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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

1. THE PROBLEM

Placed at the door of learning, youth to guide,
We never suffer it to stand too wide.
To ask, to guess, to know, as they commence,
As Fancy opens the quick springs of Sense,
We ply the memory, we load the brain,
Blind rebel Wit, and double chain on chain;
Confine the thought, to exercise the breath;
And keep them in the pale of Words till death.

Alexander Pope, Dunciad, IV 153-160

Alexander Pope, English critic and satirist (1688-1744), realized that teachers often strive for a curriculum which permits teacher security at the expense of student creativity. One wonders whether the curriculum has improved much since Pope’s day.

The English curriculum, specifically, has long been a confused catchall area of the humanities. It is here that students are taught how to be successful on dates, make formal introductions, and talk on the telephone. No two curriculum handbooks are consistent in philosophy. No two English teachers agree on subject matter or method. In short, the English curriculum is in a state of turmoil which appears to be getting worse instead of better. Although some curriculum evaluative criteria have been developed which are both exhaustive and concrete, the areas which they propose to evaluate
are so large and complex that the task becomes monumental at the onset. Most, if not all, of these attempts have been sincere efforts to define, structure, and control the direction of English instruction—yet the results are weak.

Sincerity, however, does not insure one success.

There exist numerous examples of curriculum projects breaking down after millions of dollars had been spent on "foolproof" evaluative systems. The reasons were many and varied for these failures but they can generally be classified into one of two groups:

The area to be studied was too large. Size, alone, is not a sign of success or failure but it is a contributing factor. Project English, the largest language arts evaluation ever conducted, failed due to lack of funds, absence of centralized coordination and administration, and want of a clear rationale of just what was to be accomplished on a national level. Even at state and local levels, when cultural differences, political philosophies, and teacher attitudes are not taken into account, there is little chance that profitable curriculum analysis will or can take place. The area to be studied is simply too large and unmanageable for the staff and evaluative instruments.

Emphasis on statistically oriented research led to failure. It goes without saying that most graduate study
and research follow empirical methods based upon measurable evidence. There are many good reasons for this and educational research would undoubtedly not be where it is today without such methods. The problem lies, however, in the fact that when one evaluates an English curriculum (or any part of it) he is examining many items which do not lend themselves to quantitative analysis. The affective domain would seem to be the logical answer at first glance but it solicits raised eyebrows in many educational circles due to its lack of concreteness. This, then, is the dilemma of the researcher who attempts to evaluate any of the constituent parts of an English curriculum.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It has been previously illustrated how difficult an extremely large curriculum analysis is to administer. This does not mean that analysis of a local school's curriculum is an easy task either. Even if one has the funds and qualified individuals there are likely to be differences of opinion as to the methods used as well as the desired goals.

For purposes of this study one must discard the notion that the soundest curriculum study springs from large grants of money on a national scale. Instead, one must acknowledge the value of small evaluative studies at the individual building level. Even parts of one school building's curriculum would provide a wealth of information for study. Next,
one must assume that, taken together, a composite of these isolated studies would be far more valuable than guidelines and recommendations dropped like a net over the entire language arts area nationally.

The problem presented in this thesis is threefold. Taken together, these items present the bulk of work for any person attempting curriculum evaluation at the local level:

1. **Meaningful evaluative information must be obtained.** Instead of glib and generalized assumptions about what ought to be, one should achieve specific information relevant to the researcher as well as his departmental colleagues.

2. **The information must relate to other studies so that a larger curriculum analysis will result.** If the soundest method of national evaluation is to create concrete building blocks locally, these individual studies must mesh to provide something larger and more meaningful. As often stated mathematically, "the whole must equal more than the sum of its parts."

3. **Some sort of tested instrument which is valid and reliable must be redesigned to fit local needs.** The tool chosen for this study presented some serious drawbacks at the beginning which were overcome through a variety of additions, deletions, and revisions. The "System for Analyzing Social Science Curricula" prepared by Irving Morrissett (in collaboration with William Stevens, Jr.) was obviously intended for use in the social studies area. Some semantic changes were necessary in order to convert the system to language arts but most of these changes were "mental" and of minor consequence.
III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The relevance of this study is many faceted because it both directly and indirectly affects many people. Reduced to its most elementary level one might say that it is the first attempt by an individual to apply an accepted curriculum analysis system to a part of the English program of Dwight D. Eisenhower Senior High School. Although there has been continual internal scrutiny of the program during academic years and summers, no concerted effort has been made to objectively analyze a part of the program or its rationale. Since the school has a student population of over thirteen hundred and is operating in its second decade of service, it seems reasonable that a close look at some aspects of the English curriculum might be valuable. Each year that this researcher has served the school the English curriculum has changed—often without careful consideration of the consequences. Every few years the wheel comes full cycle and things are essentially the same as when curriculum revision began. This is not a blanket condemnation of the program or the dedicated people responsible for the revision. Rather, realizing the limited funds and time allotted to those who desire change and have worked for it in the past, this study proposes to expose the English literature curriculum to a battery of questions prepared by Morrisssett in the hope that some sort of overall picture will appear. This picture will hopefully shed light on the past and present of the program in order to lend
the continuity necessary for future development.

It should also be noted that an examination of the English literature program at Eisenhower Senior High School is only a beginning and that the same evaluative procedures hopefully will be expanded to the remaining areas of the program. If one agrees that structured analysis is vital to curriculum evaluation and that educators are in need of good analysis instruments, then this is an initial attempt at beginning a curriculum analysis file.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The bulk of literature describing innovations in the English language arts comes from Project English (now renamed The English Program of the United States Office of Education). This program is sponsored by the U.S.O.E. with budget support from Congress. It is designed to raise the quality of all phases of English instruction—a priority field since it is the basis for the humanities. It is the humanities approach, one can easily notice, that seems to be the trend in secondary education.

How did this gigantic English program start? Who was responsible for it? What were its aims? How much has been done? What does the future hold for the program? These questions serve as the basis for the following discussion of the U.S.O.E. English Program, its materials, and their relevance to the Eisenhower program in English literature.

In April, 1961, Commissioner McMurrin gave testimony before an appropriations subcommittee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He explained that the English Program was not so much new as it was a systematic compliment to existing reform groups. Subsequently, Public Law 531 let contracts to colleges and universities for development of materials of K-12 relevance but with special emphasis on secondary materials. The chief aims were these:
1. Assessing the status of research and experimentation and indicating new directions called for

2. Stimulating needed research and experimentation by sponsorship of projects through the office's Cooperative Research and funds

3. Providing a clearinghouse of research and development information and means for dissemination of contributions resulting from the efforts referred to above

4. Serving as a cooperative planning center to ensure maximum impact and continuity in effort (7:313-315).

To fulfill these aims, three Curriculum Study Centers were established in the spring of 1962 and two more were added during July of the same year. They were to, first of all, consider the present aims and nature of the English curriculum and make new proposals. Secondly, they were to develop sequential teaching patterns for teaching reading, composition, and related language skills based upon research in human growth and development and the teaching-learning process. Next, they were to test promising practices and materials in teaching the various facets of the discipline before developing curriculum recommendations and materials. The centers were to work in certain study areas but no sharp lines of demarcation were drawn that might hamper study or creativity. Each center was to fulfill its charge within three to five years but to issue its materials as they were produced.

