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CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Effective behavior management is one of the most important skills which the classroom teacher must have in order for optimum learning to take place. Since classroom control is a prerequisite for learning, much emphasis in our teacher-education programs must be placed on assisting teacher trainees in acquiring this skill. Furthermore, this aspect of teacher training can neither be taken for granted nor left to chance when a teacher trainee is placed in a practicum or student teaching situation.

Various members of the education profession have given support to the idea that behavior management skills should be emphasized in teacher training. For example, Morse (handout, no date) from the University of Michigan indicated that a major problem for teachers is "how to talk or counsel effectively with pupils and groups of pupils, whether it be for the purpose of exploring a general attitude, a motivational complex or control and management problem with mild or severe implications" (p. 1).

Redl (1969), in an article on Aggression in the Classroom, wrote that "the aggression is engendered
right there in the classroom. It may be triggered either by what the teacher does that's right, but that doesn't happen to fit the kid, or God knows what—the kid's reaction to the group or to other kids, or to something that maybe the teacher wouldn't have done if he had stopped to think. But anyway, it's reactive to something in the environment at the moment" (p. 1).

Both Morse and Redl referred to the importance of teachers being able to manage classroom behavior. But even more than that, they pointed to the importance of the teacher being able to determine what behaviors are being demonstrated in the classroom, to interpret the situation, and then to be able to do something about it. Therefore, teacher trainees need to be able to effectively identify behaviors in the classroom that need to be eliminated and then to be able to determine positive alternative strategies for dealing with these behaviors.

Students at Western Michigan University in the Special Education Department have indicated, through conversations with the writer, that they feel a need for additional training in classroom control. They were able to verbalize about methods of classroom management, but were unsure as how to implement this information. Questions were raised as to when to use a particular method and what to do if that method was not
effective.

Teachers in the field also tend to seek assistance in maintenance of classroom control. Furthermore, administrators in public education are concerned about teachers who have difficulty managing behavior in their classrooms.

With concern impinging from these various directions within the teaching profession, teacher-training institutions should feel compelled to include a segment dealing with behavior management in their programs, not only from an academic viewpoint but also from a practical viewpoint. Teacher trainees must be able to identify classroom behaviors which are unacceptable and they must be able to determine alternative strategies for dealing with these problems.

**Statement of the Problem**

Two major influences in the development of the problem approached in this study are:

1. The concern expressed by practicing professionals and by teacher trainees.

2. The behavior problems exhibited by many of the children found in special education classrooms.

Therefore, this study was designed:

1. To determine the efficacy of instructing teacher trainees in the identification of behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom through the use
of:

a. The traditional classroom procedures of lecture and discussion or

b. The traditional classroom procedures with the addition of a videotape as a teaching tool.

2. To determine the efficacy of instructing teacher trainees in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with behavior in the classroom through the use of:

a. The traditional classroom procedures of lecture and discussion or

b. The traditional classroom procedures with the addition of a videotape as a teaching tool.

The above concerns were addressed in order to determine an effective method by which teacher trainees may learn that which is necessary in order to attain and maintain classroom control.

Special education teacher trainees were chosen as subjects for this study because many of the pupils they will be teaching in special education programs are placed there either because behavioral problems are their major difficulty or because these types of problems arose from frustration related to their primary disabilities. This indicates the importance for special education majors to be adequately trained in behavior management. Furthermore, from a research standpoint,
special education programs may offer more situations for behavioral management techniques to be employed and observed than would regular education programs.

Review of Literature

A need has been verbalized by practicing professionals, as well as by teacher trainees, for developing methods by which behavior management skills can be taught effectively through teacher-training programs. Kalick (1971) supported this statement when he said, "Unrealistic teacher-training programs and ineffective teacher selection and assignment practices are contributing to the problems in our schools today. It has become evident that there is a critical need to change the approaches both to teacher training and placement" (p. 261). Kalick indicated that part of the problem is that students do not spend enough time with classroom reality and that videotapes could be used to provide various realistic observations of classroom situations.

According to Fulton and Rupiper (1962), the classroom observation component in teacher training programs is required by most teacher training institutions prior to student teaching. They relate, however, that most observations have been of limited value: (a) because of limited space facilities and (b) because of
particular behaviors not being exhibited by the pupils during the specified observation period.

Holcomb (1970) is in agreement with Fulton and Rupiper when he writes, "observations in the public schools usually were limited by insufficient observation stations, space, and facilities to accommodate the increased enrollments in professional education today . . . . [and] neither the students nor the instructor could be sure that the object of the observation would be present at the time of the observation" (p. 84). Because of these concerns, the question of how prospective teachers can be taught to identify classroom behaviors must be considered.

Microteaching is believed to be a viable solution to providing practicum situations which are both sequential and comprehensive. According to Allen, Cooper, and Poliakoff (1972), microteaching may be defined as "a teaching situation which is scaled down in terms of time and numbers of students" (p. 1). This definition can be expanded to indicate that microteaching situations can be videotaped and be utilized for a number of purposes.

Before discussing the uses of videotapes connected with microteaching situations, some general information is necessary. Allen et al. (1972), for-
mulated a rationale for microteaching. The following is a list of their conclusions:

1. It is real teaching.

2. "It reduces the complexities of normal classroom teaching, thus allowing the teacher to concentrate on the acquisition of a teaching skill" (p. 4).

3. It provides knowledge and information regarding performance which helps the teacher trainee to acquire teaching skills.

4. It lets the teacher trainee utilize his own capabilities by controlling the selection of the content of the lesson to be taught.

5. It provides experience for trainees in working with pupils having various backgrounds prior to a student teaching experience.

6. It "permits control over the trainees environment with regard to students, methods of feedback, supervision, and many other manipulative variables" (p. 5).

7. It is a low threat situation and is thus more conducive to learning than is a student teaching situation.

8. It is a "low risk situation" (p. 5) for the student in that it is not a part of his regular classroom situation; the teacher trainee thus fears failure less.
9. It allows for perfection of teaching skills.

10. It allows for repetition of various skills which need to be overlearned by the teacher trainee.

11. It utilizes the technique of spaced or interval practice which is necessary for "long-term storage and retrieval" (p. 5).

