients significant at the < .001 level; two items showed strong relationship at the < .01 level. This means that, with respect to the subsystems of curriculum, Professors of Curriculum scored in the same direction the importance and coverage of a curriculum practices in textbooks.

Table 10 shows the correlation coefficients computed for the subscales within the subsystems of curriculum. Significant levels of agreement were demonstrated between the ratings of the importance and coverage of subscales or subsystems of curriculum. Each of the subscales demonstrated Spearman correlation coefficients significant at the < .001 level. In other words, Professors of Curriculum scored in the same direction, the importance and coverage of subscales or subsystems of curriculum.

Based on the results of the Spearman correlation coefficients, the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regard to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum can not be rejected.

Table 10

Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Importance of Curriculum Practices with Coverage of Curriculum Practices by Subscales within the Subsystems of Curriculum

Subscale	Coefficient	N pairs	Significance
Instruction	.6345	49	.001***
Supervision	.6171	50	.001***
Evaluation	.5446	50	.001***

Significance < .05*

Significance < .01**

Significance < .001***

Summary and Analysis of Findings

The findings in this study revealed very strong correlations between the ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within textbooks. This supports the notion that Professors of Curriculum selected textbooks that were consistent with their viewpoints regarding domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum. Because of the strong agreement between importance and coverage, the findings suggest that there exists a set of curriculum practices that represent what the investigator defined as domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to determine if the Professors of Curriculum would select textbooks that were consistent with the viewpoints they identified as most important regarding the domains of knowledge in curriculum and subsystems of curriculum. By identifying the domains and subsystems, it was hoped that a knowledge base of curriculum practices could be established.

The results of this study showed that the Professors of Curriculum identified twelve influential textbooks in curriculum. There were no significant differences among the professors with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge; there were also no significant differences among the professors with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum. In context with the limitations of this study, a knowledge base of curriculum practices was identified.

This chapter begins with a description of what has taken place up to this point. Secondly, a summary of the

findings regarding the curriculum practices in the domains and subsystems, and the professors' selection of textbooks in the close ended survey is presented. Thirdly, the test results for the null hypothesis are described. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the unanticipated limitations that emerged in the course of this study, recommendations for future research, and a summary.

Background Information of the Study

Up to the present, this investigator has attempted to identify a knowledge base of curriculum practices. These curriculum practices were described in terms of domains of knowledge in curriculum and subsystems of curriculum. A survey instrument was developed. The domains and subsystems were quantified through formal reliability and validity and agreed upon by experts in the field. A group of expert judges categorized the items to ensure adequate and appropriate definitions of the universe of domains and subsystems and to enhance content validity of the instrument. A group of Chicago Public School teachers rated the importance of the curriculum practices for the purposes of establishing reliability. A selection of influential textbooks in the field of curriculum published between 1970-1990 was undertaken; twelve textbooks were identified by Professors of Curriculum. By means of a close-ended survey approach, these items were further shown to demonstrate

internal consistency and agreement between their ratings of importance and extent of text coverage by the Professors of Curriculum.

Professors of Curriculum Selection of Textbooks in the Close Ended Survey

Schubert's Curriculum: Perspectives, Paradigm, & Possibilities was selected most frequently in both the close ended and open ended survey. This findings suggests that his textbook was influential, but does not necessarily imply that it is widely used and regarded as a textbook in the field of curriculum. It would be problematic to make any assumptions about the usage or importance of the textbooks shown in Table 7 because the N is too small to render generalizations. The findings presented in Table 7 are the perceptions of the Professors of Curriculum; they are not necessarily generalizable to other populations. Collectively, Schubert's text, Tanner & Tanner's Curriculum: Theory into Practice, and Zais Curriculum: Principles and Foundations were cited by 60.7% or (N=31) of the professors who responded to the close ended survey. These results indicated that Professors of Curriculum were most familiar with these three textbooks. Other texts listed in rank order were: Eisner's The Educational Imagination (N=4, 7.8%); Eisner & Vallance's Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum (N=3, 5.9%), Goodlad's A Place Called School

(N=6, 11.8%), and Pinar's Contemporary Curriculum Discourses (N=5, 9.5%). Selection votes assigned to these four textbooks accounted for 35.3% or (N=18) of the close ended survey responses. Perhaps these textbooks were cited less frequently than the Schubert, Tanner & Tanner, and Zais' textbooks because the professors were less familiar with them.

It should be noted that there was similiarity in the rank order listings of textbooks in the open and close ended surveys. The Schubert, Eisner, and Tanner & Tanner textbooks were ranked one to three respectively in the open ended survey. In the close ended survey, the Schubert, Tanner & Tanner, and Zais textbooks were ranked one through three. The differences in the rank ordering of the textbooks was probably related to the nature of the survey tasks. In the open ended survey the professors were asked to list up to ten books without indicating rank. In the close ended survey the professors were instructed to select only one textbook.

Summary of Findings Related to Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge and Subsystems

Of the original 77 items, 69 curriculum practices (90%) remained at the conclusion of this study. These items were those that demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency, and had an alpha coefficient of at least .20.

only three acceptable items remained for three domains of knowledge: curriculum policy, curriculum development, and curriculum as a field of study. Since the established minimum number of items for a subscale was four, the underrepresentation for these domains represents a limitation of the final survey instrument. The contribution of a subscale of less than four items to the overall meaning of the instrument is somewhat questionable. This suggests that perhaps the curriculum practices or the subscale were unimportant, or that neither were a priority consideration for this particular group of respondents, namely the Professors of Curriculum.

Implications of this Study

A summary of the findings in relationship to the hypotheses indicates that: (1) **Hypothesis 1a** stating that there will be no agreement in the rankings among the Professors of Curriculum with respect to their ratings of the most influential textbooks was rejected. (2) **Hypothesis 1b** stating that there will be no significant differences among the Professor of Curriculum with regard to their rankings of the most influential textbooks across: a) gender; b) doctorate specialization; c) year doctorate was earned; d) geographical region of the institution where the doctorate was earned; and e) the geographical region of the institution of their current affiliation can not be

rejected. (3) **Hypothesis 2** stating there will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the domains of knowledge can not be rejected. (4) **Hypothesis 3** stating that there will be no significant differences among the Professors of Curriculum with regards to their ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices within the subsystems of curriculum can not be rejected. Additionally, a knowledge base of curriculum practices appears to have been established within the overall context of this study.

These findings have both practical implications as well as implications for future research. The Professors' of Curriculum ratings of the importance and coverage of curriculum practices in the domains and subsystems suggests evidence of a consensus between the professors' theoretical and philosophical beliefs and their textbook selections.

As stated in the introduction, the curriculum practices (items) were selected by the investigator's synthesis of curriculum textbooks published between 1970 to 1990 and are limited to the domains of knowledge and subsystems of curriculum. These items are representative of the kinds of activities in which teachers, curriculum specialists, teacher education professors and curriculum professors engage. Perhaps they will be useful in clarifying a knowledge base of tasks that guide program development or

assist practitioners in identifying professional and educational needs.

The knowledge base of curriculum practices identified in this investigation might influence design and delivery of professional education programs; help define program purpose; and provide education with a focus for thinking about curriculum and instructional techniques. These practices might be useful in formulating a framework for professional education, establishing structure for making informed decisions, evaluating program delivery, or identifying organizational disparities. They might also be useful in assisting educational settings define goals, identify organizing themes, and develop program models.

Limitations of this study

1. Regarding the listing of textbooks in the open ended survey, it was not clear from the instructions if the textbooks had to have been published between 1970 to 1990, or that a 1970 to 1990 edition of a work with an earlier initial year of publication could be listed. Greater precision should have been exercised in stating this definition.
2. The curriculum practices comprising the domains of knowledge in curriculum and the subsystems of curriculum were selected independently of the textbooks. Perhaps selecting the curriculum practices

from the textbooks identified by the Professors of Curriculum would have been a more appropriate procedure. If the curriculum practices had been selected from textbooks, they might have been representative of ideas advocated in those books or limited to just those textbooks. Therefore, it is questionnable whether the universe of curriculum practices would have been represented by using this approach. It is this investigator's belief that the processes utilized to determine the curriculum practices in this study permitted a more comprehensive identification process.

3. This investigation did not eliminate textbook authors who were members of the Professors of Curriculum. As previously described, textbook authors who participated in the open and close ended surveys constituted only 5.7% and 3.78% of the sample populations respectively.
4. This study did not utilize a mechanism to validate the Professors of Curriculum identification of the most influential textbooks.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the findings of this study are suggestions for further study.

1. Methods and procedures similar to this investigation might be utilized to determined whether other social

science disciplines such as psychology or sociology have an established knowledge base of practices.

