

AN EVALUATION OF A STAFF ASSESSMENT MODEL
TO IMPROVE TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS
UTILIZING THE STALLINGS INTERVENTION TECHNIQUE

by

Larry E. Hixson

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Education Administration

APPROVED:

Robert R. Richards

J. C. Fortune

Kenneth Underwood

Ronald McKeen

Lynn B. Eberwine

March 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

AN EVALUATION OF A STAFF ASSESSMENT MODEL
TO IMPROVE TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS
UTILIZING THE STALLINGS INTERVENTION TECHNIQUE

by

Larry E. Hixson

Committee Chairman: Robert R. Richards
Education Administration

(ABSTRACT)

This study will evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher performance assessment model. Teacher performance is a timely subject and very much of interest to educators, policy makers and the general public. The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) will be utilized to assess the performance of teachers. It has not been studied to date in that context.

The design of this study will be experimental research. A total of sixteen (16) vocational teachers will be observed by certified coders using the Stallings method. Eight (8) vocational teachers will serve as the control group. After the initial observation, eight (8) vocational teachers will receive a developmental treatment and a second observation will be conducted. An analysis of covariance will be

utilized to provide an analysis of the data and a comparison of the performance of the groups. The results of the study will provide data and data interpretation on the affect of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) on the teacher performance assessed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was completed with the encouragement and untiring help of several people whom I wish to thank.

Dr. Robert R. Richards, my graduate advisor, Dr. J. C. Fortune, my research expert, Dr. Kenneth Underwood, Dr. Lynn Eberwine Cross, and Dr. Ronald McKeen are owed a special "thank you" for their assistance and comments for the completion and improvement of my study.

A special "thank you" to my friend and mentor, Dr. Allen L. Davis III, for keeping me "on track" over the years.

Linda Shifflette and Elizabeth Baltes are especially thanked for sharing their knowledge and expertise of the Jane Stallings Program. Cam Harris, I appreciate your help in the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Thanks are expressed to the vocational teachers who volunteered to participate in this study: Steve Wirt, Zannette Larrimore, Peggy White, Ed Markoff, Bobby Pippin, Bob Brownschidle, Amorette Warren, Jody Puckett, Eddie Chengiah, David Nettles, Carl James, Myra Holt, Marilyn Daniels, Estelle Taylor, Gloria Thomas, and Jim Smith. The approval and support of the administrative staff, Superintendent, Dr. Judith Whittemore, and Dr. Walter L. Gant.

Harriet Meetze, thank you and Margie Stafford, for

typing the manuscript, letters, and memos necessary for completion of this study.

Lastly, but probably most importantly, a very special "thank you" for my wife, Kay, and my daughter, Kristy, for their sacrifices toward my education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I	
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study.....	2
General Hypothesis and Research Question.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	6
Summary.....	7
CHAPTER II - <u>REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE</u>	
<u>ARGUMENT FOR THE PROBLEM STATEMENT</u>	
Introduction.....	8
Research on Effective Teaching.....	8
Research on Characteristics of Successful Inservice Programs.....	17
Research on the Stallings Intervention Technique.....	19
Summary.....	21
Significance.....	22

CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction.....	23
Description of Research Methodology.....	23
Sample.....	26
Data Collection Procedure.....	26
Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	31
An Explanation of Variables on the Teacher Profile or SOI.....	32
Specific Hypotheses.....	38
Research Question.....	41
Statistical Analysis of Data.....	41
Setting.....	42
Summary.....	43

CHAPTER IV - PRESENTATION OF DATA AND
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction.....	45
Test of Hypotheses.....	46
Hypothesis 1.....	46
Hypothesis 2.....	49
Hypothesis 3.....	51
Hypothesis 4.....	53
Hypothesis 5.....	55
Reported Findings for the Research Question.....	57
Research Question 1.....	58
Summary.....	58

CHAPTER V - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction.....	60
Summary.....	60
Conclusions.....	63
Rival Explanations.....	65
Recommendations.....	66
Implications.....	67
Discussion.....	69
Summary Statement.....	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	72
APPENDICES.....	76
Appendix A Sample Individual Teacher Profile	77
Appendix B..... Variable Names	79
Appendix C..... Sample Group Profile	82
Appendix D..... Procedures for Observers/Coders	84
Appendix E..... Time Line for Teacher Observations, Staff Development, and Postobservations	94
Appendix F..... Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI)	97
Appendix G..... Effective Use of Time	99
VITA.....	116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It's neither surprising nor totally inappropriate that fixing America's teachers has surfaced as the principal focus of the debate on educational reform. After all, teachers are central to the educational process, and better teachers mean better education. It is true that we need to attract brighter candidates into teaching. It is true that a nationwide competency test is needed to screen out illiterates. It is true that incompetent and dysfunctional practitioners must be weeded out if they cannot be helped. Holding teachers to higher standards is a goal especially supported by teachers themselves. (Urbanski, 1986, p.24)

We are in an era when local educational systems are called upon to provide the best education possible for our youth. Teachers are constantly encouraged and expected to stay abreast of the latest technological advances but neither are they to lose sight of the accomplishments of yesteryear. Changes in curriculum design and instructional methodologies are attempted in the hope that student achievement will be

enhanced. As part of the emphasis placed on improvement in our schools, school systems have the responsibility of ensuring that effective teaching is occurring during the instructional day, with consequent student competency being attained. As Madaline Hunter (1979) states, "an adequate professional development program must parallel that of medicine, for it requires the professional to learn, internalize, and implement the contributions of science to increased productive human functioning" (p. 64).

Medley (1978) states that there are two (2) important ways of improving the effectiveness of teachers. One is by changing teacher evaluation, and the other is by changing teacher education. Medley says that changes in either can result in improvement only if they reflect accurate information about how the behavior of more effective teachers differs from that of less effective ones.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study sought to determine whether the Stallings Intervention Technique will affect change in a teacher's classroom behavior.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study has two primary purposes. The first purpose is to analyze teaching characteristics exhibited by a group of vocational teachers using the Stallings Observation

Instrument (SOI). The SOI identifies both effective and less effective teaching characteristics by the use of a systematic, observational coding technique. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of the Stallings intervention inservice program on individual teachers. Randomly selected experimental and control groups were involved in this study, thus utilizing a pretest-posttest design whereby teachers received a treatment or a training program called the Stallings Intervention Technique which is targeted at improved teaching.

GENERAL HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH QUESTION

The problem this study addressed is the evaluation of the Stallings Intervention Technique which assesses teacher effectiveness. Emphasis on teacher effectiveness and teacher effectiveness training has implications for more effective and improved teacher performance.

The general hypothesis which this study addressed is:

General Hypothesis:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the SOI scores of the experimental group and the SOI scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on five (5) primary variables: (1) "All Academic Statements" (001), (2) "All Organizing or Managing Statements" (002), (3) "All Behavior

Statements" (003), (4) "All Social Statements (004), and (5) "A Total of the Time Spent Percentages of Variables One (001) through Four (004)" (005).

Therefore, there are five (5) specific hypothesis statements that are written in Chapter III that will be statistically tested and results provided in the Chapter IV section of this paper.

Research Question:

The central question which this study addressed is:

Can existing teacher effectiveness characteristics of vocational secondary teachers be identified and improvements made through the Stallings Intervention Technique?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. The Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Model was designed to assist teachers in changing their classroom behavioral processes in order to organize and manage their classrooms more effectively and more efficiently. The Stallings model referred to in this study as the Stallings Intervention Technique follows a designated sequence of activities in which data is collected and teachers are trained.

2. The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) is a low-inference category observation system developed over a

period of ten (10) years by Jane Stallings and Margaret Needels (1979). The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) provides an efficient and convenient method for recording objective data on the interactions occurring within vocational classrooms.

3. The Identification and Classroom Information component is the first section of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) and records information necessary for optical scanning and data processing. Information on teacher, grade level, class size, observer information, and the observation date is recorded.

4. The Classroom Snapshot is the second section of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI). This one-page form records impressions of the total classroom with all its students and adults and records what they are doing at one point in time. The Classroom Snapshot is completed five (5) times during the classroom observation and records each person's whereabouts and involvement at that one instant.

5. The Five-Minute Interaction is the third section of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) and records the verbal interactions and activities as they occur in the classroom during the time frame of this part of the observation. In the Five-Minute Interaction, the teacher is the focus of the coding.

6. The Teacher Behavior Profile Charts are designed to include thirty-eight (38) teaching variables and graphically

depict the position of the teacher to the average total number of teachers observed. The Teacher Behavior Profile Chart also indicates whether "more" or "less" teacher effectiveness behaviors need to occur in order to improve upon research-based teacher effectiveness behaviors.

7. Teacher Effectiveness was determined in the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Model through a list of thirty-eight (38) variables which include interactive instruction, non-interactive instruction, and off-task variables. In addition, instructional, classroom management, feedback, and discipline variables are categorized.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. The sample population was restricted to a randomly stratified sample of sixteen (16) teachers with assignment by subject area into two (2) groups. Six (6) Business Education, two (2) Marketing Education, six (6) Technology Education, and two (2) Trade and Industrial Education teachers made up the sample for this study. This number represented 50 percent (50%) of the vocational teacher population in the school district where this study was conducted.

2. The collection of data from which an intervention technique for improving vocational teacher effectiveness behavior was developed is limited to the exclusive use of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) and the Stallings inservice materials.

SUMMARY

Chapter I contains the problem statement, the purpose statement, the general hypothesis and research question, and a definition of terms utilized in this study. Chapter II of this study contains a review of the related literature. Chapter III contains the methodology and procedures utilized in this study. A presentation of the data and analysis of findings are presented in Chapter IV and the study summary, conclusions and recommendations are contained in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

ARGUMENT FOR THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this portion of the paper is to review the research and literature related to this study. To do this effectively, this section is divided into three (3) parts: the first part reviews teacher effectiveness research and literature; the second part reviews research and literature describing the characteristics of successful inservice programs; and the third part reviews research and literature that has been done on the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI).

RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING

Research on teacher effectiveness, an extremely complex activity, encompassing a variety of complex skills, has long eluded definition. Ornstein and Levine (1981) comment that "teaching is a skill so complex that no single factor can fully explain or describe the qualities of an effective teacher" (p. 592). Biddle and Ellena (1964) comment that "the problem with teacher effectiveness is so complex that no one today knows what the competent teacher is" (p. 2). Broudy (1969) says that the confusion over the definition and characteristics of teacher effectiveness allows us to "define good teaching anyway we like" (p. 583). However, even in

view of the difficulty in defining effective teaching, substantial progress has been made in relating teacher behaviors to student learning success.

Kratz (1896) set out to describe the characteristics which differentiated more effective teachers from less effective ones. In those early days the researcher simply asked pupils to describe effective teachers they had known. The process consisted essentially of collating and comparing such descriptions and the end product took the form of a list of traits attributed to teachers regarded as effective.

Stevens (1912) seems to have been the pioneer user of systematic observation of behavior in the classroom as a means of studying the nature of effective teaching. Her work was not widely imitated for over forty years.

The appearance of Rosenshine's review (1979) of some fifty studies identified several aspects of teaching styles or classroom climate. This review seemed to be directly related to pupil learning and teacher effectiveness and also provided a basis for research into teacher effectiveness.

Research on teacher effectiveness conducted by Good, Biddle, and Brophy (1975) and Airasian, Madaus, and Rakow (1978) concluded that teachers do make a difference -- some teachers elicit greater student achievement than do other teachers, and this success is tied to consistent differences in teaching behavior. Furthermore, research on teacher effectiveness has suggested that teacher effectiveness exists

in clusters of behaviors (McDonald & Elias, 1976) rather than as a single variable, and that these clusters of behaviors collectively do make a difference in student learning outcomes. The more notable variables which comprise the cluster of behaviors include direct instruction, time-on-task, classroom management, psychological factors affecting the student, and teacher feedback.

Barek Rosenshine (1979), who has done extensive reviews of teacher effectiveness research, determined that effective teachers utilize the variable of direct instruction, where goals are clear to students, time allocated to instruction is ample and continuous, coverage of content is extensive, performance of students is monitored, instruction is success oriented, and feedback to students is immediate. Rosenshine concluded that direct instruction, which he discussed in terms of student engaged time and teacher monitoring of student activities, is more likely to produce student learning gains than less teacher-directed approaches.