In utilizing videotape as a tool in microteaching, the following reasons for its effectiveness were cited by Bosley (1968):

1. Preparation can be controlled for explicit portrayal of desired teaching objectives.

2. Videotape showing can be stopped, or even reversed and replayed, when questions occur or other needs for reinforcement become apparent in the class.

3. Videotaped observations can be selected for quality and stored for repeated use (pp. 2-3).

Further, Bosley indicated five significant uses for the video process. They are:

1. A flexible substitute for classroom observation.


3. A means of providing instruction in the skills and techniques inherent in the teaching processes, especially via single-concept videotapes and related aids.

5. [A record for the] preservation of original data for later analysis and research (p. 3).

Biberstine (1971), in his utilization of videotape equipment, felt that the question of distractibility should be addressed. He indicated that in most instances that within five minutes after the actual taping began, the classroom had returned to its original level of effectiveness.

From the preceding information, it becomes evident that some mechanism to permit systematic observation of behaviors in the classroom may well be needed in preparation programs for special education teacher trainees and that the use of the videotape medium may provide such a mechanism. The videotape, indeed, can provide for systematic observation. However, the number of reported uses of this observational technique are few and the research regarding this medium as a teaching tool is even more limited.

Related Research in General Education

The videotape recorder has been in commercial use only since 1956. The first reported project in education reported in the literature was the Stanford project conceived by Dwight Allen and Robert Bush at Stanford University in 1959 (Kallenback, 1966;
Biberstine, 1971). They developed a microteaching method that scaled down the amount of time, the size of the class, and the amount of teaching behavior to be developed. This Stanford project involved short videotapes of five to ten minutes in length which were presented to small groups of four to six teacher trainees. Research on the effectiveness of this program found no significant differences between the control and the experimental groups. However, the teaching method developed for this program was later used in other projects, either directly or in modified form. The major elements in this method are as follows:

1. Learning a skill.
2. Viewing a videotape of a model teacher using that skill.
3. Discussing the skill.
4. Teacher-trainee using the skill in teaching in his own subject area.
5. Videotaping or audiotaping the trainee if possible or being rated by another person.
6. The trainee, supervisor and colleagues analyzing the teaching performance in terms of strengths and weaknesses.
7. The trainee replanning the lesson (Allen et al., 1972, p. 6).
In another study at Stanford University by Allen and Cooper in 1963, more than sixty secondary education majors were divided randomly into two equal groups. The control groups carried out traditional observations in the classroom and spent time working as teacher aides. The experimental group was given concentrated training in the microteaching clinic followed by videotaping of their small group teaching. These students then viewed their own teaching via videotape. The results were as follows:

1. The microteaching group performed at a higher level of competence than the traditionally prepared group.

2. Performance in the microteaching situation predicted subsequent classroom performance.

3. There was a significant increase in the accuracy of candidates' self-perception of teaching performance (p. 11).

As a result of the Cooper and Allen studies, implications were drawn indicating that the teaching skills to be developed involved the instruction in specific teacher behaviors and that both teacher and student behaviors should be operationally defined. These specific teacher behaviors were thus designed "to influence learners in a predetermined direction . . . This required that both teacher and learner behaviors be operationally defined and that the desired
interactions be derived from a theoretical rationale" (p. 2). The following is a list of the specific teaching skills defined by these studies:

1. Fluency in asking questions.
2. Probing questions.
3. Higher order questions or those not answered from "memory or simple sensory description" (p. 2).
4. Divergent questions.
5. Reinforcing positively to obtain student participation.
6. Recognizing attending behavior.
7. Silence and non-verbal clues.
8. Cueing.
10. Stimulus variation.
11. Closure.
12. Lecturing.
13. Use of examples.
15. Completeness of communication.

Roush (1971), in his review of research in the utilization of the video recorder, reported little empirical evidence in support of videotapes as a teaching tool. His review, however, did describe the videotape as possibly providing:

1. Observation material for a class or an indivi-
dual student.

2. Immediate private feedback for a student teacher or counselor trainee concerning his performance.

3. Evaluation of performance by a supervisor and a trainee.

4. Specific preplanned recorded lessons as a basis for methods course instruction.

5. Situational materials to be used with simulation procedures or case study analysis.

6. Feedback and supervisory analysis prior to immediate replication of performance.

7. Both demonstration and feedback in developing specific teaching behaviors.


9. Research analysis of teacher behavior, pupil behavior, or teacher-pupil interaction.

10. Instructor-prepared materials for use with closed-circuit television, dial access, or film loop independent study activities (p. 850).

In his review, Roush reported on a number of studies supporting the use of the videotape medium to increase teacher effectiveness. He also reported that, because of videotape instruction, intern teachers caused a significant change in the cognitive behaviors displayed by the pupils in a secondary social studies
program. In another situation, one group of intern
teachers was shown a videotape of their own teaching
during a supervisory conference. This group showed a
greater change in selected teaching behaviors than did
two other groups of interns. One of the other two
groups did not view their teaching on videotape during
a supervisory conference while the third group was not
supervised at all during their student teaching experi­
ence.

In a 1964 study reported by Roush, which involved
the supervision of teacher trainees and videotaping,
he indicated that the following questions were analyzed
using the Stanford Micro-Teaching Appraisal Guide:

1. Does feedback from supervisors who observe
television recordings produce more change in trainee's
behavior than feedback from supervisors who observe the
lesson taught in the classroom? [The analysis found
the answer to be negative.]

2. Do trainees need to have feedback from super­visors in order to change behavior? . . . [The analysis
found the answer to be affirmative.]

3. Does verbal and videotape feedback from super­visors produce more change in trainees' behavior than
just verbal feedback from supervisors? [The analysis
found the answer to be affirmative.] (p. 852)

Holcomb (1970) reported that a study by Patrick
indicated that preservice teachers who participated in a simulated observation program were rated higher as student teachers and as first year teachers than were preservice teachers who experienced direct observation.

