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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

"Good planning is the springboard to successful classroom teaching. This is the concept behind the daily lesson plans. It has been accepted and practiced since 1844 when David Page first issued his, 'Plan of the Day's Work'." (Donny, 1964, p. 1)

It is a well accepted fact in teacher education that lesson planning is vital to good teaching. This has been accepted as far back as 1824. Mossman (1924) concluded a study in which she traced the development of lesson planning from before 1826 to 1923. She concluded in her findings that planning was generally approved by supervisors, administrators, and those 'training teachers,' but there was wide diversity in opinions concerning the form of lesson plans.

Fifty years after the study by Mossman the above statement still holds true. Supervisors, administrators, and teacher educators approve and agree that there is a need for lesson planning especially with the preservice and the beginning teachers.
Olivia summarized this fact with his statement:

Nothing gives the beginning teacher more confidence and a greater sense of security than a well-made lesson plan. With a carefully prepared plan the beginning teacher can walk into a classroom knowing that he has put down in some organized form a sensible framework for the day's instruction. (Olivia, 1973, p. 311)

Haaby supports this fact one step further:

Good teaching is the outcome of sound planning. Ordinarily, effective teaching is not something that just happens, but is the result of systematic organization which includes enough flexibility to take advantage of every emerging situation. Actual planning takes into account the why, what, how, and what next of teaching. It becomes an instrument for thinking through a topic which makes use of several resources and procedures from beginning to culmination. (Haaby, 1966, p. 8)

Haaby's statement leads us to believe that lesson planning is not an isolated plan prepared daily, but is a "systematic organization of a topic" from beginning to end, which brings us to a concept of unit planning.

According to Donny, it was about 1929 that teachers began to experiment with larger units of learning than a single lesson. The daily lesson plan began to be more than just an individual unrelated day-to-day lesson, but it took some years for this concept to be accepted. Donny states:
In 1953 there appeared a trend which swelled through the decade to 1963 and which continues to swell. This was the idea that lessons must appear in more intriguing and irresistible form, followed by the ideas that daily lesson plans are an integral part of unit plans aiming to realize long range goals. (Donny, 1964, p. 118)

In this 1950-60 decade, there was the first evidence of the outgrowth of daily lessons from the unit plan. After more than a decade later, there is still confusion with the relationship of the unit plan and daily lesson plan. Hoover states in his recent textbook:

While few teachers would deny the necessity of planning, there is some controversy with respect to the scope and nature of planning. Indeed, methods specialists themselves differ relative to the essential scope of planning. Some seem to feel that unit planning renders lesson planning almost unnecessary. Others stress the importance of lesson plans while minimizing the value of unit plans. While the planning needs of teachers will vary markedly, there is considerable justification for both unit and lesson planning. (Hoover, 1973, p. 30)

It is a recognized fact that a vital part of a preservice teacher's education is developing the needed skills necessary to plan daily and unit plans effectively. A great deal of attention is given to this fact in the literature on teacher education and in methods textbooks. To what extent the unit plan needs to be developed to influence the daily lesson plan has not been reported.
In analyzing the influence of a person's ability to plan, Conrad states that one of the major distinctions between man and the lower-order animal is man's ability to organize and plan. He states:

The factual data, complex principles and symbols which related to developing an alphabet, the theory of relativity, a jet airplane, or putting a man on the moon were conceived within the mind of man. This constitutes the first phase of planning, which precedes the execution of any complicated endeavor. (Conrad, 1969, p. 1)

It is said that everything begins with a plan. We all have planned in one way or another. When the teacher educators instruct preservice teachers in the area of planning, they are working with individuals who have had experiences in some type of planning. What is it then that makes some preservice teachers better able to plan than their peers? There are hunches that having been in leadership positions might be a strong influence, because of the responsibilities one usually assumes in such a role. Responsibilities usually include some form of planning and organizing.

Also, researchers believe that a student who does well in subject matter areas other than education (maintaining a high cumulative grade point ratio) will do well there too, including planning phases of the courses.
The fact has been established that lesson planning is a long-accepted part of the preparation of preservice teachers. The fact remains that little research has been completed in the area of analyzing the relationship of the type of plans advocated by the methods books authors and/or teacher educators.

**Need for the Study**

In the Home Economics Education Department at The Ohio State University, both unit and lesson planning are considered to be necessary in the preservice home economics teachers' preparation. Both areas of planning have been taught in the methods course in the past. During the school year of 1976-77 the teacher educators began to question the extent to which the instructional unit plan in use needed to be revised, or even given major emphasis, to enhance the preservice teachers' ability to plan daily lessons through which the unit objectives are accomplished.

In the past, the unit plan was quite comprehensive involving twelve major steps: 1) Rationale, 2) Description of unit, 3) Overall competencies, 4) Conceptual framework, 5) Outline of introduction, 6) Behavioral objectives, 7) Generalizations, 8) Outline of content to carry out behavioral objectives, 9) Strategies, 10) Evaluation, 11) Bibliography, 12) Block plan (Appendix A). Two questions were posed: Is this plan, although
thorough, more time consuming than necessary in the student teaching experience? Is such a plan frustrating to a student teacher due to complexity? Some of the steps involved in this comprehensive instructional unit plan were repeated in the daily lesson plan, which meant that perhaps the preservice teacher's planning time was not being used as efficiently as would be most profitable.

The decision was made to continue use of an instructional unit plan, but to streamline it using either a block unit (Appendix B) or conceptual unit (Appendix C) design. With the idea of streamlining the instructional unit plan, another question had to be answered: What influence would such streamlined versions of the instructional unit plan have on a preservice teacher's ability to plan daily lessons?

In reviewing the research pertaining to daily lesson plans, no information was available on the relationship of unit and lesson planning. Therefore, the need appeared to exist for such a study at this initial stage of change in instruction. The faculty members deemed it necessary to answer some of the perplexing questions about the matter to serve as a basis for future plans.

Although there is no research that addresses the relationship of unit and lesson planning, an assumption is apparent and almost all methods textbook authors precede lesson planning
with unit planning. They differ on what elements should be included in the instructional unit plan for best results. The major purpose of the unit plan is to provide the guide for a teacher in arranging materials and activities focused on a particular topic or problem so that students will attain objectives. Therefore, if the daily lesson plan emerges from a unit plan it will retain the continuity of the broad problem of the unit. "The lesson plan, whether daily or weekly, is a natural outgrowth of unit planning or of the unit idea." (Hansen, 1957, p. 165)

Hoover states: "Each lesson plan is based upon a unit outcome, deemed essential for achievement of a unit concept. Thus, back of every lesson plan is a concept." (Hoover, 1968, p. 88)

Apparently, there is agreement that some type of unit planning and daily lesson planning are important and necessary in preparation for teaching. But, the question still remains: To what extent does the type of unit planning enhance the student's ability in lesson planning?

**Statement of the Problem**

The major purpose in this study was to determine if basic concepts of planning daily lessons could be taught equally well to two groups of preservice home economics teachers through the use of differing types of unit plans.
Specific questions to answer were:

1. How do two groups of preservice home economics teachers differ in lesson planning ability when they are taught differing types of unit plans-block unit plan or conceptual unit plan?

2. Is there a relationship between cumulative point hour ratio at the time of methods course enrollment and lesson planning ability for preservice home economics teachers?

3. Is there a relationship between leadership experiences and lesson planning ability for preservice home economics teachers?

In answer to these questions, the research hypotheses investigated were:

1. Home economics preservice teachers taught "block" unit planning score equally well on a lesson plan rating scale as those students taught "conceptual" unit planning at two stages in their education program:
   a. During methods course.
   b. During student teaching.
2. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who have a high cumulative point hour ratio in all courses score significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than students with a low cumulative point hour ratio.

3. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who rank high in number of specific home economics related leadership experiences score significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than those who score low on such leadership experiences.

Assumption

The following assumption undergirds this study:

It is assumed that developing a unit plan is an important and necessary learning experience preceding lesson planning for preservice home economics teachers.

