ABSTRACT
                It was hypothesized that 1) prospective teachers who
have been trained in microplanning will score higher on tests of
teacher effectiveness and 2) will not change their attitudes about
pupils and teaching in an undesirable direction. Subjects were 20
secondary school social studies majors, 10 who volunteered to take an
experimental teacher education sequence (three 2-semester-hour
courses titled Microplanning, Microteaching, and Clinical Teaching)
and a control group of 10 taking the regular 6-semester-hour
sequence. After the treatment, experimental group Ss were matched to
control group Ss (on sex, class, cumulative GPA, and hours credit)
and all Ss were given the same statement of objectives and unit
booklet and randomly assigned five to ten high school pupils. They
planned and taught four half-hour lessons to their pupils who were
then administered a two-part test measuring recall of information and
ability to reason using the material covered. The mean pupil scores
for each S, computed for each part of the test, constituted the
criterion measure of teacher effectiveness. The Minnesota Teacher
Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and the Sorenson Teacher Role Preference
Inventory (TRPI) were administered to the experimental group as
pre-posttest along with a course evaluation questionnaire. Results of
analysis of variance tests supported the hypotheses. (Brief
description of microplanning competencies and procedures plus a
sample lesson plan are included.) (JS)

THE EFFECTS OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SUBJECT MATTER ON THE PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS[1]

by
Morton D. Waimon, Dennis D. Bell, Gary C. Ramseyer
Illinois State University

This paper reports an experiment in which a treatment designed to help prospective teachers perform pretutorial teacher behavior was developed and tested. The treatment uses procedures similar to those used in microteaching. That is, tutorial teacher behavior is divided into its component parts each of which is defined and modeled. Practice in performing each behavior is given, and reinforcement is made contingent upon the successful performance of each behavior. (Allen, D.W.; McDonald, F.J.; and Orme, M.E.J., 1966). Therefore, we called our treatment microplanning.

Microplanning is designed to enable prospective teachers to perform pretutorial teacher behavior. Pretutorial teacher behavior not only precedes tutorial behavior in time, but it relates and explains such behavior. Research, cited below, indicates that pretutorial teacher behavior is related to pupil achievement. The problem of our research was to develop a treatment which would enable prospective teachers to perform pretutorial teacher behavior effectively.

RELATED RESEARCH

Cognitive learning theorists recognize that the amount and rate of learning is influenced by the nature of the subject matter itself, the way it is broken down, and the order in which it is presented. (Anderson, and Ausubel, 1965). Ausubel (Ausubel, 1960; Ausubel and Fitzgerald, 1962), has demonstrated that advanced organizers facilitate learning and retention. Bruner (1960) indicates learning is increased when experts have

---

identified the structure of the body of subject matter to be taught. Gagne' (1965), develops a knowledge hierarchy of principles through an analysis procedure that begins by specifying the final principle, and then identifying each of the subordinate component ideas. He has found that the learning of "higher-level" materials was dependent on the mastery of prerequisite "lower-level" ideas in a highly predictable fashion. Ausubel (1965) claims that Ausubel, Bruner, and Gagne' agree that control over meaningful learning can be exercised most effectively by identifying and manipulating significant cognitive structure variables in three principal ways: (a) substantively, by showing concern for the structure of a body of subject matter, (b) programmatically, by employing suitable principles of ordering the sequence of subject matter, constructing its internal logic and organization, and (c) arranging appropriate practice trials. However, no attempts have been reported to develop a teacher training program that would enable prospective teachers to perform these pretutorial teacher behaviors.

Smith (1963; 1964; 1967b) has maintained that the quality of instruction would be increased if teachers could improve: 1) In their performance of logical operations, and 2) In the way they handle subject matter during the course of instruction. Smith (1962) has identified the logical operations teachers perform, and the types of subject matter they use. (Smith, 1967a)

Smith's second hypothesis that instruction would improve if teachers became more clear and rigorous in the way they handle subject matter inputs during instruction forms the basis for this study. This hypothesis is not only supported by the learning theorists, cited above, but is borne out in recent reviews of research on teaching. (Gage, 1968; Rosenshine, 1970; Turner, 1970). To our knowledge, however, no study has been reported in which Smith's (1967a) findings have been used to train teachers to manipulate and control subject matter.

