ABSTRACT
        This document reviews research on the implementation
by teachers of new classroom procedures. The document also traces
trends in methods for encouraging instructional innovation as these
trends were influenced by the research findings. The report begins
with an account of the curriculum reform movement, which featured
nonteaching experts telling teachers how to change. The lack of
change was first attributed to teacher failure and later to teacher
unwillingness to change. The review then traces the impact of
research on the growing understanding of several forces affecting
innovation: the pressures limiting teacher participation, the value
of shared effort and collegial support, the importance of an
anthropological or cultural understanding of the teaching situation,
the uses of action research techniques, and the application of
supervisory methods. The document concludes with a listing of 17 ways
in which the methodology of teacher supervision should be modified to
accommodate the research findings. (PGD)

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION, CLASSROOM CHANGE
AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE
CHALLENGE FOR SUPERVISION

R.L. Butt

The University of Lethbridge

Paper presented as CSSE, Guelph, Ontario,
June, 1984

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION, CLASSROOM CHANGE
AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE
CHALLENGE FOR SUPERVISON

R.L. Butt
The University of Lethbridge

The most persistent problem that has ever plagued the field of
education is that of classroom change, whether in relationship
to curriculum implementation, innovation and reform, or
professional development. Despite the endearing stubbornness
of this problem the continuing efforts of practitioners and
scholars have recently provided some glimmers of hope. Within
the curriculum field school-based approaches to curriculum
change, as opposed to large scale projects, have proved
relatively more successful in facilitating innovation, change,
and curriculum implementation. Treating curriculum
implementation as an interpretive activity on the part of
teachers has assisted in embedding changes within the unique
contexts in which teachers work. In being able to
participate, with those from outside the classroom, in
determining mutually agreed changes, teachers appear more
likely to actually make those changes in their own classrooms.
Further, the degree to which such changes are self-initiated
on the part of the teacher or a school staff also appear to be
related to successful pedagogical improvement.

The major functional element, of curriculum reform efforts

that appears to determine the success of innovative projects or curriculum implementation is the nature of the relationship between insiders (teachers) and outsiders (reformers, consultants, supervisors). The nature of these relationships, however, has been problematic within the recent history of curriculum reform, implementation and change.

At the beginning of the curriculum reform movement, curriculum development was removed not only from curriculum makers and teachers but also from educational systems completely. The "expert" designed curricula and the technological mode of implementation that was used implicitly criticized teachers. It implied that little of what teachers were doing was worthwhile, and since the pedagogy advocated within the new curricula was quite different, it also implied that teachers were not using the "best" methodology. The teacher's role, reduced to the level of a user or technician, left little room for the teacher's own ideals, intentions, or style.

This practice viewed the teacher as someone to whom things were done in order to get them to perform properly. Following the failure of original attempts at reform developers resorted to the teacher-proofing of curriculum materials.

Teacher proofing represented perhaps the low point in the history of pedagogical innovation. It suggested that since teachers were not competent to implement the new curricula,

unless they were given a simple "how to do it" guide they would not be able to manage. That this approach still did not result in success might have caused reformers to question their assumptions about curricula and their relationship to teachers. The next wave of implementation efforts, however, concentrated on "in-servicing" teachers to add behaviors, knowledge and skills that were deemed necessary for the new curricula.

It was then that "teacher resistance" was discovered! The future of implementation was not, after all, due to teachers' deficits but rather teachers' unwillingness to use the new curriculum products! This diagnosis led to what might be called implementation as a problem of selling a curriculum product. Marketing techniques were designed to assist teachers to "buy-in" and use new curricula. Some of the initial meetings designed to win teachers over could be compared to some Sunday morning television shows. One teacher union official was overheard suggesting they run a deprogramming clinic, but as any salesman knows, if your product is deficient, no amount of persuasion will sell it to an intelligent consumer. Teachers teach what they do and how they do for very personal and practical reasons and it is very difficult, therefore, for any curriculum document, materials, or mandated curriculum to be "right" for one classroom, let alone many or all.

