

[◀ Back](#)**1 article(s) will be saved.**

The link information below provides a persistent link to the article you've requested.

Persistent link to this record: Following the link below will bring you to the start of the article or citation.

Cut and Paste: To place article links in an external web document, simply copy and paste the HTML below, starting with "<A HREF"

To continue, select **FILE** then **SAVE AS** from your browser's toolbar above. Be sure to save as a plain text file (.txt) or an HTML file (.html).

If you have any problems or questions, contact Technical Support at <http://support.epnet.com/CustSupport/Customer/OpenCase.aspx> or call 800-758-5995.

Record: 1

Title:	Teacher receptivity to system-wide change in the implementation change.
Author(s):	Waugh, Russell Godfrey, John
Source:	British Educational Research Journal; 1993, Vol. 19 Issue 5, p565, 13p, 2 charts
Document Type:	Article
Subject(s):	TEACHERS EDUCATIONAL change
Geographic Term(s):	WESTERN Australia
Abstract:	Studies the receptivity of Western Australian secondary school teachers towards a system-wide educational change, the Unit Curriculum system. Teacher's receptivity towards the change as a determinant of its implementation; Variables affecting teacher's receptivity; Implications to educational administrators.
Full Text Word Count:	7412
ISSN:	0141-1926
Accession Number:	9603071456
Persistent link to this record:	http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=9603071456&db=afh
Cut and Paste:	Teacher receptivity to system-wide change in the implementation change.
Database:	Academic Search Elite

TEACHER RECEPTIVITY TO SYSTEM-WIDE CHANGE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

Contents

ABSTRACT This study is concerned with the receptivity of Western Australian

[The Model](#)[The Data](#)[The Results](#)[Discussion](#)[Implications for Educational Administrators](#)[Appendix: Questionnaire and Questionnaire Items](#)

secondary school teachers towards a system-wide educational change, the Unit Curriculum system. In any system-wide educational change that involves the classroom, teachers' receptivity towards the change is an important determinant of its successful implementation. It is important for educational decision-makers to know what variables affect receptivity so that new proposals can be tailored to achieve the best chance of successful implementation. It is proposed that there are fundamental variables common to all system-wide changes and these are included in a model of receptivity developed from previous research. This paper reports the results of an empirical study using data from 480 teachers where 56% of the variance in attitudes towards the Unit Curriculum system is predicted from four fundamental variables, when they are adapted to apply to the Unit Curriculum. These variables are non-monetary cost benefit to the teachers, perceived participation in the change decisions relating to the school and the classroom, perceived support for the change from principals and senior teachers, and feelings towards the previous educational system.

[1. Cost Benefit](#)[2. Practicality in the Classroom](#)[3. Alleviation of Concerns](#)[4. Teacher participation ? in Decision-making](#)[5. Perceived Support from Senior Staff](#)[6. Feelings Compared to the Previous System](#)[Part A. Attitude towards the Unit Curriculum](#)[Part B. Cost Benefit of the Unit Curriculum to the Teacher](#)[Part C. Practicality of the Unit Curriculum Outline in the Classroom](#)[Part D. School Support for you in Teaching the Unit Curriculum](#)[Part E. Teacher Participation in Unit Curriculum Decisions](#)[Part F. Significant Other Support for the Unit Curriculum](#)[Part G. Feelings towards the Previous System Compared to the Unit Curriculum](#)[Part H. General Behaviour Intentions towards the Unit Curriculum](#)

In England and Wales, the states of Australia, such as Western Australia, and various states of the USA, such as Michigan and New York, many aspects of education are controlled by a central authority. Amongst other aspects, central authorities often prescribe policy in curriculum, assessment and certification. In England, there is the National Curriculum Programme and the National Curriculum Assessment Programme. Gipps (1992) claims that millions of pounds have so far been spent on assessment in England and that the programme has not been very successful. McNamara (1990) claims that educational researchers have not been involved in the establishment of the National Curriculum Programme and that the views of researchers have not been used by policy-makers in its development. Partly this is because insufficient research is performed on system-wide change and partly it is because much of this research is not in a form that can be easily used by administrators.

This paper reports an empirical study concerned with the receptivity of teachers in Western Australia towards a system-wide educational change in its implementation stage, the Unit Curriculum system. This system replaced the modified Achievement Certificate System for Year 8 (13 year-olds) in 1988 to Year 10 (15 year-olds) in 1990. A model of teacher receptivity, designed to apply to any system-wide educational change in its implementation stage, was reported by Waugh & Punch (1985) and developed on the assumption that there are fundamental generalisations common to all such changes. Using data on teacher receptivity to the Certificate of Secondary Education system collected in 1980, they found that receptivity was related mainly to cost appraisal, practicality, concerns about important issues and feelings towards the previous educational system, and that these variables accounted for 43% of the variance in attitudes towards the Certificate of Secondary Education system. While the Certificate of Secondary Education was implemented by a centrally controlled authority at a time when teachers were in favour of the main aspects of that change, the Unit Curriculum system, in the view of many secondary school teachers, was implemented by government edict without proper trials, resources or adequate consultation with teachers. This study of receptivity towards the Unit Curriculum system therefore provides a test of the model under quite different circumstances from that used in previous studies and it uses a revised and updated model with improvements to the measures of the variables within the model.

