AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JAMES EDWARD BUCK for the DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
(Name) (Degree)

in EDUCATION presented on November 20, 1972
(Major) (Date)

Title: PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES OF SOPHOMORE BLOCK STUDENTS

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy
Professor Edwin Strowbridge

The purpose of this study is to list the public school classroom activities of the Oregon State University sophomore block students assigned to a public elementary school classroom for four afternoons per week for one quarter. Results of the study will provide the Elementary Education Division with partial data to be used in the now developing COMField type elementary, preservice, teacher education program.

Data was collected by questionnaire and interview from participating sophomores and selected public school personnel. This data concerned the sophomores' classroom instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) activities. Data was also collected about the classroom use of educational technology by the participating sophomores.

Results of the study indicated the major instructional (with students) activities to be assisting the classroom students after

someone else has taught the lesson and presenting a lesson to a small group of classroom students. Instructional support (without students) activities listed by fifty (50) percent or more of the sophomores were preparation of ditto masters and bulletin boards, correcting assignments, duplicating materials, helping to plan, and cleaning up. The filmstrip and movie projector were most often used by the sophomores during their one quarter in the public school classroom.

Public School Classroom Activities of Sophomore Block Students

by

James Edward Buck

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1973

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Chairman, Elementary Education Division

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented November 20, 1972

Typed by Mary Jo Stratton for James Edward Buck

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation and the accompanying academic program could not have been completed had it not been for the support and encouragement of some very nice people. To mention a few:

First, my wife, June, and son, Steven, supported the effort in every way possible. This was a family project.

Second, my major professor, Dr. Edwin Strowbridge, not only provided the initial dissertation constructs, but supported my efforts from program entry to exit. Additionally, members of my committee, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Rees, Dr. Sugawara, and Dr. Wood read drafts, suggested revisions and provided encouragement.

Third, Dr. Floyd Urbach and Mr. Richard Stockman of the TAP-Instructional Systems Clearinghouse were of major support.

My complete gratitude cannot be expressed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES OF SOPHOMORE BLOCK STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The objective of this study is to identify the major public school classroom activities of the Oregon State University elementary education sophomore block student during Fall term, 1971, and Winter term, 1972. The findings will provide the Elementary Education Division with partial data to be used in the now developing COMField type elementary preservice teacher education program. The expected outcome is a series of instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) public school classroom activities which have been identified that the participating sophomore block student is "able to do." These can then be projected into performance objectives for inclusion in the sophomore block program.

Background

In 1966 and 1967 the United States Office of Education undertook two major programs it projected would make education more relevant to the demands of our times (Lawrence, 1969). The earliest was the

National Institute for the Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth through the National Defense Education Act. This two-year study resulted in the publication of Teachers for the Real World (Smith, 1969) which outlined a plan of teacher education ranging from the teacher aide to the beginning teacher.

In 1967, a larger, more inclusive effort was initiated to introduce new models for the training of elementary teachers involving a three phase request for proposals. The three phases were to be (1) model building, (2) a feasibility study, and (3) the implementation of a model.

Phase I, Model Building, grants were awarded to nine consortiums and institutions throughout the country: Florida State University, University of Georgia, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, University of Pittsburgh, Teachers College-Columbia University, University of Toledo, and Syracuse University. In addition, the University of Wisconsin completed model specifications through their own resources and efforts. Most of these programs differ from traditional models in that behavioral objectives or competencies are stated, earlier experiences with elementary age children are provided and a field centered approach is used.

Phase II, Feasibility, grants were awarded to paper plan the models in actual operation; figure costs, locate implementation

problems and prepare for the implementation of the model.

Phase III grants, due to a change in governmental priorities and changing economic conditions, were never awarded.

Setting

In the spring of 1969, Oregon State University's Elementary Education Division implemented the first of three new programs designed to eventually change the campus bound program to a COM-Field type teacher education program. This type of program is field centered, competency based, personalized and systematic in its approach to the preservice training of teachers. Three distinct college class levels of field centered programs have been developed and implemented by the Elementary Education Division staff and students.

The original senior level, resident teaching program was initiated spring term, 1969. Junior and sophomore blocks were added and the preservice program had a field centered component in three years of study. The descriptions of the three new field centered elementary preservice programs that follow are for the 1971-72 academic year.

The student enrolling in sophomore block actually registers for a total of twelve (12) quarter hours credit in four classes of three quarter hours credit each. These include:

Ed 310 School in American Life;
Ed 312 Educational Psychology;
Ed 401 Research: Elementary Education; and
Ed 407 Seminar: Growth and Development.

(Winter Term sophomore block students registered for only nine total quarter hours and did not enroll in Ed 312 Educational Psychology.) The student then participates for one quarter as an elementary public school classroom aide for four afternoons a week. The fifth afternoon is spent in seminar with the other sophomore block students and their college instructors. The student is assigned to one kindergarten through six grade classroom in one of the 14 Corvallis public elementary schools or the Philomath Elementary School.

The junior block student also participates in a public school classroom four days per week and has one seminar day per week for the term. He is also assigned to one kindergarten through grade six classroom in Corvallis or Philomath and is normally responsible for a total of sixteen (16) quarter hours credit in six classes. At this time each class is three quarter hour credits except Ed 401, which is, at the junior level, one credit hour. These include:

Ed 367 Methods and Materials: Language Arts;
Ed 368 Methods and Materials: Mathematics;
Ed 369 Methods and Materials: Social Science;
Ed 370 Methods and Materials: Science;
Ed 401 Research: Elementary Education;
Ed 407 Literature for Children.

The resident teaching program is a post-student teaching experience with the resident senior level preservice student able to

acquire six to nine total quarter hour credits for five one-half-day sessions in a classroom. The resident teacher is under the supervision of a classroom teacher, but because of actual experience and skill, is usually free to operate in a manner similar to a first year teacher.

Student enrollment in the field program as shown in Table 1 has increased since the implementation of each program.

Table 1. Student Population of the Three New Field Centered Programs, Spring 1969-Spring 1972.

	Sophomore block	Junior block	Resident teaching
Spring, 1968-69	-	-	12
Fall, 1969-70	-	16	-
Spring, 1969-70	-	16	14
Fall, 1970-71	13	33	5
Winter, 1970-71	18	68	33
Spring, 1970-71	32	63	34
Fall, 1971-72	32	78	6
Winter, 1971-72	37	75	26
Spring, 1971-72	39	77	17

The elementary education students normally alternate between primary and intermediate classroom assignments as they proceed through the four field centered programs, the three described plus student teaching. The preservice student usually has the opportunity to participate in several differing organizational patterns: open classroom, cooperative teaching, team teaching, self-contained

classroom, along with both individualized and group paced instruction. In addition, opportunities exist for the student to become involved in curriculum and instructional programs, i. e., Man, a Course of Study, Individually Prescribed Instruction - Math, School Science Improvement Study, Minnesota Language Arts, Nebraska Social Studies and individual building projects in the development of individualized instructional programs.

The Corvallis Public Schools and Oregon State University, School of Education are deeply involved in the mutual development of a preservice program. This program is characterized as a need identified by the Teachers Standards and Practices Commission in the Education Personnel Development Paper (1971).

The rapid transition from a campus bound program to a field centered program has been dramatic. According to B. O. Smith, the program at Oregon State is "as far along as any school, including the model developers, toward a competency based, elementary training program."[1]

Procedure

The objective of this study is to identify the major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) activities

---

[1] Comment during 1970 visit to the Elementary Education Division, Oregon State University.

of the Oregon State University student registered for sophomore block Fall term, 1971, or Winter term, 1972.

This research project is descriptive in design. The procedures listed were implemented to identify the instructional and instructional support classroom activities of the sophomore block student.

Data. A questionnaire (Appendix I) designed and field tested by the investigator was used to gather data. The same questionnaire was completed by participating sophomore block students during the fifth and tenth week seminars Fall term, 1971, and Winter term, 1972. Additionally an interview with each participating sophomore during the tenth week of the term supplemented data gathered via the questionnaire.

Public school personnel represented by teachers, principals and college staff members were also surveyed by questionnaire. The questionnaire (Appendix II) was different from the student questionnaire and was also designed and field tested before implementation.

Analysis. Analysis of collected data ultimately proceeded to a categorization of major instructional and instructional support activities. This categorization was accomplished by the analysis of data received through questionnaire and interview of the sophomore student and the public school personnel. Data from public school personnel was used only to confirm activities listed by the sophomore student. The student questionnaire data, supplemented by the

interview, was clarified, classified, tallied, and readied for presentation. The listing of the major classroom activities was compiled from this data.

Dissemination. The data was submitted in the Oregon State University prescribed dissertation format to the investigator's doctoral committee. This procedure ensured availability for any interested audience.

Outcomes

The outcomes of this study were expected to be a listing of major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) activities of the sophomore block participant assigned for four afternoons per week for one term in a Corvallis or Philomath public elementary school. This study provides the Oregon State University, Elementary Education Division, a listing of public school classroom activities that the sophomore was "able to do." The Division can then translate these activities into performance objectives for the sophomore block program.

Justification

The results of this descriptive study concerning the public school classroom activities of the sophomore block students can be useful in several ways to the Elementary Education Division. First,

as Dr. Edwin Strowbridge, Division Coordinator of Field Centered Programs, has indicated, with the initial developmental and implementation stages of the field centered program now complete, descriptive data is necessary before the competency based program can be further planned. The results provide the Division with this descriptive data.

Second, the identified classroom activities can assist the Division in its efforts to develop a competency based preservice program.

Third, once the classroom activities of the initial field experience program are known, the sophomore seminar experiences can be planned to complement, support, and expand the activities. Also, the remaining two preservice years will have a "known" foundation for expansion and growth.

Fourth, the Division can interpret the identified activities for inclusion as part of the entrance requirements into the School of Education.

Fifth, it is entirely possible that the Division may elect at any time to change any, or all, of the described field centered program sequence. The need and value of the study then lies in the identification of the wide variety of classroom activities participated in by college sophomores in their initial public school classroom instructional experience. Data included in this study demonstrated that entry

into the instructional role as a college sophomore provided the student with such an experience is justification for the study in itself.

Assumptions

The study assumes that the following statements are true:

- the data collection instruments and the student interview used provided both complete and accurate information of the sophomore block students' public school classroom activities;
- the sophomore block student is the most accurate data source available and that the classroom teacher provided general supportive data for the specific data given by the sophomores;
- the public school principal and assigned Oregon State University staff also provided supporting data but data was less specific than that provided by the classroom teachers;
- the data provided by all data sources was accurate;
- the data collected and reported by the investigator was used as intended by the data source population member(s).

Limits

The limits of this study are set forth by students and design. The first, students, limits the outcomes of the study and the latter, design, specifically limits implications made from the student population.

The total population of this study is comprised of and limited to students enrolled for Fall term, 1971, and Winter term, 1972, at Oregon State University. Students registering for these classes were limited only on a first sign up and first enrollment basis. However, because the initiative for securing information about the class and the actual pre-registration for the class during the previous term remains with the student, it is possible that the outcomes of this study may not be truly representative of all sophomores wishing to enter the Elementary Education Division, but only of those who enrolled during these two terms.