2. The method of systematically identifying topical categories might be applied to undergraduate or graduate level curriculum textbooks, classical books or content area textbooks to determine if specific domains of knowledge exist.

3. Subsequent investigations might begin with a preselected list of textbooks and elicit the Professors of Curriculum assistance, knowledge, and expertise in identifying curriculum practices.

4. A listing of sales figures regarding curriculum textbooks might be utilized to validate the professors identification of the most influential textbooks. Future studies might include sales information to establish a selection of the most influential textbooks.

5. This study restricted the professors' textbook selections to books published between 1970 to 1990. Future research might identify the most influential textbooks in curriculum without an epochical restriction.

6. This study did not differentiate between textbooks used at the undergraduate or graduate levels. A different listing might have resulted had the open ended survey instructions requested this distinction. In this

connection, future studies might ask respondents to indicate their division (undergraduate and graduate) and in addition to the Professors of Curriculum, request that respondents identify the most influential curriculum textbooks at the two level. From these respondents, a sample population could be chosen to participate in a close-ended survey of curriculum practices similar to the one used in the study described here.

7. The curriculum practices statements in the survey might have suggested a view of curriculum that was not applicable to books such as Giroux, Penna & Pinar's Curriculum and Instruction. Pinar's Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists and Apple's Ideology and Curriculum. Additional research might utilize the close ended survey instrument with a selection of general curriculum textbooks and compare the findings to the results of this study.

8. The Professors of Curriculum was the only respondent group surveyed for this study. The findings in this investigation are therefore limited to their perceptions. Additional research that included a sample of education department chairs, or directors of teacher education in the public and/or private sector universities, as well as the Professors of Curriculum would provide comparative data that could be used to

validate the curriculum practices identified in this study.

Summary

Using a researcher-constructed instrument, open and closed ended survey approaches, this study identified a list of the most influential textbooks in curriculum, a knowledge base of curriculum practices in textbooks, and showed that the Professors of Curriculum tended to select textbooks that advocated the curriculum practices that they identified as most important. The implications of these findings were also discussed in terms of future practices and research studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Heritage Dictionary (1983). New York, New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Anderson, C.H. and Murray, J.D. (1971). The Professors. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc.

Apple, M.W. (1988). Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education. New York, New York: Routledge.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieh, A. (1990). Introduction to Research in Education. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Beauchamp, G. (1981). Curriculum Theory. Fourth Edition. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock.

Beauchamp, G. (1971-1973). Basic Components of a Curriculum Theory. Curriculum Theory Network, 10, 16-22.

Berdie, D.R., Anderson, J. F. and Niebuhr, M.A. (1986). Questionnaires: Design and Use. Second Edition. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Berlin, Barney M. and others (1988). The Principal as Curriculum Leader: Expectations vs. Performance. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 72 (509) 43-49.

Bernstein, H.T. (1988). A Conspiracy of Good Intentions: America's Textbook Fiasco. Washington, District of Columbia: The Council for Basic Education.

Bernstein, H.T. (1985). The New Politics of Textbook Adoption. Education Digest, 51, 12-15.

Bertilson, H.S. (1983, October). Inaccuracy of Knowledge Represented in College Textbooks: Aggression as an Example. Paper presented at the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association Meeting, Jackson Hole, Wyoming. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 995).

Borg, W.R., and Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction. Fifth Edition, New York, New York: Longman Inc.

Bowler, M. (1978). Textbook Publishers Try to Please All, but First They Woo the Heart of Texas. The Reading Teacher. 31(2) 514-518.

Bowler, M. (1978). The Making of a Textbook. Learning. 6 (7) 38-42

Bruner, J.S. (1968). Toward a Theory of Instruction. New York, New York: W.W. Norton.

Cody, C. (1990). The Politics of Textbook Publishing, Adoption and Use in Textbooks and Schooling in the United States. Eighty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Cole, J.Y., and Sticht, T. Editors. (1981). The Textbook in American Society. Washington, District of Columbia Information Office. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 185).

Cronbach, L.J. (1984). Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York, New York: Harper and Row, Inc.

Doll, R.C. (1989). Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process. Seventh Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Duin, A.H. and Prenn, M. (1985). Identifying the Factors that Make Expository Text More Comprehensible. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 856)

Eisner, E.W. (1985). The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs. Second Edition. New York, New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E.W. (1987). Why Textbooks Influence Curriculum. Curriculum Review, 26, 11-13.

English, F.W., Ed. (1983). Fundamental Curriculum Decisions. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

English, R. (1980). The Politics of Textbook Adoption. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(4). 275-280.

Ennis, C.D. and Hooper, L.M. (1988). Development of an Instrument for Assessing Educational Value Orientations. Curriculum Studies, 20(3), 277-280.

Fraley, A.B. (1977). Core Curriculum: An Epic in the History of Educational Reform. Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia College.

Galluzzo, G.R. and Pankratz. R.S. (1990). Five Attributes of a Teacher Education Program Knowledge Base. Journal of Teacher Education. 41 (4). 7-14.

Galtung, J. (1967). Theory and Methods of Social Research. New York, New York: Columbia University Press.

Gideonse, H.D. (1989). Relating Knowledge to Teacher Education: Responding to NCATE'S Knowledge Base and Related Standards. New York, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Giroux, H.A., Penna, A.N. & Pinar, W.F. (1981). Curriculum & Instruction: Alternatives in Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.

Gronlund, N.E. (1985). Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. Third Edition. New York, New York: MacMillan.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991). Values in Pedagogical Content Knowledge. Journal of Teacher Education. 41(3) 44-52.

Husen, T. and Postlethwaite, T.N. (1985). The International Encyclopedia of Education. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Jaeger, R.M. Ed. (1988). Complementary Methods for Research in Education. Washington, District of Columbia: American Educational Research Association.

Johnson, M. J. (1976). An Invited Response to "What Curriculum for Graduate Instruction in Curriculum? Part 1". Curriculum Inquiry, 6(1), 83-87.

Johnson, M.J. (1970-1971). Appropriate Research Directions in Curriculum & Instruction. Curriculum Theory Network. 6, 24-37.

Johnson, M.J. (1968-1970). On the Meaning of Curriculum Design. Curriculum Theory Network, 3, 3-9.

Keith, S. (1985). Choosing Textbooks: A Study of Materials Selection processes for Public Education. Book Researh Quarterly, 1(Summer) 24-37.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research. Third Edition. Orlando, Florida: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kimpston, R.D. 91986). A Framework for Curriculum Research. Curriculum Inquiry, 16(4), 463-474.

Komoski, P.K. (1980). What Curriculum Leaders Need to Know About Selecting Instructional Materials. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (35th, Atlanta, Georgia. March 29-April 2, 1980.) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 146).

Leithwood, K. Graduate Curriculum Studies with a Focus on Curriculum Processes. Curriculum Inquiry. 13(1), 65-84.

Madaus, F. and Stufflebeam, D. Editors. (1988). Educational Evaluation: Classic Works of Ralph W. Tyler. Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academics.

Marshall, J.D. 91986). The Politics of Curriculum Decisions Manifested through the Selection and Adoption of Textbooks for Texas. Doctoral dissertation. University of Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 900).

Mason, E. and Bramble, W.J. (1978). Understanding and Conducting Research. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

McNeil, J.D. (1990). Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction. Fourth Edition. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.

Morrill, P.H. and Spees, E.R. (1982). The Academic Profession. New York, New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.

Norusis, M.J. (1988). The SPSS Guide to Data Analysis for SPSS-X. Chicago, Illinois: SPSS, Inc.

Oberg, A. (1985). Curriculum Study and Professional Practice: How are they Linked? Curriculum Studies, 17(2), 207-209.

Ornstein, A.C. (1990). Strategies for Effective Teaching. New York, New York: Harper & Row.

Ornstein, A.C. and Hunkins, F. (1988). Curriculum: Foundations, Principles & Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Ornstein, A.C. and Levine, D. (1989). Foundations of Education. Fourth Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin.

Ornstein, A.C. (1987). The Field of Curriculum. What Approach? What Definition? High School Journal. 70(4), 208-216.

Ornstein, A.C. (1986). Curriculum, Instruction, and Supervision--Their Relationship and the Role of the Principal. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 70(489). 74-81.

Parker, F. (1987). Textbook Censorship and the Religious Right: Rise or Decline (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 715).

Payne, D.A. (1974). The Assessment of Learning: Cognitive and Affective. Lexington, Massachusetts: District of Columbia Heath and Company.

Perrucci, R. (1982). The Failure of Excellence in Textbooks. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Sociological Association. (San Francisco, California. September 6-10, 1982). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233963).