Ralph C. M. Flint, Assistant Commissioner of the U.S.O.E., was the first Project English Director. He saw the years of 1961-62 as largely an orientation period. At the same time, he was hopeful that legislation would be enacted to support
summer institutes and confident that it would be since foreign language and the National Science Foundation already had been approved. The legislation passed as expected and the first applications for Center participants were solicited on January 2, 1963.

Since 1963, more funds have allowed the English Program to move into the areas of basic and applied research, curriculum improvement, a developmental activities program, and a small contract program. To qualify for any of these programs one must show the significance of the proposed project for education, the soundness of the research design or operational plan, the personnel and facilities available to carry out the proposed project, and the economic efficiency of the proposal (8:40).

By April of 1963 there were twenty-nine research projects in operation and six funded curriculum study centers. The rapid expansion after 1963 necessitated the inception of the N.C.T.E.–E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse in October of 1967. At about the same time people were trying to build materials on the basis of the "typical" English classroom if one could be identified. Applebee (2:275) found some interesting data which he presented in two graphs located in Appendix A.

With these statistics, coupled with an even greater mushrooming on the part of the centers, Robert Carlsen and James Crow (of University High School, University of Iowa) were asked to evaluate the progress of the centers. They
compared them to grandmother's home remedies by stating, "The Curriculum Centers seem to be supplying the elderly lady English with a similar barrage of pills, each claiming to be vital to the health of a separate part of the organism. Therefore, it is difficult to pull together generalized tendencies or give any real overview" (6:986).

Mr. Crow was to sift materials from the Centers (that had been solicited by N.C.T.E. vice-president Dwight Burton who wanted the best and most representative materials) and sort out "aha" materials—those with new ideas he would like to have tried in the high school where he was former department chairman. His general impressions were:

1. English consists of three separate subjects entitled language, literature, and composition. Centers focus on one or two of these areas with great emphasis while recognizing that the others exist. No center examined communications or humanizing values.

2. Each of the three subjects is established as a discipline to be studied for its own sake. The old concern for English as a "service" or utilitarian subject has vanished. Each area has its own body of concepts and abstracted principles that are systematically presented.

3. Each student must commit himself to one of the three items and run the same track or build the same wall. The rigidity, order, and stability of ideas is ever present—the systematic building upon a previously established foundation. No one (at least by 1967) had suggested a different
model yet the author suggests that perhaps knowledge of the humanities grows more like a jig-saw puzzle than a brick wall.

4. The standard, recommended teaching strategy is the inductive method. It is highly discussed and praised but left to be anything the teacher wants it to be. Sometimes it is close to programmed instruction while at other times students "are first told what to believe about Willa Cather's work after which they are to study the novel inductively to see these things." Almost never does inductive teaching imply an open-ended and possibly uncertain conclusion that the student may reach. It is used, instead, as a means to get the student to arrive at a pre-determined insight.

5. The fountainheads of the English Curriculum seem to be Jerome Bruner and Northrop Frye. Bruner's emphasis is on "structure" as in *The Process of Education* whereas Frye's deals with the unity of all literature through common sources in archetypal patterns.

6. In each of the three subjects there are central prevailing tendencies:

Language--That language is a human institution having a history, a geography, a sociology, a psychology, a structure and a theory is an established point of view of the Curriculum Centers. It should be studied by all young people but sentence patterns (kernal) are replacing the eight parts of speech.

Composition--The emphasis is on composition as a
discipline to be learned and mastered and away from composing as a utilitarian skill to be developed. There are various approaches to writing with a general emphasis "on establishing the kind of classroom environment that will encourage experimentation with linguistic resources instead of being the kind that fosters little more than frigid correctness."

Literature--Literature is usually organized by themes, genres, or modes. Chronological and biographical study is minimized if not nonexistent. Only a few centers are aware of individualizing literature program so that all students do not read the same things. There is also a considerable placement of mature works of literature at the lower grade levels. For instance, The Red Badge of Courage, War and Peace and "Beowulf" are taught during the eighth grade.

While the centers have weaknesses, they are defining English and making valuable contributions:

1. Consistency of materials that surpasses most publishers.

2. Redirection of emphasis within the three subject areas. For example, composition is a serious subject to be studied rather than a necessary evil to be taught.

3. N.D.E.A. Institutes came into being about the same time as English Centers and they have complimented one another.

4. Several Centers deal with specialized problems--perhaps their greatest asset. The teaching of deaf children, the culturally deprived, and English as a second language serve as a few examples (6:987-989).
Mr. Crow's observations make it quite clear that instructional plans tend to keep language, literature, and composition separated. Blocks of time are often used to pursue each rather than as an attempt to combine them. The diagram in Appendix B illustrates this point (15:3).

Reading, writing, speaking and listening are involved in each, yet they remain polarized.

Mr. Crow also identified some key disappointments during his perusal of center materials:

1. There seemed to be nothing startlingly new in the work of the centers. Each built its program on ideas prior to its beginning with an emphasis on using existing ideas instead of innovating. All centers (with the exception of Carnegie) based their materials on a five-day week for one hundred and eighty days—no scheduling innovations, no look at ungrading. No center proposed working in the direction of a general humanities program with the purpose of showing students the interrelationships among the arts.

2. There appeared to be a very serious bypassing of developmental skills. The nuts and bolts of a discipline are either discarded or assumed to have been learned in lower grades.

3. The majority of center materials focus almost exclusively on content to the exclusion of methodology.

4. The biggest fault of the centers was their lack of plans for any sort of systematic evaluation. By the same
token, one center had published over five thousand pages during its first year of operation. A typical evaluative statement was, "The subjective judgments of teachers through journals kept and the judgments of observers in class tended to make us believe that the program was successful." The Center at the University of Florida was the only one to make a legitimate attempt at evaluation. Each center gave the appearance of surety and movement forward—none would admit any failures (6:990-991).

In regard to these disappointments it appears likely that the conclusions reached by The Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association were largely correct. Here, the study had little or no impact at the time although its assumptions were sound. Indeed, there seem to be twenty year cycles—the lifespan of a professional generation. The years 1900-1920 were "job analysis centered." From 1920-1940 it was the "child centered" curriculum only to be replaced by the "discipline" or subject matter curriculum from 1940-1960. Each new generation seems to want to start from the beginning no matter how inharmonious this is with professionalism. English teachers, it would seem, have yet to learn this. Perhaps continued summer institutes will reverse this trend.

