DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 447 SP 025 513

AUTHOR Worsham, Murray E.; Emmer, Edmund T.
TITLE Teachers' Planning Decisions for the Beginning of School. R&D Rep. No. 6152.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 83
GRANT OB-NIE-G-80-0116-P2
NOTE 165p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; Class Activities; *Class Organization; Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Decision Making; Learning Strategies; *Lesson Plans; Middle Schools; *Policy Formation; Secondary Education; Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *First Week of School

ABSTRACT

Eleven middle school teachers' planning and classroom activities for the first day of the school year were examined through interviews, written lesson plans, and classroom observations. The purpose was to identify factors in planning and to identify relationships among planning and classroom management on the first day and throughout the first 8 weeks of school. Planning variables included goal emphasis, contextual factors and alternatives considered, content emphasis and level of detail of written plans, and teacher feelings of success and projected changes in future first-day planning. Results indicated that teacher written plans were not very detailed; however, teachers' activities on the first day were generally congruent with their written plans and their stated goal emphasis. Results also suggested that more comprehensive first-day planning is positively related to more effective classroom management throughout the first 8 weeks of school; that a procedural emphasis is most common on the first day but that teachers who restricted their first day activities to administrative tasks have less effective 8-week classroom management success; and that teachers who combine an affective and procedural emphasis on the first day have better 8-week classroom management results. (Author/JD)

Teachers' Planning Decisions for the Beginning of School

Murray E. Worsham

Edmund T. Emmer

Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Teachers' Planning Decisions for the Beginning of School

Murray E. Worsham

Edmund T. Emmer

Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

(R&D Rep. No. 6152)

February 1983

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Education, Contract OB-NIE-G-80-0116, P2, Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Project. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Abstract

Eleven middle school teachers' first day planning and classroom activities were examined through interviews, written lesson plans, and classroom observations to identify factors teachers considered in planning and possible relationships between first day planning and classroom management on the first day and throughout the first 8 weeks of school. Planning variables included goal emphasis, contextual factors and alternatives considered, content emphasis and level of detail of written plans, and teacher feelings of success and projected changes in future first day planning.

Results indicated that teacher written plans were not very detailed; however, teachers' activities on the first day were generally congruent with their written plans and their stated goal emphases. Results also suggested that more comprehensive first day planning is positively related to more effective classroom management throughout the first 8 weeks of school; that a procedural emphasis is most common on the first day but that teachers who restrict their first day activities to administrative tasks have less effective 8-week classroom management success; and that teachers who combine an affective and procedural emphasis on the first day have better 8-week classroom management results.

In recent years, research on classroom management has emerged as a promising means of identifying student and teacher behaviors that contribute to student learning and achievement. Sets of specific teacher behaviors comprising the organizing, controlling, and coordinating of classrooms have been identified and described through direct observations of teachers who are effective in producing student learning gains (Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Evertson, Anderson, Anderson, & Brophy, 1980).

Effective management behaviors and styles have been the focus of extensive research in fields other than education. In management research in both business and government, several specific management skills have been operationalized. Three of these skills parallel those identified by educational research: organizing, controlling, and coordinating. A fourth skill found to be crucial in most management research that has not yet been systematically analyzed in classroom management research is that of planning (Cribbin, 1972; Fulmer, 1979; Sayles, 1979).

These skills are employed by managers who have been found to be most effective in their ability to establish and maintain productive, smooth running businesses or classes. In business as well as classroom management, the effectiveness of managers in implementing these functions appears related to characteristics of both the manager and the situation. Leaders who are more task-motivated than relationship-motivated tend to be most effective in highly unfavorable and in highly favorable situations (Fiedler, 1974). In applying this finding to a school setting, it is possible to examine an important aspect of the

situation not readily available in many management settings: the initial contact between teacher (manager) and students. Fiedler's findings suggest that from the first contact between teachers and students, effective planning, organization, control, and coordination of their classrooms, should result in increasingly favorable situations on subsequent days. Educational research substantiates the fact that the first day of school has powerful implications for the rest of the year (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976). Teachers who demonstrate management skills on the first days of school typically become identified as more effective classroom managers, on the basis of student achievement and student task engagement behaviors throughout the year (Emmer et al., 1980; Evertson & Emmer, 1982) as well as on the basis of student ratings of teachers (Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976).

Planning, though identified in business management literature as one of the four primary ingredients of effective management, has had less attention in educational management research than observed teacher classroom behaviors. More effective classroom managers have been assumed to plan more effectively since their classrooms run more smoothly (Berliner, 1977; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Evertson & Emmer, 1982), but this inference has not been tested. Further, the manner in which teachers actually plan has only recently begun to be examined systematically.

Research on planning has not led to clear or conclusive findings. Studies of teacher planning focusing on goals, for example, indicate that teachers do not consider goals in planning (Peterson & Clark, 1978; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Mintz, Note 1; Smith & Sendelback, Note 2; Yinger, Note 3), while others have found that teachers do have

goals in mind (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Borko, Note 4; Russo, Note 5). Studies examining teacher consideration of alternatives have concluded that teachers do generate alternatives in planning (Morine, Note 6), that they do not (McCutcheon, 1980), and that generating alternatives may be a part of teachers' problem conception rather than problem solution (Yinger, 1980). Teachers' mental and written plans have been examined by few researchers (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Morine, Note 6; Ben-Peretz, Note 7), as have possible relationships between teacher planning and classsroom events (Peterson, Marx, & Clark, 1978; Zahorik, 1970).

Investigations of relationships between teacher planning and student achievement have resulted in confusing findings (Peterson et al., 1978; Morine, Note 6). For example, Morine (Note 6) found relationships between some planning variables and more and less effective teachers at varied grade levels, while Peterson et al. (1978) found more extensive planning correlated negatively with student achievement. Both found a "Miscellaneous" category to be positively and often highly correlated with student achievement and indicated that further study was needed to interpret this finding accurately. Research has indicated student engaged time to be a mediating variable both predictive of student achievement and affected by teacher management behavior (Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Kounin, 1970; Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cohen, Dishaw, & Moore, Note 8). Relating teacher planning to student engaged time may therefore prove to be more productive than continued efforts to relate teacher planning directly with student achievement.

The purpose of this descriptive study is to investigate the nature and role of teacher planning as a factor affecting classroom management,

focusing on the first day of school. While analyzing and describing the content of teachers' planning considerations and written plans, the long held assumption that more complete planning leads to more effective management will also be examined. Relationships within teacher planning data and between planning and observational data will be examined, in order to identify possible relationships between teacher planning at the beginning of the year and classroom management, on the first day and throughout the first 8 weeks of school.

Review of Research

Research findings in classroom management have paralleled those in other fields of management research in the identification of dimensions essential to effective management. Three of these dimensions are organizing, controlling, and coordinating (Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Cribbin, 1972; Evertson et al., 1980; Fulmer, 1979; Sayles, 1979). A fourth dimension, planning, has been found to be crucial to effective management in business (Cribbin, 1972; Fulmer, 1979; Sayles, 1979) but has not been systematically examined in terms of classroom management. This study examines teacher planning within the framework of classroom management and focuses on planning and classroom variables for the first day of school. Studies involving such specific planning variables as teacher consideration of goals, alternatives, context, teacher reflection, and features of teachers' written lesson plans will be reviewed. Research investigating the relationship of teacher planning and student behavior and outcomes will also be discussed.

Management

The importance of management functions and principles has become increasingly apparent within the past two decades in such diverse settings as government, business, and education. Management has been seen largely as "a learnable but unteachable art" (Cribbin, 1972, p. 5), with descriptions and definitions focusing on functions and roles of managers. A manager has been defined, for example, as one who influences "the thinking, attitudes, and activities of others so that they willingly direct their behavior toward organizational objectives" (Cribbin, 1972, p. 15). Despite the notion of management as an art, progress has been made in specifying and operationalizing various aspects of management. Dimensions of management that have been found important include planning, organizing, controlling, and coordinating (Cribbin, 1972; Fulmer, 1979; Sayles, 1979).

Planning serves as a guideline for reducing future uncertainty and risk of failure (Fulmer, 1979; Kast & Rosenzweig, 1970). Planning may be comprehensive or functional, long- or short-term (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1970). Organizing involves identifying jobs to be done and determining the most efficient and orderly way to accomplish them. This aspect of managing includes arranging for special needs or abilities and matching jobs with workers to ensure worker satisfaction such that they remain actively task oriented (Cribbin, 1972; Fulmer, 1979). Managers control workers' activities to prevent undesired behavior variations and to ensure that plans are carried out smoothly (Cribbin, 1972; Fulmer, 1979; Kast & Rosenzweig, 1970). Such control involves performance feedback and specific policies and procedures (Webber, 1981). Coordination includes ensuring that workers understand their jobs and the value of

their efforts (Fulmer, 1979) as well as promoting a climate of mutual cooperation and assistance (Cribbin, 1972).

The effectiveness with which managers carry out such functions has been examined from several approaches. One promising approach has been that of the contingency model of leadership (Fiedler, 1974). This theory explains the effective performance of a group as a function of both the leader's personality and "the degree to which the situation gives the leader power, control, and influence over the situation, or, conversely, the degree to which the situation confronts the leader with uncertainty" (Fiedler, 1974, p. 65). Leaders are classified as relationship-motivated or task-motivated. Situations vary in favorability on three subscales: the degree to which (a) the leader is accepted and supported by members (leader-member relationship), (b) the task is structured and clear regarding goals, procedures, and measures of success (task structure), and (c) the leader is in a position to punish and/or reward members to gain compliance (position power). Extrapolating from this model, the more a leader, given inherent or legitimate position power, is able from the first contact to gain cooperation and support from group members and clarify and structure the situation and required tasks, the more effective that leader will be.

These leadership concepts and at least three of the four previously mentioned management dimensions are directly applicable to educational research findings on classroom management. Viewing the classroom from the perspective of the contingency model of leadership and important management functions, it follows that the more effectively that teachers, who hold legitimate position power, carry out these functions in the classroom, the more favorable the situations will become. The

sooner teachers put these functions into effect and gain the cooperation of students, the more likely they are to promote favorable classroom situations early in the school year. Thus teachers who are more highly task oriented during the initial contacts with students (i.e., on the first day of school) will be more likely to become increasingly effective in the classroom, leading students to become highly task oriented as well.

Classroom Management

While research on general management has not examined initial contacts between managers and groups, research on classrooms has the advantage of being able to do just that. The first day of school has been found to have lasting effects on the rest of the school year (Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976) in terms of the organization, control, and coordination implemented by teachers. Teachers who gain the cooperation of students immediately and who communicate clear and specific rules and procedures are more likely to have successfully managed classrooms for the duration of the year and hence have higher student achievement (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Doyle, 1979; Emmer & Evertson, 1982; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). These teachers have also been shown to be considered more effective according to student ratings (Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976).

Studies done after the first day of school have collected classroom process information providing descriptions of teacher and student behaviors (process variables) associated with desirable student outcomes, producing evidence that some teachers reliably produce higher learning gains in students than do others (Good, Biddle, & Brophy, 1975; Medley, 1977). Teacher behaviors most consistently related to student

learning gains have included classroom management skills. Classroom management has been defined as "planning and conducting activities in an orderly fashion; keeping students actively engaged in lessons and seatwork activities; and minimizing disruptions and discipline problems" (Brophy & Evertson, 1976). While teacher planning cannot be directly observed in the classroom, teacher organization, control, and coordination of classrooms have been observed. These appear to be crucial clusters of teacher behaviors included in the classroom management skills of teachers affecting student classroom behavior and resulting in desirable student outcomes.

Classroom organization has been shown to be a strong contributor to the maximization of student engaged time, which is itself a primary predictor of student learning gains (Brophy & Evertson, 1976). Organization within the classroom involves the use of materials and assignments that match students' learning needs and abilities. It also includes such things as use of regular procedures to distribute and collect papers, noting student progress, and handling noninstructional chores to allow the greatest amount of time for actual instruction. Well organized teachers increase the likelihood that students will be successful and will actively participate in written and oral assignments, with a minimum of student time wasted in confusion over what to do.

Teacher control can be seen in teachers' setting clear expectations for student behavior through a presentation of rules and procedures, and in their monitoring of student behavior and providing consistent feedback. Consistent implementation of rules and procedures and consequences for behavior tends to increase students' on-task behavior

and decrease the possibility of inappropriate and disruptive student behavior.

In well organized and controlled classrooms where expectations are clear and events run smoothly, coordination involves a further step, in promoting the development of a pleasant, relaxed environment in which teacher and students work together toward mutually acceptable goals. Teachers communicate to students the value of learning what is offered, and a positive teacher/student relationship is established.

First Day of School

Most studies of management, in both business and classrooms, have been conducted in situations that are ongoing, that is, after management guidelines have been established and precedents already set. In classroom research, only a few studies have focused on the first day of school even though it has long been considered crucial, with powerful implications for the rest of the school year (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976; Waller, 1932). Management variables have been found to be important ingredients of the first day as part of teachers' pattern setting for the rest of the year (Brophy & Putnam, 1979; Emmer et al., 1980; Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976).

The pattern of student cooperation or lack of cooperation is one example that has been described. Pupil deviant behaviors have been hypothesized to increase until teachers take action, thus effecting a slight decrease (Doyle, 1979). Once the level of pupil deviant behavior has accelerated, according to Doyle, it does not revert to former lower levels; hence the importance of teachers' using effective management skills on the first day of school to enlist student cooperation and to

prevent deviant behavior from emerging in the first place. Further empirical evidence supports Doyle's conclusions and the importance of first day effective classroom management.

Moskowitz and Hayman (1976) studied first day behavior of junior high school teachers in a large urban school district, attempting to identify teacher behaviors that differentiated "best" from "typical" and new teachers. Fourteen junior high school teachers were categorized as "best" teachers on the basis of student responses at the end of the school year. Students were asked to name a teacher they "liked a lot" and also from whom they "learned a lot" (p. 283). Classroom observers described and coded teachers' behaviors on the first day of school and on six other occasions throughout the school year. "Best" teachers were found to monitor student behavior closely on the first day, correcting problem situations quickly and quietly to prevent them from developing. These teachers were also observed to be well organized, explicit in orienting students as to what to expect, and pleasant and even-tempered even in dealing with potential problems. Throughout the year these teachers had less off-task student behavior, as well as the consensus of students' favorable attitudes and reported learning.

Another study investigated classroom management with emphasis on beginning of the year activities (Emmer et al., 1980). A year long study of 27 third grade teachers identified more effective managers on the basis of student engagement rates, student achievement, and detailed narratives written by trained classroom observers. Teachers identified as more effective managers were found to have clearly identifiable management behaviors on the first day of school. These teachers maintained contact with the whole group throughout the first day. They

presented rules and procedures that were necessary for initial activities, using examples and reasons. They provided children with enjoyable tasks at which students could be successful, and they monitored behavior closely, stopping inappropriate behavior promptly. They appeared to be more effective planners, having prepared to deal with constraints such as shortage of materials, and being organized in their ability to keep students engaged when interruptions occurred. These teachers were described as taking the role of "classroom leaders" (p. 225) and as establishing a pleasant environment in which they maintained control. This pattern was maintained throughout the year.

Teacher Planning

While observable teacher classroom behaviors appear to have observable effects on student classroom behavior and achievement gains, even from the first day of school, the effect of teacher thinking and planning that occurs outside the classroom is less clear. Planning has been defined as "a process of preparing a framework for guiding teacher action, a process strongly oriented toward particular actions rather. . .than knowledge or self-development" (Clark & Yinger, Note 9, p. 8-9).

Called the "invisible thinking" activity in teaching (Clark & Yinger, Note 10, p. 15), teacher planning has been studied in several ways. Originally described in prescriptive terms, theoretical statements were made about how teachers should plan (Eisner, 1967; MacDonald, 1965; Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1950). Empirical studies were first published in 1970 (Zahorik), and researchers have sought to understand what teachers consider in planning (McCutcheon, 1980; Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6),

what teacher planning looks like (Peterson, Marx, & Clark, 1978; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6; Yinger, Note 11), what teachers believe about planning (McCutcheon, 1979), and effects of planning on the classroom (Peterson et al., 1978; Zahorik, 1970).

Teacher considerations in planning appear to have been examined chiefly from two aspects. One involves what teachers report thinking about while planning; the other includes teacher statements made during the actual planning process and what teachers actually write in their plans. Studies investigating teacher planning have not always differentiated between what teachers think about planning and the physical process and evidence of planning. As a result, some conclusions made about teacher planning in general that appear on the surface to be contradictory may be understandable when applied to the specific aspect of planning under investigation.

Consideration of goals. Research regarding teachers' consideration of goals (i.e., what teachers intend to accomplish) during planning has had inconsistent results. Several studies have indicated that teachers do not consider academic or behavioral goals when planning (Peterson et al. 1978; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Mintz, Note 1; Smith & Sendelback, Note 2; Yinger, Note 3). All of these studies, however, examined teachers' actual statements during planning or their final written plans in a naturalistic setting. In laboratory settings when teachers have been asked directly to make decisions about goals or objectives, they have done so and have reported that doing so is consistent with their regular planning processes (Borko, Note 4; Russo, Note 5). While stating or writing goals may not be part of teachers' observable planning behavior in a naturalistic setting, teachers have

been reported to make mental plans or images which include more detailed aspects of the lesson than they write or readily verbalize (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79). According to teachers' responses to probes about their planning process, one aspect they seem to consider in these mental plans involves objectives or goals (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79).

Consideration of alternatives. Consideration of alternatives in planning has been suggested as being conducive to more effective planning in allowing for instructional variety and greater teacher flexibility (Morine, 1973). Alternatives indicate a deliberate choice made by the teacher about any aspect of the lesson, e.g., activities, instructional methods, or materials. Morine called teacher generation of alternatives "planning for variety" (1973), and posited that improving teachers' skills in generating and considering alternative instructional procedures would aid teachers in flexibly handling the unpredictability of teacher-student interactions as well as increasing instructional variety. Planning for a variety of instructional activities has been found to be related to higher student task orientation during seatwork (Kounin, 1966); variety in instructional patterns has been related to positive student attitudes and higher student achievement (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971).

Empirical studies show that teachers do not generally include alternatives in their written plans (Peterson et al., 1978; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6). When questioned, however, most teachers in a study by Morine (Note 6) indicated that they do consider alternatives in planning although they seldom write them in their plans.