HYPOTHESES

As pointed out it is Smith's view that teachers fail because they do not know how to work with subject matter

during the course of instruction. Our experience leads us
to believe that the reason teachers lack clarity and rigor
in the handling of subject matter during instruction is
that they enter the tutorial situation without having
planned their lessons effectively. We believe that the
success or failure of tutorial behavior depends largely
upon the quality of the pretutorial teacher behavior. Our
hunch might be summed up this way: If you plan a good lesson
you may teach a good lesson; if you plan a bad lesson you
cannot teach a good one. Our objectives, therefore, are to
help prospective teachers learn to plan good lessons; that
is, identify their content objectives; know why the content
objectives are held; and select appropriate strategies for
teaching them. Our hypotheses are: 1) prospective teachers
who have been trained in microplanning will score higher on
tests of teacher effectiveness; 2) prospective teachers
will not change their attitudes about pupils and teaching in
an undesirable direction.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects (Ss) in our experimental group were ten
secondary school social studies majors who volunteered to
take an experimental teacher education sequence.[2] Our control
group consisted of ten Ss drawn from a pool of all social
studies majors taking the regular teacher education sequence
at ISU. The regular teacher education sequence consisted of
a two semester hour course called American Public Education,
and a four semester hour course called Secondary Education.
The experimental treatment consisted of three courses each
carrying two semester hours of credit. These courses were
titled: Microplanning; Microteaching; and Clinical Teaching.

Data Sources

At the end of the treatment each S in the experimental
group was matched to a control group member. Each match was

---

[2] One member of the experimental group was unable to complete
the entire experiment.

accomplished equating the members of each pair with respect
to sex, class, cumulative GPA, and hours of university credit.
All Ss were given the same statement of objectives, and a
copy of the unit booklet titled, Negro Views of America,
by Oliver and Newman, published by Xerox Corporation. Ss
were randomly assigned from five to ten high school pupils
drawn from study halls at University High School, at I.S.U.
Ss planned and taught four half-hour lessons to their pupils
on Monday through Thursday. On Friday Ss administered a
test covering the material in the unit booklet. This test
which comes with the unit booklet has an A level section
which measures recall of information, and a B level section
which measures the ability to reason using the material
covered. The mean pupil score for each S was computed for
each of the two levels of the test, and this constituted
the criterion measure of teacher effectiveness used in
this study.

Two tests were used in obtaining measures of attitudial
changes. These are the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory
(MTAI) and the Garth Sorenson Teacher Role Preference
Inventory (TRPI). These tests were administered to the
experimental group on a pre-posttest basis. The MTAI is
designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which
predict how well he will get along with pupils in inter-
personal relationships and indirectly how well satisfied
he will be with teaching as a vocation. The Teacher Role
Preference Inventory has three sub-tests yielding five scales
covering attitudes towards objectives, content, and methods.
Generally these subtests measure attitudes lying along a
progressive-traditional continuum. The final instrument
used was a course evaluation questionaire which was developed
especially for this study. This was administered to each
S in the experimental group during a structured interview.
The responses of each S was tape recorded, and a typescript
was made for this tape of each interview.

<div align="center">Treatment</div>

Microplanning

Microplanning consists of six competencies (see Figure I).
These competencies grew out of the curriculum questions: Why

teach? (competencies 1 and 2), What to teach? (competencies
3 and 4) and How to teach? (competencies 5 and 6). They
are designed to help prospective teachers to be clear and
rigorous in the handling of subject matter during the
course of instruction. The procedures used to teach each
competency are based on behavior modification techniques.
Microplanning began by having Ss select a high school text
in their major field, and a chapter in that text to be
planned. At the end of each phase of the treatment Ss
demonstrated their competency by handing in their plans.
The instructor used these written plans to determine the
degree to which Ss had attained the competency. The following
objectives and criterion measures were used for the micro-
planning phase of the treatment:

1. Rationale: Given a body of subject matter Ss will be
able to explain why they are going to teach it. In judging
the statements handed in the instructor determined if the
needs were clear; if they were significant; and if they
made sense for the specific body of subject matter.