Medley's (1977) studies on teacher effectiveness determined that more effective teachers spent less time on procedures and management activities and more time on instruction.

Stallings, Needels, and Staybrook (1979) studied reading instruction at the secondary school level and found, as with basic skill instruction in the early grades, growth in reading skills was associated with clusters of teacher

behaviors, which included maximum time-on-task, total group instruction directing questions to specific students rather than to volunteers, providing regular feedback, controlling negative and encouraging positive behaviors, and using probing and guiding questions when students did not know an answer. The researchers also determined that negative teacher behaviors such as grading papers during the class period, socializing and/or allowing class activity interruptions, and allowing negative behaviors were minimally demonstrated by effective teachers.

Stallings and Kaskowitz (1974) found that instructional programs where students' roles were broadened to allow for student initiative, and where access to a wide variety of materials and activities predominated, produced students who were better able to see the relationships between parts and wholes. The researchers also concluded that these students demonstrated more independent and cooperative behavior.

Thus, the concept of direct instruction includes the opportunity to learn variable (Berliner, 1980) and refers to the related set of effective teacher behaviors which include maximum time-on task, teacher directed instruction (Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974), and incorporated lecture, demonstration, recitation, drill and practice.

Sullivan and Higgins (1983) found that effective teaching is organized around three (3) topics: (1) teachers deciding what their students should learn, (2) teachers

teaching it well, and (3) teachers checking to see if students have learned it. In a report by Tursman (1981) trends and issues affecting effective teaching include the effects of one's teaching style, teacher behavior in the classroom, and teacher attitudes do have an influence on effectiveness in the classroom. The fifth chapter contains excerpts from interviews with eleven Teachers of the Year on their teaching methods and their attitudes toward effective teaching.

John Heywood (1982) found that assisting student teachers in planning and implementing lessons at the secondary level through use of advance organizers, increases teacher effectiveness. The researcher found that effective teaching is directly associated with discipline, motivation, perception concepts and cognitive development, learning objectives and strategies, problem solving, the curriculum and the planning and implementation of lessons, and student appraisal and student-teacher self-appraisal.

Levin and Long (1981) wrote a book revealing their findings concerning successful instructional and learning processes with educators. Effective teaching according to these researchers focuses on three (3) types of variables in classroom learning and instruction: active learning time, feedback and corrective procedures and instructional cues.

Squires' (1983) research discusses a model for improving school and classroom effectiveness by saying that

educators must pay attention to school climate, teacher behaviors, student behaviors, leadership, supervision, and student achievement.

Acheson and Gall (1980) say that emphasis on practical techniques of clinical supervision in working with teachers to help them improve their classroom teaching is crucial to improve teacher effectiveness.

Research by Reed (1979) indicates that the questioning process used by teachers is critical in stimulating student learning. This study indicates that a high percentage of questions asked by ineffective teachers call only for factual answers and that oral activity in the classroom is largely teacher-dominated. Reed examines the effectiveness of teachers trained in questioning techniques as opposed to untrained teachers and finds trained teachers to be significantly more effective teachers.

Smith (1977) suggests that the primary way to improve teaching is to help educators improve instruction through examination of different approaches to conducting behavioral objectives. Smith says that classroom teachers have been convinced that behavioral objectives are necessary for the functioning of the "general model of instruction" and that the "general model of instruction" is necessary for the improvement of instruction. Suggestions for properly constructing behavioral objectives for the purpose of improving teacher effectiveness are given with an emphasis on

making it possible for the teacher to test hypothesis regarding the effectiveness of different learning experiences for the attainment of stated objectives. Read and Greene (1975) examine the trends of education today, and discuss some of the basic prerequisites for effective teaching. The authors state that teachers must realize that there is a great potential for creativity in the classroom and this is a major source of being an effective teacher.

Michael Apple (1973) says that educators should closely examine the methods of evaluating or grading students. Teacher effectiveness according to Apple emphasizes the following themes: learning should be examined while it is taking place, the milieu in which learning occurs should be analyzed, and standardized test outcomes are not the sole criterion on which the success or failure of an educational enterprise should be judged.

Trentham (1985) investigated relationships between teachers' sense of efficacy, superintendents' ratings of teacher competency, and selected demographic background of teachers. Trentham found that by discriminant analysis, superior and average competency teachers could be differentiated from low competency teachers on four (4) significant variables, one of which was efficacy scores.

Rosenholtz (1985), in her study, develops a theoretical context for understanding the evidence on effective schools. Susan Rosenholtz analyzes how effective schools surmounted

the problem of recruiting and retaining good teachers. The author says that because effective principals in effective schools focus on improving student achievement, teachers have concrete, realizable goals motivating them to become more effective and productive.

A review of research concerning students' ideas of teacher effectiveness by McKelvey and Kyriacou (1985) showed evidence in favor of the use of student evaluations of teaching performance. This evidence includes the validity of pupil perceptions and the value of such an exercise in itself in establishing a sound student-teacher relationship. Sherman (1985) says that there are four (4) essential steps toward effective teaching which concern enthusiasm, discussion and questioning, homework, and evaluation of students.

The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study is a major study by Richard Coatney (1985) on teaching effectiveness. Findings and educational implications dealing with time, instructional processes, and classroom environment are discussed as they directly relate to teacher effectiveness.

Kyriacou and McKelvey (1985) also conducted a study in secondary schools where they observed and described in terms of the eight (8) dimensions of effective teaching a rating scale to determine a teacher's preparedness, pace and flow, transitions, cognitive matching, clarity, business-like, withitness, and encouragingness. This study indicated that

this approach provided a useful heuristic device for the constructive exploration of teaching. In an article by Carol Englert (1984) the focus of effectiveness is discussed from the teacher's point of view. The interpretation of teacher effectiveness in regular and special needs classes focuses within the domains of classroom management, instructional organization, and the teacher's presentation. Effective practices of successful teachers are identified and discussed within each of these teaching domains.

Waters and Wyatt (1985) outline in their study a program called the Intern-Intervention Program of Toledo, Ohio. This program uses experienced effective teachers to train and evaluate both beginning teachers and experienced teachers who are ineffective. The program has proved to be excellent in its early stages in improving teacher effectiveness. Green (1984) says that classroom supervision for the improvement of teacher effectiveness can be accomplished through the use of behavior modeling and Theory Z organization.

Carfield and Walter (1984) describe the Walter-Carfield model for teacher evaluations. Their model uses a Teacher Effectiveness Chart designed to reduce teacher anxiety and hostility and reduce administrator time in conducting evaluations to determine teacher effectiveness. Beach and Reinhartz (1984) present a successful teacher effectiveness model based on the use of an effective teaching criteria list with descriptors of effective teachers.

RESEARCH ON CHARACTERISTICS OF
SUCCESSFUL INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Michael Sportsman (1981) stated that "The original concept of the inservice program was that teachers would periodically be put in touch with the most recent or significant happenings in the world of education" (p. 308). In theory, teachers would be exposed to new developments in education and then implement these ideas into their instructional programs. In practice, Daniel Duke (1977) identifies the reasons why inservice education often times meets with failure. Duke identifies inservice failure to be the result of inservice trends which are either overly vague or parochial in scope and which make no provisions for long-term involvement of teachers in an on-going, self-improvement program. In addition, Duke says that the use of outside consultants who rarely have any long-term involvement with the district after the inservice program is also a factor in inservice failure.

Lyte (1978) addresses the need for inservice programs to become a regular feature in the professional life of all educators. He states that inservice programs must be relevant, on-going, and of benefit to students as well as to teachers.

Arends and Hersh (1980) state that "a substantial amount of theory and practice from related fields can provide a sufficient empirical base for planning and implementing

inservice teacher education" (p. 22). Arends and Hersh also define staff development as being based upon four (4) areas of research and practice: (1) adult learning theory, (2) human interaction, (3) organizational development, and (4) planned change. From adult learning theory, the researchers identify three (3) guidelines for staff development. They state that staff development programs should strive to allow experiences that lead to skill mastery and observable competence, provide ample opportunity for teachers to contribute to inservice content and process, and seek ways to integrate teachers' work and education into staff development programs. Also addressed are guidelines for human interaction. Arends and Hersh identify worthwhile staff development programs as being based on teachers' perspectives, as resolving teachers' problems, and as instilling in teachers the belief that they have the capacity to solve their own problems. Successful staff development programs must also provide active roles for participants, provide feedback and classroom follow-up, and show teachers how to monitor and analyze their own teaching behaviors.

In the area of organization development, the guidelines identified include planning staff development activities which are tied to total district and school objectives as well as to the regular work of teachers. Staff development activities should also be an extension of what teachers already know. Finally, Arends and Hersh identify guidelines

addressing the area of planned change which suggest that in order for significant teacher behavior change to occur, long-term systematic efforts are required in which teachers are allowed to volunteer for training. Arends and Hersh further identify peer support as being necessary and propose that inservice programs provide for "synergism -- the overall effect of becoming greater than the sum of the interactive components" (p. 31).

Holly (1982), who conducted interviews with 102 teachers in grades K through 12, determined that the single most important factor in determining the value teachers placed on inservice education was its personal relevance. In addition, Holly concluded from her interviews that teachers desired greater input into program planning, greater teacher-to-teacher sharing, and greater participation in program activities.

RESEARCH ON THE STALLINGS INTERVENTION TECHNIQUE

Debra Sullivan's study (1981) found that "the primary objective of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Model is to help teachers change so that they can manage their classrooms more effectively." In her study, classroom observations and specific recommendations for teaching behaviors are made for each teacher, and a series of teacher training sessions help them to change their behaviors. Classroom observation data are collected at the conclusion of the training sessions, and teachers receive

profiles showing results of their efforts at changing. This model uses the Secondary Observation Instrument (SOI), which collects information on the teacher and other classroom data and records information about the classroom environment and the participants.

Merrill Meehan (1981) presents an evaluation of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Project. The research project was designed to increase student achievement in basic skills through the use of research-based, systematic change in teachers' classroom management and organizational techniques. Meehan's project evaluation focused on pretest-posttest changes in teachers' perceived responsibility for student achievement, ratings on teachers' level of use of the innovation, and changes in "correct implementation" of specific classroom teaching behaviors after intervention transpired.

Jane Adolf (1983) conducted an evaluation of Stallings' 1975 Project Follow Through (PFT) to examine methodological issues inherent in evaluation research. Adolf found that Project Follow Through (PFT) included the following assertions: (1) Internal validity may be affected by a discrepancy in the number of variables used to describe program models and the number used to assess individual programs; (2) External validity may be questionable due to non-random assignment of the sample to treatment conditions; and (3) Reliability may be reduced as a result of confounding observers

with program models, possible inconsistency of observations, and lack of control over extraneous variables. Adolf concluded that an evaluation of Stallings' PFT produced valuable implications for the development of educational programs and contributed methodological innovations for studying large educational projects. This study also emphasized the utility of the Classroom Observation Instrument and points out implications of Stallings' work for future evaluation research.

Jane Stallings' study (1985) reported on the first year of a Madeline Hunter intervention program implementation. Thirteen (13) teachers in two (2) schools were observed before and after a three (3)-month intervention to identify relationships between staff development programs, teacher implementation of the program, student engaged rates, and student achievement in reading and mathematics.

Each teacher participating in this study was observed two (2) times during the pretest and posttest process. Stallings found that Hunter's intervention program for the purpose of improving teacher effectiveness provides significant improvements.

SUMMARY

Thus, a review of literature and research pertaining to effective teaching, inservice programs, and the Stallings Intervention Technique indicates that successful teacher training programs are characterized by active teacher participation in training areas which are relevant and

immediately applicable to the classroom. In addition, successful teacher training programs integrate knowledge that teachers have with new information which is research-based, provides continuous feedback and program evaluation, and is implemented by competent teachers. Competent teachers can include teachers who are trained in specific skills and who are able to train their peers.

SIGNIFICANCE

There are significant uses that this investigator intends to put into place after obtaining results from this study. Training and guidance in demonstrating effective teacher behaviors are a top priority in inservice program development for vocational teachers.