Portelli, J.P. (1987). Perspectives and Imperatives: On Defining Curriculum. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(4), 354-367.

Rogan, J. and Luckowski J. (1990). Curriculum Texts: The Portrayal of the Field. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22(1), 17-39.

Rosales-Dordelly, C.L. and Short, E. (1985). Curriculum Professors Specialized Knowledge. Lanham, Maryland: University of America Press.

Saylor, J.G., Alexander, W.M. & Lewis, A.J. (1981). Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning. Fourth Edition, New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Schmidt, M. (1981). Textbook Selection Criteria. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252956).

Schubert, W. H. (1984). Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.

Schubert, W.H. (1986). Curriculum: Perspectives and Practice. New York, New York: MacMillan.

Schwab, J.J. (1983). The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to Do. Curriculum Inquiry, 13(3), 238-265.

Scott, K. and Oliner, P. (1987). Prosocial Education and the "Feminine" Voice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (Washington, District of Columbia, April 24, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 791).

Scriven, M. (1967). Goal-free evaluation. In E. House (Ed.), School Evaluation. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and Starratt, R. J. (1988). Supervision. Fourth Edition. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Short, E.C. (1983). The Forms & Use of Alternative Curriculum Development: Strategies: Policy Implications. Curriculum Inquiry. 6(3), 43-64.

Short, E.C. (1984). Organizing What We Know About Curriculum. Manuscript paper written at The Pennsylvania State University.

Siegel, S. and Castellan, Jr., N.J. (1988). Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Second Edition. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Solomon, M. (1978). Textbook Selection Committees: What Teachers can do. Learning. 6(70), 43.

SPSS-X Inc. (1988). SPSS-X User's Guide. Third Edition, Chicago, Illinois: SPSS, Inc.

Stein, J. (1982). An Investigation of Influential Curriculum Books in Selected Introductory Teacher Education Textbooks: 1975-1980. Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago.

Stufflebeam, D., Foley, W. Gephart, W. Guba, E., Hammond, R., Merriman, H. and Provus, M. (1971). Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock.

Taba, H. (1962). Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. N. (1980). Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice. Second Edition. New York, New York: Macmillan.

Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. (1990). History of the School Curriculum. New York, New York: Macmillan.

Tanner, L., Ed. (1988). Critical Issues in Curriculum. Eighty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, P.J. (1984). The Gatekeepers: Monitors of Textbooks Innovation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (68th, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 23-27, 1984). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 402).

Thompson, P.J. (1987). Writing a Textbook: From Theoretical Knowledge to Tacit Knowledge -- And Back Again! Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (Washington, District of Columbia, April 20-24, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 289 170).

Thorndike, R.M., Cunningham, G.K. Hagen, E.P. & Thorndike, R.L. (1991). Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. Fifth Edition. New York, New York: Macmillan.

Tuckman, B.W. (1988). Conducting Educational Research. Third Edition. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt, Brace Javanovich, Inc.

Tulley, M.A. and Farr, R. (1985). Textbook Adoption: Insight, Impact, and Potential. Book Research Quarterly 1 (Summer), 4-11.

Tyler, R.W. (1949). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, R.W., Gagne, R.M. and Scriven, M. (1967). Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical. Curriculum Inquiry. 6(3), 205-228.

Warming, E.O. (1982). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Fifth Edition. New York, New York: Macmillan.

Wiles, J. and Bondi, J.C. (1991). Supervision: A Guide to Practice. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Woodward, A. and Elliot, D.L. (1990). Textbooks: Consensus and Controversy in Textbooks and Schooling in the United States. Eighty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Worthern, B.R. and Sanders, J.R. (1987). Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. White Plains, New York: Longman, Inc.

Zais, R.S. (1976). Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc.

APPENDIX A

INVESTIGATOR-DESIGNATED CATEGORIES AND ITEMS

FOR PILOT STUDY: STAGE ONE

DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE IN CURRICULUM

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY

1. States the purposes of education
2. Identifies values that guide teaching and learning
3. Determines an orientation to curriculum
4. Establishes educational aims
5. Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education
6. Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, & existentialism
7. Determines the ends of education
8. Establishes the primary focus of subject matter
9. Defines the teacher's role in relation to the curriculum

CURRICULUM THEORY

10. Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.
11. Uses techniques of science or logic to present a systematic view of phenomena
12. Describes political concepts of curriculum making
13. The uses of language and metaphors to clarify meaning of curriculum.
14. Empirical confirmation is the basis for justifying curriculum.
15. Uses principles and rules to study curriculum
16. Describes moral concepts of curriculum making
17. Deal with descriptive and prescriptive realms of inquiry
18. Investigates ideas of what ought to be taught

CURRICULUM RESEARCH

19. Creates new visions of what or how to teach
20. Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular curriculum problem
21. Questions normative premises about curriculum
22. Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field

23. Leads to improved programs for learning
24. Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving
25. Determines whether actions yield predicted results
26. Activities that influence curriculum policy

CURRICULUM HISTORY

27. Describes past curriculum thought and practices
28. Reveals insights and approaches to problems, events, or issues
29. Helps educators analyze present conditions
30. Analyses progress of curriculum
31. Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations
32. Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum
33. Interprets past curriculum practice
34. Examines conditions that promote curriculum changes

CURRICULUM CHANGE

35. Assures that innovations are properly implemented
36. Develops steps for achieving institutional growth
37. Integrates careful planning
38. Analyses resisting and supporting forces
39. Improves curriculum programs
40. Works to get curriculum adopted
41. Considers social forces that influence curriculum
42. Communicates successful school programs to other specialists

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

43. Identifies resources, time and space needed to create curriculum products
44. Determines how curriculum will proceed
45. Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction
46. Identifies tasks, steps, and roles needed to create curriculum documents
47. Determines important content or knowledge to teach
48. Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan
49. Decides nature and organization of curriculum
50. Recommends what learning experiences to include

CURRICULUM DESIGN

51. Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum

52. Permits curriculum ideas to function
53. Elaborates aims, goals, and objectives related to curriculum
54. Attempts to define what subject matter will be used
55. Diagnoses learners' needs
56. Selects subject matter and learning experiences
57. Determines desired outcomes of instruction
58. Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized
59. Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

60. Plans curriculum practice
61. Translates curriculum plans into action
62. Integrates content and learning experiences
63. Specifies instructional activities
64. Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction

CURRICULUM EVALUATION

65. Judges worth of instructional methods and materials
66. Determines effectiveness of curriculum content
67. Guides program development for individual students
68. Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes
69. Identifies strengths of curriculum content
70. Provides information about students' needs and interests
71. Determines if objectives have been met
72. Provides information about effectiveness of the curriculum
73. Offers suggestions for curriculum modification
74. Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum
75. Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum

CURRICULUM POLICY

76. States what should be taught
77. Develops curriculum guides
78. Determines attitudes and values to be taught
79. Influences the control of the curriculum
80. Mandates school goals
81. Works with special interest groups

82. Develops school grants
83. Communicates with local and state government agencies

CURRICULUM AS A FIELD OF STUDY

84. Elaborates on the theory of curriculum
85. Promotes curriculum planning and implementation
86. Identifies important subject matters by grade level
87. Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum
88. Studies the processes of curriculum
89. Analyzes structures of curriculum
90. Works with curriculum specialists
91. Attempts to integrate theory and practice of curriculum

SUBSYSTEMS OF CURRICULUM

INSTRUCTION

92. Identifies how students learn
93. Decides on school activities to facilitate learning
94. A plan for implementing the curriculum
95. Organizes learning experiences into units, courses and/or programs
96. Makes daily decisions about content and learning experiences
97. An activity that facilitates learning
98. Deal with structuring knowledge
99. Focuses on sequencing learning experiences
100. Uses reinforcers to promote learning
101. Determines how subject matter will be sequenced
102. Decides breadth and depth of subject matter

SUPERVISION

103. Focuses on improvement of instruction
104. Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices
105. Promotes planned productivity, receptivity to change, and innovation
106. Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure
107. Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences
108. Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth
109. Encourages performance improvement

EVALUATION

110. Assesses teacher's use of curriculum
111. Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes
112. A plan to gather information to make decisions
113. Provides a description or judgment based on formal inquiry
114. Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved
115. Measures student outcomes
116. Judges worth of curriculum design
117. Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process
118. Reports summary data useful in selecting among alternatives
119. Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized
120. Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.

APPENDIX B

DIRECTIONS FOR THE PILOT STUDY: STAGE ONE

Arrange the items listed on the white cards into one of the categories listed below. Write the number in the lower right hand corner of the index card that best identifies the category to which you think the item belongs. Please modify the wording of phrases in cases where you feel you can make the phrase less ambiguous or more clearly worded. A definition for each category has been provided.

