

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-17,187

VER VELDE, Raymond Bernard, 1936-
CLASSROOM DECISION MAKING: A COMPARISON OF
TWO GROUPS OF TEACHER TRAINEES.

The University of Arizona, Ed.D., 1974
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© COPYRIGHTED

BY

RAYMOND BERNARD VER VELDE

1974

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

CLASSROOM DECISION MAKING: A COMPARISON OF TWO
GROUPS OF TEACHER TRAINEES

by

Raymond Bernard Ver Velde

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by RAYMOND BERNARD VER VELDE
entitled CLASSROOM DECISION-MAKING: A COMPARISON OF
TWO GROUPS OF TEACHER TRAINEES
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the
degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Edward D. Bowen 2/8/74
Dissertation Director Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the
following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in
its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

Edward D. Bowen 2/8/74
Mrs. K. Blubaugh 2/8/74
Pat M. Nash 2/8/74

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory
performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Raymond Bernard Ver Velde

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is a great distance between an idea and its fulfillment. Along the way one must have the encouragement of someone who says, "I think you will come up with something worthwhile. Don't be afraid to try something new." Such a person is Dr. Edward Brown, the Director of this research effort. His encouragement and patience are sincerely appreciated.

Dr. Vance Frasier is also to be thanked for his interest in the writing of the original test instrument used in the study.

Dr. Milo Blecha, who stepped in to fill Dr. Frasier's place, and Dr. Pat Nash, who saw the study through to its completion, are also due sincere thanks for their kind assistance.

Valuable help was also provided by the members of my minor committee, Dr. Henry E. Butler, Jr. and Dr. Robert Grant, who were always ready to listen whenever called upon.

And to my wife, Peggy, thank you for maintaining your patience and sense of humor throughout the entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I. PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Hypotheses	3
Limitations of the Study	5
Definition of Terms Used	5
Block Methods Students	5
On-Campus Methods Students	6
Classroom Management (Synonym: Class Management)	6
Instructional Methods (Synonym: Teaching Method)	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
Trends and Changing Views of Teacher Education	7
Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs	11
Current Models of Teacher Preparation Programs	13
Evaluation and Assessment of Teacher Education Programs and Product	16
Research in Teacher Education	18
III. PROCEDURES AND SOURCES OF DATA	21
The Instrument	21
Sources of Data--the Sample Groups	23
Selection and Independence of Groups	23
Randomization	24
Homogeneity of Variance	24
Treatment of Sample Groups	24
On-Campus Methods Program	25
Block Methods Program	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Administration of Test Instrument	27
Treatment of the Data	28
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS	30
Identification of Areas of Agreement or Disagreement Between Groups	31
Testing the Hypotheses	31
Organization of the General Item Analysis	33
Item Analysis of Statistically Significant Disagreements	34
Item Analysis of Agreements Between Groups	36
Items With Three or More Statistically Significant Disagreements Between Groups	38
Situation 3	39
Situation 16	39
Situation 18	40
Situation 29	41
Situation 35	42
Items Which Produced Two Disagreements Between Groups	44
Item 25	46
Item 30	47
Items Which Produced No Disagreements Between Groups	48
Item 7	48
Item 12	49
Item 26	49
Summary	50
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	53
Summary of Significant Disagreements Between Groups	54
Summary of Agreements Between Groups	58
Conclusions	59
Recommendations	61
Recommendations Regarding the Test Instrument	61
Recommendations for Teacher Training Programs	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX A. DECISION-MAKING IN CLASSROOM SITUATIONS	66
APPENDIX B. MEAN SCORES FOR ALL ITEMS AND ALL GROUPS	88
APPENDIX C. TABLE OF STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DISAGREEMENTS	97
LIST OF REFERENCES	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Numbers of Disagreements According to Curriculum and Classroom Management Areas	35
2. Numbers of Agreements According to Curriculum and Classroom Management Areas	37

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was a comparison of two student teacher training programs: the Block Methods Program and the On-Campus Methods Program. The Decision-Making in Classroom Situations instrument was administered to 50 students in each program and to 20 Faculty Members of the Department of Elementary Education, The University of Arizona. Block Methods Students had participated in an internship semester and methods courses prior to student teaching, while On-Campus Students had taken methods course instruction only. Both groups were just beginning their student teaching semester at the time of the study, January, 1973.

The decision-making instrument described 40 situations in which decision making was required. Twenty situations involved Curriculum and twenty involved Classroom Management. Five decision choices were offered for each situation making a total of 200 decision choices for the entire instrument.

Individuals in the two Student groups and the Faculty group were required to rank the decision choices according to their appropriateness. Decision-ranking responses for each group were converted to means, which were analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance

by Ranks to determine if groups agreed or disagreed in terms of their rankings.

Responses of Block Methods Students were compared with responses of On-Campus Methods Students, responses of Block Methods Students were compared with those of the Faculty, and the responses of On-Campus Methods Students were compared with the Faculty responses.

For each of the three pairs of groups, 200 comparisons were possible. Thus 600 comparisons were made in all. The hypotheses which formed the bases for these comparisons were stated as follows:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students.
2. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and Faculty members.
3. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by On-Campus Methods Students and Faculty members.

*n represents the decision number from the instrument being tested by the hypothesis.

Results indicated that the two student groups tended to agree with each other more often than they did with the Faculty, though Block Students were in more accord with the Faculty than On-Campus Students. These effects were observed in both Curriculum and Classroom Management areas.

These results led to the conclusion that the additional Block internship experience did not cause Block Students to respond differently from the On-Campus Students. It was suggested that elementary school conditions under which trainees work may have to be controlled more closely in order to make comparisons and evaluation of teacher training programs more accurate.

The recommendation was made that interns and student teachers be placed under the guidance of teachers who are specially trained by the University. It was also suggested that the Faculty continue to assist and advise their students through the first year of employment, thus increasing the opportunity for evaluation of teacher training programs.

CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

Every educational decision in this world is made by some one, some place; therefore, it is not sacred and it can be remade in a different way.

--John Goodlad (1966, p. 15)

Teaching and learning are human endeavors which have been carried on every since man arrived on the scene. Today, in spite of technology, kits, and innovations in school design, the humanness of teaching and learning persists.

Schools may be in a state of change, reorganization, and reassessment; but they still remain "people" places, where teachers and students react as individuals, even when they are part of a group situation. Attitudes, emotions, and environment bring forth varying responses to classroom and playground situations. Teachers are obliged to make a great variety of decisions every day--decisions involving curriculum and classroom management. Their decision choices may have profound effects upon the learning of their students.

Teacher-training institutions, recognizing the importance of decision making to the professional survival of their trainees, are trying to develop and test programs

that give greater opportunity for pre-service teachers to observe and to participate in classroom decision making.

The Block Methods Program at The University of Arizona provides students with a semester of classroom internship in addition to their semester of student teaching. This study was designed to provide a basis for comparing the decision-making responses of the Block Students with the decision-making responses of two other groups--the regular-program On-Campus Methods Students and the Faculty of the College of Education, The University of Arizona.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is summarized in the following question: Is there a difference in the decisions made in response to classroom situations in the elementary classroom by Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students, and how will their choices compare with those made by Faculty members of the Department of Elementary Education?

Purpose of the Study

Teacher training programs in colleges and universities are subject to continual examination and revision in the search for better ways in which to prepare teachers for the real world of the elementary school. Many of the new models for teacher education include increased field experience for teacher trainees and closer partnership

between university and public school personnel. Accompanying the development of new models for teacher education is a need for evaluation and assessment of the outcomes of the programs.

This study is intended to provide one basis for comparison of the two teacher training programs. Responses of Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students were compared by the use of a decision-making instrument. The responses of these two groups were also compared with the decision-making responses of Faculty members of the Department of Elementary Education, The University of Arizona.

Hypotheses

This study compared three groups in terms of their rankings of possible solutions to situations in instructional methods and classroom management. The three groups were as follows: Block Methods Students, On-Campus Methods Students, and Faculty Members of the Department of Elementary Education.

The instrument, describing forty classroom situations, was administered to individuals in the three groups. For each situation 5 decision choices were presented, making a total of 200 decision choices. Subjects ranked the five choices for each situation according to their opinion of the relative appropriateness of the choices. For each of the

200 choices, a comparison of the responses of the three groups was made to determine the extent to which they agreed or disagreed in their rankings for each decision choice.

Responses of Block Methods Students were compared with responses of On-Campus Methods Students, responses of Block Methods Students were compared with those of the Faculty, and the responses of On-Campus Methods Students were compared with the Faculty responses. The hypotheses which formed the bases for these comparisons are stated as follows:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students.
2. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and Faculty members.
3. There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n* of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by On-Campus Methods Students and Faculty members.

*n represents the decision number from the instrument being tested by the hypothesis.

The three comparisons made for each of the 200 choices generated 600 hypothesis tests.

Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted at The University of Arizona, Department of Elementary Education. Any conclusions reached are limited to the academic years 1971-1972 and 1972-1973.

Definition of Terms Used

The repeated usage of certain terms in the study requires the following definitions:

Block Methods Students

Block Methods Students have participated in a special teacher training program during the semester preceding their student teaching semester. In addition to taking a series of methods courses, the students participating in this program spend between 8 and 12 hours each week working in an elementary school classroom. They carry out assignments which require them to plan and implement instruction with children, under the direction of the classroom teacher and University personnel. An on-campus seminar period is also required. A complete description of course work, field work requirements, and objectives of the Block Methods Program is included in the section titled Treatment of Sample Groups in Chapter III.

On-Campus Methods Students

The On-Campus Methods Students have been enrolled in a series of methods courses in Elementary Education. Some of these courses require a limited amount of observation of children in various settings. Requirements vary according to the course and the instructor. A complete description of course work and of the requirements for On-Campus Methods Students is included in the section titled Treatment of Sample Groups in Chapter III.

Classroom Management (Synonym: Class Management)

Classroom Management is "the administration or direction of class activities with special reference to such problems as discipline, democratic techniques, use and care of supplies and reference materials, the physical features of the classroom, general housekeeping, and the social relationships of pupils" (Good 1959, p. 99).

Instructional Methods (Synonym: Teaching Method)

Instructional Methods involve "a rational ordering and balancing, in the light of knowledge and purpose, of the several elements that enter into the educative process, the nature of the pupil, the materials of instruction, and the total learning situation" (Good 1959, pp. 553-554).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Trends and Changing Views of Teacher Education

The professional preparation of teachers has evolved at varying rates throughout history. A review of writing and research presents strong evidence of a great change-period now in progress--or about to begin.

Changes in teacher education have been directly related to changes in education itself, and changes in education have in turn reflected the conditions of the times. Societal values, technology, and philosophies of child rearing have all had their effect upon teacher preparation programs (Commager 1966, pp. 56-57).

In an historical view of student teaching, the work of Pestalozzi is viewed as a change force, since his methods of sense-perception, reasoning, and individual judgment required new techniques of instruction. Pestalozzi's teachers received virtually all their training in the form of field experience, with little formal instruction of "methods" courses (Johnson 1968, pp. 23-24).

Henry Barnard initiated another change period with the introduction of the "teacher institute," which included a great deal of inservice teacher training. During the

first half of the twentieth century, teacher education institutions evolved from normal schools to state teachers colleges to their place in the University system. State certification requirements and methods courses became important considerations in teacher education (Johnson 1968, pp. 190-196).

The role of field experience in teacher preparation has also changed. As far back as 1901 "internships" were considered a vital part of teacher training; and during the latter part of the 1950's, when teachers were needed in great numbers, teacher trainees in some programs received salaries for their work in the public schools (Gardner 1968, p. 12).

Traditionally, however, the "student-teaching semester" was the culmination of the teacher's professional preparation. Student teachers, under the direction of "cooperating teachers" worked in classrooms in order to gain experience necessary to conduct classrooms of their own. Stones (1972, p. 4) characterizes the relationship of experienced teacher and student teacher as "sitting with Nellie," a practice as old as civilization.

The critics of public education have also taken teacher education programs to task for various reasons. Conant (1963, p. 211), on one hand, advocates greater attention to traditional studies and state control of student teaching.

On the other hand, it has been suggested that some course work be "squeezed out to make room for earlier preliminary classroom experiences and a more extended internship in the senior year" (Kalick 1971, p. 261).

Silberman (1971) maintains that prospective teachers need "over-all philosophy and view of the whole purpose of education . . ." along with "far more immersion in the classroom" (p. 37).

This increased classroom experience is seen by many as the key to upgrading teacher preparation. Wilhelms (1970, p. 24) criticizes the practice of putting "abstract" theoretical academic study first with a "final massive dose of experience" at the end.

Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962) also advocate greater emphasis upon field experiences and a close examination of the way prospective teachers are taught, since "teachers handle children in the learning process in the same way that they were handled in the course of their professional training" (p. 73).

Smith (1969) feels that theoretical concepts "can best be mastered, in the initial phases of teacher preparation, by studying actual behavioral situations and interpreting them with the concepts which are to be learned and subsequently used in teaching" (p. 51).

Contemporary concerns and trends in teacher education appear to cluster in their area of field experiences in

the actual classroom environment, or a simulation of the classroom environment.

Since the actual classroom experience requires a great deal of professional decision making, several writers have suggested that such behaviors be analyzed so prospective teachers can learn how to make competent choices. Joyce and Weil (1972, p. 123) discuss two central concepts in the decision theory model: prediction system and value system. Value judgments inherent in choicing are seen as a function of the teacher's "basic knowledge of the foundations of education (related to) the classroom setting" (Harnack 1968, p. 124). The teacher as decision maker is a current theme in the reexamination of teacher training programs (Brubaker 1970, pp. 4-5).

Other practical considerations for more effective field experiences center around classroom management and discipline. Discipline is increasingly viewed as too important for its techniques to be learned in an offhand manner during the last weeks of a student teacher's training. "Classroom discipline," states Brown (1971), "is the means by which the basic goals of education can be attained" (p. 23).

Kounin (1970) would have student teachers well-trained in classroom management skills, since "the mastery of group managerial skills actually enables the teacher to program for individual children" (p. 145).

Student teachers themselves are asking for more training in classroom management techniques and the chance to practice these techniques, thus avoiding "reality shock" once they enter a classroom to begin their actual student teaching experience (Metzner, Nelson, and Sharp 1972, p. 194).

Other trends in public education which affect student teaching are differentiated staffing (Tanner 1969, p. 36) and the demands of some critics for a more "humanizing" approach to education (Blume 1971, p. 412).

Emerging field-centered programs of teacher education are described as "programs that conduct almost all of their activities on site, using actual school classrooms as laboratories for learning." Such field centers are intended to "bridge the gap between theory and practice" (Clegg and Ochoa 1970, p. 568).

Thus the partnership notion of teacher education is reinforced--whereby the teacher education institution and the schoolroom play cooperative roles in teacher preparation (Peck 1972, p. 14).

Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs

Pressure for change and criticisms of teacher education have brought about some intensified efforts to make things happen in teacher education. Performance-based teacher education has been hailed by some as a promising

practice. It "connotes a program designed specifically to provide the prospective teacher with learning experiences which will prepare him to assume a specified teaching role" (Massanari 1971, p. 1).

Performance-based (also called competency-based) teacher education programs have been described by Elfenbein (1972) as follows:

Programs in which the competencies to be acquired by the student and the criteria to be applied in assessing the competency of the student are made explicit and the student is held responsible for meeting those criteria which include knowledge, performance and product.

The criteria--the standards by which the student is assessed are of three types:

Performance--requires the student to demonstrate required teaching behavior.

Knowledge--requires the student to demonstrate required cognitive understandings.

Product--requires the student to demonstrate through his teaching changes in behavior of the pupils (p. 90).

The performance-based idea, however, is seen as having some drawbacks such as "narrowness: the focus on specific teaching behaviors at the expense of the whole view," and the difficulty of establishing relevant performance criteria. Factors in its favor are described as "sharper focus on objectives, more attention to individual differences, opportunity for more effective integration of theory and practice, and greater opportunity for evaluation, assessment, and feedback" (Massanari 1971, p. 7).

Evaluation, assessment, and feedback are accountability elements which are incorporated into the competency-based field practice (ComField) models of student teaching which have been recently developed in many universities in the United States (Hale 1968, p. 119).

Current Models of Teacher Preparation Programs

Performance based (or ComField) structure has had heavy influence upon the newest models for student teaching programs.

With funding from the Office of Education, several universities in the United States have proposed and studied the feasibility of new models for teacher preparation (Burdin and Lanzilloti 1970, p. vii).

A consortium of twenty-six colleges in northwestern United States produced a ComField model which is termed "situation specific." Analysis of the appropriateness of a teaching behavior is done in terms of the characteristics of the setting as well as the characteristics of the learner and the desired outcomes (Schalock and Hale 1968, p. 9).

Three student teaching models which present somewhat contrasting elements are the Florida State Model, the University of Massachusetts Model, and the University of Washington Model.

The Florida Model proposes a three-phased program: an underclass phase, a pre-service phase, and an inservice phase.

The underclass phase (first two years of college) consists of general education with the addition of an "awareness-involvement" program.

This refers to "the engagement of pre-program underclass students in activities specifically designed to expose them to elements of teaching and learning not normally available to them, and thus to yield information for them about teaching" (A Model for the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers 1968, p. 46).

The preservice phase begins in the Junior year, but varies in length of time from individual to individual. Mastery of five teaching behaviors is required of the trainees. These are "ability to state objectives, select and organize content, utilize appropriate strategies, utilize evaluation skills and techniques, and demonstrate a willingness to provide leadership . . ." (A Model for the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers 1968, p. 11).

Provisional certification is provided at this point. During the next two school years the trainees are employed as part-time teachers in "portal schools" and the University assumes a partnership role with the schools in planning a program which will fit the needs of the school and will be consistent with the goals of the model program. Three

University summer sessions are also devoted for practical preparation for the trainee's teaching assignments. Thus there is a pre-service to inservice continuum built into the program (A Model for the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers 1968, pp. 122-125).

The University of Massachusetts has also incorporated pre-service to inservice flow into its model. However, this model concentrates upon "performance criteria in three broad conceptual areas related to teaching: content knowledge, behavioral skills, and humanistic skills" (Cooper 1969, p. 10). Decision making is emphasized; and diagnosis, evaluation, and assessment are continuous throughout the program (Allen and Krasno 1968, p. 42). Performance criteria were developed in collaboration with other faculties in the University, particularly in regard to content knowledge (Allen and Krasno 1968, p. 38).

The University of Washington Model emphasizes the idea of public-school-university partnership. All professional training in theory and methods of teaching are to be done at three elementary schools in Seattle. The three schools are in different parts of the city, so students have the opportunity to observe and participate with minorities and children living in suburban communities.

A feature of the program is that theory and methods instruction are carried on by University personnel in the public school setting. Instruction is followed by

application periods, where college faculty and students work directly with children.

This structure expands the role of the faculty to encompass the elements of instructor, demonstrator, model teacher, school-university liaison, and supervisor of teacher trainees in the field. The program of intense field experience takes place over a period of a year or more, depending on the needs of the individual students (Clegg and Ochoa 1970, pp. 568-572).

The close relationship of theory and practice incorporated into the Washington model and other models will make it necessary for college faculty to become responsible for a "clinical experience" wherein they work closely with students over an extended period of time (Abruscato 1972, p. 146). This extended guidance gives increased opportunity for the spiral evaluation-assessment-reassessment features of many of the new models.

Evaluation and Assessment of Teacher Education Programs and Product

Evaluation of student teachers and student teaching programs is a major concern in literature on teacher education.

Although performance-based objectives seem to make it easier to assess objectively the skills attained by a trainee, there is still the uncertainty about "what occurs in the students' classrooms later" (Weintraub 1968, p. 15).

Differing philosophies of evaluation are also evident from a review of literature. Conant (1963) would take an objective approach, having "the competence of a future teacher tested by practice teaching under conditions set by the state and subject to state supervision" (p. 112).

Arthur Combs, on the other hand, takes the more subjective view that a helpful evaluation of student teachers begins with aiding them "to explore and discover personal meaning," since "any information will affect a person only in the degree to which he has discovered the personal meaning of the information for him" (Smith 1969, p. 219).

Methods of evaluation vary also. Stanford University's Teacher Intern Program assesses itself with "on-going research with microteaching, video recording, and modification of teaching behavior." Their students are evaluated with their own Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide (Stiles and Parker 1969, p. 1420). The educational specifications of the University of Toledo program for teacher education include a four-part evaluation model for assessing the decision-making skills of the trainees. The four-part design consists of (1) context, (2) input, (3) process, and (4) product (Wiersma 1969, p. 206).

The ComField or performance based models "place great stress on the demonstration of explicit performance

criteria as evidence of what the prospective teacher knows and is able to do" (Andrews 1972, p. 2).

Guidelines for total programs of direct and simulated experiences in teacher education, prepared for the Association for Student Teaching, advocate evaluation of instructional competence, but also include a suggestion that "affective competence" be evaluated somehow (Smith 1969, pp. 33-35).

However, the difficulty of assessing the total performance of a prospective teacher in the affective domain is still an area of concern. Ned A. Flanders' system of interaction analysis has been discussed as a promising basis for evaluation and research in the more subjective areas of teacher performance (Hunter and Amidon 1966, pp. 282-289). A modified system of interaction analysis has been proposed, wherein the original ten categories of interaction have been expanded to 24 categories, especially tailored to the student teaching situation (Amidon 1966, p. 6). Flanders (1970, p. 9) has even proposed that faculty members work with college students to improve teacher education by analyzing each other's teaching behaviors.

Research in Teacher Education

Although there is a wide variety of philosophy, technology, and systems being put to work in the evaluation

of teacher training programs and teacher trainees, there is general agreement in literature that the field is still "an unexamined problem" (Sarason et al. 1962, p. 39).

Gage (1972), in discussing the pressing need for research, states, "Research is the procedure that will base both the content and method of teacher education less on opinion and more on scientific knowledge. The source of knowledge . . . must be research, and research on teaching in particular" (p. 143).

Some of the recent developments in teacher education may be helpful in implementing research. The ComField models are viewed as promising vehicles for research in the future (Clarke 1971, p. 151).

Video-taping and classroom simulation are other promising developments for research. A study at the University of Hawaii in 1965-66 compared direct observation with video tapes to determine which type of experience helped students gain more insight into the process of teaching. Results indicated that the video tapes were more efficient and useful to the trainees than direct observation (Jenkins 1966, p. 55).

A study by Kallenbach (1967, p. 7) was also concerned with videotaped sessions. One group of teacher interns did field practice in schools, while one group did microtape lessons on campus. Ratings on the Stanford Teacher Competency Appraisal Guide showed no difference between groups.

Methods courses had little transfer effect, compared to inservice classroom experience, according to a study of two groups, each consisting of twenty elementary teacher candidates. The study, conducted at Marygrove College, indicated that independent experience with children in a classroom situation resulted in "greater demonstrated competency on the part of the teacher candidate" (Best 1965, p. 3).

Research regarding decision-making behavior on the part of teacher trainees is a relatively unexplored area, although professional decision making is acknowledged to be a crucially important behavior of teachers (Bush 1967, p. 40). Classroom simulation techniques are a promising use of technology in this area (Kersh 1965, p. 4). The difficulty in this type of research, however, lies in the development of an instrument for assessing the decision-making behavior of teacher trainees (Hill and Martin 1971, p. 447).

Davies and Amershek (1969), writing in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, sum up the status of research in student teaching as follows:

A review of research in this field leaves one with a great feeling of urgency to expedite the study of student teaching. Given its ascribed importance in teacher education, it is alarming to find so little systematic research directly related to it. . . . Discussion and descriptive reports are plentiful, but comprehensive basic study of the process involved is lacking (p. 1384).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND SOURCES OF DATA

The classroom teacher, in the course of the day's work, makes a multitude of decisions. Some of these decisions must be made in an instant, while other choices can be made in a more leisurely fashion. Two general categories of decision-making situations appear to exist in the elementary classroom: (1) decisions with regard to curriculum and instructional methods, and (2) decisions about classroom management and personal relationships.

The Instrument

Since decision making is a crucial activity for teachers, it has also become a focus of concern for those who seek to prepare teachers for the challenges of the classroom.

Therefore a type of instrument was needed with which to examine the decision-making responses of teacher trainees to the "real-life" types of situations often encountered in today's classrooms.

This study involved comparisons of the decision-making responses of three groups: two treatment groups of teachers about to embark upon their student teaching semester, and a group of faculty members from the Department

of Elementary Education. Thus there was a need for an instrument which would gather the data necessary to make a comparison of responses without the implication of "rightness" or "wrongness."

It was decided that the researcher would take the initiative in designing an instrument, incorporating the structure of ranking the decision choices for each classroom situation described from most appropriate to least appropriate.

The test instrument dealt with two general areas of decision making: Curriculum (including methods of instruction) and Classroom Management (group and individual relationships). Twenty test items were prepared for each of the two areas.

The 40 test items each consisted of a description of a classroom situation in which a teacher would be required to make a decision. Five decision-responses followed the situation description, and the subject was requested to rank each situation according to its appropriateness for the particular situation described. Rankings ranged from a rank of 5 for "most appropriate" decision down to a rank of 1 for "least appropriate" decision.

The 40 described situations were collected from a variety of sources. During five years as a classroom teacher and five years as assistant principal and principal of elementary schools, the researcher was an observer or

participant in many situations which called for decision making on the part of the teacher. Many of these situations were documented and collected and appeared as items in the instrument. The decision choices which accompanied these items were actual choices that teachers had made in response to the described situations.

Other items were suggested by the writings of Ginott, Glasser, and Dreikurs. These items generally pertained to classroom management and interpersonal relationships.

Some of the items in the curriculum and methods section were suggested by referring to the course objectives on file in the Department of Elementary Education. All test items were reviewed by a three-member panel of Faculty members from the Department of Elementary Education.

Sources of Data--the Sample Groups

Selection and Independence of Groups

In addition to the 20 faculty members, 100 elementary education students responded to the instrument. Fifty students were randomly selected from a larger group of students who had participated in the Block Methods Program. Fifty students were randomly selected from a larger group who had received their methods course instruction on the campus. The two groups had no members in common and were

completely independent of each other. Both groups were on the threshold of their student teaching semester.

Randomization

Randomization procedures described by Harshbarger (1971, pp. 78-80) were followed. A table of random digits was used to select subjects from each group (pp. 505-509).

Homogeneity of Variance

Grade point averages were obtained for each individual in each group of teacher trainees. These grade point averages reflected the students' academic work up to the time they entered the College of Education. The averages were compared in order to determine whether the two groups were similar or dissimilar in terms of this measure of academic achievement. Grade point averages were 2.2151 for the Block Methods group and 2.3178 for the On-Campus Methods group, on a 1.00 scale. The difference of only .1027 between the two groups indicated relative homogeneity as far as academic achievement was concerned.

Treatment of Sample Groups

The two sample groups (Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students) had each participated in a different teacher-training program. While both programs contained some similar elements, there was a marked divergence of the two programs during the Senior year, with the

Block Methods Program featuring more classroom participation and interaction with children.

The features and characteristics of the two programs are described in the following section.

On-Campus Methods Program

The On-Campus Methods Program included the following requirements:

1. Freshman and Sophomore Years were spent completing 56 hours in the College of Liberal Arts. Course work was carried on in the areas of English, Science, Social Science, Mathematics, Humanities, Government, and Health.
2. The Junior Year for Elementary Education majors included course work in the following areas:

Educational Psychology
 Foundations of Education
 Literature for Children
 Foundations of Reading
 Music in the Elementary School
 Art in the Elementary School
 Physical Education in the Elementary School

3. The Senior Year included Methods Courses in the following areas:

Science
 Language Arts
 Communicative Arts
 Mathematics
 Social Studies
 Music Materials and Activities

Student Teaching (The University of Arizona Biennial Catalog, 1973-74, 1974-75, 1973, p. 114).

Course instruction was carried on at the campus of the University, although some instructors required that their students spend some time observing children in

various settings. This requirement varied with the course and the instructor.

Block Methods Program

The Block Methods Program included the following characteristics and requirements:

1. Freshman, Sophomore, and Junior Year requirements were similar to the On-Campus Methods Program.
2. During the first semester of their Senior Year, students participated in a three-unit Seminar in Elementary Education, plus methods instruction in Mathematics, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading.

These courses were conducted mainly on the campus and supplemented with demonstration teaching in the public school classrooms.

3. Students were committed to the program from 8:30 to 4:00, Monday through Friday.
4. During the initial four weeks of the fall semester, students observed classrooms at all grade levels. Then they were assigned as two-member teams to a classroom where they spent from eight to twelve hours per week, carrying out assigned tasks in the following areas:
 - a. Assisting the teacher in carrying out plans.
 - b. Developing and/or making instructional aids.

- c. Preparing lessons, mini-units, and teaching units with University staff, for teaching large and small groups.
 - d. Working with individual children to diagnose their skills.
 - e. Doing library research.
 - f. Learning the operation and use of audio-visual equipment and machines.
 - g. Becoming acquainted with teaching materials and aids available in the classroom.
5. During the second semester, each student was assigned to a classroom for the student teaching phase of their professional training.

Administration of Test Instrument

The test was administered to faculty members and the two treatment groups during the first week of the Spring Semester, 1973.

Since there were three Block Methods Programs in operation, the test instrument was administered at the three following locations: (1) Sunnyside Block Methods Students met at Los Ranchitos Elementary School, (2) Tucson School District 1 Block Methods Students met at Kellond Elementary School, and (3) Open Block Methods Students met in their campus seminar period.

On-Campus Methods Students were requested to take the test during one of several times scheduled during the testing week.