Other studies have found that rather than teachers' developing and choosing among several alternatives in planning, teacher planning may be actually a "progressive elaboration of a major idea" (Clark & Yinger, Note 9, p. 258). Yinger (1980) followed an elementary school teacher for a 5 month period, observing her classroom and recording her planning and classroom activities. On the basis of information collected from observations and interviews, Yinger developed a process model of planning which conceptualizes teacher planning as consisting of three parts: (a) problem finding, (b) problem formulation/solution, and (c) implementation, evaluation, and routinization.

It is in the problem-finding phase that Yinger suggests teachers generate a variety of ideas, with the purpose of developing an initial problem conception, "a worthy instructional idea that has not recently failed" (p. 117) to be elaborated, investigated, and adapted for use. In this model teachers generate alternative ideas about the nature of the task but then consider only one solution at a time to achieve their goal ("goal" being described as the successful implementation of classroom activities). This is somewhat different from the traditional notion of teachers' generating a list of possible solutions and through the mental process of elimination selecting one activity or solution for implementation.

A study by McCutcheon (1980) appears to substantiate Yinger's observation that teachers prefer to use an initial adapted or revised activity than to generate and consider systematically a series of alternative solutions before selecting one for implementation. Most of the 12 elementary school teachers in McCutcheon's study reported that they tended to use the first idea that occurred to them. Explaining why

they did not usually consider alternatives, they gave several reasons: (a) they preferred to use ideas that had been successful in the past; (b) planning time was limited; (c) some alternatives would interrupt routines that kept lessons moving smoothly; (d) choices were made on a year to year basis contingent on the nature of the students; (e) choice was curtailed by having required textbooks; and (f) they seemed to "know" what would work best with their students and rejected other possibilities.

It was noted, however, that experienced teachers in this study mentioned drawing from a repertoire of ideas that had been successful in the past. This appears to be akin to Yinger's description of the process of initial problem conception in which teachers generate ideas resulting in one "worthy idea" that has not met with recent failure. While there is certainly a distinction to be made between "generating" and "drawing from" ideas, and Yinger's model emphasizes the process of "discovery and design" rather than deliberation and choice, it appears that the notion of alternatives plays a part in both processes and may need some clarification in terms of definition and role to result in meaningful interpretations.

Consideration of context. Contextual factors tend to dominate teachers' considerations in planning. While context has been defined with varying degrees of breadth and inclusiveness (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Clark & Yinger, Note 10), all definitions include factors within the school which are likely to affect teachers' planning and decisions. Most commonly described contextual factors include characteristics of students, school personnel, materials and equipment for use in the

classroom, content to be taught, and activities in which students are to participate.

Considerations about students have been found to be salient across several aspects of teacher planning. In investigating teacher planning in British secondary schools, Taylor (1970) looked at course syllabi and collected information from 26 teachers via questionnaires and group discussions. He found the most common theme across all types of data collection to be the importance of the pupil. Especially salient were pupil abilities, needs, and interests. Factors following this in order of importance were subject matter, aims, and teaching methods. Taylor proposed that curriculum planning begins with consideration of content to be taught and its accompanying contextual factors (e.g., resources, time, sequencing), followed by pupil interests and attitudes. Only then are such factors as aims and purposes, learning situations, philosophy, and evaluation procedures considered.

In addition to considerations about students, both content and student activities have been found to be important considerations in teacher planning (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6). Zahorik sought to examine teachers' use of behavioral objectives and both prescriptive theoretical models of planning, i.e., the separate ends-means model (Popham & Baker, 1970; Tyler, 1950) and the integrated ends-means model (MacDonald, 1965). Zahorik asked 194 teachers to list decisions they made before teaching and to note the order in which the decisions were made. Upon categorizing teacher decisions, he found that decisions regarding pupil activities were listed by the greatest number of teachers (81%), and decisions about

content were most often listed as the decision made first (51%). At 28%, behavioral decisions were a substantial second to this.

Zahorik concluded from his results that neither theoretical model accurately describes the way in which teachers actually plan. Teachers did not appear to follow a logical sequence of objectives in planning as proposed in the separate ends-means model, nor did most teachers begin their planning with considerations regarding student activities (only 3%) as implied by the integrated ends-means model of planning. With evidence that neither prescriptive model was comprehensive nor completely accurate regarding teacher planning, Zahorik's conclusions implied the need for the development of a new model of planning, based on the actual process and thinking of teachers during their planning activities.

An extensive study of instructional planning by Morine (Note 6) substantiated Zahorik's findings of teacher emphasis on activities and content. Morine asked 20 second grade and 20 fifth grade teachers to plan and then teach two 20-minute lessons, one reading and one math, with topics specified. For each lesson, teachers were asked to write down what they expected to do during the instruction period, in such a way as to help an observer better understand the lesson. Teachers were interviewed after each teaching session and given one additional task. After the reading lesson, they watched a videotape of the lesson they had taught and were asked to evaluate the lesson and state any changes they might make in future planning based on their observation of the videotape. After the math lesson, teachers were shown five prerecorded videotapes of other teachers using different approaches to teaching the lesson they had just completed. Teachers were to (a) think of other

possible variations in approach, (b) tell how students might respond to the various alternative approaches in contrast to their own approach, and (c) describe how they would plan for a similar future lesson.

Written plans of these teachers frequently included mention of worksheets to be used in the lesson. Worksheets are teacher-made written activities for students on various subjects; their inclusion in teacher plans indicates consideration of specific materials, content, and student activities.

In another study, Morine-Dershimer (1978-79) studied 10 teachers over time to collect data on both their teaching behavior and thinking. The author found a "distinct difference between the preactive [preinstructional] decision and the written plan" (p. 84). Interviews to elicit the unstated plans of teachers were conducted. Teacher responses to the most general questions, with no probes, consistently indicated that teachers considered content, activities, and materials during the process of planning.

Written Lesson Plans

One of the most frequently taught planning skills in teacher training programs is that of writing lesson plans (Morine, 1973). For most teachers writing plans is a routine activity (Morine, 1973), with a structured planbook serving as a receptacle for daily lesson plans. A planbook plan has been defined as "a shorthand outline of what will transpire, based on the teacher's mental planning, the textbook, or a list of skills" (McCutcheon, 1980, p. 11). A lesson plan may serve as an external memory aid, as a shorthand form of mental planning by teachers (McCutcheon, 1980), and as a way of organizing instruction. Teachers have reported plans to be of psychological benefit, providing

them with "direction, security, and confidence" (Clark & Yinger, Note 9, p. 15). Research has focused on several aspects of teacher lesson plans, such as length, form, level of detail, and content.

Length and level of detail. While teachers generally write only minimal information about plans in their planbooks, most plans examined by researchers have been written with the knowledge that they would be studied for research. Teachers in one study indicated that plans submitted to interviewers were not typical of their usual style of preparation (Morine & Vallance, Note 12). Most teachers in another study (Morine, Note 6) acknowledged writing longer and more detailed plans than usual for the benefit of the researcher. While the majority of teachers in this study indicated that student teachers should write more detailed plans, student teachers in a study by Ben-Peretz (Note 7) tended to produce shorter and less detailed plans than did teachers.

In examining the level of detail in second and fifth grade teachers' lesson plans for a 20-minute math and reading lesson, Morine (Note 6) used three categories. A vague plan was one which briefly mentioned activities in only a general way. A specific plan included information such as specific examples to be used or questions to be asked. A detailed plan contained such information as verbatim statements the teacher intended to make, indications of expected student behavior, diagrams showing how information would be arranged on the chalkboard, etc. No difference in specificity was found related to subject matter taught, and fifth grade teachers had somewhat more detailed plans in both reading and math.

Content and sequence. Teachers' written lesson plans have frequently been found to be basically an outline or list of topics to be

covered in a lesson (Clark & Yinger, Note 9). Plans for academic lessons appear to be largely based on the textbook to be used (McCutcheon, 1980), with sequencing and activities drawn from teachers' editions of texts (Clark & Yinger, Note 9).

Second and fifth grade teachers' written plans for a 20-minute lesson in reading and math were analyzed by Morine (Note 6) sorting statements into several categories: specific and general statements, statements about cognitive and affective aspects, pupil categories, and process categories. More specific than general statements were made, and emphasis seemed to be more on cognitive than on affective aspects of the lesson. The latter phenomenon may be due to the nature of the lessons, which were academic in content. Cognitive aspects included such things as teacher introduction, questioning, explanation, and directions; data selection and organization; use of pupil ideas; and content focus.

A more detailed analysis of the cognitive aspects category reveals several interesting findings. Teacher introduction and questioning received more emphasis in plans than did teacher explanation and directions. Data selection was more frequently mentioned than most other categories, with fifth grade teachers making more frequent responses than second grade teachers to this category. The highest frequency of specific statements in this category was the use of pupil ideas, with more such statements seen in reading than in math lessons and more by second grade than by fifth grade teachers.

It is interesting to note that with the exception of teacher directions (which were rarely mentioned in plans), no categories involving procedural matters were included in this study and none mentioned as

having been attended to by teachers in their plans. It is possible that in an isolated 20-minute session not many procedures would be necessary. Also, because these teachers were working with a sample of 12 students from their own regular classes and because the study was conducted after school was well underway, it is highly possible that such procedural matters as transitions between activities, checking papers, and passing papers to students or to the teacher had become so routinized as to make their mention unnecessary.

In analyzing the process of one teacher's planning over time, Yinger (1980) found that one outstanding aspect of her planning was the use of teaching routines. Defined as mechanisms to "establish and regulate activities and to simplify planning" (p. 111), routines were central to this teacher's planning.

Yinger identified four types of routines in this teacher's planning: activity routines, instructional routines, management routines, and executive planning routines. Activity routines controlled and coordinated such features of instructional activities as structure and sequence, duration, acceptable student behavior, and the teacher's instructional moves. Instructional routines were teacher style and methods for carrying out such instuctional moves as questioning, monitoring, and giving instructions. Management routines were procedures designed to coordinate and control student behavior and classroom organization not directly associated with an activity. These included transitions between activities, passing out or collecting materials, and starting class upon entering the room. Executive planning routines were part of the planning process itself and resulted from the teacher's experience in similar situations.

Routines served two major functions. First, they "increased the teacher's flexibility and effectiveness by reducing the time and energy she put into planning and carrying out decisions" (Yinger, 1980, p. 112). Second, they "increased the predictability and reduced the complexity of the classroom environment for the students" (p. 112). Efficient routines resulted in more time being devoted to content and less to procedures.

The lack of mention of procedures in written plans, therefore, may indicate that (a) necessary procedures have been routinized, (b) the teacher includes procedures only in mental, not written, plans, or (c) the teacher feels no need for efficient procedures to be specified. In the case of teachers in Morine's (Note 6) study, there may have been little need for procedures for a 20-minute lesson, and what procedures were needed may already have been routinized in the regular class, eliminating the need for including procedures in plans.

One characteristic common to almost all written lesson plans in Morine's (1976) study was that of specifying the sequence of the lesson. Teachers generally wrote things down in the order in which they were to occur in the lesson. The fact that teachers use plans as a guide and as a means of organizing instuction (Clark & Yinger, Note 9) makes it logical that most teachers would identify steps to be followed and write them in chronological order.

Teacher Reflection

It has been found that teachers reflect on past lessons and on what might occur in current and subsequent lessons (McCutcheon, 1980). While it might be assumed that teachers can learn from reflecting on experience (Morine, Note 6), some evidence indicates that this ability may

be limited in most people (Einhorn & Hogarth, 1981). One means used to determine whether teachers might consider making changes based on past experience was used by Morine (Note 6).

To determine whether teachers reflect on a lesson just taught and whether they consider that lesson in planning for the future, Morine (Note 6) included "Looking Back/Looking Ahead" questions in interviewing teachers. After having taught a 20-minute lesson in reading, teachers were asked how they might reteach the same lesson to a similar group of students, and what they might plan to do in teaching a follow-up lesson to the same students. Almost all the teachers indicated that they generally did think about both possibilities after teaching a lesson. More fifth grade than second grade teachers indicated that they would make changes in reteaching the lesson, and the changes they mentioned more frequently pertained to cognitive aspects of the lesson (e.g., teacher directions, explanation, summary, and review; vocabulary; content focus; pacing/time; pupil ability, background, and ideas) than to instructional materials to be used.

More teachers mentioned attention to affective aspects of the lesson in discussing reteaching the lesson than in discussing planning for a follow-up lesson. Interestingly, the only teachers who did mention affective issues in the lesson follow-up were second grade teachers with high pupil gain scores. The author suggested that teachers might be more aware of the affective aspects of an academic lesson in retrospect than in forethought; whether this pattern holds true for other kinds of lessons and other grade levels was not examined. It does appear, from these results, that more effective teachers are

somewhat more likely than others to consider affective aspects in their planning.

Relationship of Planning and Classroom Behavior

Extensive empirical research has shown that teachers do not plan according to prescriptive models of planning (McCutcheon, 1979; Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Peterson et al., 1978; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6; Yinger, Note 11), indicating that there is a mismatch between these prescriptive models and actual demands of classroom instruction (Shavelson & Stern, 1981). The degree to which teachers follow the actual plans they do write has been examined only recently.

While not directly comparing how closely teachers followed plans, Zahorik (1970) studied one means by which planning might affect the teaching process. More specifically, he examined the effect of teacher planning on teacher classroom verbal behavior deemed sensitive to students. Twelve fourth grade teachers were randomly assigned to one of two groups, planners and non-planners. Two weeks before the lesson was to be taught, teachers in the planning group were given a lesson plan outlining the topic and presenting several objectives. Teachers in the non-planning group were told nothing except that in 2 weeks they should allow 1 hour to present a topic that would be disclosed to them just prior to the instructional period. All instructional periods were audio-taped and then coded using six categories to measure verbal aspects of teacher sensitivity to pupils. Results indicated first that both groups of teachers used more insensitive than sensitive verbal behaviors. Second, non-planners used significantly more verbal statements indicative of authentic data extension and somewhat more

statements indicative of broad data initiation. Planners used significantly more verbal statements classified as non-authentic data extension and somewhat more statements classified as narrow data initiation. Third, both groups exhibited similar verbal behaviors regarding data encouragement. Finally, planners used significantly more data initiation statements, and non-planners used significantly more data encouragement statements.

Zahorik concluded from these results that planning results in a rational, sequential guideline which teachers try to follow closely. Planners tried to channel students' responses into the prescribed format, thus decreasing the flexibility of teacher/student interactions. Planning seemed to fix the interactive environment, reducing teacher sensitivity to students and giving priority instead to implementation of the plan.

Several points should be made regarding this study. First, teachers did not make their own plans, but were given a lesson plan to follow 2 weeks before the lesson. Such a plan presumably written by the researcher might have been given greater attention and weight than one they had written themselves. Having 2 weeks in which to study the plan adds to the likelihood that teachers in the planning group would infer that they were to study the plan and follow it as closely as possible. With plans they make themselves, teachers might feel more at liberty to allow changes according to the nature of teacher/student interaction and thus to appear more flexible and sensitive to student needs.

A second point regarding teachers' being given a plan rather than making one of their own involves the use of alternatives. In being told

to teach from a ready-made lesson plan, teachers may have felt somewhat constricted in the approach, materials, etc., that they might use. In being told to teach a topic extemporaneously, teachers would necessarily be planning "on their feet," and sensitivity to students would likely serve as a primary cue as to the direction the lesson should take. The findings of the study may, therefore, have been a result of its design rather than demonstrating clearly that planning itself results in less sensitive teacher verbal behavior.

A study examining whether teachers do what they plan to do was conducted by Peterson, Marx, and Clark (1978). They examined the relationship of teacher planning with student classroom behavior and achievement in a laboratory setting. A sample of 12 elementary school teachers was instructed to "think aloud" during 90-minute planning periods before presenting lessons to groups of randomly selected junior high school students. Each teacher was given social studies material and cognitive and affective objectives. Teachers were to teach a 3 hour lesson over the material to three different groups of junior high school students on three different days. Both planning and teaching periods were recorded and coded.

The authors found that most of the teachers' planning statements concerned content or subject matter, with statements regarding teacher and student activities and teacher strategies (instructional processes) immediately following in number. The smallest amount of teacher planning time was spent on objectives. Teachers who focused on subject matter in their planning also tended to focus on subject matter in class; teachers who discussed teacher and student activities in planning tended to have more group communications in class, possibly in order to

keep their planned instructional processes (e.g., role playing or group investigation) going throughout the lesson. In most instances, teachers appeared to implement plans that they had made with no significant changes in focus.

Morine-Dershimer (1978-79) approached classroom deviations from plans from a different viewpoint. The term, "teacher plan," included more than just the written plan in her study. It included "the teacher's detailed or comprehensive mental image or set of expectations from the lesson" (p. 85). These mental plans were found to be more detailed than written plans and to cover more aspects of the lesson. Discrepancies between plans and classroom events were determined by 10 teachers during 60 stimulated recall interviews in which they commented on a videotape recording of a lesson they had taught.

Four types of decision points from the videotapes were coded according to teachers' perceptions and comments. Decision points were categorized as follows: (a) type of decision point, e.g., pupil- or plan-related decision, explanation of routine procedures; (b) instructional concerns, e.g., pupil learning behavior, lesson content (skill or process), plan- or pupil-related pacing; (c) sources of information, e.g., observation of pupils' verbal and nonverbal behavior, teacher expectation or recall of prior knowledge; and (d) teacher awareness, e.g., principles of instruction or alternative procedures identified, teacher feelings expressed. At each decision point, teachers could mention several elements of any or several of the four categories.

Discrepancies of actual lessons from mental plans were identified by teachers' reactions to decision points on the videotape. The amount

of teacher-perceived discrepancy was measured in two ways: (a) the proportion of decision points at which teachers expressed surprise or otherwise indicated that the event was different from their expectations, and (b) the proportion of decision points at which teachers indicated feeling disturbed or bothered by that event.

Lessons with little or no discrepancy were those in which teachers identified fewer than 25% of the decision points as unexpected. Lessons with minor discrepancy were those in which 50% or more decision points were described as unexpected but fewer than 25% were described as having disturbed or bothered teachers. Lessons with critical discrepancy were those in which more than 50% of the decision points were identified as unexpected and 50% or more of the points were also described as disturbing or bothersome.