Teacher training programs, for preservice and experienced teachers, should reflect an awareness of current research such as competency based education in vocational classrooms. Local principals, supervisors, and teachers should, after this study, be knowledgeable in the use of instruments which collect teacher effectiveness behavior data.

Finally, teacher effectiveness inservice training for vocational educators must serve as a link to achieve an overall school system goal.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of Chapter III will be to discuss the methods and procedures that were used to gather and interpret the findings of the teacher profiles for the sixteen (16) teachers on which this study is based.

Once the teacher observations or Stallings Observation Instruments (SOIs) were completed by trained coders and scored electronically, there was an interpretation of the teacher profiles by the trained coders with the experimental group. Subsequently, all eight (8) teachers in the experimental group attended all four (4) sessions of the Stallings inservice program which was planned to improve teacher effectiveness. The teacher profile sheets served as the primary assessment tool that enabled each teacher to determine specific areas needing improvement. The treatment group was provided inservice training to become more effective teachers based on four (4) intervention training sessions conducted by certified trainers utilizing the Stallings model

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is an evaluation of a staff assessment model to improve teacher effectiveness utilizing the Jane Stallings Intervention Technique. The methodology

utilized in this study is experimental research. A total of sixteen (16) teachers were observed by two (2) certified coders in the Stallings method of teacher assessment. Eight (8) teachers received a developmental treatment and eight (8) teachers served as the control group. After the initial observation, the treatment was administered to the experimental group in four (4) separate workshop sessions (Figure 1).

All sixteen (16) teachers were actually observed and coded on four (4) separate occasions to obtain reliable SOI profile results. The pretest profile scores were obtained by averaging the two (2) preobservation scores. The same process was utilized to obtain posttest results. Afterwards, a second observation of both the experimental and control group was conducted. An analysis of covariance was utilized to provide an analysis of the data provided through the pretest and posttest observations for both groups.

Stallings Observation Instruments (SOIs) were collected on all sixteen (16) teachers as an integral part of this study. Appendix F shows a sample of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) that was used to collect data for this study. Therefore, the primary data source used in this experimental study was the collection of data using a low inference instrument called the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) which records specific denotable behaviors such as activities, materials, and interactions in the classroom.

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	CONTROL GROUP
September 22-26	Pretest	Pretest
October 20	Treatment	No Treatment
October 28	Treatment	No Treatment
November 11	Treatment	No Treatment
November 26	Treatment	No Treatment
December 15-19	Posttest	Posttest

Figure 1

Treatment was administered to the experimental group in four (4) separate workshop sessions.

SAMPLE

Sixteen (16) vocational teachers currently employed were selected to participate in this study. The randomly stratified sample was assigned by subject area into two (2) groups: a control group and an experimental group. Each group consisted of three (3) Business Education, three (3) Technology Education, one (1) Marketing Education, and one (1) Trade and Industrial Education teacher(s) (Figure 2).

The sixteen (16) teachers were asked by the researcher and verbally agreed to participate in the investigation. The purpose of the investigation and the resultant implications from the data collected were also explained to all sixteen (16) teacher participants. Each teacher participant was assured anonymity in that he/she would be identified only by a randomly assigned number on the coding sheet called the Stallings Observation Instruction (SOI).

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) is a teacher-focused system containing information that was collected by two (2) trained coders on all sixteen (16) subjects in this study. The Stallings Observation Instrument has three (3) parts including the Identification and Classroom Information Section, the Classroom Snapshot, and the Five-Minute Interactions. The completed and scored SOI provides an assessment of each teacher's current effectiveness in the classroom.

The Identification and Classroom Information section of

GROUPS	PROGRAM AREAS				TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBJECTS
	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Technology Education</u>	<u>Trade & Industry</u>	<u>Business</u>	
Received Stallings Workshops	1	3	1	3	8
(Experimental Group)					
Did Not Receive Stallings Workshops	1	3	1	3	8
(Control Group)					
TOTALS	2	6	2	6	16

Figure 2

A randomly stratified sample of sixteen (16) teachers assigned by subject area into two (2) groups: an Experimental Group and a Control Group.

the SOI booklet is simply the front of the booklet where the coders provide information necessary to help the reader in interpreting the data processing analysis. It includes information about the teacher being observed such as the number assigned to assure anonymity, length of class period, number of students present in the class, grade level, and number of adults present. Information about the coder is also provided in this section such as name of coder, date of observation, and the chronological order of booklets being used for this study. The Identification and Classroom Information actually sets the stage for the booklets to be analyzed by data processing.

The Classroom Snapshot is a form that the coders will complete five (5) times during each teacher observation. The snapshot form is used to record information about the classroom environment much like a polaroid picture being taken at five (5) different instances during the class period. This snapshot actually allows the coders or observers to record the whereabouts of every person in the classroom. The Classroom Snapshot allows the coders to reveal information about activities occurring, materials used by the teacher, teacher involvement with students or adults, and any student groupings that may be taking place.

The Five-Minute Interaction (FMI) is the third part of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI). The coders are able to record about three hundred (300) verbal interactions

during each teacher observation session. Interactions and activities taking place in the classroom are recorded on this form and are categorized into four (4) columns including who, to whom, what, and how.

In order for the coders to successfully complete the SOI, they must follow the proper sequence of activities including the completion of the Identification and Classroom Information Section prior to the start of class, divide the class period into five (5) equal time frames, and complete classroom snapshots and Five-Minute Interations (FMI) during the class period. Data was collected in the manner described above on all sixteen (16) teachers that were observed in this study.

To collect the data and ensure reliability of the data results, two (2) trained coders in the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Model were used. Each observer had received seven (7) days of intensive training in observing and coding classroom behaviors. Assessment of the coders' training knowledge was determined by the coding of a videotaped master lesson on which 90 percent (90%) mastery is expected for successful completion of the training session.

To become a certified coder of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI), each coder attended a seven (7)-day training session. The certified coders used in the study were trained by Debra Sullivan who was trained directly by Jane Stallings, the developer of the SOI. Both coders

participated in intensive training sessions concerning the use of codes contained in the SOI. This training consisted of memorization of codes and application of codes through vignettes and actual videotaped lesson presentations. Practice in actual classrooms guided by Debra Sullivan was an integral component of the coder's training.

Once the week-long training was completed, trainee coders, who are also teachers, went back to their respective schools and coded other teachers. These SOI booklets were sent to Debra Sullivan for evaluation of the reliability of each coder. The trainees then met again for a three (3)-day reliability testing session. The first day was a practice day. The second day trainees went into classrooms with a certified coder and a comparison was made between the trainee's and certified coder's SOIs. The third day both trainees were given a videotape test; whereby each coder could become certified if she coded the videotape using the SOI with ninety percent (90%) accuracy. Both of the observers used in this study became certified by coding the videotape with more than ninety-five percent (95%) accuracy.

Appendix D is an explanation of procedures that the coder/observer should follow which is taken from Chapter Two of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Demonstration Project Handbook (1981).

The next logical step in this research paper was to set up the times that the certified coders would actually observe

teachers using the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI). This can be found in Appendix E.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Upon completion of the coding booklets, the completed Stallings Observation Instruments (SOIs) were delivered to the Hampton City School System in Hampton, Virginia. The Hampton School System computer scanned the thirty-two (32) SOI booklets generated by two (2) live observations of all sixteen (16) teachers participating in the study for both the preobservation and postobservation. A total of sixty-four (64) SOI booklets were scanned to obtain data for this study. A sample booklet can be found in Appendix F. A researcher attempting a similar study could send the booklets to INTRAN, a firm in Minneapolis, Minnesota which has the capability to perform the same scanning process. At the completion of the scanning process, the computer profiles containing raw data were reviewed and analyzed by the two (2) certified Stallings coders. During this final step data on the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) was actually analyzed. A computer printout was generated on each teacher and on teachers as a group, summarizing the thirty-eight (38) teaching variables which are actually subsets of variables one (001) through five (005).

Teacher profiles generated from the classroom observation data identify thirty-eight (38) teaching variables or behaviors observed on all teachers. For the purpose of this

study, the researcher will analyze primary variables one(001) through five (005) comparing experimental and control group posttest scores to determine whether or not those teachers who were given Stallings inservice training became more effective teachers. According to Stallings (1980) the resulting design of the teacher training program is formulated from the teacher profiles and the recommendation of "more" or "less" use of research-determined effective teacher behaviors.

The total mean score on the pretest of the experimental group and control group will be analyzed with the posttest score of each group. A second observation of both groups three (3) months after the initial observation and treatment have taken place will reveal a posttest mean score for both groups.

Using an analysis of covariance, the two (2) group means will reveal if there was a significant difference in the control group that did not receive a treatment and the experimental group.

AN EXPLANATION OF VARIABLES ON THE TEACHER PROFILE OR SOI

The Individual Teacher Profile Summary Sheet contains thirty-eight (38) variables that determine whether a teacher should be spending more or less time on an activity to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. From analyzing an individual teacher profile like the one in Appendix A, the researcher can clearly determine by a

comparison of the "Criterion" column to the "Your Class" column which areas a teacher needs training in order to become a more effective teacher. Although this appears to be a simple task, the reader must ask the question, "What is the acceptable range in percent on either side of the criterion score that is acceptable or nonacceptable?" To answer this question, the researcher must refer to Appendix B as a guide. In most cases, a high or low frequency range is given which denotes that a teacher has some flexibility in teaching behavior.

Variables 001 through 004 on the teacher profile are mutually exclusive of each other which include: All Academic Statements (001), All Organizing or Managing Statements (002), All Behavior Statements (003), and All Social Statements (004). These are mutually exclusive because it is highly unlikely that a teacher will be directing statements in either of these categories at the same time. For example, when a teacher makes a statement about academics (001), the teacher is not making a statement concerning student behavior (003). Variable 005 is a total of the time spent percentages of variables 001 through 004. From this total the researcher can analyze how a teacher is spending the majority of time concerning types of statements made to students in a class period.

Variables 006 through 038 are a subset of variables 001 through 004. These variables denote specific behaviors of

students and the teacher during the class period.

Variable 006, Teacher Instructs or Explains, denotes, for example, the amount of time a teacher spends lecturing to the class. More effective teachers spend more time on variable 006, instructing the class than less effective teachers do (Stalling and Kaskowitz, 1974). Variables 007 through 010; Teacher Asks Direct Questions or Commands (007), Teacher Asks Clarifying Questions (008), All Open-Ended Questions (009), and Student Asks Academic Questions (010), are considered to be directly related to the questioning techniques of teachers. Variables 007 through 010 reveal the amount of time a teacher spends asking questions. Also, these variables reveal the types of questions a teacher asks of his/her students during a class period. It has been revealed in inservice sessions that teachers should ask high level questions that require more than a "yes" or "no" answer. The teacher profile will determine whether teachers have actually benefited from previous staff development sessions dealing with high level questioning techniques.

Variable 011, Teacher Calls Upon New Students, also is considered to be a necessary behavior that the teacher should use to engage as many students as possible in the lesson being presented.

Variables 012 through 015, Students Respond Academically (012), Student Initiates Comments or Responses (013), Student Does Not Know the Answer (014), and Student Refuses to Answer

(015), are grouped together because they all correspond to responses of students. Variable 012 denotes a response from a student. The response may be correct or incorrect. It is not the coder's function to determine correctness of the response, merely that there was a response. Variable 013 indicates that a student has responded by an unsolicited comment. In other words, the student has not been called upon to respond. If a student does not know an answer, Variable 014 is used. The student may verbally say "I don't know" or may by body language (shrug of shoulder, shake of head) indicate that he/she does not know the answer. The most negative of student responses would be Variable 015, Student Refuses to Answer. This is a blatant refusal to answer and is most often expressed verbally.

Variable 016 denotes teacher behaviors that include praise to his/her students, support, and positive feedback. This All Praise variable could correspond, overlap, or be related to variables 001 through 004.

Variables 017 and 018 are Teacher Praises or Supports Academic Responses (017) and Teacher Praises Behavior (018). These variables are directed toward students or a class that provides correct answers to the teacher's academic questions. Variable 018 reflects the percentage of time spent by a teacher who praises desirable student behavior rather than dwelling on negative off-task behavior.