Faculty Members were asked to respond to the instrument individually and to return it during the testing week.

Treatment of the Data

Data were gathered and organized according to the following steps:

1. Decision-ranking responses of the three groups (Block Methods Students, On-Campus Methods Students, and Faculty) were tallied.
2. The rankings for each situation were averaged to obtain a mean score for each situation. These mean scores were computed for each of the three groups. All mean scores are presented in Appendix B.
3. Using the mean scores, tests of statistical significance were made to determine the significance of agreement among the three groups. The responses of the Block Methods Students were compared with responses of On-Campus Methods Students, responses of Block Methods Students were compared with those of the Faculty, and the responses of On-Campus Methods Students were compared with the Faculty responses. The instrument presented 200 decision

choices. The three comparisons made for each of the 200 choices generated 600 hypothesis tests.

The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance test was used to test the 600 hypotheses, since the ordinal data obtained from the instrument required a non-parametric test of statistical significance. Also, the Kruskal-Wallis test is appropriate in the case of two or more independent samples (Siegel 1956, pp. 185-193). An alpha level of .05 was used, with two degrees of freedom, in order to determine significance level. Results of the statistical comparisons are reported in Appendix C.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this chapter, the data were analyzed from several viewpoints:

1. An overall item analysis of test results was presented. This analysis dealt with areas of agreement and disagreement between groups, including a consideration of the results for each Curriculum area and the Classroom Management area.
2. Each situation which produced three or more statistically significant disagreements between groups was examined and analyzed.
3. A grouping was made of those situations which yielded two statistically significant disagreements between groups. Data for this grouping were discussed according to areas of disagreement and agreement between groups.
4. Each situation which produced total agreement between groups was discussed. Total-agreement situations were those in which no significant disagreements between groups were obtained.

Identification of Areas of Agreement or
Disagreement Between Groups

In order to determine whether or not the three groups were similar or different in their responses to the test instrument, areas of agreement and disagreement between groups were analyzed. For each group, test results yielded a measure of the group members' rankings of the appropriateness of each decision choice offered for each situation item. Rankings for each decision were totaled for each group and divided by the number of subjects in that group. Thus the mean ranking afforded each decision by each group was determined.

To establish statistically significant differences in the mean rankings afforded each decision by each group, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was employed, with an alpha level of .05.

Testing the Hypotheses

Two hundred hypothesis tests were possible for each of the three between-group comparisons. A total of 600 comparisons were made. These figures were computed as follows:

40 situation items
x 5 decisions for each situation
<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/> 200 decisions for each between-group comparison

200 decisions
x 3 between-group comparisons
<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: 0;"/> 600 possible comparisons.

The hypothesis for each comparison and the instances of disagreements and agreements which apply are presented below:

There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and On-Campus Methods Students.

For these comparisons the 200 hypothesis tests revealed 25 cases of disagreement out of the possible 200. One hundred seventy-five null hypotheses were accepted. Thus, in 25 cases out of 200, the Block Methods Students and the On-Campus Methods Students disagreed with each other in terms of their rankings of the appropriateness of the decision choices offered for each situation. These two groups agreed in 175 cases.

There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by Block Methods Students and Faculty members.

For these comparisons the 200 hypothesis tests revealed 43 disagreements out of the possible 200. One hundred fifty-seven null hypotheses were accepted. Thus the statistical tests showed that Block Methods Students and Faculty Members disagreed with each other 43 times out of 200 in terms of their rankings of the appropriateness of the

decision choices offered for the test situations. They agreed 157 times out of 200.

There is no significant difference between the mean rank awarded decision n of the Decision-Making in Classroom Situations Instrument by On-Campus Methods Students and Faculty members.

The null hypothesis for each comparison was rejected by 50 instances of disagreement out of the possible 200. In 150 cases the null hypothesis was accepted. Thus the test results showed that On-Campus Methods Students and Faculty Members disagreed with each 50 times out of 200 in terms of their rankings of the appropriateness of the decision choices offered for the test situations. They agreed 150 times out of 200.

Appendix C consists of an item-by-item presentation of the hypothesis testing results described in this section.

Organization of the General Item Analysis

The general item analysis was organized according to two categories: (1) statistically significant disagreements between groups, as determined by the application of the Kruskal-Wallis test to the mean rankings given each decision choice by each group and (2) agreements between groups in terms of their mean rankings of the decision choices.

The two categories were further subdivided into Curriculum and Classroom Management areas.

Item Analysis of Statistically
Significant Disagreements

Disagreements between groups were tallied and classified according to two dimensions:

1. Between-group comparisons were recorded for the following groups:

Block-On-Campus

Block-Faculty

On-Campus-Faculty

2. Disagreements were further classified according to the following areas:

Math

Social Studies

Language Arts

Reading

Classroom Management

Of the 600 possible comparisons, 118 resulted in statistically significant disagreements. Table 1 outlines the areas of disagreement between groups, according to curriculum and classroom management areas.

Of the total of 118 statistically significant disagreements, 59 occurred in the Curriculum areas and 59 in the Classroom Management area. Of the Curriculum items, Language Arts and Math had the highest numbers of disagreements, with 21 and 17, respectively. Social Studies and Reading produced 10 and 11 of the disagreements.

Table 1. Numbers of Disagreements According to Curriculum and Classroom Management Areas

	Number of Disagreements (tallies)	Block-On-Campus Disagreements	Block-Faculty Disagreements	On-Campus-Faculty Disagreements	Number of Possible Comparisons
<u>Curriculum</u>					
Math	17	7	3	7	75
Social Studies	10	1	4	5	75
Language Arts	21	3	7	11	75
Reading	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75</u>
Total	59	13	20	26	300
<u>Classroom Management</u>					
Total	59	12	23	24	300
Total	118	25	43	50	600

Comparisons between the two Student groups generated fewer disagreements than comparisons between Students and Faculty. Block-On-Campus disagreements accounted for only 25 of the total of 118, while Block-Faculty comparisons generated 43 disagreements, and On-Campus-Faculty comparisons accounted for 50 disagreements.

In one subject matter area, however, this trend was reversed. The Math curriculum area produced 7 of its 17 disagreements between Block and On-Campus students, and 7 between On-Campus and Faculty. In this area, Faculty and Block disagreements accounted for only 3 of the Math disagreements.

Item Analysis of Agreements Between Groups

In order to report the positive side of the data, item analysis was made of agreements between groups. Agreements between groups were tallied and classified according to the following two dimensions: (1) Group comparisons and (2) Curriculum-Classroom Management classifications (see Table 2).

From 600 possible comparisons, 482 agreements were found between groups. The two student groups agreed 175 times out of 482. Block-Faculty comparisons generated 157 agreements, while On-Campus-Faculty comparisons accounted for 150 agreements. As was the case with the disagreements, the agreements were evenly divided between the Curriculum

Table 2. Numbers of Agreements According to Curriculum and Classroom Management Areas

	Number of Agreements (tallies)	Block-On-Campus Agreements	Block-Faculty Agreements	On-Campus-Faculty Agreements	Number of Possible Comparisons
<u>Curriculum</u>					
Math	58	18	22	18	75
Social Studies	65	24	21	20	75
Language Arts	54	22	18	14	75
Reading	<u>64</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>75</u>
Total	241	87	80	74	300
<u>Classroom Management</u>					
Total	241	88	77	76	300
Total	482	175	157	150	600

areas on one hand and Classroom Management on the other. Each category accounted for 241 agreements.

Across the Curriculum and Classroom Management areas, numbers of agreements were somewhat higher between the Block and On-Campus groups. The only exception was in Math, although the effect was not great. In that area the numbers of agreements were greater between Block and Faculty than they were for the other two groups. Block-Faculty agreements accounted for 22 of the 58 Math agreements, with Block-On-Campus and On-Campus-Faculty comparisons resulting in 18 agreements each.

The foregoing item analyses provided a basis for further examination of the data. The following section deals with specific situation items which accounted for three or more disagreements between groups in terms of their rankings of the appropriateness of the decision choices offered for each test situation.

Items With Three or More Statistically
Significant Disagreements
Between Groups

There were five situations which yielded three or more statistically significant disagreements between groups. Each situation is reproduced and discussed separately in this section.

Situation 3

A teacher is planning to introduce multiplication concepts. A teaching activity for the first day's lesson must be chosen.

- ___ (11) Introduce the multiplication concept using cross-product.
- ___ (12) Have the children make their own arrays with egg cartons.
- ___ (13) Multiplication chart (point out patterns such as 9's).
- ___ (14) Repeated addition, with the use of the number line as an instructional aid.
- ___ (15) Work sheet with multiplication problems through the 2's.

For the five decisions listed, there was significant disagreement among the three groups in their rankings of the appropriateness of the decisions.

For "most appropriate decision" the On-Campus group disagreed with both the Faculty and the Block groups. The Faculty and Block groups chose decision (12) as the most appropriate activity, while the On-Campus group chose decision (14) as the best activity.

Situation 16

A creative writing center is set up, using the following stimuli: story-starters, colorful pictures, objects such as seashells, small toys, and nature collections. These stimuli are varied often.

What self-teaching materials would you put at such a center to assist the students with spelling and handwriting, if your main objective for the center is creative expression?

- _____ (76) Handwriting practice sheets and a variety of spelling books.
- _____ (77) A list of the 500 most commonly used words; variety of dictionaries; list of words by classification, such as color, shape, size and movement; examples of standard cursive and manuscript writing.
- _____ (78) Handwriting stencils to trace capital letters and to help in the transition to cursive writing; word list of the 1,000 most commonly used words; examples of good story-writing by other children in the class.
- _____ (79) Handwriting practice books using the Palmer and Zaner-Blosser material, plus phonics books on different levels.
- _____ (80) A typewriter so that children who write and spell well can type their stories as a reward for good work.

Although all three groups chose decision (77) as the most appropriate, the Faculty group was statistically more enthusiastic about it, with a mean ranking of 4.55. The Block group awarded it a ranking of 4.16, while the On-Campus group's ranking of 3.84 showed that they did not like it much better than their second choice, item (78), which they ranked 3.82.

Situation 18

An intermediate student does not succeed on grade-level spelling tests.

- _____ (86) Have the student choose 5 words from the list and be prepared to spell them correctly. Gradually increase the number of words.
- _____ (87) Give him individual instruction and more study time for the words.

- _____ (88) Get an easier spelling book for him to use.
- _____ (89) Have one of his peers test him each day to see how many words he knows on his weekly spelling assignment.
- _____ (90) Practice writing the words in the air before the spelling test.

Faculty members awarded decision (86) a "most appropriate" ranking of 4.5. Neither student group ranked this decision as high. Block students gave it a mean ranking of 4.08, while On-Campus students ranked it 3.70 and chose decision (87) as their most appropriate choice.

Although Faculty members were quite definite in their disapproval of decision (90), (they ranked it 1.25), both student groups gave it a significantly more acceptable rating. In fact, the Block group gave it a mean ranking of 2.12, and three students out of 50 said it would be their first choice.

Situation 29

Your sixth grade class is involved in working an assignment in long division. The teacher is working with a small group of students who need help in multiplication. Peter raises his hand and says, "I don't understand how to do this division."

- _____ (141) Teacher: Where were you when I explained long division to the class? It was your responsibility to ask for help at that time. Try to figure it out on your own. I'll help you later.
- _____ (142) Teacher: I am busy now. These people need help too. I can't hold a special class for each person in here.

- ___ (143) Teacher: Please look at the beginning of the chapter again. It goes over long division step by step. I'll try to find time to help you sometime today.
- ___ (144) Teacher: Long division is difficult. I wish I could help you now. Why don't we pick a time when we can work together to review long division. Please join our group in multiplication while you wait.
- ___ (145) Teacher: Patricia, would you help Peter with his long division? I know you understand it very well.

Faculty members ranked decision (144) as "most appropriate." They gave it a mean ranking of 4.65, and 14 out of 20 ranked it as their first choice. Both student groups, however, awarded it lower rankings. The Block students ranked it 4.08, and liked (145) almost as well (4.00 ranking), while the On-Campus group ranked it 3.82, and chose decision (145) as the most appropriate course of action.

The Faculty group ranked decision (142) as the least appropriate choice, but both student groups disagreed, and 4 out of 40 On-Campus students chose that decision as the most appropriate. Both student groups chose decision (141) as their least appropriate course of action.

Situation 35

Several children in the third grade class are continually coming to the teacher to tattle. They also disrupt the class by tattling out loud.

- ___ (171) The teacher ignores the tattling and compliments those children who do not tattle.
- ___ (172) The teacher says, "Tattling is for babies. I hope you will all learn to take care of your own problems."
- ___ (173) The teacher reads the story "The Tattle Tale Cure" to the class, followed by a discussion of tattling.
- ___ (174) The teacher says, "Most tattlers cause the trouble themselves. I don't wish to hear any more tattling."
- ___ (175) The teacher listens politely to the tattling, counseling each child on how he could avoid the situation.

In this situation the Faculty group was almost unanimous in its "most appropriate" choice. Seventeen out of 20 chose decision (173), awarding it a mean ranking of 4.8. The On-Campus group also chose this decision as "most appropriate," giving it a ranking of 4.50. Block students, however, were not so enthusiastic, and only 26 out of 40 chose it as "most appropriate."

Although Faculty members chose (175) as their next most appropriate choice, both student groups disagreed, choosing (171) as their next most favored decision.

Faculty members ranked decision (172) as "least appropriate," giving it a mean ranking of 1.45. Although Block students also ranked it as a poor choice (mean ranking of 2.02), six On-Campus students out of 50 said it was the most appropriate decision. Their mean ranking of

2.40 for this decision sets them apart from both Faculty and On-Campus groups.

The above discussion highlighted items in which statistically significant disagreements were found between groups in at least three out of the five decisions offered for those items.

Another group of situation items produced disagreements in only two out of the 5 decision choices offered for each situation. There were 17 of these situations, which will be discussed according to subject matter area and patterns of disagreement and agreement between groups. The complete text of all test situations and choices is reproduced in Appendix A.

Items Which Produced Two Disagreements Between Groups

Two Math curriculum items (1 and 5) produced disagreements between faculty and students as to what constituted the "least appropriate" decision. For example, in Item 5, decision 22 was the "least appropriate" choice for the Faculty, although 13 out of 50 On-Campus students and ten out of 50 Block students chose it as "most appropriate."

For Situation 9, a Social Studies item, only Faculty and Block agreed on their choice of "least appropriate" decision, while On-Campus students disagreed, giving that decision a significantly higher ranking. However, neither

student group favored any one decision choice much above the others.

There were three Reading items in this two-disagreement classification (Items 11, 13, and 14). For each item, there was significant disagreement among groups as to the "most appropriate" and "least appropriate" decisions. Significant Faculty-Block disagreements occurred in 5 of the 6 disagreement instances.