The author presents three case studies to illustrate the three discrepancy levels. She found that in cases in which there was little or no discrepancy between plans and classroom reality, teachers tended to be "image-oriented" and to use their recall of previous knowledge about pupils. In these classes, teachers used established routines for handling decision points. In cases with a minor discrepancy between plans and reality, teachers tended to be "reality-oriented" and to observe a fairly narrow range of student behavior. "Inflight," or on-the-spot decisions, characterized the handling of decision points in these situations. With more pervasive discrepancies between plans and classroom reality, teachers tended to be "problem-oriented" and to consider a broader spectrum of information about pupils. In these situations, teachers usually postponed making decisions until a later time.

For 18 of the 60 lessons on which stimulated recall data were obtained, information was also collected about teacher conceptions of pupils formed during the lesson. Based on combined sets of data, four lessons were found to be image-oriented, with few or no discrepancies; 11, reality-oriented, with minor discrepancies; and three, problem-oriented, with a critical level of discrepancies.

By expanding the definition of plan to include teachers' mental plans and by pinpointing discrepancies between plans and reality to be points at which teachers perceived they were making decisions, the author has examined an important aspect of teacher planning and teaching. It is not clear, however, to what extent each identified discrepancy actually deviates from plans or the nature of the plans. Whether the teacher had changed the timing, sequence, or focus of a lesson or actually shifted from one content area to another or whether minor changes in methods or styles were made cannot be determined. It was apparent, however, that the degree of discrepancy affected the kinds of student information these teachers considered in class.

Relationship of Planning and Student Outcomes

Studies attempting to predict student achievement directly from teacher planning have had inconclusive results. Morine (Note 6) analyzed lesson plans and planning statements of 40 second and fifth grade teachers for a 20-minute lesson in math and reading. Teachers were selected from a group who had participated in a previous study (Berliner, Marliave, & Moore, Note 13). In the previous study, 200 volunteer second and fifth grade teachers had taught a 2-week unit on reading and a 2-week unit on mathematics to their classes. Pupil gain scores were derived from relevant pretest and posttest data, and 40

second and fifth grade teachers with high and low pupil gain scores were selected to participate in Morine's 1976 study.

Lesson plans for the 20-minute math and reading lessons were analyzed according to the general type of plan, using categories such as specificity, general format, and mention of alternative procedures. Individual planning statements were coded according to "The Basic Category System," classifying each statement into a category such as goals, pupil background, management/control, materials, cognitive aspects, and affective aspects.

A few differences were found when teachers were compared according to high and low pupil gain scores. While most teachers used moderately specific plans in outline form, differences were seen among second grade teachers. Second grade teachers with high pupil gain scores tended to write more detailed plans for math; second grade teachers with low pupil gain scores had more vague plans for reading. Second grade teachers with high pupil gain scores were the only teachers in all groups to mention affective aspects of the follow-up lesson.

Teachers in all groups were equally likely to include goals in their plans. The only difference noted in mention of goals was that fifth grade teachers with high pupil gain scores tended more frequently than those with low gain scores to state behavioral as opposed to non-behavioral objectives in the reading lesson. The only teachers who developed original behavioral goals, rather than using goals from the curriculum or provided by the author, were four teachers with high pupil gain scores.

Differences in teachers' noting pupil background and considering alternative procedures were seen only among fifth grade teachers. Those

with high pupil gain scores noted pupil background more frequently than did those with low gain scores in planning for both math and reading lessons. Fifth grade teachers with high pupil gain scores noted alternative procedures more often than did those with low gain scores in planning for the reading lesson.

According to these results, more effective second grade teachers seem to be more concerned with affective matters than do other teachers, whereas more effective fifth grade teachers appear more behaviorally oriented. Other results are difficult to interpret. While more of the effective fifth grade teachers appeared to consider pupil background than did less effective fifth grade teachers (7:1), most fifth grade teachers (32) did not consider pupil background at all. Similarly, while more of the effective fifth grade teachers considered alternatives than did less effective fifth grade teachers in planning for reading (4:1), closer inspection reveals that most (15) did not consider any alternatives. Morine reports these results but makes no interpretations and draws no conclusions as to their implications.

Difficulties in finding clear results in comparing teacher planning and student achievement are also apparent in the study by Peterson, Marx, and Clark (1978) described in the preceding section. Twelve teachers were given social studies materials and related objectives and were to teach a 3-hour lesson to three different groups of junior high school students on three different days. Planning and teaching periods were tape recorded and coded. Both teachers and students filled out four preaptitude measures (verbal ability, reasoning ability, flexibility of closure, and conceptual level), with student outcomes

measured by a multiple choice test, an essay test, and an attitude questionnaire.

Relationships between teacher planning and student achievement were unexpected and difficult to interpret. Teacher productivity, i.e., the total number of planning statements, was stable across the three lessons. Teachers who were the most verbal in planning had high student achievement the first day. On the second and third days, however, correlations were negative: More teacher planning seemed to lead to lower student achievement. More teacher planning was also indicative of poorer student attitude toward the teacher, subject matter, and instructional processes. These results are reminiscent of Zahorik's (1970) findings of extensive teacher planning leading to less sensitivity to students.

A confusing though possibly important finding in the Peterson et al. (1978) study involved a category labeled Miscellaneous. The authors found the Miscellaneous category to be positively and often highly correlated with both student achievement and attitude on Days 2 and 3. According to the authors, the nature of statements coded Miscellaneous included more personal remarks than actual planning statements. The authors proposed that teachers coded high in the Miscellaneous category might have been more relaxed, indicating stylistic differences among teachers, with implications as to the effectiveness of their teaching. The authors concluded that the category of Miscellaneous needed to be further broken down to identify kinds of planning statements that were positively related to desirable student outcomes.

Both studies described above attempted to relate teacher planning

directly to student achievement, with less than satisfactory results. It has been suggested elsewhere (e.g., Carnahan, Note 14) that such inconclusive results are not surprising. Planning may not directly affect achievement, but it might affect mediating variables that in turn influence learning.

The Context for the Present Study

The present study investigates teacher first day planning and its relationship to student outcome variables related to engaged time using a subset of teachers from a larger study at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) at the University of Texas at Austin. Several studies conducted by the Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Program (RCLT), formerly called the Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching (COET) project, at the R&DCTE examined teacher management behaviors at elementary and junior high school levels. Student outcomes have included both achievement and attitude data and student classroom behaviors related to student engaged time. In clarifying classroom management skills of teachers, specific student behaviors have been identified and measured.

The most recent study conducted by the RCLT program at the R&DCTE was the Junior High Management Improvement Study (JMIS), conducted in 1981-82. This study was designed to test the effectiveness of materials and teacher workshop experiences developed from findings of the Junior High Classroom Organization Study (JHCOS, 1978-79) and a 1980-81 pilot study. The goal was to help teachers construct and maintain effective learning environments in their classes.

The JMIS included 35 teachers in eight junior high schools, grades seven and eight in one school district, and 26 teachers in six middle

schools, grades six through eight in a second school district. Teachers in the study in the second school district had 2 or fewer years of teaching experience.

Stratified random selection was used to form two treatment groups of teachers, balanced for years of experience, subject, and grade level. The experimental group received a teacher's manual before school started and participated in one workshop before school and in another after several weeks of school. The other group received the manual and one workshop later in the year. All of the teachers in the study were observed approximately 22 hours each, including observations on the first day of class and throughout the year.

Observers were given 3 days of training in the use of several coding systems and in writing activity records of classroom events, including teacher and student behavior. Observers were in the classrooms of participating teachers on the first day of school.

A variety of observational data, counts and ratings, and teacher self-reports were collected for each class. Such data included:

1. Classroom Activity Records (CARs) described classroom environments, instructional activities, and teachers' and students' behaviors during each observed class, and included codes denoting categories of activities as they occurred throughout the class period;

2. Component Ratings (CRs) were completed by observers after each class session. These consisted of 54 Likert-scale items describing teachers' and students' behaviors and classroom climate; and

3. Student Engagement Ratings (SERs) were counts of students in different engagement categories (e.g., on task, off task, unsanctioned, dead time) made every 10 minutes during observations.

Preliminary results indicated that teachers who received the manual and workshop before school started used the recommended management procedures significantly more than did teachers not receiving the information. Use of the JMIS strategies was associated with higher levels of student on task behavior and cooperation in the first two months of school.

Recommended management behaviors used significantly ($p < .01$) more in classrooms of treatment teachers than in classrooms of control group teachers included monitoring student understanding, efficient opening and closing routines, effective monitoring of behavior, stopping inappropriate behavior quickly, planning enough work, and efficient routines for assigning work.

Summary of Background

Management research has consistently identified four major components of management: planning, organizing, controlling, and coordinating. Educational research on classroom management has identified management skills comprising organizing, controlling, and coordinating and has differentiated more and less effective classroom managers on the basis of student learning gains and student classroom task engagement variables. In addition, some research on classroom management has found classroom management variables to be identifiable on the first day of school and has shown that classroom management on the first day appears to set a pattern affecting student learning and task engagement throughout the school year (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Moskowitz & Hayman, 1976).

While planning has been empirically identified as a primary component of management per se, teacher planning has only begun to be

investigated and has yet to be empirically linked to classroom management. Mixed findings have resulted from attempts to determine whether teachers have goals and consider alternatives in planning and from attempts to identify kinds of goals and alternatives that are more likely to be considered (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Stern & Shavelson, 1980; Morine, Note 6). Research describing teacher planning has found contextual factors to be prevalent in teachers' planning considerations (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Morine, Note 6).

Teachers' written lesson plans have received scant attention. Content, detail, length, and specification of sequence have been identified as relevant aspects of written plans (Morine, Note 6) with teaching routines central to overall planning (Yinger, 1980). With plans seen as a guide to classroom activity (Morine, Note 6), the relationship between plans and classroom events appears to be a close one. Teachers have been found to do basically what their plans indicate (Peterson, Marx, & Clark, 1978), sometimes at the expense of their sensitivity to students (Zahorik, 1970).

Teachers have been found to have mental plans or images that are more detailed than their written plans (Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79). Teachers' mental plans add a new dimension to research on teacher planning and offer the possibility of resolving current conflicts in findings about various aspects of teacher planning.

Attempts to relate teacher planning and student achievement have had inconclusive results. In investigations of other aspects of classroom management, use of student engagement time and behaviors as a

reliable mediating variable has had more productive results than attempts to relate classroom management variables directly to student achievement (Carnahan, Note 14). It may be that examining planning within the framework of teachers' classroom management skills and relating planning to student engagement will be similarly productive.

Statement of Purpose

Classroom management research has not yet systematically examined teacher planning, although researchers have long held planning to be a crucial factor in the effective management of classes. It has been noted that some management procedures and student behaviors common to many classes may not appear at all in more effective teachers' classes, their appearance anticipated and prevented by these teachers' efficient planning (Berliner, 1977). Thus a clear description of teacher planning and its relationship to classroom management is due. By focusing on the first day, it may be possible to get a comprehensive picture of the way in which teachers plan for every aspect of teacher and student behavior in the classroom. The first day has been said to set the tone for the rest of the year; perhaps the same might hold true for first day planning.

Because little research has been done on teacher planning, and virtually none on planning with regard to classroom management, the first step must be a thorough description of the process and implementation of teacher planning along with observation of actual classroom management behaviors. Guba (1978), for one, notes that the first step in scientific inquiry must be descriptive. Only after a clear picture of the object of investigation has been delineated can it be explained and refined. This study is such an initial step, with the intent of

answering as completely as possible three major questions: (a) What are teachers trying to accomplish on the first day of school? (b) What is the relationship between planning variables and teachers' evaluation of the first day? and (c) What is the relationship between teacher plans and actual first day events and events throughout the first 8 weeks of school?

Methods

The present study uses two sources of data in order to examine middle school teachers' plans and activities on the first day of school and to compare these with dimensions of classroom management throughout the first 8 weeks of school. Teachers' first day planning is assessed by means of structured interviews and teachers' written lesson plans. Observational data collected on the first day and throughout the first 8 weeks of school is used in relating teacher first day planning to classroom behavior. These observational data were collected as part of a larger study, the Junior High Management Improvement Study (JMIS), conducted by the Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching Program (RCLT) of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) at the University of Texas at Austin.

Three kinds of analyses were conducted. First, interviews with teachers about their planning were coded using numerical categories and frequencies. Relationships among these interview variables were then examined. Second, teacher planning variables were compared to teacher evaluations of the first day. Third, planning variables were correlated with observational variables to identify relationships between plans, events, and teacher evaluations of the first day. In addition, to help

make the quantitative results more concrete and interpretable, case study descriptions of teacher planning were prepared from data obtained from four teachers. These are presented in Appendix A.

Interview Development

A structured interview technique was used to collect information regarding teachers' plans for the first day of school. The following section describes the rationale and development of the structured interview used in the actual study.

Preliminary Interview

Because the study did not use materials and procedures that had been previously developed and validated, the first step in the actual study was the development of appropriate interview questions. The interview focused first on planning, then on actual classroom activities, and finally on teachers' alternative and future ideas for planning. The original 10 questions and rationales follow. To facilitate recall, each teacher was given a typed description of the activities observed in his or her class on the first day.

1. Is there anything new about your teaching situation this year--school, grade, etc.? If so, what? Research has found that some cognitive processes are more available for verbalization in the novice than in the expert (Ericsson & Simon, 1980). As new teachers or teachers in new situations might be considered "novice" planners for the first day of school, this question was included.

2. When did you write these first day lesson plans? (e.g., before or after the workshop) If before, did you change anything before the first day of school? If so, what? Why? What made you decide to do so? A subset of teachers in the JMIS had attended a workshop on classroom management before the first day of school. This question referred to

that workshop and sought to determine whether the workshop had influenced teachers in making changes in their first day plans. The workshop did not directly address planning but might have had an indirect effect. The possibility of such an influence would not affect the results of this study because the present study focuses on what comprises teacher planning and classroom management practices rather than on why teachers plan or behave in a particular manner. The question was included for informational purposes, more relevant to the RCLT Project than the present study.

3. What factors did you consider when making your first day plans? (What kinds of information did you seek? Did you consider anything in particular concerning your classroom, materials, students, kinds of activities, etc.?). Question 3 sought to identify contextual factors teachers considered in planning for the first day. The question was asked in an open way in order to avoid influencing teacher responses. After the teachers completed their response, specific probes were made. It has been established that teachers consider subject matter and content, student characteristics, and activities in planning for instruction during the school year (Cooper, Burger, & Semour, 1979; Morine-Dershimer, 1978-79; Peterson et al., 1978; Stern & Shavelson, 1981; Mintz, Note 1; Morine, Note 6). This question seeks to identify such considerations for the first day of school.

4. Did you have any major goal(s) for the first day? Things you wanted to be sure to accomplish? If so, what were they? Why? While studies have resulted in contradictory (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Borko, Note 4; Russo, Note 5) and negative findings (Peterson et al., 1978; Taylor, 1970; Zahorik, 1975; Mintz, Note 1; Smith & Sendelback, Note 2;

Yinger, Note 3) regarding whether or not teachers set goals during planning, research emphasis has been on teachers' having articulated or written these goals during planning sessions. Morine-Dershimer (1978-79) found that teachers formed mental plans or images that included more detailed aspects of the lesson than were evident in their written plans. One aspect that teachers seemed to consider although they did not usually mention it in writing was goals for the lesson. Question 4, therefore, sought to determine whether this group of teachers had goals in mind regarding the first day, whether or not these had been put into writing.

5. For each activity: What outcome did you want? Was this as you had planned it? If not, how and why was it different? (What was going through your mind when you changed from your plans? Why?). One purpose for the original interview was to investigate teachers' in-class decisions to deviate from their written plans. This question was asked about each such deviation. It has been found that teachers usually consider deviating from plans only when they deem a lesson to be going poorly, and that they base this judgment on student participation and involvement (Clark & Yinger, 1977). By comparing teachers' reasons for deviating from plans on the first day with objective classroom data, the author hoped to determine whether first day decisions to deviate were similar to reported decisions on other school days.

6. Did you know before you started the day/activity that you would change it, or did you change it "on the spot?". Following the notion of the teacher as "rational decision maker" (Shavelson, 1973), it was considered possible that after writing plans, teachers might continue thinking about them and reworking them in their minds (McCutcheon, 1980;

Morine, Note 6) without actually writing down such revisions. Question 6 was asked to account for this possibility.

7. Did you consider alternative activities in your planning? (What were they?) If so, why did you reject them? While alternatives have been found to be rarely considered in teachers' interactive planning decisions (Clark & Yinger, Note 9; Marland, Note 15), and then only when teachers perceive that their lessons are not going smoothly (Marx & Peterson, 1981; Clark & Yinger, Note 9; Clark & Joyce, Note 16; Clark & Peterson, Note 17), some debate has ensued over teachers' consideration of alternatives in preactive planning. Morine (1973) posited that the ability to generate and recognize various kinds of alternatives was indicative of skilled planning and teaching. In response to questioning, a majority of teachers in a study by Morine (Note 6) indicated that they did consider alternatives but rarely wrote them down. Several studies, however, have found that teachers do not generally consider alternatives in preactive planning (Peterson et al., 1978; Zahorik, 1975). Question 7 was a further attempt to determine whether consideration of alternatives played a part in teachers' planning processes.

8. What things do you plan to use in the same form next year? Why? and 9. What things do you expect to do differently next year? Why? Morine (Note 6) posited that teachers' reflections about their teaching might be related to teaching effectiveness. Teachers in her study stated that they normally considered both how they would reteach a lesson and how they would teach a follow-up lesson when considering a lesson after they had taught it. The questions in the present interview, placed after discussing the day's events in some detail, allowed teachers to express in concrete terms the results of this kind of reflection about the first day.

10. Do you consider your first day to have been successful? For you? For the students? Why or why not? Following teachers' concrete descriptions of specific things they would keep the same or change in subsequent first day planning, an attempt was made in Question 10 to ascertain teachers' overall ratings of their first day. While some studies indicate that people learn from experience only to a limited degree (Einhorn & Hogarth, 1981) and that teachers in particular are often not aware of some of their behavior and of events that occur as they teach (McNair, 1978-79; Shavelson & Stern, 1981), research has found that given appropriate feedback and training, teachers can change and improve their judgments (Hammond, 1976; Sherman, Weinshank, & Brown, Note 18). It may be that teachers who admit feeling less than completely successful and who initiate suggestions for changes are more aware of classroom behavior and events and would be among those who would most benefit from an intervention geared toward more effective teaching.

Pilot Study Design

A pilot study was conducted prior to the current study, to investigate elementary school teachers' first day planning and in-class decisions, with classroom deviations from lesson plans serving as indicators of in-class decisions. Elementary school teachers who were part of a larger study were randomly selected to be contacted by telephone in March and April of the 1980-81 school year. Ten female teachers who had retained their first day lesson plans agreed to participate.