With the failure of the expert designed curricula and the
industrial or commercial model of change, the focus of
development has shifted more recently from the large-scale
curriculum development project back towards regional policy
makers at the provincial or state level. Teacher
representatives have been involved in the development of
curriculum guidelines. Yet, despite the practical classroom
guidelines written in teachers' language, this process has
been subject to administrative approval through vertical sets
of committees who are usually subjected to limiting
frameworks. However, the very nature of the representative
teacher committee mitigates against making policies that meet
the unique requirements of local needs. What common factors
would exist for teachers in inner-city, suburban, country,
remote regions? If we drew a Venn diagram of the potential
intersection of these disparate needs we would end up with
minimal bland basics taught through culture-free workbooks
which represent minimum rather than maximum teaching potential
and in the pluralistic, multicultural, regional world of today
this does not make sense.

In an attempt to promote "ownership", various types of
action-research were tried in which teachers were expected to
experiment with new curricula; trying it on for size; ironing
out problems; developing new ones. These action-research
activities leave questions about insider/outsider

relationships unanswered. How much power does the teacher have? How far can developer intentions be adapted? Does it still remain a manipulative device aimed at implementing other people's intentions, overcoming teacher resistance and gaining commitment through compliance. These questions keep coming back to haunt us.

In order to provide a more powerful framework by which we can understand the dysfunctional aspects of these relationships and how they might be improved I draw on Olson (1982) who discusses the problem of classroom change as viewed through three kinds of science of practical described by McKeon (1952). These three kinds of practical sciences, the logistic, the dialectic, the problematic, are distinguished from each other by the relationship of theory to practice or knowledge to action that each embodies.

Within the logistic conception, it is assumed that practice itself has no knowledge to offer, therefore the practical is conceived of as something in need of scientific guidance through the direct application of theory to practice. Theory and practice are separate; implicitly theory is superior to practice. At the human level, reformers, who possess the theory are perceived as superior to the practitioners, who need to be assisted to do things the right way.

The dialectic treats theory and practice as one thing. It

proceeds through a discussion, formulation, and exploration of ideals which are held against the light of reality. The innovative doctrine, then, is assessed against the knowledge of particular circumstances. Practical action is evolved from the dialectic which is adapted to particular conditions and situations.

In human terms, reformers and teachers might together examine and discuss the potential of a particular innovation as it might take acount of both the ideal and the real in a particular teacher's situation. Theory and practice are regarded as aspects of the same thing, each can be advanced through the appreciation of and resolution of each other's perspective. The dialectic, then, recognizes the influences of both outside forces and a will to accomplish personal purpose on a teacher's action. It assists in dealing with potential contradictions of the short term and moving toward the long term common commitment of improving curriculum. Insiders and outsiders are equal partners who share their different perspectives and knowledges which each other.

The problematical holds the problem as the focus of action. In this conception, all who have a stake are involved on an equal basis in communication characterized by deliberation, persuasion, and agreement to a particular decision. The method to amelioration of the problem, as opposed to a generalized procedure used by the logistic, is derived by the

group from the nature of the problem and its context.

In human terms the problematical approach might involve a group of teachers and others working together to examine problems in their own practical arenas. Through an examination of what they actually do and how this differs from what they think they do, and what they wish to do, they bring about increase in self awareness, an appraisal of personal purpose, and situation-dependent problem-oriented action.

It is easy to see that most attempts at curriculum change have been of the logistic variety and we can therefore understand how they have failed through separation of theory from practice, policy from action, and responsibi cy from function. It is no wonder that the elitism and coercive power structure within this paradigm educes so-called resistance and subversion on the part of alienated teachers.

The potential of the dialectic and the problematic in bringing together insiders and outsiders is enormous. Under the umbrella of McKeon's metatheoretical framework for the dialectic and the problematic, newer approaches to inquiry, research, development and change are evolving which do not artificially produce a gap that has to be bridged between theory and practic and between insiders and outsiders. Purpose and action are integrated as are the intellectual and practical activities of insiders and outsiders.

The major question at this juncture is how can we encourage insiders and outsiders to create these new types of horizontal collegial relationships? How can researchers, reformers, administrators, and others outside the classroom comprehend the realities of teaching? How can teachers raise their own consciousness and begin to consider unexamined habits, working life, and notions of what is "needed" and "practical"? Can vision be brought to insiders and reality to outsiders through creating a variety of ways in which they can work together on an equal footing?