Variables 019 through 021, Teacher Corrects Academic

Response (019), Teacher Corrects Academic Response with Guidance (020), and Teacher Corrects Behavior (021), are grouped together because teacher feedback is necessary in all cases. In most instances when the teacher attempts to correct a student, he/she should clarify or ask the student for additional information. In Variable 019 a student merely gives the correct information to the teacher. In Variable 020 a teacher is attempting to pull the correct information from students. In Variable 021 a student is exhibiting undesirable behavior and the teacher corrects the behavior. A more effective teacher may say, "Johnny, your response is incorrect but consider".

Variable 022, Teacher Monitoring Written Work, is used to indicate that the teacher is actively involved in observing students as they do seatwork.

Variables 023 through 025, All Written Work (023), Students Read Aloud (024), and Teacher Reads Aloud (025), are grouped together to denote non-interactive instructional activities. According to Stallings and Kaskowitz (1974), too much time spent on students doing written work or too much time spent by the teacher reading or student silent reading are negatively correlated to student learning gains.

Variable 026, Teacher Working Alone, denotes how much time is spent by the teacher working alone while the students are present in class. The teacher could be involved in any number of non-instructional activities such as grading

papers, putting up a bulletin board or rearranging a portion of the room. This type of behavior is not making good use of instructional time.

Variables 027 and 028, Intrusions (027) and Teacher Involved with a Visitor (028), are grouped together because this type of behavior has a direct effect on the teacher's instructional time and creates a situation for decreased teacher supervision of his/her students. These types of situations lead to off-task behavior which is undesirable in a classroom.

Variables 029 through 030, Positive Interactions (029) and Negative Interactions (030), are grouped together because these activities describe verbal and nonverbal responses or interactions.

Variables 031 and 032, Teacher Touching (031) and Teacher Movement (032), are nonverbal interactions and behaviors on the part of the teacher being observed. The criterion measures for these items denote a very small percentage of a teacher's time should be spent on this type of behavior; however this behavior should not be nonexistent. For the purpose of this study, these variables will not be used.

Variable 033, All Activity-Related Comments or Actions, refers to responses and interactions taking place between the teacher and students during the classroom period that are directly related to instruction. This variable is directly

interrelated with other variables such as academic questioning and student responses.

Variables 034 through 037, Student Organizing Comments (034), Student Academic Comments (035), Teacher Organizing Comments (036), and Teacher Academic Comments (037) are grouped together because all contain the common thread of teacher or student comments. The coder must pay close attention to these comments so as to indicate whether the comment was instruction (academic) related or organization (management) related.

Variable 038, Students Academic Discussion, is conditioned in this study by the subject and grade level of students. The amount of student discussion taking place in the classroom is hopefully teacher directed and controlled academic discussion. Because this variable is still being validated, it will not be used in this study.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher will use the first five (5) variables to assess teacher effectiveness for which variables six (006) through thirty-eight (038) are subsets.

SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES

The specific hypotheses that relate to the general hypothesis listed earlier in the introduction to this study are stated below. The following hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

HYPOTHESIS 1:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable one (001) which is " All Academic Statements".

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable one (001) which is "All Academic Statements".

HYPOTHESIS 2:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the scores on the experimental group and the scores on the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable two (002) which is " All Organizing and Managing Statements".

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable two (002) which is "All Organizing and Managing Statements".

HYPOTHESIS 3:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable three (003) which is "All Behavior Statements".

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable three (003) which is "All Behavior Statements".

HYPOTHESIS 4:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable four (004) which is "All Social Statements".

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable four (004) which is "All Social Statements".

HYPOTHESIS 5:

There will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable five (005) which is the "Total of All Statements in Variables One (001) through Four (004)".

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable five (005) which is "Total of All Statements in Variables One (001) through (Four (004))".

RESEARCH QUESTION

This study will answer one (1) research question in addition to the five (5) specific hypotheses stated earlier: Can teacher effectiveness characteristics of vocational secondary teachers be identified and significant improvements made through the Stallings Intervention Technique?

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study is basically a design whereby an experimental group has received some type of treatment and is compared to a control group which has not received any treatment. The primary purpose of this type of design was to determine what effect the treatment would have upon the experimental group.

The raw deviation scores from the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) for each subject involved in this investigation were entered on an IBM computer terminal which was tied in to a main frame IBM computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program and the IBM computer at Hampton City Public Schools in Hampton, Virginia, were used as the sources for obtaining the statistical computations for this study. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer program was also utilized as a back-up source for confirming the SPSS results.

Analysis of covariance using pretest scores as a covariate of the posttest scores was used to determine the significance of each hypothesis concerning the variables, Academic Statements (001), Organizing or Managing Statements,

(002) Behavior Statements (003), Social Statements (004), and a Profile Total (005). A probability level of .05 was regarded as acceptable for determining statistical significance in order to accept or reject the null hypothesis for each of the five (5) posed hypotheses in this study.

SETTING

This study was conducted in the school system of York County, Virginia.

York County is located in the Tidewater area of Virginia and is part of the heart of Colonial America. Yorktown, the seat of local government, borders the Revolutionary battlefields where the British, in surrendering to General Washington, effectively ended the war. In sharing the peninsula between the James River and the York River with the cities of Hampton, Newport News, and Williamsburg, York County also shares the economic health of the Tidewater area. The county has moved rapidly from a rural community to a suburban area and is assuming more and more urban characteristics. County residents work throughout the peninsula in many governmental and military operations, including one of the largest shipbuilding yards in the world.

York County has nine (9) elementary schools (K-6) with an enrollment of approximately 4,000; three (3) intermediate schools (7-8) with approximately 2,000 students; and three (3) high schools (9-12) with approximately 2,650 students.

All of the schools in the division are accredited by the

State Board of Education and by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and about seventy-five (75%) of those graduating go on to some kind of post-high school training.

Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Superintendent of York County Schools, Dr. Judith D. Whittemore and the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, Dr. Walter L. Gant. At a conference with the superintendent and assistant superintendent, the purpose of the investigation was explained. The most feasible method for collecting the data in York County schools was also discussed. The superintendent was very interested in the results of this study because if results were significant, the Stallings intervention program would be instituted throughout York County schools.

SUMMARY

Chapter III has served as an explanation concerning how and what procedures were used in this study to interpret the SOI teacher profiles taken from a sample of vocational teachers. From this analysis and assessment, there were four (4) teacher effectiveness inservice sessions held utilizing the Stallings training materials for each teacher in the treatment group based on the resultant needs indicated from the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI). Once the four (4) Stallings improvement workshops for each teacher in the treatment group were held, all sixteen (16) teachers were observed again, which was approximately three (3) months

following the initial observation. An analysis of covariance using pretest scores as the covariate was used to determine whether or not the Stallings intervention inservice workshops increased teacher effectiveness. A time line showing when preobservations, inservice training sessions, and postobservations transpired for this study are listed in Appendix E.

Chapter IV will present the findings of this study. An analysis will be reported with respect to furnishing evidence for each hypothesis posed earlier in this investigation.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

AND

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effects of the Stallings Intervention Technique on vocational teachers. The treatment intervention in this study was to involve vocational teachers in the experimental group to four (4) Stallings inservice workshops (Appendix G). These workshops were designed by Jane Stallings (1980) to improve teacher effectiveness.

Hypotheses were formulated concerning possible differences between the experimental and the control group after the experimental group completed the Stallings inservice workshops taught by certified coders in the Stallings Intervention Technique. The dependent variable in all hypotheses was the posttest scores on the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI). There are five (5) independent variables in this study which are: (1) All Academic Statements; (2) All Organizing and Managing Statements; (3) All Behavior Statements; (4) All Social Statements; and (5) A Total of Variables One (1) through Four (4). Variables one (1) through five (5) are considered primary variables of the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI).

Chapter IV includes the restatement of the null hypotheses, the report on the results of, and the analyses of the findings in relation to the hypotheses.

The data gathered on the five (5) hypotheses stated in Chapter III of this study were tabulated. Results were based on the comparison of eight (8) treatment group vocational teachers and eight (8) control group vocational teachers. All of the original randomly selected treatment group teachers participated in the Stallings intervention program during the 1986-87 school year from September through December. Control group teachers included those who were eligible but did not receive the Stallings inservice workshops.

TEST OF HYPOTHESES

The analysis of covariance was the statistical measure utilized to test each of the five (5) hypotheses. The pretest was used as a covariate of the posttest. The .05 level of significance was selected as the difference to be regarded as significant between the groups.

HYPOTHESIS 1

Null Hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable one (001) which is " All Academic Statements".

Results:

The results relevant to Hypothesis 1 are presented in Table 1.

Analysis of Findings:

An F-ratio of .622 was obtained for the variable one (1) posttest differences. The ratio obtained yielded a significance level at the .445 level for the group posttest differences. The analysis after inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 showed there was no significant difference in teacher effectiveness between the control and experimental groups.

The results of the pretest analysis on variable one (1) prior to inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups. The significance of "F" on the pretest was .033 which indicated that the two (2) groups were significantly different. Therefore, it appears that the control group performed better on the pretest on variable one (1) than the experimental group before inservice training.

Table 1 shows that an analysis of covariance using the pretest as a covariate of differences in posttest scores was utilized. This data reveals that the Stallings Intervention Technique as measured on the SOI resulted in no significant difference in the two (2) groups.

Therefore, null hypothesis 1 was accepted.

TABLE 1

Analysis of covariance, using the pretest as a covariate, of differences in posttest scores on variable 001: All Academic Statements.

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIFICANCE OF F
Covariates (Variable 001- pretest)	604.908	1	604.908	5.689	.033
Main Effects (group)	66.093	1	66.093	.622	.445
Explained	671.001	2	335.500	3.156	.076
Residual	1382.179	13	106.321		
TOTAL	2053.180	15	136.879		

HYPOTHESIS 2

Null Hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable two (002) which is "All Organizing or Managing Statements".

Results:

The results relevant to Hypothesis 2 are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of Findings:

An F-ratio of .662 was obtained for the variable two (002) posttest differences. The ratio obtained yielded a significance level at the .445 level for the group posttest differences. The analysis after inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 showed no significant difference in teacher effectiveness between the control and experimental groups.

The results of the pretest analysis on variable two (002) prior to inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups. The significance of "F" on the pretest was .040 which indicated that the two (2) groups were significantly different. Therefore, it appears that the control group performed better on the pretest on variable two (002) than the experimental group before inservice training.

Table 2 shows that an analysis of covariance on the

TABLE 2

Analysis of covariance, using the pretest as a covariate, of differences in posttest scores on variable 002: All Organizing or Managing Statements.

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIFICANCE OF F
Covariates (Variable 002- pretest)	496.731	1	496.731	5.181	.040
Main Effects (group)	66.093	1	66.093	.622	.445
Explained	671.001	2	335.500	3.156	.076
Residual	1382.179	13	106.321		
TOTAL	2053.180	15	136.879		

effects of the Stallings inservice training on teacher effectiveness as measured by the SOI using pretest and posttest scores resulted in no significant difference.

Therefore, Null Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

HYPOTHESIS 3

Null Hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable three (003) which is "All Behavior Statements".

Results:

The results relevant to Hypothesis 3 are presented in Table 3.

Analysis of Findings:

An F-ratio of .554 was obtained for the variable three (003) posttest difference. The ratio obtained yielded a significance level at the .470 level for the group posttest differences. The analysis after inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 showed no significant difference in teacher effectiveness between the control and experimental groups.

The results of the pretest analysis on variable three (003) prior to inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups. The significance of "F" on the pretest was .393 which indicated that the two (2) groups

TABLE 3

Analysis of covariance, using the pretest
as a covariate, of differences in posttest scores
on variable 003: All Behavior Statements.

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIFICANCE OF F
Covariates (Variable 003- pretest)	2.010	1	2.010	.780	.393
Main Effects (group)	1.429	1	1.429	.554	.470
Explained	3.439	2	1.719	.667	.530
Residual	33.512	13	2.578		
TOTAL	36.951	15	2.463		

were different. Therefore, it appears that the control group performed better on the pretest on variable three (003) than the experimental group before inservice training.

Table 3 shows that an analysis of covariance on the effects of the Stallings inservice training on teacher effectiveness as measured by the SOI using pretest and posttest scores resulted in no significant difference.