Limitations

The following limitations in this study were recognized by the investigator: 1) Only one section of the methods course
is offered each quarter in the Home Economics Education Department at The Ohio State University; therefore, the levels of treatment were administered at different quarters. 2). The student teaching centers were very different; also, the Winter Quarter student teachers experienced unavoidable circumstances due to the weather, which altered some of their schedules. 3) The scores on the leadership experience rating scale could be considered subjective, since all scoring was done by the researcher. 4) The researcher scored all daily lesson plans.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study:

**Block Unit Plan:** a systematic arrangement of planning components including 1) rationale for unit of study, 2) overall competency(ies) to be attained, 3) conceptual framework of content to be taught and 4) teaching-learning strategies including evaluation, 5) block plan divided into days and for each day the concepts to be taught, teaching/learning strategies and evaluation.
Conceptual Unit Plan: a systematic organization of 1) overall competencies to be attained and 2) a conceptual framework which delineates major topics to be taught.

Daily Lesson Plan: a systematic organization of planning components including 1) title of lesson, 2) class, date, time, 3) conceptual base, 4) behavioral objectives to be attained, 5) openings, 6) outline of content, 7) teaching strategies including evaluation, 8) closure including generalizations and 9) format.

Cumulative Point Hour Ratio: a student's academic standing determined by dividing the total points earned (A-4, B-3, C-2, D-1) by the total credit hours undertaken.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Even though researchers have not addressed directly the concerns about lesson planning ability for student teachers and their methods of instruction in the methods course, studies do provide sufficient information to support the assumption that undergirds this study: "It is assumed that developing a unit plan is an important and necessary learning experience preceding lesson planning for preservice home economics teachers."

The discussion of related literature is divided into the following sections: Importance of Instructional Planning Process for Teachers; Theories of Learning Related to Instructional Planning; Factors Related to Instructional Planning Ability; Components of Instructional Unit Plan; and Components of a Daily Lesson Plan.

Importance of Instructional Planning Process for Teachers

Possibly the first significant evidence we have in history of educators viewing instructional planning as an important
process for teachers comes from David Page, first president of the New York State Normal School at Albany. As cited by Mossman, in his book as well as in an address delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, 1844, he argued for a "Plan of the Day's Work", meaning, "a definite arrangement in the day's work so that every class has something to do, and a definite time to do it in." (Mossman, p. 2)

Schomas (1972) reported much support for the importance of planning by preservice teachers. From rankings obtained during student teaching for both elementary and secondary school student teachers she noted that planning for instruction was ranked number one in importance.

Several writers have reviewed problems and adequacy of preparation of beginning teachers (Penrod, 1967; Mullen, 1968). Both indicated that the beginning teachers believed that aspects causing most difficulty were planning daily and unit lessons, and planning for a variety of learning experiences. These authors support the need of preservice and beginning teachers to feel confident in their planning ability.

Mehl, Mills, Douglass and Scobey (1958) view teaching as one of the most complex and significant of human endeavors. They believe it is complex because of the many intangible values and numerous human factors involved. They cite the following points as advantages of planning for any teacher who wants to be a success:
1. Helps the teacher clarify her thinking about the distinctive contribution her teaching subject makes to the objectives of education.

2. Tends to insure that the relative values of various instructional materials and procedures are given proper consideration.

3. Serves to make the teacher more resourceful in recognizing pupils' needs, utilizing pupils' interests, and providing more satisfactory means of motivation.

4. Reduces the amount of trial and error in teaching through a better organization of curricular materials, use of more appropriate methods, and greater economy of time.

5. Wins respect of pupils. They appreciate the teacher who is a learner with them and makes preparation for work as she/he expects them to do.

6. Presents one of the teacher's best opportunities for continuous personal and professional growth.

7. Contributes to the teacher's feeling of self-confidence and self-assurance.

8. Aids the teacher in recapturing waning enthusiasms, thereby insuring a fresh, up-to-date presentation of instructional materials. (Mehl, Mills, Douglass and Scobey, 1958, p. 127-128)

Rosenshine (1971) reviewed all available studies in which teacher behavior was studied in relation to student achievement. Under the variable "organization," six high inference studies containing student or observer ratings of organization of the lesson, organization of the teacher, disorganization of the lessons, or perceived singularity of goal direction were summarized thus:
The six studies yielded moderate support for a variable such as organization. Without exception correlations for 'disorganization' were negative. Clear significant results were obtained in two studies (Anderson and Walberg, 1968; Fortune, 1967), both significant and non-significant results were obtained in two studies (Belgard et al., 1968; Solomon et al., 1963), and no significant results were obtained in two studies (Fortune et al., 1966; Walberg, 1969).

Although significant results were not reported in all the studies reviewed, the point was evident that correlations for 'disorganization' were negative. This infers that the organization of a teacher does have a relationship to student achievement.

Six secondary methods textbooks reviewed (Fleck, 1968; Hall and Paolucci, 1970; Hatcher and Halchin, 1973; Callahan, 1971; Hoover, 1973; and Klausmeier, 1958) support the importance of instructional planning to preservice and inservice teachers.

Callahan (1971) summarizes the usefulness of the daily lesson plan in the following statements:

1. It encourages the planner to relate the objective and procedures singled out for daily presentation to the overall objectives and procedures of the unit.

2. It permits making the daily adjustments necessary for effective teaching.

3. It encourages a vivid and up-to-minute recall of the unit content.

4. It encourages specific planning needed to meet problems related to classroom control, motivation and differentiated instruction (Callahan, 1971, p. 171).
Inlow (1970) believes the simple fact that units which extend beyond a one-day period encourage teachers to organize learning into blocks, effecting clear perspective as a result.

Hoover (1973) basically summarizes the value of the unit plan to the teacher and learner:

Unit planning provides a basic course structure around which specific class activities can be organized.

Through careful unit planning, the teacher is able to integrate the basic course concepts and those of related areas into various teaching experiences. Unit planning enables the teacher to provide adequate balance between various dimensions of a course. By taking a long-range look, he is able to develop essential priorities in advance of actual classroom experiences.

The unit plan seems to be the best technique yet developed to enable a teacher to break away from traditional textbook teaching.

Emphasis upon behavioral outcomes in both unit and lesson planning tends to result in a more meaningful series of learning experiences. (Hoover, 1973, p. 39)

Alcorn, Kinder and Schunert (1970) supports the above values of unit planning, since they view unit planning as being based on sound psychological principles of learning. The unit emphasizes learning by wholes, the continuity of learning, and the integration of student learning experiences.

Callahan (1971) emphasizes the importance of the unit plan by viewing the teacher who chooses not to develop unit plans.
Callahan states:

Teachers who deny the value of unit planning often resort to unit plan substitutes, such as extensive daily lesson plans, expanded or modified yearly plans, poorly organized and hastily written notes, or, in some cases, no written plans of any sort. Because there are some logical reasons for not strictly following an organized unit plan, a few teachers have tried to rationalize their lack of preparation. (Callahan, 1971, p. 131)

Theories of Learning Related to Instructional Planning

The first stream of thought related to unit planning appeared in 1926 when Morrison pointed out that there "must be some external organization of subject matter and experiences which best correlated with the internal learning products we wish the learner to achieve." (Morrison, 1939, p. 23) Morrison condemned the fragmentary factual knowledge, the memorized subject matter, the crass verbalisms which resulted from everyday teaching. In place of the typical subject-matter-to-be-covered-under-assignment, he proposes that a unit of learning be:

...a comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment, or an organized science, of an art, or of conduct, which being learned results in an adaptation in personality. (Morrison, 1939, p. 25)

In the early thirties, Morrison's idea of unit planning and teaching was considered revolutionary. The major learnings
he believed could be achieved through a unit plan and unit teaching, skill in reflective thought or problem-solving and the achieved ability to carry on self-dependent intellectual life did not reappear strongly until Smith in 1950 presented the "process" unit, which stressed methods and patterns of thinking as outcomes. (Smith, 1945, p. 218)

A second major movement contributing to the development of the unit concept came from those who were trying to fit education to the nature of the learner. The "project" or "activity curriculum" was a result of this movement.