These questions have begin to be addressed in earnest within the curriculum field as the fundamental importance of the preoccupation of and relationships among insiders and outsiders within various efforts at educational improvements have been realized. Many studies have documented the failure of the logistic (top-down) approach to curriculum implementation, innovation, and classroom change. I do not, however, wish to dwell on those here but instead wish to move on to consider a series of studies, mostly Canadian in origins, which I think are laying the foundation for a more fruitful approach to classroom change. This approach necessarily focuses on collaborating with teachers in their own professional development.

The first issue that must be examined is the fact that many efforts at classroom change have been initiated by outsiders.

Furthermore, outsiders have been ignorant of classroom reality and teacners perspectives on changes proposed- outsiders dreams, if you will. This has resulted, in large measure; in proposed changes that are inappropriate, difficult to make, and too idealistic. Also these proposals and, indeed, others that did appropriately address teacher or classroom-based needs still were not able to derive, through teacher participation and ownership, the personal commitment necessary to make them successful The result has been to disenfranchise teachers. The ensuing alienation of teachers has been identified by Trempe (1983, 1984) as the major stumbling block to curriculum improvement in Quebec. In her current work (Raymond, 1984) has begun to identify the large gaps teachers see between what they feel is important to their work and recently developed centralized curriculum policy in Quebec. In British Columbia, Flanders' (1983) study of teachers' perspectives on their own professional development needs paints a very sad human picture of the effects of centralized implementation efforts on teachers and the way they work. Such factors as reelentless time pressure isolation, information overload, network of unrealistic expectations, the demanding mental and emotional effort of teaching, lack of preparation time, an atmosphere of negativism, lack of status and fear for their jobs all contribute to the state of anomie that teachers find themselves in. The result of this working reality and the subsequent feeling that their judgments are

being devalued is a feeling of both powerlessness (Common, 1983) and inadequacy. Given these conditions, it is not surprising that teachers sometimes respond negatively to the few colleagues that find the energy and commitment to engage in innovative projects that threaten the status quo (see Aikenhead, 1982).

Teachers may find some relief, and, indeed, outsiders may find some success in innovation within a more balanced and human approach to change that involve all stakeholders in a collegial way that acknowledges each participant's expertise. One important context from which the alternative approach I wish to characterize is derived is the anthropological or cultural approach to change and development used by Friere (1973) and Diaz (1977) in developing areas. Friere has published enough about his activities to provide us with much food for thought. Others, such as Diaz and Canadians like Don Snowden (1981) have, understandably been so committed and embroiled in the richness of activity and social learning that has not been matched by equally active publication. The cross-cultural contexts within which these educators work provide an obvious need for understanding the cultures of those involved, for acknowledging of the researchers' ignorance, for the need for consciousness-raising on the part of both the researcher and t' participants in a mutual approach to learning. Understanding the participants culture

enables the researcher to comprehend how things are the way they are and perhaps how they can be otherwise through a dialogical (MacDonald, 1975) or mutually negotiated process.

It has been less obvious, but of vital importance, for those outside schools, who do not know or have forgotten the realities of classrooms, teachers working lives, the culture of the school (Sarason, 1971) to approach development and change in a similar way.   .icies, innovative projects, and new programs only have life in classrooms and schools, through the professional lives of teachers. Culturally derived change efforts then, in large measure, must be school and classroom based. Even when working within a relatively centralized system those schools that scored most highly on basic achievement measures were those who functioned in a school-based way (Wilson, 1981) through having coherent school and community goals that all agreed upon, clear objectives and cohesive efforts to meet them.

> Social learning, necessarily implies relationship with
> others, not only as an object or knowledge but as
> companions on the road in the same process -- to think
> with others; to decide with them; to act in an
> organized way with them. It is a horizontal,
> pedagogical relationship in which all are considered
> capable to give and receive; therefore all are masters
> and disciples, parents and children. The group is the
> educator who leads the members along the road to
> permanent maturity. It is no longer a vertical
> relationship in which the teacher [reformer]
> monopolizes knowledge and decisions (Diaz, 1977).