Much of the initial criticism of the English Program of the United States Office of Education was leveled by persons fearing that a "national curriculum" would soon result. Michael Shugrue (14:92), Assistant Secretary for English of the Modern Language Association, dispelled such rumors by
stating that, "The diversity and range of these federal projects demonstrate effectively the lack of any attempt on the part of the federal government to develop or impose a national curriculum in English." Instead, Mr. Shugrue set forth the following purpose of the English Project:

1. Curriculum Study Centers directly concerned with a new English curriculum

2. Centers concentrating on the preparation of teachers

3. Demonstration centers focusing on the implementation of new curriculum ideas in the classroom and inevitably doing curriculum research

4. Individual research projects on special problems such as how disadvantaged urban children learn to read and write

Furthermore, he explained that the longest established centers have had the greatest impact--the University of Nebraska, Northwestern University, and the University of Oregon have already influenced curriculum reform at home and abroad (14:92).

I. A CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN ENGLISH--NEBRASKA

It would be a monumental task, if not impossible, to assess the work of all English Curriculum Centers. Many of them (or at least some of their work) would not apply to a high school English literature program. Therefore, the Nebraska English curriculum has been chosen as an example of a comprehensive secondary English program with detailed work done in the area of English literature.

Nebraska is probably the finest example of a complete
program in the areas of language, literature, and composition. It was one of the first centers to be funded and deals with a K-12 program. Previously, the University of Nebraska had been a consulting base for schools prior to Project English in 1961. Nebraska submitted its proposal early and was established as a Curriculum Center in 1962. The staff set about correcting deficiencies in the state's curricula before doing any innovative work. Here is a capsule summary of the Nebraska problem in 1962:

1. There was no coherent conception of the domain covered by English teachers.
2. Too much time was being spent on traditional grammar.
3. Little attention was paid to new developments in the language arts.
4. Most literature programs were unsystematic and uncoordinated. Many materials were being taught and retaught year after year for no precise educational reasons (13:1-2).

The cumulative effect of these weaknesses pointed in the direction of composition. Therefore, composition was the first area to be approached on a K-12 basis through a cooperative effort of businessmen, teachers, other Nebraska colleges, and the Nebraska State Department of Education. As the group got involved in composition reform they were further motivated by The Conant Report of 1962 and by The National Interest and the Teaching of English published by N.C.T.E. in 1961. The project soon got wider than just composition and the trivium concept of language, literature, and composition was introduced. It had once been a popular
idea around the turn of the century before being revived again during the Sputnik revolution. Since Sputnik, the old reading, writing, speaking, and listening approach has been discarded.

The group decided that "If all linguistic situations and skills are the English teacher's proper domain, then he has no domain" (13:5). Five local districts served as volunteers for the Nebraska group. The U.S.O.E. provided $250,000 and the Woods Charitable Fund added another $100,000. As a result of this funding, composition was de-emphasized and a literature program with a related language and composition sequence for K-12 replaced it. Eventually, the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center divided their senior program into a Language-Composition section and a Literature-Composition section. The literature included some very weighty readings such as Plato, Virgil, Dante, Pascal, Berkeley, Hume, Cicero, and Locke.

The Research and Development Program of the U.S.O.E. has lightened the financial load of the centers but Nebraska's leaders claim they need ten to twenty times as much money to produce a thorough K-12 program. However, their A Curriculum for English is a comprehensive curriculum plan. The evaluation on the elementary level is good but funds were depleted before the secondary materials could be evaluated.
Obviously, Morrissett did not pull his "Analysis System" out of the air. Realizing the need that existed, he sought ways to build an instrument which would do a thorough job without becoming so cumbersome that it could not be practically used. He saw the need for an evaluative program that would get to the structure of a discipline and provide teachers with good materials—especially for slow learners. In the words of Jerome Bruner (5:9), "Good teaching that emphasizes the structure of a subject is probably even more valuable for the less able student than for the gifted one, for it is the former rather than the latter who is most easily thrown off the track by poor teaching."

Recognizing the need for all students to benefit from curriculum examination, several precursors laid the groundwork for Morrissett's work. George Hirshfield, in 1967, developed "A Taxonomic Approach to the Evaluation of Secondary School English Programs" using a Modified Bloom's Taxonomy for examining secondary English objectives. He selected the categories: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. After observing thirty-one teachers' tests and related materials in five schools he found that (in eleven hundred test questions) knowledge, analysis, and comprehension consistently appeared. Far more time was devoted to knowledge than any other area—especially in terms
of objective test items. Essay questions probed all areas of the Taxonomy but stressed comprehension most and synthesis least. Similar studies have made it quite obvious that the lower end of Bloom's Taxonomy is overworked while the more divergent areas have been neglected (11:736).

Suspecting that classroom atmosphere might be one possible explanation for the lack of divergent thinking, Hackett, Brown, and Michael (1968) examined the differences in the average level of achievement between two groups of twelfth-grade students. The seventy-seven pupils were divided into four classes taught by two teachers, each of whom taught one experimental and one control class. The experimental students participated in the development of cognitive understandings and were exposed to a minimum threat to self-esteem. Divergent thinking was encouraged. The control groups of students were exposed to convergent thinking and pressured into acquiring vast amounts of factual information. Class questioning was conducted in a threat-inducing manner so that creativity and divergent thinking were held to a minimum.

After a four-day study of Antigone in which the experimental group discovered and discussed personal meanings while the control groups were asked routine questions leading to the "right" answer, the students were tested. Each was required to take a twenty-five item multiple-choice test and write a forty-minute essay. The students confronted with divergent thinking performed significantly better on both tests. In light of these results the three investigators recommended a
A significant exploration in instructional practices was launched in 1967 by Bruce Appleby at the University of Iowa (3:742-743). He sought to discover what cognitive and affective differences might result between an individualized reading program in English literature and a non-individualized approach. Approximately two hundred students were put into three groups through random sampling for a period of one semester. Experimental Group A received instruction in individualized reading having complete choice of what they read. Evaluation in this teacher-guided program was through individual conference rather than group examination. Control Group A consisted of students who desired an individualized English literature course as well as some individuals who were in no English class at the time. Control Group B received instruction in a traditional classroom. "Ability to Interpret Literary Materials" of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development and the "Inventory of Satisfaction Found in Reading Fiction" were the tests administered at the end of the semester. No differences between groups were found in the areas of relaxation, escape, and associational values but in the category "satisfactions from reading for information," there was a significant difference favoring Experimental Group A. Students in this group had fewer literary dislikes than students in the other groups and gained more satisfaction when reading for characterization, style, and technique.
Experimental Group A pupils also found more possible contributions of literature to their own self-improvement. In concluding his study, Appleby was convinced that students are much more likely to derive satisfaction from an individualized course in English literature than from a required, traditional course.

In designing an individualized reading program one must acknowledge the interplay between language, literature, and composition and assess the role that each is to play. (See Appendix B.) It has been generally agreed upon that the soundest method of organization is to place literature at the core of the program and, after the literary portion is built, organize the study of composition and language around it. This organizational scheme allows for study in depth rather than breadth and de-emphasizes the chronological survey approach.

