DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 389 SP 037 305

AUTHOR Byra, Mark; Jenkins, Jayne
TITLE Learner Decision Making in the Inclusion Style of Teaching.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Active Learning; *Class Activities; *Decision Making; Educational Theories; Elementary School Students; Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; *Learner Controlled Instruction; *Physical Education; *Student Participation; Student Role; Teacher Role; Teaching Styles; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Spectrum of Teaching Styles (Mosston)

ABSTRACT

In the inclusion style of teaching, learners must make decisions about level of task difficulty. They must decide at which level to enter the presented task and then, for additional sets of trials, decide whether to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. This study examined learner decision making in a physical education class. A total of 40 fifth graders from 2 classes in an elementary school volunteered to participate (22 female and 19 male). For two consecutive lessons, each 30-minutes in length, the learners received instruction on striking a ball with a bat, in the inclusion style of teaching. At the end of each session, a task sheet was used to monitor performance and trials of performance that were made. In the first set, learners selected from four possible batting conditions and three ball sizes with varying levels of task difficulty. After completing the first 10 trials, the majority of learners who had made the task easier reported they felt a need to increase the level of difficulty. One-half who chose to make the task difficult at the beginning stated they wanted to make the task easier. Slightly more than half chose to retain the same task conditions for a third set of trials and approximately 45 percent selected a different level of difficulty. The data from this study indicated that learners can make appropriate decisions about level of skill difficulty and affect the amount of time spent in "good practice." The task sheet and six tables of data are appended. (Contains 16 references.) (JLS)

Learner Decision Making in the Inclusion Style of Teaching

Mark Byra, Ph.D.
School of Physical and Health Education
University of Wyoming
P.O. Box 3196
Laramie, WY 82071
(307)766-5227

and

Jayne Jenkins, M.S.
Department of Exercise and Sport Science
University of North Carolina @ Greensboro

Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Special Interest Group in Research on Learning and Instruction in Physical Education, Chicago, IL, March 1997.

Learner Decision Making in the
Inclusion Style of Teaching

In the 1960s, Muska Mosston caught the attention of the physical education profession by introducing the Spectrum of Teaching Styles. What began as an endeavor to extend physical education teaching has expanded beyond the field of physical education into other disciplinary subject matter. Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles is well known to educators in many countries and in various areas of the academic spectrum. Many in the education arena have embraced the Spectrum of Teaching Styles as it was established in the 1970s and conceptually refined in the 1980s and 1990s (Franks, 1992; Goldberger, 1992; Mellor, 1992).

Validating selected theoretical assumptions associated with the Spectrum of Teaching Styles (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994) continues to be critical to the pursuit of knowledge about the Spectrum. Over the past decade a number of different questions have been asked and answered about various aspects of Mosston and Ashworth's teaching styles. Questions researched include the effect different styles of teaching have on learner skill and knowledge performance (Beckett, 1990; Goldberger, Gerney, & Chamberlain, 1982; Jenkins, 1995), the effect different styles of teaching have on learners of different skill ability (Beckett, 1990; Ernst, 1995; Goldberger & Gerney, 1986), the effect different teaching styles have on learner social interaction patterns (Byra & Marks, 1993; Emst, 1995; Goldberger, Gerney, & Chamberlain, 1982), and the effect different teaching styles have on learner decision making (Byra & Marks, 1993; Ernst, 1995).

One teaching style that has received some attention over the past decade is the inclusion style of teaching. In the inclusion style of teaching the teacher makes all of the pre-impact decisions (planning of the episode). The learner makes the impact decisions (doing the task) related to posture, location, order of tasks, starting time per task, pace and rhythm, stopping time per task, interval, and attire and appearance, as well as determines at which level to enter the presented task and when to move to a different level of difficulty. The purpose of this style is to include all learners at their appropriate level of participation and skill (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994). In the inclusion style of teaching the teacher allows for individual (skill) differences amongst the learners, and provides all learners an opportunity to enter an activity at an appropriate level, an opportunity to step backward to a lower level in order to succeed in the activity, and an opportunity to compare their aspirations to reality of performance.

An important component of the inclusion style of teaching is the episode task sheet. Task sheets are the guidelines for learner practice in the inclusion style of teaching. These sheets provide the learner with information about "what to do" and "how to do it" and the teacher with a record of learner progress (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994). Inclusion style task sheets provide the learner legitimate options for skill practice. These options are based on factors that make the practice of the given skill more or less difficult.