When Smith appeared in 1950 with a theory similar to Morrison, he was supported by the rise of the theory of instrumental logic and by the new psychology of child behavior.

A flood of new terms and schemes appeared. The subject matter unit, the unit of learning, the unit of understanding (and of appreciation), the unit of adaptation, and the topical, theme, and survey units. The phrase "center of interest" was used by some to mean a systematic organization of subject matter attached to an interest of the learner; by others, to mean an interest of the learner around which subject matter from various sources might be organized. Contrasting with the subject-centered organizations there appeared the unit of work, the unit of behavior, and finally the unit of experience. (Burton, 1963, p. 327)

A search for the beginnings of formal lesson planning requires that we trace Herbartianism to its source in Europe. John Frederick Herbart (1776-1841) is the inspiration of this movement. The formal steps of instruction were based upon his psychology and philosophy. (Mossman, 1924, p. 12)
The Herbartian ideas in education were brought to this country by a group of young men who studied in Germany in the decades before and after 1890. By a campaign of translating the writing of noted Herbartians, writing books and articles developing the doctrines further, and speaking at public educational meetings, they created much interest in these theories in the last decade of the nineteenth century. These Herbartians were interested in several of the fundamental doctrines taught by Herbart and his disciples. Those among the most interested were McMurry, De Garmo, and McMurry.

McMurry in 1897 modified the steps in instruction as developed by Herbart and the following five steps were believed by him to constitute the one correct order of instruction:

I. Presentation
   1. Preparation
   2. Presentation
   3. Association & Comparison
   4. Generalization or Abstraction
   5. Practical Application

II. Elaboration
Since these steps are passed through in this invariable order without reference to the nature of the subject matter presented, they are rightly called the Formal Steps of Instruction. They indicate the order of the movement of the mind, or of the forms through which thought must pass in reaching full maturity. (Mossman, p. 19)

The Five Formal Steps came to be familiar terms in educational writings, and provided the earliest evidence of an educational theory related to lesson planning.
Donny (1964) identified at least two schools of thought concerning lesson planning which existed concurrently during the decades from 1923 to 1963. The traditional school proponents followed the precepts set forth by Herbart's formal steps in planning with minor deviations, with the teacher planning daily lessons for mastery of subject contained in textbooks. The progressive school followers opted for a pupil-centered class, where the teacher acted as a resource person, guiding students toward achievement of self-set goals. There slowly emerged a third school of thought in approach to learning embodying the best of philosophy from the traditional and the progressive schools of thought on planning.

The authors of textbooks on general principles in secondary education from 1923 to 1963 tended to present materials concerning daily plans which was somewhat theoretical in nature. The writers in professional periodical literature during this period tended to present material concerning daily lesson plans which was practical and personal in nature.

Conrad (1969) found a positive relationship between the educational theory and an individual's planning pattern.

Conrad contrasts the major theories of learning which support the varying types of planning. The typical Skinnerian program proceeds along a single, or linear track. Many of the premises which support this type of planning, or programming,
are germane to general arguments in support of closely-structured planning. Crowder (1964), among others, criticizes the Skinner approach as being too rigid and inflexible. While he agrees with the arguments for carefully programmed instruction, he points out that people are different and that programs should provide branching opportunities to meet individual differences.

Conrad views the Crowder-Skinner dichotomy as a definite contribution to a discussion of planning objectives. "It clearly spotlights the question of how tightly structured a lesson plan can be and still meet needs of individual students." (Conrad, 1969, p. 22)

The cognitive theory of instruction in which the concept is the major mediating variable for decision-making behavior supports the teacher's role as one of giving guidance by encouraging concept formation which leads to objective behaviors. (Woodruff, 1967)

Contrary to the cognitive theory, Roger (1967) expresses a view representative of many who believe that instruction should definitely be student-centered. He advocates an emphasis on significant experiential learning which has a quality of personal involvement, is self-initiated, is pervasive, is evaluated by the learner, and has personal meaning for the learner. Conrad stated:
There are many different types of planning in use and much of this divergence in planning philosophy can be attributed to differences in theories of instruction and learning. (Conrad, 1969, p. 18)

**Factors Related to Instructional Planning Ability**

Hughes and Crabtree (1976) researched selected factors that contribute to success for Home Economics student teachers. The factors studied, that may possibly be related to planning ability, were grade point average and high school and college extracurricular activities.

The correlation between sophomore grade average and student teaching grades (.388) was significantly different from zero, as was the correlation between home economics course work grade point average and student teaching grades. Thus, it was concluded that both measures of academic achievement—grade point average—are related to success in student teaching of home economics. (Hughes and Crabtree, 1976, p. 43)

High school extracurricular activities and college extracurricular activities were found to be related to success as evidenced in student teaching grade. The correlations (.269, .376, and .280) were significantly different from zero, but not high enough to be useful as predictive factors. Conrad (1969) suggested that leadership styles are considered vital to many kinds of learning, which promote differing levels of planning. Conrad suggested that additional research is
needed to identify the voices which shape a teacher's planning habits.

Young's (1970) major purpose in her study was to determine if significant differences existed between scores on teaching plans developed by students in a curriculum course and during student teaching when one group of subjects had no knowledge of their student teaching assignments while taking the curriculum course and the other group of subjects had such knowledge.

Analysis of variance was performed. Analysis of covariance was also performed since groups were not matched and a t-test indicated a significant difference in grade point average. Subjects in the one group had lower grade point average but their teaching plans received significantly higher scores than plans from the first group, whose grade point average was higher.

Schomas (1972) supports Young's findings on the grade point average in her study. Schomas found the correlation between ratings on lesson plans and overall college grade point average was -.17. This gave evidence that there was negative significant relationship between ratings on quality of teaching plans prepared by students and their overall college grade point average.

Fielstra (1963) compared the top and bottom quartiles of ratings on 200 student teachers at the secondary level in an attempt to determine which characteristics of student teachers discriminate most effectively between "excellent" and "good"
student teachers. With the use of a rating scale containing 32 items in the area of scholarship, professional competence, and personal qualities, he discovered that measures which best discriminate the "excellent" from the "poor" were adaptability to a variety of teaching situations and skill in planning.

Components of Instructional Unit Plan

Callahan (1971) has devoted a major portion of his textbook to unit planning. He believes that most educators express a preference for five basic steps in unit planning:

1. Information basic to understanding the nature of the group to be taught must be assembled, organized, and recorded.

2. Appropriate major and minor objectives must be determined, carefully worded, organized, and written down.

3. Procedures appropriate for the achievement of each objective must be determined and adequately described.

4. Teaching materials, resources, and devices necessary for the conduct of teaching procedures must be selected and listed.

5. Evaluation procedures that bear a direct relationship to unit objectives must be determined and listed. (Callahan, 1971, p. 132)

As with daily lesson plans, there is no set format for an instructional unit plan. Klausmeier (1958), Hall and Paolucci (1970) and Callahan (1971) offer examples of instructional unit plans.
Klausmeier (1958) labels his example as a Framework for a Teaching-learning unit. This framework is an organization of content and activities in outline form. Hall and Paolucci's example varies in that it is not in outline form, but a two-column type of plan with content in one column and learning experiences in the other column. Callahan (1971) has several examples, differing subject matter areas, but the format is basically that of a topical outline.

The components in the three examples are similar. They include stating objectives, content, learning experiences, teaching aids, and evaluation.