There are no comparisons made or implied between this field centered sophomore block population and other field centered or campus bound sophomore level programs.

Terminology

The following is an explanation of key words used in this paper.

Classroom activities--public school classroom activities performed or participated in by the sophomore block student.

COMField--a competency based, field centered, individualized and systematized U. S. Office of Education Phase I Elementary Education preservice model. COMField was developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in a consortium of twenty-three (23) colleges and universities from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Alaska.

Field-centered--education classes at Oregon State University traditionally have been held on campus in a specific classroom. A field centered class has its focus in the field, in this case an assigned public school classroom.

Instructional activities--those classroom activities engaged in by the sophomore block students which directly involve the public school students.

Instructional support activities--those public school classroom activities engaged in by the sophomore block student which do not directly involve students in the classroom.

Sophomore block--in the 1971-72 school year a one quarter, twelve (12) hour credit class for the Oregon State University sophomore which assigns the student to a public elementary school classroom for four afternoons per week and to a seminar on the fifth afternoon.

Summary

This descriptive study is concerned with the major public school classroom activities of the Oregon State University sophomore enrolled in either Fall term, 1971, or Winter term, 1972, sophomore block program. The sophomore student participates in a Corvallis or Philomath public elementary school classroom for four afternoons per week for one quarter. Data describing their classroom activities was collected by a questionnaire and supplemented by personal

interview. Data to support that provided by the sophomore was obtained from the assigned classroom teacher, building principal and Oregon State University staff. This data was analyzed to ultimately list the major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) activities of the sophomore while in the public school classroom. The data was then submitted in the Oregon State University prescribed dissertation format to the investigator's doctoral committee.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This descriptive study is concerned with the identification and description of the classroom activities of the sophomore student in a field centered, preservice, teacher training program. This particular focus suggests a review of related literature in two specific areas; first, a brief description and summary of the U.S. Office of Education, Phase I, Teacher Training Program model specifications and second, the sources used by the Phase I model developers to specify competency or performance objectives. Supplemental to the library search conducted by the investigator, an ERIC search was completed in both areas by personnel at the Retrieval-Dissemination Center of the Oregon Board of Education. Additionally the section on sources used by the model developers to specify competencies or performance objectives was confirmed by Marion Tonjes, Associate Director, Florida Center for Teacher Training Materials.[2]

---

[2] The Florida Center for Teacher Training Materials is identifying, collecting, field testing, and disseminating to the teacher education institutions in the State of Florida competency based teacher education materials.

The information which follows can be considered the principle basis for specific information in this field.

Phase I, Elementary Teacher Education Models

In October, 1967, the U. S. Office of Education issued a request for proposals which would develop educational specifications for a comprehensive undergraduate and inservice teacher education program for elementary teachers (defined as teachers of preschool through grade eight). Eighty proposals were received for Phase I of the Elementary Teacher Education Project. On March 1, 1968, the Bureau of Research awarded nine contracts to design conceptual models for the training of pre-kindergarten and elementary school teachers, for preservice as well as inservice components. The models were to be completed and their specifications to be blueprints for the exemplary teacher training programs by October 31, 1968 (Bosley, 1969).

The reasons for selecting elementary teacher training for the support of new model specifications by the U. S. Office of Education change according to the author reviewing the models. Monson (1969) cited a personal letter received from the U. S. Office of Education in his review. He indicated that according to the Office of Education, and almost everyone studying teacher education, elementary teacher

education programs need improving and updating. The four support statements listed by Bosley (1969) are based on a wide perception of the elementary teacher training programs throughout the country. These are: first, the demand for well trained teachers remains high; second, many of the institutions which have held a major responsibility for teacher education are in the same stage of a long transition from normal school to multi-university; third, new research must be absorbed and adapted for use; and fourth, the demand is increasing for the training institutions to follow the preservice student from the first year of training and provide inservice experiences for graduates. Whatever the actual rationale of the selection, the original request for proposals indicated that the stated purpose was for the utilization of new knowledge, materials and methodologies produced by research and development activities in the creation of a variety of sets of detailed educational specifications which could be used as guides in developing teacher education programs (Johnson, 1970).

Whatever the actual reason, now it is not as important as the resulting model specifications. The ten model specifications developed by the nine institutions and consortiums funded by the Bureau of Research and the one independently funded, has indeed provided elementary teacher training with innovative guides (Reddick, 1971).

It is the purpose of the following review to briefly examine each of the ten models completed during the design phase of the Elementary Teacher Education Project.

Florida State University. The Florida State model specifications are built around a three phase concept design to provide not only a broad academic competence and skills base for beginning teaching, but also the final polish of professionalism and teacher competence. The three phases are underclass, preservice, and inservice (Sowards, 1969). The inservice phase is conducted in portal schools which are public schools within a public school district. These schools are throughout the state and are responsible as teacher training institutions as well as usual public schools for children.

As a result of this model and other statewide concerns, the Florida legislature has passed legislation requiring all teacher training institutions in the state to develop competency based programs and is supporting instructional development efforts with financial support of the Florida Center for Teacher Training Materials.

University of Georgia. The core of the Georgia Educational Model is formed by performance specifications. These are statements which describe a particular competency, or competency requirement, which a teacher should possess in order to operate at optimum effectiveness in a teaching-learning environment. Some 2,000 specifications have been developed for teacher performance. The model specifies the need for a career development sequence for teachers in four categories; aide, teaching assistant, teacher with one area of competence, and a specialist. As is usually the situation, the

materials, treatments, etc., designed that will individualize and support the performance specifications must be developed (Johnson, Shearron and Stauffer, 1969).

University of Massachusetts. The specifications for the Massachusetts Model for Elementary Teacher Education Program state that three areas of competency are necessary for superior teaching: (1) subject matter competency (mastery of content knowledge); (2) presentation competency (mastery of content knowledge plus behavioral skills); and (3) professional decision making competencies (mastery of content knowledge, plus behavioral skills, and human relations skills). A basic assumption in the specifications is that there will be a differentiated teaching staff consisting of master, senior staff and associate teachers. A unique feature of the specifications is the concept of "pulsating thinker" which incorporates divergent and convergent thinking, and feedback into the usual features of problem solving (Clarke, 1969).

Michigan State University. The Behavioral Science Teacher Education Model specifies a five year program which culminates in a year long internship. The program has some 2,700 modules which emphasize clinical and professional behavior. Also specified is Interpersonal Process Recall which is a technique for analyzing teacher candidates' performances (Houston, 1969). The clinical behavior specifications are unique among the models (Clarke, 1969).

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. This competency based, field centered, individualized and systematically designed and operated program (COMField) was developed by a consortium of twenty-six (26) colleges and universities plus five state education departments in the Northwest (Schalock, Kersh and Horyna, 1970). According to Schalock (1969) the goal of the COMField specifications is the development of a teacher education program that generates evidence that teachers can bring about appropriate learning in children before they assume responsibility for it in the classroom. The program anticipates the widespread use of pupil instructional packages and takes a broad view of teacher outcomes (Clarke, 1969). The specifications call for four levels of certification at different program stages: (1) upon entrance of the laboratory school; (2) upon commencement of practice teaching; (3) upon beginning classroom teaching; and (4) upon becoming a supervising teacher (Schalock, 1969).

University of Pittsburgh. The University of Pittsburgh model is essentially a teacher education program within an Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) format. It is intended for the preparation of teachers using individualized instruction in their classrooms. Nine teacher competencies are identified for development: (1) specifying learner goals; (2) assessing pupil achievement; (3) diagnosing the learner; (4) planning programs; (5) guiding pupils; (6) off-task pupil behavior; (7) evaluating the learner; (8) teamwork; and (9) self-development (Gorman, 1969).

Syracuse University. This model specifies a five-year program with graduated steps of professional practice from tutoring to a one-year internship. The internship takes place in teaching centers which exemplify proto-cooperation among university, school system and other educational institutions (Clarke, 1969). The model also specifies that it is a blueprint for the development and implementation of an elementary teacher education program for the generalized elementary school teacher and could be adapted by a variety of teacher training institutions (Weber, 1969).

Teachers College, Columbia University. The model specifies the development of the four teacher roles (interactive teacher, institution builder, innovator, and scholar) with a basic teaching strategy for the candidates of a democratic inquiry group of 12 students. A contact laboratory is organized to provide the teacher candidates with opportunities for study, micro-teaching and experimentation so they are not merely socialized to the school as it now exists (Joyce, 1969).

University of Toledo. A consortium of the state universities of Ohio developed the specifications for the Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Program. This model specification abandons the self-contained classroom and graded elementary school, and places instead emphasis on the development of teachers for work in team and Multi-Unit schools. The Multi-Unit school concept was developed by

the Research and Development (R & D) Center for Cognitive Learning at the University of Wisconsin (Wiersma, 1969).

University of Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin was not one of the original nine consortiums and institutions funded during Phase I. However, the School of Education through its own resources and efforts did develop the Wisconsin Elementary Teacher Education Project and was one of eight funded for Phase II, Feasibility (Boerrigter, 1970). The Wisconsin Elementary Teacher Education Program specifies an instructional program which emphasizes student choice in the establishment of learning goals, learning resource modes and learning rate. It also emphasizes educational technology to assist students in instructional modes, field and clinical experiences and program management (McCarty, 1969). Since model specifications did not receive Phase I funding, dissemination of the specifications has not been equal to that of the funded models. Consequently, this model has not been considered as a model program by most writers and hence comparative and summary information is lacking.[3]

The nine U. S. Office of Education Phase I Elementary Teacher Training Models have been summarized and compared by listing what each does best and by citing common elements.

Clarke (1969), in his answers to the following six questions,

---

[3]Karl Massanari, Director, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Personal communication, June, 1972.

lists those models which he considers as successful in meeting the requirements:

1. Q. Which models seem to draw heavily on other disciplines, i. e., use an interdisciplinary approach?
   A. Michigan State University; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory; Teachers College, Columbia University.

2. Q. Which models have most handbook materials, such as position papers or outlines of teaching units?
   A. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory; Teachers College, Columbia University; University of Toledo; University of Massachusetts.

3. Q. Which models seem to presuppose a reorganization of the schools as they now exist?
   A. Teachers College, Columbia University; University of Toledo; University of Massachusetts.

4. Q. Which models are most scientific, behavioristic, or mechanistic in approach?
   A. University of Toledo; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

5. Q. Which models recognize the humanistic and affective components most?
   A. Syracuse University; Teachers College, Columbia University; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

6. Q. Which models emphasize selection of candidates for teaching?
   A. Florida State University; University of Georgia; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory; Michigan State University; University of Pittsburgh (Clarke, 1969, p. 292).

Monson (1969) cites the "commonalities of change and newness of the models" when compared with traditional elementary teacher preparation programs. These are:

1. More reliance on technology--from video-tape machines and programmed instruction to entire computer-assisted and computer-based programs.