2. Objectives: Given a body of subject matter Ss will be
able to state what the pupils will be capable of doing once
they have successfully completed the unit. In judging
objectives the instructor determined if they grew out of
the needs; if they were listed correctly as cognitive,
psychomotor, or affective; if they were stated unambiguously;
and if they went beyond simple recall of subject matter.

3. Structure of Knowledge: Given a body of subject matter
Ss will be able to state the most general concepts and
propositions to be found in it. In judging the structure
of knowledge the instructor determined if the propositions
were clear; if the ideas were integrated; and if the total
structure was cumulative.

4. Selecting and Organizing Content: Given a body of subject
matter Ss will be able to determine their content objectives,
and the subordinate component ideas needed to achieve them.
Content objectives should be clear, integrated, and cumulative.
Subordinate component ideas should be relevant to the content

objectives; consist of all necessary subordinate ideas; and arranged in a logical order.

In order to help Ss break down their chapters into lessons with several content objectives, and subordinate component ideas we adapted a classification system developed by B. O. Smith (1967[a]). Smith found that discourse in a lesson could be broken into units which he called ventures. Each venture consists of a set of utterances dealing with a single topic and having a single overarching content objective. Smith found eight types of ventures in his data. Each type of venture contains certain verbal actions that are ways of attaining the venture's objective. These are called moves. Moves are units of content found within a venture. A simplified version of Smith's classification system was used to help Ss identify the content objectives and subordinate component ideas in their lessons. The adaptation of Smith's categories used in the treatment is shown in Figure 2. Ss planned lessons which had at least three ventures each containing three moves. A typical lesson is shown in Figure 3.

5. **Methods of Teaching:** Given a body of subject matter Ss will select an appropriate method for teaching it. Ss were notified that they should use the lecture, recitation, discussion, and inquiry methods in their lesson plans. Generally the more indirect methods (discussion and inquiry) were to be used with the higher order content objectives.

6. **Teaching Actions:** Given a body of subject matter Ss will be able to determine the appropriate actions needed to teach it. Ss were instructed to use a variety of actions in their plans. These were judged appropriate in terms of the content objectives. As content objectives increased in magnitude the actions selected should be such that they elicit higher order responses from pupils.

Microteaching

Microteaching followed microplanning. Three of the nine weeks were used in training Ss to analyze lessons recorded on typescripts and videotapes. Ss were taught to analyze whether

the teacher behavior in the lesson was clear vs. vague;
positive vs. negative; and indirect vs. direct. The remaining
six weeks were used by Ss to teach each other their lessons
previously planned, and to analyze each others teaching.
A videotape machine was used to record and play back each
lesson.

Clinical Teaching

Clinical teaching completed the treatment. Ss were
assigned to a social studies teacher at the I.S.U. laboratory
school. The clinical teacher was instructed to discuss his
plans with Ss prior to his lesson; teach the lesson; and
analyze the lesson after it was finished.

RESULTS

Table 1 displays for the subjects in both groups the
mean pupil achievement scores on levels A and B of the unit
test. The unweighted group means are given at the bottom
of this table. An unweighted group mean is essentially the
simple mean of all the mean pupil achievement scores for a
level test. It is noteworthy that when the pairs of level
B scores in Table 1 are examined, in all but two cases, the
experimental subject of each pair out performed the control
subject in terms of mean pupil achievement. This trend is
not present in the level A scores for the pairs of subjects.
To lend possible statistical support to these observations,
a simple randomized blocks analysis of variance was utilized
with the mean pupil achievement scores. This analysis was
conducted once on the level A scores in both groups and again
on the level B scores. Table 2 reports the results of these
analyses. On level A which measured the recall of factual
information there was no significant difference between the
unweighted group means for the experimental and control groups.
However, on level B which measured reasoning ability, the
experimental unweighted group mean was significantly greater
than the control unweighted group mean ($F=7.03$ with
$F_{.95}$ $(1,8)=5.32$). Here the significant difference of 2.15
in favor of the experimental group may not appear to be of
unusual magnitude. However, it should be remembered that the
analysis of variance design used in this portion of the study

lends a great degree of precision to the comparisons since
the raw scores are themselves means and the subjects in both
groups were carefully matched on cumulative G.P.A., sex,
class, and hours of university credit. Thus the difference
of 2.15 which is truly based on the means of two sets of means
is indeed unusually large in a probability sense.