Student learning in the inclusion style of teaching has been systematically researched. Goldberger and Gerney (1986) compared learner performance across the inclusion, practice, and reciprocal teaching

styles. In this study it was found that average aptitude children learned best with the practice style, but exceptional children, those with above and below average aptitude, learned best from the inclusion style. In another study Goldberger, Gerney, and Chamberlain (1982) found that learners improved their skill when taught in the inclusion style of teaching, but the inclusion style was not as effective as the practice style in skill development.

Research indicates that learner skill performance does improve over time when instruction is provided to students in the inclusion style of teaching. However, little is known about the types of decisions learners make in the inclusion style of teaching and why these decisions are made. In the inclusion style of teaching the teacher creates an environment in which students are able to choose level of difficulty within a task, assess their own skill performance, and make the nine decisions that are shifted from the teacher to the learner in the impact phase of an episode (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994). Everyday, students make decisions about their involvement in class, such as whether to follow instructions, engage in the learning activities, and put forth an appropriate level of effort, and these decisions have a major impact on what is learned. If students are provided opportunity to think and behave in certain ways, as is the case in the inclusion style of teaching, it is likely that student learning will be impacted in a positive manner (Solmon & Lee, 1996). Based on this perspective, it is important to learn more about teaching styles and/or strategies that will empower students to think and behave in ways to facilitate learning.

The purpose of this study was to examine learner decision making in the inclusion style of teaching (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994). The types of decisions the learners made about the selection of alternative levels of difficulty within a task and the reasons why they made these decisions were examined.

Method

Subjects

A total of 40 fifth graders from two classes in one elementary school (K-5) volunteered to participate in this study. Twenty-one of the learners were girls and 19 were boys, all 11 or 12 years of age. All learners were taught by the same teacher who had 22 years teaching experience in physical education. For 16 of those 22 years the teacher taught at the elementary (K-5) level. This teacher was trained in the appropriate use of Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles, with particular emphasis on the inclusion style of teaching. A score of 93% was achieved on a written exam of Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles in a university graduate level course (Models of Teaching). In addition, several episodes of each of Mosston and Ashworth's didactic teaching styles were taught to university and elementary-aged learners. Having one teacher provide all instruction in this study helped to control for unplanned variability in the teacher factor.

The learner subjects and their parents received an orientation prior to the beginning of this study. This orientation included a brief statement of the purpose of the study and discussion of the styles of teaching. The parents were asked to sign a consent form for their child's participation in this research

study at the orientation. Approval of this research study was granted by the University Institutional Review Board.

Procedures

For two consecutive lessons, each 30-minutes in length, the learners received instruction on striking with a bat in the inclusion style of teaching. During each of the two lessons the teacher introduced the purpose of the inclusion style of teaching, described the roles of the learner and teacher, demonstrated and explained the striking task and prepared task sheet, and provided the learners with an opportunity to perform 30 trials of the batting task. While the learners were practicing, the teacher observed them and provided individual feedback about their role (social) behavior (i.e., choosing a level of difficulty and assessing self-performance). When skill performance errors were observed, the teacher referred the learners to their task sheet and checked subsequent performance. At the end of each lesson the teacher reviewed learner role and skill performance. The task sheet that was used included a description of the task and factors to be manipulated, critical skill cues for batting, examples of positive and corrective specific feedback statements, and space for recording the task entry decision as well as subsequent decisions (see Figure 1).

During each lesson the learners performed three sets of 10 trials of the batting task. Prior to completing each set of 10 trials the learners had to make decisions about two factors that would affect the degree of difficulty of the batting task. The first factor related to the conditions under which the ball was to be batted. The learners could choose from four alternative batting conditions: (a) hit a ball from a batting tee (least difficult), (b) hit a ball that was underhand-tossed from the side by a partner, (c) hit a ball that was underhand-tossed from in front by a partner, or (d) hit a ball that was self-tossed (most difficult). The second factor related to the size of ball to be batted. The learners could choose from three different sized balls: (a) large (least difficult), (b) medium, or (c) small (most difficult). The large ball measured nine inches across its diameter, the medium sized ball five inches, and the small ball three inches. Each learner recorded his/her decision making on the prepared task sheet (see Figure 1). All of the subjects used the same sized bat during the study. Both lessons were audio-videotaped.