The Language Arts area also had three situation items in the two-disagreement category (Items 17, 19, and 20). For these three items, there were 6 instances of significant disagreement between Faculty and On-Campus groups, and 4 significant disagreements between Faculty and Block students. In general, student groups disagreed with Faculty and tended to agree between themselves. Although Faculty rankings of the "least appropriate" decision always produced a mean value of less than 2, neither student group showed that great a degree of disapproval. The lowest mean ranking for any one decision was 2.16 for the Block and 2.06 from the On-Campus group.

In addition to the 9 Curriculum items in the two-disagreement category there were also 8 Classroom Management items in which statistically significant disagreements among groups occurred in 2 out of 5 decision choices for a given situation.

In 6 out of 8 of these Classroom Management items, disagreement between groups occurred in their choices of the "most appropriate" decision.

Items 25, 30, and 33 provide the most clear-cut disagreements among Faculty and student groups in their "most appropriate" choices. These items are reproduced and discussed below.

Item 25

The teacher has brought the fourth grade class outside to play. When the period is over and the teacher blows the whistle, Judy protests. "It was my turn to jump rope. I never get to jump. I'm always gypped."

- ___ (121) Teacher takes one end of the jump rope and asks another girl to turn the other end, saying to Judy, "Here, Judy, take five jumps so you will feel better."
- ___ (122) Teacher says "Don't complain. I saw you jumping at recess this morning."
- ___ (123) Teacher calls the class together outside and explains that Judy has complained about being gypped out of her jump rope turn. The teacher appoints turners and invites Judy to take her turn.
- ___ (124) Teacher ignores the remark and goes in with the class.
- ___ (125) Teacher explains that exceptions cannot be made for one student because it is not fair to the others.

Faculty ranked decision (121) as the most acceptable, giving it a mean ranking of 4.45. On-Campus students, however, gave it a score of 3.32, and Block students ranked it only 2.92. Additionally, 11 out of 50 Block students

said they thought decision (121) was the least acceptable course of action. Neither student group was very happy with any one choice, though Block students gave decision (125) a rank of 3.60 and On-Campus students awarded it a 3.74 rank.

Item 30

A reading group is in session in a corner of a team teaching classroom. The teacher has developed a lesson on antonyms using the song "Oh Susannah" ("It rained all night the day I left . . ."). The children are enjoying the lesson and are now responding with antonyms of their own. At this time Johnny comes sliding into the circle--ten minutes late. He had been painting in the art center.

- ___ (146) The teacher goes back over the lesson for Johnny's benefit and scolds him for his tardiness. In this way the other students get a review of the lesson and are reminded of their responsibility to be on time.
- ___ (147) The teacher sends Johnny back to his seat with a workbook assignment to do on his own.
- ___ (148) The teacher has the children take turns relating to Johnny everything that has happened in the lesson.
- ___ (149) The teacher quietly but firmly tells Johnny which page to find in his book, and reminds him of his responsibility to be on time to his reading group.
- ___ (150) The teacher ignores Johnny's entrance and goes on with the lesson.

Faculty awarded choice (150) a "most appropriate" rank of 4.7. Block students disagreed, however, ranking it only 3.64. On-Campus students awarded it an even lower rank

of 2.82, and 15 out of 50 students in that group said they thought it was the least appropriate choice. On the other end of the ranking, Item (146), chosen as least appropriate by the Faculty, was chosen as most appropriate by 9 out of 50 On-Campus students.

There were only three test items where agreement was unanimous among all groups for all decisions. These items are reproduced and discussed in the following section.

Items Which Produced No Disagreements
Between Groups

Item 7

Map skills are being introduced in a Third Grade classroom. The teacher wants to include direction, symbols, and scale. The first day's introductory activity must be chosen.

- ___ (31) Have the children choose between drawing a map of their classroom, their home, or their neighborhood.
- ___ (32) Pass out city road maps for children to inspect and to locate their home.
- ___ (33) Show an introductory film on maps.
- ___ (34) Provide various levels of textbooks, and direct a study of the sections on maps.
- ___ (35) Initiate class discussion of why we need maps.

Faculty and On-Campus groups both chose decision (35) as the most appropriate choice, while Block students chose Item (31). Mean differences in rankings were not

statistically significant, however. All three groups chose decision (34) as the least appropriate decision.

Item 12

In your fourth grade classroom you have one or two students who are far ahead of all the rest of the class in all reading areas.

- ___ (56) Provide the students with the next highest level of basal readers.
- ___ (57) Give them free time in the library to choose their own reading materials and to engage in independent research projects.
- ___ (58) Allow the students to go to the fifth grade reading class.
- ___ (59) Provide them with workbook material above their grade level.
- ___ (60) Plan an enrichment program with a wide variety of reading materials. Emphasize drawing inferences, predicting outcomes, enjoying humor, and interpreting character.

All three groups chose decision (60) as their most favored decision, and decision (57) as their next most appropriate choice. Although the faculty chose decision (59) as "least appropriate," both student groups chose (58) as the worst choice, and (59) as just slightly more acceptable. Differences in mean rankings were not statistically significant, however.

Item 26

A third grade teacher is planning to use the cooking center for making instant pudding. How can the teacher organize the project so that each person in each group is actively involved in the measuring, mixing, serving, and cleaning up? This must be done without close supervision by the teacher.

- ___ (126) The teacher appoints a dependable group leader. The leader assigns the jobs to the other members of the group.
- ___ (127) Each step in the pudding-making operation is described on a separate card. The cards are numbered in order, and dealt out to the members of each group.
- ___ (128) The teacher invites a dependable sixth grade student to serve as an advisor at the cooking center.
- ___ (129) The teacher posts an easy-to-read recipe at the center. As each group goes to the center they are required to elect a leader. The leader assigns jobs to the other members of the group.
- ___ (130) The teacher posts an easy-to-read recipe at the center. Groups go to the center and organize themselves for the task.

There were no marked patterns of preferences or rejections found in the rankings made by the three groups. The highest ranking given any one choice was a mean of 3.90 awarded decision (127) by the Block group. The lowest ranking was a mean of 1.95 for decision (128), awarded by the Faculty. There were no statistically significant differences among any groups. Apparently the organization of a cooking center is not a controversial item for University students and faculty.

Summary

In this chapter a discussion was presented regarding the analysis of test results made by tallying statistically significant disagreements between groups in their rankings

of the appropriateness of decision choices offered for 40 classroom situations.

In order to determine statistically significant disagreement, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was applied to the mean rankings given each item by each group. An alpha level of .05 was applied to determine the significance of the H values obtained through the Kruskal-Wallis test. Comparisons were made between the following groups:

Faculty-Block Students

Block-On-Campus Students

Faculty-On-Campus Students

In the case of comparisons where the H values exceeded the .05 criterion, significant disagreement between groups was judged to have occurred.

Item tallies of disagreements were made according to curriculum and classroom management classifications and also according to the between-group comparisons.

A total of 118 statistically significant disagreements were found between groups in regard to their rankings of the appropriateness of the decision choices offered for the 40 situations. Half of the disagreements occurred in the curriculum areas and half in the classroom management area.

In order to double-check these results, tallies were made of agreements between groups. There were 482 comparisons in which agreement occurred between groups.

Implications of these results will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the results of the examination of the data, to determine what meanings they might have for the purpose of the study--a comparison of the Block Methods Program and the On-Campus Methods Program. Students who had volunteered to participate in the Block Methods Program had spent a semester as interns in an elementary school in addition to taking methods instruction. In January, 1973, when the test was administered, the students had completed their internship semester, plus methods courses in Math, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading. On-Campus Methods Students had completed methods course instruction in Math, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading but had not participated in any formal field experience program.

For the purpose of the study it was necessary to compare decision-ranking responses of the two Student groups to a classroom situation test instrument. The responses of a third group, the Faculty members of the Department of Elementary Education, were also collected and analyzed. Responses of Block Students were compared with responses of On-Campus Students, responses of Block Students were

compared with those of the Faculty, and responses of On-Campus Students were compared with Faculty responses.

In the following section the hypotheses of the study are discussed in relation to instances of their rejection.

Summary of Significant Disagreements Between Groups

Of the total of 118 statistically significant disagreements 59 occurred in the Curriculum areas and 59 in the Classroom Management area.

From the Curriculum items, Language Arts and Math had the highest numbers of disagreements, with 21 and 17, respectively. Social Studies and Reading produced 10 and 11 of the disagreements.

Comparisons between the two Student groups generated fewer disagreements than comparisons between Students and Faculty. Block-On-Campus comparisons accounted for only 25 disagreements of the total 118, while Block-Faculty comparisons generated 43 disagreements and On-Campus-Faculty comparisons accounted for 50 disagreements.

One hundred eighteen between-group disagreements out of a possible 600 was not a striking figure. However, when the disagreements were sorted out according to specific between-group comparisons and according to Curriculum and Classroom Management areas, some patterns did emerge. Some of the specific test results are listed in the following

section, along with the implications drawn from those results.

Block-On-Campus comparisons generated the fewest disagreements (13), while On-Campus-Faculty comparisons produced twice as many disagreements (26). Block-Faculty comparisons produced 20 disagreements.

As measured by the test instrument, the decision-ranking responses of the student groups showed little differentiation, regardless of the training program that each group had experienced. This closeness was evident both in the Curriculum and Classroom Management areas. Even though the Block Methods Students had spent a great deal more time in the "real world" of the elementary school classroom, they tended to agree with the On-Campus group in the means and methods they would choose to deal with Curriculum and Classroom Management situations.

Of 118 disagreements, 59 occurred in Curriculum and 59 in Classroom Management.

Neither Curriculum nor Classroom Management is more controversial than the other, although pre-service and classroom teachers often discuss more concerns about Classroom Management than about Curriculum.

In the Classroom Management area, student groups disagreed with each other only 12 times. They both disagreed twice as often with the Faculty.

Both student groups, regardless of their training program, chose the same approaches to Classroom Management situations. Test results showed a considerable difference between the decisions of the students on one hand and the Faculty on the other. Perhaps the students' belief that "There is a classroom in your future" made them approach the decision-making situations differently from the Faculty, whose elementary classroom experience was largely behind them.

In the curriculum areas of Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading, the student groups disagreed more than twice as often with the Faculty than they did between themselves.

In spite of the difference in training programs, the test instrument did not differentiate between student groups in terms of their curriculum decision choices in Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading. A possible implication might be that methods course instruction in these areas was not oriented toward a problem-solving approach as applied to classroom situations.

Out of 17 Math curriculum disagreements, 7 occurred between Block and On-Campus groups, 3 between Block and Faculty, and 7 between On-Campus and Faculty. The higher number of 7 disagreements between student groups was an exception to the trends observed in classroom management, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Reading.

The test instrument differentiated between student groups in terms of their choices of means and methods in Math. This differentiation could be caused by the Block classroom experience or the Block Methods instruction in Math, or by both.

The lower number of Block-Faculty disagreements could be the result of close relationship of Math methods instruction to the classroom situations encountered by Block Students, leading to greater rapport with the Math Faculty instruction.

Since On-Campus Students disagreed 7 times with both the Block Students and Faculty, it appears that, for Math at least, the Block classroom experience and Block methods instruction resulted in a differentiation between the two student groups.

An alternate means of examining the data for patterns and implications was a consideration of instances of agreement between groups. Out of 600 possible comparisons, there were 482 instances of agreement between groups. In other words, in 482 cases out of 600 there were no differences between groups in their rankings of the appropriateness of the decision choices offered for each situation.

Summary of Agreements Between Groups

Of the 482 agreements found between groups, the two student groups agreed 175 times out of 482. Block-Faculty comparisons generated 157 agreements, while On-Campus-Faculty comparisons accounted for 150 agreements. The agreements were evenly divided between Curriculum areas on one hand and Classroom Management on the other. Each category accounted for 241 agreements.

Four hundred eighty-two agreements out of 600 possible comparisons seemed to indicate a considerable degree of consensus among the three groups. When the agreements were grouped according to specific between-group comparisons and according to Curriculum and Classroom Management areas, some patterns did emerge. The following section lists specific test results, along with the implications drawn from those results.

Block and On-Campus group comparisons generated 175 agreements out of a possible 200.

The internship experience of the Block Methods Students did not cause them to respond differently from the On-Campus Methods Students. In spite of greater exposure to actual classroom situations, the Block Students chose the same means and methods as the On-Campus Students in dealing with decision-making situations in Curriculum and Classroom Management.

Block and Faculty comparisons produced more agreements than On-Campus and Faculty comparisons. This effect was particularly noticeable in the Math curriculum area (see Table 2).

Perhaps the classroom experience of the Block Students gave them somewhat more rapport with the ideas and instruction of the Faculty, especially in Math. Another possibility might be that the Math area was one of the curriculum areas in which Block Students were more often involved during their internship, giving rise to more questions and interest regarding their Math methods instruction.

Conclusions

The test instrument used in the study was designed to assess similarities or differences between two student groups in terms of their decision-making responses to classroom situations. A third group--Faculty Members of the Department of Elementary Education--was also tested, to provide a third dimension for comparison of the two student groups.

Instead of differentiating between the two student groups, the test instrument gave evidence of close agreement between the two student groups in terms of the means and methods they said they would choose to deal with certain classroom situations. Furthermore, both student groups

disagreed twice as often with the Faculty as they did between themselves, placing the Faculty at a considerable distance in terms of decision choices. The Block Students were slightly more agreeable with the Faculty than the On-Campus group, who disagreed with their instructors in one out of every four instances.

Therefore it appears that the additional classroom internship experience enjoyed by the Block Methods Students did not make their decision-making responses any different from those of their On-Campus contemporaries. Regardless of their training program, students tended to respond similarly.

Perhaps the student-faculty gap may have been caused by the self-perceptions or the relative positions of each group. The students' rather insecure positions as pre-service teachers embarking upon their student teaching semester may have caused them to respond in a different manner from the Faculty, who held somewhat more secure positions as "authorities" in the field of elementary education. Also, students were perhaps more successful than the Faculty in imagining themselves faced with the potentially anxious moments described in some of the test items.

Therefore the relative positions and self-perceptions of the group members may have had as great an effect upon the results as the training programs experienced by the two student groups.

Although 118 disagreements out of 600 possible comparisons produced some interesting patterns, there still remained a total of 482 between-group agreements--a rather remarkable result, considering the diverse backgrounds and experiences of the 120 individuals who took the test. Although differences between students and Faculty did exist, there was, nevertheless, a great deal of consensus among the students and Faculty of the Department of Elementary Education.

Recommendations

As a result of the study, recommendations are made regarding (1) the test instrument and (2) the teacher training programs which were involved in the study.

Recommendations Regarding the Test Instrument

The Decision-Making in Classroom Situations instrument consisted of 40 situation items. Each item was accompanied by five decision choices which were to be ranked in order of their appropriateness. In some instances the individuals who took the test indicated that they felt none of the choices were appropriate. Thus the test might be improved by providing a blank for individuals to write in their own responses if none of the choices suited them.