2. Greater stress on individualization and flexibility in the form of self-pacing, self-evaluation, and added self-responsibility.

3. More emphasis on performance criteria or training cycles and the use of behavioral objectives. More definitions of teacher tasks. Thus less structuring of formal courses.

4. Earlier experiences with children--and often more and more varied experiences than in present programs.

5. Increased cooperation among those concerned with teacher education in the universities and colleges, in the public schools, in media development, and within other agencies.

6. Highly selected laboratory experiences, simulations, microteaching, and internships.

7. Planned in-service followup programs for graduates in their first year of teaching.

8. Differentiated roles for elementary school personnel and college staffs.

9. Movement toward a five-year internship program in basic elementary teacher preparation.

10. More emphasis on liberal education and toward an intradisciplinary approach to teacher education (Monson, 1969, p. 101).

Classroom Activities

The rationale of partially developing competencies for the pre-service elementary training program from data gathered from students in the field is unique to the Oregon State Elementary Education Division. Five Phase I model specifications specifically mention competencies, performance criteria or similar terms which refer to specific teacher behavior (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971). These five are the:

1. COMField Model as it stresses "instructional experiences that lead to both development and personalization of competencies" (Schalock, 1968);
2. Michigan State Model in which some 2,700 modules are specified, many of which are trainee behaviors (Houston, 1969);
3. Massachusetts Model which is explicit in requiring "the specification of instructional and program goals in terms of behaviors to be exhibited by the trainee" (Allen and Cooper, 1968);
4. Syracuse Model which specifies its objectives in behavioral terms, provides situations where these behaviors can be learned and are manifest, and then assesses their quality and character in behavioral terms (Weber, 1969);
5. Teacher College Model which has 818 educational specifications (Joyce, 1969).

The important relationship between these specified teacher behaviors as stated in the Phase I Models and the Elementary Education Division's developing field centered, competency based program is the manner in which the Models' teacher behaviors were selected. Not one model specifies how their particular criteria were chosen. None of the proposals contain a literature review upon which the model builders based their decision. The behaviors represent "expert

opinion" derived from experience and interpretation of descriptive studies of classroom teaching (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971). The Elementary Education Division has chosen to field center their training program and develop their expected teacher behaviors from both "expert opinion" and studies of the field centered student experiences.

The focus of the performance criteria is the interaction of the preservice student and the learner. Similarly, the focus of research on classroom teacher performance is this same interaction. The research on teacher behavior is both voluminous and contradictory (Ornstein, 1971) and need not be reviewed here since this study is not concerned with the teacher-learner process. However, this study is concerned with the description of the sophomore block student's classroom activities, a part of which are in the teacher-learner interaction domain. Also, future studies that develop competencies and programs partially on the descriptive data of this study will need to use developed and proven instruments of data collection and analysis for the student performance criteria verification.

The research concerning teacher-learner interaction has had two main approaches. The early research emphasis was on discovering which presage variables or teacher characteristics were related to student growth (Morsh and Wilder, 1954). The results of these studies were unsuccessful in identifying stable relationships between teacher traits and changes in learner attitude or achievement. Even

the related studies which examined teacher characteristics failed to predict change in teacher behavior (Trow, 1960; Wallen *et al.*, 1963).

The current emphasis of classroom behavior is reviewed by Simon and Boyer (1970) in the Classroom Interaction Newsletter. These editors categorize seventy-nine (79) systems into seven major classes:

- affective--the emotional content of communication;
- cognitive--the intellectual content of communication;
- psychomotor--non-verbal behaviors, posture, body position, facial expressions and gestures;
- activity--what is being done that relates a person to someone or something;
- content--what is being talked about;
- sociological structure--the sociology of the interactive setting including who is talking to whom and in what roles; and
- physical environment--descriptions of the physical space in which the observation is taking place, including materials and equipment being used.

This publication can assist any future Elementary Division program researcher in the selection of developed and tested data collection and analysis instruments. This selection is essential for both student performance criteria evaluation and program evaluation.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Introduction

The objective of this study is to identify the major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) public school classroom activities of the Oregon State University student registered for sophomore block Fall term, 1971, or Winter term, 1972. Collection of the data for this investigation was possible only with the cooperation of the Oregon State University students enrolled in sophomore block, Dr. Frank Cross and Mrs. Jerry Snyder, instructors of the sophomore block class, and principals and teachers in Franklin, Garfield, Jefferson, and Roosevelt and the Philomath Elementary School. Permission, cooperation, and encouragement to gather data from (1) the sophomore block students and staff came from Dr. Cross; (2) the four Corvallis Public Elementary Schools from Mr. Harry Johnson, Director of Curriculum and Research, and then from the building principals: Mr. John Schaer, Franklin; Mr. Richard Lorenzen, Garfield; Mrs. Mary Louise Henry, Jefferson; and Mr. Wendel Waldon, Roosevelt; and (3) the Philomath Elementary School teachers from Principal, Mr. Ron Ball.

Population

The student population for this study was limited to the thirty-two (32) students registered for Fall term, 1970, and thirty-seven (37) students registered for Winter term, 1971, of the sophomore block classes. No effort was made to influence the class enrollment. However, in order to register for sophomore block, the initiative to become informed about the class, demonstrate enough interest to complete a short information questionnaire and get his/her name on the sign up list in Education Hall was required of each student. Once enrolled, participation in this study by the student was voluntary. No records or information about participating students were given to the class instructors during the term and in-seminar statements were made to that effect by both the investigator and instructors before and during data collection.

Elementary schools for the collection of data from teachers and principals were selected on the basis of a Winter term sophomore block population of six or more sophomore block students. The building principal then selected a minimum of six participating teachers to complete the questionnaire.

The Oregon State University participating staff members were the two sophomore block instructors, Dr. Frank Cross and Mrs. Jerry Snyder. No other Oregon State University staff were used as a

data source even though an administrative decision during Winter term, 1971, created a change in the elementary public school classroom supervisory personnel of the sophomore block students. The change was a position appointment of an Oregon State University Elementary Education Division member to assume the supervisory responsibility in each participating elementary school for the students enrolled in the sophomore block, the junior block, the student and resident teaching programs. Previously the supervision of all the sophomore block students was the responsibility of Dr. Cross and Mrs. Snyder. The contact retained by the two instructors was thought to be sufficient for continuation with this data source for Winter term.

Instruments

Three data collection instruments (Appendices I, II, and III) were used in this study. The instruments were based on experience with the sophomore block program and students by Dr. Edwin Strowbridge and the investigator during the 1970-71 school year. Although each instrument was developed by the investigator, it was edited by Dr. Strowbridge and validated on a small sample (six-ten) of the actual data population prior to its implementation. Validation was a verbal interaction between the investigator and members of the target population, students or public school personnel, to determine if they could communicate the desired data using the instrument. No

formal data was retained; however, as a result several changes were made and reviewed by Dr. Strowbridge before full implementation. Additionally the questionnaires and interview provided opportunities for the participant to add any data or classroom activity that was not specifically mentioned or asked for.

Data Collection

Data concerned with instructional and instructional support activities as performed by the sophomore block student within the public school classroom was gathered by written questionnaire (Appendix I) administered during fifth and tenth week seminars. An identical questionnaire was used in both cases. Two questionnaires were administered so that the changes in the sophomores' classroom activity over the ten-week period would be represented in the data. Also, during the tenth week each participating student was interviewed (Appendix II) in a group of three for approximately thirty (30) minutes to acquire data to supplement the written questionnaire.

Oregon State staff, building principals and the selected classroom teachers each completed a written questionnaire (Appendix III) during Spring term, 1972.

Data Analysis

Data gathered by the questionnaire and interview was processed

to categorize and list the major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) activities of the sophomore block participant. To accomplish this task specific procedures were identified for organization, summaries and listing. These were:

Organization.

- each questionnaire page was marked with the appropriate term, week, and student's code number assigned for this study;
- interview data was identified and attached to the appropriate questionnaire; and
- sophomores were identified and recorded that completed both fifth and tenth week questionnaires.

Summaries.

- the tenth week questionnaire data in the five major sections; 1. Sophomore Student Background Information, 2. Instructional Activities, 3. Instructional Support Activities, 4. Educational Technology, and 5. Supportive Data was identified, clarified, classified, tallied and readied for dissertation presentation with the data being presented in table form;
- the fifth week questionnaire data in the same five sections that enhanced the already tallied tenth week data and was used in a comparative manner in the data presentations; and

- Fall term summaries were readied before winter data was available.

Listing. Using the graphed data,

- the major classroom activities, instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) were listed; and
- major differences between groups were noted and discussed.

Reporting Results

The sophomore block students' public school classroom activity data concerning the public school classroom activity of the sophomore block student was gathered by questionnaire and supplemented with data obtained during a personal interview. Additional data was collected concerning these same classroom activities from the sophomore student's respective classroom teacher, building principal, and assigned Oregon State University staff. The data was identified, clarified, tallied and readied for dissertation presentation in table format in five sections. These are: (1) Sophomore Student Background Information, (2) Instructional Activities, (3) Instructional Support Activities, (4) Educational Technology, and (5) Supportive Data. The table format changed to accommodate the data. However, in most instances both the total number of sophomores and the percentage that number represents were reported. A descriptive summary precedes each table.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present data that has been collected and classified to meet the stated purposes of the study. The data is presented in table format whenever possible. Interpretive comments are in Chapter V. Table format changes to accommodate the data being presented. It is important to note that in most instances both the total number of sophomores participating in an activity and the percentage that number represents are listed. A descriptive summary precedes each table.

The data for Fall and Winter terms was processed and presented separately. Initially, this was for the convenience of the investigator. Fall term data was analyzed as Winter term data was being collected. Since the purpose of the study was to identify and list major instructional (with students) and noninstructional (without students) public school classroom activity of the sophomore block participant, data is offered separately and in a side-by-side manner which facilitates comparison and interpretation.

Data is presented in five major sections. The following outlines the content of each section.

Section 1, Sophomore Student Background Information, contains both demographic data about the participating sophomore block student and public school classroom and sophomore block program information.

Section 2, Instructional Activities, is divided into five parts, each one describing activities of the instructional cycle. These parts are:

A. deciding what to teach;

B. planning a lesson;

C. preparing and gathering instructional materials;

D. teaching a lesson; and

E. evaluation of student progress.

Section 3, Instructional Support Activities, details those classroom activities that did not directly involve the public school classroom student.

Section 4, Education Technology, charts the use of educational technology by the sophomore during the ten weeks of classroom participation.

Section 5, Support Data, reports the supporting data from the public school classroom teachers with whom the sophomore students spent the classroom time.

It is important to remember when reading both Chapters IV and V that these describe the public school classroom activities of college

sophomores. These sophomores spent four full afternoons per week in the public school classroom for one term.

Section 1. Sophomore Student Background Information

Several sets of demographic and background data were collected to present general characteristics about the participating sophomore block students. A summary of the data indicates the vast majority graduated from a large high school with a record of academic success. The participating sophomores proceeded directly from high school to college and have done well academically in college. The student has worked with and experienced elementary age children in an instructional or supervisory capacity, excluding babysitting, either during the summer or in a classroom previous to entering college and is not an only child.