Place Figure 1 About Here

Following both lessons the investigator interviewed each learner independently. Three questions were asked: (a) What choices did you make about the task and size of ball for the first set of 10 trials and why did you make these choices?; (b) What changes did you make for the second set of 10 trials and why did you make these changes?; and (c) What changes did you make for the third set of 10 trials and why did you make these changes? The post-lesson interviews were audiotaped and subsequently transcribed for analysis.

Data Sources and Analysis

Data from two sources were analyzed, learner task sheets (i.e., decisions about level of difficulty for batting condition and ball size) and transcribed post-lesson interviews. Frequency counts were calculated for the types of decisions made by the learners within each of the two factors for the first, second, and third sets of task trials. Percent scores were then computed for each level of difficulty within each factor.

The transcribed post-lesson interviews were analyzed using qualitative data reduction techniques (Patton, 1990). The learner responses for each of the three post-lesson questions were analyzed separately. First, two coders analyzed each learner's interview statements to identify common elements across the data. Second, the coders grouped the interview statements according to these common elements and reread the statements to arrive at a consensus for category descriptors. Third, the two coders independently categorized all of the statements according to the category system developed. Frequency counts were calculated for each category within each question. An intercoder simple percent agreement score of 88 was yielded for the categorization of the interview statements.

Style implementation during the study was verified through systematic observation. A modified version of the Inclusion Style-Analysis Checklist (Sherman, 1982) was employed to ascertain the level of fidelity between the teacher's instructional behaviors and the style specific behaviors. A simple percent agreement score of 96 was obtained for teaching style verification.

Results

Lesson One

First Set of 10 Trials.

Right from the beginning the learners chose to select from all four of the batting conditions and three ball sizes. The most frequently selected batting condition was batting from a tee (see Table 1). Almost 60% of the learners chose this level of task difficulty. It was the least difficult batting condition of the four presented. The other three batting conditions, batting a ball tossed from the side, batting a ball tossed from in front, and batting a self-tossed ball, were selected rather evenly across the remaining subjects.

The two ball sizes selected most frequently were the five inch (medium) and three inch (small). Approximately 95% of the students selected from these two ball sizes in lesson one (see Table 1). Only two subjects chose the largest ball size (nine inch).

The learners who chose to make the task easiest (i.e., batted a medium or large ball off a tee) reported that they chose these levels of task difficulty because they wanted to enter the task at an easy level and work their way up to performing the task under more difficult conditions (see Table 1). Those who chose to make the task more difficult for themselves (i.e., batted a tossed ball of medium or small size) stated that they did so because they had previous experience playing baseball. A small group of the learners reported that they didn't know what they could do prior to entering the task and thus selected a batting condition and ball size rather arbitrarily.

Place Table 1 About Here

Second Set of 10 Trials.

After completing the first set of 10 trials the learners were required to revisit the chosen task conditions and decide whether to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. For the second set of 10 trials more than 50% of the learners chose a more difficult batting condition while maintaining the same ball size (medium or small). A smaller group of learners (36%) stayed with the same batting condition and an even smaller group (10%) chose an easier batting condition (see Table 2). The learners who did not stay with the same size ball select the larger sized one (25%) more frequently than the smaller sized one (15%).

After completing the first 10 trials the majority of those learners who had made the task "easy" for themselves reported that they needed to increase the level of task difficulty because the task conditions chosen had made the task too easy. Others, who decided that they had made the task too easy, reported that they wanted to improve their batting performance and could do this by increasing the level of difficulty of the task. A smaller group reported that they just wanted to do something different with the second set of trials. These learners seemed to be curious about the other batting conditions and ball sizes from which they could choose.

One-half of the learners who chose to make the task difficult right from the start stated that they had made the task too difficult and wanted to make it easier for themselves. Others who chose from one of the easier batting conditions in the first set reported that they wanted to improve their batting skill and that they perceived improvement would be achieved by making the task more difficult.

Place Table 2 About Here

Third Set of 10 Trials.

Upon completing the second set of 10 trials the learners were again required to revisit the chosen task conditions and decide whether to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. For the third set of 10 trials an even split was observed across the three possible decisions the students could make (see Table 3). Approximately one-third of the learners chose a more difficult task condition, one-third a less difficult task condition, and one-third to decided to stay with the same task condition as in the second set of 10 trials.