In Western Australia, the Unit Curriculum system allows students to choose units of study appropriate to their needs, interests and abilities. Units are studied for about 40 hours and cover core areas like English, mathematics, science and social studies as well as many other areas such as art, drama, media, physical education, music and performing arts. Students can pursue any area of study in depth providing they maintain some breadth of study according to rules laid down by the schools and

[I. Overall Feelings towards the Unit Curriculum](#)

[J. Concerns about important Issues](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[REFERENCES](#)

providing the schools have the resources. Schools follow common syllabuses with common assessment procedures that allow up to 20% variation in their objectives. This system stands in contrast to the system that it replaced where all students studied English, mathematics, science and social studies for about 200 minutes a week throughout the academic year and then pursued various optional subjects offered by the schools for about 80 minutes per week. Schools were responsible for assessments which were moderated to ensure comparability of grades state-wide for only the core subjects.

NOTE

The most important changes of the Unit Curriculum system involved the syllabus units of 40 hours rather than year-long courses; the introduction of seven equal status syllabus components (English and communication, mathematics, social studies, science and technology, practical arts and crafts, personal and vocational education, and the performing arts) rather than the core plus option system; the concept of studying a series of units in a particular area in depth according to needs, abilities, interests and school resources; and having comparability of assessments of student achievement through guidelines rather than through external moderators for the core subjects. By July 1992 when all the data for this study were collected, teachers had been involved with the Unit Curriculum system for more than 4 years and hence their attitudes, feelings and behaviour intentions would have stabilised. There is a need to study teacher receptivity to system-wide changes in order to find out how best to implement changes so that educational decision-makers can better provide for students and teachers. While changes can be divided into three stages such as initiation, implementation and routinisation, it is in the implementation stage that many changes falter. In a review of the politics of educational change, James (1991, p. 201) has stated that there is a need for:

the continuation of implementation studies. The task here will be to refine what is known so that it will be possible to engage local initiative more constructively. A highly refined stream of good advice needs to reach key actors at the state level.

This is particularly relevant in Western Australia where education is centrally controlled by a state authority in regards to certification of student achievement. Teachers have to implement system-wide changes and it is important that the educational decision-makers understand how teachers form their receptivity to the change. If we can find out the main variables influencing receptivity to change, then we can provide advice to the decisionmakers on how best to tailor their proposals so that teachers will implement changes for the betterment of society. This study is in line with these comments and builds on previous research on system-wide change in the implementation stage. The study refines the variables used by Waugh & Punch (1985), combines aspects of some variables and uses recent research on change to study teacher receptivity to the Unit Curriculum.

The Model

The model used in this study is set out in Table 1. The dependent variable is receptivity and is measured in three aspects: attitude, overall feelings and behaviour intentions. Attitude is defined as a general favourable or unfavourable stance towards the Unit Curriculum as a whole. This predisposes the teacher towards a general evaluation of whether the Unit Curriculum serves a worthwhile purpose. Overall feelings are defined as an opinion about the Unit Curriculum as a whole without any strong orientation to action measured on a continuum from oppose through dislike to support and applaud. Behaviour intentions are defined as a direct intention to behave and communicate with others about the Unit Curriculum in the near future on a continuum from praise through support to oppose and resist. The questionnaire items are given in the appendix.

The Unit Curriculum has been in operation in government schools for over 4 years and it is assumed that, while teacher receptivity to it has stabilised, receptivity will vary between teachers within and amongst schools. This variation is seen as being due to the fundamental variables, adapted to apply to the Unit Curriculum, and to a number of personal variables which are not included for study here. The fundamental variables are feelings towards the previous system compared to the Unit Curriculum; personal teacher variables relating to the change such as a non-monetary cost benefit and concerns about important issues of the change; teacher/student variables such as practicality in the classroom; teacher/school variables such as participation in decisions affecting the school and the classroom in relation to the change, alleviation of concerns relating to the change through school support and perceived other teacher and senior teacher support for the change.

It is not assumed that the fundamental variables are completely unrelated and independent and it is not expected that teachers will view them as separate identities, although it is possible that some teachers will do so for some variables. The fundamental variables are separated and studied in this way in order to manage the study of change. Previous research in Western Australia (McAttee & Punch, 1979; Waugh & Punch, 1985) and in other countries (Giacquinta, 1973; Doyle & Ponder, 1978; Waugh & Punch, 1987) has shown that this method is helpful in understanding teacher receptivity to change. Within Western Australia, it has also been helpful to administrators because it focuses on variables which school principals and other educational administrators can use in managing change.