All participants in the study volunteered their time and effort. Each student enrolled had equal opportunity to participate in the study. A complete listing of participating students is contained in Appendix IV.

The sophomore block student was assigned to an elementary school classroom for four afternoons a week for one term. Sophomores experienced any one of several combinations of other adults in that classroom. This could include the certified and

Table 2. High School from which Block Student Graduated.

	600+ Students		200-600 Students		Less than 200 students	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fall Term	23	88	3	12	-	-
Winter Term	27	87	3	10	1	3

Table 3. High School Grade Point Average.

	N	Mean	Range
Fall Term	25	3.29	2.0-3.92
Winter Term	30	3.32	2.3-3.85

Table 4. College Grade Point Average to Sophomore Block Term.

	N	Mean	Range
Fall Term	26	2.98	2.3-3.47
Winter Term	30	2.99	2.24-3.91

Table 5. Age of Sophomore Block Student.

Age	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
18	-	-	1	3
19	13	52	15	48
20	8	32	13	42
21+	4	16	2	7

Table 6. Organized Experience with Elementary School Age Children Prior to Entering College.

	N	%
Fall Term	20	77
Winter Term	20	64

Table 7. Number of Siblings.

No.	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
0	-	-	3	10
1	5	20	10	33
2	8	32	6	20
3	8	32	4	13
4 or more	4	16	7	24
	25		30	

Table 8. Participants.

	Total enrolled	Completed 5th wk Questionnaire	Completed 10th wk Questionnaire	Total participants	Completed both Questionnaires	Completed interview
Fall Term	32	22	25	26	21	22
Winter Term	37	30	26	31	25	20

Table 9. Other Adults in the Elementary School Classroom.

	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
One Teacher (T)	15	65	10	40
1T, 1 ST*	3	13	3	12
1T, 1 JB	2	8	4	16
1T, 1 HS	2	8	3	12
1T, 1 SB	1	4	1	4
1T, 1 JB, 2 HS	-	-	1	4
1T, 1 RT	-	-	1	4
1T, 2RT, 1 JB	-	-	1	4
1T, 1 ST, 1 JB	-	-	1	4
	23		25	

*ST - Student Teacher; JB - Junior Block Student; HS - High School Student; SB - Sophomore Block Student; RT - Resident Teacher

responsible classroom teacher (T) plus some or none of the following: a student teacher (ST); resident teacher (RT); junior block student (JB); sophomore block student (SB); or high school student (HS).

Also as background it is important to mention the expectations on the part of the students as directed from the college instructors. The sophomore block experience is intended, according to the hand-out given the students (Appendix V), as an opportunity to learn about children. This is to be accomplished by tutoring, assisting, listening, and being with the classroom students whenever possible.

Section 2. Instructional Activities

The data concerning the instructional activities (with students) by the sophomores is illustrated in each of the five parts of the instructional cycle. These five are: (A) deciding what to teach; (B) planning a lesson; (C) preparing and gathering instructional materials; (D) teaching a lesson; and (E) evaluation of student progress. The inclusion of these five sets of data in this section allows for clear analysis of data directly concerned with the instructional process even though some of the activities included do not directly involve the public school classroom student.

A. Deciding What to Teach. A summary of the data indicates the sophomores generally felt they had an opportunity to decide what to teach as reported in the following table. This was usually a choice

within a specified area. Also, as of the tenth week the sophomores indicated they conducted this activity a minimum of once a week.

Table 10. Deciding What to Teach.

	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
Had opportunity*	15	60	15	62
No opportunity	6	24	2	8
No response	4	16	7	30
	25		24	
*How much opportunity				
Once a week or more	11	73	11	74
Twice	3	20	2	13
Once	1	7	2	13

B. Planning a Lesson. Most sophomores indicated they had an opportunity to plan a lesson. As indicated on the handout (Appendix V) and supported overwhelmingly by the teachers in their responses to the questionnaire, their plans were normally discussed with the classroom teacher before the actual teaching of any lesson. The sophomores indicating they had planned a lesson (eighty-three (83) percent Fall term and eighty-five (85) percent Winter term) did so in many subject areas. Often one sophomore planned a lesson in more than one subject. The numbers and percentages mentioned in the following table (Table 12) are only of those indicating they had planned a lesson.

C. Preparing and Gathering Instructional Materials. The data reported from the sophomores concerning the preparation and

Table 11. Frequency of Planning a Lesson.

Frequency	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
Daily	4	16	5	19
Twice per week	7	28	2	7
Once per week	2	7	2	7
Five total times	-	-	2	7
Four total times	3	12	1	4
Three total times	1	4	4	15
Two total times	1	4	2	7
One time only	3	12	5	19
	21	83	23	85

Table 12. Subject Area for Planning a Lesson.

Subject	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
Art	7	28	5	19
Math	7	28	4	15
Non-traditional activity with no subject area identified	1	4	3	12
Reading	2	7	2	7
Spelling	3	12	2	7
Science	3	12	2	7
Assist teacher	1	4	2	7
Music	-	-	1	4
Physical Education	5	20	1	4
Social Studies	2	7	-	-
Language Arts	1	4	1	4

gathering of instructional materials was in personal terms and did not lend itself to reporting in tabular format. Several examples of these terms were: I am doing it daily; Before every lesson I teach; It depends on the lesson and the materials; and Most of the time when not teaching or planning. In summary, ten Fall term, forty (40) percent, and one Winter term, four percent, sophomores indicated they were preparing and gathering many instructional materials they were not personally using.

D. Teaching a Lesson. This section illustrates responses received about classroom activities with the classroom students when the sophomore was involved in the instructional process. Data is presented for the following instructional activities.

Tenth Week Summary

- Assisted students after someone else had taught the lesson (Table 13)
- Presented a lesson to students (Table 14)
- Assisted teacher in presenting a lesson (Table 15)

Changes in the instructional activities from the fifth to the tenth week

- Assisted students after someone else had taught the lesson (Table 16)
- Presented a lesson to the students (Table 17)
- Assisted teacher in presenting a lesson (Table 18)

Table 13. Assisted Students After Someone Else Taught the Lesson--Tenth Week Summary.

	N	%
Fall Term	25	100
Winter Term	24	100

Table 14. Presented a Lesson to Students--Tenth Week Summary.

	N	%
Fall Term	22	88
Winter Term	18	75

Table 15. Assisted Teacher in Presenting a Lesson--Tenth Week Summary.

	N	%
Fall Term	10	42
Winter Term	14	58

Table 16. Assisted Students After Someone Else has Taught the Lesson--Changes in Frequency from Fifth to Tenth Week.

Frequency	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
More	6	30	3	14
Same	14	70	16	76
Less	-	-	2	10
	20		21	

Table 17. Presented a Lesson to the Students--Changes in Frequency from Fifth to Tenth Week.

Frequency	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
More	14	74	15	71
Same	5	26	5	24
Less	-	-	1	5

Table 18. Assisted Teacher in Presenting a Lesson--Changes in Frequency from Fifth to Tenth Week.

Frequency	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
More	3	15	6	29
Same	1	5	2	10
Less	1	5	2	10
No response	15	75	11	51
	20		21	

Frequency of Instructional Activity

- Assisting students after someone else has taught the lesson (Table 19)

- Presenting a lesson to the students
  Large group (Table 20)
  Small group (Table 21)
  One student (Table 22)

- Assisting teacher in presenting a lesson (Table 23)

Subject Area Summary for Instructional Activity

- Assisting students after someone else has taught the lesson (Table 24)

- Presenting a lesson to the students
  Large group (Table 25)
  Small group (Table 26)
  One student (Table 27)

- Assisting teacher in presenting a lesson (Table 28)

Tenth Week Summary. All sophomores completing the tenth week questionnaire reported they had assisted students after someone else taught the lesson. Percentages indicating participation in the other two areas, presenting a lesson and assisting the teacher in presenting a lesson, were less.

Changes in the Instructional Activities from the Fifth to the Tenth Week. The sophomore became more involved as the term progressed in the role of a teacher of lessons while retaining the earlier established role of assisting students after someone else has taught the lesson.

Frequency of Instructional Activity. It is important to examine

how often the sophomore participated in the three instructional activities. These tables contain data only from those students completing both the fifth and tenth week questionnaires. The sophomores were given specific group number limits. These were large group, sixteen (16) or more students, and small group, two to fifteen (15) students.

Table 19. Frequency of Assisting Students after Someone Else has Taught the Lesson.

Frequency	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Daily	17	68	20	80	18	75	17	71
Twice/week	-	-	3	12	4	17	5	20
Once/week	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	9
Five times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Four times	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-
Three times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Two times	2	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	20	80	25	100	23	96	24	100

Subject Area Summary for Instructional Activities. The sophomores also identified the subject matter of the instructional activity. To interpret the following data it is important to note two items. First, only those students who indicated participation in the particular activity were used to calculate the number and percentage. The total number of participating students has been included in each table. Second, since many students indicated more than one subject

Table 20. Frequency of Presenting a Lesson to a Large Group of Students.

Frequency	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Daily	-	-	2	8	1	4	-	-
Twice /week	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	8
Once /week	2	8	2	8	2	8	4	16
Five times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Four times	1	4	2	8	-	-	2	8
Three times	1	4	2	8	-	-	1	4
Two times	1	4	2	8	1	4	-	-
Once	2	8	4	16	2	8	2	8
	8	32	15	60	7	28	11	44

Table 21. Frequency of Presenting a Lesson to a Small Group of Students.

Frequency	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Daily	2	8	3	12	4	16	2	8
Twice /week	-	-	1	4	2	8	5	20
Once /week	1	4	4	16	-	-	1	4
Five times	-	-	2	8	-	-	1	4
Four times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three times	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-
Two times	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	8
Once	3	12	1	4	2	8	-	-
	7	28	13	52	9	36	13	54

Table 22. Frequency of Presenting a Lesson to One Student.

Frequency	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Daily	7	28	9	37	3	12	-	-
Twice /week	1	4	-	-	1	4	3	12
Once /week	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Five times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Four times	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Three times	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Two times	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	4
Once	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	8
	8	32	9	37	6	24	9	36

Table 23. Frequency of Assisting Teacher in Presenting a Lesson.

Frequency	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Daily	2	8	2	8	-	-	1	4
Twice /week	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8
Once /week	-	-	3	12	2	8	3	12
Five times	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-
Four times	-	-	2	8	-	-	-	-
Three times	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-
Two times	-	-	1	4	2	8	2	8
Once	2	8	2	8	1	4	1	4
	4	16	11	48	6	24	9	36

area of instructional activity participation, and were so tallied, the total number and percentage, if computed from individual totals, would exceed the number of participating sophomores and one hundred (100) percent in many instances. To clarify, in the first table (Table 24), sixteen (16) sophomores, forty-four (44) percent, of the number indicating they had assisted students after someone else had taught the lesson did so in math. Many of these same sophomores also assisted the classroom students in spelling and art.