Less movement was observed for the factor of ball size. More than 50% of the learners chose to stay with the same sized ball. An equal number of the remaining learners chose between selecting a larger sized ball and a smaller sized ball.

Those students who decided to make the task more difficult in the third set perceived success as being the major reason for increasing the level of task difficulty (see Table 3). They indicated that their

decision was based on the success that they had experienced during the previous set of trials. Others who decided to make the task more difficult in the third set stated that they needed practice hitting a tossed ball. A smaller group of learners reported changing level of task difficulty upward just because they wanted to do something different, as was the case for the second set of 10 trials. A few learners simply identified the need to practice hitting a tossed ball, which meant choosing a batting condition that was more difficult.

Just under 20% of the learners reported that they would stay with the same batting condition and ball size for set three because the batting task as designed for the second set of trials "felt good." One student expressed, "if you are doing well with something, there is no sense in changing."

Those students wanting to make the task easier in the third set did so for the purpose of success. "Being successful" was viewed as important to these students.

Place Table 3 About Here

Lesson Two

First Set of 10 Trials.

In lesson two the majority of the students (62.5%) chose to enter the task at the two less difficult levels (i.e., batted a medium or large ball off a tee) (see Table 4). This decision-making was similar to that which occurred in lesson one. Although the majority selected from the two less difficult batting levels, a sizable number of students did select from one of the two more difficult batting conditions, batting a tossed ball from in front or batting a self-tossed ball (37.5%). In terms of ball size, the learners selected the five inch (medium) and three inch (small) balls most frequently, as was the case in the first lesson.

In the second lesson approximately half of the learners reported that they wanted to start out with an easier batting condition to be assured of success (see Table 4). Several learners stated that they were choosing easier conditions for the first set of trials in lesson two to increase their score (over lesson one).

Others stated that their choice was based on experiences in lesson one. They indicated that they liked what they had done in the previous lesson and thus stuck with the levels of difficulty chosen.

The learners who chose to immediately make the task more difficult in lesson two felt that they had performed it under conditions that were too easy in lesson one. A few students reported that they chose a more difficult level of performance because they "simply wanted to do something different."

Place Table 4 About Here

Second Set of 10 Trials.

After completing the first set of 10 trials the learners were required to revisit the chosen task conditions and decide whether to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. Over 40.0% of the learners chose to keep the same batting condition and 77.5% the same ball

size as used in the first set of 10 trials (see Table 5). This represented a slight increase over the scores reported for lesson one. While the majority of the students stayed with the same batting condition, a fairly large number did opt for a less difficult (20.0%) or more difficult (37.5%) batting condition.

The ball size selected for the first set of 10 trials continued to be the student's most popular choice for their second set of 10 trials in lesson two. Fewer students changed ball size in lesson two (22.5%) compared to lesson one (40%).

Those learners who reported making the task "easy" for themselves in the first set of 10 trials indicated that they needed to increase level of task difficulty because the task conditions chosen had made the task too easy (see Table 5). Others who increased level of task difficulty stated that they felt a need to do something different. This reflected choosing a batting condition that they had yet to experience, one that was more difficult. For the first time, some learners reported that they didn't know why they had chosen a more difficult batting condition.

About a third of the learners indicated that they kept the batting condition the same to improve their score. Several of the learners who chose to make the task difficult right from the start stated that they needed to make the task easier for themselves in the second set.

Place Table 5 About Here

Third Set of 10 Trials.

Upon completing the second set of 10 trials the learners were again required to revisit the chosen task conditions and decide whether to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. For the third set of 10 trials slightly more than 50% of the learners chose to retain the same batting condition and 75% the same ball size (see Table 6). Fewer students changed the level of task difficulty for the third set of 10 trials compared to the second set.

Those learners who selected a smaller ball size or more difficult batting condition reported that they needed to make the task harder for themselves (see Table 6). Learners who chose to go in the opposite direction, that is, choose a less difficult batting condition and/or ball size, did so because of a lack of success in the second set or purely to try a new task condition. The students who kept the same batting condition and ball size in the third set of 10 trials reported following this action because they had felt successful in the second set of 10 trials.