Therefore, Null Hypothesis 3 was accepted.

HYPOTHESIS 4

Null Hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable four (004) which is "All Social Statements".

Results:

The results relevant to Hypothesis 4 are presented in Table 4.

Analysis of Findings:

An F-ratio of 3.351 was obtained for the variable four (004) posttest difference. The ratio obtained yielded a significance level at the .090 level for the group posttest differences. The analysis after inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 showed no significant difference in teacher effectiveness between the control and experimental groups.

The results of the pretest analysis on variable four

TABLE 4

Analysis of covariance, using the pretest
 as a covariate of differences in posttest scores
 on variable 004: All Social Statements.

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIFICANCE OF F
Covariates (Variable 004- pretest)	1.684	1	1.684	3.580	.081
Main Effects (group)	1.567	1	1.567	3.351	.090
Explained	3.260	2	1.630	3.466	.062
Residual	6.115	13	.470		
TOTAL	9.375	15	.625		

(004) prior to inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the groups. The significance of "F" on the pretest was .081 which indicated that the two groups were not different. Therefore, it appears that the control group's and experimental group's performance on the pretest on variable four (004) was not significantly different, unlike variables one(001), two(002), and three(003).

Table 4 shows that an analysis of covariance using the pretest as a covariate of differences in posttest scores was utilized. This data reveals that the Stallings Intervention Technique as measured on the SOI resulted in no significant difference in the two (2) groups.

Therefore, Null Hypothesis 4 was accepted.

HYPOTHESIS 5

Null Hypothesis: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the scores of the control group after controlling for the pretest differences on variable five (005) which is "A Total of Variables One (001) through Four (004)".

Results:

The results relevant to Hypothesis 5 are presented in Table 5.

Analysis of Findings:

An F-ratio of .498 was obtained for the variable five (005) posttest difference. The ratio obtained yielded a

TABLE 5

Analysis of covariance, using the pretest as a covariate, of differences in posttest scores on Variable 005: A Total of Variables 001 through 004.

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIFICANCE OF F
Covariates (Variable 005- pretest)	.051	1	.051	8.199	.013
Main Effects (group)	.003	1	.003	.498	.498
Explained	.054	2	.027	4.349	.036
Residual	.081	13	.006		
TOTAL	.135	15	.009		

significance level at the .493 level for the group posttest differences. The analysis after inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 showed no overall significant difference in the two (2) groups. Those teachers who received inservice training did not become significantly more effective teachers than those teachers who did not receive inservice training.

The results of the pretest analysis on variable five (5) prior to inservice training using the SOI with an alpha level of .05 shows that there was an overall statistically significant difference between the groups. The significance of "F" on the pretest was .013 which indicated that overall the two (2) groups were different. It appears that generally the control group performed better on the pretest variables than the experimental group before inservice training.

Table 5 shows that an analysis of covariance on the effects of the Stallings inservice training on teacher effectiveness as measured by the SOI using pretest and posttest scores resulted in no significant difference. Overall the experimental group did not improve significantly after inservice training on all variables over the control group.

Therefore, null hypothesis 5 was accepted.

REPORTED FINDINGS FOR THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The results of this study will be presented for the

stated research question in addition to five (5) specific hypotheses.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

Can teacher effectiveness characteristics of vocational teachers be identified and significant improvements made through the Stallings Intervention Technique?

Each dependent variable was exposed to an analysis of covariance using the pretest as a covariate of the posttest. The alpha level of significance was set at .05.

The results of the posttest analyses of this study indicate that teacher effectiveness characteristics can be identified through the use of certified coders utilizing the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI).

The posttest analyses for variables one (001) through five (005) are presented in Tables 1 through 5. It was found that no statistically significant differences in teacher effectiveness existed between the control group and the experimental group. Therefore, the results show that no significant improvements in teacher effectiveness are made through the use of the Stallings Intervention Technique.

SUMMARY

The data obtained in this study was used to determine if vocational teachers in the experimental group were more effective teachers than those in the control group after

the Stallings Intervention Technique. Each vocational teacher was observed in September 1986 prior to inservice training and observed again in December 1986 after inservice training. A pretest analysis was conducted to determine whether the experimental and control groups were different at the outset of the study prior to training. An analysis of covariance, using the pretest as a covariate of the posttest on five (5) different variables was performed to determine the actual effects of the Stallings inservice training on vocational teachers.

The data obtained in this study indicates that vocational teachers in the experimental group who were exposed to the Stallings inservice workshops did not become more effective teachers than teachers in the control group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The final chapter of this study contains four (4) sections which include a summary of the research investigation, conclusions made based upon the actual findings, recommendations, and implications concerning the Stallings Intervention Technique for further research.

SUMMARY

Purpose

The primary purpose of the study was to determine if participation in an experimental based intervention program for teacher effectiveness would enable vocational teachers to improve their effectiveness as classroom teachers as measured by the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI).

Treatment

The Stallings Intervention Technique, designed and developed by Jane Stallings (1980), was used as the treatment for this research investigation. The Stallings Intervention Technique consisted of four (4) individual inservice workshops held over a three (3) month period and through involvement in these workshops, the vocational teachers were exposed to teacher effectiveness characteristics. The study

was designed to determine whether or not the Stallings Intervention Technique could improve vocational teacher effectiveness. The Stallings inservice workshops were designed to create an awareness and provide information on how to improve a teacher's classroom effectiveness. The goal of the Stallings program was to provide inservice training to teachers so that posttest scores on the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) would significantly improve over the scores of the control group.

Measure

The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) profile score was used as the dependent measure in this study. The SOI measures the amount of time during a class period that a teacher utilized the primary variables: All Academic Statements (001), All Organizing or Managing Statements (002), All Behavior Statements (003), and All Social Statements (004), that are critical in effective teaching today.

A basic assumption of the researcher who developed the SOI was that a teacher's level of effectiveness develops over time with the proper training. It is the aim of the SOI to measure this level of teacher effectiveness in individuals and groups at any point in a teacher's career.

Design

The design of this study is experimental research. Sixteen (16) randomly selected teachers were divided into two

(2) groups by random assignment, a control group and a treatment group, consisting of eight (8) persons per group. The Stallings inservice workshops provided the treatment for this study. The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) was used to assess teacher effectiveness characteristics on the pretest and the posttest.

Procedure

The population for the study was comprised of sixteen (16) vocational secondary teachers from the York County, Virginia school district who verbally agreed to participate in this investigation. Those sixteen (16) teachers were randomly selected with random assignment by groups. The treatment group and the control group consisted of eight (8) teachers which included three (3) Business Education, one (1) Marketing Education, three (3) Technology Education, and one (1) Trade and Industrial Education teacher(s).

A pretest, utilizing the Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) was administered during the third week of school in September to both the treatment and control groups. The Stallings inservice workshops were conducted over the next three (3) months of school to the treatment group.

Teachers in the control group experienced none of the workshops in which teachers in the experimental group were involved. The posttest was administered to both the experimental and control groups during the second week in December.

CONCLUSIONS

There are two (2) primary conclusions that can be drawn from this study based on the data collected. First, it can be concluded that the Stallings Intervention Technique did not improve teacher effectiveness appreciably on the teachers who participated in this study. There certainly was not a statistically significant difference in the two (2) groups upon completion of the experiment. Secondly, a school district should be very careful concerning spending local funds on the Stallings program materials. A similar experimental study should be conducted locally to determine if the teachers respond positively to the Stallings intervention technique before the materials are purchased.

Analysis and Results

Analysis of covariance was utilized as the statistical procedure to determine treatment effects using the pretest as a covariate of the posttest. Differences in posttest results were regarded as significant for $p < .05$.

The following results were obtained in this study:

(1) No significant difference ($p > .05$) was found between the experimental group and the control group on the SOI posttest of each variable in the study, including: All Academic Statements, All Organizing and Managing Statements, All Behavior Statements, All Social Statements, and the Total of Variables One (1) through Four (4). It was concluded that teacher participation in the Stallings Intervention Technique

did not significantly enable teachers to possess more effective teaching characteristics than teachers in the control group.

(2) The experimental group's SOI scores did not improve significantly compared to the control group on all five (5) primary variables in this study.

(3) A significant difference ($p < .05$) was found between the experimental group and the control group on the SOI pretest of variables one (1), two (2), and three (3), All Academic Statements, All Organizing and Managing Statements, and All Behavior Statements. It was concluded that those teachers in the control group scored better on the pretest on variables one (1), two (2), and three (3) than did those in the experimental group.

(4) No significant difference ($p > .05$) was found between the experimental and control groups on the SOI pretest of variables four (4) and five (5), All Social Statements and a Total of Variables One (1) through Four (4).

(5) Cross tabulations were formulated on variables one (1) through five (5) which primarily confirmed that the previous data resulted in no significant difference in each variable on the pretest and posttest.

(6) The input data used on the SPSS and SAS statistical programs did indicate that on variables one (1) through four (4) the mean deviation scores for the experimental group on the posttest more closely resembled the scores of the control

group. There was a slight treatment effect because, for example, on variable two (2) the groups started out on the pretest with almost a four (4) point difference. At the end of the study on the posttest, the experimental group came closer to the control group's score. There was, however, no statistically significant effect that the treatment had on the experimental group.

RIVAL EXPLANATIONS

There are rival explanations that connote why the results of this study were not significant.

(1) As an artifact of the researcher's sampling procedure, the study may have had more significant results if all subjects were randomly assigned to equal groups based on pretest scores.

(2) Some of the teachers in the experimental group individually exhibited good teaching behaviors on the SOI. As a group, however, the sample was small and the results did not reflect effective teaching because of one subject's extremely low score.

(3) One subject in the experimental group appeared as an "outlier" because of a visitor in the classroom during the observation, thus dragging the mean below zero on the SOI.

(4) One observation score was extremely low on the posttest which created a negative effect on the experimental group mean.

(5) The treatment in this study helped some members of

the experimental group but was not powerful enough to overcome the initial difference in the groups.

(6) There is a possible latent effect present in this study. Teachers in the control group may have some dormant or previous knowledge that increased their posttest scores without the Stallings program.

(7) There was a "fan effect" in this study. The two (2) groups were unequal on the pretest. Subsequently, posttest results revealed that the treatment tended to move the groups further away.

(8) The total sample size for the experimental and control groups (eight (8) per group) was small even though this represented fifty percent (50%) of the vocational teachers in York County. Given this, one deviant score would have a greater impact on the group mean.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the findings in this study, some recommendations may be made for further study and research:

(1) Since the Stallings Intervention Technique is an exemplary program in that a few school systems are actually using the materials and it has not been thoroughly evaluated, further studies should be carried out to determine its effectiveness with other populations in other school settings.

(2) Similar studies could be conducted with a larger number of teachers and over a longer period of time. This may add credibility to the assertion that providing inservice

workshops to teachers to improve their effectiveness would make a difference. During a longer period of time, more practice from information learned in workshops and more observations could occur. Teachers could have more time to try out more strategies for improvement. The effects of the inservice workshops may provide more significant results than did this investigation.

(3) Similar studies should conduct a mini-course on the aims and objectives of the Stallings Intervention Technique to teachers and administrators as part of the orientation to the use of the Stallings program.

(4) Evaluation studies need to be conducted assessing the effectiveness of other techniques designed specifically to increase teacher effectiveness. The Stallings model is not the sole model program on the market which is aimed at increasing a teacher's effectiveness in the classroom.

(5) Similar studies could recruit trained teachers to analyze their own classes through the use of the Stallings coding technique. Having teachers view themselves through the use of an SOI with understanding might increase their own scores on the posttest.

IMPLICATIONS

The Stallings Intervention Technique appears to be an all-purpose series of workshops aimed at teacher effectiveness improvement. The Stallings workshops would be

a success at improving a teacher's effectiveness for those teachers who have the ability to improve and would probably not improve a teacher's effectiveness for those who are indifferent toward the inservice workshops or do not have the ability to change. This researcher speculates that the workshops did help some teachers in the study based on slight increases in posttest scores.

However, according to workshop trainers several of the teachers in the experimental group were defensive about the Stallings workshop materials. All of the experimental group teachers did not respond positively towards the Stallings Intervention Technique and this implies that there may be a legitimate reason to question the use of the Stallings program in some school districts.