Table 24. Subject Matter Area of Sophomores Assisting Students after Someone Else has Taught the Lesson.

Subject Area	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	11	68	13	62	17	70	13	52
Language Arts	2	12	4	19	6	25	7	28
Reading	1	6	3	14	4	16	7	28
Spelling	4	25	3	14	5	21	7	28
Science	-	-	2	9	7	29	5	20
Social Studies	2	12	3	14	5	21	4	16
Art	3	19	1	5	4	16	3	12
Music	-	-	-	-	2	8	2	8
Health	1	6	1	5	2	8	1	4
All subject areas when in room	1	4	4	19	-	-	1	4
Total number of sophomores assisting	16		21		24		25	

Table 25. Subject Matter Area of Sophomores Presenting a Lesson to a Large Group of Students.

Subject area	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Physical Education	4	50	3	20	2	30	2	18
Art	3	39	7	47	3	42	4	36
Math	1	12	4	27	1	14	3	27
Social Studies	1	12	2	13	-	-	-	-
Science	-	-	3	20	-	-	1	9
Music	-	-	-	-	1	14	4	36
Special presentation, no subject indicated	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	36
Reading	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	9
Spanish	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	9
Total number of sophomores presenting	8		15		7		11	

Table 26. Subject Matter Area of Sophomores Presenting a Lesson to a Small Group of Students.

Subject area	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	7	100	7	54	6	67	10	71
Language Arts	2	29	2	15	1	11	4	29
Spelling	-	-	2	15	2	22	2	14
Science	-	-	1	8	-	-	2	14
Art	-	-	2	15	-	-	-	-
Reading	-	-	-	-	1	11	-	-
Total number of sophomores presenting	7		13		9		14	

Table 27. Subject Matter Area of Sophomores Presenting a Lesson to One Student.

Subject area	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	7	87	7	77	3	50	5	55
Reading	1	13	-	-	1	17	1	11
Language Arts	-	-	2	23	2	33	3	33
Art	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	11
Total number of sophomores presenting	8		9		6		9	

Table 28. Subject Matter Area of Sophomores Assisting Teacher in Presenting a Lesson.

Subject area	Fall Term				Winter Term			
	Fifth week		Tenth week		Fifth week		Tenth week	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Science	2	50	4	36	-	-	2	28
Language Arts	1	25	3	27	1	17	-	-
Physical Education	1	25	1	9	-	-	-	-
Art	-	-	3	27	3	50	2	28
Math	-	-	1	9	-	-	1	14
Substitute teacher	-	-	1	9	-	-	-	-
Social Studies	-	-	-	-	2	33	5	71
Music	-	-	-	-	1	17	-	-
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
Spelling	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
Total number of sophomores assisting	4		11		6		7	

E. Evaluation of Student Progress. The activity noted by the sophomores in evaluation of student progress was discussion with the teacher, when and if he recorded anything in this area of the questionnaire.

Table 29. Participation in Evaluation of Student Progress.

	Fall Term		Winter Term	
	N	%	N	%
Discussion with teacher	10	38	12	48
No response	11	42	9	36
Not involved	3	12	1	4
Lesson responsibility	2	8	3	12
	26		25	

Section 3. Instructional Support Activities

The major classifications of this section were derived from discussions and observations of the sophomore block students and from discussions with the 1970-71 instructor of the sophomore block program. Data was derived from the checklist on pages two and three of the Sophomore Classroom Activity Survey (Appendix I). The sophomore was provided with the opportunity to identify and list other instructional support activities in addition to those on the checklist.

The instructional support activities with fifty (50), or greater, percent of the sophomores indicating participation have been further detailed in succeeding tables. These are Tables 31 through 41.

Table 30. Participation in Instructional Support Activities.

Instructional Support Activity		Daily	Twice / week	Once / week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Making a bulletin board*	F	-	-	3	9	2	3	3	3	24	96
	W	-	1	1	2	7	2	7	5	25	96
Making a ditto master*	F	2	1	6	3	1	2	5	2	22	88
	W	4	2	9	-	2	2	2	-	21	81
Helping to plan*	F	8	5	3	-	1	-	1	1	19	76
	W	11	-	2	1	2	1	1	-	18	70
Duplicating materials*	F	8	9	5	-	-	-	2	-	24	96
	W	13	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	20	76
Diagnosing student needs*	F	9	2	5	1	1	1	-	-	19	76
	W	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	7	27
Recording student progress in cumulative folders	F	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	2	9	36
	W	3	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	9	35
Mounting pictures	F	-	-	3	4	2	5	2	1	17	68
	W	-	2	1	-	-	4	4	3	13	50
Take message to office or another teacher	F	1	1	3	2	-	2	2	1	12	48
	W	-	-	4	-	1	2	2	3	12	46
Correcting assignments*	F	16	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	23	92
	W	20	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	24	92
Review books for new ideas	F	2	-	7	1	3	3	2	1	19	76
	W	1	3	4	-	-	-	-	1	9	35
	F	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	11	15	60
	W	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	2	5	19
Searching through files	F	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	4	15	60
	W	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	3	5	19

(Continued on next page)

Table 30. (Continued)

Instructional Support Activity		Daily	Twice/ week	Once/ week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Drawing large illustrations	F	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	5	10	40
	W	-	-	1	2	-	3	3	-	10	38
Participating in parent conferences	F	-	-	-	5	-	1	1	5	12	48
	W	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	12
Gathering and preparing supplies for a project*	F	4	4	4	4	-	1	1	1	19	76
	W	7	3	3	-	2	1	1	1	18	69
Cleaning up*	F	14	1	2	2	1	-	-	-	20	80
	W	12	1	2	-	-	-	2	-	16	61
Setting up for a PE activity	F	2	2	2	-	1	1	-	1	9	36
	W	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	5	19
Assisting in completing report cards	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	20
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	15
Attend faculty meeting	F	-	-	8	-	-	3	1	4	13	52
	W	-	-	4	-	4	1	1	4	14	54
Planning instruction	F	4	1	5	3	-	4	1	-	18	72
	W	10	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	15	58
Attend professional meetings	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	20
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	19

*Detailed information; Tables 31-41.

The following are instructional support activities which have been selected for further detailing.

Making a Bulletin Board. The sophomores provided data on the number of bulletin boards prepared as well as the time involved to make each board. Both fifth and tenth week data is presented because of the change in the time to prepare each board as the term progressed.

Table 31. Number of Bulletin Boards Made.

	No. made	
	Range	Mean
Fall Term		
Fifth week	0-10	3.2
Tenth week	0-10	4.4
Winter Term		
Fifth week	0-5	2.7
Tenth week	0-10	3.9

Table 32. Time Spent for Each Bulletin Board Made.

	Time (min.)	
	Range	Mean
Fall Term		
Fifth week	15-150	55
Tenth week	10-240	74
Winter Term		
Fifth week	15-150	46
Tenth week	15-240	85

Making a Ditto Master. The data concerning time spent by each sophomore in ditto master preparation was indeterminate. However, the increase in ditto master preparation as the term progressed is clearly evidenced by the following (Table 33).

Helping to Plan. This classification was interpreted by the investigator to the sophomores to mean their involvement in the planning, but only as assistants. This is compared to another instructional support item, planning instruction, in which the sophomores did the actual planning.

Table 33. Frequency of Ditto Master Preparation.

	Daily	2/week	1/week	Individuals 5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	3	2	3	-	-	3	5	5	21	84
Tenth week	2	1	6	3	1	2	5	2	22	88
Winter Term										
Fifth week	2	5	3	-	4	3	2	3	22	84
Tenth week	4	2	9	-	2	2	2	-	21	80

Table 34. Frequency of Sophomores Helping to Plan.

	Daily	2/week	1/week	Individuals 5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	5	4	5	-	-	-	-	1	15	60
Tenth week	8	5	3	-	1	-	1	1	19	76
Winter Term										
Fifth week	8	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	15	60
Tenth week	11	-	2	1	2	1	1	-	18	70

Duplicating Materials. The duplicating of materials activity turned out to be more than just using the ditto master duplicating machine. Many schools have copy machines, so this activity was also noted by the students. Comments on the questionnaire indicated the copy machine is a minor part of the following figures.

Table 35. Frequency of Sophomores Duplicating Materials.

	Individuals									
	Daily	2 /week	1 /week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	10	3	3	-	-	2	2	-	20	80
Tenth week	8	9	5	-	-	-	2	-	22	88
Winter Term										
Fifth week	9	4	3	1	2	1	1	1	22	84
Tenth week	13	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	20	76

Table 36. Mean Time Spent by Each Sophomore per Duplicating Materials Session.

	Mean Time /Session (min.)	
	Fifth week	Tenth week
Fall Term	11	11
Winter Term	14	14

Diagnosing Student Needs. Data indicates a large variance between Fall and Winter term sophomore student participation in this activity (Table 37).

Correcting Assignments. This instructional support activity was a time consuming one for the sophomores since the daily assigned time in the public school classroom was only four hours (Tables 38 and 39).

Gathering and Preparing Supplies for a Project. The data reported for this activity was in personal terms and did not lend itself to reporting in tabular form. The sophomores had two opportunities during the questionnaire to respond to this question. In both instances the responses were similar. In summary, ten Fall term sophomores, forty (40) percent, and one Winter term sophomore, four percent, indicated they were gathering and preparing supplies they were not personally using.

Cleaning Up. These activities are both daily and specific to certain classroom projects (Tables 40 and 41).

Section 4. Educational Technology

The sophomore block student in the public school classroom used a variety of equipment. Since this data is accumulative throughout the term, only data from tenth week questionnaires was included in the following table (Table 42). Data about the use of the duplicating

Table 37. Frequency of Sophomores Diagnosing Classroom Student Needs.

				Individuals						
	Daily	2 /week	1 /week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	9	1	2	1	-	1	-	1	15	60
Tenth week	9	2	5	1	1	1	-	-	19	76
Winter Term										
Fifth week	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	7	27
Tenth week	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	7	27

Table 38. Frequency of Sophomores Correcting Assignments.

				Individuals						
	Daily	2 /week	1 /week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	9	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	15	60
Tenth week	14	1	2	2	1	-	-	-	20	80
Winter Term										
Fifth week	12	1	2	-	-	1	2	1	19	73
Tenth week	12	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	16	61

Table 39. Time Spent Daily Correcting Assignments.

	Range (min.)	Median (min.)	Mean (min.)
Fall Term			
Fifth week	20-120	30	49
Tenth week	20-120	45	50
Winter Term			
Fifth week	20-120	30	47
Tenth week	20-120	30	34

Table 40. Frequency of Sophomores Participating in Classroom Clean-up Activities.

				Individuals						
	Daily	2/week	1/week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Fall Term										
Fifth week	9	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	15	60
Tenth week	14	1	2	2	1	-	-	-	20	80
Winter Term										
Fifth week	12	1	2	-	-	1	2	1	19	73
Tenth week	12	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	16	61

Table 41. Time Spent by Sophomores for Each Clean-up Activity.