To test the difference between pre and posttest means
for the experimental group on the two attitudinal instruments,
a simple repeated measures analysis of variance was employed.
The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3. As
was expected, the experimental treatment failed to produce
significant changes between pre and post test means on the
MTAI and the five scales of the TRPI. That is, the attitudes
of the experimental subjects toward students, content, teaching
method, and interpersonal style remained essentially unchanged
at the conclusion of the treatment.

The interviews with Ss using the course evaluation
questionaire yielded more data than can be reported here.
Therefore, we limited ourselves to reporting responses which
dealt with the treatment, and which were made by at least
40% of the Ss. In their reactions to microplanning Ss (60%)
said that they would like an opportunity to adapt the planning
procedures presented to them instead of having to follow them
explicitly. However Ss (50%) felt that they were prepared
for student teaching; that they (40%) knew how to plan units
and lessons; and that they (40%) were better prepared to teach
than students in the regular sequence. Ss (50%) liked the
course in microteaching because of the feedback they received
on their teaching behavior. However, many Ss (40%) felt that
microteaching is an artificial situation. The course in
clinical teaching was critized by most Ss (60%) because
it lacked integration with the previous courses. Ss com-
plained of a lack of communication between their laboratory
school instructors, and their college instructor.

DISCUSSION

The results reported above suggest that greater pupil
achievement in using a body of subject matter to solve
problems is produced by prospective teachers trained in

microplanning. Further that training which places heavy
emphasis on helping prospective teachers learn to manipulate
and control subject matter does not result in the develop-
ment of attitudes which would be considered undesireable
by teacher educators.

Many teacher educators are currently engaged in teaching
people to teach by having them master one at a time a given
set of tutorial teacher behaviors. A recent study (Ward,
1969) has shown that microteaching is rapidly being adopted
by teacher training institutions throughout the United
States. Yet research in both learning, and teaching
indicates that a strong relationship exists between pupil
outcomes, and the degree of clarity and rigor a teacher
can achieve with respect to the manipulation and control
of subject matter. Our study leads us to believe that
teachers cannot be clear and rigorous in handling subject
matter inputs during the course of instruction unless
they have learned to perform pretutorial teacher behaviors.
That is, prospective teachers have to learn how to solve
problems having to do with purpose, content, and method
before they engage in tutorial behavior. We feel that the
use of behavior modification techniques to reinforce
prospective teachers for performing such tutorial responses
as establishing a set; achieving closure; providing feed-
back, etc., could lead prospective teachers to have an
oversimplified view of teaching. It might be that pro-
spective teachers should never be allowed to engage in
tutorial behavior before they have demonstrated their
competence in performing pretutorial teacher behavior.
Microteaching unless preceeded by successful performance
in microplanning could be a case of misplaced emphasis.

FIGURE 1.

Microplanning Competencies and Procedures

	Rationale	Behavioral Objectives	Knowledge Structure	Selecting Content	Teaching Methods	Teaching Actions
A. Define Behavior						
B. Model Behavior						
C. Practice Behavior						
D. Evaluate Behavior						

10

FIGURE 2.

Adaptation of Smith's (1967[a]) Categories
for Use in Microplanning

1. VENTURES LOWER COGNITIVE DOMAIN.   The teacher helps pupils grasp subject matter
dealing with a single topic and having a
primary cognitive meaning.

   1.1 Conceptual Venture.   The meaning, uses, or implications of a term are noted
and discussed.
     1.11 Descriptive moves.   Information about the term is noted and discussed.
     1.12 Comparative moves.   The concept is compared with some other concept.
     1.13 Instantial moves.   Specific instances of the term are noted or discussed.