The Data

The questionnaire was developed from previous research in the area of change (McAttee & Punch, 1979; Giacquinta, 1973; Waugh, 1983; Waugh & Punch, 1985; Conley, 1991). The initial questionnaire was pre-tested and refined with teachers from a number of subject areas at one school. The main analysis was carried out with data from 480 teachers at 17 government secondary schools in the Perth metropolitan area. The analysis of the item data followed the seven criteria outlined by Wright & Masters (1981) in order to obtain valid measures of each of the variables in the model. These criteria involve: first, an assessment of the extent to which each item functions as intended; second, an estimation of the relative position or calibration of each valid item along the dimension which the items define; third, an assessment of the extent to which each person's responses form a valid response pattern; fourth, an estimation of the position on the dimension defined by the valid items for each person whose pattern of responses is valid; fifth, the person measures and the item calibrations must fit together on a common continuum defined by the items, and they must share a constant interval from one end of the continuum to the other so that their numerical values mark off the continuum in a linear way; sixth, these numerical values should be accompanied by standard errors which indicate how precisely the positions of persons and items on the continuum are estimated; and last, the results must be objective enough to support some useful generalisations so that the items remain more or less the same in their function and meaning from person to person and group to group.

While existing scales were used for the variables, where new research evidence was available, some new items were developed as in the case of the variable, participation (Conley, 1991). All the variables were pre-tested, including those with existing and new items, before being used in the main data collection. The items and variables of the main body of data were analysed to ensure that the seven criteria mentioned above were satisfied and this meant that some items had to be discarded. For the analysis, the Rating Response Measurement Model (Andrich, 1978), a generalisation of Rasch's (1960) simple logistic measurement model was used with a computer program called Quest developed by Adams & Khoo (1992). The analysis produced scales for each variable that exhibited sound psychometric properties and showed that all the scales represent unidimensional measures of the variables.

The questionnaire contained four sections. The first contained three measures of the dependent variable receptivity: attitude, overall feelings and behaviour intentions. While attitude was measured with a 10 item semantic differential in line with research reported by Osgood et al. (1970), only seven items were retained after the analysis. Overall feelings were measured with an eight item Likert scale using four response categories without a neutral category because Dubois & Bums (1975) reported that many respondents use a neutral category when they do not hold neutral feelings. Behaviour intentions were measured with a six item Likert scale with four response categories on a continuum from praise through support to oppose and resist in relation to behaviour and communication with others.

The second section contained scales relating to two personal teacher variables: non-monetary cost benefit of the change and concern about important issues related to the change. Cost benefit (Doyle & Ponder, 1977-78) is conceptualised as a ratio between the amount of return and the amount of investment for the teacher in terms of benefit for the teacher and the student. It was revised by Waugh (1983), further revised and adapted for this study and is measured by a five item scale with four response categories. Concern is measuring the important issues of the Unit Curriculum as seen by teachers and it uses a five item Likert scale with four response categories.

The third section contained teacher views on how practical the Unit Curriculum was in the classroom, as defined by Doyle & Ponder (1977-78), and further revised for this study. It was measured with a seven item Likert scale which was reduced to five items after analysis. The fourth section contained variables relating to the interaction between the teacher and the school such as participation, the alleviation of concerns and perceived support for the

Unit Curriculum. Participation was defined along the lines of recent research performed by Conley (1991) who found that teachers examined such aspects as authority versus influence, actual outcomes versus expected outcomes, and classroom decisions versus administrative decisions. It was measured with a seven item Likert scale which was reduced to five items after analysis. Teachers' concerns can be alleviated through such things as meetings, teacher friends, senior supportive teachers and so on (Giacquinta, 1973; Waugh & Punch, 1987). In this study, it was measured with a seven item Likert scale which was reduced to five items after analysis. Support for the Unit Curriculum from the principal, senior teachers and other teachers, as perceived by the teachers, was measured by a five item Likert scale which was reduced to four items after analysis.

The data were collected from a sample of 480 secondary school teachers who were teaching the Unit Curriculum in 1992 at 17 government schools in Perth, Western Australia. Twenty schools were selected randomly from 54 government schools in Perth and then located on a map of Perth. Based on the researchers' local knowledge of the schools, four schools were discarded and three others added to ensure a wide variation in teacher attitudes across a wide variation of implementation of the Unit Curriculum in schools. Only two schools declined to participate. The sample of schools is representative of government secondary schools teaching the Unit Curriculum in Perth during 1992.

The Results

The first result to note is that there were some strong and widespread objections to the Unit Curriculum system. Of 450 teachers, 190 (42%) perceived the Unit Curriculum as 'worthless' rather than 'valuable'; 307 (68%) perceived it as 'restrictive' rather than 'permissive'; and 264 (59%) perceived it as 'ineffective' rather than 'effective'. With regard to behaviour intentions, while 230 (50%) of 455 teachers indicated that in their behaviour and communication with others, they would probably oppose the Unit Curriculum up to 1994 only 156 (34%) indicated that they would actively and openly resist the Unit Curriculum.

It is interesting that the variable overall feelings paints a slightly different picture whereby only 126 (28%) of 448 teachers indicated that they had opposed the Unit Curriculum up till now (1992) and 194 (44%) indicated that they had supported the system up till now. These data reflect a commonly written response on many questionnaires that the Unit Curriculum was fine in theory but it was implemented without adequate consultation with teachers, that insufficient resources were provided for its full and proper implementation, and that the trials were not evaluated properly. They also reflect a common feeling conveyed to the researchers, particularly by English, mathematics and science teachers, that the course outlines were restrictive and detrimental to learning in their subject, and that there was inadequate development of skills by the students. This occurred in part because there was a rush to teach and assess achievement in the time available for the units. Moreover, there was a belief that the students were not able to build on knowledge and skills from previous units. In contrast to this there was wide and, at times, strong support from teachers of courses who believed that their subjects were given higher or equal status with English, mathematics, science and social studies and that they were able to adapt the courses to suit their subject, their teaching style and their students.