Working with a school staff in a collective and individual

manner, in a way, and on issues, that they see as important
has other important advantages. The personal meaning that
individual teachers might develop counteracts their feelings
of alienation and powerlessness mentioned earlier and more
often than not leads to commitment. The collective approach
breaks down barriers of isolation and may build powerful
mutual peer support systems. This process is not instant, but
gradual, and it requires commitment and continuity of both
insiders and outsiders over time, as the majority of the
studies cited in this paper indicate (see also Butt, 1981 and
Aikenhead, 1983).

One significant difference might exist, however, between
Frierian work in communities in developing areas and within a
school-based approach to curriculum change. Within developing
areas, using a Frierian approach the project is initiated and
driven by the needs and interests of the local participants as
embedded with ∩ their realities and as interpreted and
negotiated through the facilitator. Functional policy is
developed in situ, and is seldom effected by. that is,
constrained by, external policy. In the case of teachers and
schools, however, whether innovative projects are initiated
from within or without, they are still constrained by policy
external to the school, whether local or central in character;
such are the legislated democratic rights of those bodies.

Bearing in mind the policy framework within which most

teachers and schools must work, it might be difficult for them
to be completely autonomous without some special arrangements
being made. In order to provide a necessary recognition of
the teacher as `ecision-maker, curriculum developer, and
arbiter of the functional detail of what and how children
shall learn two conditions are necessary. Firstly, curriculum
policy must not go beyond broad frameworks in prescribing what
to teach (even though guidelines might provide banks of ideas
or suggestions that might assist the teacher) (Walker, 1979;
Connelly, 1972). Secondly, as Aoki has emphasized (1983), the
implementation and elaboration of curriculum must, due to the
situation-specific and personal nature of teaching together
with the particular uniqueness of location and learners, be a
creative interpretive activity. The potential of curriculum
policy and guidelines (Ben-Peretz, 1975) as it might exist for
each situaticn and each particular teachers' theories-in-use
are interpreted and actualized. This synergy of potential,
theories-in-use, and practical needs is described by Aoki
(1983) as situational praxis.

This view gives the teacher a major functional role as an
elaborator or developer of curriculum - not so much in terms
of developing formal curriculum units or materials - but in a
day to day sense. It is an exploration of potential synergies
of mandated curriculum, pupil needs and interests, available
resources, and the teachers own personal practical knowledge

(Elbaz, 1981; Connelly and Elbaz, 1980).

In this sense curriculum implementation becomes an act of research. Stenhouse (1975, Ch.10) has explicated this notion of teacher as researcher, the potential of which has seldom been realized or formalized through the power structure of our existing system (Woods, 1983).

Stenhouse (1975) states three conditions that are necessary for a teacher to actualize their potential as researchers:

1. The commitment to systematically question one's own teaching.

2. The commitment and skills to study ones' own teaching.

3. The concern to question and test theory in practice by the use of these skills.

In reality, the teacher, alone in the classroom, faced with all the stresses of that reality, making 200 decisions per hour, acting as the main arbitrator of many many influences on what the curriculum-as-lived and classroom pedagogy shall be, finds it very hard to be a researcher. At the moment in the alienated world of teaching only approximately one in 25 teachers is growing personally through teaching (Flanders, 1983). Ideally, if teachers were authentic, possessed an attitude of building practical competence through personal research, were self-initiated as far as their own professional development was concerned, they could grow their way out of

their current anomie. But, as Flanders (1983) found, though
teachers realize they should initiate, they also realize they
need significant others to assist. This gives rise to the
notion of necessity of collaborative research or professional
development (Connelly and Ben-Peretz, 1980) conducted in a
collegial and reciprocal manner with peers and/or outsiders.
The sheer number of curricula that a teacher has to deal with,
together with providing a coherent philosophy, set of goals,
objectives, and practices across teachers for pupils' learning
also make it sensible to approach matters of curriculum
improvement and professional development collectively at the
school level with the assistance of an outsider.

But what of the specific nature of the relationship between
insiders and outsiders?