Biberstine (1971) referred to a number of research studies on the utilization of the videotape as a teaching technique. One of these studies was that of Gage, Runkel and Chatterjee, 1960, who reported that feedback from videotapes produced change in teacher behavior. MacDonald and Allen in 1967 and Tanzman in 1969 suggested that changing of teacher behavior resulted from teacher training procedures involving videotapes. Solomon and McDonald in 1970 found that two conditions had to be met before the appropriate changes in teaching behavior would occur. They are:

1. The person is aware of the behavior expectations, and looks for deviations of his behaviors from these, and

2. The person has adopted these expectations and is trying to make his behavior congruent with them (p. 218).

Bosley (1968) discussed the Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-STEP), an experiment which used the videotape medium. One of the experiments involved the use of film loops made of model teachers teaching which were then utilized as a teaching tool. Paramount
in M-STEP's reasoning for the review of programs was the desire to find ways to broaden the scope of utilization of media by "defining techniques and applications . . . [and] appraising the effectiveness of media in learning situations" (p. iii). Five significant uses which the M-STEP project found for the video process were these:

1. [It is] a flexible substitute for classroom observation.
2. [It is] a useful source of self-appraisal for student teachers.
3. [It is] a means of providing instruction in the skills and techniques inherent in the teaching processes, especially via single-concept videotapes and related aids.
4. [It is a means of] recording and evaluating the progress of student teaching . . .
5. [It allows for the] preservation of original data for later analysis and research (p. 3).

Brigham Young University implemented a program using microteaching for each of 750 students in a beginning education course. In this particular instance microteaching was defined as "the creation of a miniature teaching situation under controlled conditions" (Webb, Baird, Belt and Holder, 1968, document resume). It took approximately 365 hours of time to
tape the 730 students individually. The taping occurred outside of the regular scheduled class time and took place during a ten week period. In the evaluation of this project, 87% of a random sample of the total group rated the microteaching as "excellent." The random sample consisted of 41 students. (p. 6)

Fulton and Rupiper (1962) investigated a situation similar to that at Brigham Young University. They asked the question, "Can vicarious observational experiences be provided which are as effective as direct observational experiences relative to school situations" (p. 157)? If this question could be answered in the affirmative, problems mentioned earlier in this review of literature (i.e. limited space for observations of actual classrooms, how to control the behaviors which are observed) could be alleviated. Vicarious observations were, therefore, given to students via film and slide sequences. The results showed:

1. "Students who participated in the vicarious observational experiences demonstrated significantly greater understanding of concepts [teaching] as determined by analysis of difference between adjusted means [P < .01] than students who participated in direct observational experiences" (p. 161) for the course entitled School in American Culture.

2. In the Human Growth and Development and the
Educational Evaluation and Guidance courses, no significant differences were found as determined by an academic test.

The authors drew two general conclusions from this study which are summarized as follows:

1. Many problems associated with direct observation can be alleviated.
2. Filmed observational sequences can be used with at least equal effectiveness as direct experiences.

Borg, Kallenback, Morris and Friebel (1968) reported on a study regarding a microteaching program that was designed to change twelve specific teacher-trainee behaviors in teaching a discussion lesson. Five groups of 15 to 17 student teachers each were subjects in this study. Significant changes occurred for those who completed the entire microcourse. The method utilized was patterned after the Stanford study referred to on page 9 in this dissertation. There were, however, two important differences between this and the Stanford study. One was that this model contained a self-contained package of inservice materials. The other was the self-evaluation plan designed for this program. The authors drew the conclusion that models employing microteaching may be effective in the development of specific teaching skills.

Research carried out at the University of
Tennessee took a different tack in that they used the videotape medium as a simulation technique. In analyzing their research, Bosley (1968) noted the following types of problems for which he feels the medium is applicable:

1. Dealing with the constantly disrupting child.
2. Handling children's constantly disrupting behavior toward one another.
3. Motivating individual students.
4. Adjusting classwork to the rapid learner.
9. Learning to control the student teacher's impatience with students.

Many of the types of problems cited in the Bosley article could be dealt with effectively by a system designed by Good and Brophy (1970). This system provides a comprehensive record of all dyadic contacts between the classroom teacher and the individual students in the classroom. Most interaction systems analyze how the teacher deals with the classroom as a whole. However, the Good and Brophy system provides relevant feedback to teachers as to their teaching behavior and how it affects each individual student. The development of this system is based on the fact that many teachers direct their attention toward indi-
vidual students. Therefore, analysis of the teacher-student-interaction should not be derived from a gestalt type of assessment of the teacher's behavior. These authors indicated that their position has been supported by Davis and Dollard, 1940; Becker, 1952; Hoehn, 1954; Lahadern, 1967; deGroat and Thompson, 1949; Good, 1970; St. John, 1932; and others. Many categories are utilized in this system of teacher behavior analysis. Three of these categories are quoted here:

[1.] Teacher's feedback reactions—(praise, criticism, giving correct answer, failure to give feedback etc.) . . .

[2.] Work related contacts—either teacher or student initiated praise, criticism, process feedback etc. . . .

[3.] Behavior evaluations—praise, warning, criticism is coded (p. 133).

These behaviors can be tallied by a single person. Four observers were involved in a reliability check, and the reliability in most categories was 80% or higher between these observers within a two-week period of time. The Good and Brophy system shows much promise in evaluating the "total impact of behavior modification studies" (p. 134) and in producing possible changes in teacher behavior. This type of objective behavior analysis could provide information which would be more
acceptable to classroom teachers since they often find it difficult to accept feedback which suggests that change should be made in their behavior. Furthermore, this system could provide answers to the following questions:

1. Do teachers treat male and female students alike in equivalent situations?
2. Does student behavior influence teacher behavior . . . ?
3. Do some students receive little or no teacher contact?
4. Do some students receive predominately negative comments by the teacher?
5. Do students in minority groups or other identifiable groups receive treatment that differs (p. 135)?

Related Research in Special Education

Research studies in the area of Special Education and the use of the videotape as a tool in educating teacher trainees as to methods of control of behavior in the classroom are limited in number. However, there are a few studies which are relevant to the concern of this study.