Following written instructions, two independent coders (see Appendix B) compared each teacher's first day lesson plan with the

narrative description of classroom events recorded by an observer. Four categories of deviations were coded: events in plans but not observed; events observed but not in plans; changes in sequence of events; changes in duration of events. Events were defined as activities scheduled for 15 minutes or more and/or that appeared to be given importance in written plans (e.g., written separately rather than in a list, underlined, marked by an asterisk, etc.). Upon completion of the total task, the few coding discrepancies that existed were resolved through discussion to the satisfaction of both coders.

Teachers were provided with a copy of the narrative description of their first day and were interviewed for 30-45 minutes. Questions about specific planning items and observed events were based on deviations found between plans and events that had been coded previously. Although the structured interview format was used as a basis for the interviews, considerable leeway was allowed in order to get as much information from teachers about their thinking as possible. The interviewer elaborated and made specific probes on questions that teachers had difficulty answering. For example, Question 3 was quite general. The phrase, "things at school," was inserted to narrow down the general term, "factors," and if teachers still had difficulty answering, various aspects of students and the classroom, kinds of materials, etc., were suggested as possibilities. If teachers mentioned anything that seemed unusual or that was unclear to the interviewer, it was pursued and discussed.

Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. While results for the pilot were not quantitatively analyzed, some qualitative impressions were noted. Most of these elementary school teachers had unwritten

general goals in mind for the first day; made "on-the-spot" decisions to deviate from plans, usually as a result of influences from outside the classroom; felt that the first day had been relatively successful; and had in mind several changes they intended to make on the first day of the following school year. Several teachers were vague about what school factors they had considered in planning. One teacher, for example, used the same first day plans each year, and another followed a more experienced teacher's suggestions for the first day. Some teachers appeared to focus solely on student attitudes and activities for the first day, while at least two teachers were also clear about what they themselves would be learning about their students (e.g., handwriting skills, attention spans, interpersonal relationships, ability to follow directions). Based on information gleaned from this interview and on parts of the interview that appeared to be unclear to teachers, interview questions were modified for the present study.

Revisions Based on Pilot Study

The present study is different from the pilot study in several ways. Modifications in the interview (see Appendix C) included adding questions and information and rewording several questions. Teachers were asked whether their lesson plans were to have been shown to anyone other than the interviewer. The question was included because teachers in Morine's (Note 6) study had stated that in writing lesson plans someone else was to read they often wrote in more detail than they did solely for their own use. Because teachers in this study were not approached about their planning until after the beginning of school none of them could have anticipated showing their plans to the interviewer in this study.

Two brief paragraphs explaining and giving examples of contextual factors were inserted into the present interview as an introduction to questions about context that followed. Pilot study teachers tended to ask questions about the definition of context and to hesitate and seem unsure of their responses to questions about context, even after a brief explanation. It was hoped that by giving teachers such information before the interview, they would have had time to think about the related questions and be able to answer them more clearly.

Question 3 was made more specific by adding the word, "contextual," to describe the kind of factors sought. Question 5 was separated into two questions, one to focus on plans and one on the Classroom Activity Record (CAR) to simplify matters for the interviewer. Question 8 of the original interview was omitted in the present interview, because teachers tended to answer this in explaining their reasons for changing their plans (Question 9).

Added to Question 10 was the question, "Was there anything specific that you did that you feel was more or less successful than other things?" Morine (Note 6) found that teachers with high student gain scores made more specific statements in planning than did those teachers with low student gains. More effective classroom managers have been found to be quite specific in explaining their expectations to students, in teaching procedures to students, and in giving feedback to students about student behavior (Anderson, Evertson, & Emmer, 1980). They also appear to be sensitive to particular elements of situations that are most salient to students (Anderson et al., 1980). This interview question was added to examine teachers' specificity in reflecting upon their teaching, providing qualitative information surrounding teachers' feelings of success.

A question that was asked informally of most of the pilot study teachers was added to the present interview: "What was your reaction on reading the account of your first day in this class?" It was added at the end of the interview because many teachers had responded to the question with strong feelings and seemed to enjoy discussing these feelings and reactions.

The present study includes several changes other than modifications in the interview. First, the focus was shifted from deviations between plans and classroom events to teachers' considerations in planning, because a necessary step before examining deviations systematically is to analyze lesson plans and teachers' considerations in preparing lesson plans in the first place. Coding done in the pilot study prior to the interview to identify kinds of deviations was therefore unnecessary in the present study and was omitted. Second, interviews in the present study were held 4 to 6 weeks after the first day of school rather than in March and April, as in the pilot study. Middle school rather than elementary school teachers were involved.

Finally, after the present interview was conducted, it was decided to exclude the two questions asking about specific thoughts during planning and during classroom activities. While this might better have been decided prior to the interview, it was only in the process of interacting with the teachers that it became apparent that, even with the observer's description and their lesson plans to stimulate their memories, teachers did not remember such specific thoughts. They tended rather to try to reconstruct what they "might have been" or "should have been" thinking. Because this was not useful or reliable information for the purposes of this study, the questions were dropped.

Procedures for Data Collection

Middle school teachers from six schools in one school district participating in the JMIS were contacted by telephone in random order after the third week of school. A total of 11 teachers, seven females and four males, had first day lesson plans and agreed to participate in the present study. Teachers were told that their participation in the present study was strictly voluntary. They were informed that the purpose of the study was to investigate teachers' planning and decisions for the first day of school. Teachers who were contacted but not included in the study were those who indicated that they no longer had their first day lesson plans or who did not wish to participate.

As interview dates were set (between 4 to 6 weeks into the school year), teachers were given a copy of the interview questions, their first day Classroom Activity Record (CAR) and lesson plans. They were asked to read the CAR to stimulate recall of the first day and to look over interview materials before the interview. Interviews lasted an average of 45 minutes and were tape recorded and transcribed. The CAR was a detailed narrative account of teacher and student behaviors in the classroom written by trained observers in the JMIS.

The modified interview (Appendix C) consisted of 13 questions. Rationales for the questions and modifications are presented in the previous section. To summarize, teachers were asked first about their first day planning in general and the role of context in their planning. They were then asked to describe their thinking that contributed to each activity included in the written lesson plans. Focusing next on the CAR, teachers were asked about each activity as it was described by classroom observers. Finally, they were asked several miscellaneous

questions about alternative ideas, possible changes for the next year, the extent to which they felt the first day was successful, and their personal reactions upon reading the CAR of their class.

Data Sources

In order to examine teachers' plans and activities on the first day of school and to compare these with dimensions of classroom management throughout the first 8 weeks of school, two sources of data were used in the present study. These included observational data from the JMIS and teacher planning data from written teacher lesson plans and from interviews conducted for the present study.

Observational Data

Three sets of data were used from the JMIS: Classroom Activity Records (CARs), Student Engagement Ratings (SERs), and Component Ratings (CRs). CARs are detailed narrative descriptions of teacher and student classroom behavior written by trained classroom observers. They include numerical codes denoting kinds of activities (e.g., teacher presentation of content, student recitation, seatwork, transition) and frequent time points. For an excerpt from an actual CAR written in a math class on the first day of school, see Appendix D.

Coding procedures for CARS. For the present study, CARs were used to determine the proportion of time spent on procedural/behavioral, academic, affective, and other activities. These codes were the same as those used in the JMIS, with the exception of Affective Time and Other. Definitions of the categories and procedures for coders are described in Appendix D. Coders listed the sequence of activities according to the CAR Activity Codes, adding a brief description of each specific activity from the text of CAR. Materials and equipment were checked as used or

not used in the classroom, as noted by the observer. Materials included worksheets, textbooks, other books, and an "other" category. Equipment included chalkboard, overhead projector, and an "other" category. For descriptions of these categories and instructions to coders, see Appendix D. Procedural content covered by teachers was rated on a 5-point scale by coders, based on the relevance such content had to the smooth functioning of class on the first day or soon thereafter. Descriptions of each rating are found in Appendix D.

Coding procedures for Student Engagement Ratings (SERs). Student Engagement Ratings (SERs) included classroom counts made by observers at 10 minute intervals of students on and off task and in dead time. Students on task were defined as those students who were doing what the teacher expected them to be doing. Students off task (unsanctioned) were defined as those students who were not doing what the teacher expected them to be doing. Students in dead time were those students for whom no expectations had been made clear, and so had nothing specific to do. First day counts were averaged and the averages written on the coding sheet for each category. A class average for classes after the first day through the first 2 weeks of school was derived and recorded for each category.

Coding procedures for Component Ratings (CRs). Component Ratings (CRs) were ratings made on a 5 point scale after each observation. First day ratings were recorded on the coding sheet. Average ratings for classes after the first day and through the first 8 weeks of school were derived and recorded for each category. Ratings of student participation and success, classroom climate, and inappropriate and

disruptive student behavior were included. Descriptions of the categories and ratings scales are found in Appendix D.

Teacher Planning Data

Interviews were coded on such aspects as nature and emphasis of goals, presence of alternative considerations, contextual factors, teacher feelings of success, and teacher reflection. Descriptions of these categories and coding procedures are found in Appendix E.

Written lesson plans were coded on such dimensions as level of detail, content nature and emphasis, and specification of sequence. Descriptions of these categories and procedures for coding are found in Appendix E.

The two coders who analyzed lesson plans and interviews were trained by using pilot study interviews. Half of the pilot study interviews were coded independently and results compared. Ambiguities in the coding system were resolved, and the second half of the pilot study interviews were then independently coded. Coding for the present study were begun only after satisfactory agreement in most categories (.8 or higher) was achieved. The two coders independently analyzed lesson plans and interviews from the present study according to written instructions in order to categorize and rate information. Because both coders scored each lesson plan and interview, the average of their scores on each variable was used in the analyses. Using the intraclass correlation statistics, the reliability of each variable used is shown in Table 1. Most variables indicated satisfactory coder agreement. Ten variables that were unreliable were omitted from subsequent analyses.

Results

The data analyses and results are given in this section and in Tables 2 through 15 (pp. 81 - 107). The sequence of tables coincides with the presentation of the results. The first set of results shows the summary data for each set of variables used in the study; the remaining results show the relationships between sets of variables. When reporting correlations, two degrees of relationship are noted: Statistical significance using the $p = .05$ level for Type I error rate and correlations which do not reach this level but which might indicate a trend toward a meaningful result. The rationale for reporting the latter type of correlation is that this study is a descriptive, exploratory one, with a small ($n = 11$) sample size. Adoption of the $p = .05$ Type I error rate to reject the null hypothesis of no correlation requires a value of $r = .60$. Thus, exclusive reliance on this criterion would cause an excessive Type II error rate. Consequently, some correlations of .38 or higher are reported and discussed as "trends." This value of r indicates that 15% of the variance in one variable can be accounted for by the other variable, indicating a potentially important relationship (Medley, 1977). Furthermore, the descriptive use of correlations without reference to standard significance levels has some precedence in prior research on teacher planning (Peterson & Clark, 1978). Inferences about the presence of relationships in some populations of teachers should not be made, however, without confirmation in other research. In practice, most of the correlations less than .60 ($p = .05$) reported in this study are .45 or greater. When presented as the basis for a result, such correlations will be identified in the text by noting their value.

Case Studies

In keeping with the descriptive nature of this study, four case studies of planning activities are presented in Appendix A. The choice of these four teachers as cases was based on their exhibiting a variety of planning behaviors as well as in achieving varying degrees of management success. The reader may find it helpful to examine these case studies before or after reading the Results section in order to acquire concrete referents for the material presented here.

Description of Teacher First Day Intentions

To determine what teachers hoped to accomplish on the first day of school, means and frequencies were calculated based on interview data (see Table 2). Teachers appeared to give more attention to goals and contextual factors than to consideration of alternatives. They indicated feeling moderately successful about their first day, with a few changes in mind for the first day of the following year. Most teachers wrote vague and sketchy first day plans with an emphasis on procedural/behavioral content.

All 11 teachers indicated having had at least one goal in mind when they planned for the first day of school. Procedual/behavioral goals, such as acquainting students with classroom rules and procedures and completing administrative tasks, received most emphasis. Affective goals received considerably less emphasis than was placed on procedural goals. Affective goals included teachers' wanting students to feel relaxed and to get acquainted. Academic goals received still less emphasis. The Other category received no mention by teachers.

Teachers who had procedural/behavioral or affective goals tended to be consistent in the content of their written plans and in their

classroom activities. Academic goal emphasis showed less consistency between written plans and classroom focus.

Teachers were asked what alternatives and contextual factors they took into consideration in planning for the first day. These factors might have been thought about and discarded, incorporated into plans, held in abeyance or have been involved in planning in some other way. Alternatives did not appear to receive much consideration by most teachers. Other activities or activity sequences were the main alternatives considered.

Contextual factors included people, materials, and equipment. Among contextual factors considered, school personnel received the most mention, followed by materials and equipment. Of school personnel considered, most teachers mentioned other teachers, followed by principals. Other teachers were apparently helpful with questions regarding content and materials; principals were salient primarily when they required teachers to have students fill out numerous forms for school records. Counselors were virtually never mentioned as being considered. Student ability level and behavior also received little explicit consideration in planning. Materials received more consideration than did equipment, with the Other categories receiving the most mention in both areas.

Teachers indicated moderate feelings of success about the first day and considered the day to be somewhat more successful for students than for themselves. Most teachers reported at least minor changes they might make in planning for the first day of the following year, with activities receiving the most mention, followed by changes in sequence/timing, and, finally, materials.

None of the teachers' first day lesson plans were detailed. Most were found to be vague and sketchy, with a few rated as more specific. Most teachers emphasized procedural/behavioral content in written plans, followed by affective, academic, and, finally, other.

Relationships Among Interview Responses and Written Lesson Plan Variables

Table 3 shows correlations obtained among first day written lesson plan and interview variables. Variables included goal emphasis, consideration of alternative and contextual factors, and content emphasis and level of detail of written plans. Relationships include a nearly significant positive correlation ($r = .54$) between procedural/behavioral goal emphasis in the interview and procedural/behavioral emphasis in written plans, and significant ($p < .05$) correlations between affective goal and content emphasis, and between consideration of student ability level and specificity of written plans. An emphasis on affective goals was negatively related to written plan emphasis on procedural/behavioral content. Consideration of an alternative approach was positively associated with the presence of an academic emphasis in the first day written plans.

First Day Planning and Observational Variables

Tables 4 and 5 show relationships between teacher planning variables and classroom climate variables. The planning variables examined include goal emphasis, alternatives and contextual factors considered, and level of detail and content emphasis in first day written plans.

First day planning and classroom climate. Table 4 shows relationships between planning variables and classroom climate variables for the first day of school only. Classroom climate variables include teacher

conveys value of curriculum, class is task oriented, and class has a relaxed atmosphere. No consistent pattern of results was discernable. Consideration of books other than textbooks and consideration of chalkboard were both positively related to classroom climate variables. However, consideration of chalkboard and consideration of other equipment were negatively related to climate variables. A majority of these relationships are trends and their conflicting patterns mark them as probably due to chance.

First day planning and student first day behavior. Student behavior data obtained from the JMIS study include the following: numbers of students on task, off task, and in dead time; ratings of student success; amount of student disruptive and inappropriate behavior; amount of student avoidance of seatwork; and student participation in discussion and/or recitation. Table 5 shows relationships between teacher planning (as indicated in both the interview and the written lesson plans) and student classroom behavior on the first day of school.

There was a tendency for consideration of principal to be associated with poor management results. This variable was positively related to the number of students in dead time (r = .51) and to the amount of student inappropriate and disruptive behavior (r = .55 and .59). An academic goal emphasis was significantly and negatively related to inappropriate student behavior.

Content emphasis in written first day plans and use of class time. Table 6 shows relationships between emphasis on various content categories in written plans and how class time was actually used on the first day. Content emphasis in written plans and apportionment of class time each included the following categories: procedural/behavioral, affective, academic, and other.

Consistent positive relationships were found between content emphasis in plans and proportion of class time with a similar focus. That is, procedural/behavioral content emphasis in plans was positively related (r = .57) to procedural/behavioral proportion of class time, etc.

First day consideration and use of contextual factors. Table 7 shows several significant relationships between contextual materials and equipment teachers reported considering in planning and those observed actually being used by teachers in the classroom. Consideration of chalkboard was related to actual use of worksheets and of other books (but not to use of chalkboard). Consideration of overhead projector was related to its use, and negatively related to use of the chalkboard.

First day planning and appropriateness of procedural content. Table 8 shows relationships between appropriateness of procedural content and goal emphasis, alternatives considered, and content emphasis in written plans. Appropriateness of procedural content was rated on a 5-point scale, based on the relevance of procedural content to first day activities that the teacher was observed to present to or to discuss with the class on the first day of school. No relationships were found.

Planning and Teacher Evaluations of the First Day

Table 9 shows relationships between first day planning variables and teachers' first day evaluations. The planning variables examined include goal emphasis, alternatives and contextual factors considered, and level of detail and content emphasis in written first day plans. Teacher evaluations of the first day include teacher feelings of success

for themselves and for students, and changes teachers intended to make in planning for a future first day.

Consideration of alternatives was negatively related to feelings of success (r = -.45) and positively related to intentions to make changes in future first day planning (r = .47). The categories, "Other" changes and alternatives which were positively related, involve affective components. Consideration of student ability level was negatively related to feelings of success for teachers (r = -.41) and positively related to extent of changes they planned to make for a future first day (r = -.40). Academic content emphasis was negatively related to feelings of success for teachers (r = -.48). There was a tendency for vague or sketchy written plans to be negatively related to the extent of projected change (r = -.46).

Teacher Evaluations of the First Day and First Day Observational Variables

Tables 10 and 11 show correlations obtained between teacher evaluations of the first day and observational variables involving classroom climate and student behavior. Teacher evaluations of the first day include teacher feelings of success for themselves and for students and projected changes teachers would make in planning for a future first day (i.e., extent of changes; plans to change materials, activities, sequence/timing, or other).

Teacher evaluations of the first day and classroom climate. Table 10 shows relationships between teacher first day evaluations and first day classroom climate. Teachers' feelings of success for themselves and for students were significantly and negatively related to two climate variables: teacher conveys value of curriculum and class is

task oriented. Teacher plans to change materials was negatively related to relaxed classroom atmosphere.