In the main, the teachers who supported the Unit Curriculum were those whose subject areas were content based, such as social studies and home economics teachers, and teachers of the subjects which were previously classified as optional or electives. Such subjects included art, practical arts, performing arts, physical and health education, and personal and vocational education. Unfavourable comments in relation to restrictiveness, over-assessment and lack of resources were spread across all subject areas. Out of 423, 286 teachers (68%) classified the Unit Curriculum as restrictive rather than permissive; 331 (78%) classified it as idealistic rather than realistic while 245 (58%) classified it as complicated rather than uncomplicated.

The zero order correlations between the variables are shown in Table II. The three aspects of receptivity correlate positively and to a similar degree with the other variables in the model and, although the regression analysis to follow will differentiate between the three aspects of receptivity, the interpretation of the zero order correlations considers receptivity in general. Receptivity correlates positively and moderately well with non-monetary cost benefit, practicality in the classroom, participation in school and classroom decisions, school support (alleviation of concerns), and with feelings towards the previous educational system. Receptivity has only a low positive correlation with concerns about important aspects affecting the Unit Curriculum.

A series of multiple regression analyses with these data, using the three aspects of receptivity separately, confirm

and extend these correlational findings. When attitude towards the Unit Curriculum is used as the dependent variable, non-monetary cost benefit perceived by the teachers ($\beta = 0.256$) [1], perceived participation in school and classroom decisions ($\beta = 0.171$), perceived support for the Unit Curriculum by significant others ($\beta = 0.224$), and feelings towards the previous educational system ($\beta = 0.274$) account for 56% of the variance in attitudes. When overall feelings towards the Unit Curriculum is used as the dependent variable, non-monetary cost benefit ($\beta = 0.109$), perceived participation in school and classroom decisions ($\beta = 0.087$), feelings towards the previous educational system ($\beta = 0.472$), and perceived concerns relating to important issues affecting the Unit Curriculum ($\beta = 0.105$) account for 39% of the variance in overall feelings. When behaviour intentions towards the Unit Curriculum is used as the dependent variable, non-monetary cost benefit ($\beta = 0.136$), perceived participation ($\beta = 0.083$), perceived support for the Unit Curriculum by significant others ($\beta = 0.083$), and feelings towards the previous educational system ($\beta = 0.514$) account for 58% of the variance in behaviour intentions.

Discussion

In any major educational change which involves teaching in the classroom, the attitudes and behaviour of the teachers who have to implement the change, and particularly the strength of their receptivity to the change, are important determinants of the success of the implementation of that change. It is proposed that there are fundamental variables common to all major educational changes and that a good understanding of the important influences on teacher receptivity to those changes will be reflected in a research finding that a majority of the variance in receptivity can be accounted for by these fundamental variables. In the case of the Unit Curriculum, a major system-wide change introduced in Western Australia in 1988, the fundamental variables have been taken from previous research on change in Western Australia (McAttee & Punch, 1979; Waugh & Punch, 1985; Waugh & Punch, 1987) and from research in other Western countries (Giacquinta, 1973; Doyle & Ponder, 1977-78; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Conley, 1991) and it would be expected that these fundamental variables will account for the majority of variance in teachers' receptivity to the Unit Curriculum.

Given that this study accounts for 56% of the variance in teachers' attitudes to the Unit Curriculum with the variables, perceived non-monetary cost benefit by the teachers, perceived participation in school and classroom decisions affecting the Unit Curriculum, perceived support for the Unit Curriculum by significant others such as the principal and senior teachers, and teachers' feelings about the previous educational system, it seems that the model is very useful in understanding the main variables that correlate with teacher receptivity. This is supported by the similar amount of variance (59%) accounted for in teachers' behaviour intentions towards the Unit Curriculum by the same predictor variables. This is further supported by the fact that these results, obtained in relation to a successfully implemented system-wide change in which teacher receptivity was not very favourable in some schools, confirm and extend the results from previous studies of system-wide change in Western Australia when teacher receptivity was particularly favourable to the change.

It could be argued that the variations among teachers in regard to their receptivity towards the Unit Curriculum emerge from their rationalisation of the items in various sections of the questionnaire because all the variables are measured with the one questionnaire at the same time. That is, the measurement of the fundamental and dependent variables is not independent and a lower percentage of actual variance was measured several times. While there is no way of knowing how much this might have occurred in this case, there are a number of points to note. Firstly, teachers gave written comments in open-ended questions at the end of each section which was clearly marked with the variable to which teachers were to refer. Teachers did respond differently to the various sections. Second, the items in each section are different and each variable was shown to be unidimensional using the Rating Response Measurement Model. Third, the researchers spoke at length with many teachers during the pre-testing of the questionnaire and later after the administration of the questionnaire at the various schools. The teachers identified the different variables as aspects of implementation to be considered.

The model used in this study sets out the variables and their relationships in a straightforward manner. It could be argued that this has over-simplified the interactions that occur when major changes are implemented. While this is probably true and more research needs to be done on the interactions, the variables used in this study give strong pointers to the variables to be used in such research. The results of the present study also give strong pointers to educational administrators who have to implement system-wide changes.