The key elements of such a reading program were presented by Hans Guth (9:341-437) during the early 1960's. He suggested that students be allowed to read, interpret, and judge for themselves. After such discussion and interpretation well-planned discussion groups would allow students to crystallize their personal response. Each student would approach the discipline as a literary scholar and historian. Rather than pursue a "body of knowledge," each student would be allowed to search and discover on his own. Guth argued that too much lecture, in any setting, stifles independent exploration and that avoidance of curriculum extremes will promote creativity.
III. OTHER APPLICATIONS OF MORRISSETT'S CURRICULUM ANALYSIS SYSTEM

Since the spring of 1967 there has been an increased awareness of the Curriculum Analysis System and a good deal of evaluation done with it. To date, most applications have taken place in the social science areas as a result of seminars conducted by the Analysis System's co-authors. The uses of the work done by Morrissett and Stevens are varied both in terms of complexity and curriculum areas examined. Still, most researchers who have used the system would agree that:

1. Structured analysis is a vital part of curriculum evaluation.
2. Educators are in need of an analysis instrument.
3. A central file of curriculum analysis is needed.

Most respondents to post-seminar questionnaires indicated that uses of the Analysis System would be many and varied. Some envisioned in-service teacher education, graduate teacher education and pre-service teacher training while others considered analysis of existing materials, new materials, or modifications of present instructional items.

The first exposure to and use of the Curriculum Analysis System occurred at Purdue University in the spring of 1967. Here, under an Experienced Teachers Fellowship Program funded under Title V-C of the U.S.O.E. Higher Education Act, much time was spent on the development and elaboration of the system. Near the end of the seminar, the first applications
on curricula were made. File cards, containing their numerical designation in the analysis system, were used to record bits of analytical information but no in-depth analysis was made.

Some time later, under another Experienced Teachers Fellowship Program at Carnegie-Mellon University, Professor Edwin Fenton and his associates refined the questions contained in the Curriculum Analysis Outline and applied them to small segments of curricula. They concluded that the Project English materials produced at Carnegie-Mellon could be taught to all levels of students and taught well even by those with no special training in their use. Further, they recommended that the effective inductive instructional methods be more varied and that the reading load be reduced so that students could pursue topics in depth. Lastly, they requested much more audio-visual material to embellish the three-year humanities program they proposed (16:14).

A few months later, also at Carnegie-Mellon University, a two-week institute was conducted for curriculum specialists. This proved to be the most exhaustive application of the system to that date since most of its forerunners had been concerned with development and refinement. Each curriculum person applied the system to a unit or a portion of larger curriculum package. Most of these analyses were quite brief; generally from two to eight pages and seldom requiring more than fifteen man-hours of time. Hitting only the highlights, these reports led to further revision of the system and its
present form reflects these changes.

The Wabash Valley Education Center, working under a Title III E.S.E.A. Grant, is coordinating an eleven-county curriculum analysis effort involving thirty teachers in Indiana. Morrisett's system is the basis for an examination of problems of social change and communication, models of inquiry, types of objectives, and teaching philosophies and rationales. The investigations of these thirty teachers will eventually be combined and disseminated to other Indiana teachers through in-service seminars. The contributing teachers meet twice monthly for six-hour periods to coordinate their efforts. A west coast program has just begun along the same lines as the Wabash program and is headquartered in Marin County, California, with similar funding (16:14).

Carnegie-Mellon University has been the leader in examining specific course content. This writer obtained two curriculum analyses completed at Carnegie during a 1968 N.D.E.A. Summer Institute. The first, an eighth grade unit entitled, "From Subject to Citizen" examines Elizabethan England—a six-week's project. The analysis is somewhat weak in that little information is provided in many categories of the analysis system and "none stated" is a common reply to questions regarding the cost, availability, and rationale of many materials. Nevertheless, this analysis does provide one with a sample of the Morrissett system at work and points out several pitfalls that others might well avoid (1:1-10).
The second completed Carnegie analysis deals with a high school economics program (4:1-8). Like the previous analysis, approximately eight persons contributed to its development. A much more thorough probe was accomplished in this analysis as evidenced by the responses to all one hundred and twenty-five categories. No item was left blank or answered "none stated" and behavioral terms were used throughout the philosophy and rationale sections. Taken together, these analyses illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of Morrissett's Curriculum Analysis System when applied to widely differing curriculum fields.

At a still more immediate and local level, John Marshall and his associates in the Vancouver, Washington, Public Schools have conducted an exhaustive study of social studies materials (12:1-37). The emphasis in their work has been on examining new curriculum materials before adoption and evaluating classroom experience with such materials. The authors state that their efforts are not presented as definitive works but rather as an example of what can be accomplished in a limited amount of time. The quality of the analyses ranges from very high to below average. Although understandably brief, many provide a quick over-all view of a specific course. Others, however, are too brief, contain too many unanswered items, and violate nearly every rule of professional writing. Taken together, they represent a collection of material that can be put to immediate use within a school district. A similar attempt will be made in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

In developing their "System for Analyzing Social Science Curricula," Morrissett and Stevens realized that some criteria must be specified, desirable qualities must be discovered or assumed, and other characteristics of the curriculum would have to be left to individual needs or tastes. They realized that curriculum materials could not be analyzed and rated like hand lotions or perfumes. Working with the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) they saw the need for a comprehensive and sophisticated taxonomy of questions that could be asked of any curriculum.

The result of Morrissett's work was a curriculum analysis system of the "armchair" type. It provided an exhaustive list of questions organized within a carefully structured taxonomy which probes an author's rationale as it seeks to discover the values presented in the material.

Since the spring of 1967 a few persons have used the curriculum analysis system through a variety of approaches. To date, some have done cursory analyses of one to two pages while others have gone to greater depth and detail through reports of seven to eight pages. Morrissett described the most complete of the analyses (applied to a portion of a unit) as having taken about fifteen hours. In short, Morrissett's instrument has been sporadically applied to many portions of curricula but, at present, no complete, detailed
study has been produced. This can partially be attributed to the constant revision of the taxonomy and other items of the system.

While extremely time consuming, the Curriculum Analysis System provides one with information he would otherwise not seek or obtain through other methods of inquiry. Such was the case when the system was applied to an English literature program. A copy of Morrissett’s Curriculum Analysis System is presented in Appendix C.

I. DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS

Media Available from the Producer

Printed text. The textbook, Adventures in English Literature, is a hardbound high school anthology of approximately nine hundred pages. There is no introductory section addressed to the student.