Elbaz (1983) asked herself the question as to how could she,
as an outsider, begin to think of intervening into teachers
professional lives in order to help them make changes in their
classrooms. Prior to any sort of intervention it would be
imperative for the outsider to learn about the teachers own
professional reality, style, beliefs as well as functional
metaphors, images, and rules of teaching; to understand the
personal practical and professional knowledge and context
within which changes might be made, and successfully embedded.
This "cultural" spade work is necessary because Elbaz assumes
that the teacher is an autonomous agent within the schooling

17

process with unique personal practical knowledge, teaching craft, or theories-in-use, that have been built up through experience.

The major condition that Elbaz (1983) feels would permit self-initiated professional development for both insider and outsider within a critical but mutually supportive relationship is that it be reciprocal, that is, it cannot be maintained if one party is always bringing enlightenment to the other.

Roger Simon (1983) goes beyond construing the problem of change as one where outsiders are preoccupied with dreams and insiders with realities to correctly point out that teachers have their own ideals. These are often held in contradiction to the way teachers are forced to work by both the practical realities of the classroom and also overlapping sets of social relations. But teachers and "outsiders" lives are riddled with contradictions among ideals and practices and Simon claims that, in working together the dreams and realities of both insiders and outsiders can interpenetrate to bring a critical awareness of the contradictions in the work of teachers. This, in turn, will influence the nature of pedagogy to move towards being more authentically owned by teachers and pupils in the classroom.

The next several curriculum researchers that I will discuss

move much closer to facilitating teacher development and
curriculum implementation through a process which is closer to
the notion of supervision. These processes also recognize
that curriculum policy, in the end, in practice is
curriculum-as-lived by teachers and pupils enabling teachers
to write curriculum documents Ireland (1983) concentrated on
assisting teachers to examine their own practice in light of
their own objectives or ideals. They also examined the aims
and principles implicit within their own teaching. These two
processes enabled teachers to unearth the points of congruence
and incrongruence among their beliefs, values, and actions
through their own perceptions, those of an observer (outsider)
and also students. Teachers were researchers, in a
collaborative way with outsiders, through a process of
self-monitoring and analysis of classroom events (Russell,
1983).

Wasserman (1983) draws from the analogy of training a concern
musician to illuminate the retraining of teachers for the
purposes of reform. There are no short cuts. As Segovia said
"I never practice my scales more than five hours a day"
(p.48).

Wasserman sees at least five conditions as necessary for
successful retraining.

   1. One prior condition is passion and commitment
      - this implies a highly personalized interpretation

of curriculum.

2. Practice, practice, practice - of those professional and practical classrooms behaviors required.

3. Specific, concrete, diagnostic feedback which will enable the teacher to see themselves as they are performing and also enable them to make judgments about what to remedy or change - leading to effective self-evaluation.

4. A constant examination and clarification of their own beliefs through making them conscious and explicit.

5. Autonomous functioning.

In all of these efforts at change jacques Daignault (1983) through a colourful parable urges us not to focus too much on narrowing the gap between reality (what is) and dreams (what ought to be). Doing so, as we saw in the curriculum reform movement of the 60's has caused the gap between thinking and action to widen. If, as Daignault suggests, we know reality and accept dreams for what they are, but focus instead on narrowing the gap between thought and action, within ourselves as individuals, as many of the foregoing researchers have done, then we shall gradually improve reality.

What is really needed by outsiders, besides the personal learning that they egage in through collegial insider-outsider relationships, is a backdrop of knowledge which truly reflects the teachers perspective - the teachers voice - concerning their own realities and dreams. Also we need to understand how teachers and their classrooms grew, changed, or developed

to be the way they are, in order to gain some clues as to how we can participate in further growth and development. This need is currently being met by many qualitative approaches to understanding classroom reality.One methodology that offers much promise, as a basic form of research for understanding professional development, change, and supervision is the study of teachers' personal and professional life histories through biography (Butt, 1984).