It should be noted here that while the Unit Curriculum was 'successfully' implemented by teachers, a great deal of

mutual adaptation occurred because insufficient resources, such as more teachers for smaller classes and vertical timetabling, were not provided. That is, the Unit Curriculum was implemented in a variety of ways by different schools and to varying extents because teachers were able to adapt the main aspects of the change and to change their teaching in varying degrees in line with the policies and procedures at their different schools.

In Western Australia, teacher assessment of student achievement from Years 8-10 was first introduced in the early 1970s with the Achievement Certificate system and in the late 1970s it was introduced in Years 11 and 12. While there was some initial adverse reaction to the increased work-load of assessment in the 1970s, it quickly became an accepted part of the educational system in Western Australia. Teachers support assessment at school and are opposed to the introduction of examinations in lower secondary school in Western Australia. In addition to this, teachers are comfortable with their assessment role and this is not an issue with them as far as the Unit Curriculum is concerned.

Implications for Educational Administrators

Based on this research, which itself brings together variables from research on teachers' attitudes to major system-wide change over nearly three decades, there is evidence to suggest that major educational changes can be implemented more faithfully to their original proposals by teachers if administrators take into account the following variables. It must be noted that these variables only refer to the implementation stage of the change and not to the initiation stage for which other variables and strategies will be important (Giacquinta, 1973; James, 1991).

1. Cost Benefit

If teachers are required to perform extra work to implement the change at their schools and in their own classrooms, then they must obtain some return for this investment. This return can be in the form of increased satisfaction with teaching, better student learning, better matching of courses with student needs, interests and abilities, and so on. Administrators need to take this aspect into account in their proposals and be able to explain the benefits for teachers knowing that teachers will work this out during the implementation.

2. Practicality in the Classroom

Teachers need to be able to implement the change in their classrooms. In order to do this, the change has to be suited to, or adaptable to, the various teaching styles for various subjects. Some subjects are process oriented such as English; some are content and sequentially based such mathematics and languages; others are practical oriented such as the practical and performing arts. Sufficient resources have to be allocated to allow teachers to implement the change in each subject and at each school as appropriate to the new proposal. Teachers also have to be able to manage the day to day running of their classrooms and, clearly, new proposals need to allow them to do that.

3. Alleviation of Concerns

Some strategies and mechanisms should be set in place in order that teachers can raise their concerns about the change and have those concerns addressed. This can be done in a number of ways such as regular school meetings, supportive senior staff who can give advice informally, and meetings with change agents and head office administrators.

4. Teacher participation ? in Decision-making

The school principal and senior staff should set in place mechanisms whereby teachers can take part in decisions about the changes that affect the school and, particularly, their classrooms. In respect to the main aspects of the change that will affect them in the classroom, teachers will examine their authority versus their influence, the actual outcomes versus the expected outcomes, and classroom decisions versus administrative decisions.

5. Perceived Support from Senior Staff

Teachers are more likely to have positive attitudes towards the change if the principal and senior staff are publicly seen as supporting the change in their communications and actions at the school. This means that, while the senior staff should communicate the advantages and benefits of the change, they should do so in an objective way without making exaggerated claims.

6. Feelings Compared to the Previous System

Teachers are more likely to have positive attitudes towards the change if it is perceived to be offering clear advantages over the previous system. Hence any independent change agents, head office administrative staff and senior school staff should clearly explain to the teachers the advantages of the change. Various methods can be used to do this such as meetings, brochures, displays and letters.

TABLE I. Model of teacher receptivity to the unit curriculum

Dependent variables

Attitude towards the Unit Curriculum
Overall feelings towards the Unit Curriculum
Behaviour intentions towards the Unit Curriculum

Fundamental variables expected to be related
to the dependent variables

Non-monetary cost benefit to the teacher
Practicality of the Unit Curriculum in the classroom
Alleviation of fears and concerns about implementation
Participation in decision-making at school
Concerns about critical issues relating to the Unit Curriculum
Feelings towards the previous system compared
to the Unit Curriculum
Perceived support for the Unit Curriculum

TABLE II. Correlations of the variables with receptivity

Fundamental variables	Attitudes	Overall feelings	Behaviour intentions
Cost benefit	0.59	0.56	0.71
Practicality	0.36	0.28	0.36
Participation	0.60	0.43	0.56
School support	0.48	0.32	0.46
Teacher support	0.63	0.45	0.74
Concerns	0.12	0.20	0.15
Feelings toward previous system	0.69	0.60	0.74

With N = 379, $p < 0.001$, Pearson product-moment correlations on interval scale scores estimated from the Rating Response Measurement Model for each of the variables.

[Appendix: Questionnaire and Questionnaire Items](#)

Part A. Attitude towards the Unit Curriculum

Teachers were asked to respond to 10 adjective pairs as a four category semantic differential with the Unit Curriculum as the referent. (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies for the 480 respondents, in category order, for each adjective pair). The adjective pairs are:

satisfactory/unsatisfactory (63,165,156,82,14missing); worthless/valuable (27,170,224,43,16missing); wise/foolish (21,206,179,58,16missing); good/bad (40,221,149,54,16missing); absurd/intelligent (33,148,250,33,16missing); restrictive/permissive (148,165,122,29,16missing); idealistic/realistic (186,176,95,11,12missing); effective/ineffective (25,169,179,91,16missing); unnecessary/necessary (99,159,165,42,11missing); complicated/uncomplicated (92,174,147,54,13missing).