1 = **Curriculum philosophy*** - A set of values, beliefs, and/or a particular orientation that determines an individual's broad view of a subject.

2 = **Curriculum research*** - An activity used to advance conceptualizations and understanding of the field

3 = **Curriculum change*** - A process that influences whether innovations are adopted or rejected, and the nature of the diffusion.

4 = **Curriculum design*** - Any activity or aspect that impacts upon the organization of curriculum

5 = **Curriculum evaluation*** - Activities that range from analyzing all information needed by decision makers in education to assessing objective testing programs.

6 = **Curriculum as a field of study*** - Activites that are concerned with the combination of subject matter, curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation, research, and theory building.

7 = **Supervision**** - Activities that focus on the improvement of instructional planning and the quality of instruction.

* = domain of knowledge in curriculum
** = subsystem of curriculum

Arrange the items listed on the multi-colored index cards into one of the categories listed below. Write the number in the lower right hand corner of the index card that best identifies the category to which you think the item belongs. Please modify the wording of phrases in cases where you feel you can make the phrase less ambigous or more clearly worded. A definition for each category has been provided.

8 = **Curriculum theory*** - A set of generalizations or related statements that highlight the relationships among curriculum elements and direct its development, use and evaluation.

9 = **Curriculum history*** - A chronicle of the past and present events that influence the direction of the field of curriculum

10 = **Curriculum development*** - Activities that influences the process of curriculum construction.

11 = **Curriculum implementation*** - Activities that impact upon how the curriculum will be put into practice.

12 = **Curriculum policy*** - Written documents or statements that guide and mandate what should and will be taught.

13 = **Instruction**** - Activities that focus on organizing student learning experiences and making decisions about content and related methods and materials.

14 = **Evaluation**** - Activities that render judgements to determine the value, worth, and merit of educational programs and innovations.

* = domain of knowledge in curriculum
** = subsystem of curriculum

APPENDIX C

ITEMS DELETED AS A RESULT OF PILOT STUDY: STAGE ONE

2. Identifies values that guide teaching and learning

4. Establishes educational aims

9. Defines the teacher's role in relation to the curriculum

12. Describes political concepts of curriculum making

13. The uses of language and metaphors to clarify meaning of curriculum.

14. Empirical confirmation is the basis for justifying curriculum.

16. Describes moral concepts of curriculum making

17. Deals with descriptive and prescriptive realms of inquiry

18. Investigates ideas of what ought to be taught

19. Creates new visions of what or how to teach

21. Questions normative premises about curriculum

23. Leads to improved programs for learning

26. Activities that influence curriculum policy

28. Reveals insights and approaches to problems, events, or issues

29. Helps educators analyze present conditions

34. Examines conditions that promote curriculum changes

35. Assures that innovations are properly implemented

36. Develops steps for achieving institutional growth

40. Works to get curriculum adopted

41. Considers social forces that influence curriculum

42. Communicates successful school programs to other specialists

43. Identifies resources, time and space needed to create curriculum products

44. Determines how curriculum will proceed

46. Identifies tasks, steps, and roles needed to create curriculum documents

47. Determines important content or knowledge to teach

53. Elaborates aims, goals, and objectives related to curriculum

55. Diagnoses learners' needs

61. Translates curriculum plans into action

63. Specifies instructional activities

70. Provides information about students' needs and interests

78. Determines attitudes and values to be taught

81. Works with special interest groups

86. Identifies important subject matters by grade level

88. Studies the processes of curriculum

94. A plan for implementing the curriculum

95. Organizes learning experiences into units, courses and/or programs

96. Makes daily decisions about content and learning experiences

101. Determines how subject matter will be sequenced

102. Decides breadth and depth of subject matter

105. Promotes planned productivity, receptivity to change, and innovation

112. A plan to gather information to make decisions

113. Provides a description or judgment based on formal inquiry

118. Reports summary data useful in selecting among alternatives

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS FOR PILOT STUDY: STAGE TWO

April 29, 1991

Linda S. Behar
440 W. Barry, #403
Chicago, IL 60657

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction working on a dissertation under the direction of Professor Allan Ornstein at Loyola University of Chicago.

The topic I will be investigating involves identifying the most influential textbooks in curriculum between 1970-1990. A textbook is designed to explain basic information of a field including theory, research, and practice. Textbooks are important instructional tools for teachers, too.

This research is also concerned with the selection of topics that textbooks advocate. Your assistance in this phase of the research will be appreciated.

The enclosed survey sheet lists educational practices that textbooks might discuss. Based on your opinion, please rate the importance of each statement using the following scale: [5] very important; [4] fairly important; [3] of some importance; [2] fairly unimportant; [1] very unimportant.

The survey should take about twenty minutes. Please complete the attached survey sheet and return to Beverly Hides by May 3rd.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Linda S. Behar

APPENDIX E

Pilot Study: Phase II Survey

DIRECTIONS: Rate the items listed below using the following scale: [5] very important; [4] fairly important; [3] some importance; [2] fairly unimportant; [1] very unimportant. Circle the number that most nearly represents your opinion. The survey should take about 20 minutes.

1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, and existenialism.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter will be used.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Determines the ends of education.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis and feedback conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Uses techniques of science or logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5

16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Integrates careful planning.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Develops curriculum guides.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Analyses resisting and supporting forces.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Identifies how students learn.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	1	2	3	4	5

37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Develops school grants.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	States the purposes of education.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Mandates school goals.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	States what ought to be taught.	1	2	3	4	5

57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	Communicates with local and state government agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	1	2	3	4	5
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	Plans curriculum programs.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	Decides nature and organization of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	1	2	3	4	5
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	1	2	3	4	5
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	1	2	3	4	5
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.	1	2	3	4	5

76.	Identifies strengths of curriculum content.	1	2	3	4	5
77.	Measures student outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F

LISTING OF CATEGORIES AND ITEMS FOR PILOT STUDY: STAGE TWO
(RESULTS OF PILOT STUDY: STAGE 1)

DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE IN CURRICULUM

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY

1. States the purposes of education
2. Determines an orientation to curriculum
3. Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education
4. Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, & existentialism
5. Determines the ends of education
6. Elaborates on the theory of curriculum

CURRICULUM THEORY

7. Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.
8. Uses techniques of science or logic to present a systematic view of phenomena
9. Uses principles and rules to study curriculum
10. Identifies how students learn
11. Deals with structuring knowledge

CURRICULUM RESEARCH

12. Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular curriculum problem
13. Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field
14. Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving
15. Analyzes resisting and supporting forces
16. Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum

CURRICULUM HISTORY

17. Describes past curriculum thought and practices
18. Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum
19. Interprets past curriculum practice
20. Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

21. Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction
22. Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan
23. Decides nature and organization of curriculum
24. Integrates content and learning experiences
25. Develops school grants
26. Develops curriculum guide

CURRICULUM DESIGN

27. Permits curriculum ideas to function
28. Attempts to define what subject matter will be used
29. Selects subject matter and learning experiences
30. Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized
31. Establishes the primary focus of subject matter
32. Integrates careful planning
33. Guides program development for individual students

CURRICULUM EVALUATION

34. Judges worth of instructional methods and materials
35. Determines effectiveness of curriculum content
36. Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes
37. Identifies strengths of curriculum content
38. Determines if objectives have been met
39. Provides information about effectiveness of the curriculum
40. Offers suggestions for curriculum modification
41. Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum
42. Ascertains whether outcomes are the result ofthe curriculum
43. Determines whether action yield predicted results
44. Improves curriculum programs
45. Determines desired outcomes of instruction
46. Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan

CURRICULUM POLICY

47. States what should be taught
48. Influences the control of the curriculum
49. Mandates school goals
50. Communicates with local and state government agencies
51. Recommends what learning experiences to include

CURRICULUM AS A FIELD OF STUDY

52. Analyzes structures of curriculum
53. Attempts to integrate theory and practice of curriculum
54. Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum
55. Promotes curriculum planning and implementation

SUBSYSTEMS OF CURRICULUM

INSTRUCTION

56. Decides on school activities to facilitate learning
57. An activity that facilitates learning
58. Focuses on sequencing learning experiences
59. Uses reinforcers to promote learning
60. Plans curriculum practice

SUPERVISION

61. Focuses on improvement of instruction
62. Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices
63. Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure
64. Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences
65. Encourages performance improvement
66. Works with curriculum specialists
67. Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth

EVALUATION

68. Assesses teacher's use of curriculum
69. Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes
70. Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved
71. Measures student outcomes
72. Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process
73. Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized
74. Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.
75. Analyses process of curriculum
76. Judges worth of curriculum design
77. Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction

APPENDIX G

CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATIONS AND ALPHA COEFFICIENTS FOR PILOT STUDY STAGE 2

Subscale: Curriculum Philosophy

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	.2660	.7486
5.	Determines the ends of education.	.3748	.7245
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	.4228	.7054
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	.4873	.6870
51.	States the purposes of education.	.6670	.6257
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	.6337	.6503

Alpha coefficient = .7307

Subscale: Curriculum Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	.2521	.9442
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	.5642	.9325
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	.7197	.9274
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	.8437	.9262
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	.7489	.9269
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	.7268	.9263
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	.7419	.9249
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	.7938	.9260
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	.7506	.9238
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	.8234	.9275
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	.7085	.9238
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	.7436	.9265
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	.7241	.9274

Alpha coefficient = .9332

Subscale: Curriculum Design

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	.5282	.9117
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	.7200	.8909
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	.7408	.8882
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	.8568	.8759
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	.6524	.8999
20.	Integrates careful planning.	.7818	.8841
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	.7830	.8830

Alpha coefficients = .9049

Subscale: Curriculum Theory

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	.5470	.8206
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	.6930	.7777
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	.6202	.7998
33.	Identifies how students learn.	.6509	.7903
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	.6393	.7939

Alpha coefficient = .8306

Subscale: Curriculum Policy

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.	.5965	.7546
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	.6605	.7320
55.	Mandates school goals.	.7105	.7124
56.	States what ought to be taught.	.5781	.7582
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	.3763	.8213

Alpha coefficient = .7964

Subscale: Curriculum History

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	.6290	.7153
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	.6500	.7000
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	.5052	.7788
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.	.5932	.7310

Alpha coefficient = .7844

Subscale: Curriculum Development

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
27.	Develops curriculum guides.	.7951	.8239
38.	Develops school grants.	.7046	.8426
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	.7317	.8358
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	.5622	.8649
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	.5797	.8618
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	.6551	.8504

Alpha coefficient = .8695

Subscale: Curriculum Research

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	.7320	.7946
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	.6502	.8164
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	.7192	.7968
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	.5778	.8348
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	.5993	.8293

Alpha coefficient = .8468

Subscale: Curriculum as a field of study

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	.7966	.8046
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	.7637	.8167
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	.6423	.8693
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	.6999	.8421

Alpha coefficient = .8697

Subscale: Instruction

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	.8226	.8142
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	.7153	.8426
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	.7319	.8375
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	.5313	.8855
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	.7172	.8409

Alpha coefficient = .9722

Subscale: Supervision

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	.4648	.8488
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences.	.7053	.8098
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	.6441	.8202
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	.7164	.8085
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	.4799	.8488
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	.5015	.8407
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	.7883	.7993

Alpha coefficient = .846

Subscale: Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	.8157	.9155
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	.7170	.9210
40.	Assess effectiveness of curriculum process.	.7755	.9181

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	.7663	.9184
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	.6780	.9234
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	.6779	.9231
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	.7046	.9217
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	.6137	.9260
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	.7687	.9182
77.	Measures student outcomes.	.6964	.9221

Alpha coefficient = .9282

APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER FOR OPEN-ENDED SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

April 8, 1991

Linda S. Behar
440 W. Barry, #403
Chicago, IL 60657

Dear Professor:

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction working on a dissertation under the direction of Professor Allan Ornstein at Loyola University of Chicago.

The topic I will be investigating involves identifying the most influential textbooks in curriculum between 1970-1990. The "Professors of Curriculum" have been selected to be the respondents because of their contributions to the field of curriculum studies. Your assistance in this phase of the research will be appreciated.

I realize that a listing of Curriculum Classics was undertaken by Columbia Teacher's College during 1976. This research is attempting to identify influentual curriculum textbooks* published between 1970-1990. You will be contacted again in September or October for phase II, the final portion of this study.

Please complete the attached survey sheet and return within ten days.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Linda S. Behar

Note: *=A textbook is designed to explain basic information of a field, including theory, research, and practice.

APPENDIX I

LISTING SHEET FOR THE MOST INFLUENTIAL TEXTBOOKS IN CURRICULUM

April 8, 1991

Linda S. Behar
440 W. Barry, #403
Chicago, IL 60657

DIRECTIONS: The survey below is divided into two parts. Part I deals with background data. Part II deals with a listing of curriculum textbooks. The entire survey should take about 10 minutes.

PART I: PLEASE INDICATE THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION

1. Sex: M _____ F _____
2. Is your doctorate in curriculum and/or instruction?
   YES _____ NO _____
3. What year did you earn your doctorate? Before 1941 ___; 1941-1950 ___; 1951-1960 ___; 1961-1970 ___; 1971-1980 ___; 1981-1990 ___
4. Name the institution where you received your doctorate.
   _____
5. Name the institution with which you are affiliated.
   _____

PART II: LIST THE TEXTBOOKS PUBLISHED BETWEEN 1970 AND 1990 WHICH YOU BELIEVE HAVE HAD THE MOST IMPACT UPON THE FIELD OF CURRICULUM. (LIST AS MANY AS TEN. RANKING IS UNIMPORTANT.)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

APPENDIX J

CLOSE ENDED SURVEY COVER LETTER

LOYOLA
UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

Lake Shore Campus
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626
Telephone: (312) 508-8278

Department of Curriculum and Human Resource Development

August 15, 1991

Dear Professor:

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction working on a dissertation under the direction of Professor Allan Ornstein at Loyola University of Chicago.

The topic I am investigating involves identifying the most influential textbooks in curriculum between 1970-1990 and an analysis of curriculum practices (or itwms) within those textbooks. In phase one of this study, the most influential textbooks were selected by a random sample of the Professors of Curriculum. These textbooks are listed at the bottom of this letter.

This phase involves three tasks. Your assistance in this portion of the research would be appreciated. This survey should take no more than 20 minutes.

First, using the twelve textbooks listed below, select the one with which you are most familiar. Indicate your selection by circling the corresponding letter. Second, using the numbers listed to the left of each item, rank the importance of each curriculum practice (or item), based on your opinion, using the following scale 5 = very important, 4 = fairly important, 3 = some importance, 2 = fairly unimportant, 1 = very unimportant. Third, using the numbers listed to the right of each item, rate the extent to whcih each curriculum practice (or item is covered in the textbook you selected using the following scale, 5 = very great extent, 4 = great extent, 3 = some extent, 2 = little extent, 1 = very little extent.

Please complete the attached survey sheet and return in the enclosed envelope within ten day. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Linda S. Behar

A.	Apple	Ideology & Curriculum
B.	Eisner	The Eductional Imagination
C.	Eisner & Vallance	Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum
D.	Giroux, Penna, & Pinar	Curriculum and Instruction
E.	Goodlad	A Place Called School
F.	Goodlad	Curriculum Inquiry
G.	Kliebard	The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1953
H.	Pinar	Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists
I.	Pinar	Contemporary Curriculum Discourses
J.	Schubert	Curriculum: Perspectives, Paradigm, & Possibility
K.	Tanner & Tanner	Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice
L.	Zais	Curriculum: Principles & Foundations

APPENDIX K

CLOSE ENDED SURVEY

CURRICULUM PRACTICES

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement below. Use the numbers listed on the left-hand side and rank the importance of each curriculum practice (or item) based on your opinion. Use the following scale: [5] = very important; [4] = fairly important; [3] = some importance; [2] = fairly unimportant; [1] = very unimportant. Using the numbers listed on the right-hand side, rate the extent to which each of these curriculum practices (or items) are covered in the textbook with which you are most familiar, and use the following scale: [5] = very great extent; [4] = great extent; [3] = some extent; [2] = little extent; and [1] = very little extent. Circle the number that most nearly represents your opinion. The survey should take about 20 minutes.