	Range (min.)	Mean (min.)
Fall Term		
Fifth week	10-30	14
Tenth week	10-30	15
Winter Term		
Fifth week	10-60	15
Tenth week	10-60	16

Table 42. Frequency of Use of Educational Technology.

		Daily	Twice / week	Once / week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Filmstrip projector	F	-	-	1	1	2	1	4	3	12	48
	W	-	2	1	-	2	-	7	4	16	62
Cassette tape recorder	F	2	-	1	2	-	1	2	3	11	44
	W	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	2	6	23
Reel-to-reel recorder	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0	4
	W	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	0
16 mm Movie projector	F	-	-	3	2	1	1	1	4	12	48
	W	1	-	2	1	1	1	1	4	11	42
Overhead projector	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4	16
	W	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	5	8	31
Opaque projector	F	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	10	15	60
	W	-	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	7	27
Micro projector	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	8
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	4
Duplicating machine	F	8	9	5	-	-	-	2	-	24	96
	W	13	3	1	-	1	-	1	-	20	76

(Continued on next page)

Table 42. (Continued)

		Daily	Twice / week	Once / week	5	4	3	2	1	N	%
Heat press	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	12
	W	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Intercom system	F	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	4	16
	W	-	2	2	-	1	-	1	2	8	31
Typewriter	F	1	4	3	-	1	-	4	5	18	72
	W	5	2	1	1	5	-	3	-	17	65
Television	F	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Phonograph	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	4
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	7

Sophomores completing tenth week questionnaire: F 25
W 26

machine was omitted from this listing since it was previously detailed in Section 3 of this chapter.

Section 5. Supportive Data

Questionnaires were completed by twenty-one (21) classroom teachers in five elementary schools. Each of these teachers supervised at least one Fall or Winter term sophomore block student. Also completing questionnaires were one elementary school principal and the two Oregon State University instructors of the Sophomore Block Class. Data has not been included from the elementary school principal or college instructors. Only one of the five building principals completed the questionnaire and data provided by the college staff was too general for inclusion.

The data provided by the teachers indicates definite support for that data provided by the sophomore block student. The teachers generally noted that the sophomores were doing more in the classroom than was indicated by the data collected from them. Three sets of data have been put in tabular format as examples (Tables 43, 44 and 45). These are in the area of deciding what to teach, planning a lesson and evaluation of student progress. Sophomore data has been included to visually show teacher support.

Table 43. Classroom Teacher--Sophomore Block Student's Opportunity to Decide What to Teach.

	Teachers		Sophomores	
			Fall Term	Winter Term
	N	%	%	%
Had opportunity	12	57	60	62
No opportunity	1	5	24	8
No response	1	5	16	30
Assisted only	7	33	comment unique to teacher questionnaires	
	19			

Table 44. Classroom Teacher--Sophomore Block Student's Opportunity to Plan a Lesson.

	Teachers			Sophomores	
				Fall Term	Winter Term
	N	%		%	%
Yes, a few	8	39	90%	72	58
Yes, many	11	51			
Yes, but only with teacher guidance	2	10			
	21				

Table 45. Classroom Teacher--Sophomore Block Student's Opportunity to Evaluate Student Progress.

	Teachers		Sophomores	
			Fall Term	Winter Term
	N	%	%	%
Discussion	14	66	38	48
Not involved	1	5	12	4
No response or questionnaire comment not meaningful	2	10	42	36
Lesson responsibility	3	14	8	12
Checks papers	1	5	comment unique to teacher questionnaire	
	21			

Summary of Findings

The findings of the study were presented in five sections. The following is a summary of the findings presented within each section.

Section 1. Sophomore Student Background Information. The sophomore participating in this study has a history of academic success in both high school and college. The student came from a large (600 plus) student high school, had at least one sibling, and had previous classroom or supervisory experience, excluding babysitting, with elementary age children before entering college.

Section 2. Instructional Activities. All sophomore block students participating in the study assisted students after someone else had taught the lesson throughout the term. At least seventy-five (75) percent presented a lesson to the students during the term and a minimum of forty-two (42) percent assisted the teacher in presenting a lesson sometime during the ten weeks in the public school classroom. They also assisted the teacher in deciding what to teach, planned lessons in specific areas, prepared and gathered their own materials, and discussed with the teacher the evaluation of student progress.

Section 3. Instructional Support Activities. The instructional support activities parrticipated in by fifty (50) or more percent of the sophomores were: the preparation of a bulletin board and ditto master, helping to plan, duplicating materials, diagnosing student

needs, correcting assignments, gathering and preparing supplies for a project, and cleaning up.

Section 4. Educational Technology. Educational technology used by fifty (50) percent of the sophomores for at least one term were the duplicating machine, typewriter, filmstrip and 16 mm movie projector.

Section 5. Supportive Data. Data was provided by twenty-one (21) classroom teachers from five elementary schools. Each teacher had had a sophomore block student in her classroom Fall term, 1971, or Winter term, 1972. The data definitely supports that provided by the sophomore block students.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is threefold: first, to list the major instructional and instructional support activities of the sophomores; second, to describe how these identified activities are useful to the Elementary Education Division as originally proposed in Chapter I; and third, to present conclusions concerning the participating sophomores and the field centered sophomore block program.

Classroom Activities

A. Instructional. The foremost instructional (with classroom students) activity was assisting the student on a one-to-one basis. This was done either in an academic situation after someone else taught the lesson or was just listening, talking and enjoying students. One of the purposes of the sophomore block program, as explained to the sophomores (Appendix V), was to learn about children by doing things with them. If being with elementary children on a one-to-one basis in classroom subject and activity areas is indicative of the opportunity to experience and learn about children, then the sophomore had that opportunity.

Many of the sophomores also presented a lesson to students. To accomplish this they were guided in what to teach by their classroom teacher, but usually planned their own lesson, discussed the plans with the teacher, carried out their plans with students, and discussed the instructional activity and evaluation with the teacher. The sophomores accomplished this task with large and small groups of children along with the individual student.

There is a third major instructional activity between assisting students after someone else has taught the lesson and actually presenting a lesson. As the sophomores assist the students they are continually reviewing the concepts and skills presented by others. This may be directly after the presentation or at a later time.

Forty-nine percent of the participating sophomores did assist the teacher in presenting a lesson. This deals with the presentation, or with the planning, preparation or evaluation of the lesson.

These instructional activities (assisting students on a one-to-one basis, presenting a lesson, reviewing concepts and skills with the individual student and assisting the teacher in presenting a lesson) constitute the major involvement with the classroom students by the sophomore block student.

B. Instructional Support. The range of instructional support activities (without classroom students) of the participating sophomore were both complementary to those of the classroom teacher and

supportive of the identified instructional activities. The major activities of most of the sophomores were correcting papers, ninety-six (96) percent, correcting assignments, ninety-two (92) percent, and duplicating materials, ninety-six (96) percent Fall term and seventy-six (76) percent Winter term.

The following listing of activities is more circular than linear in nature. Also, as instruction is planned and evaluated, teachers will organize these activities in different patterns.

Evaluation and Diagnosis. The sophomores for the most part, were included in evaluation of student learning discussions with teacher and/or team members. Also, while working with the individual student or correcting assignments, the sophomore was constantly diagnosing individual learner needs.

Deciding What to Teach. The sophomore generally was not in a position to decide what to teach, but was usually included in topic selection discussions with the teacher and/or team members. Also, it must be remembered that sophomores are in the classroom during the afternoon for one term and are probably not ready for such experience.

Planning a Lesson. The sophomores both assisted the teacher in planning instruction and planned instruction for their own groups. It is especially important to note from comments on teacher questionnaires that this self planning activity was closely supervised by the classroom

teacher. At no time during the two terms did any student write or talk in terms of instructional objectives. The main emphasis in the sophomore field centered program is to be with elementary age children in the instructional setting. The program appears to be centered on the classroom student and not on the instruction of the classroom student.

Preparing and Gathering Materials. Many sophomore instructional support activities are classified in this area. The preparation of bulletin boards and ditto masters included at one time or another at least eighty (80) percent of all the participating sophomores. Duplicating materials and gathering materials for a specific lesson also involved a majority of the sophomores. The lesson is then taught and the spiral starts once again.

Room, building and professional activities were also listed by the sophomores. Even though the certified teacher is paid to help children learn, she is also involved as a teacher in other activities. A majority of the sophomores were involved in either daily or project clean-up activities. What is of most inerest here is the percentage of Fall term silent participation in parent conferences. The words "silent," "observing," were written in by the sophomores. Also about half of the total sophomore group had attended a faculty meeting.

The previously listed instructional and instructional support activities did form the major public school classroom activities of the

Fall term, 1971, and Winter term, 1972, sophomore block students.

Usefulness of Identified Activities

The following comments describe how the identified, public school classroom activities of the sophomore block student can be used as suggested in the Justification section of Chapter I. To most effectively accomplish this, the Justification statements are being repeated and followed by comments concerning each.

Justification 1: The results of the study will provide the Elementary Division with descriptive data concerning the sophomore block students' activity in the public school classroom.

Comment: Chapter IV, Findings, and the Classroom Activities section of Chapter V, Conclusions, do provide this descriptive data.

Justification 2: The identified classroom activities can assist the Division in its efforts to develop a competency based preservice program.

Comment: As the survey of related literature indicated no U. S. Office of Education Phase I model developer or known developer of competency based materials to date has any data for the selection of any competency or performance objective. The Elementary Division now has data to show what public school classroom activities sophomores "are able to do." Once the Division identifies the activities the sophomore "should be able to do" then evaluation criteria can be

added to have a performance objective. Also, learning activities must be identified to assist the student to accomplish each performance objective.

Justification 3: Once the classroom activities of the initial field experience are known, the sophomore seminar experiences can be planned to complement, support, and expand these activities. Also, the remaining two preservice years will have a "known" foundation for expansion and growth.

Comment: The activities identified by this study present many seminar topics that could enhance the time spent by the sophomore in the public school classroom. Several examples of these follow.

A. A seminar planned to increase the awareness of the sophomore as to the actual teacher activity in the classroom. In this study seventy-six (76) percent of Fall term sophomores indicated they had diagnosed student needs. Only twenty-seven (27) percent of the Winter term sophomores noted such an activity. Yet thirty-eight (38) percent of the Fall term and forty-eight (48) percent of the Winter term sophomores listed discussion with the classroom teacher in the area of evaluation of student progress and all students identified assisting students as an instructional activity. Additionally, sixty-six (66) percent of the teachers indicated the sophomores discussed evaluation of student progress with them. With a clarification of potential classroom activities, the sophomore could be more aware of the total implication of any activity.

B. A seminar designed to provide each sophomore with several specific questioning and inquiry techniques to use while assisting students after someone else has taught the lesson. Since this study presented data to show that all sophomores worked with students in this manner, specific technique tools to assist the sophomore in assisting the classroom student would provide a learning experience for all sophomore block students.