Liberman and Swope (1969) reported on closed circuit television (CCTV) as it was used by the Special Education Department of the Board of Cooperative Edu-
cation Services located in the Northern Westchester and Putnam County areas of New York state. Significant information was found in relation to: (a) the understanding of behavior patterns of students and (b) methods of dealing with these behaviors effectively. The program involved over 850 children who had been diagnosed as mentally impaired, emotionally impaired, or brain injured and their teachers who were in their first year of teaching. These teachers constituted the group to be observed via CCTV. At the completion of the taping, these teachers viewed themselves on videotape and received a tally sheet made of their recorded behaviors. This tally was completed using the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis. The videotape plus the tally recording made it possible for the teachers to analyze their own classroom techniques as well as to determine "behavior patterns in the classroom and methods to deal with them effectively" (Liberman and Swope, 1969, p. 50). In general, the teachers indicated that the tapes revealed that changes were needed in their classroom organization and in their teaching techniques in order to meet the needs of the children. Two examples of this included: (a) structuring a class along individualized instructional modes which afforded the students more success and (b) adding remedial reading to the programs.
Liberman and Swope concluded that using CCTV in this way was beneficial for helping teachers in this special education program with analyzing their classroom behavior.

Gavin (1969) reported that his search of the literature indicated videotape recordings similar to those discussed in the Liberman and Swope article were more effective than direct CCTV observation because videotapes of classroom behavior could be recorded and edited in advance, thus providing an effective medium for observation. This medium is also more effective than the traditional procedure of direct observation used in many practicum situations. An essay type instrument confirmed the effectiveness of videotape as a classroom observation method.

Hoerner (1972) reported on a videotape use directly involving the training of children. In Arlington, Virginia, this medium was employed in order to teach mentally retarded persons self-help skills.

Gelfand (1970), in a study which utilized videotapes in connection with teacher performance, found that this medium could meet the following objectives:

1. To identify sources of teacher error in administering individual behavior modification programs to behaviorally retarded children ages three to twelve years, and
2. To develop effective individual and group training programs for a variety of professional and paraprofessional teaching personnel (p. 1). This program was administered in the Behavior Modification Center at the University of Utah. It identified good teachers as those who (a) adhered strictly to behavior modification techniques in order to modify prescribed behaviors, (b) reinforced positive behaviors, and (c) ignored inappropriate responses. In one of the phases teaching staff members were taped daily. In their feedback interview they were praised for appropriate techniques used in the classroom and were given suggestions of possible alternative strategies to use in place of inappropriate techniques. As the teachers' use of primary and social reinforcement techniques increased, it was noted that the children's appropriate classroom behaviors also increased.

At San Jose State University in California, videotapes were used in the area of competency programming in special education. This was "a five year program designed to move from a traditional teaching approach to a performance-based approach in both generic and advanced specialization" (David and Butler, 1975, p. 1). Video materials were designed to focus on communication and its disorders in the special education areas of learning disabilities, mental retardation, speech pathology, and...
audiology. The tapes, used as a teaching device, were divided into the following tri-classification system:

1. Lecture tapes which were to supplement the course content giving "characteristics of exceptionality, behavioral examples, related diagnostic techniques, [and] related exceptional skills" (p. 6).

2. Evaluation tapes which were designed to be shown to students and then to receive oral and written information from the students allowing for immediate application of theory to a specific clinical or school setting.

3. Observation tapes which were designed for students to use in observing a continuing therapy session in either an "autotutorial or classroom setting" (p. 7). These tapes were also used for assessment purposes.

The comparison study between this media competency-based approach and the traditional approaches in teaching special education at San Jose State University revealed the following benefits:

1. More effective instruction over shorter time intervals . . . . The videotapes are cost-effective. Both student and faculty time is reduced, travel time is obliterated; and the professor is assumed (sic) that the students will have effective observational opportunities . . . .
2. **A higher level of learning opportunities.** It is not necessary to search out a classroom ... and hope for one specific instance of behavior to occur ... 

3. Increased opportunity for modeling ... [of experienced teachers.]

4. ... A more individualized approach to student's training needs ...

5. **Increase in observational skills measured through learning response time** ...

6. **The identification of a hierarchy of competencies.** The faculty is able to measure student competencies since he (sic) specifically aware of the stimuli to which the student is responding ...

7. **Increased opportunities for evaluation** ...

There are little or no extraneous distractions, and the exceptional individual's behavior is more easily identifiable since the edited tape provides visual detail with greater clarity (pp. 9-10).

Behaviors were videotaped for this program on a one-to-one basis because of the emphasis on individualized and prescriptive teaching. It should be noted, however, that in a personal interview with the authors, they mentioned that group sessions were impossible because of much difficulty in obtaining parent permission. They had hoped originally to include group sessions in order to pick up more realistic behaviors which face
teachers in the classroom (Interview with David, Butler, and others, 1975).

Striefel and Eberl (1974) studied the use of videotape to determine if modeling behavior by an individual person, a videotape of the same person, and/or a ten year old boy would have the same effect on the behavior of mentally retarded institutionalized individuals. The video model was effective in obtaining imitative behavior from the subject 50% of the time. However, the modeling behavior was considerably higher when a live adult was used.

Barclay's research (1968) took a still different direction. He reported on research which indicated the efficacy of using microteaching techniques for in-service training of school psychologists who are presently practicing in the field. This model, a Social Learning Model for School Psychology, suggests a strong possibility for instituting behavior modification techniques in the planning of individual curricula in order to "accelerate markedly the rate of achievement of educationally handicapped and mentally retarded children" (document resume). This model has three main functions: "(a) assessment, (b) strategy-making and (c) evaluation" (p. 4). To further explain these functions, the psychologist must know the parameters of the problem behaviors exhibited in the classroom in
order to determine the appropriate strategy, or strategies, for dealing with them. The psychologists chosen for this study were involved in a program consisting of didactic instruction, television experience, group criticism, and a micro-consultation procedure. Each skill was outlined, taught, and videotaped while the psychologist was practicing the skill and was then criticized by the group. Among the skills identified as those to be learned were: "teaching psychologists how to determine the parameters of the problem behavior . . . , teaching psychologists how to focus on one operant behavior rather than on a total array of behaviors . . . [and teaching them] how to develop a strategy for coping with a problem behavior" (p. 9).