Teacher’s guide. A comprehensive paperbound guide of two hundred and fifty pages accompanies the text but its recommended instructional strategies and teacher behavior are largely stated in non-behavioral terms. It suggests that the selections of each literary period be related to the history, sociology, and art of their day. The guide is of the "cookbook" variety with specific daily directions, a synopsis of each literary selection, ideas for reports and projects as well as class discussion questions. Each unit concludes with a bibliography citing long play records (optional at extra
cost), books, films, film-strips, and other materials available from other sources. No transparencies, spirit masters, or artifacts are mentioned.

Tests. A one hundred and twenty page "Reading Tests" booklet is designed for student use. The answers are contained in the Teacher's Guide. Mostly matching, true-false, and multiple choice, the majority of questions come from the bottom rung of the cognitive taxonomy and require simple recall only. Norms on tests are not available.

Sources of Materials


Authors of text.
1. Paul McCormick, a teacher at several N.D.E.A. English Institutes who is Department Chairman at Hunterdon Central High School, Hunterdon, New Jersey.

2. Winifred Post, English Department Head at Dana Hall School, Wellesley, Massachusetts. A Radcliffe and Harvard graduate, she served on College Board Commissions on English and has played a leading role in national English testing programs.

3. Quentin Anderson is Professor of English at Columbia University and is a specialist in nineteenth-century English literature.
4. G. B. Harrison is Emeritus Professor of English at the University of Michigan and one of the greatest living Shakespearean editors and critics.

5. A. R. Gurney, Jr. is Associate Professor of English at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a well-published expert on drama.

6. Dwight Lindley is Professor of English at Hamilton College in Clinton, New York. He is a recognized specialist in Victorian literature.

7. Alan Pryce-Jones is an English author, critic, and essayist who was formerly editor of the London Times Literary Supplement.

8. Thomas M. Folds is Dean of Education at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. He is a leading art critic.

9. J. B. Priestly is one of England's most established playwrights, novelists, critics, and essayists.

Authors of guide. The Teacher's Guide was prepared by Rewey Belle Ingles, formerly of University High School, University of Minnesota and Josephine Spear, Chairman of the English Department at University School, Indiana University.

Authors of reading tests. Rewey Belle Ingles, formerly of University High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Time Required

The text is divided into eight literary periods which differ in length and complexity. Sub-units within the literary
periods may be taught independently—i.e. Shakespeare within the Elizabethan Period. The text has been used at Eisenhower in a team teaching situation covering twelve weeks. By selectively excluding some works a rapid survey can be presented even though the text is intended for a year's study.

Style

Layout. The book consists of a literary period (18th century) being portrayed by its more representative authors and poets such as Defoe, Steele, Addison, Pope, Swift, Johnson, Boswell, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Gray, Blake, and Burns. The author's life and writings are treated in some detail before selections (often partial) are presented which typify his work. A short introduction prefaces each selection, obscure words are defined at the bottom of the page, and a "Commentary" section follows each major piece. Here, the authors identify highlights in the selection.

Literary style. This varies according to the type of literature being presented. The editors' work is largely in the form of brief expository essays focusing on the readings.

Money Cost

The text is $5.10 (net) to schools, the Teacher's Manual including test answers is $1.50 and the Reading Tests Booklet is $1.20. Three sound filmstrip sets: Romantic Age, Victorian Age and Chaucer are available for $37.50 each.
Availability


Performance Data Availability

No tests on the materials available on the Classic Edition. It is a newly styled version of the former Mercury and Olympic Editions of the same basic text which were tested in the public domain version.

Subject Area and Content

English literature is the language arts discipline emphasized with stress on inquiry and literary comparison as the structure of the discipline.

Dominant Characteristics of Curriculum Form

Each unit is preceded by an expository essay covering the characteristics of the period, their influence, political background, and importance to literature. Each unit ends with the editors' suggestions for study, discussion, student reports, and composition.

II. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

Rationale

A responsible student in a democratic society needs to be an independent thinker.

1. The inquiry method is the fundamental tool that will help individuals make rational decisions.
2. A desire to learn is predicated upon the ability to work with a variety of resources.

3. Wide reading is essential to a successful survey of literature.

Inquiry skills will allow for one to make personal decisions and deal with contemporary issues in light of history.

A study of English literature may well enhance one's knowledge of social sciences in general and aid his participation in American society.

The acquisition of substantive facts is only important when they are related to something else.

The curriculum.

1. Develops the student's ability to use the inquiry method.

2. Provides expository background material before confronting the student with value decisions.

3. Increases the student's literary, historical, artistic, and sociological background.

4. Leaves room for individual exploration on topics of interest and gives clues to their sources.

5. Fails to include educational games, role playing and other more innovative approaches.

6. Confronts the student with a tiresome routine unless an imaginative teacher is present. One format is perpetuated with little instructional variety.
General Objectives

The over-all goal is to develop an independent thinker with a wide reading background in English literature. This general objective consists of four interrelated parts: attitudes, values, inquiry skills, and knowledge.

Cognitive. Inquiry skills are emphasized so that decisions will be logically based. Comparisons between our heritage and the present will be an important outcome of literary study.

Affective. Some objectives are stated in non-behavioral terms and are difficult to apply to inquiry skills. The basic curriculum purpose is to clarify and refine previously held values rather than to impose them.

Specific Objectives

Both cognitive and affective objectives are stated in the Teacher's Guide. They are not classified into taxonomic categories nor broken down more specifically in unit objectives or daily lesson objectives.

Cognitive objectives. Cognitive objectives are not presented in relation to the entire course nor are they listed for each chapter. The first chapter, "A Guide to Britain," is the only one to specifically list objectives:

1. To show major differences between Great Britain and America evident on a first visit.
2. To have students understand the causes of these differences.

3. To let students understand the racial background of the English.

4. To clarify the personal characteristics of the Englishman.

5. To explain the attitude of the English toward royalty and the part played by the Monarch in government.

6. To open up the whole of English literature by touching on a few high spots in such a way as to arouse curiosity and a desire to begin its study.

Affective Objectives.

1. To create anticipation of the course by an interesting opening.

2. To enable students to sense the historic element which permeates all life in England.

3. To vivify the English countryside and other scenic characteristics.

4. To make students appreciate the rights of the individual and the parliamentary form of government developed by the English.

Behavioral Objectives

It is obvious from reading the objectives that no manifest effort was made to state them behaviorally. This holds true for both cognitive and affective objectives.
No specific guides to observation and measurement were given.

No attempt has been made to evaluate objectives.

**Antecedent Conditions**

The Teacher's Manual begins with a recognition of "individual differences" but little illumination is shed on the point by referring to classes as "strong" or "weak." The clearest intimation that the text is college preparatory resides in the authors' choice of adjectives to describe the potentially successful student. The emphasis is placed upon the student with college plans, a good mind, and a special bent toward literature. The terminal student is not mentioned.

To achieve success, a capable teacher with a well-planned program would have to teach the course. Otherwise, many readings and activities would go beyond the reach of most students.

Slower students would need a great deal of individual help in order to achieve success.

**Pupil Characteristics**

Material will most likely be successful with above average students. College-bound students would be most likely to achieve most of the objectives.