Teachers also responded with general written comments on their overall attitude to the Unit Curriculum, and with general written comments after each Part B-Pan J.

Part B. Cost Benefit of the Unit Curriculum to the Teacher

Teachers responded to five items in four categories as 'Yes, very much so' (vms), 'Yes, a little', 'No, not much' (nm), or 'No, not at all'. (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The five items are:

1. In weighing up the balance between the work generated for you by the Unit Curriculum and your satisfaction with teaching, is the Unit Curriculum worthwhile? (52 YESvms, 196 YES, 162 NONm, 70 NO, none missing.)
2. In weighing up the balance between the work generated for you by the Unit Curriculum and your home life, is the Unit Curriculum worthwhile? (39 YESvms, 136 YES, 214 NONm, 91 NO, none missing.)
3. In weighing up the balance between the work generated for you by the Unit Curriculum and better student classroom learning, is the Unit Curriculum worthwhile? (43 YESvms, 144 YES, 176 NONm, 117 NO, none missing.)
4. In weighing up the balance between the total problems generated for you by the Unit Curriculum and the total benefits for the student, is the Unit Curriculum worthwhile? (38 YESvms, 157 YES, 181 NONm, 104 NO, none missing.)
5. In weighing up the balance between the responsibility for student assessment generated by the Unit Curriculum and your work load, is the Unit Curriculum worthwhile? (38 YESvms, 148 YES, 187 NONm, 107 NO, none missing.)

Part C. Practicality, of the Unit Curriculum Outline in the Classroom

Teachers responded to eight items in four categories as 'Yes, very much so' (vms), 'Yes, a little', 'No, not much' (nm), or 'No, not at all'. (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The eight items are:

1. Do the course outlines suit your classroom teaching style? (99 YESvms, 259 YES, 98 NONm, 20 NO, 4 missing.)
2. Do the course outlines sufficiently reflect your educational philosophy? (54 YESvms, 220 YES, 157 NONm, 45 NO, 4 missing.)
3. Do the course outlines provide a sufficient variety of classroom learning experiences? (110 YESvms, 233 YES, 111 NONm, 22 NO, 4 missing.)
4. Is the classroom content tuned to the needs of the students? (46 YESvms, 213 YES, 174 NONm, 43 NO, 4 missing.)
5. Do the students object to your classroom assessment program? (17 YESvms, 75 YES, 192 NONm, 190 NO, 6 missing.)
6. Do the course outlines provide sufficient flexibility to help you manage the day-to-day running of the classroom? (68 YESvms, 225 YES, 140 NONm, 43 NO, 4 missing.)
7. Are the available resources in your subject area sufficient to implement the course outlines as stated? (99 YES vms, 213 YES, 97 NONm, 67 NO, 4 missing.)
8. Are those students who failed a previous unit in your subject area, a problem in your class? (168 YESvms, 168 YES, 103 NONm, 33 NO, 8 missing.)

Part D. School Support for you in Teaching the Unit Curriculum

Teachers responded to seven items as 'strongly agree' (SA), 'agree' (A), 'disagree' (DA), or 'strongly disagree' (SDA). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order). The seven items are:

1. There are regular school meetings at which I can raise my fears and apprehensions about the Unit Curriculum. (33 SA, 157 A, 175 DA, 114 SDA, 1 missing.)
2. Whenever there are Unit Curriculum problems, there is a senior teacher to whom I can turn for advice. (122 SA, 257 A, 67 DA, 33 SDA, 1 missing.)
3. There is good general support whenever I have problems with Unit Curriculum books, equipment, field-work etc. (50 SA, 232 A, 150 DA, 45 SDA, 3 missing.)
4. There is at least one school person with whom I can talk about any Unit Curriculum student problems. (150 SA, 263 A, 48 DA, 17 SDA, 2 missing.)
5. The principal is very supportive in solving Unit Curriculum problems (51 SA, 205 A, 160 DA, 62 SDA, 2 missing.)
6. Any fears, problems or apprehension I have about the Unit Curriculum can sometimes be solved informally in general conversation at school. (58 SA, 252 A, 127 DA, 41 SDA, 2 missing.)
7. There are some problems with the Unit Curriculum that cannot be solved through support at this school. (26 SA, 62 A, 166 DA, 221 SDA, 5 missing.)