Place Table 6 About Here

Discussion

In the inclusion style of teaching learners must make decisions about level of task difficulty. They must first decide at which level to enter the presented task and then, for additional sets of trials, decide whether

to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. The results from the entry (first) set of 10 trials in lessons one and two indicate that given the opportunity 5th graders will select from different levels of difficulty when entering task performance at the beginning of a lesson. These data support Mosston and Ashworth's (1994) contention that within the inclusion style of teaching students will choose a level of skill performance that matches their perceived ability level. Within this particular study, there seemed to be "a reality accommodating individual differences" (Mosston & Ashworth, 1994, p. 117) which the learners fully accepted.

The students seemed to be acting in accordance with reasoning as they selected task difficulty for their first set of 10 trials in lessons one and two. Those familiar with the task selected from the more difficult task conditions, while those who were unfamiliar with the task selected from the less difficult task conditions. Students who chose to make the task less difficult reported doing so for purposes of success. One student stated, "I chose hitting the bigger ball (medium sized) off the batting tee because I wanted to make sure that I could do the task. I wanted to be successful."

The reasons identified above are all examples of rational decision-making. The results from this study (entry level task decision-making) don't support the findings from Goldberger, Gerney, and Chamberlain (1982). Goldberger et al. observed learners making inappropriate decisions for their skill level. The learners would choose a level that appeared too difficult for them to reach success, and even with encouragement or prompting from the teacher, the learners would not change levels. This was not the case in the present study. To shed more light on this contrast in findings one might have to further analyze the task sheets and levels of task difficulty presented to the learners in the two studies. Perhaps the levels of difficulty matched the different levels of skill ability more favorably in the present study. Another plausible reason for this difference may relate to the contrasting settings in which these two studies were conducted. Goldberger et al. conducted their study in a laboratory setting, whereas the present study took place in "real" physical education classes.

For the second and third sets of task trials the learners made decisions to perform the task the same way, make it more difficult, or make it less difficult. The results showed that some learners selected to make few if any changes to level of task difficulty, while others selected to make the task less difficult or more difficult for themselves. This finding supports Mosston and Ashworth's (1994) assertion that learners will choose to step backward (make the task easier) to succeed in an activity or, conversely, step forward (make the task more difficult) to find success in an activity when given the opportunity (as in the inclusion style of teaching).

One trend was apparent in learner decision-making for the second and third sets of task trials in lessons one and two. A greater number of learners selected the same batting condition and same ball size (same as in previous set of trials) from one set of trials to the next across both lessons. The following responses were representative of the learners falling into this category; "because I liked this way---I could hit!" "Cause I got 9 out of 10 and I thought that maybe I should try again to see if I could get 10 out of 10."

This finding suggests that over time these 5th graders used the different levels of task difficulty to help them identify an appropriate match between their aspiration and the reality of their ability. Mosston and Ashworth (1994) identify this relationship as one of the objectives of the inclusion style of teaching.

Although slightly more than half of the learners chose to retain the same task conditions from the second set of task trials to the third, changes from one level of task difficulty to another were not precluded over time. Approximately 45% of the learners selected a different batting condition and 25% a different ball size for the last set of trials in the second lesson. This suggests that even after completing five sets of 10 trials, the learners were still attempting to challenge themselves by increasing or decreasing level of task difficulty for the purpose of success.

The reasons for making changes seem to be grounded in sound thinking. Learners who made the task more difficult indicated that their first selections were too easy. One learner who made the task more difficult by selecting a smaller ball size stated, "I chose the smallest ball because I knew I could get 10 out of 10 with the medium ball." Another student said, "I changed the ball size to medium to work harder cause I wanted to get more better at baseball!" Learners who simplified the task indicated that they initially had made the task too difficult for themselves. One learner who selected a less difficult batting condition for the last set of 10 trials said, "I changed to a tee because I got frustrated, cause I only got seven (of ten)." Challenging oneself for the purpose of success was the most prevalent theme in the learners' interview statements for the second and third sets of trials.

Two variables critical to learning are time spent in good practice and matching tasks to learner ability (Gusthart, Kelly, & Rink, 1997; Rink, 1996). The data from this study indicate that learners can make appropriate decisions about level of skill difficulty and, in turn, affect the amount of time spent in "good practice." It seems that in well designed inclusion style of teaching episodes, these variables can be facilitated.