Also, the instrument could be shortened and made less burdensome by eliminating those items which excited no controversy between groups.

Since this original instrument was designed for this particular study, it might be interesting also to administer it to other groups at other times, to see if educators in different positions would respond according to any recognizable patterns.

The instrument might also be used as part of teacher education programs. A discussion of the situations and problems posed by the Curriculum and Classroom Management items might help students relate the content of their methods courses to classroom practices.

As a further extension of this use of the instrument, the situations could be adapted to videotape presentations for methods course instruction. This use would give opportunity for students to practice decision making first in the relative safety of a college classroom.

Recommendations for Teacher Training Programs

One of the main reasons why comparison and evaluation of student teaching programs is difficult is that the field experience conditions are sometimes beyond the control of the University Faculty. Although methods course instruction can be carefully planned by a Faculty to provide their students with certain knowledge and skills, the field

experience provided by the elementary school varies to a great extent. Some students may find themselves in a school atmosphere which is supportive of the instruction they have received, while other students may find contradictions and confusion.

Perhaps the purposes of both the Block Methods and the On-Campus Methods Programs could better be served by a closer control over the field experiences provided for the students. Then it might be possible to make more valid comparisons and evaluations of the programs.

Instead of placing interns and student teachers under the guidance of a relatively unselected group of classroom teachers, the Department of Elementary Education might consider developing a cadre of classroom teachers who would be charged with the responsibility of assisting in the professional development of teacher trainees. The members of this rather select group would receive special training and additional pay. They would be expected to work in an expert and professional manner with teacher trainees, and in close cooperation with the University Faculty.

Another recommendation might be the extension of University influence and support through the first year of their students' employment. University Faculty would assist individual teachers in an advisory capacity and would also organize group sessions for problem solving. Teachers who

participated in this program could receive additional college credit.

The teacher cadre and the first-year advisory programs would make several program comparisons possible:

1. Block Programs with internship under teacher cadre could be compared with Block Programs with internship under teachers who were not members of the cadre.
2. Comparisons could be made of On-Campus student teacher groups, where one group is working with teacher cadre and one group is working with classroom teachers who are not members of the cadre.
3. Block Program student teachers could be compared with On-Campus Program student teachers, where all the field experience of both groups was carried on with teacher cadre.

If the University Faculty were actively involved with their first year teachers, they would have opportunity for more continuous evaluation of the products of their programs. The effects, if any, of the various training programs could thus be measured by the ultimate criterion--the ability of the teacher to deal effectively with the curriculum and classroom management challenges inherent in the elementary school environment.

. . . it is the behavior of teachers in classrooms that will finally determine whether or not our schools meet or fail to meet the challenge of our time.

--Arthur Combs (1965, p. v)

APPENDIX A

DECISION-MAKING IN CLASSROOM SITUATIONS

Please check one:

Male _____

Married _____

Female _____

Single _____

Did you participate in a block program?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, which one?

Sunnyside _____

Kellond _____

Open Block _____

Introduction

The responses you make on this test will have no bearing on you as an individual. Test results will be reported in groups only, with no names attached. However, it is important that you consider these situations seriously. Your cooperation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Directions

The 40 situations described in this test booklet have been designed in an attempt to find out what you would do, or at least say you would do in some real teaching situations. Each situation is described in a short paragraph.

Five decision-making responses are provided for each situation. Please judge the appropriateness of the decisions for each situation. Rank the most appropriate decision 5. Rank the next best choice 4. Continue ranking the decisions ending with a rank of 1 for the decision you consider the least appropriate.

5 Most appropriate

4

3

2

1 Least appropriate

1. A group of primary students is having difficulty relating subtraction to addition. The teacher chooses an instructional aid to demonstrate the inverse operation relationship.
 - (1) Number line
 - (2) Practice examples of addition and subtraction.
 - (3) Clock
 - (4) Matrix
 - (5) Popsicle sticks

2. A classroom has a learning center for math. Instructional material must be chosen to teach the concepts and relationships of diameter, radius, and circumference.
 - (6) Circular objects and rulers with which to measure the circles.
 - (7) Variety of math textbooks on different levels, with the geometry sections marked for easy reference by the students.
 - (8) Easy-to-read library books on circles (for example, Adventures With a Party Plate).
 - (9) Paper plates, string, long strip of paper, rulers, and pencils.
 - (10) Practice sheet with circles to be measured; provide rulers.

3. A teacher is planning to introduce multiplication concepts. A teaching activity for the first day's lesson must be chosen.

- _____ (11) Introduce the multiplication concept using cross-product of sets.
 - _____ (12) Have the children make their own arrays with egg cartons.
 - _____ (13) Multiplication chart (point out patterns, such as 9's).
 - _____ (14) Repeated addition, with the use of number line as an instructional aid.
 - _____ (15) Work sheet with multiplication problems through the 2's.
4. A third grade class is beginning a unit on money. The teacher wishes to include the concepts of buying, selling, making change, and performing mathematical operations using the decimal point and dollar sign.
- _____ (16) Provide catalogues and newspaper advertisements; give each child \$10.00 in play money; ask them to spend the \$10.00.
 - _____ (17) Have a classroom store; the children take turns being customers and store keepers; they use play money.
 - _____ (18) Provide each child with a shopping list and a grocery advertisement from the newspaper; have the children find the total cost of their shopping list.
 - _____ (19) Prepare story problems which deal with money; guide the children to perform the mathematical operations required.
 - _____ (20) Provide information on money systems used in the past; let the children devise their own money system.
5. Select a method for correlating math with a field trip to the zoo.
- _____ (21) Count the different types of animals they see and make story problems.
 - _____ (22) Have the students keep track of the mileage and length of time it takes to get to the zoo; from these data have them figure the average miles per hour.

- _____ (23) Have the children make a graph of the species of animals within each of the major classifications of living things.
 - _____ (24) Provide the students with information on the cost of food and the quantity consumed by different animals; ask them to figure the cost of feeding the zoo animals.
 - _____ (25) Provide the students with city road maps; have committees of students plan the route and the mileage to and from the zoo.
6. A sixth grade class is studying community planning. This lesson includes zoning for commercial and residential development.
- _____ (26) Use a variety of Social Studies textbooks dealing with community planning; compare and contrast problems of small, medium, and large communities.
 - _____ (27) Assign roles to groups in your classroom. These groups would be identified as transportation specialists, home builders, business developers, a citizen ecology group, and a zoning commission; build a model city.
 - _____ (28) Plan a field trip of your city; include business areas, residential areas, industrial parks, recreation areas, and areas of urban blight.
 - _____ (29) Show films illustrating problems faced by cities in countries around the world; emphasize the similarities among community problems.
 - _____ (30) Divide the class into committees; each committee will be required to present a panel discussion on some aspect of community planning.
7. Map skills are being introduced in a Third Grade classroom. The teacher wants to include direction, symbols, and scale. The first day's introductory activity must be chosen.
- _____ (31) Have the children choose between drawing a map of their classroom, their home, or their neighborhood.
 - _____ (32) Pass out city road maps for children to inspect and to locate their home.
 - _____ (33) Show an introductory film on maps.

- _____ (34) Provide various levels of textbooks, and direct a study of the sections on maps.
 - _____ (35) Initiate class discussion of why we need maps.
8. A fourth grade teaching unit is being prepared, dealing with social cooperation, living together in the community, and the role of individuals and institutions in community life.
- _____ (36) Direct a textbook study of different types of communities (small rural communities, large cities, etc.).
 - _____ (37) Turn the classroom into a simulated community, with government, services, commerce, and zoning.
 - _____ (38) Take a field trip to city hall, the police station, and the fire station.
 - _____ (39) Invite speakers from the community to tell about their work.
 - _____ (40) Show films on community life in the U.S. and around the world.
9. Select a method of evaluation that you would use after completion of a unit of study on maps and globes.
- _____ (41) Display the types of maps and globes that you have used in your unit; ask the students to choose the map or globe they would use in certain described situations.
 - _____ (42) Have committees plan and describe a vacation trip, using a road map of their state.
 - _____ (43) Use the prepared test at the end of the map unit in your Social Studies text; read the questions aloud for any students who have reading difficulty.
 - _____ (44) Give every student a similar map; ask the students to respond to a set of questions regarding distance, directions, scale, and symbols.
 - _____ (45) Have the students draw a map of their neighborhood, using scale, symbols, and direction.
10. What instructional materials or activities would be most useful in a teaching unit on "Man's Adaptability to his Environment?"

- ___ (46) Directed textbook study, supplemented by research activities using encyclopedias and library books.
 - ___ (47) Social Studies learning center which includes pictures and written material on man's adaptation to different environments around the world. Students are required to compare and contrast strategies of food-getting, shelter, clothing, and transportation.
 - ___ (48) Field trip around the community to see how local inhabitants have adapted to their environment.
 - ___ (49) Audio-visual materials showing man operating in different environments of the world.
 - ___ (50) Discussions relating man's adaptation to his environment to animals' adaptations. Provide pictures and reading material on animal adaptation. Initiate class discussions on the subject of adaptation of all living things.
11. What type of reading materials would you use with a small group of fifth grade students who are functioning below grade level in their reading? No learning disabilities are indicated.
- ___ (51) Workbook material from a lower grade level.
 - ___ (52) Basal readers from a lower grade level.
 - ___ (53) Intensive phonics review.
 - ___ (54) High interest-low vocabulary material.
 - ___ (55) Self-selected reading of library books.
12. In your fourth grade classroom you have one or two students who are far ahead of the rest of the class in all reading areas.
- ___ (56) Provide the students with the next highest level of basal readers.
 - ___ (57) Give them free time in the library to choose their own reading materials and to engage in independent research projects.
 - ___ (58) Allow the students to go to the fifth grade reading class.

- _____ (59) Provide them with workbook material above their grade level.
- _____ (60) Plan an enrichment program with a wide variety of reading materials. Emphasize drawing inferences, predicting outcomes, enjoying humor, and interpreting character.
13. A group of children in your reading class need development of their sight vocabulary. Although they have adequate word attack skills, they tend to stumble and guess when reading words of high frequency.
- _____ (61) Make a word wall in the classroom, so the children can add to it and refer to it, strengthening their recognition of the high frequency words.
- _____ (62) Use the words of high frequency on spelling tests to supplement the regular spelling list.
- _____ (63) Choose an appropriate sight vocabulary list. Make word cards for students to use. Make a tape recording of sentences using the words. Students read and listen to the sentences, circling the words of high frequency.
- _____ (64) During the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity the teacher points out the words of high frequency as the children read aloud. The teacher then makes a list of the words each child has difficulty with and gives this list to the child to practice.
- _____ (65) Give each child a list of the words of high frequency for him to use in his creative writing and as a spelling aid.
14. A third grade student in your reading class has a limited sight vocabulary (He knows "and," "is," "a.") He attempts only to make the sounds of initial consonants when attacking a word. He is the only student in the class with this type of reading problem.
- _____ (66) Use a basal reader on a pre-primer level.
- _____ (67) Have the student dictate stories to you. His own stories are then used for his reading material.
- _____ (68) Make a tape recording of the words of high frequency. Have the student listen to the words while he reads them from a typed list.

- _____ (69) Provide a programmed linguistic reading program such as the Sullivan series (McGraw-Hill).
- _____ (70) Assign a capable reader to help the student practice sight vocabulary words with flash cards.
15. Several fifth grade students are rapid readers, but their comprehension needs improvement. Although they can call every word correctly, they seem to understand little of what they have read.
- _____ (71) Each child in the group writes a short report on a subject of interest. He also prepares 5 questions about his own report. Students exchange reports and questions. They test each other.
- _____ (72) Use a story from the basal reader series. Discuss points to look for before the students read. Test the students orally to see if they have understood the story.
- _____ (73) Provide short stories with comprehension questions to be answered. A possible source would be the Readers Digest Skill Builders.
- _____ (74) Provide practice sheets with short paragraphs followed by multiple choice comprehension questions. Give each student answer keys so that he can check his own work.
- _____ (75) Have the students choose subjects of interest for encyclopedia research. They write a short report on what they have learned from their reading.
16. A creative writing center is set up, using the following stimuli: story-starters, colorful pictures, objects such as seashells, small toys, and nature collections. These stimuli are varied often.
- What self-teaching materials would you put at such a center to assist the students with spelling and handwriting, if your main objective for the center is creative expression?
- _____ (76) Handwriting practice sheets and a variety of spelling books.

- _____ (77) A list of the 500 most commonly used words; Variety of dictionaries; List of words by classification such as color, shape, size, and movement; Examples of standard cursive and manuscript writing.
 - _____ (78) Handwriting stencils to trace capital letters and to help in the transition to cursive writing; Word list of the 1,000 most commonly used words; Examples of good story-writing by other children in the class.
 - _____ (79) Handwriting practice books using the Palmer and Zaner-Blosser material, plus phonics books on different levels.
 - _____ (80) A typewriter so that children who write and spell well can type their stories as a reward for good work.
17. A teacher wishes to introduce intermediate students to the use of encyclopedias for research.
- _____ (81) Assign each child a subject to investigate and have him write a short report on what he has learned. The teacher serves as a consultant to assist any student who needs individual help.
 - _____ (82) Prepare the students for the use of the encyclopedia by reinforcing alphabetizing skills with worksheets and exercises with the dictionary.
 - _____ (83) Teacher reads a list of subjects for researching. Children are paired together according to their choice of subject. Each pair selects the appropriate volume and works together to find the article and read it. The teacher acts as a consultant for any students who need assistance.
 - _____ (84) Have the encyclopedia always available in the classroom, so that the children can readily choose it as a resource. When they make this choice, the teacher should take that opportunity to teach research skills and the use of the encyclopedia.
 - _____ (85) Have the children select materials of interest and make research reports on their subject.

18. An intermediate student does not succeed on grade-level spelling tests.

- _____ (86) Have the student choose 5 words from the list and be prepared to spell them correctly. Gradually increase the number of words.
- _____ (87) Give him individual instruction and more study time for the words.
- _____ (88) Get an easier spelling book for him to use.
- _____ (89) Have one of his peers test him each day to see how many words he knows on his weekly spelling assignment.
- _____ (90) Practice writing the words in the air before the spelling test.

19. A student comes to the teacher with a story he has written. The story is thoughtfully written, but contains several misspelled words.

- _____ (91) Give two grades on the story--one for content and one for spelling.
- _____ (92) Comment favorably on the story and don't criticize his spelling, so he won't get discouraged.
- _____ (93) Comment favorably on the story and ask the student to circle the words he thinks might be misspelled. Provide spelling aids for the student at a short conference.
- _____ (94) Supply the correct spelling for the misspelled words and have the student rewrite the story.
- _____ (95) Draw a circle around all the misspelled words before handing the story back to the student.

20. A teacher chooses an activity for the purpose of stimulating intermediate children to express themselves through poetry writing.

- _____ (96) Have a variety of poem books available in the classroom library so the children can make self-selection and can experience the reading of poems before they begin to write them.
- _____ (97) Put some rhyming words on the board and have each student try to write his own poem.