Minimum skills required are eleventh grade reading ability and interpretive skills. Below average students would
profit more from a reading course with minor emphasis on English literature through the use of audio-visual aids.

Teacher Capabilities and Requirements

Due to the many literary allusions contained in an English literature course, teachers must be knowledgeable in all areas of literature.

Due to the text's chronological approach, a sound basis of English literary history is a must for teachers.

Teachers should have a minimum knowledge of skills involved in the inquiry approach.

Community

The materials are not radically innovative and one cannot envision a community that would oppose them. There is no suggested method that would be offensive.

School

Physical facilities would not differ from any conventional course as long as one had ready access to an overhead projector, phonograph, film projector, and duplicating machine.

Adequate library resources are necessary and are generally met through the school library, public library and college library.

Team teaching has successfully been used with the English literature course but other innovations, while perhaps enhancing effectiveness, are not necessary.
Articulation

These twelfth grade literature materials and their instructional approach are harmonious with the tenth grade short story course and the eleventh grade American literature program.

One innovative possibility would be to incorporate social studies and art instruction into the English literature course as a "humanities study."

The materials and objectives should fit well into the total school curriculum with no conflict with other courses; in fact, they should compliment other courses.

Content

Materials have been chosen which are representative of England's literary periods and authors. The selections are intended to provide a survey of English literature which will develop interpretive skills and inquiry skills. Examination of various genre will provide reading background, increased vocabulary, and literary criticism fundamentals.

The expected attitudes and behavior of the students are to become careful and critical readers of literature who will delve further into other forms of artistic, historical and social communication.

Cognitive Structure

Adventures in English Literature places heavy emphasis upon the chronological approach to literary study. The authors have eclectically selected materials from eight
arbitrarily drawn periods of English literature. First importance has been given to representative authors while selections play a less significant role. The selections chosen are meant to portray the range of a particular writer's work while, at the same time, providing a cross-section of literature popular during the period. The authors' introductions, explanatory notes, and commentary are intended to lead the student toward related studies in the fields of science, anthropology, geography, economics, history, art, political science, psychology, and sociology. The likely cognitive outcome would be a related humanities study stressing discussion and research-oriented writing.

Genres. The authors' attempt to present all forms of literature associated with England's present and past. Poems, ballads, sonnets, plays, letters, diaries, essays, journalistic writings, biographies, and fiction forms are presented throughout the text. These add not only reading variety but a first-hand glance at the moods and people of the time.

Affective Content

The authors have chosen a wide variety of English literature in hope that the student will continue to read widely in any study of literature.

While values are latent and not manifest, the authors want the student to assess his own values in light of his reading.
Students are encouraged to develop and evaluate their own moral, religious, economic, political, and philosophical positions.

Hopefully, the affective outcomes are that students will read widely in all forms of literature, consider their findings in terms of historical precedent, and willingly seek viewpoints other than their own which can be dealt with rationally.

Instructional Theory and Teaching Strategies

No single learning theory is promoted at the expense of any other.

Any teaching strategy could be logically related to the materials and successful if handled properly by a competent teacher.

Authors' Orientation

The authors, by carefully structuring the presentation of materials, stress how to study English literature rather than what to think about it. Students are not "set up" to arrive at an insight already pre-determined by the authors.

The course is intended to be a survey of English literature and recognizes that factual accumulation is not its primary goal.

The authors view a successful curriculum in English literature to be a carefully selected, structured, sequential study with thematic uniformity.
Elements of Instructional Theory, and Their Uses in Teaching Strategies

Creation of disposition to learning:
1. The general introduction to each literary period arouses student curiosity through comparisons to other periods, photographs, time lines, and a brief overview of the contents.

2. The students' study of American literature (eleventh grade) can be related to the conflicts and goals of English literature as America's foundation is traced still further back in time.

3. A very thought-provoking course introduction can be presented through a variety of audio-visual forms centered around slides of England duplicated from those taken by faculty members.

Structure and form of knowledge: A comparative approach is stressed which emphasizes specific content areas of English literature while restricting the total number of concepts to be considered.

The order of content is solely based on a chronological approach to the study of literature. All aspects of reinforcement are left to the discretion of the individual teacher.

Teaching Forms or Modes or Transactions

Major emphasis is placed upon directed study, discussion, and composition.

Resource-to-student transactions are a part of the course (texts, recordings, etc.) but are not the publisher's
supplementary materials. These materials are located in the English Resource Center.

Directed readings, discussions, and posed problems are the recommended teacher-student interactions.

Student-student interaction is lacking on the part of the text. A creative teacher could easily include instructional items in this category.

Use of Teaching Forms

The teaching forms employed place undue emphasis upon "traditional" instructional techniques. The format for each chapter is identical: read, discuss, and write. More balance is needed; especially if the material is presented in a year's course.

The spiral theory of learning is present (where the same concepts are reinforced at higher levels) more likely as a result of the course content than of the authors' intent.

Although rather narrow in scope, the teaching forms and strategies are compatible with the authors' instructional theory.

Overall Judgments

The Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. text, Adventures in English Literature-Classic Edition, is a comprehensive, carefully selected anthology of England's literature. The rationale which led to choice of content, sequence, and process is not given. It is implied by the authors, however, that a meaningful survey of English literature can take place
if one studies representative selections or parts thereof.

The course objectives, as stated in the Teacher's Guide, are realistic but not behaviorally stated. It is difficult for one to evaluate his attainment of course goals.

The literary selections are good but the suggested activities and related materials are not very diversified. While meaningful, they tend to promote the read, recite, review syndrome unless embellished by the teacher. Much has been added at Eisenhower through a team teaching approach.

The recommended teaching strategies do not emphasize total student involvement. The material is teacher-oriented. This poses the largest instructional problem to the potential teacher. The suggested activities for students are not numerous enough or sufficiently detailed to permit student exploration.

The evalutative materials are not compatible with the implied objectives of the course. Far too much importance is placed upon the acquisition of factual knowledge. The majority of questions are in the areas of memory and translation with a few dealing with interpretation. Questions dealing with application, analysis, syntheses, and evaluation are practically nonexistent.

**Sources of Evaluative Data**

Letters were sent to all of the publisher's regional offices inquiring into evaluative areas. Specifically, this writer asked for conclusions from analysts, evaluators and
researchers. Standardized test results and classroom observation findings were also solicited along with out-of-classroom effects of the materials.

All requests were answered with free copies of the Teacher's Guide and test booklets in addition to a wide proliferation of promotional pamphlets. The specific evaluative questions were ignored.

**Effects Predicted by Analysts and Reported by Observers**

No information available.

**Comparisons**

No information available.