   1.2 Particular Venture.   A topic or group of related topics is explicated.   This
would include consideration of an object, event, person
or place.
     1.21 Particular identifying moves.   Information directly concerned with the
particular is noted or discussed.
     1.22 Relating moves.   The particular is related to other objects, events, or
conditions.
     1.23 Appraisal moves.   The value or significance of a particular is noted or
discussed.

   1.3 Rule Venture.   Conventual ways of performing actions is described or discussed.
     1.31 Formulation moves.   A rule is presented and its purpose clarified.
     1.32 Justification moves.   The rule is made plausible.'
     1.33 Application moves.   Actions guided by the rule are described in
relation to some specific situation.

2. VENTURES HIGHER COGNITIVE DOMAIN.   The teacher helps pupils use or apply subject
matter dealing with a single topic and having
a primary cognitive meaning.

   2.1 Interpretative Venture.   Pupils transform subject matter in order to demon-
strate they comprehend its meaning, significance,
or reason.
     2.11 Explication moves.   The literal meaning, significance, or reason for
something is given.
     2.12 Extrapolation moves.   Inferences that go beyond the literal meaning,
significance, or reason are made.
     2.13 Evidential moves.   Support or denials that the inferences made are
correct is given.

   2.2 Procedural Venture.   Subject matter is used to decide upon a sequence of
actions (symbolic or manipulative) by which an end
may be achieved.
     2.21 Problem moves.   The problemmatic situation is defined or clarified.
     2.22 Performance moves.   Actions which must be taken in order to solve the
problem are noted or discussed.
     2.23 Proceudre moves.   Actions are abstracted, summarized, or generalized.

   2.3 Evaluative Venture.   Pupils apply subject matter in order to determine
the truth or worth of something.
     2.31 Identification moves.   The value object or event is clarified before
it is rated.
     2.32 Rating moves.   A rating is made, and reasons (criteria) given which
substantiate the rating.
     2.33 Justification moves.   The rating is discussed, and alternatives are
considered.

11

FIGURE 3.

Sample Lesson Plan

UNIT TITLE: Using Land Within Its Capability.

LESSON TITLE: What Are The Differences In Surface Features?

OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to evaluate important
                land features selecting correct classifications
                from arbitrary categories to assign to these
                features.

INTENT		CONTENT	METHOD
Particular	1.	Slope influences the speed with which water runs off a field and the amount of soil that washes with the water.	Lecture: I will present a background of slope of soil to the students.
	a.	Slopes can be measured by three different kinds of levels.	

	b.	Slopes are classified as nearly level, gently sloping, moderately sloping, and strongly sloping.	Materials:
			  Lecture Notes
			  Text

	c.	Surface runoff is the greatest force in erosion of topsoil.	
Conceptual	2.	Erosion means the amount of original topsoil that has been carried away.	Recitation: I will head a discussion where the students will be lead into the idea of erosion degrees.
	a.	Topsoil is the richest part of the soil.	
	b.	We measure the amount of topsoil by using a soil probe.	Materials:
	c.	Types of erosion range from no apparent erosion to very severely gullied.	Text Blackboard
Procedural	3.	How can farmers prevent erosion?	Discussion: Students will be divided into two groups and asked to arrive at a solution to the problem of erosion.
	a.	Increase in slope presents increased possibility of soil washing.	
	b.	There are several ways to decrease the amount of slope.	Materials: Pictures and charts
	c.	It is the farmer's job to stop soil washing and maintain maximum topsoil.	

TABLE 1.