IMPORTANCE		EXTENT COVERED
1 2 3 4 5	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, and existentialism.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Attempts to define what subject matter will be used.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Encourages performance improvement.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines the ends of education	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis and feedback conferences.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses techniques of science or logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Guides program development for individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Selects subject matter and learning experiences	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines if objectives have been met.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Deals with structuring knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Influences the control of the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Integrates careful planning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Works with curriculum specialists	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Develops curriculum guides.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyses resisting and supporting forces.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Identifies how students learn.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interprets past curriculum practice.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Judges worth of curriculum design.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Develops school grants.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	States the purposes of education.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Mandates school goals.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	States what ought to be taught.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Communicates with local and state government agencies.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Improves curriculum programs.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Plans curriculum programs.	1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Integrates content and learning experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Decides nature and organization of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	An activity that facilitates learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Identifies strengths of curriculum content.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Measures student outcomes.	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX L

Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients

for the Importance of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge

Domains of Curriculum

Curriculum Philosophy

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	.7025	.7929
5.	Determines the ends of education.	.4880	.8041
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	.6799	.7993
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	.5323	.8318
51.	States the purposes of education.	.6428	.8070
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	.7101	.7937

Alpha coefficient = .8450

Subscale: Curriculum Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.*	.0868	.8483
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	.3264	.8312
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	.4984	.8194
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	.4540	.8235
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	.2716	.8354
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	.2727	.8333
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	.4624	.8214
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	.6907	.8039
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	.6040	.8117
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	.6923	.8061
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	.7697	.7988
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	.6328	.8104
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	.5908	.8139

Alpha coefficient = .8392

Curriculum Design

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	.6288	.8337
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	.7463	.8157
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	.6173	.8363
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	.7389	.8161
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	.4871	.8536
20.	Integrates careful planning.	.7631	.8145
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	.3492	.8657

Alpha coefficients = .8505

Curriculum Theory

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	.6467	.5350
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	.4298	.6448
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	.4969	.5983
33.	Identifies how students learn.	.4237	.6391
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	.2630	.7012

Alpha coefficient = .6974

Curriculum Policy

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.*	.1074	.6025
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.*	.1233	.5726
55.	Mandates school goals.	.4198	.4316
56.	States what ought to be taught.	.5729	.3121
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	.3661	.4626

Alpha coefficient = .5308

Curriculum History

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	.4127	.6698
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	.7323	.4521

42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	.5725	.5597
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.*	.2322	.7580

Alpha coefficient = .7580

Curriculum Development

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
27.	Develops curriculum guides.*	.1435	.3755
38.	Develops school grants.*	.0780	.4523
45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	.3090	.2556
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.*	-.0397	.4664
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	.2793	.2873
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	.3782	.2239

Alpha coefficient = .3931

Curriculum Research

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	.4059	.7169
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	.5783	.6543
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	.4473	.7001
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	.5201	.6744
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	.5243	.6706

Alpha coefficient = .7340

Curriculum as a field of study

Item		Corrected Item-total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.*	.2080	.7092
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	.4157	.5586
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	.6225	.4468
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	.4805	.5077

Alpha coefficient = .7092

* eliminated

APPENDIX M

Uncorrected Data for Corrected Item-Total Correlation

Coefficients and Alpha Correlations Coefficients for Coverage

of Curriculum Practices within the Domains of Knowledge

Domains of Curriculum

Curriculum Philosophy

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
1.	Schools of thought including: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism and existentialism.	.2923	.7195
5.	Determines the ends of education.	.5602	.6106
16.	Determines an orientation to curriculum.	.3149	.6983
31.	Suggests a view of society and students in relationship to education.	.5070	.6437
51.	States the purposes of education.	.5420	.6256
52.	Elaborates on the theory of curriculum.	.4952	.6489

Alpha coefficient = .7294

Curriculum Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
2.	Determines what changes took place as a result of the curriculum.	.3360	.8394
6.	Provides information about the effectiveness of the curriculum.	.5392	.8245
12.	Determines whether actions yielded predicted results.	.4839	.8285
14.	Determines if objectives have been met.	.3659	.8378
26.	Offers suggestions for curriculum modification.	.5154	.8277
29.	Measures discrepancies between predetermined objectives and outcomes.	.3211	.8380
53.	Judges worth of instructional methods and materials.	.3834	.8352
58.	Determines desired outcomes of instruction.	.5576	.8229
62.	Improves curriculum programs.	.4501	.8307
66.	Determines effectiveness of curriculum content.	.6704	.8145
73.	Ascertains whether outcomes are the result of the curriculum.	.7604	.8076
74.	Determines criteria to measure success of curriculum plan.	.5721	.8228
76.	Identifies the strengths of curriculum content.	.4254	.8323

Alpha coefficient = .8401

Curriculum Design

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
3.	Attempts to define what subject matter took place as a result of the curriculum.	.6552	.8025
10.	Guides program development for individual students.	.7764	.7780
13.	Selects subject matter and learning experiences.	.6359	.8030

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
15.	Establishes the primary focus of subject matter.	.5562	.8182
19.	Permits curriculum ideas to function.	.4839	.8267
20.	Integrates careful planning.	.7608	.7811
32.	Indicates instructional strategies to be utilized.	.2068	.8546

Alpha coefficient = .8257

Curriculum Theory

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
8.	Creates statements that give meaning to a school curriculum.	.6159	.5656
9.	Uses techniques of science and logic to present a systematic view of phenomena.	.5007	.6213
17.	Deals with structuring knowledge.	.4748	.6252
33.	Identifies how students learn.	.4957	.6356
57.	Uses principles and rules to study curriculum.	.2235	.7258

Alpha coefficient = .7036

Curriculum Policy

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
18.	Influences the control of the curriculum.*	.1341	.6394
25.	Recommends what learning experiences to include.	.2241	.5859
55.	Mandates school goals.	.5109	.4167
56.	States what ought to be taught.	.5782	.3974
60.	Communicates with local and state governments agencies.	.3209	.5443

Alpha coefficient = .6394

Curriculum History

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
22.	Describes past curriculum thought and practices.	.5049	.5875
36.	Interprets past curriculum practice.	.8000	.3987
42.	Provides a chronology of important events in curriculum.	.4349	.6299
75.	Examines forces that inhibit curriculum innovations.*	.1937	.7722

Alpha coefficient = .6883

Curriculum Development

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
27.	Develops curriculum guides.*	-.0914	.5035
38.	Develops school grants.*	.0274	.4224

45.	Determines procedures necessary for curriculum plan.	.2398	.6927
46.	Addresses question of who will be involved in curriculum construction.	.4242	.5747
67.	Integrates content and learning experiences.	.5509	.4710
68.	Decides on nature and organization of curriculum.	.5064	.5213

Alpha coefficient = .6413

Curriculum Research

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
30.	Analyzes resisting and supporting forces.	.4163	.5263
34.	Advances hypotheses and assumptions of the field.	.4728	.5082
41.	Uses systematic inquiry for the purpose of solving a particular problem.	.2463	.6041
63.	Analyzes steps to be taken in problem solving.	.2968	.6194
69.	Focuses on research and/or inquiry of curriculum.	.4542	.5034

Alpha coefficient = .6303

Curriculum as a field of study

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
39.	Promotes curriculum planning and implementation.*	.1689	.6134
47.	Organizes patterns and structures of curriculum.	.4675	.3312
48.	Attempts to integrate theory and practice.	.3939	.4211
72.	Analyzes structures of curriculum.	.3151	.4691

Alpha coefficient = .6134

* eliminated

APPENDIX N

Uncorrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for the Importance of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum

Instruction

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	.5752	.5477
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning expereinces.	.4213	.6083
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	.5144	.5662
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	.5111	.5784
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	.2238	.7548
		Alpha coefficient =	.7548

Supervision

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	.6293	.7612
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, anlaysis, and feedback conferences.	.5152	.7612
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	.6804	.7832
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	.6536	.7498
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	.6369	.7530
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	.3489	.8050
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	.2789	.8144
		Alpha coefficient =	.7959

Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	.2856	.7628
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	.4704	.7300
40.	Assess effectiveness of curriculum process.	.4533	.7304
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	.2559	.7566

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
44.	Assesses teacher's use of curriculum.	.4752	.7310
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	.4597	.7306
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	.4101	.7370
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	.5031	.7220
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	.4947	.7232
77.	Measures student outcomes.	.4730	.7268

Alpha coefficient = .7668

APPENDIX O

Uncorrected Item-total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients for Coverage of Curriculum Practices within the Subsystems of Curriculum

Instruction

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
54.	Uses reinforcers to promote learning.	.6506	.7886
59.	Focuses on sequencing learning experiences.	.7275	.7612
61.	Decides on school activities to facilitate learning.	.7019	.7651
64.	Plans curriculum practice.	.6724	.7780
70.	An activity that facilitates learning.	.4639	.8602

Alpha coefficient = .8464

Supervision

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
4.	Encourages performance improvement.	.5974	.8593
7.	Uses goal setting, observation, analysis, and feedback conferences.	.6321	.8569
11.	Focuses on improvement of instruction.	.7202	.8426
21.	Works with curriculum specialists.	.8273	.8259
23.	Utilizes facilitation techniques and identification of communication devices.	.7298	.8412
28.	Involves evaluation for purposes of improving instruction or granting tenure.	.5335	.8670

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
35.	Uses training and modeling to promote professional growth.	.5127	.8693