- ___ (98) Read many poems aloud to the class and discuss their various structures.
- ___ (99) Provide several models of poems, such as cinquain, haiku, limerick, and short rhyming poems. Guide a series of small groups through the writing of a cooperative poem. Publish the poems written by each group for the class library.
- ___ (100) Select a well-known pattern-type poem such as "This is the House That Jack Built" and have the students substitute their own nouns and verbs for the traditional words. This assignment could thus include the classification of words into nouns and verbs.
21. A primary child speaks out in class, complaining bitterly, "You never call on me. You like the other children better than me."
- ___ (101) Teacher ignores the remark and does not vary the pattern of calling on students to recite.
- ___ (102) Teacher ignores the remark, but makes a point of calling on the student more often.
- ___ (103) Teacher: I am glad you told me the way you feel. Perhaps you would like to play teacher for a while. Would you like to be responsible for calling on students during the next word game?
- ___ (104) Teacher: I am glad you can tell about your feelings. You want to have a chance to participate more often. Teachers can make mistakes in giving children turns.
- ___ (105) Teacher: I think you are just imagining things. I call on you as often as I can. What if everyone wanted to talk all the time?
22. An intermediate teacher notices that two students often attempt to copy answers from their neighbors during math assignments.
- ___ (106) The teacher tells the class that some children have been copying answers from others. A class meeting is called so the students can discuss the problem of cheating.

- (107) Teacher has a frank, private discussion with each student, telling them that they have been seen copying answers. Teacher offers to help the students understand their assignment better, so they will not need to copy from others in the future.
- (108) The teacher quietly asks the two students to move to isolated corners of the room to complete their assignment.
- (109) The teacher goes over to the desks of the students who are copying, takes away their papers and tears them up without comment.
- (110) The teacher announces to the class that some students are copying and reminds the class to keep their papers covered.
23. The class is working on an assignment. Two children begin to argue loudly over the ownership of a pencil.
- (111) The teacher initiates a class discussion on the need for taking care of one's own property.
- (112) The teacher takes the pencil and breaks it into two pieces, giving half to one child and half to another. The two students must sharpen their stubs and finish the assignment.
- (113) The teacher tells the students, "I am disappointed in your behavior. Please go outside the classroom and discuss the matter privately.
- (114) The teacher makes a brief attempt to establish ownership, and awards the pencil accordingly.
- (115) The teacher seizes this opportunity to discuss the problem of stealing with the class.
24. A child in the fourth grade is continually striving for attention. He says funny things out loud, falls off his chair, and trips children going by.
- (116) The teacher arranges a conference with the parents, the district psychologist, and the child. At this conference the problem is discussed so solutions can then be agreed upon jointly.

- ___ (117) The teacher ignores the attention-getting behavior and praises those students who are behaving well.
- ___ (118) The teacher discusses the child's attention-getting techniques with the whole class. If everyone in the class can successfully ignore the bids for attention, the teacher rewards the class with a free play period or some other privilege.
- ___ (119) The teacher removes the child to an isolated part of the room every time he engages in inappropriate attention-getting behavior.
- ___ (120) The teacher has a frank, private discussion with the child, asking for his cooperation in improving his own behavior.
25. The teacher has brought the fourth grade class outside to play. When the period is over and the teacher blows the whistle Judy protests. "It was my turn to jump rope. I never get to jump. I'm always gyped."
- ___ (121) Teacher takes one end of the jump rope and asks another girl to turn the other end, saying to Judy, "Here, Judy, take five jumps so you will feel better."
- ___ (122) Teacher says "Don't complain. I saw you jumping at recess this morning."
- ___ (123) Teacher calls the class together outside and explains that Judy has complained about being gyped out of her jump rope turn. The teacher appoints turners and invites Judy to take her turn.
- ___ (124) Teacher ignores the remark and goes in with the class.
- ___ (125) Teacher explains that exceptions cannot be made for one student because it is not fair to the others.
26. A third grade teacher is planning to use the cooking center for making instant pudding. How can the teacher organize the project so that each person in each group is actively involved in the measuring, mixing, serving, and cleaning up? This must be done without close supervision by the teacher.

- ___ (126) The teacher appoints a dependable group leader. The leader assigns the jobs to the other members of the group.
 - ___ (127) Each step in the pudding-making operation is described on a separate card. The cards are numbered in order and dealt out to the members of each group.
 - ___ (128) The teacher invites a dependable sixth grade student to serve as an advisor at the cooking center.
 - ___ (129) The teacher posts an easy-to-read recipe at the center. As each group goes to the center they are required to elect a leader. The leader assigns jobs to the other members of the group.
 - ___ (130) The teacher posts an easy-to-read recipe at the center. Groups go to the center and organize themselves for the task.
27. What preparations could be made so that your classroom routine and instructional plans are easily carried on by a substitute teacher?
- ___ (131) Detailed daily lesson plans should be made two or three days in advance. These plans include scheduling, seating chart, description of materials, and lists of objectives for each lesson.
 - ___ (132) Prepare briefly outlined lesson plans and identify responsible students who can help the substitute with any additional information.
 - ___ (133) Make a detailed substitute kit which is continually updated. In addition to prepared seat work materials, games, and activities, the kit includes scheduling, seating chart, and a description of the classroom organization.
 - ___ (134) Appoint and identify reliable students who can assist the substitute by pointing out materials and page numbers in textbooks.
 - ___ (135) Prepare a briefly outlined lesson plan, supplemented with prepared seat work. Identify those students who might cause problems in the classroom, and include suggestions on how to deal with them.

28. A class is rehearsing a play in which the boys doing a choral reading are required to wear large green bow ties. Several of the boys object to the costume and will not cooperate in the play practice.
- ___ (136) Teacher changes the play so that no special costumes are required.
- ___ (137) Teacher threatens to call the play off because some of the students have not cooperated,
- ___ (138) Teacher tells the boys that the costumes are important for the play and the whole class is depending upon them to come through.
- ___ (139) Teacher has a frank discussion with the boys, sympathizing with their views. Teacher asks the boys for suggestions regarding kinds of costumes they feel would be appropriate.
- ___ (140) Teacher tells the boys that if they won't cooperate then they should quit and girls will be used in their places.
29. Your sixth grade class is involved in working an assignment in long division. The teacher is working with a small group of students who need help in multiplication. Peter raises his hand and says, "I don't understand how to do this division."
- ___ (141) Teacher: "Where were you when I explained long division to the class? It was your responsibility to ask for help at that time. Try to figure it out on your own. I'll help you later."
- ___ (142) Teacher: "I am busy now. These people need help too. I can't hold a special class for each person in here."
- ___ (143) Teacher: "Please look at the beginning of the chapter again. It goes over long division step by step. I'll try to find time to help you sometime today."
- ___ (144) Teacher: "Long division is difficult. I wish I could help you now. Why don't we pick a time when we can work together to review long division. Please join our group in multiplication while you wait."

- (145) Teacher: "Patricia, would you help Peter with his long division? I know you understand it very well.
30. A reading group is in session in a corner of a team teaching classroom. The teacher has developed a lesson on antonyms using the song "Oh Susannah" ("It rained all night the day I left . . ."). The children are enjoying the lesson and are now responding with antonyms of their own. At this time Johnny comes sliding into the circle--ten minutes late. He had been painting in the art center.
- (146) The teacher goes back over the lesson for Johnny's benefit and scolds him for his tardiness. In this way the other students get a review of the lesson and are reminded of their responsibility to be on time.
- (147) The teacher sends Johnny back to his seat with a workbook assignment to do on his own.
- (148) The teacher has the children take turns relating to Johnny everything that has happened in the lesson.
- (149) The teacher quietly but firmly tells Johnny which page to find in his book, and reminds him of his responsibility to be on time to his reading group.
- (150) The teacher ignores Johnny's entrance and goes on with the lesson.
31. A primary teacher has been planning a field trip to a children's art museum. Four or five children in the class have not learned to behave appropriately in such situations.
- (151) Cancel plans for the field trip, telling the class that because some of the children cannot behave the whole class cannot go on the trip.
- (152) Inform the parents of the problem children that their child can go on the field trip if one of the parents goes along. In this way the children's parents will be responsible for their behavior.

- ___ (153) Invite several mothers to go along so the teacher can spend more time with the children who might misbehave. In this way the teacher can quickly reward good behavior and avoid problems.
 - ___ (154) Write a note to each parent of the problem children, asking that they keep their child home on the day of the field trip.
 - ___ (155) Leave the children who behave inappropriately at school, dividing them up among other classrooms.
32. An afternoon thunderstorm interrupts the routine of a primary classroom. The children become excited because of the rain, thunder, and lightning.
- ___ (156) Teacher allows some time for the children to watch, listen, and talk about the storm. The children are allowed to choose between drawing a picture of the storm or writing a few words to describe it.
 - ___ (157) Teacher seizes this opportunity to teach a short lesson on the weather.
 - ___ (158) The teacher continues the regular routine of the classroom, ignoring the excitable behavior and giving verbal approval to those children who continue with their assignment.
 - ___ (159) Teacher takes her class outside to stand under the porch. In this way the children can use their senses of smell, sight, and hearing.
 - ___ (160) Teacher draws the black-out curtains and immediately initiates an energetic activity such as marching around the room to music. In this way the children can let off steam and their attention will be diverted from the storm.
33. A group of kindergarten children comes in from recess, noisy and excited from their play. The teacher has prepared a Peabody language lesson wherein the children are required to count and to identify colored shapes. The children begin to respond by shouting the answers and interrupting each other.
- ___ (161) The teacher takes the children outside for an organized game before bringing them in to resume the lesson.

- ___ (162) Teacher uses a signal such as a whistle or a bell to notify the children that it is now "quiet time," so she can begin the lesson.
 - ___ (163) Teacher waits until she sees one child behaving appropriately. Then she praises him and uses him as an example for the rest of the group before starting her lesson.
 - ___ (164) The teacher goes over to the most disruptive child, and with quiet tones settles the child down.
 - ___ (165) Teacher raises her hand and quietly asks all the children to raise their hands. While the hands are raised, she calls on a child to respond to a stimulus card. She praises the answer and the group behavior. After repeating this procedure several times, the teacher continues the lesson without requiring hand-raising.
34. It is the first day of school, and the fifth grade teacher is calling roll. The teacher asks a student his name. The student replies "Mickey Mouse." The class laughs and some of the students begin singing the Mouseketeers song.
- ___ (166) The teacher reprimands the student, and at the first opportunity arranges a meeting with the student, himself, and the principal, in order to discuss the misbehavior.
 - ___ (167) The teacher looks mildly amused and comments "I hope you will be as good a student as Mickey Mouse is an entertainer." The teacher makes no further response and continues with the roll.
 - ___ (168) The teacher reprimands the student and immediately plans to arrange a meeting with the student's parents.
 - ___ (169) The teacher ignores the response, but later has a private talk with the student, reminding him of the need for respect in the classroom.
 - ___ (170) The teacher pretends not to hear, and goes on calling roll.

35. Several children in a third grade class are continually coming to the teacher to tattle. They also disrupt the class by tattling out loud.
- ___ (171) The teacher ignores the tattling and compliments those children who do not tattle.
 - ___ (172) The teacher says, "Tattling is for babies. I hope you will all learn to take care of your own problems."
 - ___ (173) The teacher reads the story "The Tattle Tale Cure" to the class, followed by a discussion of tattling.
 - ___ (174) The teacher says, "Most tattlers cause the trouble themselves. I don't wish to hear any more tattling."
 - ___ (175) The teacher listens politely to the tattling, counseling each child on how he could avoid the situation.
36. The teacher is planning an afternoon activity period. Committees will be working on Social Studies dioramas. In the past the students have become very noisy in such a situation. As the noise level increased some students began to yell to make themselves heard, while others complained that it was too noisy.
- ___ (176) Before the activity begins the teacher describes the appropriate noise level. The students are told that if their group becomes noisy they will be asked to return to their seats. Groups which work quietly will be allowed additional committee work activities.
 - ___ (177) Before the activity begins the students discuss appropriate noise levels. During the activity the teacher makes a tape recording to be used for self-evaluation by the students.
 - ___ (178) Before the activity begins the teacher explains to the students that points will be given to each committee for working quietly. These points can be used to buy special privileges such as free time or art work.

- ___ (179) Before the activity begins the students discuss and set an appropriate noise level. A signal such as flipping the lights off and on is pre-arranged in order to let the children know that they are becoming too noisy.
- ___ (180) Before the activity begins the teacher tells the class that if they behave well and are pretty quiet they will get to have other activities like this.
- 37. The teacher would like to allow intermediate students to work independently without direct teacher supervision. Example: Allowing the children to do committee work and art projects in the halls and to go to the library to do independent research. What kind of preparation can the teacher provide the students so that they may learn to behave appropriately in such unsupervised situations?
- ___ (181) Insure success of the program by allowing only the most dependable students to participate in the independent activities. Keep the other students in the room for teacher-supervised instruction.
- ___ (182) Teacher and class discuss specific guidelines for behavior and carrying out of responsibilities before the independent activities are begun. As groups complete their activity they are required to evaluate their own behavior.
- ___ (183) Plan your activities so that the children will be so motivated and interested that no one will misbehave.
- ___ (184) Check on the activities often to see if the students are behaving properly. Praise the students who are behaving well.
- ___ (185) Alert other teachers and the librarian to monitor the students' behavior when they are out of the room, and to report any misbehavior directly to the teacher. Remove offenders from such activities in the future.

38. A primary teacher has just read "Jack and the Beanstalk." The teacher asks the children to draw a picture of their favorite part of the story. As the children work on their picture they keep getting out of their seats to show the teacher, waving their picture in front of the teacher and competing loudly for attention.
- (186) The teacher ignores the children that come to her desk. She gets up and gives special attention to those children who have remained in their seats.
- (187) Teacher: I wish I could see all your drawings at once. Show your picture to your neighbor while I walk around the classroom. I can see your pictures much better if they are on your desk.
- (188) The teacher has the children line up at her desk so she can see each picture and give individual attention to each child.
- (189) Teacher: Please don't show me your pictures now. I'll look at them all while you are out for recess. Be sure to put your name on your picture.
- (190) Teacher: what if everybody got up like this? I won't look at your pictures until you sit down.
39. It is lunch time and the class has been engaged in a variety of activities. The teacher wants the materials picked up and the room in good order before they go to lunch.
- (191) The teacher announces that it is time for lunch and dismisses the children one at a time as they finish their cleaning up.
- (192) The teacher announces that it is time for lunch and tells the children that no one can go until the room is neat.
- (193) The teacher makes no announcement of any kind, expecting the children to keep track of their own time and to plan their cleanup accordingly. The teacher dismisses children who have cleaned up first.