In the inclusion style of teaching teachers can structure their classes to empower learners to think and perform in ways that will promote learning. This is important as research indicates that students who practice effectively (i.e., complete a greater number of practice trials at an appropriate level) reflect greater gains in skill performance (Hebert & Solmon, 1996; Solmon & Lee, 1996). If students are provided opportunity to think and behave in certain ways, as is the case in the inclusion style of teaching, it is likely that student learning will be impacted in a positive manner (Solmon & Lee, 1996).

References

Beckett, K. (1990). The effects of two teaching styles on college students' achievement of selected physical education outcomes. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 10(2), 153-169.

Byra, M., & Marks, M. (1993). The effect of two pairing techniques on specific feedback and comfort levels of learners in the reciprocal style of teaching. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12(3), 286-300.

Ernst, M. (1995). The effect of peer teaching on middle school learners' skill performance, cognitive performance, and comfort level. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wyoming.

Franks, B. (1992). The spectrum of teaching styles: A silver anniversary in physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63(1), 26.

Goldberger, M. (1992). The spectrum of teaching styles: A perspective for research on teaching physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63(1), 42-46.

Goldberger, M., & Gemey, P. (1986). The effects of direct teaching styles on motor skill acquisition of fifth grade children. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57(3), 215-219.

Goldberger, M., Gerney, P., & Chamberlain, J. (1982). The effects of three styles of teaching on the psychomotor performance of fifth grade children. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 53(2),116-124.

Graham, G., Holt/Hale, S., & Parker, M. (1993). Children moving: A reflective approach to teaching physical education. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Gusthart, J.L., Kelly, I.M., & Rink, J.E. (1997). The validity of the qualitative measures of teaching performance scale as a measure of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 16(2), 196-210.

Jenkins, J.M. (1995). An exploration of theoretical constructs associated with the spectrum of teaching styles. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wyoming.

Mellor, W. (1992). The spectrum in Canada and Great Britain. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63(1), 47.

Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (1994). Teaching physical education (4th ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rink, J.E. (1996). Effective instruction in physical education. In S.J. Silverman & C.D. Ennis (Eds.), Student learning in physical education (pp. 171-198). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Sherman, M. (1982). Style analysis checklists for Mosston and Ashworth's spectrum of teaching styles. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh.

Solmon, M.A., & Lee, A.M. (1996). Entry characteristics, practice variables, and cognition: Student mediation of instruction. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 15(2), 136-150.

Name _____ Date _____ Class _____

STRIKING WITH A LONG-HANDLED IMPLEMENT

TASK

Level	Task Description	Level of Difficulty
1	Batting a ball from a tee.	Least Difficult
2	Batting a ball tossed from the side.	
3	Batting a ball from an underhand toss.	
4	Batting a ball self tossed (fungo style).	Most Difficult

BALL SIZE

Level	Ball Size	Level of Difficulty
1	Large	Least Difficult
2	Medium	
3	Small	Most Difficult

DIRECTIONS TO THE STUDENT

1. Select a task and ball size for your first set of 10 trials.
2. Write the level of the task and ball size chosen in the appropriate box below.
3. Write the number of successful hits you think you will make out of 10 trials (prediction).
4. Now do the 10 trials and record the number of successful attempts out of 10 (actual).
5. After completing the first set of 10 trials, decide which task and what size ball you wish to use to complete a second set of 10 trials. Follow DIRECTIONS 2, 3, and 4.
6. After completing the second set of 10 trials, decide which task and what size ball you wish to use to complete a third set of 10 trials. Follow DIRECTIONS 2, 3, and 4.

SET	TASK LEVEL	BALL SIZE	PREDICTION	ACTUAL
1			/10	/10
2			/10	/10
3			/10	/10

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

1. Hands touching with dominant hand on top?
2. Bat swing is in a horizontal plane?
3. Are you taking a forward step?
4. Are you rotating your hips, trunk, and shoulders?
5. Do your wrists uncock with contact?

Figure 1. Inclusion style task sheet.