Alpha coefficient = .8699

Evaluation

Item		Corrected Item-total Correlation	Alpha if item deleted
24.	Analyzes progress of curriculum.	.2086	.8066
37.	Judges worth of curriculum design.	.4692	.7701
40.	Assesses effectiveness of curriculum process.	.5561	.7566
43.	Assesses discrepancies between intended and actual learning outcomes.	.2241	.7932
44.	Assessest teacher's use of curriculum.	.5081	.7629
49.	Determines extent to which program learning activities are realized.	.4294	.7730
50.	Interprets how well teachers carry out instruction.	.7097	.7438
65.	Assesses effectiveness of an innovation.	.6070	.7489
71.	Determines whether a program should be maintained or improved.	.6323	.7459
77.	Measures student outcomes.	.3540	.7832

Alpha coefficient = .8066

APPENDIX P

KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV 2 - SAMPLE TEST

BOOKS BY GENDER

Cases	27	Sex 1 = Male
	11	Sex 2 = Female
	38	Total

Absolute	Positive	Negative	K-S Z	2-tailed P
1.3468	.11448	-.13468	.377	.999

TEXTBOOKS BY DOCTORATE SPECIALIZATION

Cases	34	Degree 1 = Curriculum and/or Instruction
	4	Degree 2 = Other
	38	Total

Absolute	Positive	Negative	K-S Z	2-tailed P
.13235	.10294	-.13235	.250	1.000

TEXTBOOKS BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION OF CURRENT AFFILIATION

Cases	18	1 = West (including Midwest)
	20	2 = East
	38	Total

Absolute	Positive	Negative	K-S Z	2-tailed P
.08889	.06111	-.08889	.274	1.000

TEXTBOOKS BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGION WHERE DOCTORATE WAS EARNED

Cases	23	1 = Regions other than Midwest
	15	2 = Midwest
	38	Total

Absolute	Positive	Negative	K-S Z	2-tailed P
.27246	..27246	.06667	.821	.510

TEXTBOOKS BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS EARNED

Cases	20	1 = 1951 to 1970
	8	2 = 1971 to 1990
	38	Total

Absolute	Positive	Negative	K-S Z	2-tailed P
.14414	.14444	-.05556	.445	.989

APPENDIX Q

Summary of Frequency Responses for the Rankings of the Importance of Curriculum Practices in the Domains of Knowledge and Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum (N=51)

1 = very unimportant; 2 = fairly unimportant; 3 = some importance; 4 = fairly important; 5 = very important; 9 = missing data; m = missing

Item	1	Valid %	2	Valid %	3	Valid %	4	Valid %	5	Valid %	9	Valid %
1	3	6.0	3	6.0	6	12.0	19	32.0	19	38.0	1	M
2	0	0.0	5	10.4	11	22.9	21	43.8	11	22.9	3	M
3	5	10.2	4	8.2	15	30.6	18	36.7	7	14.3	2	M
4	3	6.0	15	30.0	16	32.0	9	18.0	7	14.0	1	M
5	3	6.0	2	4.0	13	26.0	14	28.0	18	36.0	1	M
6	1	2.0	7	14.3	16	32.7	15	30.6	10	20.4	2	M
7	9	18.4	15	30.6	8	16.3	11	22.4	6	12.2	2	M
8	3	6.0	2	4.0	14	28.0	11	22.0	20	40.0	1	M
9	5	10.6	10	21.3	17	36.2	12	25.5	3	6.4	4	M
10	5	10.2	8	16.3	17	34.7	11	22.4	8	16.3	2	M
11	2	4.1	9	18.4	16	32.7	16	32.7	6	12.2	2	M
12	4	8.3	14	29.2	16	33.3	10	20.8	4	12.2	2	M
13	5	10.4	6	12.5	13	27.1	16	33.3	8	8.3	3	M
14	5	10.4	9	18.8	16	33.3	11	22.9	7	16.7	3	M
15	4	8.3	8	16.9	13	27.1	12	25.0	11	14.6	3	M
16	2	4.1	3	6.1	5	10.2	14	28.6	25	22.9	3	M
17	2	4.1	1	2.0	12	24.5	16	32.2	18	36.9	2	M
18	3	6.1	4	8.2	9	18.4	19	38.8	14	28.6	2	M
19	1	2.1	4	8.3	9	18.8	11	22.9	23	47.9	3	M
20	3	6.1	6	12.2	14	28.6	17	34.7	9	18.4	2	M
21	4	8.3	6	12.5	17	35.4	14	29.2	7	14.6	3	M
22	1	2.0	5	10.2	4	8.2	18	36.7	21	42.9	2	M
23	9	18.4	8	16.3	15	30.6	13	26.5	4	8.2	2	M
24	5	10.4	1	14.6	9	18.8	17	35.4	10	20.8	3	M
25	6	11.8	8	15.7	18	35.3	17	33.3	2	3.9	0	-
26	3	6.1	5	10.2	12	24.5	20	40.8	9	18.4	2	M
27	17	33.3	11	21.6	19	17.6	11	21.6	3	5.9	0	-
28	13	25.5	14	27.5	16	31.4	15	9.8	3	5.9	0	-
29	17	33.3	10	19.6	10	19.6	12	23.5	2	3.9	0	-
30	3	6.0	4	8.0	11	22.0	22	44.0	10	20.0	1	M
31	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	5.9	21	41.2	26	51.0	0	-
32	7	25.5	13	25.5	17	33.3	12	23.5	7	3.9	0	-
33	3	11.8	6	11.8	12	23.5	23	45.1	7	13.7	0	-
34	2	7.8	4	7.8	5	9.8	12	23.5	28	54.9	0	-
35	6	27.5	14	27.5	18	35.3	6	11.8	7	13.7	0	-
36	2	11.8	6	11.8	9	17.6	14	27.5	20	39.2	0	-
37	4	7.8	1	2.0	11	21.6	19	37.3	16	31.4	0	-
38	22	44.0	15	30.0	8	16.0	4	8.0	1	2.0	1	M
39	4	7.8	7	13.7	8	15.7	14	27.5	18	35.3	0	-
40	3	6.0	4	8.0	14	28.0	19	38.0	10	20.0	1	M
41	5	9.8	6	11.8	20	39.2	13	25.5	7	13.7	0	-
42	3	5.9	5	9.8	12	23.5	15	29.4	16	31.4	0	-
43	10	19.6	8	15.7	14	27.5	12	23.5	7	13.7	0	-
44	1	2.0	7	13.7	18	35.3	14	27.5	11	21.6	0	-
45	4	7.8	8	15.7	14	27.5	11	21.6	14	27.5	0	-
46	1	2.0	5	9.8	11	21.6	11	21.6	23	45.1	0	-
47	1	2.0	2	4.0	10	20.0	16	32.0	21	42.0	0	-
48	1	2.0	2	3.9	6	11.8	13	25.5	29	56.9	0	-
49	5	9.8	11	21.6	11	21.6	18	35.3	6	11.8	0	-
50	6	11.8	12	23.5	18	35.3	10	19.6	5	9.8	0	-
51	3	5.9	2	3.9	5	9.8	17	33.3	24	47.1	0	-
52	3	5.9	3	5.9	2	3.9	16	31.4	27	52.9	0	-
53	6	12.0	7	14.0	21	42.0	10	20.0	6	12.0	1	M
54	25	40.0	15	30.0	10	20.0	3	6.0	2	4.0	1	M
55	20	41.7	12	25.0	11	22.9	3	6.3	2	4.2	3	M
56	11	22.0	15	30.0	11	22.0	7	14.0	6	12.0	1	M
57	4	8.2	4	8.2	13	26.5	16	32.7	12	24.5	2	M
58	10	20.0	9	18.0	16	32.0	10	20.0	5	10.1	1	M
59	12	24.0	10	20.0	15	30.0	9	18.0	4	8.0	1	M
60	9	18.0	17	34.0	16	32.0	8	16.0	0	0	1	M

1 = very unimportant; 2 = fairly unimportant; 3 = some importance; 4 = fairly important; 5 = very important; 9 = missing data; m = missing