Teacher evaluations of the first day and student first day behavior. Table 11 shows relationships between teacher first day evaluations and first day student behavior variables. JMIS student behavior variables examined here were numbers of students on task, off task, and in dead time; ratings of student success; amount of student disruptive and inappropriate behavior; amount of student avoidance of seatwork; and student participation in discussion and/or recitation. There was a trend for the level of on-task student behavior to be negatively associated with the teacher's feelings of success ($r = -.49$) and with stated plans to change future first day activities ($r = -.45$) and sequence/timing ($r = -.43$). Plans to change materials was related to the amount of disruptive behavior ($r = .59$).

First Day Planning and Observational Variables for the First 8 Weeks

Tables 12 and 13 show relationships between teacher planning for the first day and classroom management for the first 8 weeks. Planning variables pertaining only to the first day of school are used. Classroom observational variables relevant to classroom management were calculated for the first 8 weeks of school exclusive of the first day. First day planning variables include goal emphasis, consideration of alternatives in contextual factors, and content emphasis and level of detail in written plans. Observational variables include classroom climate and student behavior variables for the first 8 weeks of school.

First day planning and 8-week classroom climate. Table 12 shows relationships between first day planning and classroom climate variables for the first 8 weeks of school.

There was a trend for first day consideration of principal to be negatively related to 8-week class task orientation (r = -.58) and relaxed atmosphere (r = -.48) and for first day consideration of student ability level to be positively related to 8-week class task orientation (r = .51). Consideration of chalkboard was positively and significantly correlated with task orientation; consideration of overhead projector was negatively related to task orientation and relaxed atmosphere.

First day planning and 8-week student behavior. Table 13 shows relationships between first day planning and observed student behavior variables relevant to classroom management. The student behavior variables (calculated for the first 8 weeks, excluding the first day) include numbers of students on task, off task, and in dead time; and amount of student success, disruptive and inappropriate behavior, seatwork avoidance, and participation in discussion and/or recitation.

There was a trend for first day consideration of principal to be negatively related to 8-week number of students on task (r = -.44) and student success (r = -.50) and postively related to the number of students off task (r = .56) and to the amount of student disruptive behavior (r = .51). First day consideration of books other than textbooks was positively related to 8-week student success on-task behavior (r = .47) and negatively related to student seatwork avoidance (r = -.55). Written plans with greatest procedural/behavior emphasis were related (r = .57) to greater levels of disruptive behavior, and there was a tendency for an affective emphasis to be associated with more on-task (r = .42) and less disruptive student behavior (r = -.44). Because all teachers had some degree of procedural/behavioral emphasis,

the "affective emphasis" teachers are those with some balance of these areas in their plans.

Teacher Evaluations of the First Day and Observational/Variables for the First 8 Weeks

Tables 14 and 15 show relationships between teacher evaluations of the first day (including feelings of success for self and for students, and projected changes in planning for a future first day) and classroom management success in the first 8 weeks. Classroom observational variables relevant to classroom management are used, calculated throughout the first 8 weeks of school exclusive of the first day. Observational variables include classroom climate and student behavior variables for the first 8 weeks of school.

Teacher first day evaluations and 8-week classroom climate.

Table 14 shows relationships between teacher evaluations of the first day and classroom climate variables for the first 8 weeks: teacher conveys value of curriculum, class is task oriented, and class has a relaxed atmosphere. A significant negative relationship was identified between teacher's feelings of success and task orientation of the class. Feelings of success for students was also negatively related to conveys value of the curriculum (r = -.52) and class task orientation (r = -.59). Teacher plans to change activities was related to conveys value of the curriculum (r = .56).

Teacher first day evaluations and 8-week student behavior.

Table 15 shows relationships between teacher evaluations of the first day and student behavior throughout the first 8 weeks: numbers of students on task, off task, and in dead time; and amount of student success, disruptive and inappropriate behavior, seatwork avoidance, and

participation in discussion/recitation. No significant relationships were found. A trend was noted that teachers who reported greater feelings of success actually to have higher amounts of off-task (r = .53) and other inappropriate behavior and lower levels of student success (r = -.49).

Discussion

Results of this study indicated that teachers' goal statements, content emphasis in their written plans, and their observed classroom activities on the first day of school were generally congruent. The relationships between written plans and classroom activities were stronger, however, than that between goal emphasis as identified through responses to interview questions and either content emphasis or observed activities. Teachers whose written plans emphasized procedural/behavioral content tended to spend the most time in class on such activities; teachers whose written plans showed affective and academic considerations allotted class time congruent with their plans. The results support the findings of Peterson et al. (1978) who found teacher plans and teacher classroom focus to be largely congruent.

An examination of what teachers hoped to accomplish on the first day found that most teachers in this study emphasized procedural/behavioral matters when discussing goals, in the content of the written plans, and in their observed classroom activities on the first day of school. This suggests that the first day is categorically different from most subsequent school days, which primarily involve academic activities. The procedural emphasis had two main objectives: to acquaint students with classroom rules and procedures and to complete administrative tasks required by school personnel. Several factors may

account for a procedural first day focus. First, teachers themselves may have decided that to have orderly classes they would initially need to focus on procedures that would facilitate it. Second, several teachers reported consulting with more experienced teachers and following their advice. Third, some teachers reported that their principals had provided them with numerous procedural tasks to complete on the first day. These tasks were chiefly information gathering and recording, although in a few cases they included a review of school rules. Finally, a few teachers had received a manual and workshop as part of the JMIS project and had been encouraged to make rules and procedures explicit to students on the first day of school.

Although all teachers in the interview reported having goals in planning, only one teacher included anything resembling goals in written plans. This seems to reinforce the need for further research involving teachers' mental planning as described by Morine-Dershimer (1978-79). Several teachers in the present study included an affective emphasis in their goal statements, their written plans, and their observed class activities on the first day. While all of these teachers were also observed to address procedural/behavioral matters in class, they seemed to place higher priority on possible student concerns and attitudes. They stressed wanting students to become acquainted with one another and with the teacher and helping the students feel welcome to the school and to their class in particular. When an academic emphasis was included in goal statements, plans, or class activities, it involved an introduction of course content and/or the use of content oriented puzzles or activities that students worked while teachers completed administrative tasks. Little time was actually spent in covering academic content on the first

day. Instead, teachers tended to plan for and use the first day to lay the groundwork for subsequent academic focus.

Examination of teachers' evaluations of the first day in terms of success for themselves and for their students, and of changes that they might make in planning for a future first day, found that most teachers felt the day to have been relatively successful. Those who indicated a belief that the day was less successful for themselves (typically because they had not followed their written plans as closely as they desired) still perceived the day as having been fairly successful for students. In spite of their feelings of success, most teachers indicated an intention to make at least one or two changes in future first day activities, frequently with an increased affective focus.

An examination of planning variables and teacher evaluations of the first day indicated that although few teachers considered alternatives, those who did so tended to feel less successful and planned to make more changes in a future first day. At least two explanations of this result are possible. Teachers who had alternatives in mind may have had doubts that they had chosen the best among the alternatives they considered. Having an option in mind may have contributed to a willingness to perceive flaws in their day that teachers without alternatives may have been reluctant to acknowledge. The second explanation takes into account that all these teachers were relatively inexperienced, with 2 or fewer prior years of teaching. Thus, the teachers with alternative ideas may have been more ready to plan changes for a future first day because they would want to try out alternatives.

It should be noted that examination of teachers' considerations of alternatives reinforced research indicating that few teachers consider

alternatives in planning (McCutcheon, 1980), and it suggests that teachers who do make such considerations are more likely to anticipate making changes in planning a repeat lesson. These projected changes frequently involve an increased affective focus, supporting similar findings by Morine (1976).

Teachers who considered student abilities in their first day planning also tended to feel less successful and to plan more changes for a future first day. It is possible that inexperience prevented these teachers from accurately providing for student ability levels. It is also possible that some teachers were more thorough in their planning (e.g., considered alternatives, student ability levels, etc.) and were more aware when they fell short of an ideal. Thus, they judged themselves to be less successful than they might have been, had they prepared less and had been less aware of alternatives. They may have had a more comprehensive picture of an ideal first day and then judged success differently from other teachers who considered fewer factors in planning. This possibility is supported by the result that teachers who emphasized academic content in their first day written plans felt less successful but planned few changes for the following year's first day. These teachers may have also had a comprehensive ideal in mind for the first day and been disappointed in not being able to meet the standards they set for themselves. Perhaps for these teachers the experience of and reflection upon that first day enabled them to acknowledge both the necessity for a major focus other than an academic one and the inevitable ambiguity involved in meeting students for the first time that prevented their feeling the need to make such changes.

Analysis of first day planning variables and first day observational variables found that although research has generally assumed teachers to be relatively autonomous, principals had frequent influence regarding first day planning and classroom activities of these teachers. Many teachers in the present study considered the principal in their first day planning: This consideration was associated with required administrative tasks. Such teachers had fewer students on task, more students in dead time, and higher levels of student inappropriate and disruptive behavior than did those teachers for whom the principal was not a consideration. Furthermore, consideration of "other materials" (a category which primarily included forms and information sheets required by principals) was also positively related to student seatwork avoidance. It is likely that time devoted to administrative tasks lowered teachers' effectiveness in establishing well managed classrooms on the first day as reflected by these student behaviors. This may be related to the amount of time spent on such tasks or to the nature of the tasks themselves.

Another set of results was not as interpretable: the relationships between certain planning categories and student first day behavior. Teachers whose planning included more than the required books and factors such as chalkboard, which other teachers may have taken for granted, were better able to elicit student behaviors conducive to a well managed classroom. Teachers who considered books other than textbooks in their planning had higher classroom climate ratings as well as more on-task students and less student inappropriate behavior on the first day. Similarly, teachers who reported considering the chalkboard in their first day planning had high classroom climate ratings. While

it does not seem likely that these variables themselves would account for better management, these results may be interpreted as indicating that teachers who were more thorough in their planning were able to achieve better management results. However, consideration of the use of the overhead projector was negatively related to the climate variables and to student on-task behavior, and positively related to the number of students in "dead time" and to student disruptive behavior. These relationships may reflect chance or anomalies in the data. An examination of the data indicates that the results are due mainly to one teacher who considered using an overhead and who was also a poor manager.

Several first day planning variables were related to student behavior observed during the first 8 weeks of school in ways that were similar to their relationships with behaviors observed on the first day of school. The first day consideration of the principals' concerns in planning, for example, was associated with lower levels of classroom climate and student inappropriate behavior during the first 8 weeks. This result strengthens the possibility that principals' administrative requirements may prevent teachers from being able to spend necessary time and/or attention to establishing a well managed classroom environment. A second possibility may be that teachers who experienced management problems tended to worry more about principals' concerns and interventions.

More effective management results in the first 8 weeks were associated with teachers who addressed student affective concerns as well as dealing with procedural behavioral matters on the first day and in their planning. Those whose first day focused on administrative

tasks mandated by principals may not have been able to accomplish first day tasks pertinent to the smooth functioning of their own classrooms. While it is possible that with experience, teachers learn to maintain a better first day balance or to make up for first day deficits during subsequent days, such was apparently not the case for some of these less experienced teachers.

Teachers who considered student ability level in their first day planning continued to have fewer students off task and higher levels of student participation in discussion and recitations throughout the first 8 weeks. These appear to be characteristic of teachers who planned more comprehensively than most, considering more factors than other teachers considered and having a more detailed perception of the way they wanted their classes to function.

Both affective goal emphasis and affective content emphasis in written plans were positively related to desirable student behavior and negatively related to undesirable student behavior during the first 8 weeks. While all teachers in this study were observed to deal with some behavioral and procedural matters on the first day, it appeared that teachers who approached classroom procedures from a more student oriented viewpoint and who had a broader perspective than immediate tasks and requirements were those who were able to lay on the first day the groundwork for better management during the ensuing weeks of school.

These findings support the previous assumptions as to the desirability of comprehensive planning and for planning that focuses on student concerns regarding rules and procedures on the first day of school (Emmer & Evertson, 1980; Emmer et al., 1980). It is possible,

furthermore, that the affective focus of these comprehensive planners served to maintain these teachers' sensitivity to students, thus preventing the apparent inflexibility found associated with teachers with extensive plans in earlier research (Zahorik, 1970). Sensitivity to students' needs and abilities along with the structure provided by comprehensive planning and clear presentation of rules and procedures appears to be the optimal combination for long-term effective classroom management.

Reference Notes

1. Mintz, S. L. Teacher planning: A simulation study. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association convention, San Francisco, 1979.

2. Smith, E. L., & Sendelback, H. B. Teacher intentions for science instruction and their antecedents in program materials. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

3. Yinger, R. J. A study of teacher planning: Description and theory development using ethnographic and information processing methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.

4. Borko, h. An examination of some factors contributing to teachers' preinstructional classroom organization and management decisions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontaio, 1978.

5. Russo, N. A. Capturing teachers' discisions policies: An investigation of strategies for teaching reading and mathematics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, 1978.

6. Morine, G. A study of teacher planning (Special Study C, BTES Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Technical Report Series). San Francisco: Far West Laboratories, 1976.

7. Ben-Peretz, M. The form and substance of teachers' lesson planning. University of Haifa, 1981.

8. Fisher, C., Berliner, D., Filby, N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L., Dishaw, M., & Moore, J. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (Technical Report V-1). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1978.

9. Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. Three studies of teacher planning (Research Series No. 55). East Lansing, Michigan: The Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, June, 1979.

10. Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. The hidden world of teaching: Implications of research on teacher planning. East Lansing, Michigan: The Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980.

11. Yinger, R. J. A study of planning: Description and model of preactive decision making (R.S. No. 18). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1978.

12. Morine, G., & Vallance, E. Teacher and pupil perceptions of classroom interaction (Special Study B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Technical Report No. 75-11-6). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975. (ERIC No. 146-157).

13. Berliner, B. C., Marliave, R. S., & Moore, J. E. Developing a sample of teachers for intensive analysis of classroom teaching (BTES). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

14. Carnahan, R. S. The effects of teacher planning on classroom processes (Technical Report No. 541). Madison: Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, Wisconsin University, May, 1980. (ERIC No. ED189095).

15. Marland, P. W. A study of teachers' interactive thoughts. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, 1977.

16. Clark, C. M., & Joyce, B. R. Teacher descision making and teacher effectiveness. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.

17. Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. Teacher stimulated recall of interactive decisions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1976.

18. Sherman, G. B., Weinshank, A. B., & Brown, S. Training reading specialists in diagnosis (Research Paper No. 31). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1979.

References

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Emmer, E. Dimensions in classroom management derived from recent research. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1980, 12, 343-356.

Berliner, D. Impediments to measuring teacher effectiveness. In G. Borich (Ed.), The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and process. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. Context variables in teaching. Educational Psychologist, 1978, 12(3), 310-316.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Brophy, J., & Putnam, J. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. 78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. Research on teacher thinking. Curriculum Inquiries, 1977, 7(4), 279-304.

Cooper, H. M., Burger, J. M., & Semour, G. E. Classroom context and student ability as influences on teacher perceptions of classroom control. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 189-196.

Cribbin, J. J. Effective managerial leadership. American Management Association, Inc., 1972.

Doyle, W. Classroom tasks and students' abilities. In P. L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications, Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1979.

Einhorn, H. J., & Hogarth, R. M. Behavioral decision theories: Processes of judgement and choice. Annual Review of Psychology, 1981, 32, 53-88.

Eisner, E. W. Educational objectives: Help or hindrance? School Review, 1967, 75(3), 250-266.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982, 74(4), 485-498.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year., Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80(5), 219-231.

Ericksson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review, 1980, 87(3), 215-251.

Evertson, C., Anderson, C., Anderson, L., & Brophy, J. Relationships between classroom behaviors and student outcomes in junior high mathematics and English classes. American Educational Research Journal, 1980, 17(1), 43-60.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982, 74(4), 485-498.

Fiedler, F. E. The contingency model--New directions for leadership utilization. Journal of Contemporary Business, 1974, 3(4), 65-80.

Fulmer, R. M. Management and organization: An introduction to theory and practice. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979.

Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J., & Brophy, J. E. Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1975.

Guba, E. The nature of naturalistic inquiry. In E. Guba (Ed.), Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1978.

Hammond, K. R., & Adleman, L. Values and human judgement. Science, 1976, 194, 389-396.

Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. Organization and mangement: A systems approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.

Kounin, J. S., et al. Managing emotionally disturbed children in regular classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, 1-13.

MacDonald, J. B. Myths about instruction. Educational Leadership, 1965, 22(8), 571-76; 609-17.

McCutcheon, G. How do elementary school teachers plan? The nature of planning and influences on it. The Elementary School Journal, 1980, 81(1), 4-23.

McNair, K. Capturing in flight decisions: Thoughts while teaching. Educational Research Quarterly, 1978-79, 3(4), 26-42.

Marx, R. W., & Peterson, P. L. In B. R. Joyce, C. C. Brown, and L. Peck (Eds.), Flexibility in teaching: Excursions into the nature of teaching and training. New York: Longman, 1981.

Medley, D. Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Mcrine, G. Planning skills: Paradox and parodies. Journal of Teacher Education, 1973, 24, 135-143.

Morine-Dershimer, G. Planning in classroom reality: An in-depth look. Educational Research Quarterly, 1978-79, 3(4), 83-99.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, J. Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 283-289.

Peterson, P., & Clark, C. Teachers' reports of their cognitive processes during teaching. American Educational Research Jouirnal, 1978, 15, 555-566.

Peterson, P., Marx, R. , & Clark, C. Teacher planning, teacher behavior, and student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15(3), 417-432.

Popham, W. J., Baker, E. L. Systematic instruction. Inglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. Research on teacher performance criteria. In D. O. Smith (Ed.), Research in teacher education: A symposium. Inglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Sayles, L. R. Leadership: What effective managers really do and how they do it. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Shavelson, R. J. What is the basic teaching skill? The Journal of Teacher Education, 1973, 24, 144-151.

81

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 1981, 51, 455-498.

Taba, H. Curriculum building, theory, and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1962.

Taylor, P. How teachers plan their courses. Slough, England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1970.

Tyler, R. W. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932.

Webber, R. A. To be a manager: Essentials of management. Holmwood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1981.

Yinger, R. J. A study of teacher planning. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80, 107-127.

Zahorik, J. A. Teachers' planning models. Educational Leadership, 1975, 33, 134-139.