What we are moving towards from separate subfields of education, such as curriculum implementation, change, innovation, supervision, professional development, teacher education, research and development is an effective synergy of them all. What was previously done separately and mostly with limited effectiveness might now be pursued in a coherent and holostic way through school-based approaches whose activiti s evolve from a collegial approach among those inside and those outside the classroom. The collective project would provide support for self-initiated professional development on the part of the individual.

Implications for Supervision

The foregoing body of curriculum research and inquiry provides the fascinating challenge to principals, consultants, change agents, supervisors, and researchers to reconsider the ways in which they work with teachers. One field of theory and

practice that should consider these issues is the field of

supervision. How does this field respond to such issues?

Context

1. Supervision efforts should not just be aimed at
   general instructional improvement across a school
   district but should take place within the context
   of:

   a. the school as the functional organizational
      unit of the educational system in a way that
      recognizes that each school has its own
      unique culture or ethos.

   b. one specific project that each school staff
      has identified as being a priority for which
      there is both collective and individual
      commitment.

   c. of each teachers interpretation of that
      project as it relates to their
      classroom/curriculum area.

   d. an extended period of time so as to allow for
      development and change to occur at a human,
      natural, and successful pace.

2. The elaboration and implementation of educational
   policy be regarded a process of interpretation and
   exploration.

3.

   a. Supervisors need to spend sufficient time in
      the school, in classrooms, to learn how the
      school operates, its routines, implicit and
      explicit rules, climate and the other aspects
      of its culture, including issues, needs, and
      concerns that the staff feels should be
      addressed.

   b. The supervisor would attend to understanding
      pertinent aspects of the teachers' personal
      professional biography that relates to
      proposed changes.

   c. Supervisors need to take sufficient time to
      lear· about the culture of the classroom of

each teacher that is to be involved in the project as in (a).

    d. Through the project the supervisor should observe, seek out, ask for, enlightenment from teachers in order to continue to understand their realities, thoughts and actions.

4. The teacher identifies specific problems which are to be worked on, for which there are feasible alternative solutions envisaged, and for which the supervisor can offer insight relevant to the teachers' situation.

5. The supervisory process would:

    a. provide the teacher with the opportunity to continuously make their beliefs and ideals more explicit to permit self examination.

    b. enable the teacher to examine and improve their practice in light of both specific objectives and ideals.

    c. identify those new skills and behaviors necessary for implementation of the teachers interpretation of the project.

    d. provide time for ample practice of those skills and behaviors until successfully mastered.

    e. provide ample specific diagnostic feedback.

    f. move towards self-monitoring and, self evaluation,

6. A reconsideration of the types of supervisory relationships and support systems for professional development related to curriculum implementations and classroom change.

7. A reconsideration of who might perform the role of supervisor.

8. A change from a vertical superordinate-subordinate supervisory relationship to one that is more horizontal and collegial between participants with equal power.

9. A change from the supervisor as the authoritative expert and the teacher as client to a team approach whereby the teacher is the expert in his/her classroom reality preferred style, and changes and the supervisor is an expert in providing supportive feedback related to those phenomena and preferred changes.

10. The teacher is seen as participating in negotiating and determining, with the supervisor, mutually agreeable practical interpretations of potential changes, curriculum guidelines, pedagogical innovations that are well related both to the teacher' lived practice and classroom needs as well as to the intentions of the innovation.

11. The teacher helps the supervisor learn about classroom reality and how innovative images might be translated into practice.

12. The supervisor helps the teacher learn to reflect on and transcend confining aspects of his/her current practices and create visions of what practice might become.

13. The supervisor would spend sufficient time in the teachers community, school, classroom to evolve a sensitivity to relevant "cultural" knowledge of the way the school functions.

14. The supervisor would attend to understanding pertinent aspects of the teachers' personal professional biography that relates to proposed charges.

15. Outsiders need education and training in these new roles.

16. The field of supervision is responsible for providing this expertise.

17. Supervisory education and training systems should reflect these concerns and behaviors within their observation categories.

REFERENCES

Aikenhead, G. (1983). A retrospective account of the development of a novel curriculum in science. Prospects for change. In Butt, R.L., Olson, J. & Daignault, J. (Eds.) Insiders realities, outsiders dreams: Prospects for curriculum change. Curriculum canada IV. Vancouver: U.B.C. Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, 139-142.