**Recommended Uses**

Judging from the length of the text and the complexity of many of its selections, it would seem unwise to attempt covering all of the material in less than one semester. A far more prudent approach might be to forego concern about "covering the text" and use it as only one tool in an entire collection of instructional resources. Due to the weak statement of course goals and large percentage of recall test items, the materials should not be used as a self-contained teaching kit.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

All of the end results of this study may not be clear for some time; at least not until the author teaches English literature for a period of time sufficient to implement changes. Perhaps there will be some departmental acceptance which will eventually benefit students and teachers alike. In the meantime several observable results, which have been exposed as a result of this study, can be reported. While somewhat difficult to categorize, the results might best be classified into the areas of advantages and disadvantages of conducting such a study.

First of all, this writer was faced with several technical problems that had to be solved before work could begin. Morrissett's Curriculum Analysis System is an instrument for evaluating social studies curricula and had to be adapted to language arts. This transition resulted in a lack of specific direction since no one had previously used Morrissett's work in relation to English curricula. Much unplowed ground was trod upon before the instrument was ready for application to an area outside the realm of social studies.

Secondly, the classification scheme used by Morrissett is highly detailed as evidenced by the approximately one hundred and twenty-five separate and distinct questions it asks of a curriculum. The questions require a thorough understanding before one can answer them concisely and concretely. With
such a large number of questions, the research becomes extremely
time consuming and laborious as the over-all picture gradually
emerges.

The first identifiable result was the recognition of
the central position of the text, Adventures in English Literature, to the course of study. This fact soon illustrated how "covering the book" could become the central goal of the course since one is expected to cover all of the literary periods in a specified length of time. The text would be better thought of as an anthology to enhance the offerings of guest speakers, films, artifacts and other sources rather than the core.

The next item, observed in this study and through teaching experience, deals with the "Commentary" section of the text which frequently follows a given literary selection. With such thorough literary analysis there is little motivation for one to read the work. Comments in this section provide canned responses for exams and are readily defensible since "the author said so."

Paralleling this weakness is the matter of gross inconsistencies in testing practices. Whereas acquisition of facts is supposedly only important when related to something else and factual accumulation is not a stated goal of the course, the testing booklet places heavy emphasis upon recall of specific fact.

Finally, the slow learner is put at a distinct disadvantage from the onset. It is implied that he can benefit from the course yet few provisions are made for him. Definite
help should be given him or he should not be included in the class. While the department now considers the course an elective, many slow learners continue to select it. The analysis of the materials points out that the content, related readings, course goals, and methodology are beyond the reach of a slow learner.

Shifting to the positive, it cannot be emphasized enough that the taxonomic approach to curriculum analysis is a sound one. It forces one to examine all levels of the cognitive and affective domains in a logical sequence.

Secondly, Morrissett's instrument demands that the researcher be extremely familiar with the material under examination. While appearing to be an armchair tool, one soon finds himself discovering weaknesses in materials that he had always assumed were airtight. In fact, a successful application of the taxonomy is predicated upon a great deal of rereading of materials. In short, an important result was the sudden awakening that one is often quite unfamiliar with the nature of his daily teaching materials.

Thirdly, a very beneficial aspect of the study was the pressure put on this researcher to explore areas of the curriculum that would have remained untouched had it not been for the dimensions of the study. A close examination of costs, objectives, methodology and student attitude is something accomplished by very few, if any, classroom teachers although it should be a prerequisite for instruction. This graphically illustrates how teachers often become saddled
with instructional strategies that are perpetuated without apparent regard to rationale.

Next, and perhaps most importantly, this study presents a strong case for the implementation of behavioral objectives at all levels of education, but most certainly in literature courses which are inherently vague due to their content. They are a must! The largely immeasurable goals presented in the Teacher's Guide are not only of little value; they tend to cloud the testing issue because one does not know what is important or how to measure it.

Lastly, a positive result of this study is the authors' lack of attempt at pushing one instructional theory at the teacher. While the format is highly structured and unnecessarily repetitive, the individual teacher is at liberty to alter instructional strategy without mutilating content.

In conclusion, this study has answered some questions that would have remained unexplored without it. The pros and cons of an English literature course make one wonder what exploration into other areas of the Language Arts Program might produce.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This work has revealed a classroom study of English literature which violates many good teaching practices. With the textbook at the center of instructional resources, the program becomes teacher rather than student-oriented. In addition, the text has not been subjected to careful testing and emphasizes the lower levels of the cognitive thought processes. The text is strongly college preparatory and leaves the slow learner to fend for himself. With no special course or daily objectives, coupled with little instructional variety, the course becomes painfully repetitive.

Further, the authors of *Adventures in English Literature* make no attempt to relate the study of English literature to other English classes--especially American literature. Content receives much more emphasis than method and the net result is that little concern is shown for the learner and how he learns. The materials examined in this study were largely serious and humorless as were the supplementary items presented in the bibliographies. While the somber side of English literature is acknowledged and the basics (spelling, vocabulary, and composition) are probably not receiving enough stress, it should be noted that Eisenhower High School's English literature program receives too much emphasis in and of itself. Every student is exposed to the same lectures, class discussions, and testing procedures regardless of his
individual expectations, talents, or background. The teacher-centered approach must be replaced by a student-centered program with the teacher present to assist the activities of his students. The content vs. method problem will solve itself if the course is properly structured. The content will be actively sought by learners if a competent instructor provides a varied approach centered around the students.

To create a significant curriculum which is student-centered one must have a variety of learning aids at his disposal. This is expensive. One possible solution is the establishment of an individualized reading program incorporating the basic text as a minimum resource rather than the fulcrum of the course. The bulk of a student's time could be spent exploring literature within the realm of the particular genre or period under consideration. By sharing their reading experiences, students would be exposed to a wide variety of English literature. General guidelines could be established for selection of works and their presentation which would allow students the freedom to read widely in areas of their interest. This would indeed be a refreshing change from the classroom where several poems are discussed each day by the teacher.

To create an English literature program revolving around individualized reading, two conditions must exist. First, an increase in library reference books, anthologies, and biographies must occur. With limited library funds, the staff must be convinced that these materials are essential.
Enough copies must be supplied that students have ready access to them. Microfilm might provide another solution to the problem of supply and demand. All materials could be put on a reserve basis in the library under the direct supervision of the library staff.

Secondly, the English Resource Center must be supplied with an abundance of English literature materials. At the present time the shelves are stocked with publishers' complementary copies which contain essentially the same information as the course text. By collecting a small fee from each student enrolled in English classes, the shelves are gradually being stocked with useable materials. If enough English literature materials can be purchased, a good program can be built around learning packages, small groups, role playing, guest speakers, and student reports. This will alleviate the lecture system.

The teaching team should exploit the cognitive domain fully and implement the affective domain wherever possible within all areas of English literature. After deciding upon the major areas of study the team should enlist student suggestions in regard to specific items of interest and class decision-making. Once a course outline is agreed upon and the necessary materials are acquired the teaching team should solicit the following from the school district:

1. A commitment from the Board of Directors and Superintendent for meaningful curriculum change beyond the scope of the established project.
2. District financial aid to support in-service training during the academic year and summer workshops for team members.