This researcher feels that the outcome of this study was not significant because teachers in the York County School System may be better than average across the state. This researcher speculates that the teachers in this study may already have reached or gone beyond the level of effectiveness presented in the Stallings workshops. Further explanation of this statement is provided in the Summary statement.

The Stallings Observation Instrument (SOI) identifies weaknesses and strengths of a teacher according to Jane Stallings. In order for teachers to improve their SOI scores, i.e. their effectiveness as teachers, they must not only be provided the knowledge and information on how to

improve, they must also have the ability and want to change and improve. It appears that often teachers who need to change or become more effective do not think they are "bad" or ineffective and, therefore, may be turned off at the results of an SOI profile that reveals their weaknesses.

DISCUSSION

There was a slight treatment effect in this study. The experimental group's point difference in variable two (002), for example, decreased from a .9 mean deviation from the criterion to a .6 on the posttest. The deviation score came closer to the criterion; however, the treatment was not validated and there was no strong treatment effect, only an insignificant increase. On the pretest the two (2) groups' scores were so far apart that after the inservice workshops, the posttest scores had a fan effect.

A "good" teacher or more effective teacher can recall to an observer what sequence of events occurred in his/her classroom. For example, an especially noisy area of students whose behavior was corrected by the use of a behavior statement will be remembered; whereas, an ineffective teacher will lecture to the class and not notice that the students in the right rear of the room were holding their own conversation about last weekend's football game. The ineffective teacher often gets so wrapped up in what he/she is teaching that he/she almost forgets the class is there. This type of activity appears as a weakness on the

individual's SOI profile. Since the SOI profile shows by means of a raw score exactly all activities that occurred during the class period, this could have a negative effect. Through the Stallings workshops, the ineffective teacher would become defensive, while the teacher who wants to improve will become aware of improvements that can be made.

The treatment tended to move the experimental group towards becoming more like the control group at the outset of the study. The pretest differences in the group at the outset of this study may in fact be due to certain teachers attitudes toward inservice workshops in the experimental group.

This research investigation entitled "An Evaluation of a Staff Assessment Model to Improve Teacher Effectiveness Utilizing the Stallings Intervention Technique" was conducted for the purpose of inquiry on a specific teacher effectiveness model. Although this investigation did not produce significant positive results, this study should not become the sole indicator of the future effects of the Jane Stallings (1980) intervention program. We as educators are constantly in search of a solution or program that will enable us to become more effective teachers. It is the desire of the researcher that this study will inspire or cause others to search for that "right" program or technique

or inservice workshop that does motivate all educators to become more effective teachers.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

In summary, the Stallings Intervention Technique may be valuable in some school districts where there is a wide range of effective teachers. However, this study did not find the Stallings program useful in York County. This may be due to the fact that teachers in York County are carefully selected because there are many candidates for each vacancy and the teachers are among the highest paid in Virginia. Since the salary scale and the location are both very desirable, York County is able to attract highly qualified teachers. Most York County teachers have gone beyond the level of needing a great deal of direction in becoming more effective in the classroom.

In essence, if a teacher is already past the point of needing the Stallings workshop materials, there will be very little improvement shown in an experimental study situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acheson, Keith A., & Gall, Meredith Damien. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers. Preservice and Inservice Applications. Longman, Inc., 1980, 198.
- Adolf, Jane W. An Examination of Stallings' "Implementation and Child Effects of Teaching Practices in Follow Through Classrooms", 1983.
- Airasian, P., Madaus, G., & Rakow, E. "Assessing School and Program Effectiveness: Estimating Teacher Level Effects." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1978, 15, 15-21.
- Apple, Michael W. "Educational Evaluation: Analysis and Responsibility." Paper presented at the Conference on Evaluation, Madison, Wisconsin, April 1973, 350.
- Arends, R., & Hersh, R. Conditions for Promoting Effective Staff Development. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, DC, February 1980.
- Beach, Don M., & Reinhartz, Judy. "Using Criteria of Effective Teaching to Judge Teacher Performance." NASSP Bulletin, November 1984, 31-37.
- Berliner, D. "Using Research on Teaching for the Improvement of Classroom Practice." Theory Into Practice, 1980, 9, 302-307.
- Biddle, B., & Ellena, W. "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness." In B. J. Biddle & W. J. Ellena, eds. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, 1964.
- Broudy, H. "Can We Define Good Teaching?" Teachers College Record, April 1969, 583.
- Carfield, Rebecca D., & Walter, James K. "Teacher Evaluation and RIF--Can There Be Peaceful Coexistence?" NASSP Bulletin, November 1984, 48-53.
- Coatney, Richard P. "The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study: Further Examination of Educational Implications." Journal of Research and Development in Education, June 1985, 44-48.
- Duke, D. "Developing a Comprehensive Inservice Program for School Improvement." NASSP Journal, 1977, 61, 66-71.

- Englert, Carol Sue. "Measuring Teacher Effectiveness from the Teacher's Point of View." Focus on Exceptional Children, October 1984, 1-15.
- Good, T., Biddle, B., & Brophy, J. Teachers Make a Difference, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1975.
- Green, Edward F. & Others. "The Need for Interpersonal Skill Training and Supervision." NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, 23-30.
- Heywood, John. Pitfalls and Planning in Student Teaching. United Kingdom, England. New York: Nichols Publishing Company, 1982, 200.
- Holly, M. "Teachers' Views on Inservice Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 63, 417-418.
- Hunter, M. "Teaching Is Decision Making." Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 62-67.
- Kratz, H. E. "Characteristics of the Best Teachers as Recognized by Children." Pedagogical Seminary, 1896, 3, 413-418.
- Kyriacou, Chris, & McKelvy, Joyce. "An Exploration of Individual Differences in 'Effective' Teaching." Educational Review, June 1985, 13-17.
- Levin, Tamar, & Long, Ruth. "Effective Instruction." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA, 1981.
- Lyte, J. "Pennsylvania's Pioneering Program of Inservice Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 267-270.
- McDonald, F., & Elias, P. "The Effects of Teacher Performance on Pupil Learning." Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study: Phase II, Final Report. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1976.
- McKelvey, Joyce & Kyriacou, Chris. "Research on Pupils as Teacher Evaluators." Educational Studies, 1985, 25-31.
- Medley, D. Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

- Medley, Donald M.. "Research in Teacher Effectiveness - Where It Is and How It Got Here." The Journal of Classroom Interaction. U. VA., Vol. 13, No. 2, 1978.
- Meehan, Merrill L. Evaluation of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Demonstration Project in Putnam County, West Virginia. National Institute of Education (ED), Washington, DC, 1981.
- Ornstein, A., & Levine, D. "Teacher Behavior Research: Overview and Outlook." Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 62, 592.
- Read, Donald A., & Greene, Walter H. Creative Teaching in Health. Second Edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
- Reed, Rodney L. Questioning and Its Implications for Educational Research. Australia, May 1979.
- Rosenshine, B. "Content, Time, and Direct Instruction." In Peterson and Walberg, eds. Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979.
- Rosenholtz, Susan J. "Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence." American Journal of Education, May 1985. 352-388.
- Sherman, Helene J. "Soundoff: Attention and Interest-- Are You Teaching Without Them?" Mathematics Teacher, April 1985, 232, 234.
- Smith, Richard B. "The Sufficiency of Different Approaches to Constructing Behavioral Objectives for the Improvement of Instruction." 1977, 17.
- Sportsman, M. "What's Wrong With Inservice." Curriculum Review, September 1981, 307-311.
- Squires, David D. "Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective." National Institute of Education (ED), Washington, DC, 1983, 142.
- Stallings, Jane. "Allocated Learning Time Revisited, or Beyond Time-On-Task." Educational Researcher, 1980, 11, 11-16.
- Stallings, Jane. "A Study of Implementation of Madeline Hunter's Model and Its Effects on Students." Journal of Educational Research, July-August 1985, 325-327.

- Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D. "Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation, 1972-1973." SRI Project URU-7370. Menlo Park, CA: Sanford Research Inst. 1974.
- Stallings, J., Needels, M., & Staybrook, N. "How to Change the Process of Teaching Basic Skills in Secondary Schools." Phase II Report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1979.
- Stallings, J., Needels, M., & Staybrook, N. "How to Change the Process of Teaching Basic Skills in Secondary Schools." Phase III Report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1979.
- Sullivan, Debra K., & Others. "Implementation of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Demonstration Project in Putnam County, West Virginia." Appalachia Education Lab, 1981.
- Sullivan, Howard, & Higgins, Norman. "Teaching for Competence." US New York. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, 1983, 104.
- Trentham, Landa, & Others. "Teacher Efficacy and Teacher Competency Ratings." Psychology in the Schools. July 1985, 343-352.
- Tursman, Cindy. "Good Teachers: What to Look For." Education USA Special Report. National Schools Public Relations Association, 1981, 101.
- Urbanski, Adam. "Lessons Learned from Evaluating Administrators." Education Week, Marion, Ohio, February 26, 1986, 24.
- Waters, Cheryl M., & Wyatt, Terry L. "Toledo's Internship: The Teachers' Role in Excellence." Phi Delta Kappan, Jan. 1985, 365-367.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL TEACHER PROFILE

INDIVIDUAL TEACHER PROFILE

FORM PROFILE

TEACHER NAME: ** NAME NOT GIVEN ** K K
TEACHER NUMBER: 000013

BASIC SKILLS TEACHER PROFILE

09/30/86

PAGE

13

VARIABLES	LESS										GREATER										CRITERION	YOUR CLASS	
	2111111111	1000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000	0000000000			0000000000
001 ALL ACADEMIC STATEMENTS																					20.00	91.02	
002 ALL ORGANIZING OR MANAGING STATEMENTS	X																				15.00	6.53	
003 ALL BEHAVIOR STATEMENTS				X																	3.00	.91	
004 ALL SOCIAL STATEMENTS					X																2.00	1.63	
005 TOTAL						X															100.00	100.00	
006 TEACHER INSTRUCTS/EXPLAINS																	X				12.00	20.40	
007 TEACHER ASKS DIRECT QUESTIONS OR COMMANDS																X					10.00	14.28	
008 TEACHER ASKS CLARIFYING QUESTIONS					X																3.00	.00	
009 TEACHER ASKS OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS					X																3.00	.40	
010 STUDENT ASKS ACADEMIC QUESTIONS																X					2.00	6.53	
011 TEACHER CALLS UPON NEW STUDENTS (ACADEMIC)						X															6.00	4.89	
012 STUDENTS RESPOND ACADEMICALLY					X																15.00	12.24	
013 STUDENT SHOUT-OUTS/INITIATES REMARKS											X										.00	3.26	
014 STUDENT DOESN'T KNOW ANSWER							X														1.00	1.22	
015 STUDENT REFUSES TO ANSWER								X													.00	.00	
016 ALL PRAISE					X																8.00	5.71	
017 TEACHER PRAISES OR SUPPORTS ACADEMIC RESPONSES						X															6.00	5.71	
018 TEACHER PRAISES BEHAVIOR							X														2.00	.00	
019 TEACHER CORRECTS ACADEMIC RESPONSES						X															6.00	2.04	
020 TEACHER CORRECTS WITH GUIDANCE							X														4.00	2.04	
021 TEACHER CORRECTS BEHAVIOR								X													2.00	.40	
022 TEACHER MONITORING ACADEMIC WORK								X													6.00	4.89	
023 ALL WRITTEN WORK																	X				.00	7.34	
024 STUDENTS READ ALOUD																					10.00	.81	
025 TEACHER READS ALOUD	X																				1.00	4.08	
026 TEACHER WORKING ALONE																X					3.00	2.04	
027 INTRUSIONS																	X				.00	.40	
028 TEACHER INVOLVED WITH VISITOR																		X			.00	.00	
029 POSITIVE INTERACTIONS					X																4.00	.40	
030 NEGATIVE INTERACTIONS																					.00	.00	
031 TEACHER TOUCHING						X															9.00	.00	
032 TEACHER MOVEMENT							X														3.00	.00	
033 ALL ACTIVITY-RELATED COMMENTS OR ACTIONS																					16.00	24.08	
034 STUDENT ORGANIZING COMMENTS																					1.00	.00	
035 STUDENT ACADEMIC COMMENTS								X													3.00	1.22	
036 TEACHER ORGANIZING COMMENTS									X												5.00	4.89	
037 TEACHER ACADEMIC COMMENTS																					7.00	17.95	
038 STUDENTS ACADEMIC DISCUSSION																					.00	.00	
TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERACTIONS FOR TEACHER																						245	