C. A seminar designed to review several instructional strategies for the sophomores to try when presenting a lesson to classroom students. The experience of presenting lessons with different instructional strategies would assist the sophomore to discover instructional strengths early in the preservice program. This would provide time to strengthen needed instructional skills and refine those already reasonably solid.

D. A seminar planned to start the sophomore in thinking about and using behavioral objectives. The lack of any sophomore mentioning behavioral objectives strongly suggests they are not being exposed in the public school classroom to learning or teaching by objectives.

E. A seminar designed for the review and discussion of elementary math concepts and skills. The majority of sophomores participating in this study noted math as the subject area in which they assisted students after someone else had taught the lesson and presented small group and one student lessons. Additionally, a special

effort should be made to encourage freshman students to take Math 193 in which the college student works in the math area with elementary school children. It is also interesting to note that in the investigator's public school experience math was usually a morning subject. Yet, it is the number one subject of most frequent participation reported by these afternoon sophomores.

F. With the "known" activities of the sophomore students the junior block can concentrate on those skills needed by the preservice student before entering student teaching. Some of these could be: diagnosis of student needs, planning lessons to meet these needs, more experience with a wider variety of instructional strategies, more exposure to the potential of educational technology to assist the learner, and another, more extensive experience with behavioral objectives and their application to instruction and learning.

Justification 4: The Division can interpret the identified activities for inclusion as part of the entrance requirements into the School of Education.

Comment: If entry into the School of Education remains a process in which the student participates after completion of a required number of credit hours, then selected, identified activities could be placed on a checklist for the supervising classroom teacher and assigned Oregon State University staff to check the number of activities participated in by the student during sophomore block and the degree of

performance achieved in each. However, if the program is to become competency or performance based, then upon accomplishment of Division required classroom performance objectives, the student would be eligible for entrance into the School of Education.

Justification 5: It is entirely possible the Division may elect at any time to change any, or all, of the described field centered program sequence.

Comment: This justification does not need interpretation, adaption, or action by the Division. The demonstration that entry into the instructional role as a college sophomore can provide the student with such an experienced background is justification enough. However the elementary preservice program changes at Oregon State University, the public school classroom activities identified and listed will be useful to any field experience program. To the investigator's knowledge the public school classroom activities listed in this study provide the Division with the only descriptive data based on actual student performance in the classroom for use in selecting those competencies or performance objectives to be used as a basis for a field centered and competency based preservice program.

Participating Sophomores

Several conclusions can and should be made about the sophomores participating in the study.

First, the high percentage of the sophomore block class that voluntarily completed at least one questionnaire, Fall eighty-one (81) percent, Winter eighty-four (84) percent, is both representative and commendable. Even more so is the sixty-six (66) percent of Fall term and seventy (70) percent of Winter term students who completed both questionnaires. The data provided by these students, when compared with that supplied by their teachers, is a viable representation of actual participation. In fact, the students evidently view themselves as doing less than did the teachers.

Second, it would appear that the procedures to gain admittance into the sophomore program provided the Fall term segment with students who were inclined towards more activity. This is concluded because of the demonstrated interest in identifying the program and gaining admittance. It amounted to keeping up with Educational Hall bulletin boards and in contact with advisors. With the sophomore block growing in population, the general knowledge about the class will spread and these students may spread over the three terms. The list of activities provided in Chapter IV leads one to conclude that either the Fall term class contained a higher percentage of students who are eager to "get going," or the classroom teacher is, by Winter term, in a "routine" and is no longer "fresh" as at the beginning of the year. She is suffering from what might be termed as "mid-year doldrums."

The possibility does exist that the greater participation by the Fall term group might be a result of the classroom teacher more than the eagerness of the sophomore block student.

The final comment about the student relates to the effect of the program and comes directly from comments volunteered by the participating sophomores. The attitude of the interview participants clearly communicated their enjoyment of the program and success within the public school classroom. Most had a suggestion or two for improvement, but all felt the program was a success. This investigator happened by chance to meet two fathers of participating students. The students were far from the most active, in fact, one essentially assisted students, corrected papers and discussed the day with the teacher. Both fathers' comments were identical concerning the program's effect on changing their daughter's attitude toward school from that of boredom and ready to quit to enjoyment and solid commitment to eventually become a certified classroom teacher.

Summary of Conclusions

Conclusions about the findings were related to three separate areas.

1. Classroom Activities. The purpose of the section was to list the major public school classroom activities of the sophomore block student. The classroom activity assisting students after

someone else has taught the lesson was found to be the only instructional activity noted by all participating sophomore block students. Non-instructional activities that supported the classroom instructional program were participated in by most sophomore students. These were correcting papers, making bulletin boards and duplicating materials.

2. Usefulness of Identified Activities. Each justification statement listed in Chapter I was reviewed and specific suggestions made as to how the identified activities could fulfill the original intent. In response to Justification statement three, seminar experiences can be planned to complement, support and expand the identified activities. Seminars were suggested in clarification of actual classroom activities, questioning and inquiry techniques, instructional strategies, behavioral objectives, and elementary math concepts and skills.

3. Participating Sophomores. Three conclusions were listed in the section. First, when a comparison is made between teacher and sophomore data it is evident that the teachers viewed the sophomores as doing more in the classroom than did the sophomores. Second, the Fall term students in the study participated to a greater extent in most activities than did the Winter term sophomores. It was concluded that either the procedure required to enroll provided the Fall term program with students inclined towards more activity, or the classroom routines established by Winter term hindered the activity of these

sophomores. Third, the sophomores indicated by verbal and written comments on the questionnaire and in the interview their enjoyment of the program and success within the public school classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Dwight W. and James M. Cooper. 1968. Model elementary teacher education program. USOE Bureau of Research, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, FS5. 258: 58022. 531 p.

Boerrigter, Glenn C. 1970. Preface--redesigning programs for the training of elementary teachers. The Journal of Research and Development in Education 3:1-7. Spring.

Bosley, Howard E. 1969. Teacher education in transition. Vol. II. Emerging roles and responsibilities. Baltimore, Maryland, Multi-State Teacher Education Project. 365 p.

Clarke, S. C. T. 1969. The story of elementary teacher education models. The Journal of Teacher Education 20:283-293.

Gorman, Charles J. 1969. The University of Pittsburgh model of teacher training for the individualization of instruction. The Journal of Research and Development in Education 2:44-46. Spring.

Houston, W. Robert. 1969. A guide to behavioral science elementary teacher education program. In: A readers guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers, ed. by Joel L. Burdin and Kaliopee Lanzilloti. Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearninghouse on Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. 23-50.

Johnson, Charles E. 1970. Purpose of the study and background. In: The feasibility of the Georgia educational model for teacher preparation--elementary, ed. by Charles E. Johnson and Gilbert F. Shearron. Athens, Georgia, University of Georgia. p. 1-13.

Johnson, Charles E., Gilbert F. Shearron and A. John Stauffer. 1969. Georgia education model specifically for the preparation of elementary teachers--a summary. The Journal of Research and Development in Education 2:52-64. Spring.

Joyce, Bruce R. 1969. A guide to the teacher-innovator: a program to prepare teachers. In: A readers guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers, ed. by Joel L. Burdin

and Kaliopee Lanzilloti. Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. 105-158.

Klein, Susan Shurberg. 1970. Student influence on teacher behavior. Philadelphia, Temple University. 113 p.

Lawrence, Richard E. 1969. Forward. In: Teachers for the real world, by B. Othanel Smith. Washington, D. C., The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. v-viii.

McCarty, Donald J. 1969. Wisconsin elementary teacher education project. Vol. V. Feasibility study: program and support systems. Madison, University of Wisconsin. 417 p.

Monson, Jay A. 1969. The new models in elementary education. Phi Delta Kappan 51:101.

Morsh, W. C. and E. A. Wilder. 1954. (as cited in Klein, 1971) Identifying the effective instructor: a review of quantitative studies 1900-52. San Antonio, Air Force Personnel and Training Center.

Ornstein, Allan C. 1971. Systematizing teacher behavior research. Phi Delta Kappan 52:551-555.

Reddick, Thomas L. 1971. Model for elementary teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan 52:439-440.

Rosenshine, Barak and Norma Furst. 1971. Research on teacher performance criteria. In: Research in teacher education, a symposium, ed. by B. Othanel Smith. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall. p. 32-37.

Schalock, H. Del. 1968. A competency based, field centered, systems approach to elementary teacher education. USOE Bureau of Research, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, FS5. 258:58020. p. 151 (plus nine appendices).

Schalock, H. Del. 1969. A guide to a competency-based, field centered systems approach to elementary teacher education. In: A readers guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers, ed. by Joel L. Burdin and Kaliopee Lanzilloti. Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher

Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. 51-84.

Schalock, H. Del, Bert Y. Kersh and Larry L. Horyna. 1970. Some information about COMField. Monmouth, Oregon College of Education. 31 p.

Simon, Anita and E. G. Boyer (eds.). 1970. Mirrors for behavior. II. An anthology of observation instruments, Vol. A and B. Philadelphia, Classroom Interaction Newsletter and Research for Better Schools, Inc. 51 p. (plus 79 appendices).

Smith, B. Othanel. 1969. Teachers for the real world. Washington, D. C., The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. 185 p.

Sowards, G. Wesly. 1969. The Florida State University model program for the preparation of elementary school teachers. The Journal of Research and Development in Education 2:22-30. Spring.

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. 1971. Educational Personnel Development, Salem, Oregon. 8 p.

Trow, William C. 1960. Role function of the teacher in the instructional group. In: The dynamics of instructional groups. The Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, ed. by Nelson C. Henry. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. p. 30-52.

Wallen, Norman E., Robert N. Travers, Ian E. Reed and Kenneth H. Wodke. 1963. Relationships between teacher needs and teacher benavior in the classroom. Journal of Educational Psychology 54:23-32.

Weber, Wilford A. 1969. A guide to specifications for a comprehensive undergraduate and inservice teacher education program for elementary teachers. In: A readers guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers, ed. by Joel L. Burdin and Kaliopee Lanzilloti. Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. 85-104.

Wiersma, William. 1969. A guide to educational specifications for a comprehensive elementary teacher education program. In:

A readers guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers, ed. by Joel L. Burdin and Kaliopee Lanzilloti. Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. p. 197-210.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

SOPHOMORE CLASSROOM ACTIVITY SURVEY

completed by _____

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather basic data describing the elementary school classroom activities of the fall, 1971, and winter, 1972, O. S. U. Sophomore aides. The information gathered will provide the Elementary Education Department with a data source for several proposed program improvements. Basically, it will be used to improve the field centered program by stating accurate information about what you are doing in the classroom. In no way will any of this information be used for personal or group evaluation. This is a descriptive study only. Your cooperation is very much appreciated. Thank you in advance for your time and efforts.

SECTION I--GENERAL INFORMATION

The instructional process from an instructor's viewpoint usually has five parts: Deciding on what to teach, planning, preparation, teaching and evaluation. Describe briefly your role so far this term, if any, in each of these areas. Please specify area, time, and size of group.

Deciding on what to teach.

Planning a lesson(s).

Preparing and gathering instructional materials and supplies.