Roush (1971), in summarizing his review of research on the efficacy of videotapes as a teaching device, indicated that he questions results that have been less than favorable: (a) because of the possibility that the research designs were inadequate, (b) because there was a lack of creativity as far as the researchers were concerned, or (c) because there were limitations in the instruments employed for measurement. He went on to indicate that continued experimentation in the use of videotapes should be considered because of its newness as a tool in the area of teacher training and that not only is research needed
but also the results need to have an influence on practice in the field.

**Uses of Videotapes in Education and Related Fields**

A variety of uses for videotapes are related to the field of education but have not been formally researched as to their efficacy. For example, small segments of behavior were isolated on videotapes and played as often as necessary so that teachers at Oberlin College could: (a) evaluate the teaching of classroom teachers, (b) achieve a satisfactory level of performance in their own teaching, and (c) determine alternative methods in dealing with situations in the classroom. More specifically, these tapes were used: "(a) as an introduction to and practice in observational techniques, (b) as a supplement to live observations by providing a wide range of behaviors of teachers, pupils and subjects, (c) as raw data for analysis of classroom behavior . . . . , and (e) as illustrations of specific teaching methods [both effective and ineffective]" (Peterson, 1967, p. 209).

During 1966-1967, videotapes were used at the College of Education of the University of Bridgeport by student teachers for the purposes of self analysis, for group discussions, and for evaluation of their teaching. Tapes were also used to teach the behavior patterns commonly exhibited by disadvantaged preschool children.
These latter tapes were edited and commentary was added prior to their being shown to educational psychology and child development classes. Other uses of tapes at the University of Bridgeport included demonstrations of model teaching and counseling situations (Ingham, 1967).

Microteaching using videotapes was used at the University of Florida by the Business Education Department so that students could criticize their own teaching. These tapes were also critiqued by the students' peers and instructors (Crews, Carr and Hunter, 1969).

Prymier (1968) discussed an approach involving five conditions in education which could be combined in creating the microteaching setting and which he defined as a "scaled down encounter." He suggested the following rationale supporting his approach:

1. Actual teaching must take place.
2. The complexity of the teaching situation is reduced—eg. number of students, amount of time, scope of presentation.
3. The focus of the task for the teacher is specific.
4. There is much control over number of students, the feedback situation, etc.
5. Feedback is expanded in that it is immediate, viewed by the teacher on videotape, and shared by a
supervisor or colleagues (p. 181).

Frymier's approach has been used in preteaching clinics, with personnel in vocational education, for training supervisors of student teachers, in training Peace Corps volunteers, for training counselors, and for assisting medical students in developing skills necessary to relate effectively to patients. Suggestions for other uses, according to Frymier, include the area of teaching administrators to relate to parents, training secretaries and receptionists, training of teacher aides, and training social workers.

Dunne (1968) reviewed the "microlab" videotape system in Lane County Oregon. The goal of this system was "to bring about greater teacher awareness of group dynamics, and to show how interplay between students and teachers affects attitudes" (p. 140). As an example, the author mentioned that if a teacher caused boredom or hostility, the tapes would draw her attention to it. Split images could be filmed since two cameras could be utilized at the same time, one on the teacher and the other on the student. Since the cameras could be controlled remotely, interruption of the class would be at a minimum. Furthermore, teachers in an adjacent room could view the master teacher via this system.

In their monograph, Allen and Cooper (1972) listed the following uses of videotape in the area of inservice
training:

1. Jefferson County Colorado used the videotape system to upgrade their instructional program.

2. Colorado State College at Greeley trained 100 teachers in early childhood education.

3. It was used as a major component in training in at least two Peace Corps centers. One use was for the training of instructors to use Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) for those who would be involved with Cuban Refugee children.

Allen and others have created a publication regarding the use of microteaching, including the use of videotapes, for inservice purposes entitled "Teaching Skills for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers" (p. 8). This publication includes detailed videotaped descriptions of the skills.

A novel use of the videotape as a tool was found at Vanderbilt University and the University of Illinois where it was considered to be very helpful in assisting college teachers to analyze their own teaching (Allen and Cooper, 1972).

Videotaped segments of youngsters' behaviors have also been used by teams of professionals in order to analyze an individual child's behavior and to formulate a treatment program which is relative to the child's strengths and weaknesses (Steward, 1968).
A similar use for the videotape was reported by Travers (1973) in his book which deals with research in teaching. He reported on a study by Gordon and Jester (1970) in which videotaping of infants was carried out within the home situation in order to complete a frequency count of their behaviors. This was accomplished in lieu of direct observation because it was thought to be more accurate.

Parochial schools have used videotapes in order to transmit teaching principles to their lay teachers. These personnel viewed themselves teaching and analyzed their behavior in regards to the school system's list of teaching principles (Steward, 1970).

Hylton and Quellmatz (1970) discussed how the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) used tapes to train observers to use the Flanders' System of Interaction Analysis. The tapes included:

1. Identifying and defining behavior categories of interest.

2. Defining representative responses within a category to assure discrete categories (p. 55).

Kalick (1971) suggested that an excellent use of the videotape medium would be to tape a candidate for a teaching position so that the tape might be used to demonstrate that candidate's teaching skills to prospective employers.
Gavin (1969), in his review of videotape as it had been employed in special education, referenced a number of uses. One such project was at Eastern Michigan University's Occupational Therapy Department where they prepared a large number of tapes regarding a variety of special education teaching situations and used live closed circuit viewing from the classroom. The Speech and Hearing Department at Eastern Michigan University also used videotapes in this manner. Another use reported in Gavin's review was the utilization of tapes as an instructional method in order to teach principles of teaching and supervision of student teachers. It was considered to be highly beneficial for a number of reasons: (a) there was no limitation on time to be spent viewing the tapes, (b) there was no limitation as to the number of viewers, (c) they could replay tapes, (d) they noted that the children made "rapid and adequate adjustment to the cameras [, and (e) an] instructional tape could be made by editing and splicing or dubbing the material" (p. 2). Another use reported by Gavin demonstrated how raw data or actual classroom behaviors could be collected on tapes which could be combined to demonstrate many teaching styles, to show what constitutes good teaching, and to train teachers how to handle specific problems in the classroom. Gavin reported that at
Hunter College videotapes were used to evaluate student teachers' performance and also for supervision purposes with this group. These student teachers were of the opinion that this procedure made them more like the "ideal teacher" (p. 8).