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

VARIABLE NAMES

APPENDIX B

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>CRITERION</u>		<u>FREQUENCY</u>
		<u>(Low)</u>	<u>(High)</u>	
Major Variables				
1	All Academic Statements		80	_____
2	All Organizing or Managing Statements..		15	_____
3	All Behavior Statements		3	_____
4	All Social Statements		2	_____
5	(Open - Space Holder)		100%	_____
Subset of Variables				
6	Teacher Instructs/Explains	()	-12-(20)	_____
7	Teacher Asks Direct Questions or Commands	()	-10-(20)	_____
8	Teacher Asks Clarifying Questions	()	- 3-(10)	_____
9	All Open Ended Questions	()	- 3-(10)	_____
10	Student Asks Academic Questions	()	- 2-(5)	_____
11	Teacher Calls Upon New Students (Academic)	()	- 6-(10)	_____
12	Students Respond Academically	()	-15-(21)	_____
13	Student Initiates Comment/Response	()	- 0-(2)	_____
14	Student Doesn't Know Answer	()	- 1-()	_____
15	Student Refuses to Answer.....	()	- 0-()	_____
16	All Praise.....	()	- 8-(16)	_____
17	Teacher Praises or Supports Academic Responses.....	()	- 6-(16)	_____
18	Teacher Praises Behavior.....	()	- 2-()	_____
19	Teacher Corrects Academic Response.....	()	- 6-(10)	_____
20	Teacher Corrects Academic Response with Guidance.....	()	- 4-(8)	_____
21	Teacher Corrects Behavior.....	(0)	- 2-()	_____

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>CRITERION</u> (Low) (High)	<u>FREQUENCY</u>
Major Variables			
22	Teacher Monitoring Written Work.....	(4)- 6-(8)	_____
23	*All Written Work		
24	*Students Read Aloud.....	()-10-()	_____
25	*Teacher Reads Aloud.....	()- 1-(5)	_____
26	Teacher Working Alone.....	()- 3-(5)	_____
27	Intrusions.....	()- 0-()	_____
28	Teacher Involved with Visitor.....	()- 0-()	_____
29	Positive Interactions.....	(1)- 4-()	_____
30	Negative Interactions.....	()- 0-()	_____
31	Teacher Touching.....	(0)- 5-()	_____
32	Teacher Movement.....	(2)- 3-(5)	_____
33	All Activity-Related Comments or Actions.....	()-16-(26)	_____
34	Student Organizing Comments.....	()- 1-(2)	_____
35	Student Academic Comments.....	()- 3-(10)	_____
36	Teacher Organizing Comments.....	()- 5-(10)	_____
37	Teacher Academic Comments.....	()- 7-(17)	_____
38	*Students Academic Discussion.....	()- 0-()	_____

* Unspecified: Conditioned by Subject and Grade Level.

APPENDIX C

GROUP PROFILE

GROUP PROFILE

SAMPLE

BASIC SKILLS TEACHER PROFILE

PGM-PROFILE VARIABLES	FREQ	MEAN	STD DEV	PERCENTAGE
TEACHER NUMBER:				
TOTAL NUMBER OF TEACHERS:	58			
001 ALL ACADEMIC STATEMENTS	38125	657.3	195.98	80.48
002 ALL ORGANIZING OR MANAGING STATEMENTS	8045	138.7	104.75	16.98
003 ALL BEHAVIOR STATEMENTS	972	18.8	18.34	2.05
004 ALL SOCIAL STATEMENTS	219	3.8	7.60	.48
005 TOTAL	47361	818.8	198.10	99.96
008 TEACHER INSTRUCTS/EXPLAINS	9112	157.1	117.87	19.23
007 TEACHER ASKS DIRECT QUESTIONS OR COMMANDS	5796	99.9	56.45	12.23
008 TEACHER ASKS CLARIFYING QUESTIONS	208	3.6	5.75	.44
009 TEACHER ASKS OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS	142	2.4	3.84	.30
010 STUDENT ASKS ACADEMIC QUESTIONS	2587	44.6	33.56	5.48
011 TEACHER CALLS UPON NEW STUDENTS (ACADEMIC)	2739	47.2	38.32	5.78
012 STUDENTS RESPOND ACADEMICALLY	5778	99.6	58.02	12.19
013 STUDENT SHUT-OUTS/INITIATES REMARKS	1381	23.8	23.32	2.91
014 STUDENT DOESN'T KNOW ANSWER	189	3.3	4.19	.40
015 STUDENT REFUSES TO ANSWER	5	.1	.43	.01
016 ALL PRAISE	2240	38.6	40.12	4.73
017 TEACHER PRAISES OR SUPPORTS ACADEMIC RESPONSES	2194	37.8	39.31	4.63
018 TEACHER PRAISES BEHAVIOR	11	.2	.78	.02
019 TEACHER CORRECTS ACADEMIC RESPONSES	1058	18.2	16.98	2.23
020 TEACHER CORRECTS WITH GUIDANCE	868	15.0	15.22	1.83
021 TEACHER CORRECTS BEHAVIOR	474	8.2	9.31	1.00
022 TEACHER MONITORING ACADEMIC WORK	2515	43.4	55.55	5.31
023 ALL WRITTEN WORK	1435	24.7	31.26	3.03
024 STUDENTS READ ALOUD	942	16.2	35.22	1.99
025 TEACHER READS ALOUD	312	5.4	10.09	.88
026 TEACHER WORKING ALONE	2932	50.6	67.68	6.19
027 INTRUSIONS	481	8.3	11.27	1.02
028 TEACHER INVOLVED WITH VISITOR	242	4.2	7.66	.51
029 POSITIVE INTERACTIONS	26	.4	1.37	.05
030 NEGATIVE INTERACTIONS	3	.1	.22	.01
031 TEACHER TOUCHING	4	.1	.32	.01
032 TEACHER MOVEMENT	2	.0	.18	.00
033 ALL ACTIVITY-RELATED COMMENTS OR ACTIONS	12116	208.9	116.39	25.57
034 STUDENT ORGANIZING COMMENTS	164	2.8	4.71	.35
035 STUDENT ACADEMIC COMMENTS	1162	20.0	27.82	2.45
036 TEACHER ORGANIZING COMMENTS	5292	91.2	80.51	11.17
037 TEACHER ACADEMIC COMMENTS	5275	90.9	71.00	11.13
038 STUDENTS ACADEMIC DISCUSSION	4	.1	.52	.01
TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERACTIONS	47381			

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

PROCEDURES FOR OBSERVERS/CODERS

APPENDIX D

PROCEDURES FOR OBSERVERS/CODERSI. Scheduling Observation

The researcher will prepare a schedule for the coders. You should call the teachers to be observed on the preceding day to confirm room number, date, and the time of your observation. Ask the teachers if they expect to have a usual day in class. This gives the teacher the opportunity to tell you if some unusual event is occurring at the time the observation is scheduled. Do not observe on field trips or during films or television shows. Ask the teachers to call you in case of illness. Do not observe a substitute. Be certain to call the teachers if you change your schedule. Inform the researcher of any changes in the schedule.

II. Pre-Observation Tasks

Fill in the cover sheet of the observation with the teacher's number, observer's number, etc. (The researcher must assign these numbers to you.)

Take all booklets, pens, and logs you need for the day.

III. Conducting Observations

When conducting observations in classrooms, the observer should be as unobtrusive and nonthreatening as possible. The observer should remember that he or she is a guest in the classroom and that only with the teacher's cooperation will the study be completed as scheduled. Teachers often form impressions about the study from the behavior of the observer; therefore, the observer's behavior is crucial. Some suggestions are presented here which may help observers establish rapport with the teachers.

1. Try to dress in a manner similar to that of the school personnel.
2. Always report to the main office of the school when you arrive. Tell the person who greets you your name, which class(es) you will be visiting, and the purpose of your visit. Also, tell the person that you will return to the office when you have completed the observations.
3. When you first enter the classroom, introduce yourself in a courteous manner. Tell the teacher that you would like to be able to hear and observe as much of the classroom interactions as possible. Ask

the teacher's permission to stand or sit in the location which seems to be most appropriate. Sometimes it will be necessary for you to move around the classroom; ask the teacher whether he or she would mind if you change your location, providing you are unobtrusive. All the above questions should be asked before the observation period begins. Often, teachers will tell you the agenda for the day and discuss specific children. Listen with interest, but do not make any evaluative comment, positive or negative, at any time. Sit at the side of the classroom toward the back.

4. If students ask you what you are doing, a response that is usually acceptable is, "I am watching the teacher." You should not encourage the students to interact with you. Be courteous and business-like. Avoid eye contact.
5. When the observation is completed, thank the teacher. Often teachers will ask you for your opinion of the class. You should be as neutral as possible. Phrases such as "It was an interesting class" or "I enjoyed my visit" will usually suffice.

Never identify any behavior or activity as positive or negative when talking with the teacher.

6. Never mention or discuss any teacher's class with other school personnel or with anyone else. If two observers are observing at the same school on the same day, they should not discuss the observation codes or a teacher's class while they are in the school or at any other time.

IV. Timetables for Coding of Instruments

Arrive at the classroom several minutes early. Ask the teacher how many students are enrolled, the grade-level of the students, and how long the period is. Divide the number of class minutes by five (5). The resulting number is the number of minutes between each "Snapshot", the first instrument in each of the five (5) coding sequences. In a fifty (50) minute class, ten (10) minutes would elapse between each Snapshot, while in a forty (40) minute class, the Snapshots would occur at eight (8) minute intervals. Always record the first Snapshot thirty (30) seconds after the official beginning of the class (usually signalled by a bell). Each Snapshot is followed immediately by a

Five (5) Minute Interaction (FMI) on which five (5) minutes of teacher-student interactions are recorded.

Begin the next sequence of Snapshot and FMI when the appropriate amount of time has passed since the last Snapshot (i.e. ten (10) minutes for a fifty (50) minute period, eight (8) minutes for a forty (40) minute period). Repeat this process five (5) times during the class period. Be sure to write down the time you should stop coding FMI frames before you start coding the FMI. It is very easy to code for more than five (5) minutes. You will complete one (1) observation booklet and the observer's log for each observed class period.

Example Timetable for Classroom ObservationInstrument Coding:

<u>50-Minute Class</u>	<u>Instrument</u>	<u>40-Minute Class</u>
Time (in minutes)		Time (in minutes)
0:30	1st Snapshot	0:30
	1st FMI	
10:00	2nd Snapshot	8:00
	2nd FMI	
20:00	3rd Snapshot	16:00
	3rd FMI	
30:00	4th Snapshot	24:00
	4th FMI	
40:00	5th Snapshot	32:00
	5th FMI	

During the class period:

- a. Thirty (30) seconds after the bell rings, begin the first Snapshot-FMI sequence
- b. After one-fifth ($1/5$) of the total class time has elapsed, begin the second sequence.
- c. Complete the third (3rd), fourth (4th), and fifth (5th) sequences. Each sequence is separated by equal time intervals.

After the class, thank the teacher and leave the room.

V. After Completing Observations

As soon as possible after completing the booklets, you should check your marks to be sure that they completely fill the bubbles and that they are not outside the bubbles. Correct with the marking pen you used during the observation. All deletions or erasures should be made with a Q-tip swab and Clorox bleach, as demonstrated during the training session.

Complete the observer's log. Describe the content of the lesson and any unusual events.

At the end of your first day of observations, bring your booklets to the project staff and discuss any questions you have regarding codes or procedures. Jane Stallings or Gigi Mohlman will be called if necessary.

At the end of each week bring your completed booklets to the project office.

Prepare a list of all the teachers you have observed, the teacher's numbers, the period you observed, the subject observed, the room number, and the number of students in the class.