Callahan (1971) adds to the above list characteristics and other factors related to a good unit plan:

1. Be practical and usable.
2. Be made up only after the examination of a wide range of usable resource materials.
3. Avoid the danger of undesirable brevity or unnecessary length.
4. Be planned in consideration of the teaching experience and subject-matter competence of the teacher who will use them.
5. Be consistent in form and make-up.
6. Possess a strong interrelationship of parts within the unit. (Callahan, 1971, p. 134)
Components of A Daily Lesson Plan

It would be misleading to infer that all daily lesson plans have identical organization; they are as varied as the teachers who use them. A number of educators feel that each teacher should be allowed a large measure of freedom in developing daily lesson plan forms and in using such forms to prepare daily lesson plans. (Callahan, 1971, p. 172)

The above statement summarizes the beliefs of many teacher educators and authors of methods textbooks. The components of the daily lesson plan and the formats vary to a large degree. However, there are some components of a daily lesson plan that are almost always included in the lesson plan format:

1. Specific objectives (including the type of objective)
2. Specific procedures
3. Use of time
4. Materials and resources
5. Assignments
6. Evaluation
7. Relationship of a particular daily lesson plan to its parent unit. (Callahan, 1971, p. 172)

In 1924, Mossman concluded the same belief apparently held true today in the world of education. Mossman stated:
There is a wide diversity in opinion as to the form of the plan. The most favored elements are (a) outline of subject matter, (b) details of subject matter and method, (c) pivotal questions, and (d) a list of items indicating the proposed procedure. (Mossman, 1924, p. 47)

Home economics education textbooks in which discussion of planning and its components occur, and which are used most often by preservice home economics teachers, were authored by Fleck (1968), Hall and Paolucci (1970), and Hatcher and Halchin (1973). All agree that the daily lesson plan should include such components as objectives, activities and procedures used to accomplish these objectives, questions for discussion, and means of evaluation. Also, components that are identified and cited in examples are identifying concepts and developing conclusions in the forms of principles and generalizations (Hatcher and Halchin, 1973; Hall and Paolucci, 1970). Fleck's discussion on objectives is more in depth than the other texts mentioned. Fleck states:

The success of student learning is often related to the clarity with which teacher and student define their respective goals. Simpson suggests that objectives be stated in terms of behavior in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. She states that classifying the objectives in accordance with the taxonomies of educational objectives will yield improved selection of content and learning experience. (Fleck, 1968, p. 115)
There is no set format that is advocated by any of the above authors, although Hall and Paolucci (1970), and Hatcher and Halchin (1973) give examples of varying formats suitable to home economics content.

One component of the daily lesson plan that has been researched extensively is the use of the behavioral objective and its relationship to instructional planning (Blaney, 1970; Bastress, 1971; Ryder, 1972; and Conrad, 1969).

Many claims are made on behalf of behavioral objectives. In essence, it is posited that their use facilitates rational instructional planning and provides a means by which the effectiveness of instruction may be determined. The first justification of a particular objective, however, should be that it is logically derived from an aim which, in the view of the institution controlling agency, ought to be achieved. (Blaney, 1970, p. 11)

Among those most closely identified with the case for behavioral objectives are Mager (1962), Lumsdaine (1963), Gagné (1965), Lindvall (1964), Popham (1965) and Glaser (1956). (Blaney, p. 11)

Gagné (1965) spells out three reasons for specifying objectives behaviorally:

a) Reveal the precise nature of terminal behavior
b) Meet the requirements of measurement
c) When given to the learners, allow students to carry out the matching procedure involved in reinforcement. (Blaney, 1970, p. 11)
Two studies related to objectives and ability to develop instructional plans resulted in negative correlations (Knight, 1972; and Bastress, 1971). The results, respectively, were: 1) There was no significant difference between student teachers who write lesson plans using behavioral objectives and those who do not use behavioral objectives, and 2) The ability to write behavioral objectives does not automatically transfer to improved instructional planning and classroom performance. Blaney (1971) discovered that teachers instructed in certain uses of behavioral objectives, compared to teachers not so instructed, constructed lesson plans that, if implemented, seemed more likely to facilitate student learning.

In summarizing the components of daily lesson plans Conrad states:

> The planning of most classroom teachers follows a pattern similar to a curriculum development process in that it (1) sets up objectives and proposes, (2) selects activities to implement the objectives, (3) identifies needed materials and resources, and (4) predetermines evaluation techniques instruments. (Conrad, 1969, p. 48)

Research supports the need for instructional planning in the teacher education process. It appears from implications in the literature that there is a need to research those factors that influence a preservice teachers ability to plan instruction. This research would further strengthen the ability of teachers to teach.
Description of the research design, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis plan are presented in four sections. Described in section one are the Non-Equivalent Posttest-Only Design and the accessible population. In section two, the data collection devices are described. Procedures used during the two phases in this study are described in section three. In section four is presented the description of the statistical method used for data analysis.

**Research Design**

An adaptation of the Campbell and Stanley Design 6 (1963, p. 25) Non-Equivalent Posttest Design with an accessible population offered structure for this study through which the research hypotheses were tested.

Random selection and assignment of individual students to classes were not possible since the groups constituted naturally assembled classes in the non-equivalent groups. However,
method of teaching unit planning was randomly assigned to the two classes.

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c}
X_1 & 0_1 & 0_3 \\
X_2 & 0_2 & 0_4 \\
\end{array}
\]

The graphic components of the design are described thus: an \(X_1\) represents the exposure of one group to the "Block" method and \(X_2\) represents "Conceptual" method unit planning, \(0_1\) and \(0_2\) represent scores on lesson planning ability in methods course and \(0_3\) and \(0_4\) represent scores on lesson planning ability in the student teaching experience. The \(X\)'s and \(0\)'s in a given row are applied to the same specific group of students. The dashed line represents comparison groups not equated by random assignment to the classes. (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p. 6) (Figure 1).

The manipulative variate in this study was the instructional procedure used in teaching unit planning.

Specifically, two teaching strategies were involved:

1. Block unit planning which includes 1) rationale for unit of study, 2) overall competencies, 3) conceptual framework, and 4) teaching/learning strategies arranged within a time span.

2. Conceptual unit planning which includes 1) overall competencies and 2) a conceptual framework which delineates major topics to be taught.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Non-manipulative Variates</th>
<th>Manipulative Variate</th>
<th>Controlled Variate</th>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics students enrolled in Fall Quarter 1977 Methods Course and Winter Quarter 1978 Student Teaching N = 23</td>
<td>Leadership and group affiliation rating</td>
<td>Cum. Grade Point Ratio</td>
<td>Instruction on use of the Block Unit Plan</td>
<td>Instruction on the dev. of lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics students enrolled in Winter Quarter 1978 Methods Course and Spring Quarter 1978 Student Teaching N = 17</td>
<td>Leadership and group affiliation rating</td>
<td>Cum. Grade Point Ratio</td>
<td>Instruction on use of Conceptual Unit Plan</td>
<td>Instruction on the dev. of lesson plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1. NON-EQUIVALENT POSTTEST DESIGN**
Two non-manipulative variates were involved:

1. Cumulative grade point ratio.
2. Home economics leadership experience.

Two criterion variables were involved:

1. Score on daily lesson plans during methods course.
2. Score on daily lesson plans during student teaching.

Population

Group A consisted of twenty three students in the home economics education major at The Ohio State University who enrolled in a methods course during the Fall Quarter 1977, and who continued on into the supervised teaching Winter Quarter 1978.

Group B consisted of seventeen students in the home economics education major who enrolled in the methods course during Winter Quarter 1978, and continued on into a supervised teaching experience Spring Quarter 1978. Therefore, the accessible population for this study was composed of two intact groups. A "T test" of the cumulative point hour ratio between Group A and Group B was computed to determine if significant academic differences existed between the two groups of preservice teachers before treatment. Based on the Apriory decision level of .05, there is no significant difference (Table 1).
TABLE 1. T TEST OF CUMULATIVE POINT HOUR RATIO BETWEEN GROUP A AND GROUP B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.965</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls for Threats to Validity

Since the opportunity to assign students randomly to the two treatments was not possible the Non-Equivalent Group Design offered optimum conditions for the accessible population. This design was appropriate in that the treatment was randomly assigned to the groups. The opportunity to collect the demographic data was possible within the parameters of the course structure.