- (194) The teacher gives the following explicit instructions:
- (1) Get ready to go to lunch.
 - (2) Put all your books and pencils away.
 - (3) Make sure the paint brushes are clean.
 - (4) Pick up all the paper on the floor.
 - (5) Get your lunches or lunch money out.
- (195) The teacher announces that it is almost lunch time and that the class can be dismissed to lunch when materials and equipment are put away properly and the room is neat.
40. Intermediate teacher wishes to initiate a learning center program. None of the students have used learning centers before.
- (196) Set up as many learning centers as the program requires. Allow the students to circulate freely among the centers so they will get an idea of what is required.
- (197) Begin with two well-planned centers. Explain the centers to the whole class. Have small groups take turns working at the centers with close teacher supervision while the rest of the students work on related activities at their seats.
- (198) Devote one day to practicing the role playing. Choose one center for demonstration. Explain what the children are to do there and have one group after another go through the motions required. (Going to the center quietly, seating themselves, and beginning work.) Have the rest of the class watch and evaluate their behavior. Do this for each learning center.
- (199) Explain rules and expectations. Allow the children who function well to continue to use the centers. Use a more structured, seat-work approach for the children who do not work well in centers.
- (200) Explain the rules for using the centers and make it clear that the children may use the centers as long as they behave well.

APPENDIX B

MEAN SCORES FOR ALL ITEMS AND ALL GROUPS

Faculty = F, N = 20

Block = B, N = 50

On-Campus = C, N = 50

Situation	Decision	Rankings																	
		1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	10	28	21	10	16	28	4.50	4.20	4.50
	2	9	11	12	7	11	18	4	23	17	0	5	3	0	0	0	1.75	2.40	2.22
	3	6	14	20	10	21	15	4	13	14	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.90	2.06	1.92
	4	6	23	16	3	15	18	11	8	14	0	2	2	0	2	0	2.25	1.90	2.04
	5	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	10	14	22	10	31	22	4.50	4.40	4.32
2	6	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	9	6	20	33	36	0	3	6	4.00	3.68	3.88
	7	14	36	22	6	8	19	0	3	5	0	2	2	0	1	2	1.30	1.48	1.86
	8	6	11	14	11	27	23	3	5	9	0	5	4	0	2	0	1.85	2.20	2.06
	9	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	3	2	20	43	41	5.00	4.70	4.60
	10	1	1	11	3	10	5	14	31	26	2	6	7	0	2	1	2.85	2.96	2.64
3	11	2	14	6	9	8	6	7	19	24	2	7	10	0	2	4	2.45	2.50	3.00
	12	0	4	0	0	0	6	1	0	10	5	12	21	14	34	13	4.65	4.44	3.82
	13	1	5	18	10	28	17	9	11	9	0	3	6	0	3	0	2.40	2.42	2.06
	14	0	0	1	0	5	4	0	8	2	14	26	11	6	11	32	4.30	3.86	4.38
	15	17	27	25	2	10	17	1	11	5	0	2	2	0	0	1	1.20	1.76	1.74
4	16	0	0	2	1	4	11	6	18	8	8	24	19	5	4	10	3.85	3.48	3.48
	17	0	2	2	0	1	0	2	2	10	3	7	8	15	38	30	4.65	4.56	4.28
	18	0	0	1	3	6	7	11	22	23	6	17	15	0	5	4	3.15	3.42	3.28
	19	12	31	18	8	16	23	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	5	1.40	1.50	2.04
	20	9	17	27	6	23	9	0	6	6	4	2	7	1	2	1	2.10	1.98	1.92
5	21	5	20	10	5	10	12	5	3	4	0	5	7	5	12	17	2.75	2.58	3.18
	22	4	3	6	9	9	8	4	17	16	3	11	7	0	10	13	2.30	3.32	3.26
	23	6	19	21	3	20	8	4	5	8	2	4	10	5	2	3	2.85	2.00	2.32
	24	2	5	4	1	7	5	6	16	13	7	7	18	4	15	10	3.50	3.40	3.50
	25	5	4	9	2	3	17	1	9	9	6	23	8	6	11	7	3.30	3.68	2.74

Rankings

Situation	Decision	Rankings															\bar{X}		
		1			2			3			4			5			F	B	C
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
6	26	19	41	36	1	4	7	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	3	1	1.05	1.40	1.52
	27	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	5	10	2	19	14	18	23	23	4.90	4.22	4.14
	28	0	2	2	1	2	6	5	3	8	11	22	17	3	21	17	3.80	4.16	3.82
	29	0	1	2	10	24	16	10	19	18	0	5	6	0	1	8	2.50	2.62	3.04
	30	1	5	10	7	19	18	5	20	11	7	5	10	0	1	1	2.90	2.56	2.48
7	31	0	0	6	6	11	5	2	9	6	4	11	24	8	19	9	3.70	3.76	3.50
	32	0	4	5	3	10	8	8	14	24	9	19	7	0	3	6	3.30	3.14	3.02
	33	0	3	1	8	12	21	8	13	8	2	14	9	2	8	11	2.90	3.24	3.16
	34	19	41	36	1	4	7	0	2	6	0	0	1	0	3	0	1.05	1.40	1.44
	35	0	2	2	1	13	9	3	12	6	6	6	9	10	17	24	4.25	3.46	3.88
8	36	19	47	40	0	1	5	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	1.15	1.18	1.34
	37	0	2	0	0	2	12	0	7	2	0	7	7	20	32	29	5.00	4.30	4.06
	38	0	0	3	0	6	8	3	6	6	16	27	26	1	11	7	3.90	3.86	3.52
	39	0	1	2	2	2	1	14	31	31	4	14	12	0	2	4	3.10	3.28	3.30
	40	0	0	4	16	39	25	4	6	6	0	2	6	0	3	9	2.20	2.38	2.82
9	41	0	0	4	1	4	6	4	24	22	7	11	7	8	11	11	4.10	3.58	3.30
	42	1	2	9	5	13	12	7	13	7	7	12	12	0	11	10	3.00	4.40	3.04
	43	18	46	29	2	4	8	0	0	6	0	0	5	0	0	2	1.10	1.08	1.86
	44	0	1	2	12	26	20	7	8	4	2	8	14	1	7	10	2.90	2.88	3.20
	45	0	2	6	0	3	4	4	6	11	5	19	12	11	20	17	4.30	4.04	3.60
10	46	18	43	36	2	3	7	0	1	4	0	0	3	0	3	0	1.10	1.34	1.48
	47	0	2	0	6	5	4	0	5	5	8	8	20	6	30	21	3.80	4.18	4.16
	48	3	3	6	6	15	11	2	15	16	0	8	6	9	9	11	3.30	3.10	3.10
	49	0	1	0	6	11	14	9	15	14	2	19	13	3	4	9	3.10	3.28	3.34
	50	0	1	8	0	17	14	8	13	11	9	14	8	3	5	9	3.75	3.10	2.92

Situation	Decision	Rankings																	
		1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
11	51	5	18	15	11	21	19	4	7	11	0	1	1	0	3	4	1.95	2.00	2.20
	52	4	17	14	7	15	15	9	12	14	0	6	7	0	0	0	2.25	2.14	2.28
	53	11	10	15	2	7	9	7	23	24	0	8	1	0	2	1	1.80	2.70	2.28
	54	0	3	1	0	0	5	0	1	1	10	15	17	10	31	26	4.50	4.42	4.24
	55	0	2	5	0	6	2	0	7	0	10	21	24	10	14	19	4.50	3.78	4.00
12	56	3	11	14	12	15	20	5	21	12	0	2	4	0	1	0	2.10	2.34	2.12
	57	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	1	2	15	31	33	5	14	13	4.25	4.08	4.14
	58	7	22	21	2	9	9	11	17	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	2.70	2.00	2.08
	59	10	15	12	7	21	19	3	11	17	0	2	0	0	1	2	1.65	2.06	2.22
	60	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	13	16	33	33	4.80	4.52	4.46
13	61	0	2	8	1	7	4	5	5	12	8	13	17	6	23	9	3.95	3.96	3.30
	62	16	24	17	4	9	21	0	9	3	0	5	4	0	3	5	1.20	2.08	2.18
	63	0	3	6	1	5	6	8	10	4	3	15	10	8	17	24	3.90	3.76	3.80
	64	2	8	10	4	16	5	7	13	16	6	7	11	1	6	8	3.00	2.74	3.04
	65	1	14	9	10	12	13	0	13	16	4	9	8	5	2	4	3.10	2.46	2.70
14	66	18	33	24	2	8	10	0	4	9	0	1	4	0	4	3	1.10	1.70	2.04
	67	0	4	1	0	2	7	0	0	11	0	10	5	20	34	26	5.00	4.36	3.96
	68	0	3	7	4	8	8	5	13	15	11	19	9	0	7	11	3.35	3.38	3.18
	69	2	6	8	9	12	9	4	20	10	5	11	14	0	1	9	2.60	2.78	3.14
	70	0	4	10	6	20	16	10	13	6	4	9	17	0	4	1	2.90	2.78	2.66
15	71	0	2	4	2	7	6	0	2	5	3	12	12	15	27	23	4.55	4.10	3.88
	72	12	12	23	5	10	7	0	12	5	1	6	10	2	10	5	1.80	2.84	2.34
	73	0	8	8	8	10	8	5	18	10	5	8	12	2	6	12	3.05	2.88	3.24
	74	3	8	7	5	15	14	12	13	15	0	12	9	0	2	5	2.45	2.70	2.82
	75	6	20	8	0	8	16	3	5	14	10	12	7	1	5	5	3.00	2.48	2.70

		Rankings																	
Situation	Decision	1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
16	76	5	16	9	8	14	22	6	8	14	1	8	5	0	4	0	2.15	2.40	2.30
	77	2	2	5	0	7	6	0	5	6	1	3	8	17	33	25	4.55	4.16	3.84
	78	1	8	2	5	4	4	5	10	10	9	22	19	0	6	15	3.10	3.28	3.82
	79	11	6	13	3	25	15	5	15	12	0	4	8	0	0	2	1.60	2.34	2.42
	80	0	18	21	5	0	3	5	12	8	8	13	9	2	7	9	3.35	2.82	2.64
17	81	9	12	17	8	17	13	3	13	9	0	5	7	0	3	4	1.70	2.40	2.36
	82	11	26	8	4	8	14	2	4	8	1	6	11	2	6	9	1.95	2.16	2.98
	83	0	3	4	2	6	8	8	15	17	4	17	9	6	9	12	3.70	3.46	3.34
	84	0	5	9	3	12	10	1	8	5	4	6	10	12	19	16	4.25	3.44	3.28
	85	0	5	12	3	7	5	7	10	11	9	16	13	1	12	9	3.40	3.46	3.04
18	86	0	3	3	0	4	7	2	6	9	6	10	14	12	27	17	4.50	4.08	3.70
	87	0	3	1	0	7	5	6	16	8	8	20	20	6	4	16	4.00	3.30	3.90
	88	4	21	15	4	12	15	8	7	8	1	2	0	3	8	12	2.75	2.28	2.58
	89	1	4	8	10	11	12	4	14	17	5	13	11	0	8	2	2.65	3.20	2.74
	90	15	20	23	5	15	12	0	7	7	0	5	5	0	3	3	1.25	2.12	2.06
19	91	0	16	10	4	7	8	11	18	20	5	7	7	0	2	5	3.05	2.44	2.78
	92	0	5	3	1	9	6	4	8	3	10	15	20	5	13	18	3.95	3.44	3.88
	93	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	12	16	16	33	24	4.80	4.44	4.08
	94	0	12	12	15	16	24	3	17	8	2	5	5	0	0	1	2.35	2.30	2.18
	95	18	14	20	0	18	11	2	5	13	0	11	3	0	2	3	1.20	2.38	2.16
20	96	0	7	9	1	9	5	4	11	8	12	13	19	3	10	9	3.85	3.20	3.28
	97	11	14	15	7	13	13	2	14	11	0	5	6	0	4	5	1.55	2.44	2.46
	98	0	11	7	6	21	20	10	9	20	2	7	0	2	2	3	3.00	2.36	2.44
	99	0	1	1	0	4	5	3	5	6	2	10	12	15	30	26	4.60	4.28	4.14
	100	9	18	18	6	3	7	2	10	5	3	15	13	0	4	7	1.95	2.68	2.68

Situation	Decision	Rankings																	
		1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
21	101	6	17	15	12	24	25	2	5	7	0	3	3	0	1	0	1.80	1.94	1.96
	102	0	0	0	3	6	11	16	24	19	1	9	14	0	11	6	2.90	3.50	3.30
	103	0	0	5	0	5	5	2	15	14	14	24	19	4	6	7	4.10	3.62	3.36
	104	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3	13	11	17	30	32	4.85	4.32	4.36
	105	15	31	27	5	13	8	0	3	7	0	1	3	0	2	5	1.25	1.60	2.02
22	106	0	1	2	1	2	8	3	6	6	12	19	17	4	22	17	3.95	4.18	3.78
	107	0	2	0	0	3	6	0	8	8	3	18	11	17	19	25	4.85	3.98	4.10
	108	0	1	4	8	29	15	9	14	18	3	5	9	0	1	4	2.75	2.52	2.88
	109	20	43	40	0	3	6	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1.00	1.34	1.32
	110	0	3	4	11	14	15	8	19	15	1	9	13	0	5	3	2.50	2.98	2.92
23	111	0	2	2	2	8	13	9	9	13	5	20	10	4	11	12	3.55	3.60	3.34
	112	7	22	24	9	12	11	4	8	8	0	8	4	0	0	3	1.85	2.04	2.02
	113	2	2	4	0	4	4	4	6	11	3	9	19	11	29	12	4.05	4.18	3.62
	114	1	10	6	0	8	4	2	14	9	11	8	10	6	10	21	4.05	3.00	3.72
	115	11	16	16	7	16	18	0	13	7	2	4	7	0	1	2	1.65	2.16	2.22
24	116	0	6	15	3	11	8	8	18	9	9	12	13	0	3	5	3.30	2.90	2.70
	117	0	3	4	1	0	8	8	12	12	6	17	8	5	18	18	3.75	3.94	3.56
	118	12	24	18	6	12	18	0	3	9	1	9	3	1	2	2	1.65	2.06	2.06
	119	9	15	11	10	25	15	0	6	12	1	2	6	0	2	6	1.65	2.02	2.62
	120	0	2	2	0	2	1	4	10	8	2	11	20	14	25	19	4.50	4.10	4.06
25	121	1	11	4	0	10	14	1	10	3	5	10	20	13	9	9	4.45	2.92	3.32
	122	11	19	18	4	9	15	5	12	12	0	8	4	0	2	1	1.70	2.30	2.10
	123	4	11	11	3	11	6	2	11	13	10	10	9	1	7	11	3.05	2.82	3.06
	124	3	5	15	4	13	6	8	5	10	1	13	13	4	14	6	2.95	3.36	2.78
	125	3	4	2	8	7	9	5	12	12	3	9	4	1	18	23	2.55	3.60	3.74