EDITING YOUR OBSERVATION BOOKLETS

I. Check codes on front page for completeness:

**---Focus person number

---Grade level

---Observer number

---Date

---Booklet number

---Subject identifier

---Number of students

---Total class duration

---Number of teachers, aides, volunteers,
parents

**---Observation number

II. Check codes on each Snapshot

---Number of adults, students

---Sequence number

---Fill in bubbles with pen, if necessary

---Make sure "T" with "I", "S", "L", or
"E" is only marked in one spot.

III. Check codes on each FMI

---Focus person number

---Time started

---Sequence number

---Time stopped

IV. Make necessary deletions -- remove incorrect marks and stray marks

---Dab CLOROX on spot or cut out with
cuticle scissors

---Wait until spot dries. (Mark it with a
paper clip), dab on CLOROX again

---Check to make sure the mark is completely
erased

- V. Also delete marks (or parts of marks) that are so large that they are outside of the bubble.
- VI. Look at every mark to make sure it fills bubble completely. (At least three-fourths (3/4) of the bubble must be black). If you can see part of the number or letter, the bubble needs to be filled in more.
- VII. Check every mark to make sure it is dark enough. If your pen is running out of ink, it may not deposit enough ink on the page to make a very black mark. Hold up the page to the light to check how dark the marks are. If you can read the code number or letter through the ink, it is not dark enough. If the marks are not dark enough, you must go over every mark again with the pen. This is very time-consuming, so be sure you have an extra new pen with you so you can switch to a new pen when your old one gets too light.

** These must be correct for the computer program to run.

APPENDIX E

**TIME LINE FOR TEACHER PREOBSERVATIONS
INSERVICE, AND POSTOBSERVATIONS**

APPENDIX E

TIME LINE FOR TEACHER PREOBSERVATIONS,
INSERVICE, AND POSTOBSERVATIONS

1986:

September 22 - 26: Teacher observations were conducted each day by two (2) certified coders for a total of thirty-two (32) observations.

Thirty-two (32) observations, two (2) per teacher, were conducted during the week of September 22-26.

September 29 - 30: Computer scan of Secondary Observation Instruments (SOIs)

October 6 - 8: Analyzed each SOI profile sheet to prepare inservice needs for the experimental group.

October 13 - 14: Planned teacher inservice for experimental group only.

October 20, October 28, November 11, and November 26: Provided staff development workshops on four (4) separate days to address the needs of teachers in the experimental group (treatment).

December 15 - 19: Coders conducted two (2) post-observations on all sixteen (16) vocational teachers during this week, for a total of thirty-two (32) completed SOI booklets.

APPENDIX F

STALLINGS OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX F**STALLINGS OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT**

The booklet used to code teachers can not be reprinted under copyright laws; however booklets can be ordered from the following address:

Stallings Interprises, Inc.
305 Anchor Drive
Harbor Island
Old Hickory, Tennessee 37138

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 1

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 2

PROFILES/IMPROVING CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

WORKSHOP 3

IMPROVING INTERACTIONS

WORKSHOP 4

IMPROVING BEHAVIOR

TEACHER TRAINER'S LESSON PLANS

An outline of the materials covered in the four (4) Stallings inservice workshops is included in Appendix G. Reproduction of the Stallings material is prohibited by copyright laws.

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 1

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

TEACHER TRAINER'S LESSON PLAN

I. Introduction

- A. Have the agenda written or posted on the board
- B. Have everyone introduce themselves (name, school, subject/grade)
- C. Ice Breaker--Have everyone talk about "something good" that happened today and "something bad" that happened today.
- D. Have participants list (on 3 x 5 index cards) characteristics of one of the best teachers they had. Spend a few minutes asking each person to name their characteristics. List them on the board or chart paper. (Tie these characteristics into teacher effectiveness research as you discuss it in the workshop.)

II. Overview of the Workshops.

- A. Purpose of Workshops
 - 1. To introduce teachers to the research on teacher effectiveness

2. To discuss problems and share ideas
 3. To make a commitment to try out new techniques in the classroom
 4. To analyze use of time in the classroom through sample observation profiles
- B. Topics of Workshops
1. Workshop 1 - RESEARCH FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME
 2. Workshop 2 - PROFILES, IMPROVING CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION
 3. Workshop 3 - IMPROVING INTERACTIONS
 4. Workshop 4 - IMPROVING BEHAVIOR
- C. Your Role as a Participant
1. Discuss new things tried in the classroom and how they worked
 2. Share ideas that work
 3. Discuss peer observations
 4. Complete homework and reading assignments
 5. Attend workshops
- D. How the Workshops are Conducted
1. Sharing of expertise
 2. Group problem solving
 3. Not a lecture

III. Time on Task Research

- A. The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study

1. Review Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study
(pp. I-A-4-7)
2. Look at Graph--Discuss "Estimated Use of Time in
a School Day and Year" (p. I-A-8)
3. Review four components: Allocated Time,
Engaged Time, Academic Learning Time.
4. Ask questions: "How could you use this
information?" (If no answer, use prompts: "How
could you increase Allocated Time" Engaged
Rate?")

B. Beyond Time on Task

1. How effective teachers use their time
 - a. Ask teachers to write on cards how much time
they spend on organizing during class.
Explain what counts as "organizing."
(Specify reading class for elementary
grades.)
 - b. How much time in interactive type
instruction? (Explain)
 - c. How much time monitoring seatwork?
 - d. Call on teachers to state their "guest-
imates" out loud.
2. Present Findings of How Effective Teachers Spent
Their Time (Table 1, p. I-A-9. Go over each
item.)

- a. Stress: Efficient organization (15% or less of total activities in only 7 1/2 minutes per 50 minutes)
 - b. Stress: Check for understanding. Talk about links between student experiences/ knowledge and new information
 - c. Stress: Monitoring students' work at their seats. The reason is so that students have more time on task. They are not standing and waiting.
3. On the overhead, look at Table 2. Point out praise, corrective feedback, and intrusions. Note that too much seatwork is bad, but that some is good.
 4. Discuss "Allocated Learning Time Revisited." (Teachers read this prior to the workshop in pre-workshop reading.) Discuss that time allocation is different for different achievement levels. Point out that effective teachers were supportive.
- C. Ask teachers to look at their "guestimates" of their own use of time and compare it to the research on effective use of time.
- Show pie charts on Average Use of Time and Effective Use of Time. (Figure 1, p. I-A-11)

- D. Look at p. I-A-14 and tie in previously listed characteristics with "Research Findings" The Effective Teacher".

IV. Assign Homework

- A. "Get the Show on the Road"
- B. Task Analysis--Briefly describe what task analysis is and tell participants to complete the worksheet individually or in groups.
- C. Reading Materials for Workshop 2--Complete required activities before Workshop 2.

V. Summarize

- A. Briefly review what was discussed at the workshop
- B. Be sure to include praise and encouragement for the group. Ask for a commitment to try something new.
- C. Remind participants to bring their homework to their next workshop.
- D. Hand out Workshop Evaluation Sheet. Collect evaluations.
- E. Give the date of the next workshop.

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 1

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

A G E N D A

- II. INTRODUCTIONS
- II. ICE BREAKER
- III. BEST TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS
- IV. OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOPS
- V. TIME ON TASK RESEARCH
- VI. HOMEWORK
- VII. SUMMARY

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 2

PROFILES/IMPROVING CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

TEACHER TRAINER'S LESSON PLAN

- I. Write the Agenda on the Board or Post It
- II. Review Homework
 - A. "Get the Show on the Road"--Ask questions such as:
 1. What did you try?
 2. Was it successful?
 - B. Task Analysis
 1. Ask each person to state philosophic goal and baseline.
 2. Collect their worksheets.
 - C. Improving Classroom Organization
 1. Briefly discuss the following topics:
 - a. Room arrangement--participants discuss rationale for arrangement of the classroom. (Examples: location of teacher desk, arrangement of student desks, location of trash can, materials, finished work papers, etc.) Have participants discuss problem areas and traffic problems.

b. Grouping--participants discuss reasons for grouping (Examples: abilities, different activities at the same time, etc.)

c. Classroom Organization Log

1. Let participants discuss successes.

2. Let participants discuss failures.

III. Teaching to Achieve Independent Learners--Briefly discuss with participants how to achieve independent learners. (Participants will do this for homework.)

IV. Profiles/Snapshots

A. Explain in detail information in "Interpreting Teacher Profiles" packet.

B. Have participants choose three (3) areas in which they would like to improve. Have them write their list on a 3 x 5 index card (no name on card) and give it to you. (This will help in assuring that workshop topics are related to their needs.)

V. Assign Homework

A. Teaching to Achieve the Independent Learner

B. Effective Use of Time Training

C. Read "Bonus Materials"

VI. Summarize

A. Commend group on their participation.

Ask for commitment to try something new.

B. Give date of next workshop.

- C. Remind participants to bring profiles with them to all future workshops.
- D. Hand out evaluation form and collect.

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 2

PROFILES/IMPROVING CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

A G E N D A

- I. REVIEW HOMEWORK
- II. TEACHING TO ACHIEVE INDEPENDENT LEARNERS
- III. PROFILES/SNAPSHOTS
- IV. HOMEWORK
- V. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 3

IMPROVING INTERACTIONS

TEACHER TRAINER'S LESSON PLAN

I. Have the Agenda Written or Posted on the Board

II. Discuss Homework

A. Teaching to Achieve the Independent Learner--Call on participants to discuss their level I, II, and III activities

B. Discuss the "Effective Use of Time Training" Worksheet. Ask each teacher:

1. Did you try anything new?
2. Was it successful?

III. Improving Interactions

A. Have participants look at profiles. Point out variables relating to interactive instruction. (Variables 7, 8, 9 and 11).

B. Ask participants who met or exceeded the criterion on their profile to explain their methods/procedures for variables 7, 8, 9 and 11.

IV. Active Class Participation

A. Briefly discuss active class participation with your group.

- B. Have each participant select one method listed under "Methods to Check for Understanding" to demonstrate to the class.

V. Explain Teacher's Interaction with Students Seating Chart

- A. Explain how data is collected and entered in the seating chart.
- B. Go over the sample.

VI. Homework

- A. Improving Interactions Homework--reading materials
 - 1. Do Exercise 1.
 - 2. Do Exercise 2.
- B. Have participants do an Interaction Seating Chart on their partner. Complete the worksheet "Summary of Interaction Seating Chart" on basis of data collected.

VII. Summarize

- A. Commend group on their participation--get a commitment to try something new.
- B. Give date of next workshop.
- C. Remind participants to bring profiles.
- D. Hand out evaluation form and collect.

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 3

IMPROVING INTERACTIONS

A G E N D A

- I. REVIEW HOMEWORK
- II. IMPROVING INTERACTIONS
- III. TEACHER'S INTERACTIONS WITH STUDENTS SEATING CHART
- IV. HOMEWORK
- V. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 4

IMPROVING BEHAVIOR

TEACHER TRAINER'S LESSON PLAN

- I. Post or Write Agenda on the Board
- II. Discuss Homework
 - A. Interaction Seating Chart

Ask participants to see if any pattern emerged in their classrooms. (Examples: not calling on students in the back of the room, directing questions to only one side of the room, calling on the same students repeatedly, etc.)
 - B. Discuss Exercise 1--Check for Understanding.
 - C. Discuss Exercise 2--Acknowledgment/Praise and Correction
- III. Behavior--Profile Focus
 - A. Ask participants to examine their profiles for any variables they think would contribute to behavior (good or bad). Examples: positive interactions, organizing, shout-outs, intrusions, teacher working alone.
 - B. Have participants look at off-task and uninvolved students on Summary Report 6.

IV. Discipline/Behavior Discussion

- A. Have each participant describe a "problem" situation or child in their room this year or in a previous year.
- B. The group will offer possible solutions or suggestions. (Teacher Trainers--Record these situations and submit them at the next planning session.)

V. Off-Task Seating Chart

- A. Explain data gathering procedures.
- B. Do sample.

VI. Summarize

- A. Commend group on their participation. Ask for a commitment to try something new.
- B. Hand out evaluation forms and collect.

APPENDIX G

EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

WORKSHOP 1

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVE USE OF TIME

A G E N D A

- II. INTRODUCTIONS
- II. ICE BREAKER
- III. BEST TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS
- IV. OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOPS
- V. TIME ON TASK RESEARCH
- VI. HOMEWORK
- VII. SUMMARY

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**