History was controlled since general historical events that might produce a significant difference in scores were experienced by both groups of preservice teachers.

Intrasession history was controlled to the extent that the researcher was the instructor for the two groups as well as the scorer for the lesson plans in the methods course and student teaching. Consistency in scoring plans was established with the researcher and original course instructor scoring until
agreement was reached. The first three lesson plans within the first three weeks developed and used in the student teaching experience were available for scoring to minimize external threats that might exist in terms of time span or length of experience.

Threats of interaction of selection, maturation, and others, which Campbell and Stanley (1963) cite as major problems, were minimized since the students had no opportunity to select the course according to the treatment. Students who did not continue into the second quarter sequence were eliminated from the study.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in the collection of data.

Lesson Planning Rating Scale

For the purpose of evaluating daily lesson plans, relevant items from departmental overall rating scales were arranged on a single page for scoring purposes in the study (Appendix D). The overall rating scales for student teachers were developed by the faculty in the Home Economics Education Department of The Ohio State University. The original "development of the rating scales was based on theoretical and empirical research and practical experience." (Foglia, 1977, p. 4)
The original rating scales have a three-descriptive-level continuum base. Each continuum is composed of phrases which identify types of behavior that represent differing degrees of progress toward a desired outcome. The descriptive phrases indicate behaviors at the high, medium and low levels of performance; each component is called a dimension. The dimensions reflect the competencies and objectives of Competency Assessment of Student Teachers.

The overall rating scales from which the items on lesson planning were selected have content validity, since the competencies and objectives of the student teaching programs were reflected in the rating scale(s) and since the scale(s) were evolved from a model of supervised teaching in Home Economics based on the literature (Foglia, p. 5).

For this study, the dimensions used from the Instructional Plans part of the overall scales at the top levels of descriptions for items fifteen through thirty, which focus on lesson planning, and were scored on a 10-point scale. This adaptation of the rating scales had been used in previous quarters in the methods course to determine lesson plan scores. The analysis of this scale consisting of thirty dimensions resulted in a multiple coefficient of .99, according to Foglia. The multiple coefficient was determined by comparing every single item on the rating scale to the final grade to find out which item had most effect on final grade or contribution to final grade. Also to determine the overall degree of relationship between rating scale and final grade.
"To determine the relationships among the dimensions of each rating scale and the associated final grade which is an index of concurrent validity, the statistical technique, multiple regression was selected." (Foglia, 1977, p. 36) All of the dimensions except three were significant at the .01 level of significance (Table 2). The multiple regression analysis of the rating scale on the dimensions revealed that they were valid.

Three dimensions not included in the MRA for the rating scale by Foglia were considered "suppressed variables" and were related to variance that was independent of the criterion (Final grade). (Foglia, 1977, p. 51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Writes clear and concise generalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with needs of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Plans thoroughly for discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple R coefficient for this rating scale indicated that 26 dimensions related to the final grade. The coefficient provided evidence that the "Designing Instructional Plans Rating Scale" was valid. (Foglia, 1977, p. 54)

The overall rating scale is reliable based on internal consistency. The coefficient of reliability for the Planning Rating Scale was .89. The coefficient of reliability for each dimension in the Planning Rating Scale ranged from .31 to .81. (Foglia, 1977, p. 59) (Table 3)
TABLE 2. MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF RATING SCALE PLANNING DIMENSIONS AND ALLIED STUDENT TEACHING GRADE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale Dimension #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$R^a$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Writes clear and concise objectives</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Writes meaningful and attainable objectives</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Plans stimulating openings</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Writes accurate, up-to-date content</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with lesson objectives</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with resources</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writes varying types of questions</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Identifies items needed for demonstration</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Identifies components of laboratory</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Selects/constructs evaluation techniques</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Plans for use of evaluation results</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Plans for closure</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Uses format that communicates to self and others</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Based on ratings by 46 supervising teachers and allied grades; $p = .01$ (Foqlia, 1977, p. 47-48).
### TABLE 3: RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR PLANNING DIMENSIONS IN RATING SCALE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Writes clear and concise objectives</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Writes meaningful and attainable objectives</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Plans stimulating openings</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Writes accurate up-to-date content</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Writes clear and concise generalizations</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with needs of learners</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with lesson objectives</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Plans strategies compatible with resources</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writes varying types of questions</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Plans thoroughly for discussion</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Identifies items needed for demonstration</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Identifies components of laboratory</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Selects/constructs evaluation techniques</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Plans for use of evaluation results</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Plans for closure</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Uses format that communicates to self and others</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Foglia, 1977, p. 60)*
Demographic Information Form

Demographic information forms were developed by the researcher to obtain the cumulative grade point ratios for students, the nature of the leadership experiences in home economics related activities, and group experiences (Appendix E). These devices were used as a part of the information students provided in the methods course and were included in the simulated form of a teaching application blank to prevent sensitization prior to experimentation. The information form was administered during a regular class session of the methods course before the students were to engage in a written simulation.

The simulated application form required the students to identify all leadership experiences in home economics related activities and in positions held. Also, they were requested to complete the blank providing their present cumulative grade point ratio. Other questions pertained solely to class purposes and were not relevant to this study.

Leadership Experience Scoring Scale

A grid was developed by the researcher to arrive at a numerical rating for leadership experience (Appendix F). The grid was divided by 1) the type of organization; 2) levels of
experience: college, high school, or community; and 3) positions held: leadership (president or chairperson), other offices, committee or member only.

Each item was assigned a numerical value. College experience equaled a value of three, community a value of two, and high school a value of one. The positions held were valued as follows: leader—a value of four, officer—a value of three, committee member—a value of two, and member only—a value of one. The experience scores were tallied and ranked. The scores ranked gave evidence of number of experiences, scores ranged from sixty-six to zero. Formal request was made of the students later to report study findings so as to satisfy the Privacy Act Requirements. One student in Group A did not give her consent, therefore was eliminated from the study.

Procedure

The study was divided into three phases: 1) the developmental phase, 2) the instructional phase, and 3) the measurement phase.

Developmental Phase

The planning period began Winter Quarter 1977, when the teacher educators questioned the teaching of the comprehensive
unit plan to preservice teachers in the methods course which had been labeled as cumbersome in the student teaching situation. The decision was made to develop a block unit plan that was streamlined to promote quality planning in the least amount of time.

Experimentation of the researcher and the course instructor with a block unit plan (adaptation of the comprehensive plan) was implemented Spring Quarter 1977. No discernible handicaps in planning were apparent for the students, when compared with plans of past quarters.

The next step in conceiving an efficient yet effective unit planning process was to work with the instructor in developing a conceptual unit plan.

Instructional Phase

The instructional phase began Fall Quarter 1977 when students were taught the block unit planning process. As a regular part of instruction in the methods course the students assumed specific roles in written simulations of school communities. Each student was to assume the role of a first year teacher and to plan according to the needs within a particular situation. Preceding the simulation experience the students completed a simulated application form. On this
They identified position applied for, all experiences in home economics related activities, present cumulative point hour ratio, type of community, and leadership positions held. All other elements within the study were normal phases of the course.

The fourth week of Fall Quarter 1977, the students were instructed by the researcher on use of a block unit plan. Three 48-minute class periods were devoted to teaching. This is the usual time allotted to the unit plan phase in this course.

The fifth week of fall Quarter 1977, three 48-minute class periods were devoted to instruction on daily lesson planning.

Class One - Component parts of the daily lesson plan.

Class Two - Integrating components to develop one functional plan.

Class Three - Formats for daily lesson plans.

The students were asked to develop one block unit plan and three daily lesson plans to be submitted in the seventh week of the quarter. The assignments were completed, submitted, and scored by the researcher. The score for the daily lesson plans was determined through use of the adapted version of the departmental "Designing Instructional Plans" rating scale (Appendix D). This information was recorded and provided a portion of the data to answer the question:
1) How do two groups of preservice home economics teachers differ in lesson planning ability when they are taught differing types of unit plans—block unit plan, conceptual unit plan?