Zahorik, J. A. The effect of planning on teaching. The Elementary School Journal, 1970, 71(3), 143-151.

Table 1

Reliability E·timates (Intraclass correlations)

for Interview and Lesson Plan Coding

Variables	Probability Level	Reliability
Emphasis on procedural/behavorial goals	.01	1.0
Emphasis on affective goals	.01	.97
Emphasis on academic goals	.01	.78
*Emphasis on other goals	.50	.00
Alternatives considered	.01	.89
Alternative materials considered	.01	.78
Alternative general approach considered	.01	1.0
Alternative other considered	.01	1.0
Contextual factors: school personnel mentioned	.01	.89
Contextual factors: principal mentioned	.02	.73
*Contextual factors: counselor mentioned	.50	0
Contextual factors: other mentioned	.01	.80
Contextual factors: student ability level	.07	.60
*Contextual factors: student behavior	.63	0
*Contextual factors: worksheets	.63	0
*Contextual factors: textbooks	.25	.35
Contextual factors: other books	.01	1.0

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Probability Level	Reliability
Contextual factors: other	.01	.78
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.01	.78
Contextual factors: overhead projector	.01	1.0
Contextual factors: other equipment	.01	1.0
Teacher feelings of success: for teacher	.01	.91
Teacher feelings of success: for students	.01	.96
Teacher indication of future changes	.09	.58
Teacher intention to change materials	.02	.73
Teacher intention to change activities	.00	.89
Teacher intention to change sequence/timing	.01	1.0
Teacher intention to change other	.01	1.0
Number of words in plan	.01	.996
Plan vague/sketchy	.01	1.0
Plan specific	.01	1.0
*Plan detailed	invalid analysis (no variance)	
Emphasis in plans: procedural/behavioral	.01	.87
Emphasis in plans: affective	.01	.95
Emphasis in plans: academic	.01	.79

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Probability Level	Reliability
Emphasis in plans: other	.01	.83
*Sequence specified in plans	.63	0
Proportion of time in procedural/behavioral	.01	.995
Proportion of time in academic	.01	1.0
Proportion of time in affective	.01	.985
Proportion of time in other	.01	.99
Contextual factors (CAR): workbooks used	.01	1.0
Contextual factors (CAR): textbooks used	.01	1.0
Contextual factors (CAR): other books used	.01	1.0
*Contextual factors (CAR): other used	invalid analysis (no variance)	
Contextual factors (CAR): chalkboard used	.01	.86
Contextual factors (CAR): overhead projector used	.01	1.0
*Contextual factors (CAR): other used	.56	0
Appropriateness of procedural content	.01	1.0

*Unreliable

Table 2

Summary Statistics for Teacher Interviews,

Classroom Observations, and Lesson Plans (n = 11)

Variables[a]	Mean	S.D.	Range
INTERVIEW VARIABLES			
Goals: procedural/behavioral	4.18	1.53	1.00-5.00
Goals: affective	2.14	1.55	1.00-5.00
Goals: academic	1.73	.86	1.00-3.50
Goals: other goals	1.05	.14	1.00-1.50
Alternatives considered	.32	.44	0.00-1.00
Alternative materials	.14	.31	0.00-1.00
Alternative general approach	.18	.39	0.00-1.00
Alternatives: other/alternatives	.09	.29	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: school personnel	.68	.44	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: principal	.27	.39	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: counselor	.05	.14	0.00-0.50
Contextural factors: other school personnel	.55	.45	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: student ability level	.18	.32	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: student behavior	.14	.22	0.00-0.50
Contextural factors: worksheets	.05	.14	0.00-0.50
Contextural factors: textbooks	.23	.33	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: other books	.18	.39	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: other materials	.64	.43	0.00-1.00

Table 2, continued

Variables[a]	Mean	S.D.	Range
Contextural factors: chalkboard	.14	.31	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: overhead projector	.09	.29	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: other equipment	.55	.50	0.00-1.00
Teacher feelings of success for teacher	3.77	1.07	1.50-5.00
Teacher feelings of success for students	3.91	1.69	0.00-5.00
Teacher projected changes	1.77	.49	1.00-2.50
Teacher intention to change materials	.27	.39	0.00-1.00
Teacher intention to change activities	.68	.44	0.00-1.00
Teacher intention to change sequence/planning	.55	.50	0.00-1.00
Teacher intention to change other	.36	.48	0.00-1.00
LESSON PLAN VARIABLES			
Number of words in written plan	62.73	57.37	12.50-208.00
Plan vague/sketchy	.82	.39	0.00-1.00
Plan specific	.18	.39	0.00-1.00
Plan detailed	.00	.00	0.00-0.00
Content emphasis in written plans: procedural/behavioral	4.09	.97	2.00-5.00
Content emphasis in written plans: affective	1.86	1.15	1.00-4.50
Content emphasis in written plans: academic	1.77	.94	1.00-4.00

Table 2, continued

Variables[a]	Mean	S.D.	Range
Content emphasis in written plans: other	1.27	.49	1.00-2.50
Sequence specified in plans	.95	.14	0.50-1.00
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION VARIABLES (CR and SER Data)			
First day: students on task	83.39	13.45	50.00-99.00
First day: students off task	3.81	5.17	0.00 16.67
First day: students in dead time	6.14	14.40	0.00 50.00
First day: student success	4.36	.64	3.00-5.00
First day: disruptive behavior	1.09	.29	1.00-2.00
First day: inappropriate behavior	2.00	.43	1.00-3.00
First day: teacher conveys value of curriculum	2.73	1.35	1.00-5.00
First day: class is task oriented	3.64	.98	2.00-5.00
First day: class has relaxed atmosphere	3.64	1.15	1.00-5.00
First day: avoidance during seatwork	.55	.66	0.00-2.00
First day: participation in discussion/recitation	2.00	1.86	0.00-5.00
Eight weeks: students on task	90.19	5.53	80.90-98.53
Eight weeks: students off task	3.15	2.15	0.74-8.37
Eight weeks: students in dead time	1.46	2.76	0.00-9.54

Table 2, continued

Variables[a]	Mean	S.D.	Range
Eight weeks: student success	4.01	.57	2.67-4.75
Eight weeks: disruptive behavior	1.27	.38	1.00-2.22
Eight weeks: inappropriate behavior	2.05	.64	1.38-3.63
Eight weeks: teacher conveys value of curriculum	2.54	.84	1.25-4.25
Eight weeks: class is task oriented	3.95	.51	2.89-4.88
Eight weeks: class has relaxed atmosphere	3.88	.50	2.67-4.63
Eight weeks: avoidance during seatwork	2.24	.78	1.25-3.80
Eight weeks: participation in discussion/recitation	3.49	.56	2.57-4.67
Proportion of time in procedural/behavioral	.73	.16	0.40-1.00
Proportion of time in academic	.12	.14	0.00-0.38
Proportion of time in affective	.05	.12	0.00-0.40
Proportion of time in other	.10	.10	0.00-0.26
CLASSROOM ACTIVITY RECORD VARIABLES			
Contextural factors: workbook used	.18	.39	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: textbooks	.09	.29	0.00-1.00
Contextural factors: other books	.18	.39	0.00-1.00

Table 2, continued

Variables[a]	Mean	S.D.	Range
Contextual factors: other materials	1.00	.00	1.00-1.00
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.77	.39	0.00-1.00
Contextual factors: overhead projector	.18	.39	0.00-1.00
Contextual factors: other equipment	.09	.19	0.00-0.50
Appropriateness of procedural content	4.36	1.43	0.00-5.00

[a] See Appendix D for definitions of variables.

Table 3

Correlations Among Interview Variables and Written Lesson Plans

Interview Variables	Content Emphasis (Lesson Plan)				Level of Detail (Lesson Plan)		
	Procedural/ Behavioral	Affective	Academic	Other	Vague/ Sketchy	Specific	Detailed
Goals: Emphasis on procedural/behavioral	.54	-.66	.31	.05	-.25	.25	0
Goals: Emphasis on affective	-.62	.72	-.26	-.08	.27	-.27	0
Goals: Emphasis on academic	.08	.26	-.10	.28	-.01	.01	0
Alternatives considered	-.81	.09	.50	.19	.07	-.07	0
Alternative materials considered	-.19	.33	.58	.05	-.17	.17	0
Alternative general approach considered	-.53	-.35	.87	-.26	.22	-.22	0
Other alternative considered	-.68	.73	-.26	-.17	.15	-.15	0
Contextual factors: school personnel	.39	-.53	.37	-.02	.19	-.19	0
Contextual factors: principal	.11	-.52	.41	-.39	.32	-.32	0
Contextual factors: other school personnel	.51	-.30	-.14	.15	.05	-.05	0

Table 3, continued

Interview Variables	Content Emphasis (Lesson Plan)				Level of Detail (Lesson Plan)		
	Procedural/ Behavioral	Affective	Academic	Other	Vague/ Sketchy	Specific	Detailed
Contextual factors: student ability level	.17	-.24	-.01	.69	-.83	.83	0
Contextual factors: other books	-.29	-.15	.24	-.02	.22	-.22	0
Contextual factors: other materials	.08	-.65	.58	.25	-.12	.12	0
Contextual factors: chalkboard	-.19	-.33	.26	.05	-.17	.17	0
Contextual factors: overhead projector	.30	-.24	-.26	-.17	.15	-.15	0
Contextual factors: other equipment	.09	-.27	.07	-.24	.04	-.04	0

Note: Single underline indicates a correlation greater than or equal to .38.
Double underline indicates statistical significance ($p < .05$, two-tailed probability).

Table 4

Relationships Between Planning and First Day

Observational Variables

Variables	Classroom Climate		
	T conveys value of curriculum	Class is task oriented	Class has relaxed atmosphere
Goals: procedural/behavioral	.0689	-.1382	-.3248
Goals: affective	.0177	.1820	.2059
Goals: academic	.4422	.3132	.2667
Alternatives considered	-.0831	.2681	.0489
Alternative materials	-.0198	.1643	.1399
Alternative general approach	.0949	.4158	-.0559
Alternative: other	-.4033	-.2055	.1000
Contextual factors: school personnel	-.0692	.0479	.0408
Contextual factors: principal	-.2029	-.2159	-.1838
Contextual factors: other school personnel	-.1288	-.1688	-.1437
Contextual factors: student ability	.3227	.2101	-.0671
Contextual factors: other books	.4429	.6565	.1491
Contextual factors: other materials	.2193	.2251	.0083
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.4156	.4654	-.1166
Contextual factors: overhead projector	-.4033	-.5285	-.7250
Contextual factors: other equipment	-.1838	-.1526	-.6062

Table 4, continued

Variables	Classroom Climate: T conveys value of curriculum	Classroom Climate: Class is task oriented	Classroom Climate: Class has relaxed atmosphere
Plan vague/sketchy	-.0949	.0657	.0559
Plan specific	.0949	-.0657	-.0559
Content emphasis: procedural/behavioral	.1913	-.1562	-.1330
Content emphasis: affective	-.4033	-.3266	-.0375
Content emphasis: academic	.2016	.4543	.2183
Content emphasis: other	.1112	.0171	.0146

Note: One underline indicates $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 5

Correlations Between Planning and Student First Day Behavior

Variables	Student First Day Behavior							
	# Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discussion/ recitation
Interview Variables								
Goals: procedural/ behavioral	-.2078	.0902	.1617	.3032	.1695	.5586	.4454	-.0641
Goals: affective	.3048	-.0926	-.1567	-.4138	-.2313	-.5490	-.4301	-.1574
Goals: academic	.4371	.2581	-.1124	.0149	-.2667	-.6180	-.0585	.0284
Alternatives considered	.1300	-.2410	-.3079	-.2480	-.2283	0	.0286	-.3330
Alternative materials	-.0857	-.2340	-.1887	.4379	-.1399	0	.0818	.1587
Alternative general approach	.2727	-.3027	-.2011	.1000	-.1491	0	.3269	-.2536
Alternative: other	-.0991	.1237	-.1349	-.6708	-.1000	0	-.2631	-.3503
Contextual factors: school personnel	.0263	.1383	.1134	.4084	.2283	0	.4434	.3330
Contextual factors: principal	-.4190	-.1848	.5098	.1480	.5882	.5452	.3063	0
Contextual factors: other school personnel	.0024	.1014	.2003	.2571	.3194	0	.2241	.3261

Table 5, continued

Variables	Student First Day Behavior: # Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discuss/ recitation
Contextual factors: student ability	.0182	.0904	-.2086	.1200	-.1789	0	-.0392	0
Contextual factors: other books	.5706	-.3467	-.1904	.1000	.1491	-.5528	-.0327	0
Contextual factors: other materials	.1512	-.6000	.1609	.3130	.2667	0	.5409	.1134
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.3010	-.2989	-.1887	-.0209	-.1399	0	.0818	-.1587
Contextual factors: overhead projector	-.7847	-.2326	.9631	-.1789	1.0000	.7416	-.2631	-.1701
Contextual factors: other equipment	-.3896	-.5690	.3389	.2324	.2887	.4282	-.3545	-.0982
Written Plan Variables								
Plan vague/sketchy	.1600	-.4551	.1466	-.1000	.1491	0	.0327	0
Plan specific	-.1600	.4551	-.1466	.1000	-.1491	0	-.0327	0
Content emphasis: procedural/behavioral	-.2799	.1166	.2954	.4560	.2955	.2192	-.0065	.4525
Content emphasis: affective	-.0535	.2857	-.1030	-.6093	-.2375	-.1854	-.4440	-.4253

Table 5, continued

Variables	Student First Day Behavior							
	# Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discuss/ recitation
Content emphasis: academic	.3965	-.0016	-.3267	.2124	-.2605	-.1136	.6450	-.1303
Content emphasis: other	-.0389	.5167	-.1676	.1172	-.1747	-.2159	-.0383	.0495

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 6

Correlations between Written Plans

and Time Use on the First Day (n = 11)

Content Emphasis in Written Plans	Proportion of Class Time			
	Procedural/ behavioral	Affective	Academic	Other
Procedural/behavioral emphasis	.5689	-.6698	-.1853	.1602
Affective emphasis	-.1391	.7546	-.4817	.0018
Academic emphasis	-.5156	-.3135	.8349	.0149
Other emphasis	.0491	-.1435	-.2361	.4140

Note -- One underline indicates $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate statistical significance ($p \leq .05$)

Table 7

Correlations Between Consideration and Use of Contextual Factors

Variables Considered	Variables Used					
	Worksheets	Textbooks	Other Books	Chalkboard	Overhead Projector	Other Equipment
Other books	.39	-.15	.39	.27	-.22	.39
Other materials	.12	.27	.12	-.49	.40	.12
Chalkboard	.94	-.14	.94	.26	-.21	.17
Overhead projector	-.15	-.10	-.15	-.62	.67	-.15
Other materials	.43	-.35	.43	.17	-.04	-.04

Note: One underline indicates a correlation greater than or equal to .38; two underlines indicate statistical significance ($p < .05$, two-tailed probability).

Table 8

Correlations Between Planning and Appropriateness

Of First Day Procedural Content

Variables	Appropriateness of Procedural Content
Goals: procedural/behavioral	-.2382
Goals: affective	.3252
Goals: academic	.3748
Alternatives considered	.1768
Alternative materials	-.0094
Alternative general approach	.0449
Alternative: other	.1406

Table 9

Relationships Between Planning Variables and Teacher First Day Evaluations

Variables	Teacher Feelings of Success		Teacher Projected Changes				
	Teachers	Students	Extent	Materials	Activities	Sequence/ Timing	Other
Goals: Emphasis on procedural/behavioral	-.25	-.28	-.13	.37	.02	-.37	-.21
Goals: Emphasis on affective	.11	.14	-.05	-.29	-.27	.20	.24
Goals: Emphasis on academic	.01	.14	-.47	-.45	-.11	-.08	.13
Alternatives considered	-.37	-.30	.44	.16	-.18	.24	-.12
Alternative materials considered	.03	.16	.35	-.12	.32	.40	-.33
Alternative general approach considered	-.45	-.39	-.02	.27	-.19	-.04	-.36
Alternative other considered	.07	.11	.47	-.22	-.13	.29	.42
Contextual factors: school personnel	.09	.08	-.23	-.02	.41	-.04	-.31
Contextual factors: principal	.15	.04	.09	.11	.24	.17	-.04
Contextual factors: other school personnel	.21	.13	-.36	.19	.19	-.11	-.29

Table 9 (continued)

Variables	Teacher Feelings of Success		Teacher Projected Changes				
	Teachers	Students	Extent	Materials	Activities	Sequence/ Timing	Other
Contextual factors: student ability level	-.41	-.30	.40	.33	.09	.23	-.43
Contextual factors: other books	-.34	-.39	-.26	.27	-.19	-.04	-.36
Contextual factors: other materials	-.23	-.14	-.07	.18	.11	.29	-.46
Contextual factors: chalkboard	-.66	-.72	.05	.63	-.35	.19	-.33
Contextual factors: overhead projector	.36	.02	.15	.59	.23	.29	-.24
Contextual factors: other equipment	.15	-.10	.05	.64	-.04	-.10	-.45
Number of words in written plan	-.29	-.18	.43	-.04	.38	.18	-.18
Written plan vague and sketchy	.12	-.10	-.46	.03	-.34	-.43	.36
Written plan specific	-.12	.10	.46	-.03	.34	.43	-.36
Content emphasis in written plan: procedural/behavioral	.17	.03	-.15	.17	.39	-.20	-.17

Table 9 (continued)

Variables	Teacher Feelings of Success		Teacher Projected Changes				
	Teachers	Students	Extent	Materials	Activities	Sequence/ Timing	Other
Content emphasis in written plan: affective	.31	.40	.06	-.42	-.22	.13	.42
Content emphasis in written plan: academic	-.48	.27	-.06	-.08	-.07	-.03	-.22
Content emphasis in written plan: other	-.05	.19	.35	-.15	.40	.50	-.42

Note -- One underline indicates a correlation greater than or equal to .38;
Two underlines indicates statistical significance ($p < .05$, two-tail probability).