Part E. Teacher Participation in Unit Curriculum Decisions

Teachers responded to seven items as 'much greater' (MG), 'somewhat greater' (SG), 'somewhat less' (SL), or 'much less' (ML). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order) The seven items are:

1. The influence that I actually had compared to the influence that I philosophically expected in relation to teaching the Unit Curriculum subject matter in the classroom was: (17 MG, 138 SG, 190 SL, 107 ML, 28 missing.)
2. The influence that I actually had compared to the influence that I philosophically expected in relation to assessing student achievement in the Unit Curriculum was: (20 MG, 158 SG, 215 SL, 59 ML, 28 missing.)
3. The influence that I actually had compared to the influence that I philosophically expected in relation to describing and reporting student achievement in the Unit Curriculum was: (15 MG, 133 ML, 225 SL, 80 ML, 27 missing.)
4. The authority that I actually had compared to the authority that I philosophically expected in relation to deciding Unit Curriculum subject matter to be taught was: (17 MG, 129 ML, 178 SL, 128 ML, 28 missing.)
5. The authority that I actually had compared to the authority that I philosophically expected in relation to deciding assessment policy in the Unit Curriculum was: (13 MG, 125 ML, 209 SL, 104 ML, 28 missing.)
6. The co-ordination with other classroom teachers that I actually had compared to the co-ordination that I philosophically expected in relation to Unit Curriculum subject matter was: (29 MG, 204 ML, 143 SL, 75 ML, 29 missing.)
7. The co-ordination with other classroom teachers that I actually had compared to the co-ordination that I philosophically expected in relation to Unit Curriculum assessment policy was: (20 MG, 198 ML, 169 SL, 64 ML, 29 missing.)

Part F. Significant Other Support for the Unit Curriculum

Teachers responded to five items as 'strongly agree' (SA), 'agree' (A), 'disagree' (DA), or 'strongly disagree' (SDA). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The five items are:

1. In your opinion, your best teacher friend supports the Unit Curriculum. (24 SA, 147 A, 191 DA, 108 SDA, 10 missing.)
2. In your opinion, the principal at this school supports the Unit Curriculum. (36 SA, 259 A, 146 DA, 28 SDA, 11 missing.)
3. In your opinion, the senior teacher in your main teaching subject area supports the Unit Curriculum. (45 SA, 194 A, 156 DA, 76 SDA, 10 missing.)
4. In your opinion, the majority of teachers at this school support the Unit Curriculum (15 SA, 144 A, 243 DA,

69 SDA, 9 missing.)

5. At school meetings, the principal makes comments praising the Unit Curriculum. (6 SA, 65 A, 271 DA, 131 SDA, 7 missing.)

Part G. Feelings towards the Previous System Compared to the Unit Curriculum

Teachers responded to six items as 'yes, very much so', 'yes, somewhat', 'no, not much', or 'no, not at all'. (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The six items are:

1. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum provides for better student learning. (29,117,184,111,39missing.)
2. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum allows me to manage my classroom better. (20,87,194,140,39missing.)
3. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum provides more relevant and up-to-date content. (29,146,164,102,39missing.)
4. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum allows students to better match courses with abilities and needs. (23,118,173,127. 39 missing.)
5. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum provides for more interesting and varied experiences for the students. (36,137,170,98,39missing.)
6. In comparison to the previous education system, the Unit Curriculum provides more interesting and varied content to teach. (21,128,177,116,38missing.)

Part H. General Behaviour Intentions towards the Unit Curriculum

Teachers responded to six items as 'strongly agree' (SA), 'agree' (A), 'disagree' (DA), or 'strongly disagree' (SDA). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The six items are: 1. In my behaviour and communication with others, I will probably oppose the Unit Curriculum from 1992 to 1994. (45 SA, 188 A, 144 DA, 95 SDA, 8 missing.)

- 2. In my behaviour and communications with others, I will probably actively and openly support the Unit Curriculum from 1992 to 1994. (36 SA, 113 A, 210 DA, 113 SDA, 8 missing.)
- 3. In my behaviour and communication with others, I will probably praise the Unit Curriculum from 1992 to 1994. (22 SA, 92 A, 233 DA, 125 SDA, 8 missing.)
- 4. In my behaviour and communication with others, I will probably actively and openly resist the Unit Curriculum from 1992 to 1994. (55 SA, 254 A, 104 DA, 58 SDA, 9 missing.)
- 5. In my behaviour and communication with other teachers, I will tell them that the Unit Curriculum outlines are flexible and hence supportable from 1992 to 1994. (22 SA, 148 A, 212 SD, 89 SDA, 9 missing.)
- 6. In my behaviour and communication with other teachers, I will tell them that the Unit Curriculum can be adapted to the needs and abilities of students from 1992 to 1994. (35 SA, 194 A, 172 DA, 69 SDA, 10 missing.)

I. Overall Feelings towards the Unit Curriculum

Teachers responded to eight items as 'strongly agree' (SA), 'agree' (A), 'disagree' (DA), or 'strongly disagree' (SDA). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The eight items are:

1. I have opposed in principle the operation of the Unit Curriculum at this school up to now. (69 SA, 265 A, 96 DA, 35 SDA,15 missing.)
2. I will probably applaud the operation of the Unit Curriculum in the next few years. (21 SA,9SA, 253 DA, 95 SDA, 16 missing.)
3. I have disliked the operation of the Unit Curriculum up to now. (26 SA. 187 A, 188 DA, 66 SDA. 13 missing.)
4. I supported the operation of the Unit Curriculum up to now. (32 SA, 235 A, 150 DA, 50 SDA, 13 missing.)
5. I will oppose in principle the operation of the Unit Curriculum in the next few years. (40 SA, 215 A, 153 DA, 55 SDA, 17 missing.)
6. I will probably support the operation of the Unit Curriculum in the next few years. (21 SA. 216 A, 169 DA, 58

SDA, 16 missing.)