Hereafter, block unit planning will be referred to as Treatment A and Fall Quarter 1977 preservice teachers enrolled in the course, Principles and Methods of Teaching Applied to Home Economics, will be referred to as Group A.

The second portion of the instructional phase of this study took place Winter Quarter 1978 when twenty-five of the original twenty-nine persons were student teachers for this quarter and met at The Ohio State University for an all-day orientation seminar. (Four students who were a part of Group A, Fall Quarter, chose to student teach Spring Quarter 1978 for personal reasons so were eliminated from the study. One student did not give consent to be a part of the study, one was in a job training student teaching center, thus eliminated from the study. Final total in Group A was twenty-three.)

At the student teacher orientation session, Group A was instructed to return to the researcher in self-addressed envelopes, copies of their first three lesson plans during their student teaching experience. The first three plans were requested to minimize external threats to validity that could have been created in their individual student teaching environments. These daily lesson plans were scored on the same basis.
as used in the methods course using the adaptation of the "Designing Instructional Plans" rating scale.

Students enrolled in Winter Quarter 1978 methods course became Group B for study purposes and received Treatment B - Conceptual Unit Planning. Group B was instructed by the researcher and all procedures for the course were exactly the same as for Group A, excepting the instruction treatment - conceptual unit planning. The same requirements pertained for Group B in the methods course and in student teaching. To satisfy the Privacy Act requirements, formal request was made of the students during a student teacher seminar to report study findings (Appendix G).

Measurement Phase

For purposes in this study, analysis of data consisted of two types of statistical treatment; 1) "t" test, comparison of means and 2) correlation of coefficients. To determine if significant differences existed between two groups of preservice teachers' ability to plan daily lessons, "t"s were computed on the mean scores for three daily lesson plans developed during the methods course and three daily lesson plans developed during student teaching for both instructional treatment groups (Hypothesis 1a and 1b).
A correlation of coefficients test was used to determine if any significant relationship existed between ability to plan daily lessons and cumulative point hour ratio at the time of enrollment in the methods course (Hypothesis 2), and the number of home economics leadership experiences (Hypothesis 3). Data were then analyzed for reporting Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings and discussion of the results are organized into four sections in keeping with the concerns in the study.

1. Home economics preservice teachers taught "block" unit planning score equally well on a lesson plan rating scale as those students taught "conceptual" unit planning at two stages in their education program:
   a. During methods course.
   b. During student teaching.

2. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who have a high cumulative point hour ratio in all courses score significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than students with a low cumulative point hour ratio.

3. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who rank high in number of specific home economics related leadership
experiences score significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than those who score low on such experiences.

**Lesson Planning Ability for Two Groups During Methods Course When Taught Differing Types of Instructional Unit Plans**

For these students, regardless of type of unit plan in which they were instructed, differences do not exist in their lesson planning ability during the methods course, which occurs immediately after being taught the unit and lesson plan process. This is true, in this instance, where the same instructor was involved in the teaching.

Based on analysis of data, research hypothesis 1.a. is supported since no difference exists based on the apriority decision level of .05 of significance between these two groups of students in lesson planning ability at the time of enrollment in a methods course even though taught differing types of unit plans-block and conceptual. Mean scores on lesson plan ratings ranged from 40.666 to 60.000 (Table 4).

Perhaps if the instruction quality is comparable, the type of unit plan instruction does not foretell student lesson planning ability immediately. Perhaps, the two abilities are separate entities in the teaching process in the minds of students and not interdependent.
Lesson Planning Ability for Two Groups During Student Teaching
When Taught Differing Types of Instructional Unit Plans

Group B students, who received treatment B-conceptual unit planning, scored significantly higher on the lesson plan rating scale during student teaching than Group A who received treatment A-block unit planning.

Based on analysis of data, research hypothesis 1.b. is not supported since there is a difference in the lesson planning ability at the .01 level of significance between the two groups of students during the student teaching experience one quarter after unit planning instruction. Mean score on lesson plan ratings ranged from 40.666 to 59.333 (Table 5).

Perhaps this difference in lesson plan scores at the student teaching phase of professional development can be attributed to variables other than type of instructional unit plan taught the groups during their methods course. A possible
factor might have been that some Group A students were interrupted because of weather conditions and lesson plans were returned to the researcher later in the quarter than for Group B.

**TABLE 5. T TEST OF LESSON PLAN DATA COMPARING GROUP A AND GROUP B DURING A STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.454</td>
<td>5.411</td>
<td>-2.585</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.294</td>
<td>3.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group B students taught during the Spring Quarter and did not experience a comparable interruption in schedule. Questions may be asked, 1) Did the effort expended in the real situations by students prompt a kind of effort for Group B not experienced by Group A students, since situations were different for the groups, student teaching centers were not the same in the two quarters? 2) Were there other factors that could have impacted differently for students in the two quarters of hands-on teaching experiences?

In view of the raw data of individual scores on specific components of the daily lesson plans (Appendix H), components: behavioral objectives, openings and closures were the areas of needed improvement for Group A.
Relationship Between Lesson Planning and Cumulative Point Hour Ratio

For these students cumulative point hour ratio correlated with achievement in lesson planning ability, but not at a high level. The correlations are not high enough to be used for predictive purposes. Cumulative point hour ratios ranged from 2.30 to 3.80. For the purpose in this study the cumulative point hour ratios above 2.9 were considered high cphr and all those below 2.9 were considered low cphr.

Using Pearson product-moment correlation, the coefficients indicated that there was a relationship at the .07 level of significance (Table 6). Support for hypothesis 2 was weak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean of CPHR</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPHR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Between Lesson Planning Ability and Home Economics Related Leadership Experiences

The data for these students do not support hypothesis 3 that there is a relationship between lesson planning ability
and home economics leadership experiences. Such experiences may be helpful for some purposes but cannot be used as a predictor for lesson planning ability for the preservice home economics teachers.

Specific home economics organizations considered were 4-H, Future Homemakers of America, Home Economics Club and other home economics related groups. Taken into account also was the nature of leadership responsibility and whether or not the experience was at 1) college level, 2) community related, or 3) high school level. Scores ranged from 0 to 66 with a mean score of fourteen.

Using Pearson product-moment correlation, the coefficient indicated that home economics experiences are independent of lesson planning score. Basing the decision on a priority of .07 level of significance (Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experiences</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.755</td>
<td>.00068</td>
<td>.9963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the findings in this study support the feasibility of the use of differing types of instructional unit plans during
the methods course without creating any discernible handicap in
the preservice teachers lesson planning ability.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The major purpose in this study was to determine if basic concepts of planning daily lessons could be taught equally well to two groups of preservice home economics teachers through the use of differing types of unit plans. The research was pursued in the Home Economics Education Department at The Ohio State University. The data were collected during Fall Quarter 1977, Winter Quarter 1978, and Spring Quarter 1978.

The accessible population for this study was composed of one group of students in the home economics education major who enrolled in the methods course during Fall Quarter 1977 and continued on into a supervised teaching experience Winter Quarter and a second group of students who enrolled in the methods course during Winter Quarter 1978 and continued on into a supervised teaching experience Spring Quarter 1978.

A Non-Equivalent Posttest-Only Design offered structure for the study since treatment was possible through the naturally assembled classes and thus minimized threats to validity.
Specific questions to be answered were:

1. How do two groups of preservice home economics teachers differ in lesson planning ability when they are taught differing types of unit plans—block unit plan, conceptual unit plan?

2. Is there a relationship between cumulative point hour ratio at the time of methods course enrollment and lesson planning ability for preservice home economics teachers?

3. Is there a relationship between number of leadership experiences and lesson planning ability for preservice home economics teachers?