Importance

Item	1	Valid %	2	Valid %	3	Valid %	4	Valid %	5	Valid %	9	Valid %
61	8	16.3	9	18.4	22	44.9	7	14.3	3	6.1	2	M
62	4	8.0	4	8.0	20	40.0	12	24.0	10	20.0	1	M
63	5	10.0	10	20.0	15	30.0	11	22.0	9	18.0	1	M
64	5	10.0	2	4.0	17	34.0	16	32.0	10	20.0	1	M
65	2	4.1	7	14.3	15	30.6	17	34.7	8	16.3	2	M
66	3	6.0	8	16.0	17	34.0	16	32.0	6	12.0	1	M
67	1	2.0	3	6.0	15	30.0	14	28.0	17	34.0	1	M
68	1	2.0	4	8.0	12	24.0	21	42.0	12	24.0	1	M
69	2	4.0	3	6.0	5	10.0	17	34.0	23	46.0	1	M
70	4	9.3	9	20.9	15	34.9	8	18.6	7	16.3	8	M
71	10	20.0	6	12.0	19	38.0	8	16.0	7	14.0	1	M
72	2	4.0	4	8.0	12	24.0	9	18.0	23	46.0	1	M
73	6	12.0	9	18.0	17	34.0	12	24.0	6	12.0	1	M
74	3	6.0	3	6.0	7	34.0	17	34.0	10	20.0	1	M
75	1	2.0	2	4.0	13	26.0	18	36.0	16	32.0	1	M
76	2	4.0	4	8.0	12	24.0	24	48.0	8	16.0	1	M
77	11	22.0	10	20.0	12	24.0	12	24.0	5	10.0	1	M

APPENDIX R

Summary of Frequency Responses for the Ratings of the Coverage of Curriculum Practices in the Domains of Knowledge and Subsystems of Curriculum by the Professors of Curriculum (N=51)

1 = very unimportant; 2 = fairly unimportant; 3 = some importance; 4 = fairly important; 5 = very important; 9 = missing data; m = missing

Item	1	Valid %	2	Valid %	3	Valid %	4	Valid %	5	Valid %	9	Valid %
1	6	12.0	1	2.0	6	12.0	19	32.0	19	38.0	1	M
2	2	4.2	8	16.7	11	22.9	21	43.8	11	22.9	3	M
3	5	10.0	10	20.0	15	30.0	14	28.0	16	12.0	1	M
4	11	22.0	11	22.0	14	28.0	9	18.0	5	10.0	1	M
5	4	8.0	1	2.0	8	16.0	22	44.0	15	30.0	1	M
6	5	10.4	11	22.9	7	14.6	18	37.5	7	14.0	3	M
7	19	38.8	10	20.4	12	24.3	3	6.1	5	10.2	2	M
8	4	8.0	4	8.0	9	18.0	14	28.0	19	38.0	1	M
9	13	27.1	6	12.5	12	25.0	13	27.1	4	8.3	3	M
10	11	22.4	18	36.7	10	20.4	7	14.3	3	6.1	2	M
11	8	16.3	12	24.5	14	28.6	12	24.5	3	6.1	2	M
12	9	18.4	17	34.7	13	26.5	9	18.4	1	2.0	2	M
13	8	16.7	10	20.8	13	27.1	13	27.1	4	8.3	3	M
14	12	24.5	8	16.3	16	32.7	4	18.4	9	8.2	2	M
15	7	14.6	11	22.9	11	22.9	10	20.8	9	18.8	3	M
16	1	2.0	0	0.0	10	20.4	10	20.4	28	57.1	2	M
17	3	6.1	2	4.1	16	32.7	12	24.5	16	32.7	2	M
18	5	10.2	6	12.2	14	28.6	8	16.3	16	32.7	2	M
19	1	2.1	6	12.5	8	16.7	14	29.2	19	39.6	3	M
20	6	12.2	13	26.5	11	22.4	12	24.5	7	14.3	2	M
21	8	16.3	15	30.6	8	16.3	11	22.4	7	14.3	2	M
22	3	6.1	2	4.1	6	12.2	10	20.4	28	52.1	2	M
23	13	26.5	16	32.7	13	26.5	4	8.2	3	6.1	2	M
24	4	8.3	9	18.8	13	27.1	11	22.9	11	22.9	3	M
25	8	15.7	15	29.4	15	29.4	11	21.6	2	3.9	0	-
26	6	11.8	5	9.8	17	33.3	15	29.4	8	15.7	0	-
27	25	50.0	16	32.0	4	8.0	2	4.0	3	6.0	1	M
28	23	45.1	11	21.6	8	15.7	7	13.7	2	3.9	0	-
29	23	45.1	10	19.6	8	15.7	8	15.7	2	3.9	0	-
30	3	6.0	4	8.0	17	31.0	16	32.0	10	20.0	1	M
31	1	2.0	2	3.9	4	7.8	19	37.3	25	49.0	0	-
32	11	21.6	15	29.4	15	29.4	9	17.6	1	2.0	0	-
33	5	9.8	16	31.4	17	33.3	10	19.6	3	5.9	0	-
34	3	5.9	3	5.9	5	9.8	13	25.5	27	52.9	0	-
35	19	37.3	15	29.4	10	19.6	4	7.8	3	5.9	0	-
36	3	5.9	3	5.9	7	13.7	10	19.6	28	54.9	0	-
37	3	5.9	4	7.8	20	39.2	11	21.6	13	25.5	0	-
38	3	74.0	7	14.0	3	6.0	2	4.0	1	2.0	1	M
39	5	10.0	7	14.0	13	26.0	15	30.0	10	20.0	1	M
40	6	12.0	13	26.0	14	28.0	7	14.0	10	20.0	1	M
41	8	15.7	6	11.8	16	31.4	15	29.4	6	11.8	0	-
42	4	7.8	6	11.8	10	19.6	12	23.5	19	37.3	0	-
43	13	25.5	15	29.4	12	23.5	7	13.7	4	7.8	0	-
44	8	16.0	12	24.0	12	24.0	12	24.0	6	12.0	1	M
45	9	17.6	10	19.6	17	33.3	6	11.8	9	17.6	0	-
46	2	3.9	10	19.6	11	21.6	9	17.6	19	37.3	0	-
47	6	12.0	13	26.0	13	26.0	18	36.0	0	0.0	0	-
48	0	0.0	6	11.8	8	15.7	16	31.4	21	41.2	0	-
49	15	29.4	14	27.5	9	17.6	10	19.6	3	5.9	0	-
50	12	23.5	19	37.3	10	19.6	5	9.8	5	9.8	0	-
51	3	5.9	1	2.0	4	7.8	18	35.3	25	49.0	0	-
52	2	3.9	0	.00	1	2.0	18	35.3	30	58.8	0	-
53	11	22.0	17	34.0	11	22.0	6	12.0	5	10.0	1	M
54	26	52.0	13	26.0	5	10.0	4	8.0	2	4.0	1	M
55	21	43.8	11	22.9	9	18.8	4	8.3	3	6.3	3	M
56	15	30.0	5	10.0	14	28.0	11	22.0	5	10.0	1	M
57	3	6.1	3	6.1	15	30.6	19	38.8	9	18.4	2	M
58	9	18.4	8	16.3	15	30.6	9	18.4	8	16.3	2	M
59	15	30.6	17	34.7	8	16.3	6	12.2	3	6.1	2	M
60	22	44.9	10	20.4	10	20.4	5	10.2	2	4.1	2	M

1 = very unimportant; 2 = fairly unimportant; 3 = some importance; 4 = fairly important; 5 = very important; 9 = missing data; m = missing

	Importance											
Item	1	Valid %	2	Valid %	3	Valid %	4	Valid %	5	Valid %	9	Valid %
61	9	18.8	21	43.8	6	12.5	8	16.7	4	8.3	3	M
62	8	16.0	6	12.0	18	36.0	12	24.0	6	12.0	1	M
63	11	22.9	9	18.8	13	27.1	10	20.8	5	10.4	3	M
64	9	14.3	10	20.4	12	24.5	14	28.6	6	12.2	2	M
65	6	12.2	13	26.5	17	34.7	9	18.4	4	8.2	2	M
66	4	8.2	16	32.7	13	26.5	11	22.4	5	10.2	2	M
67	1	2.0	11	22.4	19	38.8	8	16.3	10	20.4	2	M
68	0	0.0	2	4.1	10	20.4	26	53.1	11	22.4	2	M
69	3	6.0	3	6.0	13	26.0	9	18.0	22	44.0	1	M
70	6	14.0	12	27.9	15	34.9	5	11.6	5	11.6	8	M
71	9	18.4	18	36.7	16	32.7	0	0.0	6	12.2	2	M
72	1	2.0	5	10.0	12	24.0	14	28.0	18	36.0	1	M
73	6	12.2	22	44.9	13	26.5	5	10.2	3	6.1	2	M
74	7	14.0	10	20.0	16	32.0	13	26.0	4	8.0	1	M
75	1	2.0	7	14.0	10	20.0	17	34.0	15	30.0	1	M
76	3	6.0	4	8.0	17	34.0	20	40.0	6	12.0	1	M
77	22	44.0	9	18.0	10	20.0	5	10.0	4	8.0	1	M

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Linda S. Behar has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Allan C. Ornstein, Director
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Barney Berlin
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Robert C. Cienkus
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Loyola

Dr. Ronald Morgan
Associate Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

12/3/91
Date

Director's Signature