7. I applauded the operation of the Unit Curriculum up to now. (13 SA, 99 A, 263 DA, 91 SDA, 14 missing.)
8. I will probably dislike the operation of the Unit Curriculum in the next few years (31 SA, 196 A, 168 DA, 88 SDA, 17 missing.)

J. Concerns about important Issues

Teachers responded to six items as 'strongly agree (SA), 'agree' (A), 'disagree' (DA), or 'strongly disagree' (SDA). (The numbers in brackets are the response frequencies in category order.) The six items refer to issues identified in pre-testing and interviews with teachers. The items are:

1. The monitoring standards issue is causing me concern in regard to the Unit Curriculum. (20 SA, 119 A, 205 DA, 127 SDA, 9 missing.)
2. Numeracy and literacy issues are causing me concern in regard to the Unit Curriculum (27 SA, 106 A, 208 DA, 135 SDA, 9 missing.)
3. I am concerned that the seven equal components concept is being 'watered' down in the Unit Curriculum. (21 SA, 124 A, 208 DA, 116 SDA, 11 missing.)
4. I am concerned that English, science, mathematics and social studies receive more attention than other subject areas. (91 SA, 167 A, 105 DA, 107 SDA, 10 missing.)
5. I am concerned that students who fail a unit do not have to repeat that unit before attempting a higher level unit in that subject area. (8 SA, 38 A, 168 DA, 257 SDA, 9 missing.)
6. The Better Schools Project is causing me concern in relation to the Unit Curriculum. (12 SA, 145 A, 208 DA, 99 SDA, 16 missing.)

Acknowledgements

The authors appreciated, not only the prompt attention of the editor and the referees to this submission, but also the insightful and useful comments provided by the journal referees. Our work and thinking was much improved as a result of their suggestions.

Correspondence: Dr Russell Waugh, Edith Cowan University, Pearson Street, Churchlands, Western Australia, 6018.

NOTE

[1] *Beta = beta weights or standard regression coefficients in the multiple linear regression equations.*

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, R.J. & KHOO, S.T. (1992) Quest: the interactive test analysis system (Hawthorn, Victoria, ACER).
- ANDRICH, D. (1978) A rating formulation for ordered response categories, *Psychometrika*, 43, PP. 561-573.
- BERMAN, P. & MCLAUGHLIN M.W. (1978) Federal Programmes Supporting Educational Change: implementing and sustaining innovations., Vol. 3 (Santa Monica, CA. Rand Corporation).
- CONLEY, S. (1991) Review of research on teacher participation in school decision-making, *Review of Research in Education*, 17, PP. 225-268.
- DOYLE, W. & PONDER, G.A. (1977-78) The practicality ethic in teacher decision making, *Interchange*, 8(3), PP. 1-12.
- DUBOIS, B. & BURNS, J.A. (1975) An analysis of the meaning of the question mark response category in attitude scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 35, PP. 869-884.

- GIACQUINTA, J.B. (1973) The process of organizational change in schools, in: F. N. KERLINGER (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, PP. 178-208 (Itasca, IL, Peacock for the American Educational Association).
- GIPPS, C.V. (1992). *National Curriculum Assessment: a research agenda*, *British Educational Research Journal*, 18(3), PP. 277-286.
- JAMES, T. (1991) *State authority and the politics of educational change*, in: G. GRAND (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education*, pp. 169-224 (Washington, American Educational Research Association).
- MCATTEE, W.A. & PUNCH, K.F. (1979) *Accounting for teachers' attitudes towards change*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 17(2), PP. 171-182.
- MCNAMARA, D. (1990). *The National Curriculum: an agenda for research*, *British Educational Research Journal*, 16(3), PP. 225-235.
- OSGOOD, C.E., SUCT, G.J. & TANNEBAUM, P.H. (1970) *Attitude measurement*, in: G. F. SUMMERS (Ed.), *Attitude Measurement*, pp. 227-234 (Chicago, IL, Rand McNally).
- RASCH, G. (1960) *Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests* (Copenhagen, Denmark Paedagogiske Institut).
- WAUGH, R.F. (1983) *Teacher receptivity to system wide change*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Western Australia.
- WAUGH, R.F. & PUNCH, K.F. (1985) *Teacher receptivity to system-wide change*, *British Educational Research Journal*, 11(2), pp. 113-121.
- WAUGH, R.F. & PUNCH, K.F. (1987) *Teacher receptivity to system-wide change in the implementation stage*, *Review of Educational Research*, 57(3), PP. 237-254.
- WRIGHT, B.D. & MASTERS, G.N. (1981) *The Measurement of Knowledge and Attitude*, research memorandum No 30, Statistical Laboratory, Department of Education (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago).

~~~~~

By RUSSELL WAUGH & JOHN GODFREY, Edith Cowan University, Western Australia

---

Copyright of **British Educational Research Journal** is the property of Carfax Publishing Company and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual use.

**Source:** *British Educational Research Journal*, 1993, Vol. 19 Issue 5, p565, 13p

**Item:** 9603071456

[Top of Page](#)

[◀ Back](#)