Three instruments were used in the experiment for collection of data: (1) Adapted Student Teacher Planning Rating Scale to evaluate the daily lesson plans (Appendix D); (2) Demographic Information Form (Appendix E) as a simulated teaching position application to obtain the cumulative point hour ratio for students at the time of enrollment in a methods course and the nature of leadership experiences in home economics related activities (Appendix E) and (3) leadership experience scoring scale (Appendix F), used to arrive at a numerical rating for leadership experience.
The study was divided into three phases: (1) the developmental phase, (2) the instructional phase, and (3) the measurement phase.

The developmental phase began Winter Quarter 1977, when the teacher educators questioned the teaching of a comprehensive unit plan to preservice teachers in the methods course which had been labeled as cumbersome in the student teaching situation. The decision was made to develop a unit plan that was streamlined to promote quality planning in the least amount of time. The researcher and the course instructor experimented with a block unit plan (an adaption of the comprehensive plan, Appendix A) and implemented it during Spring Quarter 1977. No discernible handicaps in planning were apparent for the students when compared with plans of past quarters. The next step in adapting the unit planning process was to work with the instructor in developing a conceptual unit plan for experimentation.

The instructional phase of the study began Fall Quarter 1977. As a regular part of instruction in the methods course, the students assumed specific roles in written simulations of school communities. Before engaging in the actual simulation the students completed the simulated teaching application (Appendix E). The purpose of this was to collect such information as cumulative point hour ratio and leadership experiences. The numerical rating for leadership experiences was scored at this point.
As a regular part of the course, the students were instructed by the researcher on the use of a block unit plan. Daily lesson planning followed, as was normal in this course. The grade for the daily lesson plans was determined through use of the lesson planning portion of the student teacher planning rating scale (Adapted Lesson Plan Rating Scale) (Appendix D). One block unit plan (Appendix B) and three daily lesson plans (Appendix D) were required. Mean scores for the daily lesson plans were used in the measurement phase of this study. Those students who continued on into supervised student teaching Winter Quarter 1978 were instructed to return to the researcher copies of their first three lesson plans during their student teaching experience. Mean scores for these three daily lesson plans were used in the measurement phase of this study.

The second portion of the instructional phase of this study took place Winter Quarter 1978. The Winter Quarter 1978 methods course was conducted exactly as the previous quarter methods course, except for the fact that unit planning was changed to include the conceptual (Appendix C) rather than the block unit. The students were required to complete one conceptual unit plan and three daily lesson plans. Mean scores of the daily lesson plans were used in the measurement phase of the study. Those students in the Winter Quarter methods course who continued on into the supervised student teaching experience Spring Quarter
1978 were instructed to return to the researcher copies of their first three lesson plans during their student teaching experience. Mean scores for those daily lesson plans were used in the measurement phase of the study.

The measurement phase involved the T test of difference between mean scores of the two groups on lesson planning ability to investigate the research hypotheses 1a and 1b and Pearson product-moment correlation to investigate hypotheses 2 and 3.

1. Home Economics preservice teachers taught "block" unit planning score equally well on a lesson plan rating scale as those students taught "conceptual" unit planning at two stages in their education program:
   a. During method course.
   b. During student teaching.

2. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who have a high cumulative point hour ratio in all courses score significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than students with a low cumulative point hour ratio.

3. Home economics preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course who rank high in number of specific home economics related leadership experiences score
significantly higher on a lesson plan rating scale than those who score low on such experiences.

The findings supported hypothesis 1.a. of no difference between scores for two groups of students on a lesson plan rating scale during the methods course. Types of unit planning instruction seems not to make a difference in lesson planning ability for these students. There was no significant differences at the .83 level. The "T" score for the mean of the lesson plan ratings between the two groups was related (-.212).

The findings failed to support hypothesis 1.b. of no d ifference between scores for two groups of students on a lesson plan rating scale during the student teaching experience. There was a significant difference for these students at the .01 level. The "T" score for the mean of the lesson plan ratings for the two groups was -2.585.

A low correlation was evident between lesson planning ability and cumulative point hour ratio for these students admitted on a 2.25 cumulative point hour ratio minimum at the .07 level of significance (.262). However, the correlation is not high enough to be used for predictive purposes for those who are in the program as teacher education candidates (Hypothesis 2). Hypothesis 3, the relationship between lesson planning ability and home
economics related leadership experiences for students was not supported. The findings resulted in a negative correlation (.0068) which was not significant at the .99 level.

Implications

Some implications for The Ohio State University Home Economics Education faculty consideration offered as a result of the findings are:

1. Two unit planning instruction types (conceptual and block) appear to be appropriate as a basis for lesson plans associated with a teacher unit for secondary students.

2. There may be merit in investigating lesson planning ability of students in all quarters, regardless of instruction in unit planning.

3. Cumulative point hour ratio within a narrow range may be an inappropriate consideration in lesson planning ability potential for students.

4. A streamlined block and a conceptual instructional unit plan are both feasible means of introducing students to daily lesson planning.

5. Teaching several unit plan models during the methods course may yield advantageous flexibility in planning for the preservice teacher once s/he is the student
teaching center, rather than teaching one unit plan model in the course.
SUGGESTED STEPS FOR DESIGNING A UNIT PLAN
(A unit plan - cluster of related ideas)

Step 1 - Choose a community and school in which the unit might be taught. Can select a unit from your yearly plan. Identify factors in the community, their implication for teaching, and how the unit plan will be influenced by these factors. (Can use yearly plan community description.)

Step 2 - Describe an area, then unit (give it a title) within the area, grade level and class, length of class period, etc. Write a rationale for this unit including the competency toward which the students will be working, give reasons why this unit should be taught.

Step 3 - Read in area of concern:
- Curriculum guides from cities and states
- College texts and notes
- High school texts
- "Tips and Topics"
- "Illinois Teacher"
- Magazines -- "Forecast", "What's New",
  "AHEA Journal", Others
- Extension Bulletins
- Check teaching file in room 351

Step 4 - Decide on conceptual framework.

Step 5 - Outline how the unit will be introduced to students in order to motivate students, include cooperative planning.

Step 6 - Write behavioral objectives in light of concepts and student needs.

Step 7 - Write generalizations in light of concepts.

Step 8 - Outline content sufficient to carrying out behavioral objectives.
Step 9 - Plan learning strategies for purpose of attaining behavioral objectives.

Step 10 - Plan and describe evaluation techniques so that each objective will be evaluated.

Step 11 - Develop a bibliography of references used by both students and teachers.

Step 12 - Design block plan for unit - with concept and strategy.

Use the following format for steps 7, 8, 9 and 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objectives evaluated in this assignment include:

- Use of implication in developing a unit plan so that student needs are met.
- Develop a conceptual framework for the unit selected.
- Write correctly generalizations and behavioral objectives which are worthwhile.
- Develop content in sufficient detail to contain information in behavioral objectives.
- Select a variety of evaluative devices which measure accomplishments of objectives.
- Write an introduction which will motivate students.
- List resources needed in teaching the unit.
- Design a unit plan which meets 80% of the criteria on the unit plan rating scale.
- Identify the competency and correctly write the competency for the unit.
- Design block plan.
APPENDIX B

BLOCK UNIT PLAN

1. Assignment Sheet
2. Rating Scale for Block Unit Plan
3. Letter to Cooperating Teachers
1) Select a unit of study from your yearly plan.

2) Give the blocked unit a title, indicate total unit length, grade level, class, and length of class period.

3) Read in area of concern to get a "real feel" for concepts.
   - Curriculum guides from cities and states
   - High school texts and notes
   - College texts and notes
   - "Tips and Topics"
   - "Illinois Teacher"
   - Magazines - "Forecast", "What's New"
   - Extension Bulletins

4) Write a rationale enumerating what individual, family, or community needs this unit will be meeting.

5) Write overall competency(ies) based on student needs.

6) Develop a conceptual framework which will delineate concepts to be taught. Organize concepts into a logical sequence.

7) Divide paper into days and for each day identify concepts to be taught and list suggested teaching/learning strategies for concept development.

**WEEK 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Cooperating Teachers
Fr: Cheryl Burgan, Graduate Associate, Home Economics Education Department

Our student teachers this quarter will be planning their units according to the method they were taught in H Ec Edu 441, Autumn Quarter. The "Blocked Unit Plan" is a simplified version of the unit plan that has been taught in the past. We are using this method of planning in order to promote quality planning in the least amount of time.

The blocked unit plan includes the following:

1. Unit title, unit length, grade level, class, and length of class period.
2. Rationale (need for unit)
3. Overall competency(ies) (end of unit outcome(s)
4. Conceptual framework (key concepts, topical outline)
5. Block plan - divided into days and for each day the concepts to be taught, teaching/learning strategies and evaluation.

These are the items that should be evaluated for their blocked unit plans on the planning instruction rating scale.

/cjd
Block Unit Plan Rating Scale

The descriptors included are for a rating scale of 10, the highest level. Each category will be rated from zero to ten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>0 2 4 6 8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States rationale that relates to needs of individuals, families, and community. Includes all identifying data, uses format that communicates to self and others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Competencies**                | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
| Writes clear and concise overall competencies that include behavior and content directly related to conceptual framework. Writes competencies that are highly meaningful to the learner now and in the future. |

| **Conceptual Framework**        | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
| Thoroughly plans an inclusive and well-organized conceptual framework relevant to learner needs. |

| **Block Plan**                  | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
| Allows adequate time to develop concepts; develops a block plan that provides time to achieve competencies; includes major concepts and strategies; logically sequenced. |

| **Strategies**                  | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
| Plans strategies including instructional resources that are compatible with unit competencies, needs of learners, individual learning styles, available resources, (IEE's, cooperative planning, FHA activities, as appropriate), has bibliography of resources for unit. |
APPENDIX C

CONCEPTUAL UNIT PLAN

1. Assignment Sheet
2. Rating Scale for Conceptual Unit Plan
3. Letter to Cooperating Teachers
CONCEPTUAL UNIT PLAN

1. Select a unit of study from your yearly plan.

2. Give the conceptual unit plan a title, indicate total unit length, grade level, class and length of class period.

3. Read in area of concern to get a "real feel" for concepts:
   - Curriculum guides from cities and states
   - High school texts and notes
   - College texts and notes
   - "Tips and Topics"
   - "Illinois Teacher"
   - Magazines - "Forecast", "What's New"
   - Extension bulletins

4. Write overall competency(ies) based on student needs.

5. Develop a conceptual plan (framework) which will delineate concepts to be taught. Organize concepts into a logical sequence.
CONCEPTUAL UNIT PLAN RATING SCALE

The descriptors are for a rating scale of 10, the highest level. Each category will be rated from zero to ten.

Competency(ies) | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
--- | --- |
Writes clear and concise overall competencies that include behavior and content directly related to conceptual framework.

Conceptual Framework | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
--- | --- |
Thoroughly plans an inclusive and well organized conceptual framework relevant to learner.

Subject Matter Content | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
--- | --- |
Writes outline of content in logical sequence that comprehensively expands conceptual framework and supports competencies.

Format | 0 2 4 6 8 10 |
--- | --- |
Uses format that communicates to self and others; consistently integrates components; includes all identifying data.
To: Cooperating Teachers

Fr: Cheryl Burgan, Graduate Associate, Home Economics Education Department

Our student teachers this quarter will be planning their units according to the method they were taught in H Ec Edu 441, Winter Quarter. The "Conceptual Unit Plan" is a simplified version of the unit plan that has been taught in the past. We are using this method of planning in order to promote quality planning in the least amount of time.

The conceptual unit plan includes the following:

1. Unit title, unit length, grade level, class and length of class period.

2. Overall competency(ies) (End of unit outcomes)

3. Conceptual framework (Key concepts, topical outline)

These are the items that should be evaluated for their conceptual unit plans on the planning instruction rating scale.

/cdr

School of Home Economics
LESSON PLAN RATING SCALE
ITEMS (Selected from overall Student Teaching Rating Scale)

The descriptors included are for a rating of 10, the highest level. Each category will be rated from one to ten.

(A) OBJECTIVES 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(15) writes clear and concise objectives that include observable behavior, content, criteria and conditions; contributes directly to unit competency attainment

(16) writes objectives that appear to be consistently meaningful and usually attainable by the learner

(B) OPENINGS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(17) plans stimulating openings that probably gain and focus attention of learners; includes objectives, rationale and means to accomplish objectives

(C) CONTENT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(18) writes accurate, up-to-date content in a logical order; promotes attainment of objectives and generalizations; appropriate to conceptual framework

(19) writes clear and concise generalizations that are completely related to conceptual framework, competencies and objectives

(E) EVALUATION 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(27) selects/constructs evaluation techniques appropriate to most objectives and learner characteristics
(28) usually plans for the use of evaluation results for records and learner growth

(F) CLOSURE

(29) plans for closure in varying ways to facilitate transfer and retention of learning

(G) FORMAT

(30) uses format that communicates to self and others; includes identifying data; appears to be easy to use when teaching

(D) TEACHING/LEARNING STRATEGIES

(20) plans strategies including instructional resources that appear to be compatible with principles of learning, needs and abilities of learners, individual learning styles

(21) plans strategies including instructional resources that appear to be compatible with lesson objectives, aids development of generalizations

(22) plans strategies including instructional resources that appear to be compatible with available resources (money, space, equipment, time: pacing, classroom time framework)

QUESTIONING

(23) writes varying types of questions that accommodate learners' vocabulary and ability to think
DISCUSSION

(24) plans thoroughly for discussions which identify intended outcomes, provide information base, initial "warm-up", procedure and closure

DEMONSTRATION

(25) consistently identifies all items needed; sequences procedure steps; provides rationale; provides criteria for judging method and product

LABORATORY

(26) completely identifies components of laboratory; plans to include: difficult techniques, procedures, learner involvement in planning, equipment and materials, evaluation
LESSON PLAN COMPONENTS

1. Title of Lesson
2. Unit Title
3. Class, Date
4. Conceptual Base
5. Activities and Procedures
   a. Announcements and assignments
   b. Opening and/or introduction
   c. Behavioral objectives (in terms of student outcomes)
   d. Outline of content (for carrying out the objectives)
      knowledge
      values, attitudes, interests, etc.
      skills
   e. Teaching strategies for carrying out the objectives
   f. Throughout the lesson the students should be guided
      into developing statements of generalizations
   g. Closing
      Summary of major points from the lesson
      Statement of generalizations

6. A list of things to be completed before class starts and a
   list of supplies and/or equipment needed for class

7. Time Estimation

8. Just in Case I Finish Early Activities
HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION 441 SIMULATION

Name______________________________________________________

Address____________________________________________________

Position Applied For:

_______Teaching

_______Administrative

_______Service

*List all past experiences in home economics activities (FHA, 4-H, Home Economics Club) and position held.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

*Present cumulative grade point average___________.

Type of community you would like to work in:

_______Urban

_______Rural

_______Suburban

Special interests (hobbies, etc.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS  
Department of Home Economics  
Education  
441  

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE SCORING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>4-H</th>
<th>FHA</th>
<th>HOME EC CLUB</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pres.-Chr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICER = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER ONLY = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
CONSENT TO SERVE AS A SUBJECT IN RESEARCH

BEHAVIORAL AND SURVEY RESEARCH FORM

I consent to serve as a subject in the research investigation entitled: ________________________________

The nature and general purpose of the research procedure have been explained to me. This research is to be performed by or under the direction of Dr. ___________________ , who is authorized to use the services of others in the performance of the research.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, video-tape, photograph, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Project Director.

Signed ____________________________
(Subject)

Date ____________________________ A.M.

Time ____________________________ P.M.

Witness - (Auditor) ____________________________
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