Situation	Decision	Rankings																	
		1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
26	126	3	17	14	3	15	15	10	8	11	4	7	10	0	3	0	2.75	2.28	2.34
	127	3	2	4	6	9	7	3	7	6	1	6	11	7	26	22	3.15	3.90	3.80
	128	9	17	19	6	11	15	3	11	6	1	7	7	1	4	3	1.95	2.40	2.20
	129	0	0	2	2	8	5	4	13	17	10	20	8	4	9	18	3.80	3.60	3.70
	130	5	14	11	4	7	8	0	11	10	3	10	14	8	8	7	3.25	2.82	2.96
27	131	0	10	5	4	7	4	2	9	11	9	17	9	5	7	21	3.75	3.08	3.74
	132	2	1	2	1	5	10	6	21	13	5	12	18	6	11	7	3.60	3.54	3.36
	133	0	4	0	3	5	7	5	1	9	3	11	16	9	29	18	3.90	4.12	3.90
	134	5	7	19	10	24	24	4	12	6	1	5	1	0	1	0	2.05	2.32	1.78
	135	13	28	24	2	8	5	3	7	11	2	5	6	0	2	4	1.70	1.90	2.22
28	136	0	6	6	2	11	7	15	27	25	3	6	12	0	0	0	3.05	2.66	2.86
	137	14	31	26	6	14	19	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	1.30	1.60	1.62
	138	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	6	9	15	33	22	2	8	16	3.95	3.92	3.96
	139	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3	2	8	17	18	38	27	4.90	4.56	4.36
	140	8	11	17	10	21	18	2	14	10	0	4	0	0	0	5	1.70	2.22	2.16
29	141	4	24	27	16	23	17	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	2	1	1.80	1.66	1.72
	142	16	22	18	4	22	25	0	3	1	0	2	2	0	1	4	1.20	1.76	1.98
	143	0	1	2	0	2	0	6	24	25	11	17	16	3	6	7	3.85	3.50	3.52
	144	0	1	0	0	2	6	1	12	11	5	12	19	14	23	14	4.65	4.08	3.82
	145	0	2	3	0	1	1	13	10	12	5	19	10	2	18	24	3.45	4.00	4.02
30	146	13	16	13	6	15	12	1	14	7	0	3	9	0	2	9	1.40	2.20	2.78
	147	7	25	16	8	11	13	5	9	12	0	4	7	0	1	2	1.90	1.90	2.32
	148	0	3	7	6	14	14	9	12	8	5	7	10	0	14	11	2.95	3.30	3.08
	149	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	17	9	20	13	7	17	19	4.15	3.96	4.00
	150	0	3	14	0	10	10	0	5	6	6	16	11	14	16	9	4.70	3.64	2.82

Rankings

Situation	Decision	Rankings																	
		1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
31	151	16	27	18	3	14	8	1	6	16	0	1	5	0	2	3	1.25	1.74	2.34
	152	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	18	11	17	20	34	1	8	0	3.95	3.64	3.56
	153	0	3	3	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	9	2	18	35	41	4.90	4.44	4.52
	154	5	19	28	13	23	18	0	6	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	2.00	1.84	1.60
	155	0	1	1	4	8	18	16	19	19	0	18	9	0	4	4	2.80	3.32	3.00
32	156	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	12	18	12	34	27	4.60	4.50	4.32
	157	0	1	3	4	6	10	11	33	25	4	10	10	1	0	2	3.10	3.04	2.96
	158	6	26	24	11	19	18	3	3	4	0	1	2	0	1	2	1.85	1.64	1.80
	159	1	0	4	0	3	3	4	9	10	8	25	16	7	13	17	4.00	3.96	3.78
	160	14	20	16	5	21	19	1	5	9	0	2	3	0	2	3	1.35	1.90	2.16
33	161	13	25	26	5	16	10	2	5	6	0	1	4	0	3	4	1.45	1.82	2.00
	162	4	4	3	3	9	11	8	19	18	5	15	11	0	3	7	2.70	3.08	3.16
	163	0	2	3	5	3	10	2	18	6	12	20	17	1	7	14	3.45	3.54	3.58
	164	1	17	14	7	21	14	8	6	15	4	4	7	0	2	0	2.95	2.06	2.30
	165	0	2	4	0	1	5	0	2	5	0	10	11	20	35	25	5.00	4.50	3.96
34	166	12	27	20	7	16	25	0	3	2	1	2	0	0	2	3	1.50	1.72	1.82
	167	0	4	3	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	6	5	20	37	40	5.00	4.44	4.58
	168	8	15	24	11	30	20	1	1	1	0	2	3	0	2	2	1.65	1.92	1.78
	169	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	17	26	10	29	24	1	2	0	3.60	3.58	3.48
	170	0	4	3	2	2	3	9	25	21	9	12	18	0	7	5	3.35	3.40	3.38
35	171	0	4	5	0	7	14	12	16	3	8	13	21	0	10	7	3.40	3.36	3.22
	172	11	15	19	9	17	17	0	7	9	0	5	4	0	6	1	1.45	2.40	2.02
	173	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	2	13	7	17	26	35	4.80	4.18	4.50
	174	8	14	20	11	16	10	1	11	9	0	7	9	0	2	2	1.65	2.34	2.26
	175	1	14	6	0	10	9	4	8	21	11	12	9	4	6	5	3.85	2.72	2.96

Rankings

Situation	Decision	1			2			3			4			5			\bar{X}		
		F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C	F	B	C
		36	176	4	21	17	6	7	12	10	15	14	0	4	2	0	3	5	2.30
	177	0	3	3	0	8	6	0	8	7	13	21	13	7	10	21	4.35	3.54	3.86
	178	11	16	15	2	12	12	7	9	8	0	8	9	0	5	6	1.80	2.48	2.58
	179	0	1	2	1	3	3	0	6	9	7	9	22	12	31	14	4.50	4.32	3.86
	180	6	9	13	12	20	17	2	12	12	0	8	4	0	1	4	1.80	2.44	2.38
37	181	11	28	29	9	16	13	0	3	7	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.45	1.62	1.60
	182	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	7	5	0	4	9	20	35	33	5.00	4.37	4.38
	183	1	2	0	0	2	8	5	9	6	14	29	26	0	8	10	3.60	3.78	3.76
	184	0	1	3	1	10	5	14	21	27	5	14	12	0	4	3	3.20	3.20	3.14
	185	9	17	15	10	20	24	1	10	5	0	0	2	0	3	4	1.60	2.04	2.12
38	186	0	5	10	4	8	11	5	13	13	11	20	9	0	4	7	3.35	3.20	2.84
	187	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	4	11	20	41	36	5.00	4.64	4.62
	188	0	7	8	7	13	13	6	18	9	7	12	18	0	0	2	3.00	2.70	2.86
	189	7	12	18	6	18	13	5	9	12	2	10	6	0	1	1	1.10	2.40	2.18
	190	13	25	13	2	9	13	5	8	14	0	4	6	0	4	4	1.60	2.06	2.50
39	191	0	6	9	7	9	13	5	15	19	5	14	6	3	6	3	3.20	3.10	2.62
	192	13	3	4	4	22	21	2	18	6	1	7	15	0	0	4	1.55	2.58	2.88
	193	5	23	25	5	8	5	4	10	14	6	4	1	0	5	5	2.55	2.20	2.12
	194	1	18	11	5	9	10	10	6	7	4	10	16	0	7	6	2.85	2.58	2.92
	195	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	4	3	15	12	17	32	32	4.85	4.54	4.48
40	196	7	12	14	4	10	13	9	17	11	0	5	5	0	6	7	2.10	2.66	2.56
	197	0	3	2	0	4	3	0	5	8	8	16	18	12	22	19	4.60	4.00	3.98
	198	0	9	10	0	7	3	0	8	8	12	10	11	8	16	18	4.40	3.34	3.48
	199	4	18	12	9	16	18	7	10	12	0	6	7	0	0	1	2.15	2.08	2.34
	200	9	9	12	7	11	13	4	10	11	0	13	9	0	7	5	1.75	2.96	2.64

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DISAGREEMENTS

Decision Number	Between-Group Comparisons		
	Block-On-Campus	Block-Faculty	On-Campus-Faculty
1			X
2	X	X	
7		X	X
11		X	X
12		X	X
14			X
15	X	X	
19		X	X
22	X	X	
25			X
27	X	X	
37	X	X	
41	X	X	
43		X	X
50	X	X	
53	X		X
55	X		
61			X
62	X	X	
66	X	X	
67	X	X	
72	X		
77		X	
78		X	X
79	X	X	
82		X	X
84	X	X	
86		X	
87	X		X
90	X	X	
93		X	
95	X	X	
97	X	X	
98	X	X	
103	X	X	
107	X	X	
113			X

Decision Number	Between-Group Comparisons		
	Block-On-Campus	Block-Faculty	On-Campus-Faculty
114		X	X
119		X	X
121	X	X	
125	X	X	
131			X
134			X
139		X	X
142	X	X	
144	X	X	
145	X	X	
146	X	X	
150	X	X	X
151	X	X	X
155	X		X
160	X	X	
164	X		
165	X	X	X
167	X	X	
172	X	X	
173	X		
175	X	X	
177	X		
179		X	X
182	X	X	
187	X	X	
190		X	X
192	X	X	
198	X	X	

The X indicates those instances in which statistically significant disagreements between groups were found by the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abruscato, Joseph. "The College Supervisor of Student Teachers," Improving College and University Teaching, XX (Spring, 1972), 146-147.
- Allen, Dwight W., and Richard M. Krasno. "New Perspectives in Teacher Preparation," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (May, 1968), 36-42.
- Amidon, Edmund. Interaction Analysis--Recent Developments. Temple University, 1966.
- Andrews, Theodore E. Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/Certification. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.
- Best, Sister G. Transfer Effects of Directed Classroom Experience to an Elementary Methods Class and Student Teaching. Detroit: Marygrove College, 1965.
- Blume, Robert. "Humanizing Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (March, 1971), 411-415.
- Brown, Duane. Changing Student Behavior: A New Approach to Discipline. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- Brubaker, Dale L. The Teacher as a Decision-Maker. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1970.
- Burdin, Joel L., and Kaliopee Lanzilloti, eds. A Readers Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), 1970.
- Bush, Robert N. "The Science and Art of Educating Teachers," Improving Teacher Education in the United States. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1967, pp. 35-62.
- Clarke, S. C. T. "Design for Programs of Teacher Education," Research in Teacher Education--a Symposium. B. Othanel Smith, ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971, pp. 119-157.

- Clegg, Ambrose A., Jr., and Anna S. Cchoa. "What Does Today's Teacher Need to Know and to Do?," Educational Leadership, XXVII (March, 1970), 568-572.
- Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers A Perceptual View of Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Commager, Henry Steele. "Challenges for Teacher Education," Frontiers in Teacher Education, 19th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966, pp. 54-62.
- Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.
- Cooper, James M. A Guide to Model Elementary Teacher Education Programs. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.
- Davies, Don, and Kathleen Amershek. "Student Teaching," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. Toronto: The Macmillan Co., 1969, pp. 1376-1385.
- Elfenbein, Iris M. Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs--A Comparative Description. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.
- Flanders, N. A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- Gage, N. L. Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1972.
- Gardner, Harrison. "The Teacher Education Internship in Historical Perspective," Internships in Teacher Education, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1968, pp. 1-15.
- Good, Carter V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.
- Goodlad, John. "Beyond Survival for the Elementary Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (September, 1966), 10-15.

- Hale, James R. Basic Training Model for the Comfield Practicum. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Lab, 1968.
- Harnack, Robert S. The Teacher: Decision-Maker and Curriculum Planner. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1968.
- Harshbarger, Thad R. Introductory Statistics. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971.
- Hill, John, and William R. Martin. "Training for Educational Decision-Making," The Journal of Teacher Education, XXIII (Winter, 1971), 443-468.
- Hunter, Elizabeth, and Edmund Amidon. "Direct Experience in Teacher Education: Innovation and Experimentation," The Journal of Teacher Education, III (Fall, 1966), 282-289.
- Jenkins, Esther C. The Efficacy of Videotapes and Direct Observation for Teaching Observational Skills. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1966.
- Johnson, James A. A Brief History of Student Teaching. DeKalb, Ill.: Creative Educational Materials, 1968.
- Joyce, Bruce, and Marsha Weil (eds.). Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Kalick, Perry M. "New Directions in Teacher Training and Placement," The Journal of Teacher Education, XXII (Fall, 1971), 261-264.
- Kallenbach, H. Warren. The Effectiveness of Videotaped Practice Teaching Sessions in the Preparation of Elementary Intern Teachers. Final Report. San Jose State College, Calif. Washington, D. C.: Department of Education (DHEW), 1967.
- Kersh, Bert Y. Classroom Simulation: Further Studies on Dimensions of Realism. Monmouth: Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1965.
- Kounin, Jacob S. Discipline and Group Management in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

- Massanari, Karl. Performance Based Teacher Education--
What's it All About? Washington, D. C.: Bulletin
of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education, April, 1971.
- Metzner, Seymour, Walter A. Nelson, and Richard M. Sharp.
"On-Site Teaching: Antidote for Reality Shock?,"
The Journal of Teacher Education, XXIV (Summer,
1972), 194-197.
- A Model for the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers.
Final Report. Tallahassee: Florida State University,
1968.
- Peck, Bryan. "On-going On-site Teacher Training," Times
Educational Supplement, MMCMLXX (April 21, 1972),
14.
- Sarason, Seymour B., Kenneth S. Davidson, and Burton Blatt.
The Preparation of Teachers. New York: John Wiley and
Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Schalock, H. Del, and James R. Hale (eds.). A Competency
Based Field Centered Systems Approach to Elementary
Teacher Education, Vol. 1, Overview and Specifica-
tions. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educa-
tional Lab, 1968.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral
Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.
- Silberman, Charles E. "The Classroom Crisis," Power and
Decision-Making in Teacher Education, Yearbook 1971.
Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education, 1971, pp. 35-39.
- Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington,
D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education, 1969.
- Stiles, Lindley, and Robert P. Parker, Jr. "Teacher
Education Programs," Encyclopedia of Educational
Research. 4th Ed. Toronto: The Macmillan Co.,
1969, pp. 1414-1422
- Stones, Edgar. "How to Teach the Teacher," Times Educational
Supplement, XXCMLXXIII (May 12, 1972), p. 4.

- Tanner, James R. "The Responsibility of the Public Schools," Reality and Relevance, Yearbook 1969. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969, pp. 32-36.
- The University of Arizona Biennial Catalog, 1973-74, 1974-75.
Tucson: The University of Arizona Records, 1973.
- Weintraub, Samuel. Evaluating a Preservice Methods Course. Paper presented to International Reading Conference, Boston, 1968.
- Wiersma, William. "A Guide to Educational Specifications for a Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Program--University of Toledo," A Readers Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), 1969, pp. 197-209.
- Wilhelms, Fred T. Realignments for Teacher Education, Yearbook 1970. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970, pp. 22-24.