Table 1
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the First Set of 10 Trials in Lesson One

Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting	1 (least)	23	59.0
Conditions	2	4	10.2
	3	6	15.4
	4 (most)	6	15.4
Size of Ball	1 (biggest)	2	5.2
	2	27	69.2
	3 (smallest)	10	25.6
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
1. I wanted to make the task easy at the beginning.		24	61.5
2. I was familiar with baseball.		12	30.8
3. I didn't know what I could do.		3	7.7

Table 2
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the Second Set of 10 Trials in Lesson One

Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting Conditions	Less	4	10.3
	Same	14	35.9
	More	21	53.8
Size of Ball	Less (bigger)	10	25.6
	Same	23	59.0
	More (smaller)	6	15.4
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
Chose to Make the Task More Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task harder because I made it too easy in the first set of 10 trials.		19	48.7
2. I did well in the first set of 10 trials and wanted to improve my skill (thus make it more difficult).		8	20.5
3. I just wanted to do something different.		5	12.8
Chose to Make the Task Less Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task easier because I made it too difficult in the first set of 10 trials.		6	15.4
2. I didn't want to get a bad score (so I made it easier).		1	2.6

Table 3
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the Third Set of 10 Trials in Lesson One

Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting Conditions	Less	14	35.9
	Same	13	33.3
	More	12	30.8
Size of Ball	Less (bigger)	8	20.5
	Same	22	56.4
	More (smaller)	9	23.1
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
Chose to Make the Task More Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task harder because I was successful (with the second set of 10 trials).		16	41.0
2. I just wanted to do something different.		7	18.0
3. I needed practice hitting a tossed ball.		3	7.7
Chose to Make the Task Less Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task easier because I wasn't as successful as I thought (with the second set).		6	15.3
Chose to Keep the Task the Same			
1. It felt good so I stayed with it (level of difficulty selected for the second set of 10 trials).		7	18.0

Table 4
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the First Set of 10 Trials in Lesson Two

Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting Conditions	1 (least)	23	57.5
	2	2	5.0
	3	8	20.0
	4 (most)	7	17.5
Size of Ball	1 (biggest)	2	5.0
	2	23	57.5
	3 (smallest)	15	37.5
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
1. I wanted to make the task easier at the beginning (to be successful)		22	55.0
2. I liked doing the task this way (during lesson one).		11	27.5
3. I needed to make the task more difficult (compared to lesson one).		5	12.5
4. I just wanted to do something different.		2	5.0

Table 5
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the Second Set of 10 Trials in Lesson Two

		Lesson 1	Lesson 2
Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting Conditions	Less	8	20.0
	Same	17	42.5
	More	15	37.5
Size of Ball	Less (bigger)	5	12.5
	Same	31	77.5
	More (smaller)	4	10.0
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
Chose to Make the Task More Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task harder compared to the first set of 10 trials.		9	23.1
2. I just wanted to do something different.		8	20.5
3. I don't know.		6	15.4
Chose to Make the Task Less Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task easier because I made it too difficult in the first set of 10 trials.		4	10.3
Chose to Keep the Task the Same			
1. I wanted to stay the same to improve my score.		12	30.8

Table 6
Learner Decision-making Regarding the Degree of Task Difficulty and Reasons Why The Task was Performed at the Selected Level of Difficulty for the Third Set of 10 Trials in Lesson Two

Factors	Level of Difficulty	Frequency	Percent
Batting Conditions	Less	7	17.5
	Same	21	52.5
	More	12	30.0
Size of Ball	Less (bigger)	5	12.5
	Same	30	75.0
	More (smaller)	5	12.5
Reasons for Making the Decision		Frequency	Percent
Chose to Make the Task More Difficult			
1. It wanted to make the task harder yet.		9	22.5
Chose to Make the Task Less Difficult			
1. I wanted to make the task easier because I wasn't as successful as I thought (with the second set).		6	15.0
2. I just wanted to do something different.		12	30.0
3. I don't know.		2	5.0
Chose to Keep the Task the Same			
1. I liked it (referring to second set of 10 trials) and stayed with it because I was successful.		11	27.5

AERA CONFERENCE 1997

TM026737

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Learner Decision Making in the Inclusion Style of Teaching.	
Author(s): Byra, M., & Jenkins, J.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

☑ Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please Signature: Mark Byra	Printed Name/Position/Title: Mark Byra, Assoc Prof.	
Organization/Address: University of Wyoming P.O. Box 3096 Laramie WY 82071	Telephone: 307-766-5227	FAX: 307-766-4098
	E-Mail Address: byra@uwyo.edu	Date: 3/25/97

(over)