Table 10

Correlations Between Teacher First Day Evaluations

and First Day Classroom Climate

Teacher Evaluation Variables	Classroom Climate Variables		
	T Conveys Value of Curriculum	Class is Task Oriented	Relaxed Class Atmosphere
Feelings of success for teacher	-.67	-.68	-.29
Feelings of success for students	-.59	-.60	-.02
Extent of changes considered	-.16	-.02	-.07
Plans to change materials	-.12	-.10	-.69
Plans to change activities	-.15	.05	-.05
Plans to change sequence/timing	-.32	-.15	-.13
Plans to change other	.15	-.11	.40

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 11

Correlations Between First Day Teacher Evaluations and First Day Student Behavior

First Day Evaluation Variables	Student Behavior							
	# Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Amt. of disrupt. behavior	Amt. of inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discussion/ recitation
Feelings of success for teacher	-.49	-.30	.42	.25	.36	.10	-.47	.30
Feelings of success for students	-.24	-.04	.09	.28	.02	-.13	.20	.26
Extent of changes considered	-.46	.27	.02	-.31	.15	.22	-.32	-.15
Plans to change materials	-.38	-.45	.51	-.03	.59	.54	-.23	-.13
Plans to change activities	-.45	.23	.11	.25	.23	0	.34	.33
Plans to change sequence/timing	-.43	.06	.22	-.05	.29	0	-.35	0
Plans to change other	.23	.23	-.14	-.43	-.24	0	.24	-.20

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 12

Relationships Between First Day Planning

and Observational Variables for the First 8 Weeks

Variables	Classroom Climate		
	T conveys value of curriculum	Class is task oriented	Class has relaxed atmosphere
Goals: procedural/behavioral	.03	-.03	-.16
Goals: affective	-.14	.15	.11
Goals: academic	-.04	.05	.35
Alternatives considered	.08	.43	-.08
Alternative materials	.08	.11	.21
Alternative general approach	-.11	.39	-.07
Alternative: other	-.15	-.04	-.16
Contextual factors: school personnel	.04	-.31	.13
Contextual factors: principal	.21	-.58	-.48
Contextual factors: other school personnel	-.10	-.33	-.22
Contextual factors: student ability	.17	.51	.39
Contextual factors: other books	.09	.52	.23
Contextual factors: other materials	.03	-.15	.23
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.11	.70	.15
Contextual factors: overhead projector	.30	-.65	-.76
Contextual factors: other equipment	.07	.12	-.27

Table 12, continued

Variables	Classroom Climate: T conveys value of curriculum	Class is task oriented	Class has relaxed atmosphere
Plan vague/sketchy	-.05	-.16	-.35
Plan specific	.05	.16	.35
Content emphasis: procedural/behavioral	.36	-.20	.11
Content emphasis: affective	-.39	-.10	-.09
Content emphasis: academic	-.14	.24	.07
Content emphasis: other	.004	.13	.39

Note: One underline indicates $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 13

Correlations Between Planning and Student 8-Week Behavior

Variables	Student 8-Week Behavior							
	# Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discussion/ recitation
Interview Variables								
Goals: procedural/ behavioral	-.35	.21	.26	-.20	.39	.40	.20	.24
Goals: affective	.49	.25	-.35	.22	-.52	-.46	-.36	-.27
Goals: academic	.44	-.33	-.08	.16	-.41	-.30	-.51	-.51
Alternatives considered	.04	-.29	-.35	.36	-.39	-.31	-.28	.49
Alternative materials	-.54	-.18	-.21	.20	-.13	.06	-.13	.59
Alternative general approach	.02	-.22	-.23	.36	-.34	-.12	-.42	.25
Alternative: other	.21	-.06	-.14	-.07	-.23	-.33	.10	.08
Contextual factors: school personnel	.04	.13	.35	-.08	.25	.23	-.10	-.42
Contextual factors: principal	-.44	.56	.34	-.50	.51	.39	.38	-.26
Contextual factors: other school personnel	.25	.28	.35	-.15	.43	.30	.27	.56

Table 13, continued

Variables	Student 8-Week Behavior: # Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discuss/ recitation
Contextual factors: student ability	-.03	-.41	-.27	.37	.01	-.18	-.26	.57
Contextual factors: other books	.47	-.33	-.25	.62	-.34	-.31	-.55	-.24
Contextual factors: other materials	.06	.04	.27	.07	.27	.17	-.09	-.35
Contextual factors: chalkboard	.14	-.27	-.23	.51	-.13	-.18	.36	.36
Contextual factors: overhead projector	-.008	.77	.01	-.75	.79	.25	.47	-.52
Contextual factors: other equipment	-.26	.28	-.45	-.11	.17	.21	.04	.37
Written Plan Variables								
Plan vague/sketchy	-.08	.40	.20	-.10	-.05	.17	.16	-.42
Plan specific	.08	-.40	-.20	.10	.05	-.17	-.16	.42
Content emphasis: procedural/behavioral	-.27	.26	.27	-.23	.57	.36	.31	-.09
Content emphasis: affective	.42	-.15	-.33	-.17	-.44	-.37	-.09	-.07

Table 13, continued

Variables	Student 8-Week Behavior: # Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Ss disrupt. behavior	Ss inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discuss/ recitation
Content emphasis: academic	-.05	-.31	.07	.34	-.34	-.06	-.39	.13
Content emphasis: other	.22	-.49	-.23	.15	-.06	-.27	-.30	.19

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 14

First Day Teacher Evaluation Variables and

Classroom Climate for the First 8 Weeks

First Day Evaluation Variables	T conveys value of curriculum	Class is task oriented	Class has relaxed atmosphere
Feelings of success for teacher	-.28	-.66	-.35
Feelings of success for students	-.52	-.59	-.12
Extent of changes considered	.49	.13	.10
Plans to change materials	.25	.11	-.45
Plans to change activities	.56	-.06	.21
Plans to change sequence/timing	.17	-.24	-.04
Plans to change other	-.14	-.19	-.00

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Table 15

First Day Teacher Evaluation Variables

and 8-Week Student Behavior

First Day Evaluation Variables	Student Behavior							
	# Ss on task	# Ss off task	# Ss in dead time	Ss success	Amt. of disrupt. behavior	Amt. of inapprop. behavior	Ss avoid. seatwork	Ss part. in discussion/ recitation
Feelings of success for teacher	-.25	.53	-.07	-.49	.36	.44	.54	-.18
Feelings of success for students	-.25	.24	.02	-.33	.11	.38	.39	-.05
Extent of changes considered	.05	-.27	-.39	.00	.02	-.50	-.12	.39
Plans to change materials	.10	.38	-.23	-.12	.48	.12	.14	.01
Plans to change activities	.03	.20	-.35	-.02	.11	-.29	-.12	.12
Plans to change sequence/timing	.07	-.10	-.40	-.12	.10	-.27	-.08	.02
Plans to change other	-.16	.15	.53	-.21	-.11	.10	.25	-.18

Note: One underline indicates a $r \geq .38$; two underlines indicate a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Appendix A

Casestudies

Teacher 39

This science teacher was beginning his third year teaching. He had a minimal amount of student task avoidance in his classroom during the first 8 weeks of school and had high ratings on classroom climate variables and student success. When asked his goals for the first day of school he emphasized affective concerns. He stated that he wanted to, "get to know the kids" and to help them feel relaxed and at ease. He added that he wanted "to make sure that the kids understood where I was coming from, what they could expect from me, and what I. . .expected from them," suggesting behavioral concerns. He also wanted the students to know "what's going to go on in earth science this year." Although the latter statement seemed to imply an academic aspect, his written lesson plans indicated only procedural concerns. Aside from this possible discrepancy, goal statements made in the interview were congruent with written notes the teacher used for lesson plans. His first two written points were "to prepare students for my classroom expectations-procedures," and "to introduce myself, tell about me." His brief written plans did not indicate whether he intended to communicate short- or long-term expectations to students; classroom observation revealed that this intention was clearly part of his mental plan.

The first day narrative written by the classroom observer indicated that this teacher did follow through with his stated and written intentions to get acquainted with his students and to introduce himself to them. During the first 12 minutes of class the teacher called students forward to get a schedule, during which time he chatted briefly with each student. During the following few minutes, the teacher introduced

himself to the class and talked about his background and current interests and activities.

Consistent with his plan to make expectations explicit, the teacher discussed procedures and rules for such items as the care of books and equipment, required materials and the importance of bringing these to class, the form for heading papers, procedures for making up missed assignments, and appropriate class behavior. He also described his grading system and illustrated it on the chalkboard. Throughout this discussion as well as during his earlier self introduction, he regularly encouraged students to ask questions and made occasional jokes. The observer also noted that the teacher made good eye contact with students and used student names in examples of procedures and rules.

Two sets of materials used in class the first day included a student information questionnaire and a list of required materials. Teacher 39 reported that he had consulted more experienced teachers about what they did on the first day and the kinds of information they sought from students. He had then composed a student questionnaire, combining information from other teachers and his own ideas. He provided students with a list of required materials, saying that reading it aloud with the students would "probably cut down the questions by 3/4." This can also be seen as a way in which this teacher prevented problems that might result from ambiguity, and made his expectations clear.

Thus in planning for the first day, this teacher had only a few critical goals around which he focused the entire class period. He went to some length to prepare written segments of the lesson, and although

he did not state an intention to vary the activities for students, he provided a balance of listening (with opportunities to question and discuss) and writing activities. While relatively simple in conception and implementation, plans made by this teacher were carefully designed, closely followed, and effective in achieving the teacher's stated goals.

Teacher 38

Teacher 38 was a first year English Teacher. He had a high number of inappropriate student behaviors and students off task in his classroom throughout the first 8 weeks and a low rating on classroom climate variables. He stated that his goals were "to get index information cards filled out, get at least two books passed out, and. . . get those books covered." He explained that the information cards were to provide him with students' parent names, phone numbers, and other student data, and that he wanted the books distributed so he could "start on my curriculum." Although these can be categorized as procedural goals, they do not include communicating information to students about what would occur in that classroom, nor do they have implications beyond concrete activities for the first day. Later in the interview, in response to a question about his spelling lesson, the teacher responded with another goal: "To establish a pattern in this spelling unit. The pattern was that we were going to have spelling every week, and on Mondays we were going to do Section A of a particular unit [etc.]. . . ." Thus he had at least one academic goal that had implications beyond first day activities.

Teacher 38's written plans, though brief, did include two items in addition to those corresponding to his stated goals. One item was academic in nature: "Spelling, Sections A, B, and D;" the other was "rules and policies." Asked what outcome he desired from presenting rules and policies to students, teacher 38 stated, "I just wanted. . .to let them know what the rules and policies were, and then try to build on them as we go along." Beyond the concrete presentation of information,

this teacher did not suggest what purpose such communication might serve, either for immediate or long term use.

In the classroom on the first day, this teacher did indeed follow his lesson plans and achieve his stated goals. Students completed information cards and were issued two textbooks which they covered. The teacher communicated classroom rules to students, including when students would be permitted to leave their seats, sharpen pencils, and talk; and that the teacher, not the bell, would dismiss them at the end of class. Following his presentation of rules, the teacher sat at his desk and worked as students finished covering books and worked on their spelling assignment. Not all students worked; some students whispered or talked quietly and were ignored by this teacher. Toward the end of the period the teacher checked students' books and collected a paper that students had filled out earlier.

Asked about the influence of contextual factors, Teacher 38 answered, "I really don't know what influences me. I guess what influences me most is other teachers. I just go to them, find out what they're doing, because I'm new at this. . ." Asked specifically what kinds of information he sought from teachers regarding the first day, the teacher said, "Curriculum mainly. I just wanted to know what they were going to do, what their ideas were. And I just kind of followed along."

From examining Teacher 38's interview and first day description, it appears that he was somewhat inconsistent in answering interview questions and had not given much thought to implications of the activities he gleaned from other teachers or to the manner in which he

wanted his classroom to function throughout the year. Some of this shortsightedness might be attributed to the fact that Teacher 38 was a first year teacher with no teaching experience except his semester of student teaching. His tendency to describe a goal in response to a question other than that about goals, however, and his responding to the question about goals with a partial list of concrete activities that occurred on the first day, indicate a relatively shallow approach that had not been thought out carefully either before or after the first day.

An example of his retrospective thoughts about the first day included his response to questions about possible changes and satisfaction with the first day. Asked about possible changes he might make the following year, Teacher 38 stated that he would probably plan to do the same activities but might be "more business like. . .more stern," in his approach to the students. He indicated mild dissatisfaction with the fact that he had not consistently enforced policies he had wanted students to abide by, such as raising hands rather than speaking out, or getting out of their seats to ask questions. While these comments indicated that this teacher had had some mental plans prior to the first day that he did not put into writing, his stated reason for the possible change was fairly concrete and immediate: "If you go over [rules] then you need to give that immediate feedback to let them know that this is the way it's going to be."

It is possible that a factor, "consideration and communication of long- term behavioral expectation," not tapped by the present study would be relevant to an analysis of planning, especially in terms of management effectiveness. While such a dimension would not necessarily

be seen in written plans or in a classroom observation, it is an aspect of teachers' mental planning that might pertain to the quality of plans and affect first day activities and teacher/student classroom behaviors.

Teacher 49

Teacher 49 was a science teacher and had taught for 1 1/2 years. She had among the lowest number of students off task and in dead time and above average ratings in classroom climate, student success, and student participation in discussion/recitation. She had below average numbers of students counted as on task and above average ratings of disruptive and inappropriate studen* behavior. Her interview responses and written lesson plans were quite extensive, with her stated goals centering around acquainting students with classroom rules and procedures. She explained that rules were necessary to provide more time for academics, saying, ". . .without [rules] you might as well forget about the kids' ever learning anything. . . . If you spend 95% of your time disciplining, that's only 5% left to do any learning." She emphasized that in a science lab setting such as hers, clear rules and procedures were especially important for the proper handling of equipment as well as efficient use of time.

This teacher's written plans were quite specific, and were much more detailed than was suggested by her stated goal of presenting rules and procedures. The lesson plans listed administrative tasks, academic activities, some specific procedures to be discussed, and the introduction of two brief opening and closing activities. In describing opening and closing activities to the interviewer, Teacher 49 expressed an affective consideration: She hoped to "spark a little bit more interest in [students], to make them want to come back."

The class period observed for Teacher 49 lasted much longer than a normal 55 minute class; it was a 2 1/2 hour period during which teachers in that school were expected to accomplish several school-

mandated tasks, including completing forms, providing instructions about lunch schedules, locker assignments, etc. Teacher 49 began the class period by praising students' quiet behavior as they entered. She then immediately read the class rules aloud from the front chalkboard where, according to the observer, they were "prominently displayed." She followed her written lesson plans by next attending to administrative chores, having students fill out school information cards, copy schedules, and so on. She praised students who followed directions and circulated among students, helping those who needed assistance. She put examples of what students were to write on the chalkboard. As indicated in her plans, Teacher 49 distributed copies of the student handbook to the students and went over a portion of it with them. She then instructed students to copy the class rules, and she pointed out a word search sheet they were to complete after copying the rules. These activities were listed in her written plans, and when asked about them, she explained that she felt that it was extremely important for students to become familiar with the rules, and that she frequently provided word searches to be used after students completed an activity "to keep them in control. Too much idle time is where you get your problems." She praised students for their quiet working and introduced one aspect of her discipline system by telling them that their continued cooperation would soon earn them some free time on Friday.

After 1 1/2 hours Teacher 49 had students stand up and walk around the classroom. Despite the specificity of her lesson plans, she had not listed a "break" time. In discussing her decision to let students get up and move, she explained that she had figured they were getting "tired of sitting," and she also wanted to give them an opportunity "to get

acquainted with the room." Other than this departure from written plans, Teacher 49 followed her plans fairly closely. She had to contend with innumerable interruptions from PA announcements and requests from the office but each time returned to the task at hand and managed to maintain a sense of continuity and to complete her agenda.

Teacher 55

Teacher 55 was beginning her second year of teaching English. She had among the highest number of students on task throughout the first 8 weeks of school and well below average numbers of students off task and in dead time. Her 8 week classroom climate rating was just below the average rating. She had extremely brief first day lesson plans and gave similarly brief interview responses. Asked her goals for the first day, she described only affective goals: "Just for the kids to get to know me and to get to know each other and to just make them feel more at ease." She added that this was a sixth grade class, and these students were new to middle school. Her written plans reflected her affective focus in two of the three items listed: "1) Welcome students and introduction, 2) boundary breaker-group activity." The third and last written item concerned filling out information index cards.

Consistent with her stated goal and written plans, Teacher 55 began the class period with an introduction of herself and the school. She then called roll and introduced the boundary breaker game, in which students were to pair off, learn four facts about each other that were written on the chalkboard, and then introduce each other to the rest of the class.

At the conclusion of the game, Teacher 55 conducted a brief discussion about the value of taking English and described materials students would need for this class and consequences for not bringing necessary materials to class. Neither of these activities was mentioned in the lesson plans, nor did the teacher refer to them in discussing what she wanted to accomplish the first day. These activities appeared to be well organized and integrated into the overall sequence of

activities however, so they were clearly a part of this teacher's mental planning and served at least to focus students briefly on some academic and procedural expectations held by Teacher 55.

The teacher then returned to the third item of her lesson plans, having students fill out information cards for her future use. For the remainder of the class period, which lasted 6 more minutes, Teacher 55 discussed various items with students, seemingly at random. She discussed responsibility, various school procedures such as the up-only and down-only staircases, and her paper heading requirements. She encouraged students to tell what they liked so far about school and told them that the following day they would discuss and institute a "behavior agreement." She told students that she, not the bell, would dismiss them and followed through with that when the bell rang.

According to the observer, the teacher appeared relaxed, calm, and sure of herself. Asked about the discussion during the last few minutes of class, Teacher 55 reported that when she had time left after completing the tasks she had written down to accomplish on the first day, "I just filled in." Nevertheless, the fact that she engaged students in a useful discussion rather than allowing them to sit in dead time indicates that in her mental planning she had a reservoir of appropriate "fill-in" activities (or at least one appropriate discussion filler) on which she could depend when the need arose.

Appendix B

Written Instructions for Coders: Pilot Study

Pilot Study

Comparison of Lesson Plans and Classroom Events: Coder Instructions

1. Note time interval on narrative. Only compare plans for that time interval.

2. Go through narrative noting activities of 10 minutes or longer.

3. Compare with plans re

   a. Events in plans (scheduled for 10 mins. or emphasized), but not observed.

   b. Events (of 10+ min. duration) observed but not in plans.

   c. Changes in order of events.

   d. Changes in duration of events (±10 mins.)