Mean Pupil Achievement Scores for Each Subject on Levels A and B
of Unit Test on "Negro Views of America"

Matched Pair	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Subject Name	No. of Pupil Results	Mean Pupil Achievement Level A	Mean Pupil Achievement Level B	Subject Name	No. of Pupil Results	Mean Pupil Achievement Level A	Mean Pupil Achievement Level B
1	J.F.	5	18.0	20.0	P.W.	5	21.2	18.8
2	P.G.	7	18.6	18.6	C.S.	7	18.6	16.9
3	S.G.	7	20.9	19.9	C.A.	7	18.0	14.4
4	D.H.	8	20.5	24.0	J.B.	4	21.5	18.0
5	K.H.	8	20.5	21.4	S.P.	9	18.9	20.2
6	D.M.	7	22.4	25.0	J.W.	5	24.4	25.0
7	R.S.	4	24.0	25.3	H.K.	6	22.3	21.3
8	G.T.	7	20.3	21.1	T.G.	6	24.3	21.7
9	P.W.	8	20.6	22.6	R.J.	8	20.5	22.3
Unweighted Group Means			20.64	21.99			21.08	19.84

TABLE 2.

Tests of Differences Between Unweighted Group Means of Table 1.

Test Level	Means		Difference (Exp.-Control)	F
	Experimental Group	Control Group		
A	20.64	21.08	-.44	.31
B	21.99	19.84	2.15	7.03*

*p$<$.05, F(1,8)=5.32

TABLE 3.

Tests of Differences Between Pre and Post Test Means
of the Experimental Group on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude
Inventory (MTAI) and the Garth Sorenson Inventory (TRPI).

Scale	Means		Difference (Post-Pre)	F
	Pre-Test	Post-Test		
MTAI	50.10	55.10	5.00	.58
TRPI-Student Orientation	54.11	54.56	.45	.06
TRPI-Social Orientation	48.11	45.33	-2.78	1.29
TRPI-Subject Orientation	41.78	44.11	2.33	.74
TRPI-Didactic Method	19.78	19.89	.11	.13
TRPI-Interpersonal Warmth	30.89	31.11	.22	.31

REFERENCES

Allen, D.W.; McDonald, F.J.; and Orme, M.E.J. "The Effects of Feedback and Practice Conditions on the Acquisition of a Teaching Skill." Paper presented at AERA meeting, Chicago, Illinois, 1966.

Anderson, R.C. and Ausubel, D.P. (Editors). Readings in the Psychology of Cognition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Ausubel, D.P. "The Use of Advance Organizers in the Learning and Retention of Meaningful Verbal Material," Journal Educational Psychology, Vol. 51 (1960), pp. 267-272.

Ausubel, D.P. and Fitzgerald, D. "Organizer, General Background and Antecedent Learning Variables in Sequential Verbal Learning," Journal Educational Psychology, Vol. 53 (1962), pp. 243-249.

Ausubel, D.P. "Introduction." In R.C. Anderson and D.P. Ausubel (Editors), Readings in the Psychology of Cognition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965, pp. 9-10.

Bruner, J.S. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960, pp. 17-32.

Gage, N.L. "Can Science Contribute to the Art of Teaching?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLIX, #7 (1968), pp. 399-403.

Gagne, R.M. The Conditions of Learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965, pp. 172-204.

Rosenshine, Barak. "Evaluation of Classroom Instruction," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 40 (1970), pp. 279-296.

Smith, B.O., Meux, Milton and others. A Study of the Logic of Teaching. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois (U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project Number 258-7257), 1962 (mimeographed).

Smith, B.O. "Teaching: What It Is and What We Can Do About It," The American School Board Journal, Vol. 147, #1 (1963), pp. 9-11.

Smith, B.O. "The Need for Logic in Methods Courses,"
    Theory Into Practice, Vol. 3, #1 (1964), pp. 5-8.

Smith, B.O., Meux, Milton and others. A Study of the Strategies
    of Teaching. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research,
    University of Illinois (U.S. Office of Education,
    Cooperative Research Project Number 1646), 1967 (mimeographed).

Smith, B.O. "Recent Research on Teaching: An Interpretation,"
    The High School Journal, Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 64-73.

Turner, R.L. "Good Teaching and Its Contexts," Phi Delta
    Kappan, Vol. LII, #3 (1970), pp. 155-158.

Ward, B.E. A survey of microteaching in secondary education
    programs of all NCATE accredited colleges and universities.
    Unpublished doctoral dissertation of South Dakota, 1969.