Since the development of the videotape, interaction analysis can better be used as a teaching tool. The first use of the combination of the videotape and interaction analysis was in 1962 at Temple University in The Laboratory on Teacher Role Behavior (Amidon, 1969). In this program students were taped while teaching a short lesson to other college students. A teacher observed the skill lesson and did an interaction analysis which was then summarized on a matrix and given to the student who taught the lesson. This student could then use the matrix and the videotape for self analysis. Amidon referred to his earlier article (1968) when reporting results indicating that the student teachers who were given this training were exhibiting behaviors different from that of the control group. As a result of an American Association of College for Teacher Education workshop, Amidon's model was changed to the Skill Development in Teaching (SKIT) model which involves the components of microteaching, interaction analysis and nonverbal analysis.

Bradley (1970) reported videotape uses in training...
graduate students for educational supervision; in
training classroom teachers in analyzing behavior
patterns of children who are either mentally retarded,
emotionally disturbed, or brain injured; in training
counselors; and in teaching remedial reading (p. 161).

A similar use of the videotape medium was em­
ployed at a teacher training program at the University
of Washington by instructors: (a) in the observation
of student teachers in the area of Emotionally Im­
paired, and (b) in the evaluation of these student
teachers' skills by noting the effects of teaching on
each child's behaviors (Haring and Fargo, 1969).

In order to alleviate several problems found in
attempting to observe emotionally disturbed children
accurately videotapes were utilized by Norton and
Kounin (Kounin, 1970). For several months they had
been observing emotionally disturbed children in the
classroom and had been recording their observations in
notebooks. At the conclusion of their observation
period, they felt they had very little scientific
data due to the fact that the human observer has the
following deficiencies:

1. An inability to obtain complete records of
what happened.

2. A tendency to selectively notice and record
events that were impressive, contrasting, in line with
some pre-existing hypothesis or concerns, intense, or otherwise perceptually outstanding to the point of the inclusion of other mundane and less noticeable events.

3. A propensity to include labels, evaluations, judgments, pseudointerpretations, summaries, and other types of nonobjective and nondescriptive entries.

4. An inclination to arrive at premature interpretations about the management of children's behavior (pp. 60-61).

Because of these observer deficiencies, Norton and Kounin decided to use a videotape recorder as the observer. The lens of the videotape, unlike the human eye, has no "bias, theories, preconceptions, needs, or interests . . . . [It records] without forgetting, exaggerating, theorizing, judging, interpreting, or eliminating" (p. 62). The behavior categories they decided to use in analyzing the tapes included:

1. Definitely and completely involved in work (DI)
2. Probably involved in work (PI)
3. Definitely not involved in work (DO)
4. Restless
5. Languishing
6. Engaged in task related deviancy (TR)
7. Engaged in nontask related deviancy (NTR)

(p. 64)
Supportive Comments from the Literature

Many authors cited in this review of literature have been very positive in their evaluation of the videotape as it is used in simulation and/or micro-teaching. For example, Holcomb (1970) found the following advantages to simulation exercises which utilized the videotape medium:

1. The simulation program eliminated the necessity of college students traveling to the public school.

2. The simulation program lessened the disruption of the public school.

3. The simulation program controlled what the teacher education students observed.

4. The simulation program allowed close concentration through focusing student attention and eliminating distractions.

5. The simulation method allowed time for discussion directly after viewing (while interest was high).

6. The college instructor could point out pertinent aspects of the teaching strategies as they were being observed (pp. 85-86).

Further, he indicated that students could view several different teaching situations as well as observe more behavior in less time.
Prymier (1968) reported that videotaped simulation exercises may serve to:

1. Provide intensive focused opportunities to study and analyze critical teaching problems which may occur during student teaching or other preservice activities . . . .

3. Provide opportunities for unfettered problem solving free of censure and failure . . . .

6. Reduce teacher failure and turnover . . . .

8. Orient beginning teachers . . . .


Prymier, in this same article, quoted Cunningham, from a paper presented at the International Intervisitation Conference at the University of Michigan in 1966, as saying,

My personal view of simulation is that it is the most promising single innovation . . . that we have available today. Much, indeed most, of its potential remains to be activated; we have only begun to invent appropriate means for its usage (p. 192).

Robert Kraych, in a proposal for federal funding, supported the videotape medium when he stated:

True progress is achieved in the field of education when curricular and technological advances
are translated into broadly-based programs at the operational level. . . . The lecture method continues to prevail. . . . [but new media and instructional methodology] in the area of teacher education . . . is of critical dimensions (Ingham, 1967, p. 1054).

In the area of classroom management, Allen, Cooper and Poliakoff (1970) are of the opinion that problems of classroom management have not yet been solved successfully with microteaching. However, a few examples of teaching skills which can be presented in a microtaught situation include: "Reinforcement: the teacher administers verbal and nonverbal rewards to students for effective participation. The use of silence; eg. after a student response or following a teacher's question" (Bosley, 1968, p. 5). Bosley, who was the Director of the Multi-State Teacher Education Project in 1968, said that "for the first time in history, through video processes we now possess powerful technological aids for developing effective teaching performance" (p. 6).

Peterson (1967) wrote that only the surface has been touched in the use of tapes for instructing teacher trainees. One possible use would be "to provide more precise knowledge in the area of classroom discipline" (p. 210). Along this same line, Kallenback (1966) was
of the opinion that the use of the videotape recording
was only limited "by our imagination and finances . . .
tape You-Name-It for whatever" (p. 19). However, he
prefers to use the medium for the improvement of
teacher competencies.

Gavin (1969) proposes some interesting possibilities for using videotape in the area of special
education:

1. Screening possible future personnel in the field
   by observing interaction with a handicapped child.
2. For first level training of teacher trainees--to
   teach, evaluate, plan, re-teach.
3. For second level training--this is the same as
   number 2 except for working with more than one
   handicapped child.
4. For third level training--this follows the same
   idea but proposes working with an entire class.