Teaching the lesson(s).

Evaluating student progress.

SECTION II--SPECIFIC INFORMATION

For each of the activities listed below please do the following:

1. If you HAVE DONE the activity put an (X) in column 1, then complete columns 3 and 4; if not, go on to next item;

2. Estimate in column 3 HOW OFTEN you have done this (for example, 3 times, once every day, 3 times every week);
3. Estimate in column 4 HOW MUCH TIME you spend for each occurrence of the activity.

Part 1. Instructional Support Activities (time spent in supporting the instructional process without being directly involved with students)

Example:

HAVE DONE	ACTIVITY	HOW OFTEN	HOW MUCH TIME EACH
X	Taking lunch count	once every day	5 min.
_____	Making a bulletin board		
_____	Making a worksheet (ditto) master		
_____	Helping to plan what will happen tomorrow		
_____	Duplicating materials		
_____	Taking attendance		
_____	Diagnosing student needs		
_____	Taking lunch count		
_____	Recording student progress in cumulative folders		
_____	Mounting pictures		
_____	Taking a message to the office or to another teacher		
_____	Correcting assignments		
_____	Reviewing books for new ideas		
_____	Reading cumulative folders		
_____	Searching through files		
_____	Drawing large illustrations		
_____	Participating in parent conferences		
_____	Gathering and preparing supplies for a project		

HAVE DONE	ACTIVITY	HOW OFTEN	HOW MUCH TIME EACH
_____	Cleaning up		
_____	Setting up for a P. E. activity		
_____	Assisting in completing report cards		
_____	Attending faculty meetings		
_____	Planning instruction		
_____	Attending professional meetings		

Identify others not previously listed.

Materials	Diagnosing	Planning	Evaluation

Identify by title and number the other adults in your classroom.

(teacher-1, student teacher-2, junior block student-1, high school helper-1)

Part 2. Instructional Activities (time spent working with students). Note change in column 4.

HAVE DONE	ACTIVITY	HOW OFTEN	SUBJECT MATTER
_____	Assisted students with their assignment after someone else taught the lesson with: _____ a large group (15+) _____ a small group (2-15) _____ one student		
_____	Reviewed recently introduced concepts or skills to a: _____ large group _____ small group _____ one student		
_____	Presented new concepts or skills to a: _____ large group _____ small group _____ one student		

HAVE DONE	ACTIVITY	HOW OFTEN	SUBJECT MATTER
_____	Assisted another teacher in presenting a lesson to a: ____ large group ____ small group ____ one student		
_____	Played games with students: ____ in room ____ on playground		
_____	Supervised, with no other teacher, the students in: ____ the room ____ on playground		
Other			

In your own words, describe what you now do best with students.

Equipment

HAVE USED	EQUIPMENT	HOW OFTEN	SUBJECT MATTER
_____	Filmstrip projector		
_____	Cassette tape recorder		
_____	Reel to reel recorder		
_____	Movie projector		
_____	Overhead projector		
_____	Opaque projector		
_____	Micro projector		
_____	Duplicating machine		
_____	Heat press		
_____	School's intercom system		
_____	Typewriter		
_____	_____		

SECTION III--PERSONAL PROGRESS

Briefly answer the following questions as best you can today. Don't worry about what is going to happen the remainder of the term.

What seminar assignments and activities to date do you think have benefited you the most?

Activity Reason

What experience has not occurred thus far in seminar that would have made your classroom participation more meaningful?

In terms of content and/or experience, what should the junior block seminar experience provide you?

What classroom activities have been most meaningful to you?

Activity Reason

What activity would you like to do in your classroom that you have not done?

In terms of content and/or experience, what should your next classroom assignment provide you?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name	School Grade level
O. S. U. Address	Teacher
O. S. U. Telephone number	Time spent daily
	No. weeks in program

Education Information

1. Home town and high school _____
2. High school G. P. A. (4. 0 perfect) _____
3. High school experiences with elementary school age children.

4. College level education classes completed before this term.

5. Experiences with elementary school age children since beginning college.

6. Number of college credit hours completed _____ G. P. A. _____

Personal Information

1. Age _____
2. Number of brothers _____ Number of sisters _____
3. Your ordinal position (1st born, 2nd, 3rd, etc.) _____
4. Occupation of parents _____

APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW GUIDE

All interviews were conducted singularly by the principal investigator. Three questions were asked each participant. These are listed below. The purpose of the interview was twofold.

1) To gather data concerning the sophomore block students' classroom activities to supplement the completed questionnaires.

2) To give the principal investigator a personal feeling concerning the sophomore student classroom activities.

The first mentioned provided useful supplemental material. This data was used to clarify and add to questionnaire data. The second, although totally subjective, provided the basis of need to interpret and categorize data from the questionnaire. Although the students did an excellent job of clarifying their written answers, there were several times when personal knowledge of the situation, gained through the interview, hopefully allowed the data to be used as intended.

Question 1.

Briefly tell what happens on an "average" day. Start when you arrive and outline your day.

Question 2.

What other adults are in the room while you are? If more than one teacher, what effect has this had on your experience?

Question 3.

What suggestions would you make to improve sophomore block for next term and what do you now need from junior block?

The interview time period was usually completed before each could completely answer question three.

APPENDIX III

SOPHOMORE BLOCK
CLASSROOM ACTIVITY SURVEY
Form B

Teacher, Principal, OSU Staff

Completed by _____

School and Grade _____

Sophomore Block Students _____
name term

_____
name term

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather basic data describing the elementary classroom activities of the fall, 1971, and winter, 1972, OSU Sophomore Aides. The information gathered will provide the Elementary Education Department with a data source for several proposed program improvements. Basically, it will be used to improve the field centered program by stating accurate information about what students have been doing in the classroom. In no way will any of this information be used for personal or group evaluation. This is a descriptive study. Your cooperation is very much appreciated. Thank you in advance for your time and efforts.

SECTION I--GENERAL INFORMATION

The instructional process from an instructor's viewpoint usually has five parts: Deciding on what to teach, planning, preparation, teaching and evaluation. Describe briefly the sophomore block student's role, if any, in each of these areas.

1. Deciding on what to teach.

2. Planning a lesson(s).

3. Preparing and gathering instructional materials and supplies.

4. Teaching the lesson.

5. Evaluating student progress.

SECTION II--SPECIFIC TASK INFORMATION

Please list here the major instructional (with students) and instructional support (without students) your sophomore block student averaged doing once a week during the term.

Instructional	Instructional Support
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.

Other:

SECTION III--SOPHOMORE BLOCK PROGRESS

Please briefly answer each of the following on the basis of what has happened today. Don't consider plans or proposals for action tomorrow.

Benefits

In each teaching environment it is possible for the students, teacher, and sophomore block student to gain from the experience. List below how each benefited from the sophomore block student being in the classroom for at least four afternoons for one term.

Students:

Teacher:

Sophomore Block Student:

Recommendations

How could the sophomore block experience be improved:

for the block student?

for the classroom teacher?

What should the junior block program provide for the "experienced" sophomore block student?

Teaching Experience

1 yr_____ 2 yr_____ 3-5 yr_____ 6-10 yr_____ 10+ yr_____

Supervision Experience

Student teachers	1 _____	2 _____	3 _____	4 or more ___
Resident teachers	1 _____	2 _____	3 _____	4 or more ___
Junior Block	1 _____	2 _____	3 _____	4 or more ___
Sophomore Block	1 _____	2 _____	3 _____	4 or more ___

Administrative Experience

1 yr_____ 2 yr _____ 3 yr _____ 4 yrs or more _____

APPENDIX IV

SOPHOMORE BLOCK STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

Student	Fifth week questionnaire*	Tenth week questionnaire	Interview
	Fall Term, 1971		
Barker, Joan	0	X	X
Ballantyre, Claudia	X	X	X
Barnes, Dianna	X	X	X
Bloye, Bonnie	X	X	X
Brackman, Donna	X	X	X
Case, Joyce	X	X	X
Gallagher, Rae	0	X	X
Howell, Marilyn	X	X	X
Hulbert, Deanne	X	X	X
Huntly, Mary Jo	X	X	X
Johnson, Vicki	X	X	X
Leatherwood, Patricia	X	X	0
Ludden, Daryl	X	X	X
Piontkowski, Marcia	X	X	X
Morgan, Kathy	X	0	0
Platt, Janis	X	X	0
Rinearson, Ingra	0	X	X
Rukka, Diane	0	X	X
Russell, Linda	X	X	X
Santesson, Paula	X	X	X
Sitton, John	X	X	X
Snodgrass, Kathy	X	X	X
Usher, Ella	X	X	X
Weniger, Patty	X	X	0
Winniford, Wren	X	X	X
Youngberg, Ann	X	X	X

(Continued on next page)

Appendix IV. (Continued)

Student	Fifth week questionnaire	Tenth week questionnaire	Interview
	Winter Term, 1972		
	X	X	X
Booth, Lynell	X	X	0
Bowen, Teri	X	X	X
Brown, Connie	X	0	0
Burkhart, Deborah	X	X	X
Cameron, D'Leo	X	X	X
Christianson, Linda	X	X	0
Cody, Margaret	X	X	X
Cornwell, Cathy	0	X	X
Darrow, Charlotte	X	X	0
Frolini, Judy	X	X	X
Flock, Margene	X	X	0
Garrison, Carolyn	X	X	X
Gedney, Jennelle	X	X	X
Golden, Lauree	X	X	X
Henningsen, Debra	X	X	X
Horie, Kimiko	X	X	0
Hough, Susan	X	X	X
Inman, Nancy	X	0	0
Lewis, Donna	X	0	0
Marolf, Judy	X	X	X
Mathes, Candy	X	0	0
Martin, Nancy	X	X	X
McGee, Debbie	X	0	0
O'Brien, Terry	X	X	X
Pickens, Cheri	X	X	X
Rose, Cheryl	X	X	X
Taylor, Katina	X	X	0
Upham, Janet	X	X	X
Watson, Judy	X	X	X
Young, Becky	X	X	X

*0 = no participation
X = participation

APPENDIX V

OSU SOPHOMORE HANDOUT TO STUDENTS

As a Sophomore Block student you will accomplish many of the following tasks in your classroom this term:

make bulletin boards
correct papers
run ditto machine
make dittos
tutor--any subject helping 1 or 2 students
run and set-up movie projector, film strips, etc.
help at library and select books for class
prepare charts and visual aids for lessons
invent and make learning games
enter in at recess (organize games if possible)
help gather material for lessons (i. e., art)
help answer questions during study time
small group work (reading, etc.)--under teacher's direction
listen for oral reading
read stories aloud to class
observe other classes
attend faculty meetings
help with class discussions (following movies, etc.)

If you have any special talents--offer them.
Hootenanny (guitar), foreign languages, etc.

*Above all, be a friend and do things <u>with</u> the children whenever possible:

sitting with them
encouraging during a rough time
offering subtle suggestions (in art, etc.)
at recess and P. E.
in music class
in the library finding books

Add some of your own experiences to the list: