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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The student teaching experience is the culminating experience of a teacher education program. An emphasis has been placed on student teaching by professional bodies and State Education Departments (State of Ohio - State Board of Education, 1985). Student teaching is now firmly established as an essential component of teacher education programs.

The final preservice field experience is student teaching during which the student teacher assumes major responsibilities for the full range of teaching duties in a regular school setting. The experience should be a time when earlier program goals are demonstrated. During student teaching the student teacher is assigned to work with a cooperating teacher, the regular teacher at the field site. A university supervisor is assigned to work together with the cooperating teacher to assist the student teacher in developing his/her teaching potential. These three individuals form the student teaching triad which are expected to work together to develop the teaching potential of the student teacher.

Collaborative efforts are crucial if teacher education programs are to achieve their goals (Wilkinson & Taggart, 1985). Yee (1969)
noted, however, that the interpersonal relationship among the triad members seldom reaches a level that is effective and the relations generally deteriorate as the experience progresses. Locke (1984) noted that no matter what type of question is asked, the perceptions of the triad members differ on at least some of the dimensions—often to a substantial degree. Without a collaborative effort, the effect of student teaching as a culminating experience is less likely to be achieved.

Student teachers view their student teaching as the most important part of their professional training (Taggart & Wilkinson, 1985). Experienced teachers report that the most significant portion of their professional training was student teaching and the most influential factor was the cooperating teacher (Copeland & Boyan, 1975; Karmos & Jacko, 1977). However, cooperating teachers often do not feel that they really play a legitimate part in the total student teaching experience. Rather, the public school teacher is likely to feel that he/she does most of the work and receives little in return (Cramer, 1977).

Cotton (1975) surveyed eighteen cooperating teachers who worked regularly with student teachers in the physical education program at The Ohio State University. In this survey, a number of the cooperating teachers concerns were identified. These concerns focused on three main areas:

1. the role they should have regarding the actual experience the student teacher should have.
2. their role working with the student teacher in providing feedback, making suggestions and, in general, guiding the learning experience of the student teacher.

3. their role in the evaluation process of the student teacher.

The cooperating teacher's influence was perceived by the student teacher to be more in personal support and role development (Karmos & Jacko, 1977), and in student teacher's attitude (Yee, 1969). Jensen (1971) investigated changes in the educational perception of student teachers, cooperating teacher and teacher educators. It was noted that the greatest congruence in educational perception was between the student teacher and the cooperating teachers, while there was dissonance with university supervisors. Zevon (1974) noted that student teachers tend to imitate their cooperating teachers in the field, regardless of the approval or disapproval of the college supervisor.

Student teachers judged their cooperating teacher to be effective if the feedback they provided following observation of a class was abundant, immediate and specific (Brunelle, 1978) and were dissatisfied with cooperating teachers who did not provide enough feedback or give feedback that was too general, too deferred, or too negative (Brunelle, Tousignant & Pieron, 1981). Often, the cooperating teachers cannot provide meaningful feedback about teacher performance to the student due to their lack of observation skills (Copeland & Boyan, 1975). It is sometimes difficult to train cooperating teachers to use observation systems on a regular basis to
improve their direct influence upon student teachers (Copeland & Boyan, 1975) and it is unknown if those cooperating teachers who do use them appropriately maintain this behavior across time (Locke, 1984). The effect these behaviors have on student's behavior is also unknown.

Supervision of student teachers is an important component of a teacher education program. School-based teachers are in the best position to supervise, yet few have the skills to supervise based on the current knowledge and theory of effective teaching (Taggart, 1986). Training cooperating teachers to be effective supervisors makes enormous sense, as university supervision in the form of visitation is economically and pedagogically inefficient (Siedentop, 1981). Price (1978) surveyed the preservice field experience and its supervision process and suggested the role of the university supervisor change from being a supervisor of student teachers to one of instructor for supervising teachers. Cooperating teachers who have effective supervisory skills can promote the development of effective teaching skills by student teachers on a daily, lesson by lesson basis. This situation would be the perfect example of effective supervision (Taggart, 1986).

The cooperating teacher should be trained to provide objective feedback and hold the students accountable for the demonstration of teaching behaviors that were learned in the undergraduate program. Markey, Glenn and Lewis (1977) suggested that training supervisors in the specific skills needed to work with beginning teachers should be a
priority of teacher education programs. If cooperating teachers can be trained to communicate more explicit information to the student teachers and hold them accountable for their performances then supervision will improve (O'cansey, 1986).

The interaction between the participants in a post teaching conference in student teaching is central to the success of the student teaching experience. However, there appears to be no evidence to suggest that anything significant is happening within conferences between the supervisor and the student teachers. Hawkins, Wiegard & Landin (1985) indicated that feedback given to the student teachers is often vague and implicit. Student teachers fail to follow through successfully with tasks specified by supervisors because they are implicit and incomplete.

The teacher education program must continue into the gymnasium in the form of a close relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. The cooperating teacher must possess excellent observation skills and be able to set the appropriate contingencies and conditions for behavior to change (Paese, 1984). To have cooperating teachers monitor student teacher performance in a manner consistently compatible with program goals is crucial if effective supervision is to occur (Taggart, 1986). This process requires effective and consistent technical feedback, and reinforcement if the student teacher's learned behaviors are to generalize to the special characteristics of the local environment (Joyce & Showers, 1982).
To facilitate a student teaching experience which is compatible with the teacher education program goals, a cooperating teacher would need to support and facilitate the achievement of those goals (Evans, 1976; Friebus, 1977; Karmos & Jacko, 1977). The cooperating teacher must have theoretical and practical knowledge to identify appropriate teaching behaviors and then be able to collect accurate and reliable data which provides the necessary evidence that such behaviors occurred (Taggart, 1986). It is essential that physical education teacher education programs train the cooperating teachers to be effective supervisors if the goals of the program are to be achieved. The arrangement of the training programs as far as time and format should be mutually agreed upon. The program would need to be highly structured and done in sequential fashion (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

In view of the problematic nature of student teaching it is necessary that training programs be cost effective and emphasize the precise goals of the teacher education program. A training program in which skills are presented in a self-instruction module (SIM) appears to be important. There is strong evidence in the research literature to support the usefulness of self-instructional modules to promote greater gains in achievement in less time coupled with greater satisfaction. Kulik & Kulik (1979) suggested that the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI), developed by Keller, is the most effective S.I.M. because it allows individuals to work at their own pace, it demands unit perfection, and it stresses the written word.
Taggart and Wilkinson (1985) attempted to investigate the effects of a self-instructional module on the type of feedback given by cooperating teachers during student teaching. The results of this study suggested that cooperating teachers can use the skills of accurate data collection to provide feedback to student teachers.

Ocansey (1985) used Wilkinson and Taggart’s S.I.M. to train cooperating teachers and university supervisors to collect accurate data. Ocansey also developed a self-instructional module called a Behavioral Model of Supervision in Physical Education. This module instructed cooperating teachers on how to use the collected data. Ocansey (1985) used his module to train cooperating teachers and university supervisors in the effective skills necessary to implement the BMS-PE. Upon completion of the self-instructional module, cooperating teachers and supervisors were able to plan an effective supervision guide and communicate tasks in an explicit manner.

The previous studies concluded that the cooperating teachers supervisory behaviors can be changed. There is also a great deal of research demonstrating that the teaching behaviors of the student teacher can be changed through intervention. There is very little research that has studied changes in the student teacher’s teaching behavior and the student teacher’s pupils in-class behavior that might be related to changes in the cooperating teacher’s supervisory behaviors.
Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the effects that self instructional modules completed by the cooperating teacher have on the post teaching conference task statements of the cooperating teacher, the teaching behaviors of the student teacher and the behaviors of the pupils in class.

The study attempted to provide answers to the following sub-questions:

1. What are the effects of Wilkinson & Taggart's and Ocansey's self instructional modules on the task statements of the cooperating teachers during post-teaching conferences with the student teacher?

   A. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teachers explicit task statements during their post teaching conference?

   B. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teachers accountability task statements during their post teaching conference?

   C. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher's specific feedback during their post teaching conference?

2. What are the effects of the intervention on the targeted behaviors of the student teacher that are identified by the cooperating teacher?

   A. Is there a relationship between the degree of explicitness and accountability of task statements and the teaching behaviors of the student teacher?
B. What are the effects on the student teacher's behavior on the inclass behavior of the pupils?

3. Can the student teachers' teaching behaviors that have reached criterion level be maintained when intervention begins on another teaching behavior?

A. Are any of the cooperating teacher's explicit and/or accountability task statements directed toward behaviors that have reached criterion within the next two post teaching conferences?

B. Are the student teacher's behaviors that have achieved criterion level maintained over two class periods without any of the cooperating teachers explicit and/or accountability task statements directed at the achieved behavior?

4. What are the effects of the Basic ALT-PE and MBMS-PE, when presented singularly or in combination, on the task statements of the cooperating teacher, and the behaviors of the student teacher and his/her pupils?

A. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher's, student teacher's, and pupil's behaviors when Basic ALT-PE is presented before MBMS-PE? What are the effects when MBMS-PE is presented before Basic ALT-PE?

B. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher's, student teacher's and pupil's behaviors when Basic ALT-PE is presented alone? What are the effects when MBMS-PE is presented alone

5. Can the cooperating teacher appropriately identify teaching behaviors of the student teacher that need intervention?

A. What percentage of The Ohio State University Undergraduate Physical Education goals are addressed in the task statements
of the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference?

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to cooperating teachers in secondary physical education, their student teachers, and the pupils during the spring quarter of the school year.

2. The study was limited to the investigation of selected behaviors of the cooperating teachers, student teachers, and pupils.

3. The results of the study were limited to the activity in progress at the time of the intervention. A change in class activities could cause a change in the inclass behaviors of the target students.

4. The results of this study were limited to the feedback that a cooperating teacher provided to a student teacher during the audiotaped post teaching conference.

5. The results of the study were limited to the categories of the research instrument. Any category system tells us nothing more and nothing less than what its categories allow it to tell.

6. The results of this study were limited to the cooperating teacher and student teacher's ability to suggest appropriate strategies to increase or decrease any targeted behavior of the student teacher.
7. The results of the study were limited to the validity of the data that the cooperating teacher collected during the targeted class period.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were assumed to be true and relevant to this study:

1. The observer agreement/accuracy measures conducted throughout the study were representative of the accuracy of each coding episode.

2. The cooperating teacher's completed and reached criterion on the modules given to them during the study.

3. The feedback provided on the post-teaching conference audiotape was the most significant feedback given by the cooperating teacher on the observed lesson.

Definition of Terms

Baseline—The level or amount of a specified behavior prior to an intervention procedure.

Cooperating Teacher—A teacher who is employed full-time by a school district and who is willing to supervise a student teacher during their culminating field experience.
Inter-observer Agreement- The percentage of agreement on how often two observers watching three subjects and equipped with the same definitions of behavior, see it occurring at the same time (Baer, 1977).

Intervention- Self-instructional modules given to the cooperating teachers that introduces a way to systematically observe a lesson, and discusses how to be more explicit and accountable in the post-teaching conference.

Lesson Plans- A detailed guide to teacher and student behaviors which occurred during a single class meeting. It detailed the means by which learning activities were established and carried out.

Multiple Baseline- Baseline data are collected simultaneously across either behaviors, conditions, or individuals. Once a stable baseline is obtained, an intervention is applied to the first baseline series. When criterion-level performance is attained in the first data series, the intervention is applied to the second. Then the process is completed with the third, and so on, until the intervention has been applied to each dependent variable.

Overlapping- The number of intervention data points that fall within the range of data points during baseline. The lower the percentage of overlap, the greater the impact the intervention had on the target behavior.
Percentage of Overlapping—Calculated by determining the range of the
data point values of the first condition, counting the number of data
points plotted in the second condition, counting the number of data
points of the second condition that fall within the range of values on
the first condition, and then dividing the total number of data points
which fall within the range of the condition by the total number of
data points of the second condition and multiplying the number by 100.

Summary

The context of student teaching and the importance of the
interactions among participants during student teaching were
discussed. The purposes of the study and the specific research
questions to be addressed in the study were stated. The limitations,
assumptions, and definitions of terms appropriate to this study were
also delineated.
Due to the nature of this study, it was necessary to review literature on a number of different topics. The inservice and preservice supervisory processes are discussed. Since this study attempted to change the behaviors of the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and the inclass pupil's, it was important to review the literature in those areas. The study also attempted to enhance cooperating teacher's supervisory skills by training them to be more explicit with their task statements so the review discusses the training of and supervision by cooperating teacher. Finally, the concepts of explicitness and accountability are discussed.

The Supervisory Process

This section reviews the literature on interactions between the supervisor and supervisee during teacher conferences. The section discusses both the supervision of the inservice teacher as well as the student teacher.

The Supervision of Inservice Teachers

Cooper (1982) noted that little of significance is happening in the face-to-face interactions between supervisors and teachers.
Interactions between supervisors and teachers tend to be on the "safe" topics that are not threatening to either person. Incidents occurring within the supervisor-supervisee interactions have been mainly incomplete and vague. One of the early studies that attempted to investigate the interactions that occur between the supervisor and supervisee was completed by Blumberg and Amidon (1965). They adapted Flanders Interactional Analysis System (FIAS) to describe supervisor-teacher interactions during supervision. The instrument was a rating scale that showed the rate at which supervisors emphasized either direct or indirect behavior. The instrument was administered to 166 teachers.

They concluded that when supervisors are either predominantly indirect (eliciting and accepting teachers ideas and feelings and positively reinforcing them) or either direct and indirect (telling, suggesting, or criticizing), teachers perceived supervisory conference as more productive.

Blumberg and Cusik (1970) analyzed fifty audiotape recordings of conferences between supervisors and teachers. The concern was to develop and test out a method of describing, in a systematic and quantifiable fashion, the interaction process that takes place between a supervisor and a teacher. The tapes were analyzed by use of a 15 category interaction system developed by Blumberg using categories developed by Flanders and Bales (1951). The data indicated that teachers talked slightly more than supervisors, and supervisors gave information five times as often as the teachers asked for it. Perhaps more importantly, supervisors apparently seldom asked teachers for
ideas about actions or problem solving. Supervisor-teacher interaction did not appear to be a collaborative affair.

The method for describing the interactive process as utilized by Blumberg & Cusick (1970) allows for speculation of what occurs during a conference. Blumberg & Cusick failed to specify the scope of the conference, and the procedure for the data collection is vague. There is no evidence of whether the data were collected before or after teaching, and there is no evidence regarding the ratio of tapes to the subjects in the sample.

Blumberg, Loehr and Goldstein (1978) investigated the supervisor-teacher interaction and identified five categories of substantive issues. The categories, in descending order, were: individual student problems, classroom environment and behavior, general school or department matters, individual teacher concerns with self, and socializing. None of the categories identified included discussions about teaching skills, strategy or technique.

These early studies according to Mosher and Purpel (1972) utilized unreliable rating instruments, and they cautioned that care should be taken when interpreting the data. The research methodologies utilized in these studies attempted to explore and describe the processes of supervision, they therefore have some relevance to this study.
The Supervision of Student Teachers

This section of the literature review deals with supervisory interaction of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher within the context of student teaching.

The importance of student teaching has long been voiced by teacher educators and student teachers. Student teaching experiences are now firmly established as an essential component of quality teacher education programs. Student teachers view the student teaching experience as the most important part of their professional training. It is important that teacher educators and coordinators of student teaching focus on this aspect of the training program. This should be done, according to Griffin (1981), in a systematic, research based effort to improve the quality of the student teaching experience. Furthermore, any particular focus prescribed for the student teaching experience should be a culmination of the early foci sequentially arranged throughout the program. It must be a time when the prospective graduate demonstrates the effects of a four year teacher education program.

The supervisor of student teachers must possess excellent observation skills and be able to change behaviors (Paese, 1984). Gangstead (1984), suggested that student teachers can change their behaviors quickly if there is a clear description of the behavior category under investigation; attention is paid to specific relationships between the situation in which the behavior occurs, emission of the behavior, and the consequences that accrue to the behavior; consistent monitoring of behavior frequency or duration is
done; and an analysis made on the effectiveness of the instructional variable.

Griffin (1981) noted that, despite the growing importance of the topic, current research on student teaching reflects the tendency to focus on isolated aspects of student teaching without considering the other aspects. One important aspect that has not received much consideration is the communication between the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher during the student teaching experience. Zimpher and Nott (1980) indicated that cooperating teachers questioned many student requirements and suggested replacement activities.

Student teachers judged their supervisor to be effective if the feedback they provided following observation of a class was abundant, immediate and specific (Brunelle, 1978) and are dissatisfied with cooperating teachers who do not provide enough feedback or give feedback that is too general, too deferred, or too negative (Brunelle, Tousignant & Pieron, 1981). The cooperating teachers often cannot provide meaningful feedback about teacher performance to the student because of a lack of skills in observation (Copeland & Boyan, 1975). It is, however, sometimes difficult to train cooperating teachers to use observation systems on a regular basis thereby improving their direct influence upon student teachers (Copeland & Boyan, 1975) and it is unknown if those cooperating teachers who do use them appropriately maintain this behavior across time (Locke, 1984).
Many studies have reported lack of communication as the most frequent problem between student teachers and cooperating teachers. O'Neal (1983) analyzed the conferences between twenty student teachers and their cooperating teachers. Findings indicated that the cooperating teachers dominated the conferences. Southhall and King (1979) found lack of communication leading to failure of the student teacher to follow through with suggestions from the cooperating teacher. Zimpher and Nott (1980) noted that when supervisors set low or few expectations, those were the exact expectations the student teachers fulfilled.

As the review of the literature indicates, the feedback given to the student teacher is often vague and incomplete. The feedback fails to provide specific strategies designed to improve subsequent teaching performances of the student teacher. The interventions in this present study attempted to change such vague and incomplete statements evident in supervisor's verbal communication behavior during conferences.

**Behavioral Change Through Intervention**

This section will review the literature that has investigated the effects that experimental interventions have had on the behaviors of inservice teachers, preservice teachers, and inclass pupil's. This section of the review is relevant because the focus of the study is to change the behaviors of the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and inclass pupil.
Behavioral Change in Inservice Teachers Through Training and Supervision

Shrak (1973) studied the effects of the application of immediate secondary reinforcement on teaching behavior. Skrak utilized a systematic observation system to determine if any change could be observed on teaching behavior following immediate secondary reinforcement during classroom observation. The study attempted to determine if the use of immediate secondary reinforcement during teaching observation would result in modification of teacher behaviors compared with a clinical supervisory procedure which did not employ immediate secondary reinforcement.

In this multiple baseline design study, both supervisor and teacher agreed on what behavior should be modified. Once the behavior was selected five consecutive fifty minute observations were made by the supervisor. The first three observations were made employing immediate secondary reinforcement. The last two observations did not consist of immediate secondary reinforcers.

It was found that the use of immediate secondary reinforcement during observations in clinical supervision did not result in a greater degree of behavior change than did clinical supervision which did not employ immediate secondary reinforcement. However, the results indicated that utilizing immediate secondary reinforcement during teaching observations with experienced teachers and two out of three student teachers was successful.

Cooper, Thomson, and Bear (1979) attempted to increase teacher attention to describe child responses. The intervention provided the
teacher with a daily percentage of time that the teacher spent attending to appropriate child responses plus a daily failure frequency of not attending to appropriate child responses. Also provided after each lesson were examples of appropriate child responses. They found an increase in teacher attending behavior to appropriate child responses subsequent to the onset of the experimental feedback.

Cossairt, Hall, and Hopkins (1973) attempted to increase teacher praise for student attending behavior through the use of experimenter's instructions, feedback, and feedback plus social reinforcement by the experimenter. For conditions A and B (instructions and feedback) the results were inconclusive. With the introduction of experimental praise to the teacher, contingent upon increased teacher praised of student attending behavior, the teachers demonstrated more praise for student attending than in either of the other two conditions. They concluded that it took more than instructions and feedback to teachers to change their behavior.

Van Houten and Sullivan (1975) used audio cueing over the classroom's public address system to increase the teacher's rate of praise to students. A second intervention was also implemented that required the teachers to self-monitor their praise rate during class. The findings demonstrated the efficacy of auditory prompting as a method of increasing teacher praise. Self-recording was relatively ineffective.

Lombardi (1981) investigated the effects of long-term daily supervision which employed interaction analysis procedures on the
teaching behavior and interactions of four elementary school physical education teachers. It was concluded that the use of interaction analysis data, employed on a daily long-term basis, seemed to influence teaching behavior and the resulting interaction in the gymnasium. The feedback from the collected data provides the teachers with specific information related to the teaching-learning process, which can be used to stimulate change, growth, and the improvement of pedagogical practices.

Mancini, Wuest, Vantine and Clark (1984) provided 10 secondary physical education with conventional feedback as well as instruction and supervision through CAFIAS to assess the effect feedback had on teacher's and student's behaviors, students' Academic Learning Time - Physical Education (ALT-PE), and on the teacher's level of burnout. Teachers in the treatment group both verbally and nonverbally praised and accepted their students' ideas and efforts more, used more verbal questions to elicit students' input, and provided more information. Their students' ALT-PE increased, with their students spending less time inappropriately engaged than the control group. The treatment group teachers perceived themselves as less burned out.

McKenzie (1981) used simple feedback and goal setting on a teacher to reduce distracting mannerisms and increase positive interactions. The teacher also demonstrated the behaviors outside of the targeted class. Saudergras (1972) found video-tape feedback to teachers increased their praise rate and altered their attention patterns to students. Speidal and Tharp (1978) designed a three day training program to increase the use of positive verbal feedback by experienced
teachers. The components of the program included lecturing, discrimination training, modeling, guided practice, and audiotape feedback. No attempt was made to test for differential effectiveness of each component. They found that the rates for the trained behaviors (academic and management praise) were significantly higher than the non-trained behaviors.

Ratliffe (1986) investigated the effects of behavioral intervention (videotape and manual introducing two systematic observational instruments designed by the researcher) conducted by two school principals on the teacher's feedback, and the teacher's class activity and management time. The combined effort of the interventions was to lower management time and increase student activity time for both teachers.

Dunbar and O'Sullivan (1986) examined the effects of verbal and graphic feedback on the distribution of teacher verbal behaviors and the teacher's use of student demonstrators during elementary coeducation physical education lessons. The results indicated that in baseline both classroom generalists who taught physical education to their own classes interacted with boys and girls inequitably. The feedback provided was influential in establishing more equitable teacher interaction patterns and teacher's use of demonstrators between the boys and girls.

There were some studies, however, that have not been as successful in modifying teacher behavior (Rule, 1972; Breyer & Allen, 1975). Breyer and Allan (1975) demonstrated that information provided to a
teacher on an intermittent basis (every second day) was insufficient to increase her positive comments and decrease her negative comments.

The overall picture drawn from this review is that the behaviors of the inservice teacher can be changed in a positive direction through many different types of intervention (training sessions, audiocueing, graphic feedback, or direct supervision). However, there is little research investigating the effective behavioral changes by the inservice teacher on students.

**Behavioral Change in Preservice Teachers Through Supervision**

Wilde (1972) examined the effects of training student teachers in reinforcement principles. The student teachers with reinforcement training had higher frequencies of approval responses for student's appropriate behaviors and lower frequencies of disapproval of inappropriate behaviors.

Hughley (1973) found that student teacher's rates of positive reinforcement for skill and on task behaviors could be significantly increased through the use of directed information feedback. Rife (1973) used a modeling and feedback intervention to effect certain student teacher behaviors. His data showed evidence of decreasing management time, increasing positive information feedback on pupil skill attempts, increasing responses to pupil on task behaviors and decreasing responses to pupil off-task behaviors.

Rushall and MacEachern (1977) assessed the effects of systematic behavioral feedback on the teaching behaviors of physical education student teachers. An observer met with each of the seven student
teachers and had discussion orientated toward the important behavior categories for teaching physical education. Feedback was provided to the student teacher in the categories that the student teacher thought were important. The feedback produced changes in thirteen out of eighteen categories.

Mancini, Wuest, and van der Mars (1985) discussed the findings of six studies done at Ithaca College on their physical education preservice teacher program. The studies were conducted to determine the impact of using systematic supervisory feedback (Cheffers Adaptation of Flanders Interaction Analysis System) on the teacher behaviors and interaction patterns of 210 preservice physical education teachers. Each study reported that teaching behaviors and interaction patterns of preservice physical educators can be altered. The preservice teachers praised and accepted their student's ideas and efforts more, made greater use of questioning in their classes both verbally and nonverbally, and provided students with more information due to the use of CAFIAS as a feedback tool.

van der Mars (1984) studied the efficacy of prompting as a supervisory aid to preservice physical education teachers. Three student teachers were prompted via a wireless microphone on the use of positive behavior feedback, use of positive skill feedback, use of pupils first names and use of gymnasium scans. The findings indicated that periodic prompting resulted in limited increases in the use of positive skill feedback and pupil's first names, but did not increase the use of positive behavior feedback or gymnasium scanning.
Van der Mars (1987), in a similar study, used audiocueing in an reversal design to change the verbal praise of student's overall class behavior by a student teacher. Results showed that when audiocues were introduced, verbal praise rate increased significantly. Upon removal of the audiocues, the rate of verbal praise decreased gradually.

Carlisle and Phillips (1984) used six hours of enthusiasm training to increase the ratings of 12 preservice teachers in enthusiasm during their teaching of an experimental teaching unit (E.T.U.) lessons. The students of the trained teachers also had higher skill achievement gains than the control group. Rolider, Siedentop, & Van Houten (1984) used 14 hours of enthusiasm training to increase the level of enthusiastic behavior in 6 student teachers. The results indicated that the teachers were able to increase the use of verbal, non-verbal, and voice inflection components of enthusiastic behavior. The increases were also correlated with more junior and senior high school students rating teachers as enthusiastic each day.

The teaching behaviors of the student teacher can be positively changed through varied types of direct intervention (training, direct feedback, prompting, modeling and audiocueing). Although the research indicates that behaviors can be changed, very little research has been done to investigate if the student teachers behaviors can be changed by changing the supervisory behaviors of the cooperating teacher. This study attempted to change the behaviors of the student teacher by changing the supervisory behaviors of the cooperating teacher.
Behavioral Change in Inclass Pupils

Most studies of pupil behavior utilizing the operant model are focused on decreasing disruptive behavior and increasing academic performance. Most research done in this area focused on the regular classroom setting. This section discusses the classroom research briefly and elaborates on research completed in the physical education setting.

Paese (1983) studied the effectiveness of university supervisor's feedback on the Academic Learning Time in Physical Education (ALT-PE) of students in two student teacher's classes. Results indicate that ALT-PE is a valuable supervisory tool in helping student teachers improve instructional performance and in helping student teacher's increase their pupil's achievement.

Vogler & French (1983) used a group contingency called "Good Behavior Game" to effectively increase the level of on-task behavior of 23 behavioral disordered students in a physical education setting. The strategy had a positive and similar effect on younger and older behaviorally disordered students.

Rolider, Cooper, & Van Houten (1984) compared the effects of modeling, instruction, and grade incentives on the rate of positive statements among teammates during game playing in a college basketball class. The results suggest that the implementation of the three conditions resulted in higher rates of positive statements with grade incentives being the most powerful treatment followed by modeling.

Disruptive pupil behavior has been changed successfully through token reinforcement (Ringer, 1973; Robinson, Newby, and Ganzell,
group-oriented contingencies (Baer & Richards, 1980; Gresham, 1983), behavior games (Harris and Sherman, 1973) and brief time-out (Porterfield, Herbert-Jackson, & Risley, 1976, Fox & Shapiro, 1978).

Pupil achievement and social behavior has been increased by the use of daily grading contracts (Williams and Anandam, 1973). Webb and Cormier (1972) also studied achievement and behavior of eighth graders and found that significant results were obtained by the use of behavioral objectives, criterion evaluation, and remediation. Stedman (1972) reported that no change could be found in high school student’s ability to learn biology when behavioral objectives were the intervention.

It is evident that pupil behavior can be changed through various types of intervention. There is little evidence in the literature suggesting that a change in the teacher’s behavior can change the behavior of the pupil. A change in the pupil’s inclass behavior which was caused by changing the student teacher’s teaching behaviors, which, in turn, was caused by changing the supervisory behaviors of the cooperating teacher has not been researched. This study will attempt to investigate this three tiered behavioral change.

Training Of And Supervision By Cooperating Teachers

There is a limited research base on the effects of supervision by cooperating teachers. Four studies that have been completed at the Ohio State University indicated that training programs for cooperating teachers may be of value. The Ohio State University supervision
research program demonstrated significant change in the teaching behavior of student teachers when university supervisors and cooperating teachers worked as a team (Darst, 1973; Hamilton, 1973) and when the cooperating teachers alone assumed the role of supervisory change agent (Hutslar, 1976; Cramer, 1977). These studies were "the first absolute confirmation that it is possible to induce any specific behaviors in a group of working physical education teachers." (Locke, 1979, p.11).

Hutslar (1976) and Cramer (1977), implemented a training model which consisted of a five week workshop prior to student teaching. In the workshop, the cooperating teachers were taught how to code and were provided with several alternatives for managing the student teaching experience. The cooperating teachers also had their own teaching behaviors coded to make their teaching more consistent with the university program and so they could experience what it feels like to be the target of a behavior change program.

Moskowitz (1966) and Amidon (1967) had cooperating teachers learn and use Flanders Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) as a way to make cooperating teachers more effective. They found that training only the cooperating teachers in FIAS is not sufficient to produce a change in selected teacher behaviors. These findings supported Rosenholz's (1985) review that noted that teachers who are unaware of the standards used to evaluate them are in no position to redirect their energies toward such improvement.

Paese (1984) trained both the cooperating teachers and student teachers to record the student teachers' verbal interaction. First,
the cooperating teachers discussed the collected data with the student teachers, then the student teachers provided their own data by coding an audiotape of their verbal behavior. The number of verbal interactions increased in all three subjects during both phases of the study, with the student's self coding being a more effective intervention.

Taggart and Wilkinson (1985) utilized a self-instructional module to develop cooperating teacher skills to promote supervisory effectiveness. The self-instructional module was designed to systematically develop the cooperating teacher's observational skills. They demonstrated specific supervisory skills can be acquired by cooperating teachers using a self-instructional module. Ocansey (1986) extended this study by demonstrating that cooperating teachers can acquire the essential skills to implement a well-defined supervisory model, facilitate communication of tasks in an explicit manner and hold student teachers accountable for their performances during post-teaching conferences.

Other inservice programs have consisted of a six hour training program in observing, analyzing and modifying another teacher's performance (Nelson, 1975) and microteaching, interaction analysis, inquiring techniques, levels of questioning and thinking, and session planning (Olmo, 1973). Both had positive effects on the cooperating teachers performance.

The research cited has indicated that specific supervisory behaviors of the cooperating teacher can be altered. However, it is unknown if the cooperating teacher's behavioral changes have any
effect on the supervisee. This study will attempt to investigate that question.

The Concept of Tasks and Accountability in Student Teaching

This section of the review will identify the important features of tasks and accountability in both physical education and classroom settings. This section of the review is essential because it provides the basic understanding for one of the dependent variables within the present study. The dependent variable of the cooperating teacher involved communication of information about tasks and accountability within the post teaching conferences.

The Concept of Tasks

The original notion of tasks may be traced to Walter Doyle. A task, according to Doyle (1980) is “a set of implicit or explicit instructions about what a person must do to cope successfully with a situation” (p.2). A task can be defined as a goal and a set of operations necessary to achieve the goal. Alexander (1982) noted that the definition revealed three important components. The same components were identified by Maqer (1975). Any task may be divided into three components namely; situation, performance, and criterion.

These components closely parallel Doyle’s definition of a task. Coping successfully refers to the degree to which the performance meets the criteria which exists, as Doyle pointed out, either implicitly or explicitly in a task statement. What a person is expected to do is akin to Maqer’s notion of performance. Situation is
a term which is common to both writer's definitions. Although Mager
focuses upon the notion of objectives and Doyle upon tasks and their
goals, an analysis of the components revealed that the two foci are
similar.

Explicitness of Tasks

Tousignant (1982) described three degrees of task explicitness
within the physical education setting. She referred to implicit
tasks, generally implicit tasks, and specifically explicit tasks.
Tinning (1983) applied the same three degrees in his study with slight
modifications. Tinning's degrees were described as implicit tasks,
partially explicit tasks, and fully explicit tasks. Implicit tasks
were those in which only the performance and possibly the situation
were specified but then only in the most general manner. Partially
explicit tasks were those in which both situation and performance were
communicated but criterion was not detailed. Fully explicit tasks
were those in which details of situation, performance and criterion
were explicitly communicated to the student teacher.

Ocansey (1986) modified Tinning's descriptions slightly to analyze
tasks within a supervision conference setting during student teaching.
Implicit tasks were changed to include only one of the three
components. These same concepts were utilized in the present study
with slight modifications to analyze the cooperating teacher-student
teacher conference.
The Concept of Task Systems

Task systems are groups of tasks related to a particular aspect of content within a lesson (Ocansey, 1986). Doyle (1981) identified the existence of two task systems within classroom settings. They were: (1) a managerial system which concerns the organization and direction of pupil's behavior and social interactions, usually as they prepared to engage in the academic system, and (2) academic (instruction) system consisting of the statement, performance, and consequence relative to the subject matter task. Task systems tend to overlap in practice and may be collectively referred to as a "structure".

Tinning (1983) investigated the tasks in student teaching and found no useful correspondence between the two task systems. Thus, Tinning provided a more appropriate classification for understanding the nature of task systems in student teaching. He identified three task systems: teaching, organizational, and social.

The teaching task system comprised of teaching tasks which related specifically to situations in which the student teacher had direct contact with pupils for the purpose of facilitating pupil involvement in the subject matter of physical education (motor activity).

The social task system comprised of social tasks which in some way functioned to create and maintain cordial relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher, or university supervisor, or other school personal.

The organizational task system comprised of organizational tasks related to preparation for teaching. They include planning tasks which specifically related to planning units or lessons in various
学位的详细。它们还包括了将体育馆或操场实际布置起来以促进教学的职责。

**Accountability of Tasks**

斯金纳（1974）指出，当一个人对另一人“进行会计记录，以确定它是否符合规定”（p. 84）时，存在责任。廷宁（1983）指出，关注的重点是学徒教师的行为和规定的具体要求由合作教师或大学监督。学生教学中的责任必须考虑是什么规定了什么，以及什么保持了账户。然而，正如亚历山大（1982）指出的那样，责任也应涉及行为的后果。奥坎西（1986）指出，当责任声明在所有三个责任成分都存在时，学生教学项目的目标可以得到促进。

亚历山大（1982）和廷宁（1983）指出，为了确定责任的焦点，应考虑责任系统的三个成分。责任的三个成分是账户记录、与规定的比较和后果应用。账户记录包括简单地口头询问某项任务是否完成。与规定的比较是一个过程，用于确定任务在有效监督指南中的表现程度。后果应用涉及合作教师监控某些教学行为，然后提供
feedback (positive or negative consequences) contingent upon the student teacher's performance of the stated tasks (Ocansey, 1986).

Account keeping, as noted by Tinning (1983), was focused on the teaching task system. All forms of coding behaviors were related to teaching tasks (amount of activity time, use of student names). In terms of comparing with specification, Tinning found that there was no observable behavior to ensure a comparison.

The process for such comparisons were in part the basis for contrived feedback consequences applied by the cooperating teacher or university supervisor. Typically, the cooperating teacher or supervisor monitored certain teaching behaviors and then offered feedback based upon whether or not the observed behavior was congruent with the criteria level.

Two types of applied consequences were identified as contrived feedback, and arranged contrived consequences. Arranged contrived consequences are those in which the consequences are specified in advance. There was only one arranged contrived consequence statement recorded during Tinning's (1983) study of the student teaching experience. He found that the consequences for performance were not pre-specified and as such there was no dominant focus of the accountability system.

Tousignant and Siedentop (1983) analyzed the structure of tasks in required physical education classes and identified the contingencies operating within the task system (accountability). It seemed that the type of accountability used in most classes, and the permissiveness of the task structures, created situations where it was unnecessary for
the students to make formal attempts to negotiate the task requirements because there was no risk involved.

Informal accountability systems that did not require student participation lead to participation avoidance by beginners. As the criteria of performance increased (putting forth an effort, emitting a motor response, and demonstrating the appropriate topography of a skill), a higher rate of on-task behavior was observed.

Tinning and Siedentop (1985) studied the characteristics of tasks and accountability within student teaching. In this case study, less than half of the tasks were stated in a fully explicit manner, and comparisons to explicit tasks were not always made to explicit specifications.

There appears to be no strong system of accountability operating within the student teaching experience. The consequences for not achieving a stated task seem to be weak and ineffective. This study focused on the task and accountability statements during post teaching conferences.

Summary

The first section of the review looked at the findings relative to the interactions that occur between supervisors and supervisees during conferences at both the inservice and preservice level. Supervisors apparently seldom asked inservice teachers for ideas about actions or problem solving, and their conference interaction does not appear to be a collaborative affair. The feedback given to the student teacher by the supervisor is often vague and incomplete.
In the second section, literature relevant to behavioral changes in inservice teacher's, student teacher's, and inclass pupil's were reviewed. It is evident that behaviors can be changed through various types of intervention.

The third section discussed the training of and supervision by cooperating teachers. Although the research base is limited, cooperating teacher's supervisory behaviors can be changed. However, there is little conclusive evidence regarding the effects that the training has on the supervisee.

In the final section of the review, the origins of the notion of tasks were discussed. All of the studies conducted within physical education support the notion that task specifications often lack specific criteria, and the student teacher is rarely held accountable for their performances during the student teaching experiences.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS, DATA ANALYSIS AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The methods and procedures described in this chapter center around the research problem stated in chapter 1 (page 7):

What are the effects of Wilkinson & Taggarts', and Ocansey's self-instructional modules completed by the cooperating teacher on the post teaching conference task statements of the cooperating teacher, the teaching behaviors of the student teacher and the behaviors of the pupils in class.

The content of this chapter is presented in the following order:

Selection of subjects, setting of the study, dependent variables, instrumentation, independent variables, supervisor's role, interventions, intervention sequence, assignment of intervention, data collection, systematic observation training, interobserver agreement, experimental design, and data analysis.

Selection of Subjects

Cooperating Teachers

Seven cooperating teachers volunteered to participate in this study. All seven teachers taught middle or secondary school physical education in suburban school districts in central Ohio. All seven
teachers had previous supervisory experience. The individual characteristics of the cooperating teachers are listed in Table 1.

Six of the 7 cooperating teachers were volunteers who had not completed either one of the self-instructional modules. One of the volunteering cooperating teachers (C.T. 3) had completed one of the self-instructional modules previously. She was kept in the study because it was felt that the additional data could be valuable. Cooperating teacher 3 did not have a true baseline. She redid the module she had previously completed and then data was collected for two weeks. She then completed the second module.

Eight cooperating teachers each agreed to work with a student teacher during the spring quarter prior to being asked to participate in the study. The researcher visited each cooperating teacher prior to the spring quarter to discuss the goals of the program and the research study. The cooperating teachers were asked if they would be interested in participating in a research study to determine the role of the cooperating teacher during the student teaching experience. The taping of their post-teaching conferences, and completing either two, one or no self-instructional modules was discussed. They were not told of the content of the self-instructional modules. All the cooperating teachers agreed to participate.

One of the cooperating teachers was excluded from the study because his teaching load was 60% Physical Education and 40% Health classes. All of the cooperating teachers major teaching load was in Physical Education.
Each cooperating teacher received a memorandum prior to data collection thanking them for volunteering and stating what their responsibilities were during the study (see appendix A). The researcher visited each cooperating teacher individually and discussed the responsibilities prior to the start of data collection.

Student Teachers

Seven student teachers from The Ohio State University Physical Education Teacher Education program were selected from the population of 8 student teachers. The student teacher not used in the study had a work load that consisted of 12 physical education classes weekly and 8 health classes. The individual characteristics of the student teachers are listed in Table 2.

All seven students agreed to be a part of the study. They were told that they would be required to tape their verbal behavior during one class per day over a 4 to 7 week period, and the same class will be coded at least twice a week during the study by trained observers. The student teachers seemed a little apprehensive about getting their verbal behavior taped. They were told by the researcher that none of the collected data would be used to evaluate them. A memorandum was given to the student teachers stating their responsibilities during the study (see appendix B).

Students (Pupils)

Systematic observation data was collected for the target lesson on three pupils in the class using a modified version of ALT-PE (Siedentop, Tousignant, & Parker, 1982). Three pupils were chosen to
be observed and the observer rotated between the students during the lesson (observe student 1 for 5 seconds, record for 5 seconds; observe student 2 for 5 seconds and record for 5 seconds; observe student 3 for 5 seconds and record for 5 seconds). The three pupils selected represented an above average pupil, an average pupil, and a below average pupil. The same three pupils were not watched by all observers during the study. The cooperating teachers who were trained to observe coded the same three students each day. The observers selected their pupils by asking the cooperating teacher or by randomly selecting the pupils. It was felt that observing three pupils on a rotational system enhanced the believability of the data. If a targeted pupil was absent, a replacement was selected from the same skill level (above average, average, below average).
### Table 1

**General Characteristics of the Cooperating Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Years at Present School</th>
<th>Total # Of S.T</th>
<th>Total # Of S.T (O.S.U.)</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

CT....COOPERATING TEACHER  MA....MASTERS IN ART  M....MALE
ST....STUDENT TEACHER  BS....BACHELOR OF SCIENCE  F....FEMALE
# TABLE 2

General Characteristics of the Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Overall Point Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST 1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

ST....STUDENT TEACHER  
F.....FEMALE  
M.....MALE
Setting

The study was conducted during the spring of 1987. All seven subjects were assigned to a public middle or high school within a thirty mile radius of the campus. The voluntary cooperating teachers were full time instructors at the public schools.

School

The populations of the middle and high schools used in this study ranged from 650-1,850 students. The socio-economic status of the students was either middle or upper middle class. There were two seventh, two eighth, one ninth and two tenth grade classes used in this study. The individual characteristics of the schools are listed in Table 3.

Targeted Class

One class a day at the secondary level was chosen for data collection. The targeted class was the class that was followed by either a planning period or a period of free time so that the student teacher and the cooperating teacher could tape their post-teaching conference without interruption. The individual characteristics of the targeted class are listed in Table 3.
### Table 3

General Characteristics of the School and Targeted Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>S.E.S.</th>
<th>Grade of Targeted Class</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Mainstreamed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18/31</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>M/UM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16/23</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23/64</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

SES...Socioeconomic Status  
F......Female  
M......Male
Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this study were the task statements of the cooperating teacher, the teaching behaviors of the student teacher and the inclass behaviors of the students. The categories used to describe the dependent variables are presented in this section.

Cooperating Teacher's Task Statements The task statements emitted by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference were coded into the following categories: Task Statement Category (Substantive, Process, Other); Explicitness of Statements (Implicit, Fully Explicit), Accountability Statements (Full, Partial), and Feedback Statements (Specific and General).

Task Statement Categories- Each task statement was coded into one of the three following categories:

Substantive- relates to any task statement that makes reference to the teaching of or the planning for the subject matter. Examples include: Reference to activities, drills and games during the lesson plan that are incorporated to assist the students in acquiring the subject content; setting up the gymnasium or playing field with equipment to improve the teaching of the subject matter ("I think if you lowered the two nets the students would be more consistent with their serves"); discussing strategies to improve subsequent teaching of the subject matter with the target class ("If you give the students a handout on the rules of the game they would hopefully learn them more quickly").
Process- relates to any task statement that makes reference to the inclass behavior of either the student teacher or the students without reference to subject content. Examples include: reference to student activity or waiting time ("The students seemed to be more active today."); reference to teachers use of student names, teacher student interaction or management time; setting up the gymnasium or playing field with equipment to improve the students activity time ("I think if you set up two nets instead of one the students will be more active"); discussing strategies to improve the behaviors of the student teacher or students in the targetted class ("If you put all the class rules and consequences on a poster, I think you would have less off task behavior").

Other- relates to any task statement that makes reference to the professional preparation or socialization of the student teacher. Examples include: student teachers' promptness or attire; extracurricular activities; interactions with other staff members

Components of Explicitness- The following are the three components that make up a fully explicit task statement.

Performance- Refers to the statement that tells the student teacher the task to be completed.

Situation- Refers to the conditions under which the task will be performed.
Criterion- Refers to the standard by which the completion of the task will be judged.

Levels of Explicitness Each task statement was coded into one of the three following categories.

Implicit Tasks. Those in which you communicated either none, one or two sections (situation, performance, and criteria) explicitly by either verbal or written means, but did not give details concerning one of the sections for successful performance.

Example: Reduce management time during your teaching. The situation is the physical education lesson, and the performance is to reduce management time but no information concerning specific criteria.

Fully Explicit Tasks. Those in which the details of situation, performance and criterion were explicitly communicated to your student teacher.

Example; Reduce management time during your teaching by getting the students out of the locker room before the late bell. The situation is the physical education lesson, the performance is to reduce management time and the criteria is to get the student out of the locker room before the late bell.

Components of Accountability- The following are the three components that make up a fully accountable task statement.
Account Keeping- comprised of making simple verbal questions as to whether a task was completed or not. Collecting data on pupil's performance in the student teacher's class is also part of account keeping.

Comparing With Specification- is a process for determining the degree of task performance in view of the specification in the effective supervision guide.

Consequence Application- Involves the cooperating teacher monitoring certain teaching behaviors and then offering feedback (positive or negative consequences) contingent upon the student teacher's performance of the stated tasks.

Levels of Accountability- Each accountability statements was coded into one of the two following categories.

Partially Accountable. Those in which you communicated either none, one or two (account keeping, comparing with specifications, consequence application) sections by either verbal or written means, but did not give details concerning one of the sections for successful performance.

Example: You seemed to have had less management time during your teaching today. This statement barely covers comparing with specification, but no account was kept, nor were any consequence applied.
Fully Accountable. Those in which the details of account keeping, comparing with specifications, consequence application were explicitly communicated to the student teacher.

Example: You reduced your management time by getting the students out of the lockerroom before the late bell. That was well done. The account keeping was the cooperating teacher knowing that the students were out of the lockerroom before the late bell, comparing with specifications was comparing today's performance (reduction in management time due to kids getting out of the lockerroom before the bell) and the consequence application was the positive statement (That was well done).

Specific and General Feedback - Each feedback statement was coded into one of the two following categories.

Specific Feedback - Positive or negative cooperating teacher reactions to the student teachers' teaching behaviors or pupils' behavior in either the substantive, process, or other category which identifies the exact part of the behavior to which the cooperating teacher reacted.

Examples: Your class was in activity 40% of the time; You have learned the names of your students very quickly; It is good to use a simulated game when introducing the rules of the game.

General Feedback - Positive or negative cooperating teacher reactions to the student teachers' teaching behaviors or pupil's behavior in either the substantive, process, or other category which does not
identify the exact part of the behavior to which the cooperating teacher reacted.

Examples: Your class went well today; The kids played well today.

**Student Teacher's Teaching Behaviors** The selection of student teachers behaviors were based on the program goals of the university. The student teacher's verbal behavior categories were defined as follows:

**Positive Specific Feedback**—Positive teacher reactions to student skill attempts which identifies the exact part of the movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Examples: Good move, John. You shot from right behind the screen.; That was nice, Michelle. Your circle was different from everybody elses.; That's better. Your arms were stretched much more than before.

**Positive General Feedback**—Positive teacher reactions to student behaviors or skill attempts which communicate a general teacher response to the attempt or behavior, but do not identify the exact part of the behavior or movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Examples: Nice shot; good effort; good move; that's the right idea; tough defense, Jim.; that's better, Jill; A-1 job; that was a tremendous pass, Bob.; very good.

**Negative Specific Feedback**—Negative teacher reactions to student skill attempts which identifies the exact part of the movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.
Examples: How will you ever hit the golf ball if you don't keep your left arm straight; Fred, when did you ever see me swing at a baseball with my eyes closed.

Negative General Feedback- Negative teacher reactions to student behaviors or skill attempts which communicate a general teacher response to the behavior or attempt, but do not identify the exact part of the behavior or movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Examples: Tom, you will never win a badminton game with your serve; That was one of the worst foul shots I ever saw, Diana!

Corrective Skill Feedback- Teacher reactions to errors in student skill performance.

Examples: Mary, try to keep your left arm straight when you are swinging a golf club.

Use of Names- Teacher’s use of the student’s name during a verbal interaction with that particular student.

Inclass Pupil’s Behavior The inclass pupil’s behaviors were based on how students spent their class time in accordance with six categories (Activity, Waiting, Management, Transition, Knowledge, and Off Task Behavior). The categories used in Basic ALT-PE are defined as follows:

Management - The pupil is engaged in activities that are related to class business but are unrelated to the instructional activity. For
example: the student is sitting in an assigned row while the teacher takes attendance.

Transition - The pupil is engaged in managerial and organizational activities that are related to instruction. For example: moving from one station to another, or chasing after a basketball that went off the court.

Activity - The pupil is engaged in a motor activity, actively responding, or actively supporting a peer. For example: throwing a softball, answering a question asked by the teacher, or spotting a peer on the uneven bars.

Waiting - The pupil is void of an opportunity to be engaged in a motor activity, or active supporting. For example: the student has just dribbled a basketball the length of a court and is now standing on line waiting for her next turn.

Knowledge - The pupil is listening to instructions, watching a demonstration, asking a question, or discussing the subject matter. For example: the pupil is watching the teacher demonstrate the proper technique to throwing a frisbee.

Off Task - The pupil is engaged in an activity that is completely unrelated to the class activity. For example: chasing another student, or talking to a peer when the teacher is talking.
Instrumentation

Five instruments were used to collect the data on the dependent variables. The following is an explanation of the instruments used for data collection. All instruments will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter.

1. Basic ALT-PE was used to collect data on pupils behaviors by trained cooperating teachers and graduate students.

2. An event recording instrument was developed and used to identify the explicit and accountability task statements of the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference was used. The instrument was used in conjunction with an audiotape of the post-teaching conference and an effective supervision guide that was written out during the conference.

3. The university supervisors kept a log that identified and described any interaction that the supervisor and the student teacher had during the study.

4. A copy of the students lesson plan was collected to see if changes in the student teachers planning is directly correlated with the goals and strategies identified on the effective supervision guide.

5. A checklist was be used to assist in diagnosing the student teacher's strengths and weaknesses in planning, managing and instructing physical education lessons throughout the student
teacher's field experience. This instrument was used to see if changes in the student teachers weaknesses are correlated with the goals identified on the effective supervision guide.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables in this study were two self-instructional modules developed and tested by Taggart & Wilkinson (1985), and Ocansey (1986). Taggart and Wilkinson's Observational Coding Manual (BASIC ALT-PE) was designed to teach supervisors the techniques for data collection during physical education lessons. The data is are categorized in the following categories: Activity, Management, Transition, Waiting, Knowledge, Off-task, Use of Student Names, Positive and Negative Feedback and General and Specific Feedback.

The modified version of Ocansey's Behavior Model of Supervision in Physical Education (BMS-PE), designed to help the cooperating teacher to communicate tasks explicitly and to hold the students accountable for those tasks, was also used. An explicit task statement by a cooperating teacher occurred when he/she stated the situation, performance and criterion of the task to be performed by the student teacher. The cooperating teacher held the student teacher accountable when he/she demonstrated account keeping, compared the data to specifications provided earlier and applied a consequence to the student teacher.
Supervisory Role During Student Teaching

The cooperating teachers at the secondary level were the main supervisor for the student teachers. The student teachers were appointed a university supervisor. The supervisor did not engage in direct supervision but was available as a resource to the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. Any discussions between the university supervisor and the student teacher were recorded by the supervisor on a form provided by the researcher (see appendix C). The researcher met with the university supervisors and discussed their responsibilities during the study and gave them a sheet outlining their role during visits to the school (see appendix D).

The cooperating teachers were given the goals of The Ohio State University's Physical Education Teacher Education program prior to the student teaching experience (see appendix E). The goals of the program emphasize the use of student names, positive behavioral interactions, well-planned lessons, low management time, appropriate student behavior, development of student self-management skills, high activity time, low waiting time, active monitoring, skill analysis and feedback, safe environment, and teacher enthusiasm. These goals are systematically practiced and observed prior to the preservice teachers student teaching experience. It would be ideal if the cooperating teacher supported these goals so that the student teacher could implement teaching methods, techniques and strategies that are consistent with their preservice program and the research base.
**Interventions**

This section discusses the two interventions used to change the cooperating teacher’s task statements during the post teaching conference. Basic ALT-PE was designed to teach supervisors techniques for collecting objective data systematically. The Modified Behavioral Model of Supervision was designed to train teachers to communicate tasks explicitly and hold the student teacher accountable for the stated task.

**Basic ALT-PE**

Wilkinson & Taggart’s self instructional module, otherwise known as the Observational Coding Manual (OCM), was designed to teach supervisors the techniques for data collection during student teaching using a data collecting technique known as BASIS ALT-PE. Basic ALT-PE is a simplified version of the system originally developed by Siedentop, Birdwell, and Metzler (1979) and later modified by Siedentop, Tousignant and Parker (1982). The cooperating teacher learned to collect and code data on the teaching performance of the student teacher, and also the performance of selected pupils in the student teacher’s class. It was necessary to ensure that the cooperating teacher could code the identified behaviors with a minimum of 80% reliability.

The collected data were the basis for the post teaching conference. The collected data were summarized by the cooperating teacher, and target goals, strategies and feedback were based on the
summary. The cooperating teacher coded lessons with 80% reliability upon completion of Taggart and Wilkinson's self instructional module.

The Observational Coding Manual employed a self-instructional procedure. The module consisted of written materials, audiotape and videotape components. The instructions within these materials were sequenced in a systematic order. They were self paced so they could be followed systematically. There were opportunities to review materials until mastery was achieved.

The audiotape was used with the first part of the manual. The audiotape covered use of student names, and positive and negative behavioral interactions by the teacher. The cooperating teachers were required to listen to the audiotape and make a tally in the appropriate box each time they heard a name used, and each occurrence of a positive or negative interaction.

The videotape part of the module was used to introduce the key behaviors of Basic ALT-PE and provide coding practice. The data were coded into the following categories: Activity, Management, Transition, Waiting, Knowledge, and Off-task. Definitions of each category will be provided later in this chapter.

Basic ALT-PE utilizes an interval recording technique to collect data. Interval recording refers to observing a targeted student in the teacher's class for short periods (5 seconds) and deciding what behavior best characterized the time period. To minimize confusion, an interval in which a student was observed in activity was coded as activity. The cooperating teacher would observe the targeted student
for 5 seconds and then record the behavior category that best represented the behavior of the target student.

**MBMS-PE**

The second intervention utilized in this study was a modified version of Ocansey's Behavioral Model of Supervision in Physical Education (MBMS-PE). This intervention was used to change the cooperating teacher's explicit and accountable task statements.

Modifications were made in the category descriptions and the levels of accountability and explicitness. Ocansey categories or tasks were teaching, organizational, and social. The teaching category was further broken down to micro and macrolesson tasks. The teaching task was modified to the process category, the organizational task was changed to the substantive category, and social task was included in the other category.

Ocansey had three levels of both accountability and explicitness. The three levels were fully explicit and accountable, partially explicit or accountable, and implicit. The implicit and partially explicit categories were collapsed into one category (implicit).

At the completion of this self-instructional module, the cooperating teacher was able to: (1) communicate goals in an explicit manner and hold the student teacher accountable for their performance during post teaching conferences and (2) be able to develop an effective supervision guide that will state the targeted behavior, the responsibilities of both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, a criterion level, and a completion date.
The modified version of Ocansey's Behavioral Model of Supervision in Physical Education (MBMS-PE) was systematically organized into three booklets. The booklets were: 1. An Exercise Book, 2. A Discussion Handbook, and 3. An Answer Key Book. Emphasis was on unit mastery and the exercises were criterion referenced.

The section that emphasized communicating goals in an explicit manner consisted of instructions related to the concepts of tasks and accountability. There were exercises and discussions that provided the cooperating teacher with knowledge about the degrees of explicitness, and the different types of statements of accountability that exist with student teaching.

To facilitate the cooperating teacher's ability to conduct an effective post-teaching conference, the self instructional module provided simulated exercises. The intent of the simulations was to enable cooperating teachers to communicate tasks to students in a more explicit manner and to hold them accountable for their performance. An example of an exercise would be reading a task statement from a conference setting, identify the situation, performance and criterion, and then classify the task as explicit or implicit.

The section that introduced the development of a supervisory guide consisted of discussions and exercises that taught the cooperating teacher how to use the guide. Examples of the supervisory guide are provided (Table 4 & 5). The discussion and exercises emphasized the following categories:
1. The cooperating teacher and student teacher identified the teaching goals to be achieved - information gathered during previous observations were utilized for making decisions about behaviors that needed improvement.

2. The cooperating teacher and student teacher specified tasks each would perform that would facilitate the student teacher's attempt to achieve the identified goal. To facilitate this process, a range of effective teaching techniques were provided in the Discussion Handbook.

3. Strategies are specified during the post teaching conference that can facilitate intervention and modification of behaviors that need improvement.

4. Criteria are established for evaluation of performance for each behavior that needed improvement.

5. Responsibilities of both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher are identified that are necessary to achieve the targeted goal.

6. Start and target completion date are indicated.

The student teacher that is assigned to the cooperating teacher who has completed MBMS-PE will have their inclass teaching behavior coded by a trained observer two to three times a week. Approximately
once a week two trained coders observed and collected data for the purposes of measuring interobserver agreement.

**Assignment of Intervention**

The number of modules that a cooperating teacher was to complete was decided prior to the study. An attempt was made to assign the different interventions to the schools with the most similar curriculums. If the activities taught at the targeted schools are similar (controlled), then the results from the research would be more believable.

The cooperating teachers that received both modules were teaching track, soccer, and softball. The cooperating teachers who received one module were teaching different units during baseline and tennis during the intervention phase. The cooperating teachers that did not receive a module were teaching a variety of individual sport activities (badminton, table tennis at school 6, and golf and tennis at school 7), as well as softball. Cooperating teacher 3's curriculum was not of concern because there wasn't a need to pair this cooperating teacher with another teacher because she had already completed Basic ALT-PE. Due to complications during the study the phases overlapped across subject matters.

The cooperating teachers were given the modules on Friday and were expected to have the modules completed by Monday. The teachers were given a number to call if they had any difficulty during the completion of the module. They were also given a cover letter with
Table 4

Effective supervision guide (ESG) as used in the training component of the BMS-PE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Tasks For Student Teachers, US/CT</th>
<th>Intervention Strategies</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Actual Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI/US WELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Effective supervision guide (ESG) as used in the training component of the BMS-PE.

**Effective Supervision Guide**

**Cooperating Teacher:** Kofi Mensah  
**School:** Cranbrook Elem  
**Class:** 6th Grade  
**Student Teacher:** John Deer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Tasks for Student Teachers, US/CT</th>
<th>Intervention Strategies</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Actual Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Positive Behavior** | CT/US WILL:  
1. Observe two 30 min. lessons each week.  
2. Provide # of positive interactions after each lesson.  
4. Provide explicit information.  
5. Apply consequences following performance.  
ST WILL:  
1. Graph data  
2. Review weekly feedback  
3. Implement strategies  
4. Evaluate teaching in conferences | ST WILL:  
1. Maintain weekly average of 10 positives for two weeks  
2. Review written protocols on positive interactions (ST) prior to teaching | 10/5/86 | ST WILL: Maintain weekly average of 10 positives for two weeks | 11/13 | 11/27 | Immediate improvement over baseline, but occasional low rate. Then stabilized well above targeted level |
the module explaining what was to be done (see appendix F). The researcher visited the school on the Monday to verify the module was done and answer any questions the cooperating teacher had.

The researcher provided each cooperating teacher that completed ALT-PE with a cassette player and a 5 second interval cueing tape so the cooperating teacher would know when to observe and record during observation. The researcher practiced coding with the cooperating teacher the first day, and answered any questions that arose. The interobserver agreements collected during the first observation was only one of the interobserver agreement checks gathered during the Basic ALT-PE phase.

The researcher went over the supervisory guide with the cooperating teachers who had completed MBMS-PE. The researcher suggested that the student teacher's input should be encouraged when filling out the guide. The researcher also answered any questions that the cooperating teacher had about the module.

**Intervention Sequence**

During the study, the cooperating teacher observed the student teacher teaching the targeted class for one or two weeks of baseline and then observed the student teacher during two to five weeks after intervention, depending on the number of modules completed. It was expected cooperating teachers 1, 2, and 3 would utilize the supervision behaviors they acquired upon completion of self instructional modules. It was expected that cooperating teachers 4 &
would utilize the behaviors acquired when either BASIC ALT-PE or MBMSP-PE was completed prior to the start of the second unit.

The cooperating teacher and student teacher audiotaped their post-teaching conference after one specific class each day. The same class period was observed and audiotaped throughout the entire experience. The first week or two provided the needed baseline data on the cooperating teachers' verbal behavior. The conference occurred as soon after the completion of the targeted class as possible. Since most teachers teach classes back to back, the target class was the class that was followed by either a planning period, lunch, or was the last period of the day.

Baseline data were collected on cooperating teachers 1, 2 and 4 before the other cooperating teachers started. This was because the researcher wanted to start coding the student teachers' behaviors during the first complete unit the student teacher taught solo. After two weeks of collecting baseline data cooperating teacher 1 completed Wilkinson & Taggart's (1985) self-instructional module and cooperating teacher 2 completed Ocansey's self instructional module. The cooperating teachers were given the self instructional module on Friday and were expected to have completed the module by the following Monday. Cooperating teacher 4 remained in baseline.

The other cooperating teachers 3, 5, 6, and 7 started baseline condition one week after the three other cooperating teachers had started. Cooperating teacher 3 had already completed one of the modules (BASIC ALT-PE) before baseline was collected.
Cooperating teacher 4 remained in baseline for three weeks because when the researcher brought the self instructional module to the school on Friday, it was discovered that the cooperating teacher had taken a personal day. Cooperating teachers 3 and 5 received intervention after two weeks in baseline.

Cooperating teacher 3 and 4 received MBMS-PE and cooperating teacher 5 received BASIC ALT-PE. Cooperating teachers 4 and 5 only received one module apiece. This was to study the effects the self instructional modules had on the cooperating teacher's, student teacher's, and student's behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE was presented alone, and when MBMS-PE was presented alone.

Cooperating teachers 1 and 2 remained in the second phase of the study for three weeks. It was planned only to be in phase two for 2 weeks, however cooperating teacher 1 had a great deal of trouble finishing the first module over the assigned weekend. Cooperating teacher 1 would not have completed the second module on the assigned weekend, so the date was pushed back a week. This limited the days available to collect data at both sites during the final phase of the study and necessitated data collection at the very end of the school year. Cooperating teacher 1 did MBMS-PE and cooperating teacher 2 completed ALT-PE. Cooperating teacher 1 and 2 did the modules in different order. This was to study the effects the self instructional modules had on the cooperating teacher's, student teacher's, and student's behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE is presented before MBMS-PE, and when MBMS-PE is presented before ALT-PE. A schematic of the intervention sequence is on Table 6.
Data Collection

Johnston & Pennypacker (1980) noted that identifying a trend in a set of data inevitably requires collecting an adequate number of observations. The more detailed and accurate the information under both nontreatment and treatment conditions, the more exact will be the resulting knowledge of the relations between the independent and dependent variable.

Data were collected on the cooperating teacher's task statements, the student teacher's inclass behavior and planning, and the pupil's inclass behavior during the study. Data were collected on the cooperating teacher's task statements every day, while data on the student teacher and inclass pupil's behavior were collected between two to five times each week.

Cooperating Teacher- The cooperating teacher was asked to hold a post-teaching conference with the student teacher after the target lesson was taught. Each of the conferences were to last from 5 to 15 minutes and were audiotaped. Some of the conferences lasted longer. The researcher supplied the tape recorder and the audiotapes on a weekly basis.

Student Teacher- Each of the student teacher's lesson plans for the targeted class were copied and handed in for each class that was observed. The student teacher's verbal behavior was audiotaped via a wireless microphone. Directions on how to operationalize the wireless microphone were provided (see appendix G). Each student teacher had
an opportunity to wear the wireless microphone prior to the study to minimize the reactivity effect. The researcher supplied the tapes, tape recorder, and batteries on a weekly basis.

Pupils of the Targeted Class- A Basic ALT-PE coding sheet was used to code the behaviors of three pupils in the targeted class (see appendix H). The coding was done by either university personnel or cooperating teachers that were trained to use Basic ALT-PE. The researcher collected the data sheets on a regular basis. The data were then graphed to identify trends and levels in the coded behaviors.

Coder Training

Coding the Targeted Classes - The cooperating teachers that did not complete Basic ALT-PE were not expected to collect objective data. Therefore, a trained observer coded the targeted class. The observers were required to have completed Wilkinson and Taggart's self instructional module, and were introduced to the effective teaching checklist (see appendix I) before the start of the study. These data were not shown to the cooperating teacher or student teacher.

The trained observers were given a class calendar schedule which included the day, time, and school for which the observer was to code. Each coder also received travel directions to each of the schools in the study, and a sheet listing their responsibilities as a coder (see appendix J). The researcher reviewed the responsibilities with the coders.
### Table 6

**Intervention Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEEK4</th>
<th>WEEK5</th>
<th>WEEK6</th>
<th>WEEK7</th>
<th>WEEK8</th>
<th>WEEK9</th>
<th>WEEK10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>MBMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

ALT....BASIC ALT-PE  MBMS....MBMS-PE  BASE....BASELINE
The targeted classes of the cooperating teachers that learned Basic ALT-PE were observed daily by the cooperating teacher. The researcher provided all needed coding sheets to the cooperating teacher. Each cooperating teacher received a calendar schedule that identified each time someone from the university was going to be observing and coding the target class (see appendix K).

**Coding Student Teacher's Verbal Behavior** - All the student teacher's had their verbal behavior taped each time they were coded using ALT-PE. The tapes were listened to by the researcher or trained graduate student's. Event recording was used to summarize the tapes onto the coding sheet (see appendix L). A tally was marked on the coding sheet each time the student teacher used positive specific, positive general, negative specific, negative general or corrective feedback. Names used in verbal interactions by the student teacher was written down and a tally mark was placed next to it each time it was repeated. The researcher discussed the categories with the coders and provided examples of each. The categories were the same as those taught on Wilkinson and Taggart's self instructional module.

Anytime a combined feedback was emitted by the student teacher, a tally was marked in each category. For example, if the student teacher says "That was a good foul shot Jim, but try to arch the ball a little higher." This would be coded as both a positive general feedback and corrective feedback.

**Coding the Post-Teaching Conference** - The post-teaching conference of the targeted class between the cooperating teacher and the student
teacher was recorded. The researcher coded each of the post teaching conference tapes (See Appendix M). A second coder listened to a portion of the tapes to establish interobserver agreement. The cooperating teacher's verbal behavior categorized task statement categories (substantive, process, other). Each cooperating teacher task statement was classified as either fully explicit or implicit task statement category. Any statement concerned with the completion of a previously stated task was defined as either fully or partially accountable category. Any comment made that discussed aspects of the student teacher's teaching that were not task statements were placed into a specific or general feedback category.

Interobserver Agreement/Reliability

Basic ALT-PE- The researcher met with the trained observers before the study began for the purpose of discussing the categories and answering any questions about Basic ALT-PE, and trained them to use the checklist appropriately, providing them with a schedule that indicated the time and place that the coder was to code, and to observe a 5 and 15 minute teaching episode to check interobserver agreement. Interobserver agreement is the percentage of agreement for how often two observers watching one subject and equipped with the same definitions of behavior, see it occurring at the same time (Baer, 1977).

Interobserver agreement was obtained by comparing the researchers results with each of the trained coders results. Interval by interval
agreement was used. Agreement on the 5 minute episode ranged from 67-93%, and from 75-84% on the 15 minute episode. All disagreements were discussed and rectified. All interobserver agreement of the coders for the five minute and fifteen minute teaching episode prior to the study can be found on Table 7.
Student Teacher's Verbal Behavior—Trained observers coded the tapes of the student teacher's inclass behavior. Interobserver agreement measures were completed to ensure reliability of the data.

Post Teaching Conference Tapes—Trained graduate students coded the tapes of the post teaching conference. Interobserver agreement measures were completed so to ensure reliability of the data.

Experimental Design

This study could be defined more specifically as two related studies. One study had as its main dependent variable the task statements of the cooperating teacher made during the supervisory conference. The task statements were coded for explicitness and degree of accountability. The independent variable in this study was the supervisory intervention that results from the use of the two different modules (Basic ALT-PE & MBMS-PE).

Yoked to this study was the analysis of the behaviors of the student teacher and her/his students. In this study the dependent variables were the behaviors of a student teacher and his/her students. The independent variable once again was the two self instructional modules.

A change in the cooperating teacher's task statements was identified by the coding of the post teaching conference between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher using event recording. A
TABLE 7

INTEROBSERVER AGREEMENT (BEFORE STUDY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CODER</th>
<th>CODER</th>
<th>CODER</th>
<th>CODER</th>
<th>CODER</th>
<th>CODER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MIN EPISODE</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MIN EPISODE</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
change in the student teachers' behavior was identified by the student teachers' lesson plans, verbal behavior, observer checklist that identified the student teacher's strengths and weaknesses in planning, managing, and instructing physical education lessons, and by the percentage of time spent in the different BASIC ALT-PE categories.

The goals targeted on the effective supervision guide and the strategies suggested to accomplish those goals should be reflected on the future lesson plans and teaching performance of the student teacher. A change in the inclass pupil's behavior was identified by BASIC ALT-PE.

A multiple baseline design across subjects was used to judge the effectiveness of the modules on the cooperating teachers' task statements. In the multiple baseline design across subjects, the investigator sequentially applies an intervention across several subjects who exhibit the same target behavior under similar environmental conditions.

Tawney and Gast (1984) summarize several advantages to this design. Advantages include: (a) it targets a common skill across several learners, and (b) it permits the researcher to validate program effectiveness across several teachers, thereby enhancing the generality of the findings. A schematic for the multiple baseline design across subjects and the introduction of the intervention in the multiple baseline design across subjects are presented on the Tables 7 and 8.
A multiple baseline design across behaviors (Baer, Wolf and Risley, 1968) was used to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the self-instructional models on the student teachers' teaching behaviors. The multiple baseline design across subjects was used to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the modules on the task statements of the cooperating teacher.

In this multiple baseline design across behaviors, the cooperating teacher identified a behavior that needs to be increased or decreased. The cooperating teacher intervenes on the behavior while monitoring the other behaviors. When the targeted behavior reaches criterion level, intervention is then introduced to the second behavior that needs to be changed (Tawney and Gast, 1984).

Experimental control is demonstrated by applying the intervention to one behavior while maintaining baseline conditions in the other behaviors. After criterion-level responding is attained with the first behavior, the intervention is applied to the second. Following replication of criterion attainment with the second behavior, the intervention is applied to the third, and so on (Tawney & Gast, 1984).

Some of the behaviors, such as class management time, activity time, and waiting time are not functionally independent. Some induction will be observed if one of these objectives are targeted for intervention by the cooperating teacher. It was hoped
Table 8

Multiple Baseline Across Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>1, 2 AND 3</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AND 5</td>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>INTERVENTION #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 AND 7</td>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Intervention Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>BASELINE (1 or 2 WEEK)</th>
<th>INTERVENTION 1 (2 OR 3 WEEKS)</th>
<th>INTERVENTION 2 (2 OR 3 WEEKS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IV-1 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>IV-2 (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IV-2</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
<td>IV-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IV-2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the change in the targeted objective will be abrupt with little overlapping, which will minimize the induction effect.

Tawney and Gast (1984) summarize several advantages to this design. Advantages include: (a) a return to baseline conditions is not required to demonstrate experimental control; (b), because a reversal condition is not required, the multiple baseline design across behaviors obviates many of the practical and ethical problems associated with reversal designs; (c) it provides a means for evaluating programs designed to teach skills that are irreversible; and (d) because most educators are interested in response generalization and maintenance, this design provides a paradigm for continuous monitoring of student progress through two learning stages. A schematic for the multiple baseline across behaviors is presented on Table 10.

Establishing Baseline

Graduate teaching associates trained in Basic ALT-PE made initial observations of the targeted students performance in the class designated for observation in the study. The observations were completed using the Observation Coding Sheet (see appendix H). The records from these observations were used as baseline data for each student teacher. Most data points that varied from the normal range could be explained. For example, a pupil's activity time would drop considerably on test days.
Table 10  
Multiple Baseline Across Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHVR #1</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHVR #2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>INT. #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHVR #3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>INT. #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Data Analysis**

The data were graphed and analyzed visually to determine if consistent patterns of student performance vary according to the intervention. Means, percentages, and ratios were used to identify any changes that occurred between baseline and intervention.

**Cooperating Teacher’s Verbal Behavior**

The audiotapes of the post-teaching conference were analyzed using event recording. A coding sheet containing the task statement and feedback categories, and the levels of explicitness and accountability was developed by the researcher. The coder would mark down the task statement category first, then mark down either the level of explicitness or accountability of the statement, or the feedback category. A short description of the cooperating teachers verbal interaction with the student teacher was also written down. The total number for each category was then added, and graphed for easier visual inspection of the data.

Graphic displays (line graph) serve two basic purposes. First, they assist in organizing data during the data collection process, which in turn facilitates formative evaluation. Second, they provide a detailed numerical summary and description of behavior, which in turn allows the reader to analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables (Tawney & Gast, 1984).
Interpreting a Graph—Graphs are interpreted by visually analysing the level and trend of the data, as well as the percentage of overlapping between phases in the study.

The value on the vertical axis scale around which a set of behavioral measures converge is called the trend. Level is examined within a phase or condition by its mean, median, or range, by the degree of stability or variability, and by the extent of change from one level to another (Cooper, Heron, Heward, 1987).

The trend refers to the overall direction taken by the data path. Trends are described in terms of their direction (increasing, decreasing, zero trend), and the extent of variability of data points around a trend (Cooper, Heron, Heward, 1987).

The number of intervention data points that fall within the range of data points during baseline is called overlapping. The lower the percentage of overlap, the greater the impact the intervention had on the target behavior. The percentage of overlap was calculated on the cooperating teachers verbal behavior. The percentage of overlapping is calculated by determining the range of the data point values of the first condition, counting the number of data points plotted in the second condition, counting the number of data points of the second condition that fall within the range of values on the first condition, and then dividing the total number of data points which fall within the range of the condition by the total number of data points of the second condition and multiplying the number by 100.
Student Teacher's Teaching Behaviors

The audiotapes of the student teacher's verbal behavior were coded using event recording. The researcher developed a coding sheet that defined each verbal feedback category (positive and negative specific feedback, positive and negative general feedback, and corrective feedback), and provided a space for the coder to place a tally mark for each instance a feedback category was represented. There was also a place for each student name to be written down. The number of tallies in each category was then divided by the total amount of time, which gave the researcher the number of feedback statements given per minute. The rate was then graphed for easier visual inspection of the data.

Pupil's Inclass Behavior

The inclass behavior of the student teacher's pupils was coded using Basic ALT-PE. Each interval in each category (Management, Transition, Waiting, Activity, Knowledge, Off Task) was added up and divided by the total number of intervals. This gave the researcher a percentage of how much time was spent in each category. The data was summarized and graphed so that a trend and level could be identified.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This chapter discusses the effect the self instructional modules completed by the cooperating teacher had on the post teaching conference task statements of the cooperating teacher, the teaching behaviors of the student teacher and the behaviors of the students in class. Line graphs and tables are used to allow visual inspection of the data and highlight changes in behavior. The issue of reliability of the data are addressed initially. The data are presented and discussed as they pertain to each of the research questions posed in discussion Chapter 1 (page 7).

Reliability of the Data

This section will discuss the reliability of the data. Reliability data were collected on the task statements of the cooperating teachers, the verbal behavior of the student teachers, and the inclass behaviors of the student teacher's pupils.

Studies which gather data through observational recordings must demonstrate that the data are reliable. In single subject research, this is accomplished through two or more independent observers using the same procedures to obtain the same results. High interobserver agreement indicate the data obtained are reliable.
The measures of reliability are influenced by the frequency count of each behavior category. In categories where a low frequency of occurrence exists, reliability is more difficult to obtain. Errors in classifying events are inflated by the small numbers used to calculate reliability.

Event recording was used to analyze the data on the cooperating teachers’ task and feedback statements and the student teachers’ verbal behavior. To establish interobserver agreement in event recording, two observers independently record the occurrences of behavior. Percentage of agreement is computed by dividing the smaller total by the larger total and multiplying by 100 (Cooper, Heron, Heward, 1987).

Interval recording was used to code the inclass behaviors of the student teachers’ pupils. Interobserver agreement in interval measures is calculated by the number of intervals in which observers agreed on the occurrence of a behavior. Each interval in which both observers scored the occurrence of the behavior is counted as an agreement. Interobserver agreement is calculated by dividing the number of agreement intervals by the total number of agreement intervals plus disagreement intervals and multiplying by 100 (Cooper, Heron, Heward, 1987).

Cooperating Teacher’s Task Statements - The researcher listened to all of the post teaching conference tapes. A second independent observer was familiarized with the categories and listened to at
least one post teaching conference tape during each phase of each cooperating teacher. Table 11 displays the percentage of agreement in 3 of the 4 statement categories (fully explicit, fully accountable, and general and specific feedback statements) for the seven cooperating teachers.

A fully explicit task statement had to be stated by the cooperating teacher before a fully accountable task statement could be recorded. If a coder was not aware of a previously stated explicit task, then they may not be able to tell the difference between a fully accountable task statement, a specific feedback statement, or a general feedback statement.

The independent coders did not listen to all the tapes. They therefore were unaware of some of the previously stated explicit tasks. Any asterisk (*) found on Table 11 indicates a discrepancy between fully accountable statements and either specific or general task statements. The coder recorded the statement as a feedback statement but the exact same statement was recorded as a fully accountable task statement by the second independent coder.

For example, C.T. 1 told S.T. 1 her class waiting time today was 52% and yesterday it was 29%. C.T. 1 said S.T. 1 needed to try to get waiting time between 30-35%. Coder #2 recorded this as specific feedback and coder 1 recorded it as fully explicit.
### Table 11
Interobserver Agreement On Cooperating Teachers’ Task Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>F. EXPLICIT</th>
<th>F. ACCOUNTABLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
<td>2/4=50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT-PE</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>8/10=80%</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBMS-PE</td>
<td>5/7=71%</td>
<td>0/3*</td>
<td>*2/5=40%</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
<td>3/5=60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/2=100%</td>
<td>1/3=34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBMS-PE</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/3=34%</td>
<td>0/2=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT-PE</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/1=100%</td>
<td>0/2=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT-PE</td>
<td>1/1=100%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>4/6=67%</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBMS-PE</td>
<td>7/8=88%</td>
<td>2/2=100%</td>
<td>1/3=50%</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>5/6=83%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBMS-PE</td>
<td>5/6=83%</td>
<td>*1/2=50%</td>
<td>5/5=100%</td>
<td>*0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>0/3*</td>
<td>*1/2=50%</td>
<td>*4/7=57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT-PE</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/2=0%</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>8/9=89%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>1/1=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/7=57%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>4/5=80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/2=0%</td>
<td>0/3*</td>
<td>*2/4=50%</td>
<td>*2/4=50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>3/5=60%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>5/5=100%</td>
<td>3/3=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2=50%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/4=75%</td>
<td>0/1=0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/1=100%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/3=34%</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - REFER TO SECTION ON COOPERATING TEACHERS’ TASK STATEMENTS
**Student Teacher's Verbal Behavior** - The researcher trained coders to code the verbal behavior of the student teacher's verbal behavior. Two people listened to at least one verbal behavior tape during each phase. Only the verbal behavior of S.T. 1, 2, 3, and 5 are presented. The verbal behavior of 4, 6 and 7 were not used to answer any of the research question. Table 12 displays the percentage of agreement on the coded verbal behaviors used in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST 1</td>
<td>(ALT-PE) (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Names</td>
<td>94/80/88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive General Feedback</td>
<td>98/93/88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 2</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE) (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>78/80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Names</td>
<td>78/80%</td>
<td>76/80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>92/55%</td>
<td>54/95%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 3</td>
<td>(ALT-PE) (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>86/100/89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive &amp; Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>86/100/89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 5</td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td>100/92%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pupil’s Inclass Behavior—Interobserver agreement during the study was done by two observers coding the same target class during each stage of the study. Sometimes two coders were sent to the same school from the university and sometimes one coder from the university observed with a trained cooperating teacher. Only the data for student teachers 1, 2, and 3 pupils are presented. The pupil’s behavior of 4, 5, 6, and 7 were not used to answer any of the research questions. Table 13 displays the percentage of agreement on the coded inclass behaviors used in this chapter.

Table 13
Interobserver Agreement On Pupils’ Inclass Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL’S 1</td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL’S 2</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88/78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL’S 3</td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79/95%</td>
<td>80/75/94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

What are the effects of Wilkinson & Taggart’s and Ocansey’s self instructional modules on the task statements of the cooperating teachers during post-teaching conferences with the student teacher?

A. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher’s explicit task statements during their post teaching conference?

B. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher’s accountability task statements during their post teaching conference?

C. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher’s specific feedback statements during their post teaching conference?

1A. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher’s explicit task statements during their post teaching conference?

The data on each cooperating teacher's fully explicit task statements are presented and discussed. Comparisons and differences between cooperating teachers are identified in the discussion section.

Cooperating teacher 1 had a mean of 1.4 fully explicit task statements per conference during baseline, 1.9 fully explicit task statements after intervention 1 with ALT-PE, and 4.7 explicit task statements per conference after intervention 2 with MBMS-PE (see table 14). There was an abrupt change in C.T. 1's fully explicit task statement for the conference immediately after intervention 1 which was followed by a counter therapeutic change for one conference. The last 5 conferences are characterized by improving change in level and
trend. There was an abrupt change after intervention 2 as well, but due to the limited data points it is difficult to identify a level and trend. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 71% and 33% respectively.

Cooperating teacher 2 had a mean of 1.7 fully explicit task statements per conference during baseline, 2.6 fully explicit task statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE, and 1.3 explicit task statements per day after intervention 2 with ALT-PE. There was an abrupt increase in cooperating teacher 2’s fully explicit task statements after intervention 1 followed by a counter therapeutic trend for 3 conferences and followed by an increasing and stable trend for the remainder of that experimental phase. There was a counter therapeutic change following intervention 2. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 40% and 100% respectively.

Cooperating teacher 3 had a mean of 0.7 fully explicit task statements per conference during baseline, and 2.9 fully explicit task statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was an abrupt change in C.T. 3’s fully explicit task statement after intervention 1 followed by variability in the data with all points being above or equal to the upper limit in the range of baseline. The percentage of overlapping between baseline and intervention was 50%. 
Graph 1 - Number of Fully Explicit Task Statements per Conference
Table 14

Mean Number of Fully Explicit Task Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>4.7 (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6 (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>1.3 (ALT-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.9 (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8 (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cooperating teacher 4 had a mean of 5.4 fully explicit task statements per conference during baseline, and 4.8 fully explicit task statements following intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was a countertherapeutic change in cooperating teacher 4's fully explicit task statement after intervention 1. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention was 88%.

Cooperating teacher 5 had a mean of 2.6 fully explicit task statements per conference during baseline, and 2.6 fully explicit task statements following intervention 1 with ALT-PE. There was a therapeutic trend for cooperating teacher 5's fully explicit task statement after intervention 1 followed by cyclical variability in the data. The percentage of overlapping between baseline and intervention was 100%.

Cooperating teachers 6 and 7 did not receive either treatment. Cooperating teacher 6 had a mean of 2.9 fully explicit task statements, and cooperating teacher 7 had a mean of 1.1 fully explicit task statements. Cooperating teacher 6's data has a higher level of fully explicit task statements during the second half of the study. C.T. 7 had a consistent level and trend throughout the study excluding one conference period.

Discussion on the Effects of the Self Instructional Modules had on the Cooperating Teacher's Explicit Task Statements during their Post Teaching Conference
The results indicate that changes in the number of explicit task statements occurred in three of the four cooperating teachers after MBMS-PE was completed. Cooperating teacher's 1, 2, and 3 showed some increase after MBMS, but Cooperating teacher 4's task statements decreased. However it should be noted that C.T. 4 had a high rate of explicit task statements during baseline. There is a strong probability a maximum in explicit task statements was reached during baseline ("ceiling effect"). Even though C.T. 4 had a decrease following intervention, her rate per conference was still higher than any other cooperating teacher.

It is difficult to identify a trend in cooperating teacher 1 because of the limited number of data points. A decrease in fully explicit tasks is evident on the last data point. This decrease can be associated with the time of the school year. The last data point indicates the last day of actual teaching. When there is to be no more teaching, task specifications are irrelevant. Cooperating teacher 1 stated 10 fully explicit tasks during 7 days of baseline, 13 in 7 days after completion of Basic ALT-PE, and 14 in 3 days following MBMS-PE intervention.

Cooperating Teacher 4's baseline data were affected by a conference that the university supervisor and cooperating teacher had prior to the 10th day of baseline. The university supervisor and cooperating teacher discussed the possibility of the student teacher withdrawing from student teaching. The cooperating teacher suggested some of the problems may have been due to her lack of specificity and asked the supervisor to give her more time to work with the student.
teacher. Following the discussion, cooperating teacher 4 stated in the post teaching conference after the discussion. "I will take responsibility for some of the occurring problems because I have not been specific enough as far as things that need to be done." This discussion had an effect on the number of explicit tasks stated during conference 10.

Cooperating teachers 2 and 3's task statements did increase after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 2 had 10 fully explicit task statements in 7 conferences during baseline and 26 fully explicit task statements in 10 conferences after completion of MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 3 had 8 fully explicit in 10 conferences during baseline and 29 in 10 conferences following MBMS-PE.

The increases indicate that the cooperating teachers are able to refine their communications and thereby specify task statements in a fully explicit manner during their conferences through the completion of MBMS-PE.

The Basic ALT-PE module did not effect the explicit task statements of the cooperating teachers. Only one of cooperating teacher 1's data points were above the baseline level during the Basic ALT-PE phase. Cooperating teacher 3 had completed Basic ALT-PE prior to the study, so a true baseline could not be collected. However, Cooperating Teacher 3's baseline level with ALT-PE was minimal. Cooperating Teacher 5's explicit task statements had such variability that is impossible to identify a trend or level without having both baseline and intervention extended.
Cooperating teacher 2's explicit task statements fell below baseline level after completion of Basic ALT-PE, but it is felt that the last three data points were effected by the time of the school year. The last three data points indicate the last three days of school, in which two classes were combined and one softball game was played.

Basic ALT-PE was designed to train teachers to provide data based feedback to student teachers. The ability to provide data based feedback does not seem to have an effect on the explicit task statements of the cooperating teacher.

The rate of cooperating teacher 6's task statements were higher than cooperating teacher 2 after C.T. 2 received intervention with MBMS-PE. However, MBMS still had in effect on C.T. 2's explicit task statements. There are many explanations for C.T. 6's high rate of task statements. First, cooperating teacher 6 observed and kept notes on her student teacher each day. She then discussed her notes completely during the post teaching conference. She demonstrated effective supervisory techniques during this study. Second, cooperating teacher 6's curriculum consisted of 5 different activities (softball, mile run, sit and reach test, height measurement, and two days of activities that the students chose) during the first 9 data points. The last eight data points were collected during a combined unit of badminton and table tennis. Therefore, cooperating teacher 6 was providing task statements to her student teacher on new activities every second day during the first 9 conferences. Cooperating teacher 6 had 2 different activities to discuss each day during the last 9
conferences. All other cooperating teacher's post teaching conferences were based on only one activity. Finally, cooperating teacher 6's pupils had physical education every other day. The student teacher taught the same lesson two days in a row during the second half of the study. Cooperating teacher 6's task statements would be high before student teacher 6 taught a lesson for the first time, and would be low during the post teaching conference prior to student teacher 6's second presentation of the lesson.

Cooperating 7's remained stable throughout the study, except on day 13, which was the first day of softball.
B. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher's accountability task statement during their post teaching conference?

Data for fully accountable statements are found in figure 2 and 3, and Table 15. The data in figure 2 display the cooperating teachers fully accountable statements through each experimental phase. Figure 3 displays the relationship between fully explicit and fully accountable task statements. Table 15 shows the mean number of fully accountable task statements during baseline and after each intervention.

Cooperating teacher 1 had a mean of 0.4 fully accountable task statements per conference during baseline, 0.3 fully accountable task statements following intervention 1 with ALT-PE, and 1.3 fully accountable task statements per conference following intervention 2 with MBMS-PE. There was no change in cooperating teacher 1's fully accountable task statements during intervention 1. There was an increase in fully accountable statements following intervention 2, but due to limited data points it is difficult to identify a level and trend. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 100% and 66% respectively.

Cooperating teacher 2 had a mean of 0.1 fully accountable task statements per conference during baseline, 0.8 fully accountable task statements following the MBMS-PE intervention 1, and 0.6 fully accountable task statements per conference after intervention 2 with ALT-PE. There was a small increase in the daily rate of cooperating
teacher 2's fully accountable task statements following intervention 1. There was little change after intervention 2. The percentage of overlapping between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 80% and 100% respectively.

Cooperating teacher 3 had a mean of 0.2 fully accountable task statements per conference during baseline, and 2.5 fully accountable task statements following intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was a small change in cooperating teacher 3's fully accountable task statement following intervention 1 which was followed by a temporary deterioration, then an improving change in level and trend equal to or above the initial abrupt change. The percentage of overlapping between baseline and intervention was 20%.

Cooperating teacher 4 had a mean of 1.0 fully accountability task statements per conference during baseline, and 2.5 fully accountability task statements following intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was a delayed change in level in cooperating teacher 4's fully accountable task statements after intervention 1 followed by variability in level and trend. Three of the last 4 data points were equal to or above the upper limit of baseline range. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention was 63%.

Cooperating teacher 5 had a mean of 1.1 fully accountable task statements per conference during baseline, and 0.7 fully accountable task statements following intervention 1 with ALT-PE. There was a counter therapeutic change in trend for cooperating teacher 5's fully
explicit task statement following intervention 1. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention was 100%.

Cooperating teachers 6 and 7 did not receive either treatment. Cooperating teacher had a mean of 1.4 fully accountable task statements, and cooperating teacher 7 had a mean of .1 fully accountable task statements for the duration of the study.

Discussion on the Effects of the Self Instructional Modules had on the Cooperating Teacher's Fully Accountable Task Statements during their Post Teaching Conference

The results indicate that changes did occur in the cooperating teacher's accountability task statements after MBMS-PE but not after Basic ALT-PE. In some cases the increase is small (going from no fully accountable statements to one each conference). This possibly was due to the limited time of the conference (5 to 15 minutes). The cooperating teacher may have held the student teacher accountable for their behavior's at times other than the taped post teaching conference. The low ceiling for accountability statements during a post teaching conference may also have been related to the small increases. The number of fully accountable statements were directly related to the number of fully explicit task statements made. The ratio between fully explicit and accountable statements is a better indication of the interventions effect than is mean total.
GRAPH 2 - NUMBER OF FULLY ACCOUNTABLE TASK STATEMENTS PER CONFERENCE
Table 15

Mean Number of Fully Accountable Task Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>1.3 (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.8 (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>.6 (ALT-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>2.5 (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5 (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7 (ALT-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicate the cooperating teachers held their student teachers accountable for more of their explicit task statements after MBMS-PE (Table 16). Cooperating teacher 2 held his student teacher accountable for 8% of his explicit task statements during baseline, and 31% after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 3 held her student teacher accountable for 29% of her explicit task statements during baseline, and 86% after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 4 held her student teacher accountable for 20% of her explicit task statements during baseline, and 53% after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 1's explicit/accountable statements ratio remained the same after MBMS-PE was completed as the second intervention (30%). The minimum amount of data collected for cooperating teacher 1's third phase may have had an effect on this result.

The range in the cooperating teacher's baseline means (1.1 - 1.4) demonstrates a great deal of variability. C.T. 6 had the highest mean, and C.T. 2 had the lowest. The concepts of explicitness and accountability are not new. The modules were designed to emphasize the importance of explicitness and accountability in the post teaching conferences. The inability of cooperating teachers to be explicit and accountable was not an assumption of this study. The level at baseline was not a concern of the researcher. The study looked for changes in baseline level after intervention.

Cooperating teacher 1 had 3 fully accountable task statements in 7 conferences during baseline, 2 in 7 conferences after Basic ALT-PE, and 4 in 3 conferences after MBMS-PE.
Cooperating teacher 2 had 1 fully accountable statements in 7 conferences during baseline, 6 in 10 conferences after MBMS-PE, and 4 in 7 conferences after Basic ALT-PE.

Cooperating teacher 3 showed a change in trend and level with little overlap between phases. Cooperating teacher 3 had 2 fully explicit task statement in 10 conferences during baseline (Basic ALT-PE), 23 in 10 conferences after MBMS-PE.

Cooperating teacher 4 had 13 fully accountable statements during 14 baseline conferences, and 21 in 8 conferences following intervention with MBMS-PE. All but two of the data points after intervention with MBMS-PE are above or equal to the upper limit of the range of baseline fully accountable task statements.

Cooperating teacher 5's fully accountable statements were adversely effected by Basic ALT-PE. The number of fully explicit task statements actually went down. C.T. 5 had 8 fully accountable task statements during 7 baseline conferences, and 6 during 8 conferences following intervention with Basic ALT-PE.

ALT-PE seemed to have an adverse effect on the percentage of fully explicit task statements that the student teacher was held accountable for. Cooperating teacher 1's percentage decreased from 30% during baseline to 15% after completion of the module, and cooperating teacher 5's percentage decreased from 42% to 32%. Cooperating teacher 3 had a percentage of 29% during ALT-PE alone. Basic ALT-PE was designed to train the user to provide specific data based feedback. Cooperating teachers 1 and 3 completed Basic ALT-PE before MBMS-PE. It seemed the cooperating teachers based their conference on the
specific data collected for the target class for that day, and not on previously stated task statements. This may have caused the reduction in fully accountable task statements.

Cooperating teacher 6 and 7 did not receive either treatment. Cooperating teacher 6 had a fully explicit/fully accountable task statements percentage of 43%, and cooperating teacher 7's percentage was 17%.

The variability in cooperating teacher 6's accountability may be directly related to her school curriculum. Since her pupils had physical education class every other day, her student teacher taught the same lesson twice. The post teaching conference prior to either lesson had a high number of explicit task statements with few accountability statements. The conference between lessons usually had a high number of accountability statements and few task statements, especially toward the end of the study (see figure 3).

The nature of Basic ALT-PE is to allow the cooperating teacher to provide data based feedback. The module does not train teachers to communicate the data in fully explicit and accountable ways. MBMS-PE does affect the cooperating teachers explicit and accountability statements positively.
Table 16

Percentage of Fully Accountable Statements Following Fully Explicit Task Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>3/10=30%</td>
<td>2/12=15%</td>
<td>4/14=29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>1/12=8%</td>
<td>8/26=31%</td>
<td>4/9=44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/7=29%</td>
<td>25/29=86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>13/69=20%</td>
<td>20/38=53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>9/18=42%</td>
<td>7/22=32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ALT-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>23/53=43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td>4/24=17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3 - Relationship Between Fully Explicit and Accountable Task Statements
C. What are the effects of the self instructional modules on the cooperating teacher's specific feedback statements during their post teaching conference?

Data for specific feedback statements are found in figure 4 and 5, and Table 17. The data in figure 4 displays the change in all cooperating teachers' specific feedback statements through each phase. Figure 5 displays the change in general and specific feedback after interventions. Table 17 displays the percentage of specific feedback statements during baseline and after each intervention.

Cooperating teacher 1 had a mean of 3.7 specific feedback statements per conference during baseline, 3.7 specific feedback statements after intervention 1 with ALT-PE, and 3 specific feedback statements per conference after intervention 2 with MBMS-PE. There was an abrupt change in cooperating teacher 1's specific feedback statements for one conference after intervention 1 with steady decleration after the abrupt change. There was an abrupt change after intervention 2 as well, but due to limited data points it is difficult to identify a level and trend. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 83% and 66% respectively.

During baseline, 58% of cooperating teacher 1's feedback statements was specific. Following ALT-PE, 72% of all feedback was specific, and after both modules were completed specific feedback accounted for 82% of all feedback during the post teaching conferences.
Cooperating teacher 2 had a mean of 0.7 specific feedback statements per conference during baseline, 1.9 specific feedback statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE, and 2 specific feedback statements per conference after intervention 2 with ALT-PE. There was some increase in specific feedback statements after completion of intervention 1 until the end of intervention 1. The level after intervention 2 was higher than baseline and similar to intervention 1. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention 1 and 2 was 50% and 29% respectively.

During baseline, 33% of cooperating teacher 2's feedback statements was specific. After MBMS-PE, 79% of all feedback was specific, and after both modules were completed specific feedback made up 74% of all feedback given during the post teaching conferences.

Cooperating teacher 3 had a mean of 4.2 specific feedback statements per conference during baseline, and 2 specific feedback statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was an abrupt deceleration in cooperating teacher 3's specific feedback statements after intervention 1 which was followed by a therapeutic trend for 4 conferences. The last two conferences contained one specific feedback statement each. The percentage of overlap between baseline and intervention was 60%.

During baseline (ALT-PE), 74% of cooperating teacher 3's feedback statements were specific. After MBMS-PE was completed, 71% of all feedback during the post teaching conferences was specific.
Cooperating teacher 4 had a mean of 0.7 specific feedback statements per conference during baseline and 1.8 specific feedback statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. There was a great deal of variability in the number of specific feedback statements during phase 2. The percentage of overlap between phases was 88%. However, many of the data points fell near the upper limit of baseline's range.

During baseline, 67% of cooperating teacher 4's feedback statements were specific. After ALT-PE was completed, 93% of all feedback given during the post teaching conferences was specific.

Cooperating teacher 5 had a mean of 2.7 specific feedback statements per day during baseline, and 2.8 specific feedback statements after intervention 1 with MBMS-PE. Specific feedback statements after intervention 1 showed a therapeutic trend although overlap between phases was 100%.

During baseline, 59% of cooperating teacher 5's feedback statements were specific. After MBMS-PE was completed, 82% of all feedback given during the post teaching conferences was specific.

Cooperating teachers 6 and 7 did not receive either treatment. Cooperating teacher 6 had a mean of 2.5 specific feedback statements per conference, with 51% of feedback being specific. C.T. 6's specific feedback statements remained at steady level during the study. Cooperating teacher 7 had a mean of 2.9 specific feedback statements per conference, with 62% of feedback being specific. Specific feedback statements of C.T. 7 showed a counter-therapeutic trend.
Graph 4 - Number of Specific Feedback Statements per Conference
Graph 5 - Relationship between Specific and General Statements
Table 17
Percentage of Feedback Statements That were Specific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT 1</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72% (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>82% (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>79% (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td>74% (ALT-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>74% (ALT-PE)</td>
<td>71% (MBMS-PE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>93% (MBMS-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 5</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>82% (ALT-PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 6</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 7</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion about the Effects of the Self Instructional Modules had on the Cooperating Teacher's Specific Feedback Statements during their Post Teaching Conference

The data indicate that the overall effect both modules had on the mean total of specific feedback statements given during the post teaching conferences was varied. Cooperating teacher 2 demonstrated an increase of 1.2 specific feedbacks per conference over baseline after completion of Basic ALT-PE. The increase remained the same after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 4 demonstrated an increase of 1.1 specific feedback statement per conference after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 5 demonstrated an increase of .7 specific feedback statement per conference after ALT-PE.

Cooperating teacher 1's specific feedback statements remained the same after ALT-PE was completed and decreased by (.7) after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 3's specific feedback statements decreased 2.2 statements per conference below baseline (ALT-PE) after MBMS-PE was completed.

Cooperating teacher 1 and 3's decrease in specific feedback statements after completion of MBMS-PE may be correlated with their increase in fully accountable task statements. Both cooperating teachers had an increase in their fully explicit task and accountability statements after completion of both modules. Specific feedback provided to their student teachers decreased during this time. It seems that the cooperating teacher 1 and 3's interaction
were directed toward the accountability of the fully explicit tasks that were stated in previous conferences.

The percentage of specific feedback statements given when compared to all feedback statements (both general and specific) increased dramatically after the completion of either one or both of the modules. Cooperating teacher 1's percentage of specific feedback statements increased by 22% over baseline after ALT-PE and 41% over baseline after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 2's percentage of specific feedback statements increased by 139% over baseline after MBMS-PE and 124% over baseline after ALT-PE. Cooperating teacher 4's percentage of specific feedback statements increased by 39% over baseline after MBMS-PE. Cooperating teacher 5's percentage of specific feedback statements increased by 40% over baseline after ALT-PE. Cooperating teacher 3's percentage of specific feedback statements stayed about the same (74% during baseline with ALT-PE, and 71% after MBMS-PE).

These results indicate that both modules change the cooperating teachers' feedback statements. The cooperating teachers become more specific with their feedback to the student teacher after either one or both of the modules are completed. Basic ALT-PE has a greater effect on the number of specific feedback statements than did MBMS-PE. MBMS-PE had a greater effect on the number of fully explicit and accountable task statements, but led to a decrease in the number of specific feedback statements given. Apparently, specific feedback provided after MBMS is directed to the fully explicit task statements.
Since Basic ALT-PE did not effect explicit task statements, the specific feedback given is not directed toward task statements.

Summary

The results indicate that changes in the number of explicit task statements occurred in three of the four cooperating teachers after MBMS-PE was completed. The increases indicate that the cooperating teachers are able to refine their communications and thereby specify task statements in a fully explicit manner during their conferences through the completion of MBMS-PE.

The Basic ALT-PE module did not effect the explicit task statements of the cooperating teachers. Basic ALT-PE was designed to train teachers to provide data based feedback to student teachers. Changes occurred in the cooperating teacher's accountability task statements after MBMS-PE but did not occur after Basic ALT-PE. In some cases the increase is small (going from no fully accountable statements to one each conference), but this may be due to the limited time of the conference (5 to 15 minutes), and the low ceiling for accountability statements during a post teaching conference.

The results also indicate that the cooperating teachers held their student teachers accountable for more of their explicit task statements after MBMS-PE. ALT-PE seems to have an adverse effect on the fully explicit/fully accountable task statement percentage. The module does not seem to train teachers to communicate the data based feedback in fully explicit and accountable ways. MBMS-PE does affect
the cooperating teachers explicit and accountability statements positively.

The overall effect both modules had on the mean total of specific feedback statements given during the post teaching conferences was varied. Three of the five cooperating teachers increased specific feedback after completion of the modules. Two of the cooperating teachers who completed both modules demonstrated a decrease in their specific feedback rate. The decrease in specific feedback statements may be correlated with their increase in fully accountable task statements. Both these cooperating teachers had an increase in their fully accountable statements after completion of both modules.

Specific feedback provided to their student teachers decreased during this time. It seems that the cooperating teacher 1 and 3's interaction were directed toward the accountability of the fully explicit tasks that were stated in previous conferences.

It seems the cooperating teacher focuses on collecting data which was related to the previously stated explicit task after completion of MBMS-PE. The collected data was used to compare the student teacher's performance to the criteria of the explicit task. This allows the cooperating teacher to hold the student teacher accountable. The cooperating teachers who completed Basic ALT-PE had an instrument to categorize what they observe during the targeted lesson. The observation was not directed toward a particular behavior or task. The cooperating teacher reported what they observed in the form of specific feedback statements and not accountability statements.
The percentage of specific feedback statements given when compared to all feedback statements (both general and specific) increased for all cooperating teachers after the completion of either one or both of the modules. These results indicate that both modules change the cooperating teachers feedback statements. The cooperating teachers become more specific with their feedback to the student teacher after either one or both of the modules are completed.
Research Question #2

What are the effects of the intervention on the targeted behaviors of the student teacher that are identified by the cooperating teacher?

A. Is there a relationship between the explicitness and accountability of task statements and the teaching behaviors of the student teacher?

B. What are the effects on the student teacher's behavior on the inclass behavior of the pupils?

2A. Is there a relationship between the explicitness and accountability of task statements and the teaching behaviors of the student teacher?

This section of the results will discuss the relationship between the explicit and accountability task statements of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher's behavior. The explicit and accountability task statements written on the supervisory guides (part of the MBMS-PE module) were used to discuss the relationship. These task statements were chosen because the percentage of fully accountable statements following fully explicit task statements were highest during the phase with MBMS-PE. Fully explicit and accountable task statements which were similar to those found on the supervisory guide were used to show the relationship for those cooperating teachers who did complete not MBMS-PE. Changes in the student teacher's behavior were identified by either the inclass audiotapes, summary data collected using Basic ALT-PE, or by the student teachers lesson plans. The effective teaching checklist was not used to
identify behavioral changes due to the subjectiveness of the instrument.

Figures 6 through 9 show the relationship between the explicit and accountable task statements of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher's teaching behavior.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 1 decided to decrease transition time to 20%, decrease waiting time to 30-35%, and to increase enthusiasm. The teacher was to watch 3 thirty minute classes starting on lesson 15. Transition time over the next 4 observed periods was 27% (reliability check: 92%), 25%, 22%, and 13%. Waiting time over the same 4 days was 52% (interobserver agreement: 92%), 37%, 29%, and 58% (see figure 6). The average baseline rate was 23% transition time and 37% waiting. Student teacher 1's positive general feedback and use of names increased after the task to increase enthusiasm was stated. Positive general feedback was at a rate of 1.8, .9, and 2.0 per minute and use of names rose to 2.3, 1.9, and 1.7 per minute after intervention (see figure 6).

Waiting and transition time are not always functionally independent. The changes that are made in one of the ALT-PE categories has a direct effect on the other categories. It was hoped that much of the time spent after this task statement was written would be in activity time. The activity was softball. Waiting time is usually higher during a softball unit, especially if games are being played. Transition time consistently decreased after the task
Graph 6 - Relationship Between C.T. 1's Task Statements, Student Teacher 1's Teaching Behaviors and Student Teacher 1's Pupils Inclass Behavior.
was stated. Waiting time also decreased until the last day, in which a softball game was played. Cooperating teacher 1 stated during the last conference that "You can't worry about activity time during softball."

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 2 first worked on increasing use of student names (lessons 6-8). The cooperating teacher stated that he would listen to one audiotape of the student teacher's verbal behavior and count the number of student names used. It was stated by the cooperating teacher that the student teacher used student names frequently and was able to use a name when giving a positive interaction.

The rate by which student teacher 2 used student names during teacher-pupil interaction increased above the upper level of the baseline range (2.6) for all three days that verbal behavior was recorded (Figure 7).

The second task was to reduce management time (lessons 12-14) by turning lesson plans in 1 day prior to lesson, provide clear and concise instructions, reduce dressing time at start of period to 2 minutes beyond tardy bell, use student aides to help with sit-up techniques, and post team rosters in gym to eliminate time consuming questions.

Cooperating teacher 2 stated that the student teacher turned her lesson plans in on time, reduced dressing time, posted team rosters, and used gym aides appropriately. She still needed to work on providing concise instructions. Management time was coded to be 0% on
lesson 12 and 1% (interobserver agreement: 87%) on lesson 14. Management time prior to intervention was 6% (see figure 7).

The third task was to increase activity time to approximately 35-40% of period (lessons 15-17). This was to be done by effectively using management and transition periods and by handing in her lesson plan early. Cooperating teacher 2 said activity time was high but it was probably due to playing the actual soccer game. Activity time during a "drill" activities still needed to be increased. Activity time was coded to be 41% and 30%, transition was 23% and 31%, and management time was 1% and 5% during lesson 16 and 17 respectively (see figure 7).

The fourth task was to reduce transition time to between 10-15% (lessons 18-20). This was to be done by turning in lesson plans early and plan lessons efficiently to help reduce transition time. Cooperating teacher 2's comments were the amount of transition time between drills was relatively low, but time from building to field took too long (4-5 minutes), and periods of transition during drills due to retrieving errant throws was frequent (see figure 7).

Transition time was coded by the cooperating teacher to be 10% for lesson 18, 30% for lesson 19, and 25% during lesson 20. Student teacher 2's goal for improving her teaching (as written on her lesson plan) during these lessons was to get the exercises done and get students into play quickly (see figure 7).
Graph 7 - Relationship between C.T. 2's Task Statements, S.T. 2's Teaching Behaviors and S.T. 2's Pupils Inclass Behavior
The fifth task was to increase the use of positive behavioral interactions (lessons 21-24). This was to be accomplished by the student teacher turning in lessons early and reviewing information collected by the cooperating teacher (as written on the supervisory guide). The goal was to use 9-10 positive behavioral interactions over the period. Comments were that 6, 5, 3, and 3 positive behavioral interaction statements were stated during the 4 targeted lessons. It was written that remarks were not individualized enough, too general. The audiotapes during this time period were coded and 18, 8, 14, and 7 were tallied on lessons 21-24 respectively (see figure 7).

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 3's first task was to increase feedback on the proper use of a previously taught skill during game situations (specific skill feedback) to a rate of one per minute (lesson 12). Student teacher 3 emitted .6, .4, and .6 feedbacks per minute on the proper use of skills after the task was stated.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 3's second task was to decrease waiting time to 10% during badminton game play (lesson 14) by having students not involved in a game situation volleying between the courts. Other strategies suggested to minimize waiting time during games was to use hustles to encourage students to go after loose shuttlecocks more quickly to limit games to 5 minutes and if a certain amount of points are reached, the players get a bonus.

Waiting time during game play during lesson 15 was 46% and it rose to 63% (lesson 16). This task was modified the next day. The
Graph 8 - Relationship between C.T. 3's task statements, S.T. 3's teaching behaviors and S.T. 3's pupils inclass behavior.
new criteria was to decrease waiting time by 5% during a badminton unit (stated after lesson 16). Cooperating teacher and student teacher 3 also decided to increase activity time by 5% during the badminton unit while they decreased waiting time.

Waiting time was 42% and activity was 26% for lesson 16. Waiting time was 23% and activity time rose to 46% for lesson 17 (see figure 8). Lesson 17 was the last day of badminton taught by the student teacher. She was excused to organize and supervise an elementary school field day with her elementary cooperating teacher. She provided lesson plans to her cooperating teacher for the two lessons she missed.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 3's next task was to provide feedback on skill performance at a rate of one per minute during her archery unit (stated after lesson 17). The rate of either positive specific or corrective feedback was .2 for lesson 17. The rate rose to 2.0 (lesson 18). The cooperating teacher acknowledged the achievement of the task, and then increased the criteria of the task to a rate of 2 per minute. Skill feedback on skill performance was given at a rate of .7, and 1.0 on the final two lessons of the study.

A task statement that required the student teacher to increase her classes activity time to 40% was stated on the same day as the task to provide skill feedback at a rate of 2 per minute (after lesson 18). Activity time was 9% (interobserver agreement: 75%) for lesson 18 and rose to 27% (interobserver agreement: 94%) during lesson 19. Activity time was coded at 21% for lesson 20 (see figure 8).
Cooperating teacher and student teacher 4's first task was to provide individual positive specific feedback at a rate of 5 per day during the class period (lessons 16 and 17). The student teacher was to observe the target class pupil's, identify those who needed help, and then to provide individual instruction. The first day the student teacher gave three individual instructions and the next day none were given.

When the researcher coded the audiotape for lesson 16. Five positive specific feedbacks were heard, and two corrective feedbacks were coded. The audiotape for 5/13 picked up only 6 minutes of student teachers 4's verbal behavior so this tape was not used.

The second task was to increase activity time in the target class to 30% (for lesson 21). The student teacher was to accomplish this by better organization thereby reducing transition time, increasing activity time, and keeping instructions clear and concise. The task was reached the next day when activity time was coded at 66% by the cooperating teacher. The lesson plan did not include any organizational strategies that could account for this change in activity time.

The fourth task was an extension of task three. The student teacher was to increase activity time to 50% by performing the same tasks as was stated in task 3 (lesson 22). It was reported by the cooperating teacher 4 that the task was not achieved when activity time was only 45%.

Activity time was coded by the trained observers to be 15% (Interobserver Agreement: 83) on the day the fourth task was attempted.
One of cooperating teacher and student teacher 5's tasks were to increase use of pupil's name. C.T. 5 stated if the students are doing line drills, then S.T. 5 should be able to use the pupil's name in interaction each time the pupil passes him (conference 2). The cooperating teacher restated the task on conference 3. During conference 3, the student teacher was told he still wasn't using names enough. The student teacher was reinforced verbally for completing the task during lesson 6. The audiotapes during this time period were coded and use of names were coded at a rate of .6, .9, 1.4, 1.5, a minute on lessons 3, 4, 5, and 6 respectively (see figure 9).

The focus of the task statements of cooperating teacher 6 were so specific (make a sign, fill out certificates), the data collection instruments could not identify a change in the student teacher's behavior. However the cooperating teacher did identify changes. During conference 9, S.T. 6 was told to only rotate the class between activities once during a class, and always be in a position so both activities can be observed. The C.T. stated both tasks were completed during conference 11 and the student teacher received positive feedback (Good Job!). During the same conference the C.T. stated a task which involved making a sign to remind the students of an upcoming test. The student teacher completed the task and was reinforced during conference 12. C.T. 6 told her student teacher to have all the students face the stage during lecture so they can't watch the boys. The C.T. stated the next day "One student wasn't facing the stage, tell them you want to see their faces."
Graph 9 - Relationship between C.T. 5's task statements and S. T. 5's teaching behaviors
Cooperating Teacher 7 held student teacher 7 accountable for only 4 explicit task statements during 21 conferences. During conference 2, student teacher 7 was told to provide feedback to groups other than the group she was directly working with. C.T. 7 reinforced the student during conference 3 on providing feedback to other groups.

Discussion on the Relationship Between Explicitness and Accountability of Task Statements and the Teaching Behaviors of the Student Teacher.

The change in the verbal behaviors of the cooperating teacher after completion of MBMS-PE had a positive effect on the verbal behavior of some of the student teacher's. In a few instances, small changes appeared in some of the Basic ALT-PE categories and in class organization and presentation after task statements were directed toward increasing or decreasing time in those categories.

It is very difficult to correlate these changes to the cooperating teacher's verbal behavior. This study was done in a real school, not a controlled setting. Changes did occur in different settings during the study. However, since the settings were not controlled, there were are great deal of uncontrolled variables that may have caused the change.

Student teacher 2 increased her use of student names across a three day period after that behavior was targeted. Student teacher 3 increased her rate of providing skill feedback to her students during archery to a level of one per minute. Student teacher 1 increased her
positive verbal interactions and use of names after the task was to improve her enthusiasm. However, it is not known exactly how cooperating teacher 1 defined enthusiasm. It also should be noted that the increase in student teacher 1's positive interaction occurred during the final days of student teaching. Student teacher 4 increased his use of names, and student teacher 7 provided more group feedback after those behaviors were targeted.

Student teacher 2 could not provide 9 positive behavioral interactions per day during a softball unit. Student teacher 3 could not emit positive specific feedback at a rate of one per minute, nor could she increase her skill feedback during archery to a rate of 2 per minute. Student teacher 4 could not work with 5 students individually and provide instruction during class.

When the explicit task statement was directed toward changing the way the student teacher's pupils spent their time in class, the results were mixed. Student teacher 1 decreased her pupil's overall time in transition for 3 consecutive days at the end of her softball unit. She decreased waiting time for two days in a row. The third day was high in waiting time. Student teacher 2 reduced her class's management time for two consecutive days. Time spent in management prior to intervention was coded by the observers to be a small percentage of the class time. The observers were told to start coding when the student teacher started class. Student teacher 3 reduced her classes waiting time and increased their activity time the day following the verbalization of the task statement by the cooperating
teacher. Student teacher 6 positively changed her classroom presentations and organization.

Student teacher 2 could not decrease her classes transition time or activity time in the appropriate direction when that was the specified task. Student teacher 3 could not minimize waiting time during game play in badminton, nor could she increase activity time to 40% during archery. Student teacher 4 could not increase his class activity time to 50% during a speedball unit.

It is very difficult to state that a change in the student teacher's behavior was directly related to a change in the cooperating teacher’s verbal behavior (task statements). Student teacher 1's change in use of student names is the strongest correlation because of the minimal overlap between intervention and baseline. It is encouraging that other similarly targeted verbal interaction behaviors changed in the appropriate direction. However, there were many behaviors that did not change.

The relationship between the cooperating and student teacher’s change in behavior seems to be strengthened by the performance of the cooperating teachers who did not complete MBMS-PE. Those cooperating teacher’s changed student teacher’s behavior positively due to fully explicit and accountable statements. Since those explicit tasks which were followed by fully accountable statements were the tasks that were achieved, it seems essential to increase the explicit-accountable ratio. The cooperating teachers who completed MBMS-PE had the highest explicit-accountable ratio.
There are several explanations why the behaviors did not change even though the cooperating teacher was fully explicit and accountable with the task statement. Four possible explanations are discussed below.

1. The antecedent stimuli that preceded and the consequences that followed the student teacher's behavioral response were not powerful enough to cause a change in the emitted response. The antecedent stimulus that preceded the student teacher's behavior was the cooperating teacher's task statement. The explicit task statement had a criteria which could not be achieved by the student teacher within the chosen time frame. The lack of achievement could have been caused by (A) a criteria level that was set to high, (B) a lack of effective teaching strategies provided by the cooperating teacher to achieve the criteria, or (C) an inability by the student teacher to emit the targeted behavior.

The criteria should be set at an achievable level, and that level should be agreed upon by both parties involved. The student teacher needs to value the importance of the targeted behavior. The level should be adjusted accordingly after a few observation periods. Both modules discuss general criteria for such things as activity time and use of positive feedback. These criteria fluctuate, depending on activity and teaching setting. The general criteria for activity time (<40%) is more easily reached in a badminton unit than in a softball or archery unit. Providing positive feedback in a well disciplined class
should be easier than an unruly class. These factors may not have been considered by the cooperating teacher when criteria were set.

Strategies must be suggested and implemented that will allow for success. The cooperating teacher and, under normal conditions, university supervisor should be used as resources by the student teacher. If a student teacher is given a task for which he/she does not have the ability or resources to accomplish, the task will not be completed.

The student teacher must have acquired the teaching skills needed to be an effective teacher during preservice training if effective teaching is to be demonstrated during student teaching. The teacher training program is responsible to hold the students accountable prior to student teaching.

The consequences provided to the student teacher during student teaching did not seem to be powerful enough. The immediate reinforcer was the cooperating teacher's verbal praise and the delayed reinforcer was a positive reference written by the cooperating teacher. In an ideal setting, a change in the student teacher's pupils behavior would be reinforcing enough to cause the student teacher to emit appropriate responses. This, however, does not seem to be the case in most student teachers. The consequences which follow the emitted response need to be enhanced if changes in the student teacher's behavior are to occur.

2. The number of task statements given to the student teacher may also have an effect on the student teacher's inability to reach
criterion. The student teacher may not been able to concentrate on two tasks at the same time (increase activity time and positive feedback). The student teacher's have had to concentrate on more than one task at a time during their preservice training. However, the settings have been more controlled than during the student teaching experience. The effects socialization to public school teaching have on the student teacher was not addressed in this study. However, it is possible it had an effect on the student teacher's teaching behaviors.

3. The fact that the student teacher is graded pass-fail may also be a factor in why the behaviors did not change. A student teacher who is required to perform only at an average level to pass may only work to achieve that criteria. The criteria may be stated in an incomplete and implicit manner. Student teachers fail to follow through with tasks which are implicit (Hawkins, Wiegard, & Landin, 1985).

4. It is unknown how reliable the cooperating teacher's data collecting system was. There were a few instances when the cooperating teacher stated the behavior was or was not achieved though this did not concur with the data collected by the researcher. The operational definition of the stated criteria may have caused this discrepancy. Cooperating teacher 3 defined activity time differently than did Basic ALT-PE (activity time was coded to be 45% by the cooperating teacher and 13/8% by Basic ALT-PE). On two occassions, the student teacher's verbal behavior was coded and the final results
of the researcher were different than the results reported by the cooperating teacher (cooperating teacher 2 and 3 both had lower totals than the researcher in the area of positive interaction). This may again have been due to a different operational definition. The type of data collection instrument used is not as important as the reliability of the data collected using the instrument. The collected data has to be accurate and reliable, so the student teacher receives a true picture of his/her performance.
2B. What are the effects on the student teacher's behavior on the inclass behavior of the pupils?

This section discusses the effect a change in the student teacher's teaching behaviors had on the inclass pupil's behavior. The only examples used in this section are those in which a student teacher demonstrated a change in their teaching behaviors in accordance with their cooperating teacher's explicit task statement. The change in student teacher's behavior is stated first, followed by the observed change in the inclass pupil's behavior.

Student teacher 1 decreased her pupil's overall time in transition for 3 consecutive days at the end of her softball unit. She decreased waiting time for two days in a row. The third day was high in waiting time. Student teacher 2 reduced her class's management time for two consecutive days. Student teacher 3 reduced her classes waiting time and increased their activity time the day following the verbalization of the task statement by the cooperating teacher.

The changes that the student teacher made in their class presentations had an effect on the inclass behaviors of at least three students per class. The changes are limited to the categories used in Basic ALT-PE. Student teacher 1's pupil's time spent in transition was reduced for three consecutive days, and time spent waiting was reduced for two consecutive days. Student teacher 2's pupils spent a minimal percentage of their class time in activities that were unrelated to soccer for two consecutive days. Student teacher 3's
pupils spent more time active and less time waiting on 5/19 than they did on 5/18.

The instrumentation used in this study to collect data could not identify a change in the inclass behavior of the pupils if the changed behavior in the student teacher was his/her verbal behavior. It was possible to identify changes in the pupil's inclass behavior if the student teacher's change was made in the organization of the class presentation.
RESEARCH QUESTION #3

Can the student teachers' teaching behaviors that have reached criterion level be maintained when intervention begins on another teaching behavior?

A. Are any of the cooperating teacher's explicit and/or accountability task statements directed toward behaviors that have reached criterion within the next two post teaching conferences?

B. Are the student teacher's behaviors that have achieved criterion level maintained over two class periods without any of the cooperating teachers explicit and/or accountability task statements directed at the achieved behavior?

3A. Are any of the cooperating teacher's explicit and/or accountability task statements directed toward behaviors that have reached criterion within the next two post teaching conferences?

Student teacher 1 decreased her pupil's overall time in transition for 3 consecutive days at the end of her softball unit, and decreased waiting time for two consecutive days. Student teacher 1 also increased her positive verbal interactions and use of names following a task statement to improve her enthusiasm. This occurred on the last teaching day of the school year so there was no post teaching conferences.

Student teacher 2 increased her use of student names across a three day period, and reduced her class's management time for two consecutive days after those behaviors were targeted. None of cooperating teacher 2's task statements during both subsequent conferences were directed toward these improvements.
Student teacher 3 increased skill feedback to her students during archery to a level of one per minute, reduced waiting time and increased activity time during badminton lessons. One of cooperating teacher 3's task statements the day following increased feedback was to increase skill feedback to a rate of two per minute. Student teacher 3 was held accountable for that task for the next 2 days. The cooperating teacher stated a task aimed toward an increase in activity time in archery the day after activity was increased in badminton.

Student teacher 4 increased his classes activity time above the set criteria of 30%. Cooperating teacher 4 acknowledged this accomplishment and raised it to 50% for the next class meeting.

Student teacher 5 increased his use of student names across a four day period after that behaviors were targeted. None of cooperating teacher 5's task statements during both subsequent conferences were directed toward these improvements.

The only task applicable to follow up was student positioning during lecture. Cooperating teacher 6 did not discuss that task during the next two conferences.

Cooperating teacher 7 provided positive specific feedback on student teacher 7's classroom feedback the conference following completion of the stated task.
Discussion on the Direction of the Cooperating Teacher's Explicit and/or Accountability Task Statements Within the Next Two Post Teaching Conferences After Behaviors have Reached Criterion?

Cooperating teacher 1 never had a post teaching conference after student teacher 1 reached criterion. Cooperating teacher 2 and 5 did not follow up on the achieved tasks. Cooperating teacher 3 and 4 immediately increased the criterion of the previously achieved task by developing a new explicit task. Cooperating teacher 7 provided positive specific feedback on a previous achieved task.

Two cooperating teachers acknowledged the achievement of a completed task and then based the next task in the same direction as the achieved task. Their tasks took the form of a changing criterion design. The cooperating and student teachers built upon previously achieved tasks.

Two cooperating teacher did not follow-up on the achieved task. It seems these cooperating teachers expected the achieved behaviors to be maintained by the student teacher after direct intervention has ended.

One cooperating teacher provided positive feedback on the maintainence of the achieved task. This told the student teacher the behavior was still being demonstrated (maintainence), and the cooperating teacher was still monitoring the appropriate use of that behavior (accountability).
3B. Are the student teacher's behaviors that have achieved criterion level maintained over two class periods without any of the cooperating teachers explicit and/or accountability task statements directed at the achieved behavior?

The behaviors for which student teacher 1 reached criterion level were the last explicit tasks before their student teaching experience ended.

Management time in student teacher 2's class began to increase two days after criterion was achieved. Management time remained above the level achieved during the time when task statements were directed toward that criterion (lessons 11 -14). Student teacher's use of student names remained at the achieved criterion level over two periods without any of the cooperating teacher's tasks statements directed toward that behavior.

Student teacher 3's activity decreased and waiting time increased above the level achieved during intervention. However, criterion level was achieved during a badminton unit, and increased during an archery unit. Skill feedback dropped below criterion level the day following but returned to the previously achieved criterion level on the second day.

Student teacher 5's use of names rose to a rate of 1.6 per minute for lesson 7, but fell to .7 during lesson 8. His rate was above .7 for 4 lessons after lesson 8. Student teacher 5 maintained a higher rate of names than prior to the targeting of that behavior.

Discussion on the maintenance of student teacher's behaviors that have achieved criterion without any of the cooperating teachers explicit
and/or accountability task statements directed at the achieved behavior?

The behaviors which were maintained without cooperating teacher intervention were verbal behaviors. The student teachers were able to use pupil names at a level near the achieved criteria. The two behaviors which were not maintained were directed toward lesson organization and planning.

It is possible the combination of maintaining criteria of a previously achieved behavior and reaching criteria on a new behavior was too difficult. The changing of activities may also have an effect on a achieved behavior. Strategies used to reach criteria (lower waiting by 5%) in a team sport (badminton doubles) may not be applicable in an individual sport (archery). The behaviors may not generalize across different content. More research needs to be done in the area of behavior maintenance.

Summary

The two student teachers whose new explicit task was directed toward a previously achieved task but with an increased criteria did not reach the new criteria level.

Two of the four achieved tasks which were not followed up on were maintained. Both of the tasks were related to use of student names. Both student teachers continued to use names at a level close to or above the set criteria.
RESEARCH QUESTION 4

4. What are the effects of the BASIC ALT-PE and MBMS-PE, when presented singularly or in combination, on the task statements of the cooperating teacher, and the behaviors of the student teacher and his/her pupils?

A. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher’s behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE is presented before MBMS-PE? When MBMS-PE is presented before BASIC ALT-PE?

B. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher’s behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE is presented alone? When MBMS-PE is presented alone?

4A. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher’s behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE is presented before MBMS-PE? When MBMS-PE is presented before BASIC ALT-PE?

This section will discuss the effects the modules had on the cooperating teachers task and feedback statements during both interventions. The effects each module had on the cooperating teachers will be compared to identify the most efficient order.

Cooperating teacher 1’s fully explicit and fully accountable task statements remained at baseline level after Basic ALT-PE was completed. Specific feedback statements decreased below baseline level. However, cooperating teacher 1’s percentage of specific feedbacks increased above baseline (58%) after Basic ALT-PE (71%).

Cooperating teacher 3 had a mean rate of 0.7 fully explicit task statements and 0.2 fully accountable task statements following MBMS-PE. Her mean for specific feedback statements was 4.2. Her percentage of specific feedback statements was 74%.
Cooperating teacher 2's fully explicit and fully accountable task statements increased above baseline level after MBMS-PE. There was an increase above baseline level in specific feedback statements during both stages with the increase being greater during the ALT-PE phase. The percentage of specific feedbacks following MBMS-PE was 79% and increased even more after MBMS-PE (82%).

There was a positive change away from the baseline level in C.T. 1's fully explicit and accountable task statements after both modules were completed. Specific feedback statements decreased from the baseline level after ALT-PE was completed and decreased even further after MBMS-PE. Percentage of specific feedback was highest after both modules were completed.

Cooperating teacher 3 had a higher level of fully explicit and accountable task statements following MBMS-PE when compared to phase 1 with Basic ALT-PE. Cooperating teacher 3's fully explicit and fully accountable task statements increased the most after both modules were completed. Specific feedback statements decreased after MBMS-PE from the level achieved after ALT-PE was completed. There was a positive change away from Basic ALT-PE level in fully explicit and accountable task statements after both modules were completed. Specific feedback statements decreased from the baseline level after MBMS-PE was completed. Cooperating teacher 3's percentage of specific feedbacks decreased slightly below baseline (74%) after MBMS-PE (71%) was completed.

Fully explicit task statements fell below baseline level after ALT-PE was completed by cooperating teacher 2. Fully accountable task
statements stayed above the baseline level but fell below the level reached during the MBMS-PE only phase. There wasn’t a change in the rate in specific feedback following completion of Basic ALT-PE when compared to Phase 2 (MBMS-PE) but there was an increase when compared to baseline. C.T.2’s percentage of specific feedback fell below the level established with MBMS by 3% (see table 18).

Discussion on the Effects the Order had on the Cooperating Teacher’s Behaviors

Most changes that occurred in the cooperating teacher’s fully explicit and accountable task statements occurred following completion of MBMS-PE. Basic ALT-PE did not effect the cooperating teachers task statements.

Both modules had a positive effect on the cooperating teacher’s percentage of specific feedback statements. The completion of Basic ALT-PE enhanced the cooperating teacher’s ability to collect objective data, and provide specific feedback toward stated tasks. Basic ALT-PE did not improve the cooperating teacher’s explicit or accountability task statements, therefore the specific feedback was not directed toward keeping students accountable for previously stated tasks.

MBMS-PE had a greater effect when it was presented after Basic ALT-PE. Cooperating Teacher’s 1 and 3 were more explicit and fully accountable when their completed Basic ALT-PE before MBMS-PE, than was C.T.’2 the order was reversed.
Table 18
Comparison Between the Order of Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #1 (ALT-PE)</th>
<th>INTERVENTION #2 (MBMS-PE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.T. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Explicit</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Accountable</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Feedback</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Specific</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.T. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Explicit</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Accountable</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Feedback</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Specific</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.T. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Explicit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Accountable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Specific</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4B. What are the effects on the cooperating teacher's behaviors when BASIC ALT-PE is presented alone? When MBMS-PE is presented alone?

There wasn't any change in the fully explicit and fully accountable task statements of cooperating teacher 5 after ALT-PE was introduced. Cooperating Teacher 5 became more consistent giving specific feedback statements after intervention and her percentage of specific feedback statements increased dramatically above baseline level.

There was an increase in cooperating teacher 4's fully accountable task and specific feedback statements after MBMS-PE was completed. There was a decrease in the rate of fully explicit task statements after MBMS-PE. Her rate of specific feedback statements rose from 0.7 to 1.8 per conference following completion and her percentage of specific feedback statements increased from 67 to 93%.

Discussion on the Effects the Modules had on the Cooperating Teacher's Task and Feedback Statements when Presented Alone

This discussion is based on the comparison of the data collected on those cooperating teacher's who completed only one of the modules with the C.T.'s whose first intervention was the same module.

Basic ALT-PE, did not have an effect on the cooperating teacher 4's fully explicit or accountable task statements, and had a minimal effect on C.T. 1's explicitness. The percentage of specific task statements increased in all teachers upon completion of Basic ALT-PE. Cooperating teacher 3's ALT-PE phase was not compared to baseline, but she had a low level of fully explicit and accountable task statements,
and a high rate and percentage of specific feedback statements. Those cooperating teacher's who completed Basic ALT-PE only or prior to MBMS-PE (C.T. 1, 3, 5) demonstrated similar behaviors (see table 19).

Cooperating teacher 4's fully accountable task statements, and rate and percentage of specific feedback statements increased after completion of MBMS-PE only. The results are not similar for explicit task statements. This may have been due to the high level C.T. 4 demonstrated during baseline. Those cooperating teacher's who completed MBMS-PE only or prior to Basic ALT-PE (C.T. 2, 4) demonstrated similar increases (see table 20).

Summary

Any change that occurred in the behaviors of the cooperating teacher, student teacher or pupil's occurred after the completion of Basic MBMS-PE. Basic ALT-PE provided the cooperating teacher with a specific instrument to collect data. All cooperating teachers increased their use of specific feedback after Basic ALT-PE, but the increase also occurred after MBMS-PE.

MBMS-PE introduced the cooperating teacher to a way to state tasks explicitly and emphasized the importance of holding the student teacher accountable for their task statements. The cooperating teachers that did MBMS-PE before Basic ALT-PE or did MBMS-PE singularly devised their own way to collect data on the explicit task statements.
Table 19

Effect of Basic ALT-PE When Presented Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION / BASIC ALT-PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT1</td>
<td>CT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Explicit</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Accountable</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Feedback</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Specific</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

Effect of MBMS-PE When Presented Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION / MBMS-PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT2</td>
<td>CT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Explicit</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Accountable</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Feedback</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Specific</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The completion of Basic ALT-PE enhanced the cooperating teacher's ability to collect objective data, and provide specific feedback toward stated tasks. Basic ALT-PE did not improve the cooperating teacher's explicit or accountability task statements, therefore the specific feedback was not directed toward keeping students accountable for previously stated tasks.

More explicit and accountability task statements were emitted when MBMS-PE was completed after Basic ALT-PE. The cooperating teachers had an objective way to collect data on the explicit task statements and hold the student accountable for their teaching behaviors.
RESEARCH QUESTION #5

Can the cooperating teacher appropriately identify teaching behaviors of the student teacher that need intervention?

5 A. What percentage of The Ohio State University Undergraduate Physical Education goals are addressed in the task statements of the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference?

This section will compare the goals of the undergraduate program and the task statements stated by the cooperating teacher to the student teacher during the post teaching conferences. The goals of The Ohio State University Undergraduate Physical Education program can be found in Appendix E. A breakdown of the goals discussed by each cooperating teacher can be found on Table 21.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 1 task statements were directed toward increasing use of student names, increasing enthusiasm, planning for instruction and management, decreasing management/transition time, enhancing appropriate student behavior, and increasing activity.

Cooperating teacher 1 did not discuss using positive behavioral interactions, teaching self management skills, demonstrating withitness/monitoring of the managerial or instructional setting, providing clear and precise presentations and demonstrations, giving appropriate skill feedback, or ensuring a safe environment in her task statements to student teacher 1. General and specific feedback was
provided in the area of positive interactions, monitoring the managerial setting, and actively monitoring the classroom setting.

Seventy one percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 1. Fifty percent of program goals were stated explicitly by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 2 worked on increasing use of student names, increasing the use of positive behavioral interactions, appropriate instructional and managerial planning, reducing management/transition time, enhancing appropriate student behavior, increasing activity time, actively monitoring the managerial setting, and teaching student self-management skills.

Cooperating teacher 2's task statements did not cover presentations and demonstrations of subject matter, ensuring a safe activity environment, actively monitoring the instructional setting, and providing appropriate skill feedback. General and/or specific feedback was provided in the area of presentations and demonstrations, and actively monitoring the instructional setting.

Seventy nine percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 2. Sixty four percent of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 3's tasks focused on increasing appropriate skill feedback, decreasing management/transition time, increasing activity time, increasing...
positive feedback, appropriately planning for instruction and management, demonstrating enthusiasm, providing clear and concise presentations and demonstrations, and increasing appropriate student behavior.

Cooperating teacher 3's task statements did not cover using student names, teaching self-management skills, actively monitoring the managerial and instructional setting, and ensuring a safe environment. Specific and/or general feedback was provided in all areas except ensuring a safe environment.

Ninety three percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 3. Sixty four percent of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 4's tasks focused on providing appropriate individual skill and positive feedback; increasing activity time; decreasing management/transition time, actively monitoring the managerial and activity setting, providing clear and concise presentations and demonstrations, organizing for managerial and instructional concerns, ensuring a safe activity environment, demonstrating enthusiasm, enhancing appropriate student behavior.

Cooperating teacher 4's task statements did not cover using student names, reducing management and transition time, and the teaching of self-management skills.
Seventy nine percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 4. Seventy nine percent of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 5's tasks focused on providing appropriate individual skill and positive feedback; increasing activity time; providing clear and concise demonstrations and presentations, appropriately planning for instruction and management, demonstrating enthusiasm, and enhancing appropriate student behavior, and using student names.

Cooperating teacher 5's task statements did not cover reducing management/transition time, teaching self-management skills, demonstrating withitness/monitoring of managerial or activity setting, and ensuring a safe activity environment. Specific or general feedback was provided in the area of demonstrating withitness/monitoring of managerial or activity setting.

Seventy nine percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 5. Sixty four percent of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student teacher 6's task statements focused on providing appropriate skill feedback, enhancing appropriate student behavior, actively monitoring the managerial and activity setting, teacher, planning for instruction and management, emphasizing
a safe classroom environment, providing clear and precise presentations and demonstrations, and increasing activity time.

Cooperating teacher 6's task statements did not cover using student names, interacting positively, reducing management/transition time, and teaching self management skill. General and/or specific feedback was provided in the areas of reducing management/transition time, and using student names.

Seventy nine percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 4. Sixty four of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Cooperating teacher and student 7's task statements were directed toward providing positive and skill feedback, increasing activity time, providing clear presentations and demonstrations, enhancing appropriate student behavior, actively monitoring the activity setting, emphasizing a safe classroom environment, and planning for managerial and instructional concerns.

Cooperating teacher 7's task statements did not cover using student names, monitoring in managerial setting, demonstrating teacher enthusiasm, teaching self-management skills, and reducing management/transition time. General and/or specific feedback was provided in the area of using student names.

Seventy one percent of all the program goals were discussed during the post teaching conference by cooperating teacher 4. Sixty four
percent of program goals were explicitly stated by the cooperating teacher during the post teaching conference.

Discussion on the Percentage of the Universities Goals that are Addressed by the Cooperating Teachers

Seventy nine percent of the program's goals were discussed through either explicit task or feedback statements when all of the cooperating teacher's results were averaged. Sixty percent of the program goals were stated explicitly when all results are averaged. The statements made by the cooperating teacher to the student teacher were limited to the audiotaped to the 5 to 15 minute post teaching conference.

The goals addressed most frequently by the cooperating teachers were planning to meet organizational concerns, establishing appropriate student behavior, planning to meet instructional concerns, and maximizing student participation. This suggests the cooperating teacher wants the student teacher to have a well managed and organized class which is characterized by high amounts of student activity, and appropriate pupil behavior. This seems to concur with Placek's (1983) concept of busy, happy, and good.

The goals addressed least by the cooperating teachers were teacher enthusiasm, teaching self-management skills to the students, and ensuring a safe activity environment. This is not to say that the cooperating teachers were not concerned with these areas. It is possible that the student teacher demonstrated these goals from the
TABLE 21

Comparison of Explicit Task and Feedback Statements to Program Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT 1</th>
<th>CT 2</th>
<th>CT 3</th>
<th>CT 4</th>
<th>CT 5</th>
<th>CT 6</th>
<th>CT 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

CT.....COOPERATING TEACHER       T.....EXPLICIT TASK STATEMENT MADE
COMM...COMMUNICATION GOALS      F.....FEEDBACK STATEMENT MADE
ORG....ORGANIZATION GOALS       N.....NO STATEMENT MADE
INSTR..INSTRUCTION GOALS
beginning of the experience. It is also possible the student teachers taught at a teaching setting which had already established safe activity environment, and self management skills prior to the student teachers arrival.

The cooperating teachers emphasized the achievement of the program goals by the student teacher. These data suggest that the preservice training of the undergraduate student is extended from the university setting to the public school setting at these 7 public secondary schools.

**Chapter Summary**

The results indicate that changes in the number of explicit task statements occurred in three of the four cooperating teachers after MBMS-PE was completed, but not after Basic ALT-PE. The increases indicate that the cooperating teachers are able to refine their communications and thereby specify task statements in a fully explicit manner during their conferences through the completion of MBMS-PE.

Changes occurred in the cooperating teacher's accountability task statements after MBMS-PE but did not occur after Basic ALT-PE. In some cases the increase is small (going from no fully accountable statements to one each conference). The results also indicate that the cooperating teachers held their student teachers accountable for more of their explicit task statements after MBMS-PE. ALT-PE seems to have an adverse effect on the fully explicit/fully accountable task statement percentage.
The overall effect both modules had on the mean total of specific feedback statements given during the post teaching conferences was varied. Three of the five cooperating teachers increased specific feedback after completion of the modules. Two of the cooperating teachers who completed both modules demonstrated a decrease in their specific feedback rate. The decrease in specific feedback statements was related to increases in fully accountable task statements.

Cooperating teacher focused on collecting data which was related to the previously stated explicit task after completion of MBMS-PE. The collected data was used to compare the student teacher's performance to the criteria of the explicit task. This allows the cooperating teacher to hold the student teacher accountable. The cooperating teachers who completed Basic ALT-PE had an instrument to categorize what they observe during the targeted lesson. The observation was not directed toward a particular behavior or task. The cooperating teacher reported what they observed in the form of specific feedback statements and not accountability statements.

The percentage of specific feedback statements given when compared to all feedback statements (both general and specific) increased dramatically for all cooperating teachers after the completion of either one or both of the modules. These results indicate that both modules change the cooperating teachers feedback statements. The cooperating teachers become more specific with their feedback to the student teacher after either one or both of the modules are completed.

The change in the verbal behaviors of the cooperating teacher after completion of MBMS-PE had a positive effect on the verbal
behavior of some of the student teacher's. In a few instances, small changes appeared in some of the Basic ALT-PE categories and in class organization and presentation after task statements were directed toward increasing or decreasing time in those categories.

The relationship between the cooperating and student teacher's change in behavior seems to be strengthened by the performance of the cooperating teachers who completed MBMS-PE. Those cooperating teacher's changed student teacher's behavior positively due to fully explicit and accountable statements. Since those explicit tasks which were followed by fully accountable statements were the tasks that were achieved, it seems essential to increase the explicit-accountable ratio. The cooperating teachers who completed MBMS-PE had the highest explicit-accountable ratio.

More explicit and accountability task statements were emitted when MBMS-PE was completed after Basic ALT-PE. The cooperating teachers had an objective way to collect data on the explicit task statements and hold the student accountable for their teaching behaviors.

Cooperating teachers emphasized the achievement of the program goals by the student teacher. This data suggests that the preservice training of the undergraduate student is extended from the university setting to the public school setting at these 7 public secondary schools.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Supervision of student teachers is an important component of a teacher education program. School-based teachers are in the best position to supervise, yet few have the skills to supervise based on the current knowledge and theory of effective teaching (Taggart, 1986). If cooperating teachers can be trained to communicate more explicit information to the student teachers and hold them accountable for their performances then supervision will improve (Ocansey, 1986). The cooperating teacher should be trained to provide objective feedback and hold the students accountable for the demonstration of teaching behaviors that were learned in the undergraduate program.

The interaction between the participants in a post teaching conference in student teaching is central to the success of the student teaching experience. The teacher education program must continue into the gymnasium in the form of a close relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. It is essential that physical education teacher education programs train the cooperating teachers to be effective supervisors if the goals of the program are to be achieved. The arrangement of the training programs as far as time and format should be mutually agreed upon.
A Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the effects that self instructional modules completed by cooperating teacher had on the post teaching conference task statements of cooperating teacher, the teaching behaviors of the student teacher and the behaviors of the pupils in class.

In the first chapter a background of the study was outlined and the questions to be addressed were stated. The review of the literature was limited to contemporary studies which focused in some way on the student teaching experience. In particular four groups of studies were reviewed. First was a number of studies which investigated the supervisory process. Second were studies that identified changes in the behaviors of inservice and preservice teachers, and inclass pupils'. Third were the studies which investigated the training of cooperating teachers to perform supervisory functions. Fourth were the studies which investigated the concept of tasks and accountability within student teaching.

The methods and procedures utilized during this study were outlined in Chapter 3. Seven cooperating teachers and student teachers participated in the study. The study was conducted over a ten week period in the Spring Quarter of 1987. A multiple baseline design across subjects was used to measure the effects Basic ALT-PE and MBMS-PE had on the task statements of the cooperating teachers. A multiple baseline across behaviors was used to analyze the effects
intervention had on the student teachers' teaching behaviors, and the inclass behaviors of the student teachers' pupils.

Event recording was used to analyze the cooperating teacher's and the student teacher's behavior. The data collected on the cooperating teacher's behavior provided detail of the focus of the interactions within the post-teaching conference, the degree of explicitness of task specifications, and types of accountability statements. The student teacher's verbal behavior teaching physical education lessons was analyzed to provide information on the student teachers use of student names, and type of feedback given (positive and negative specific, positive and negative general, and corrective). The pupil's inclass behavior was coded into one of 6 categories (management, knowledge, activity, waiting, transition, and off task) using Basic ALT-PE.

Visual analysis of the graphs indicated that the MBMS-PE intervention increased the communication to student teachers of fully explicit task statements in 3 of 4 cooperating teachers, increased the number of fully accountable statements in all four cooperating teachers, and increased the percentage of specific feedback statements in all four teachers. Basic ALT-PE increased the rate of specific feedback statements made by the cooperating teacher as well as the ratio of specific feedback statements when compared to general feedback statements. Changes occurred in some of the targeted student teacher behavior's after the cooperating teacher completed MBMS-PE, but no functional relationship is suggested due to a lack of replications. Training cooperating teachers in Basic ALT-PE did not
have any effect on the student teacher's behavior. Changes in the pupil's behavior could not be correlated with the intervention. The data indicated that MBMS-PE should be presented before Basic ALT-PE because it had a greater effect on the cooperating teachers' task and accountability statements. Cooperating teacher's supervisory focus, regardless of the intervention, was directed toward many of the goals of the university teacher education program.

Conclusions

Part of this study was a systematic replication of Ocansey's (1987) dissertation. Ocansey's study looked at the combined effect of Basic ALT-PE and MBMS-PE on cooperating teacher's task statements. Ocansey's findings were replicated in this study. Fully explicit and accountable task statements can be increased through completion of both modules.

This study extended Ocansey's research by comparing the effects of Basic ALT-PE and MBMS-PE. MBMS-PE had a greater effect on the cooperating teacher's fully accountable and explicit task statements than did Basic ALT-PE.

The changes observed in some of the cooperating teacher's fully explicit task statements were small. Four possible explanations for the minimum change in the behaviors of some of the cooperating teachers are discussed. First, it is possible that the cooperating teacher felt there was little need to provide the student with specific guidance at that particular time. Cooperating teachers often
commented on how well the class went during post teaching conferences. Secondly, the intervention may have been done during an instructional unit the cooperating teacher had little expertise in, which lead to implicit or minimal levels of fully explicit task statements. Thirdly, the study may have occurred during a time of the year when the cooperating teacher was both teaching and coaching, therefore had minimum time to dedicate to the modules. Due to the nature of the modules (self-instructional), there was no way the researcher could hold the cooperating teachers accountable for completion or attention to the modules. Finally, the behaviors promoted within the modules may have interacted negatively with the social task system (Tinning, 1983) established between the cooperating and student teacher. A dramatic change toward explicitness and accountability in the cooperating teacher's post teaching conference behaviors may have been viewed as a threat to the cordial relationship developed during the early part of the experience.

The second part of this study investigated the effect changes in the cooperating teacher's task statements had on the teaching behaviors of the student teacher. Some behaviors of the student teacher's were positively changed by the fully explicit and accountable task statements of both the experimental and control group teachers. There seems to be a relationship between the fully explicit and accountable task statements of the cooperating teacher and positive changes in the targeted teaching behaviors (use of names, providing feedback) of the student teacher. Behaviors dealing with the organization and presentation of the lesson were more difficult to
change. This may be caused by the student teachers' limited repertoire of teaching strategies.

Sherman (1983) noted when adjustments in a lesson seem necessary, novices know fewer routines and may have included their only routine in the original lesson plan. Even when novices know an alternative, they may be reluctant or unable to initiate the routine. Anderson (1980) described experts as routine planners and call novices creative planners. Routine planning involves the retrieval of prestored solution strategies from memory, while creative planning requires the production of new strategies.

Some of the teaching behaviors which were targeted by the cooperating teachers did not change in the appropriate direction. Tinning (1983) identified contrived feedback consequences and arranged contrived consequences as the two types of applied consequences during a post teaching conference. The positive effect MBMS-PE had on the cooperating teacher's accountability statements were in the contrived feedback type. This type does not seem to be powerful enough to consistently warrant student change.

Changes in the student teacher's organization of class activities had an effect on the way pupil's spent their class time. It was very difficult to identify a functional relationship between changes in student teacher's organization and pupil's inclass behavior. If the student teachers had an informal accountability system operating in their gymnasium then participation by their pupil's would be minimal (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983).
Implications

The results of this study replicated the finding from Ocansey's study. MBMS-PE is effective in changing the fully explicit and accountable task, and specific feedback statements of cooperating teachers. The study, which also investigated student teacher's teaching behaviors, showed small changes in the student teacher's behavior after specific teaching behaviors were targeted by the cooperating teacher.

If one of the purposes of the student teaching experience is to allow the student teacher to enhance their effective teaching skills, then the supervisor of the student teacher should endeavor to keep objective account of the student teacher's performance. By accurately keeping account of the student teacher's performance, improvement on the targeted behavior could be observed by the supervisor and student teacher. The supervisor also needs to reduce the "gaps" in information communicated to the student teacher by specifying the tasks in a fully explicit manner. It is only when tasks are specified in fully explicit ways that the process of accountability is facilitated.

The positive changes in the student teacher's teaching behavior's were related to the cooperating teacher's fully explicit and accountable statements. Since those explicit tasks which were followed by fully accountable statements were the tasks that were achieved, it seems essential to increase the explicit-accountable task ratio. The cooperating teachers who completed MBMS-PE had the highest
explicit-accountable task ratio. Therefore, MBMS-PE should be completed by cooperating teachers.

The social task system (Tinning, 1983) has been identified as an important aspect of the interaction between the cooperating and student teacher. It is felt the modules should be completed by the cooperating teachers and student teachers prior to the student teaching experience. Fully explicit and accountable statements would then be considered a normal part of the cooperating and student teacher's social task system. The student teacher would expect to be held accountable for mutually agreed upon objectives, and the cooperating teacher would have an objective way to measure the student teacher's performance.

If teacher training institutions consider student teaching to be an essential component of their program they should train cooperating teachers to facilitate and support the achievement of the program's goals. MBMS-PE and Basic ALT-PE provide the cooperating teacher with self instructional packages which are compatible with the goals of the teacher education program. Therefore, the modules should be completed by all cooperating teachers who supervise student teachers so the program goals are reinforced during the student teaching experience.

A relationship between the student teacher's behavior targeted for change and the program goal from which the behavior is based needs to be emphasized. The student teacher needs to understand the importance of the program goal and how the targeted behavior is related to the goal. The grade the student teacher receives should be directly
related to the successful demonstration of the targeted behaviors during their student teaching experience. This would incorporate arranged contrived consequences (Tinning, 1983) into the student teaching experience. This type of accountability system may be more powerful than the system utilized during this study.

**Recommendations**

Based on the results and conclusions of this study the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Teaching strategies used by the student teacher to achieve the explicit task need to be emphasized, whether by the cooperating teacher, or the university supervisor. MBMS-PE needs to be modified to provide more information in this area.

2. MBMS-PE should be completed before Basic ALT-PE. The appropriate use of the data collected using Basic ALT-PE should be demonstrated to the cooperating teacher by the university supervisor.

3. The cooperating teacher should be given a longer time frame to complete the self-instructional modules. Problems occurred due to the limited time (a weekend) the cooperating teacher was given to complete the modules.

4. MBMS-PE should incorporate a changing criterion format into it's supervisory guide. The criteria set by the cooperating teacher were sometimes too difficult to achieve.

5. MBMS-PE should be combined into one booklet.
6. The supervisor(s), and student teacher should work together on a targeted goal until the goal is achieved.

7. Further research should be conducted to examine the maintenance of acquired behaviors by the cooperating and student teacher after intervention ceases.

8. Further research should be conducted to examine the effects the module has on the behaviors of cooperating teachers who are coaching, and on those who are not.

9. Further research should be conducted to examine the effect arranged contrived and contrived feedback consequences have on the student teacher's teaching behaviors.

10. Further research should be done to better understand the social task system between the cooperating and student teacher.
APPENDIX A

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COOPERATING TEACHERS
FROM: Stephen C. Coulon
TO: Supervisors of Student Teachers
RE: Tasks for spring quarter supervision research project
DATE: April 13, 1987

Dear,

It is a great pleasure to have you to work with in this collaborative research project in the supervision of student teaching in physical education. The purpose of this collaborative project and the conceptual basis for the project will be discussed in detail following completion of the project.

In this project, you will tape each of your post teaching conferences that you have with your student teacher after the targeted class. The taping of the conferences will continue for 5 consecutive weeks. The conference that you have is between you and the student teacher only!!

In this project you will be required to complete two (2) self-instructional models. You will receive the first module on May 1 and you need to have completed the module by Monday morning (May 4th). You will receive the next module on May 15th and you need to complete that module by Monday, May 18th (morning).

In order to generate "good" data as a result of your participation, here are some important tasks I would like you to accomplish:

1. Strickly keep the confidentiality of the self-instructional package as you complete the module. It is very important not to discuss the module’s content with others.

2. Make sure that your post-teaching conference is from 5 to 15 minutes in length. Please use only one side of a cassette for each conference.

3. Try to have the conference to follow the lesson immediately if at all possible and try to discuss what happened in the targeted class only.

4. Please make sure that the wireless microphone is operating appropriately when it is required to tape Tina’s verbal behavior.

5. You may listen to the tapes of ____’s verbal behavior, but you should not let ____ listen to it because it could change her verbal behavior. We do not want the audio tape to be the reason that ____’s verbal behavior changed.
6. Please write down any pre-lesson discussions you have with the student teacher about the upcoming lesson. Please sign the student teacher’s lesson plan.

Thanks for all your help.

Sincerely,
FROM: Stephen C. Coulon
TO: Supervisors of Student Teachers
RE: Tasks for spring quarter supervision research project
DATE: April 13, 1987

Dear,

It is a great pleasure to have you to work with in this collaborative research project in the supervision of student teaching in physical education. The purpose of this collaborative project and the conceptual basis for the project will be discussed in detail following completion of the project.

In this project, you will tape each of your post teaching conferences that you have with your student teacher after the targeted class. The taping of the conferences will continue for 6 consecutive weeks. The conference that you have is between you and the student teacher only!! In this project you will not be required to complete one a self-instructional model.

In order to generate "good" data as a result of your participation, here are some important tasks I would like you to accomplish:

1. Make sure that your post-teaching conference is from 5 to 15 minutes in length. Please use only one side of a cassette for each conference.

2. Try to have the conference to follow the lesson immediately if at all possible and try to discuss what happened in the targeted class only.

3. Please make sure that the wireless microphone is operating appropriately when it is required to tape ___'s verbal behavior.

4. Please write down any pre-lesson discussions you have with the student teacher about the upcoming lesson. Please sign the student teacher's lesson plan.

Thanks for all your help.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX B

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS
DEAR STUDENT TEACHERS,

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PHYSICAL EDUCATION SECTION IS DOING A RESEARCH STUDY THAT WILL HOPEFULLY ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER AS A SUPERVISOR AND TO EXTEND THE UNDERGRADUATE PRESERVICE TRAINING FROM THE UNIVERSITY SETTING TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SETTING. THIS ONLY CAN BE DONE WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER AND THE STUDENT TEACHER.

YOUR SUPERVISOR WILL BE PLAYING A SECONDARY ROLE IN YOUR SECONDARY FIELD EXPERIENCE. YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER WILL BE PLAYING A PRIMARY ROLE. WE ARE TRYING TO SEE IF WE CAN TRAIN COOPERATING TEACHERS TO MONITOR AND EMPHASIZE THE GOALS OF OUR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM. THE COOPERATING TEACHER IS IN A MUCH BETTER POSITION TO MAKE DAILY OBSERVATIONS AND MONITOR YOUR TEACHING BEHAVIORS ON A REGULAR BASIS. YOUR SUPERVISOR WILL CHECK YOUR PROGRESS ON A WEEKLY BASIS, BUT IT UP TO YOU TO ASK THE SUPERVISOR FOR ADVISE.

STUDENT TEACHER RESPONSIBILITIES

1. YOU SHOULD HAVE A COPY OF YOUR LESSON PLAN BEFORE EACH CLASS.

2. YOU SHOULD HAVE THE WIRELESS MIKE ATTACHED AND READY TO PLAY DURING YOUR OBSERVATION PERIOD. YOU ONLY HAVE TO WEAR THE TAPE RECORDER DURING THE ASSIGNED OBSERVATION PERIOD WHEN YOU ARE BEING CODED USING BASIC ALT-PE.

3. YOU SHOULD NOT ASK OBSERVERS ANYTHING ABOUT THE DATA THEY HAVE COLLECTED. THIS DATA WILL NOT BE USED TO EVALUATE YOU.

4. YOU SHOULD MEET WITH YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE TARGETED CLASS AND AUDIOTAPE YOUR POST TEACHING CONFERENCE.

THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HELP!!!!!!

SINCERELY,
APPENDIX C

LOG FORM FOR SUPERVISORS TO RECORD
INTERACTION WITH THE STUDENT TEACHERS
SUPERVISOR'S NAME -

STUDENT TEACHER'S NAME -

DATE -

VERBAL INTERACTION THAT TRANSPRIRED -

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
The following guidelines should be followed during the supervision of the Spring Quarter student teachers at the secondary level.

**DOS**

1. You should make weekly visits to the student teacher’s school.

2. You should collect data while the student teacher is teaching for your own purposes. You should use BASIC ALT-PE and the CHECKLIST.

3. You should speak to the cooperating teacher and discuss the student’s progress and teaching goals. The cooperating teacher should lead the conversation.

4. You should answer any questions that your student teacher asks. Try to be as helpful as possible as you answer the questions. Try not to be judgemental as you answer the questions. For example, if the student teacher asks you about her activity time, you can tell her she is doing well. You should not tell her that she is doing well, but she could do better if she divided the class into smaller groups.

5. You should look over the unit and lesson plans to see if they have been completed, and you can tell them what the plan(s) are lacking, but you should not critic them (OPEN FOR DISCUSSSION).

6. You should keep a log that includes any verbal interactions that you have with your student teacher. This includes any telephone calls. The date, and place of discussion should be included!!!!!!!

**DONTS**
1. You should not let the student teacher observe any of the objective data that you have collected.

2. You should not make suggestions to the cooperating teacher on what teaching behaviors need to be developed.

3. You should not give the student teacher any information about their teaching without a personal request from the student teacher.

4. You should not park in the handicapped zone EVEN if it is the last spot available on the lot.

5. You should not provide specific feedback on the lesson plans unless the student teacher asks. The daily lesson plans will be used to see if the student teacher changes his/her plans in relation to the cooperating teachers recommendations. The emphasis is on the cooperating teachers recommendations and not the supervisors!!!!!
APPENDIX E

MANAGERIAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Program Goals/Criteria for Evaluation & Feedback

Communication/Interactions (C)

1. Use student name
   - used/not used in behavioral interactions

2. Use positive behavior interactions
   - reference to positive and negative interactions that impact on classroom climate

3. Enthusiasm of teacher:
   - observed behaviors (actions, voice, smiles, etc.)
   - interact with pupils
   - be active (hustle yourself and pupils)

Organization (O)

1. Planned lesson
   - prior to teaching, plan to meet organization concerns/problems related to attendance, lockerroom supervision, class organization about field trip, etc.
   - as a result of taught lesson, plan to meet organization concerns/problems identified

2. Management Time/Transition Time
   (a) Use appropriate organizational techniques to reduce management time/transition time for pupils.
   (b) Reduce the number of teacher organizational behaviors necessary to manage effectively
   (c) Ensure effective transition between activities and in organizational areas related to instruction

3. Appropriate student behavior/unexpected disruptions
   - establish and maintain adequate rate of appropriate pupil behavior in managerial settings
   - cope with unexpected classroom disruptions/critical incidents related to school/class rules, dressing, attendance, tardiness, etc., utilizing appropriate management strategies

4. Self-management skills
   - teach self-management skills to pupils, that is, develop or utilize established structures to decrease the need for a high degree of current interaction related to classroom management

5. Withitness/Monitoring in managerial settings
   - actively monitor managerial episodes
   - identify potential safety problems (especially equipment)
Instructional (I)

1. **Planned lesson**
   - prior to teaching, plan to meet instructional concerns
   - as a result of lesson, plan to meet instructional concerns identified

2. **Maximum participation/high activity time**
   - teach so that pupils are actively engaged in appropriate motor skill or knowledge activities reflecting the goal of the lesson
   - limited waiting
   - high number of opportunities to respond

3. **Active monitoring of the instructional setting**
   - observe pupil skill attempts
   - demonstrate "withitness" (see and respond)
   - move to a position you can see pupils performing

4. **Presentations and demonstrations**
   - offer presentations and demonstrations (i.e., communicate information) that are clear, to the point, and provide appropriate (accurate) information
   - avoid lengthy presentations and demonstrations

5. **Analyze skill performance and give appropriate skill feedback**
   - focus on critical elements and reinforce or correct
   - feedback relates to critical elements (i.e., feedback is appropriate)

6. **Ensure a safe activity environment**
   - implement gradual progressions in skill drills
   - establish and practice safety procedures (rules, spotting, etc.)

Related (R)

A goal considered important for analysis but not covered by Communication/Interaction, Organization or Instructional goals. This category must be defined by the coder/observer.
APPENDIX F

COVER LETTERS FOR THE SELF INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES
FROM: Stephen C. Coulon  
TO:    Cooperating Teachers  
RE:    Tasks for spring quarter supervision research project  
DATE:  April 13, 1987  

Dear ,

Thanks again for participating in this collaborative research study. I hope the requirements thus far have not been overbearing. You should have in front of you three individual booklets. There should be a discussion booklet (blue), a answer key booklet (green), and an exercise booklet (red). You should start with the exercise booklet. Further directions regarding the discussion book and the answer key are specified in the exercise book. You should be able to complete the module within two and a half to three hours. It will be necessary for me to meet with you on Monday morning to discuss the module. It should only take 15 to 20 minutes.

After you have completed the module you will be able to plan an effective supervision guide and communicate information about tasks in more fully explicit terms to your student teacher.

I hope you are anxious to get started. It hopefully will be a beneficial experience for you. The modules have been read over, but in case there is a problem that you cannot figure out, feel free to call me at 294-4487.

Thanks again for all your cooperation.

Sincerely,
FROM: Stephen C. Coulon  
TO: 
RE: Tasks for spring quarter supervision research project  
DATE: April 13, 1987  

Dear ,  

Thanks again for participating in this collaborative research study. I hope the requirements thus far have not been overbearing.

You should have in front of you a 60 minute cassette (only side A will be used), a VCR video cassette, and a red notebook with a manual in it. You will need a cassette player and a VCR video player to complete the module. You should be able to complete the module in about three hours.

It is necessary for me to meet with you on Monday to discuss the module. It should only take 10 to 15 minutes. You will need to return all the materials to me at that time.

There are a few items we need to cover before you start so to make the experience easier. First of all, you should write your answers on the sheets provided on the inside of the front cover. If you need any extra sheets use the sheets within the manual. Secondly, the audiotape makes reference to YELLOW answer cards. They are now WHITE and the extra answer sheets are YELLOW. Finally, the manual is very specific as far as the tape counter is concerned. You may find that your counter is not consistent with the counter numbers provided in the manual. This is not a problem. If you follow the tape's instructions, you will not have any trouble.

I hope you are anxious to get started. It hopefully will be a beneficial experience for you. The modules have been read over, but in case there is a problem that you cannot figure out, feel free to call me at 294-4487. The reading of this letter was not included in the three hour estimation. Sorry!!

Thanks again for all your cooperation.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX G

WIRELESS MICROPHONE INSTRUCTIONS
WIRELESS MICROPHONE INSTRUCTIONS

1. Make sure that the 45 minute tape is in the tape recorder. The tape should be labeled and the correct date should be on the tape.

2. Connect the wireless microphone's receiver plug into the cassette recorder's microphone outlet.

3. Place the wireless microphone speaker onto the student teacher and turn on the wireless microphone.

4. Turn on the wireless microphone's receiver.

5. Turn the cassette player on. The record and play function should be depressed.

6. Make sure that all parts are turned off at the completion of a taping session.

7. Make sure that the volume is set at an appropriate level (half to two thirds of maximum).
APPENDIX H

BASIC ALT-PE CODING SHEET
**PLT-PE**
(Basic-Measure Learning Time-Physical Education)

Teacher: ___________________  School: ___________________  Grade: _______  Date: _______

Activity: ___________________  Start: _______  Stop: _______  In Class: _______

Observer: ___________________

**Key Behaviors**

Management (M) - related to class business, unrelated to instructional activity.

Transition (T) - managerial and organizational activities related to instruction.

Waiting (W) - completed a task, period of no activity and no movement between activities.

Knowledge (K) - listening to instructions, watching a demonstration, questioning, discussing.

Activity (A) - engaged in motor activity, actively responding, actively supporting.

Off-Task (O) -

**General Comments** (Consider - lesson plan, critical incidents, objectives achieved)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

**Summary Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Secs.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Secs.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Secs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Secs.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Secs.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Secs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupil Name: _______  Positive Interactions: _______  Negative Interactions: _______

Specific Comments: (Directly related to data): 

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Behavioral Interaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of student name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

EFFECTIVE TEACHING CHECKLIST
The purpose of this checklist is to collect objective data on student and teacher behavior to assist in diagnosing the student teacher’s strengths and weaknesses in planning, managing and instructing physical education lessons.

The following scale represents the degree to which the observer judged a specific behavior was demonstrated.

3 = SATISFACTORY  2 = NEEDS HELP  1 = NOT DEMONSTRATED

**PLANNING - Lesson plan**

1. Identified the major behavioral objective(s) of the lesson.  
   1 2 3

2. Identified an effective sequence of activities to achieve lesson plan.  
   1 2 3

3. Student activities appropriate for student ability.  
   1 2 3

4. Identified major performance points of skills.  
   1 2 3

5. Identified the managerial issues related to the lesson.  
   1 2 3

**MANAGEMENT - Gymnasium Routines and Transitions**

1. Prepared necessary materials and equipment before lesson begins.  
   1 2 3

2. Started class at the designated time.  
   1 2 3

3. Gained and maintained student attention.  
   1 2 3

4. Attendance taken in a time saving manner.  
   1 2 3

5. Established and maintained appropriate student behavior.  
   1 2 3

6. Dealt with minor misbehavior without interrupting pace of the lesson.  
   1 2 3

7. Is consistent in applying consequences for student misbehavior.  
   1 2 3

8. Has an efficient routine for dealing with equipment.  
   1 2 3

   1 2 3

10. Transitions are efficient - little time is wasted.  
    1 2 3
INSTRUCTION - Presentation of Material

1. Task clearly defined.  
2. Skill demonstrated initially.  
3. Instructional points specified.  
4. Instructional points demonstrated.  
5. Safety emphasized.  
6. Student understanding checked.  
7. Purpose of practice explained.  
8. Drill demonstrated.  
9. Time to get into the drill and start performing is low.  
10. Appropriate arrangement of equipment and facilities.

INSTRUCTION - Supervision and use of time

1. Actively supervising practice - provides feedback
   - scans class regularly
   - moves about the gym
2. Targets inappropriate behavior.  
3. Time devoted to practice maximized.  
4. Opportunity to respond maximized.
APPENDIX J

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TRAINED OBSERVERS
RESPONSIBILITIES

1. **YOU SHOULD BE AT YOUR ASSIGNED SCHOOL APPROXIMATELY 10 MINUTES EARLY.**

2. **YOU SHOULD CODE THE LESSON DURING THE ASSIGNED PERIOD USING ALT-PE AND THE CHECKLIST.**

3. **YOU SHOULD COLLECT A COPY OF THE STUDENT'S LESSON PLAN BEFORE THE CLASS. PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF THE PERMANENT PRODUCTS ARE DATED. (LESSON PLAN, CODING SHEET, AND CHECKLIST).**

4. **YOU SHOULD MAKE SURE THAT THE STUDENT TEACHER HAS THE WIRELESS MIKE ON, THE RECEIVER IS ON, AND THE CASSETTE PLAYER IS ON. EVERYTHING SHOULD BE IN WORKING ORDER. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO CODE VERBAL BEHAVIOR. YOU ONLY HAVE TO CODE THREE (3) SUBJECTS DURING THE CLASS.**

5. **YOU SHOULD OBSERVE STUDENT A FOR 5 SECONDS, RECORD FOR 5 SECONDS, OBSERVE STUDENT B FOR 5 SECONDS, RECORD FOR 5 SECONDS, RECORD STUDENT C FOR 5 SECONDS, RECORD FOR 5 SECONDS, AND THEN REPEAT. A CUEING TAPE WILL BE PROVIDED. YOU SHOULD SUPPLY THE CASSETTE PLAYER. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO A CASSETTE PLAYER, PLEASE SEE ME.**

6. **YOU SHOULD NOT TALK TO EITHER THE COOPERATING TEACHER OR THE STUDENT TEACHER ABOUT THE DATA THAT YOU HAVE COLLECTED.**

7. **YOU MAY LEAVE AS SOON AS THE LESSON IS OVER.**

8. **YOU MAY STOP AT WHITE CASTLES ON THE WAY BACK TO CAMPUS AND SLIDE DOWN A FEW BOMBERS.**

9. **YOU SHOULD RETURN THE DATA, CHECKLIST, AND LESSON PLAN TO ME. YOU CAN EITHER PUT IT IN MY BOX OR PLACE IT ON MY DESK. MAKE SURE THE SCHOOL'S NAME, AND THE DATE IS ON ALL PERMANENT PRODUCTS.**

THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HELP!!!

SINCERELY,
APPENDIX K

OBSERVATIONAL CALENDER PROVIDED TO THE COOPERATING TEACHERS
**OBSERVATION CALENDAR - APRIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 3</th>
<th>WEEK 4</th>
<th>WEEK 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBSERVATION CALENDAR - MAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 6</th>
<th>WEEK 7</th>
<th>WEEK 8</th>
<th>WEEK 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- X = Target class observed.
- XX = Target class observed by two observers.
APPENDIX L

EVENT RECORDING CODING SHEET FOR STUDENT TEACHERS' VERBAL BEHAVIOR
STUDENT'S NAME: ___________________________ DATE: __________

SCHOOL: __________________________________

STUDENT TEACHER'S VERBAL BEHAVIOR

NAMES USED: (PUT A TALLY NEXT TO REPEATED NAMES) TOTAL:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE SPECIFIC FEEDBACK TOTAL:

POSITIVE GENERAL FEEDBACK TOTAL:

NEGATIVE SPECIFIC FEEDBACK TOTAL:

NEGATIVE GENERAL FEEDBACK TOTAL:

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TOTAL:

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS:

Positive Specific Feedback- Positive teacher reactions to student skill attempts which identifies the exact part of the movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Positive General Feedback- Positive teacher reactions to student behaviors or skill attempts which communicate a general teacher response to the attempt or behavior, but do not identify the exact part of the behavior or movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Negative Specific Feedback- Negative teacher reactions to student skill attempts which identifies the exact part of the movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Negative General Feedback- Negative teacher reactions to student behaviors or skill attempts which communicate a general teacher response to the behavior or attempt, but do not identify the exact part of the behavior or movement pattern to which the teacher reacted.

Corrective Skill Feedback- Teacher reactions to errors in student skill performance.
APPENDIX M

EVENT RECODING CODING SHEET FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS’ TASK STATEMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>SUBSTANTIVE</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIP</td>
<td>CATG</td>
<td>EXPLIC</td>
<td>ACCOUNT</td>
<td>EXPLIC</td>
<td>ACCOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

**TASK CATEGORY**

S: SUBSTANTIVE - Teaching of or planning for the subject matter.

P: PROCESS - The inclass behavior of either the student teacher or pupils.

O: OTHER - The professional preparation or socialization of the student teacher.

**EXPLICITNESS**

F = FULLY - Situation, performance and criteria are all stated.

I = IMPLICIT - Not all of the sections (situation, performance, criteria) are stated.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

F = FULLY - Account keeping, comparison with specification, and consequence application or all discussed.

P = PARTIALLY - Not all of the accountability areas are discussed.
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