Pilot Study

Form for Coding Discrepancies Between Plans and Observed Classroom Events

Teacher # _____

		Number of Instances
a. Events in plans but not observed	a	
b. Events observed but not in plans	b	
c. Changes in order of events	c	
d. Changes in duration of events	d	

Appendix C

Interview Questions (Present Study)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (for present study)

1. How many years have you taught (before this year)?

2. Is there anything new about your teaching situation this year--school, grade, etc.? If so, what?

3. When did you write your first day lesson plans? Did you change anything before the first day of school? If so, what? What made you decide to do so?

4. Was anyone else going to read your lesson plans? (e.g., principal)

5. Did you have any major goal(s) for the first day? Things you wanted to be sure to accomplish? What? Why did you feel these were important.

I am interested in how much and in what ways context influences teachers' decisions--in planning and in their classrooms. By context I mean basically the people, materials, and equipment in the school as well as the physical structure of the school (e.g., size of classroom, etc.). This can include you, the students, principal, aides, counselor, custodian; text, library, and supplemental books, dittoes, paper, boxed learning kits; overhead projector, pencil sharpeners, number and kind of desks, chalkboards, lighting, etc.

You may think of things you did have, did ot have, or had but that were unavailable or not working. Influences might have been positive, negative, neutral, or non-existent. So in questioning you, I don't have preconceived notions of any right/wrong, better/worse answers. Rather, I am trying to find out what teachers actually do consider in planning and how these things fit together.

6. What contextual factors (such as those listed above) did you consider when making your first day plans? What kinds of information did you seek?

7. For each activity: What were you thinking when you included this activity in your plans? What outcome did you want?

8. For each activity in the Classroom Activity Record: What was going on in your mind when you started this activity? What were you thinking? Was it as you intended it to be? If not, how and why was it different?

9. Did you consider alternative activities in your planning? When? What were they? What was your thinking in rejecting them?

10. What things do you plan to use in the same form next year? Why?

11. What things do you expect to do differently next year? Why?

12. Do you consider your first day with this class to have been successful? For you? For the students? Why or why not? Was there anything specific that you did that you feel was more or less successful than other things?

13. What was your reaction on reading the account of your first day in this class?

Appendix D

Written Instructions for Coders (Present Study):

Observational Variables

Excerpt from First Day Classroom Activity Record (CAR)

Activity Code	Time	Activity
8	2:43	Teacher sits at desk as she calls roll. Students are writing, answering, helping her with pronunciation occasionally. Teacher says to keep writing if they are not through--otherwise listen because they have lost of housekeeping chores.
3	2:45	She explains ditto sheets--word find, word search--passes it out, asks if anyone has never done one before--no response. She tells them where to put heading and how. One student calls out question, teacher says raise hand. Student does, teacher calls on student. Teacher has all
	2:46	students look at her, starts, reminds them to look, then shows on sheet how to do it. Gets
	2:47	them started. She says some words are not clear, do those they can read today and they'll go over others tomorrow. Teacher walks around looking at papers, then goes to her desk at front and works.
	2:49	Students are all working. Teacher gave permission to use pen today.

Coding Procedures for CARs

Total time is the number of minutes in class from the beginning of the first activity as noted by the activity code until the time the observer notes class to be dismissed. It may be figured by totalling the times allocated to each activity.

Procedural/behavioral time will be calculated by adding the number of minutes recorded in JMIS activity codes 8-11 and determining the proportion of total class time. Proportions are to be noted on the coding sheet. Procedural/behavioral codes are defined as follows:

8 Procedural/Behavioral Presentation. The teacher presents or reviews classroom procedures or rules. This code should be used any time the teacher institutes and explains classroom procedures or rules governing student behavior. It should also be used when the teacher gives the class extensive feedback on their behavior, or discusses problems relating to student behavior in class, or students' following of classroom procedures.

9 Procedural/Administrative Routines. This code can include roll call, announcements, opening or closing routines (unless academic content is involved), giving directions for assignments (if over 1 minute), discussions of grades, distributing graded papers, recording grades in class, and changing seating. These activities must involve most of the students. For example, if roll call or distributing graded papers involves only the teacher and one or two students, while most of the students are doing seatwork, the "Individual Seatwork" code (3) should be used.

10 Checking. Going over homework problems, a quiz, or assignment for the purpose of checking/grading it in class. Little or no teacher explanation or review is entailed. The teacher or students announce answers or write them on the board or overhead transparency.

11 Transitions. Activities entailed in changing from one activity to another. Includes getting supplies, passing papers, waiting for everyone to get ready, quiet, or find the place. Activity codes for "Transitions" should not be noted in the CAR when the transition lasts less than 1 minute.

Academic time will be calculated by adding the number of minutes recorded in JMIS activity codes 1-7 and determining the proportion of total class time. Proportions are to be noted on the coding sheet.

Academic codes are defined as follows:

1 Content Development: Teacher Presentation of Content. Includes lecture, demonstration, explanation of academic content. May also include some questioning or comments from students, but the main function of this activity is informing students, introducing new material, or reviewing previously introduced material.

2 Content Development: Recitation/Discussion. Includes questioning of students by the teacher. The function of this activity is to provide students practice of skills or review of material. This category might also include short written tasks, as when teachers ask students to work one problem at their desks to assess understanding during a content development activity. To be included in "Recitation/Discussion," written tasks or

other seatwork must last less than 3 minutes. This code could also include a content-oriented game or board work actively involving most of the class.

3 Individual Seatwork. Students are working at desks individually. This code includes warm-up activities that are content-centered. Brief directions for seatwork or short teacher interruptions of seatwork to explain or clarify directions should be left in seatwork time unless they last more than 1 minute. If during a content development activity the teacher assigns a written task, the written task should be coded as "Seatwork" if it lasts 3 minutes or longer.

4 Tests. Anything called a test, quiz, readiness test, or assessment. Students work independently.

5 Pairs or Grouped Seatwork. Grouped projects, experiments, small group tasks. Teacher circulates or monitors from desk.

6 Student Presentation. One or several students present to the class for more than 1 minute. The presentation is planned ahead of time rather than in response to a direct teacher question as in recitation.

7 Small Group Instruction. Teacher works with a group of students (3 or more) for more than 1 minute while the rest of the class is in seatwork. This category takes priority over all others, e.g., don't code seatwork for the other students during this period.

Affective time will include time spent in the teacher's introducing him/herself or the classroom; student introductions; discussion of students' backgrounds and/or concerns; games or activities used

primarily to help students become better acquainted with each other and/or with the teacher. This time should be deducted from time spent in procedural, if that is where it has been coded. It may also be found within Activity Code 12, "Non-academic Activity. which is defined as follows: Games, discussions, TV, not related to content of the class". Affective time will be calculated by adding the number of minutes spent in this category and determining the proportion to total class time. Proportion is to be noted on coding sheet.

The category, "Other," will include the number of minutes spent in Activity Code 12 which are not affective in nature and in Code 13, which is defined as: Dead Time. Two-thirds or more of the class have no assigned task; students are just waiting".

Coding Procedures for Contextual Factors

Materials

1. Worksheets: Work presented to students in the form of mimeographed or dittoed sheets distributed to students or as a transparency projected on the overhead projector for such purposes as drill, review, or comprehension checks. Worksheets are not tests or pretests. They may or may not be written on by students, graded, or returned to the teacher.
2. Textbooks: Books officially approved by the school district for use in that class. These are issued to each student as part of the academic curriculum for use during the entire semester or school year.
3. Other books: E.g., library books, dictionaries, etc.
4. Other: This response is to be specified. Describe or give the title of each worksheet and book used.

Equipment

1. Chalkboard: any type of wall board on which one may write and erase easily.
2. Overhead Projector (OP): machine which projects image onto screen.
3. Other: This response is to be specified.

Describe the use of each category of equipment noted.

Coding Procedures for Appropriateness of Procedural Content

Read the CAR and note procedures presented by the teacher.

Rate the appropriateness of procedural content by checking the appropriate space.

(5) Only necessary or essential rules and procedures are presented. These involve student talk, how students are to contact the teacher, and any procedures contributing to the smooth functioning of activities to be engaged in on the first day or soon thereafter (e.g., entering the room, exiting, warm-ups, grading system).

(4) 75% of the procedural content presented is necessary for the first day or immediately thereafter. Other procedures presented may be needed only in the distant future (e.g., necessary--student talk; future--fire drill procedures, exam procedures).

(3) 50% of the procedural content presented is necessary for the first day or immediately thereafter. Other procedures may be needed much later (see Rating 4).

(2) 75% of the procedures presented are unnecessary on the first day or immediately thereafter.

(1) Only procedures unnecessary for the first day or immediately thereafter are presented.

Coding Procedures for CRs

Student success is an indication of students performing or working at acceptable levels, without frequent failure. If a student does not engage in a seatwork assignment at all, no success is assumed for him/her. The rating scale is as follows:

(5) Very high: All students are at least moderately successful.

(4) High: Most students are successful; one or two may not be able to perform the task.

(3) Moderate success levels: Three of four do not appear to be performing successfully.

(2) Fair success levels: More than four--up to one-half of the class--are unsuccessful.

(1) Low success levels: More than one-half of the class cannot do the task.

Disruptive behavior is defined as "pupil behavior that interferes with instructional, attentional, or work activities of the teacher or two or more other students". The rating scale for amount of disruptive behavior is as follows:

> A 5 rating would be obtained if such behavior occurs with a high degree of frequency. Use a 5 to note a situation which is habitual and is a constant problem for the teacher and other students. A 4 would indicate frequent occurrences of such behavior (e.g., once every 10 minutes). A mid-range rating would be obtained if such behaviors occur with moderate frequency, such as several on the average per hour, occasionally moderately or severely disruptive. A rating of 2 would indicate one or two

instances per hour, almost always mild. A rating of 1 would indicate the complete absence of any of such incidents.

Inappropriate behavior is any kind of nondisruptive pupil behavior "contrary to stated or implied classroom rules or procedures". The rating scale for amount of inappropriate behavior is a general scale:

(5) The behavior is exhibited frequently or the description is highly characteristic of the teacher.

(4) The behavior is exhibited often or the description is mostly characteristic of the teacher.

(3) The behavior occurs occasionally or the description is somewhat characteristic of the teacher.

(2) The behavior is exhibited rarely or the description is not very characteristic of the teacher.

(1) The behavior never occurs or is not at all characteristic.

Classroom climate includes three elements. The first is the teacher's communication to the students of the value of the curriculum. Specifically, the teacher "emphasizes the value, usefulness, importance of knowledge and skills of the curriculum. Teacher conveys interest, excitement." The general scale used for inappropriate behavior is also used here.

Second is task orientation of students. This indicates "the extent to which students appear to accept the importance of or necessity for doing assigned work." The rating scale calls for a

"5 if students support and demonstrate enthusiasm for assignments and activities, seem eager to participate. Rate a 3 if students appear to be accepting and willing, but not enthusiastic. Rate a

1 if students show resistance, complain, and/or avoid engaging in assigned tasks."

The third aspect of classroom climate is a relaxed, pleasant atmosphere. It is defined as follows:

"The teacher and students seem to get along nicely. There is an absence of friction, tension, or antagonism; behavior is friendly and courteous. The teacher and children obviously like each other."

The general rating scale used for inappropriate behavior and for teacher conveying value of the curriculum is used here.

Students participation has two parts. The first, avoidance during (academic) seatwork, is "the extent of persistent work avoidance by students during seatwork activities." The rating scale used is as follows:

(5) Half or more of the class frequently or persistently avoids engagement.

(4) From five to one-half of the students frequently avoid seatwork engagement.

(3) Three or four students avoid seatwork engagement.

(2) One or two students avoid seatwork engagement.

(1) No avoidance. All students engage in seatwork.

Student participation in discussion/recitation may be volunteered or elicited by the teacher and involves the "extent of student participation and overt response in whole class or small group discussions/recitations/content development." The rating scale is as follows:

(5) Most students participate (all but one or two).

(4) A majority of students participate (two-thirds plus).

(3) One-half participates (to two-thirds).

(2) Fewer than half the students participate.

(1) Participation by only a few (one to three) students.

Appendix E

Coding Procedures for Interviews

Coding Procedures for Interviews

1. Goals

Goals are defined as statements of teacher intentions regarding teacher and/or student affect or behavior for the first day of school. Rate the teacher's emphasis on each category by putting a check under the appropriate number.

(5) Strong emphasis: Indicated by teacher to be a highly important or major kind of goal, or discussed proportionately more than other categories.

(4) Somewhat strong emphasis: Indicated by teacher to be important or mentioned proportionately more than most other single categories.

(3) Moderate emphasis: Indicated to be about equal in importance with other included categories.

(2) Little emphasis: Indicated to be of minor importance, or mentioned proportionately less than other included categories.

(1) No emphasis: Not mentioned in the interview.

Procedural/Behavioral: Statements about presentation of grading system; specific rules, consequences, reward system; instructions for use of materials or equipment in classroom or school. It also includes the four procedural activity codes used in the CAR's.

Affective: Statements about introductions of teacher, students, classroom; discussion of students' background and/or concerns; statements of teacher concern about students' feelings (e.g., "I wanted them to feel comfortable.")

Academic: Statements about teacher description of the course and/or activities to be engaged in during the year, introduction to textbooks, discussion of subject matter and/or academic assignment.

Other: Any affirmative response to interview question about goals not covered by the other three categories. This response is to be specified.

List goals mentioned by the teacher.

2. Alternatives

Was there evidence in the interview that the teacher considered and discarded alternatives of any kind in planning? Check yes or no.

a. Materials: Was there evidence in the interview that materials for teacher or for student use (such as those described in 3b) were considered in planning? Check yes or no.

b. General Approach: Was there evidence in the interview that in planning the teacher considered alternative activities for the students or an alternative sequence to be followed? Check yes or no.

c. Other: This is to be specified.

List alternatives that were considered.

3. Contextual Factors

For each contextual factor, briefly tell what the teacher said and how it was to be used.

a. People

1) School Personnel: Persons employed to work in the school. Was there evidence in the interview that teachers considered school personnel in their planning? Check yes or no.

2) Students:

a) Ability Level: Academic achievement level of students. Did teachers state that students' ability levels were considered in planning? Check yes or no.

b) Behavior: Observable conduct of students. Did teachers indicate that student behavior was considered in planning? Check yes or no.

List teacher statements indicating consideration of students' ability level and behavior.

b. Materials

Were these mentioned by teachers in the interview as having been considered in planning? Check yes or no.

1) Worksheets: Work presented to students in the form of mimeographed or dittoed sheets distributed to students or as a transparency projected on the overhead projector for such purposes as drill, review, or comprehension checks. Worksheets are not tests or pretests. They may or may not be written on by students, graded, or returned to the teacher.

2) Textbooks: Books officially approved by the school district for use in that class. These are issued to each student as part of the academic curriculum for use during the entire semester or school year.

3) Other books: e.g., library books, dictionaries, etc.

4) Other: This is to be specified.

Describe or give titles of each worksheet and book mentioned.

c. Equipment

Were these mentioned by teachers in the interview as having been considered in planning? Check yes or no.

1) Chalkboard any type of wall board on which one may write and erase easily.

2) Overhead Projector machine which projects image onto screen.

3) Other: This response is to be specified. Describe how each was used.

4. Teacher Feelings of Success

This will be measured by the teacher's response to Question 12. Rate by checking under the appropriate number.

(5) Very Successful: Teacher responds affirmatively with no qualifications.

(4) Successful: Teacher responds affirmatively with only minor qualifications.

(3) Somewhat Successful: Teacher indicates partial success but with major qualifications.

(2) Not Very Successful: Teacher response is more negative than positive but includes positive aspects.

(1) Not At All Successful: Teacher indicates virtually no positive reaction to the question, or gives a definite negative response.

Don't Know: Teacher does not acknowledge feeling any degree of success or lack of success about the first day or expresses unresolved ambivalence.

5. Teacher Reflection

a. Rate teachers' statements about things they expect to change on the first day of school next year by checking the appropriate space.

None or about the same: Teacher indicates virtually no changes will be made.

Few: Teacher indicates that only one or two things will be changed, or only minor modification made in existing plans.

Several: Teacher indicates more than two things that will be changed or that a major change will be made.

Don't Know: Any response not specifying anything that the teacher intends to change or to keep as it is on the first day of school next year.

b. Plans to change

1) Materials: Was there evidence in the interview that the teacher would make changes involving different or modified materials? Check yes or no.

2) Activities: Was there evidence in the interview that the teacher would make changes involving different or modified activities and tasks for the students to do? Check yes or no.

3) Sequencing/Timing: Was there evidence in the interview that the teacher would make changes involving a rearrangement of the sequence of activities, or more or less time spent on specific activities? Check yes or no.

4) Other (specify)

List by category each change the teacher plans to make.

Coding Procedures for Lesson Plans

1. Level of Detail

Write down the total number of words in the plan.

Check one category per plan.

Vague/Sketchy: Plans which have only general statements or guidelines, e.g., "Talk about rules. Get student information."

Specific: Plans that include some concrete examples, specific activities, or specific materials to be used, e.g., "Seek & Find Worksheet," or "Ice Breaker game."

Detailed: Plans that include exact words the teacher will say, some indication of expected student responses, or a list of verbatim rules to be presented.

2. Content

Note the number of times each category is included in plans. For each category, rate by putting a check under the appropriate number.

(5) Strong emphasis: Indicated by teacher to be a highly important or major goal, or discussed proportionately more than all other categories combined (e.g., may be underlined, written in capital letters, or have an * or ! after it).

(4) Somewhat strong emphasis: Indicated by teacher to be important or mentioned proportionately more than most other single categories.

(3) Moderate emphasis: Indicated to be about equal in importance with other included categories.

(2) Little emphasis: Indicated to be of minor importance or mentioned proportionately less than other included categories.

(1) No emphasis: Not mentioned in the plans.

Procedural/Behavioral: Presentation of grading system, rules, consequences, reward system; instructions for use of materials or equipment in classroom or school; discussion of schedules or school calendar; textbooks issued. It also includes the four procedural activity codes used in the CARs.

Affective: Introduction of teacher, students, classroom; discussion of students' backgrounds and/or concerns; games or activities designed primarily to help students become better acquainted with each other and/or with teacher.

Academic: Discussion of the course and/or classroom activities to be engaged in during the year; introduction to textbooks; discussion of subject matter and/or academic assignment.

Other: Any indication of time to be spent in a manner not covered by the preceding three categories. Specify these.

3. Sequence Specified

Any indications that plans are in sequential order, e.g., items numbered, connecting words such as "then," "after," etc., used, or times noted. Mark this yes or no. If plans do indicate sequence, list the items rated in #2 and the category of each.