Aoki, T. Curriculum implementation as instrumental action and as an interpretave praxis. In Curriculum Canada IV, 18-29.

Ben-Peretz, M. (1975). The concept of curriculum pote tial. Curriculum Theory Network 5:151-159.

Butt, R.L. (1981). Classroom change and scientific literary: A case study. In Curriculum Canada III. (Leithwood, K.A. and Hughes, A. Eds.) Vancouver: U.B.C. Centre for the Study of Curriculum and instruction, 89-110.

Butt, R.L. (1984). Arguments for using biography in understanding teacher thinking. (R.Halkes and J.Olson Eds.) Teacher Thinking: A New perspective on Persisting Problems in Education. Tilburg, Holland: Swetz and Zeitlinger, B.V.

Common, D.L. (1983). Power: The missing concept in the dominant model of school change. Theory into Practice. Vol.XXII, No.3, Summer. 203-210.

Connelly, F.M. (1972). The functions of curriculum development. Interchange. 3, 161-177.

Connelly, F.M. and Ben-Peretz, M. (1980). Teachers roles in the writing and doing of research and curriculum development. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12:2, 95-107.

Connelly, F.M., & Elbaz, F. Conceptual bases for curriculum thought: A teachers perspective. In (A. Foshay, Ed.) Considered action for curriculum improvement, alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Daignault, J. (1983). Critique de la metaphysique des programmes de formation ae maitres. In Insiders Realities, 90-107.

Diaz, J. (1977). Perspectives on education in the context of peace research: towards a social pedagogy startingfrom the periphery. A paper given at the World Council on Curriculum and Instruction, August, Instanbul.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teachers' practical knowledge. Report of
    a case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 11:1. 43-71.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teachers prac.ical knowledge: Prospects for
    change. In Curriculum Canada IV, 81-89.

Flanders, T. (1983). Teaher realities, needs, and professional
    development. In Curriculum Canada IV, 139-152.

Friere, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness,
    New York: Seabury Press.

Ireland, D. (1983). The teacher as researcher: Bridging the
    gap between image and reality. In Insiders Realities
    67-80.

Macdonald, J.B.(1975). Curriculum and human interests. In
    Curriculum theorizing: The Reconceptual'sts, W. Pinar
    d., Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon, 291-293.

McKeon, R. (1952). Philosphy and action. Ethics, 62,
    79-100.

Olson, J. (1982). three approaches to curriculum change:
    Balancing the accounts. Journal of Curriculum
    Theorizing], 4:2, 90-96.

Raymond, D., & Hensler-Mehu, H. (1984). Curriculum implementa-
    tion as an interpretive activity. Paper presented at
    CACS/CSSE Conference, Guelph, June.

Sarason, S.B. (1971). The culture of the school and the
    problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Simon, R. (1983). The work of teaching and its ideological
    contradictions: Implications for co-operative education
    and control pedagogy. In Insiders Realities, 30-40.

Snowdon, D., & Anderson, G. (1981). An interview with Don
    Snowdon. McGill Journal of Education, Vol.XVI, No.3,
    Fall.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). An introduction to curriculum
    research and development, London: Heineman Educational
    Books.

Tre pe, P.L. L'alienation des eleves et des professeurs dans
    le cadre de l'enseignment des sciences. In Insiders
    Realities, Outsiders Dreams, 108-123.

Trempe, P.L. Lavoisier: Science teaching at an Ecole
    Polyvalente. In J.Olson & T. Russell (Eds.) Science
    Education in Canadian Schools, Vol.III, Case Studies
    of Science Teaching, Science Council of Canada, Hull:
    Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 209-256.

Walker, D. (1979). Approaches to curriculum development. In
    J. Schaffarziak & G.Sykes, Eds. Value Conflicts and
    Curriculum Issues, Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon, 263-290.

Was erman, S. (1983). Curriculum reform and classroom realities:
    Henny penny the sky is falling. In Insiders Realities
    41-52.

Woods, J.(1983). La participation des enseigments a la
    recherche, en education. Les limites e les possibilities.
    In Curriculum Canada IV, 153-163.