Another direction for the future is that of pro-
gram packages. One such package was released in
January, 1976. This package was designed for prospec-
tive teachers in Special Education. It is a comprehen-
sive set of print and audio-visual materials which are
designed to give teacher trainees the basic competen-
cies which are needed to teach exceptional children
systematically. One of the features of the program
which the authors consider to be very desirable is de-
monstration films of "real teachers in actual classroom" (White and Haring, letter dated 1975, p. 1).

The media included in this package are film loops, audio cassette tapes, and a worktext. The features of the program include:

1. Real kids . . .
2. Real teachers . . .
3. Real Procedures . . .
4. Real Competencies demonstrated by these [master] teachers and taught to students going through the program" (p. 3).

Benefits listed include:

1. The opportunities to observe children and teachers in real situations.
2. Observation with direction . . . .
4. Savings of time and cost . . . .
5. Accountability (p. 4).

Within number four above is included the savings of instructor time because of showing actual classroom behavior without leaving the campus.

Although there are many positive reviews of videotape as a teaching tool for improving the education of future teachers, the importance of its utility needs to be demonstrated in teacher effectiveness in the classroom. This opinion is supported by Hoerner (1972) when he indicates that the real proof of the exper-
iences in using videotape to train teachers is their change on the job! There is also a definite need for further research to determine if this tool is truly one which will benefit teacher trainees in their training in behavior management.

This study was designed, therefore, to determine: (a) if videotape training has an effect on teacher performance in the classroom and (b) if this type of training benefits teacher trainees in their use of behavior management skills. The remainder of this chapter will operationalize the concerns toward which this study is directed—as outlined in the Statement of the Problem (pp. 3-5).

Research Design

The research design for this study was primarily a pretest-posttest control group design with some elements of a time series design (Tuckman, 1972).

Figure 1

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \quad R_1 & 0 & [0_2 \ x_1 \ 0_3] & 0_4 \\
& \quad R_2 & 0 & [0_6 \ x_2 \ 0_7] & 0_8 \\
B & \quad R_{1,3} & & [0_2 \ x_1 \ 0_3] \\
& \quad R_{2,4} & & [0_6 \ x_2 \ 0_7] \\
C & \quad R_5 & & [0_9 \ x_1 \ 0_{10}] & 0_{11} \\
& \quad R_6 & & [0_{12} x_2 \ 0_{13}] & 0_{14}
\end{align*}
\]
Letter A in Figure 1 indicates that the teacher trainees who were observed in the classroom while teaching were randomly divided into two treatment groups, \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \). \( O_1, O_5, O_4, \) and \( O_6 \) refer to the observations that were carried out by the supervising teachers of the teacher trainees while they were teaching in the student teaching situation. At the time of the treatment, trainees were presented with a pretest \( (O_2, O_6) \), the treatment \( (X_1, X_2) \), and a posttest \( (O_3, O_7) \).

Letter B in Figure 1 specifies the teacher trainees who were student teaching and randomized into two treatment groups during one semester. These groups included the trainees placed in the two treatment groups as indicated in Letter A plus all other special education teacher trainees assigned to student teaching during the fall semester. Stratified sampling was employed to control for the number of the trainees who were not observed while teaching in their student teaching situation prior to the time of the treatment. In other words, those who had been observed by their supervising teachers were by use of random numbers assigned into the two groups and then those who were not observed were assigned in the same manner. The methodology indicated by Letter B did not include the collection of data associated with classroom ob-
ervation of behaviors. At the time of the treatment, a pretest \((O_2, O_6)\), treatments \((X_1 \text{ or } X_2)\), and a posttest \((O_3, O_7)\) were administered.

Letter C in Figure 1 indicates a group of teacher trainees on campus in a specified course who were randomized into sampling units utilizing cluster sampling of course sections. \(R_5\) and \(R_6\) were comprised of two sections each. The groups were presented a pretest \((O_9, O_{12})\), a treatment \((X_1 \text{ or } X_2)\), and a posttest \((O_{10}, O_{13})\). While these students were engaged in their student teaching assignments, they were observed by trained observers during the time they were teaching in the classroom.

This research design was employed to address the problem areas which were stated earlier in this chapter (i.e. determining the efficacy of training teacher trainees in the identification of behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom and in determining alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors). The pretest-posttest technique was used to determine if the videotape designed for this study is an effective tool to teach both the identification of unacceptable behaviors as well as the identification of effective strategies for dealing with them. The observation of teacher trainees while they were teaching was utilized to determine if the training had the de-
sired effect on actual teaching.

Variables

In order to operationalize the design of this study, the variables need to be identified and defined.

Independent Variables

1. Lecture/discussion method
2. Videotape method

Dependent Variables

1. Identification of pupil behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom as demonstrated in:
   (a) the college setting and (b) the student teaching setting.
2. Determination of alternative strategies for eliminating the identified behaviors as demonstrated in:
   (a) the college setting and (b) in the student teaching setting.

Control Variables and Method of Control

1. Time during which teacher trainees are observed--partially controlled by:
   a. requesting supervising teachers (Figure 1, part A, page 43) to observe on a particular date and at a particular time.
   b. observer training (Figure 1, part C).
2. Observations of teacher trainees--controlled by observation instrument and observer training.
3. Stimulus for pretest-posttest--controlled by
use of videotape presentation.

4. Pupil behaviors on the videotape—controlled by editing the actual classroom behaviors to be seen on the tape.

5. Special Education Curriculum—controlled by all teacher trainees being in the same curriculum.

6. Discussion leader's teaching style—partially controlled, one discussion leader interacting with the control and experimental group during the training sessions indicated in Figure 1, parts A and B and a second leader interacting with the sessions in Figure 1, part C.

**Intervening Variables**

1. Sex of the teacher trainee.

2. Major area of specialization within the Special Education Curriculum.

3. Minor area of specialization in the college program of the teacher trainee.

4. Previous non-special education coursework of the teacher trainees.

5. Previous experience of the teacher trainees with behavior management and/or handicapped children.

6. Feedback given by the student teacher supervisors in the special education student teaching situation.

7. Feedback given by the supervisor to the teacher
trainee from regular student teaching situation.

8. The behaviors demonstrated by pupils during the observations of the teacher trainees in their special education student teaching situation.

While direct control was not provided, it has been assumed that these extraneous variables were controlled through the randomization of the experimental and control groups.