3. Financial resources and personnel to conduct internal and external evaluation of the program in order to reveal strengths and weaknesses.

4. A replication of this study at other area schools and parts of the English program.

With fifty-two per cent of English instruction devoted to literature it seems prudent to resolve some of the basic, unresolved questions in literature curricula. For example, do students actually learn better when disparate elements are presented in interlocking relationships? Is learning better facilitated when each item is tackled singly and directly? What is inductive teaching? Is it truly superior for all types of learning at all levels? Unless these questions can be intelligently answered, as well as others like them, little progress can be made in helping students.


Literature, as illustrated here, is the crux of the problem. The "typical" English classroom relegates more than half of its time to the study of literary genres. This fact should demand a systematic approach to literary study with the other areas evolving from it.
This graph points out that the "typical" approach to literary study is far from systematic. Instead, active student involvement is limited to approximately one-third of class time. One wonders how these figures might be reapportioned to encourage more student participation.
As explained by the diagram only a small part of each study (language, literature, and composition) is unrelated to the others. The significant overlap of the three disciplines should encourage a blending of them during instruction rather than fragmentation.
The following is a condensed version of the curriculum analysis outline. There are six major headings in the outline; also, many tiers of subheadings which are selectively reflected below.

1.0 DESCRITTIVE CHARACTERISTICS

What are the general characteristics of these materials? How can they be described and characterized?

1.1 Media available from the producer

1.2 Sources of materials
Who are the author(s) and publisher? What are their contributions and roles in this field?

1.3 Time required
How long does it take to teach the package? Can some parts be taught as independent units?

1.4 Style
What is the layout? The literary style?

1.5 Money cost
What do the materials cost per student? Per teacher? Per teaching station? For the school?

1.6 Availability
When and how can we get the materials?

1.7 Performances data availability
Have the materials been tested by the author? Are school reports available? Are there reports on controlled experiments?

1.8 Subject area and content
What discipline(s) is (are) covered in the package? Is there synthesis of disciplines?

1.9 Dominant characteristics of curriculum form
Does the material stress text material, stories, games, case studies, documents, laboratory exercises, multi-media?
2.0 RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

Why did the author develop the materials and what are the expected outcomes?

2.1 Rationale
What are the author's assumptions about the goals of education with respect to the individual and to society? Are there explicit or implied assumptions about the nature of society and how man is related to society? Are the goals and assumptions internally consistent? What are the author's views on how the curriculum contributes to the goals for the individual and for society?

2.2 General objectives
What are the generalized student outcomes that can be expected from the use of these materials? What should the student be able to do generally in the cognitive domain? The affective domain?

2.3 Specific objectives
In the cognitive domain, is the student called upon to perform processes which involve the acquisition of knowledge? Comprehension? Application? Analysis? Synthesis? Evaluation? (cf. Bloom's taxonomy) Is the student called upon to demonstrate the nature and degree of his involvement with value positions? Is he expected to be aware of certain values or valued objects? Respond to them? Value them? Organize them into a consistent system? Completely internalize them? (cf. Kratwohl's taxonomy).

2.4 Behavioral objectives
Does the author word his specific objectives in such a fashion that the verbs demonstrate student action-behavior that is clearly observable and/or measurable? Are specific guides to observation and measurement given? Are tests and/or specific tasks supplied?

3.0 ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS

What are the particular conditions for which the materials are designed, or under which they are most likely to be successful?

3.1 Pupil characteristics
With what kinds of pupils will the materials be most useful and successful? Urban or rural? White, Negro, or Mexican? Under-achievers? College-bound? What previous pupil preparations and/or aspirations and/or achievements are required? What are minimum initial levels of cognitive, social, and motoric skills?
3.2 Teacher capabilities and requirements
What are the teacher prerequisites for successful use?
Special courses? Specifiable type and length of teaching experience? Unusual intelligence or skills? High motivation?

3.3 Community
Is the community hostile or open to innovation? Are there elements in the curriculum that might be particularly attractive or offensive to the community?

3.4 School
Do the materials and methods require special teaching facilities or circumstances? Large or small rooms? Flexible scheduling? Special equipment? What kind of required library facilities?

3.5 Articulation
Do the materials fit well with the existing curriculums that will precede and follow them? Do they fit well with materials in other subjects studied simultaneously?

4.0 CONTENT
What specific (content-related) changes are intended in the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of the students?

4.1 Cognitive structure
What is the subject matter? What is the author's over-all view of the concepts, processes, and factual content of the subject, and what parts of these does he wish to teach the students? To what extent do the materials incorporate the concepts, processes, and factual content of anthropology, geography, economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology? To what extent do they establish and/or use concepts, processes, and facts that cut across or synthesize the disciplines? What are the actual cognitive outcomes likely to be?

4.2 Affective content
What is the author's view of the affective content and implications of his subject and what parts of these does he wish to teach the students? Does the author ignore values, assert a value-free approach, or explicitly incorporate values in the materials? Does he attempt to teach values, or to teach about values? Are the valued objects or situations intellectual? Social? Ethical? Economic? Political? What are the actual affective outcomes likely to be?
5.0 INSTRUCTIONAL THEORY AND TEACHING STRATEGIES

What is the learning theory that is explicit or implicit in the materials? What are the teaching strategies, and are they logically related to the learning theory?

5.1 Author's orientation

What are the author's theories of learning, teaching, and curriculum construction?

5.2 Elements of instructional theory, and their uses in teaching strategies.

How are predispositions to learning created? What is the structure and form of knowledge, and do their order and sequence conform with the learning theory? What are the forms, sequence, and pacing of reinforcement?

5.3 Teaching forms, or modes, or transactions

What are the dominant teaching forms? Teacher-to-student (exposition, demonstrations)? Teacher-student interactions (discussion, case studies, seminars)? Student-student interactions (role-playing debate, simulation)? Student-resource interactions (laboratory, documents, programmed instruction)?

5.4 Use of teaching forms

What are the patterns of use of teaching forms? Do they have balance and variety? Are they compatible with the instructional theory?

6.0 OVER-ALL JUDGMENTS

What can be gleaned from the foregoing analysis and from outside sources that will help in the formation of over-all, evaluative judgments about the material?

6.1 Sources of evaluative data

What conclusions are available from analysts? From evaluators and researchers? From standard tests? From classroom observations by teachers and other observers? Is any information available about out-of-classroom effects of the materials?

6.2 Effects predicted by analysts and reported by observers

What are the cognitive, affective, and social effects on students? What is the experience of teachers with respect to ease of use? With respect to required training or special preparation? What are the effects on other classes and on the whole school? What are the effects on the community?
6.3 Comparisons

How do reports on the predicted or actual effects compare with the author's intentions? With the effects of other curricula? With the standards of the analyst?

6.4 Recommended uses

What summary statements can be made about the over-all success of the materials and the conditions under which they should and should not be used?