**Hypotheses**

Twelve research hypotheses were presented in order to address the problems outlined earlier in this study. Operational definitions of the terminology are needed, however, prior to the presentation of these hypotheses.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Teacher trainees—those undergraduate and graduate students in the Western Michigan University's Special Education curricula who were being trained to teach in the area of the mentally impaired, emotionally impaired, visually impaired, orthopedically impaired, and/or learning disabled.

2. Supervising teachers—those teachers in the field to which teacher trainees from Western Michigan University's Special Education Department were assigned for their special student teaching assignment.

3. Pupils—those handicapped students who were
enrolled in special education classrooms in which teacher trainees were placed for their student teaching.

4. Identification of unacceptable behaviors—the specification of behaviors displayed by pupils which are considered to be unacceptable in the classroom (see Appendix E).

5. Strategies for dealing with behaviors—alternative behavior management techniques which can be employed to eliminate identified behaviors (see Appendix E).

6. The videotape—a teaching tool recorded especially for this study. The tape shows emotionally disturbed learners in a high school program who were in either an academic or controlled free-time situation.

7. Videotape method—the method which utilized the videotape in conjunction with the lecture/discussion method to assist teacher-trainees in the identification of behaviors and in the discussion of the possible positive strategies which may be effective in eliminating the behaviors.

8. Lecture/discussion method—the typical college teaching procedure which utilizes lecture by the instructor and discussion between the students and the instructor. The topic discussed was the identification
of unacceptable classroom behaviors and the possible alternative strategies which may be effective in eliminating the behaviors.

9. Treatment 1—this treatment was a training session in which teacher trainees were taught by the videotape method to identify unacceptable behaviors in the classroom and to determine alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors.

10. Treatment 2—this treatment was a training session in which students were taught by the lecture/discussion method to identify unacceptable behaviors in the classroom and to determine alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors.

11. Teaching situation—the actual teaching by the teacher trainee in the student teaching situation. This teaching occurred in a special education classroom.

12. Pretest and posttest—the instrument designed for this study which directed the teacher trainee to view a segment of the videotape, list behaviors which they identified as needing changing, and identify alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors.

13. Significance—the level of significance set for testing all twelve hypotheses was .05.

Research Hypotheses

1. Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/dis-
cussion method will make significant gains in their ability to identify unacceptable behaviors.  
**Rationale**—Teacher trainees who received the lecture/discussion method described in Treatment₂, in which they discuss behaviors which can be identified as unacceptable in the classroom, should then be better able to identify these behaviors when they are demonstrated in the classroom via the simulation technique of the videotape instrument designed for the pretest-posttest in this study.

2. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make significant gains in their ability to identify unacceptable behaviors.  
**Rationale**—Teacher trainees who have the experience of the videotape method described in Treatment₁, in which they utilize the videotape as a teaching tool in order to discuss behaviors which need to be identified as unacceptable, should then be better able to identify these behaviors when they are demonstrated in the classroom via the simulation technique of the videotape instrument designed for the pretest-posttest in this study.

3. Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies.  
**Rationale**—Teacher trainees who have the experience of
the lecture/discussion method described in Treatment₂, in which positive alternative strategies are determined for the identified behaviors, should then be better able to determine alternative strategies. This will be determined by the pretest-posttest designed for this study.

4. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies.

Rationale—Teacher trainees who have the experience of the videotape method described in Treatment₁, in which acceptable alternative strategies are determined for the identified behaviors, should then be better able to determine alternative strategies. This will be determined by the pretest-posttest designed for this study.

5. Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make significant gains in their ability to identify behaviors when in the student teaching situation.

Rationale—Being trained in the ability to identify behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom should have the effect of carry over into the student teaching situation. In other words, teacher trainees having experienced Treatment₂ should then be better able to identify unacceptable behaviors in the actual
teaching situation. This effect will be determined by systematic observation of the teacher trainees in the teaching situation.

6. Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with behaviors when in the teaching situation. 
Rationale—Being trained in the ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors in the classroom should have the effect of carry over into the teaching situation. This effect will be determined by systematic observation of the teacher trainees in the teaching situation.

7. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make significant gains in their ability to identify behaviors when in the student teaching situation.
Rationale—Being trained in the ability to identify behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom should have carry over into the teaching situation. In other words, teacher trainees having experienced Treatment_1 should then be better able to identify unacceptable behaviors in the actual teaching situation. This effect will be determined by systematic observation of the teacher trainees in the teaching situation.

8. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape
method will make significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with behaviors when in the teaching situation.

**Rationale**—Being trained in the ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors in the classroom should have the effect of carry over into the teaching situation. This effect will be determined by systematic observation of the teacher trainees in the teaching situation.

9. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the identification of unacceptable behaviors is significantly superior to the lecture/discussion method as determined by the pretest-posttest. **Rationale**—The use of the videotape method should be superior to the lecture/discussion method since actually viewing behaviors, which have been controlled for the learning situation, is more realistic. The trainee should also get a better gestalt of the situation than he would in the typical lecture/discussion session. This will be determined by the pretest-posttest designed for this study.

10. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors is significantly superior to the lecture/discussion method as determined by the pretest-posttest.
Rationale--The use of the videotape method should be superior to the lecture/discussion method since actually viewing behaviors, which have been controlled for the learning situation, is more realistic. The trainee should also get a better gestalt of the situation than he would in the typical lecture/discussion session. This will be determined by the pretest-posttest designed for this study.

11. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the identification of unacceptable behaviors will result in superior skills in the identification of these behaviors in an actual student teaching situation than will result from training using the lecture/discussion method.

Rationale--The use of the videotape method should be superior to the lecture/discussion method since actually viewing behaviors, which have been controlled for the learning situation, is more realistic. Furthermore, the effect of the treatments needs to be demonstrated in the student teaching situation since the goal in training future teachers is to educate them to be effective in the classroom. Classroom control, being a prerequisite to learning, is necessary in order to become an effective teacher. This will be determined by the systematic observation of the teacher trainee in the classroom situation.
12. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors will result in superior skills in the determination of alternative strategies in an actual student teaching situation than will result from the training using the lecture/discussion method.

Rationale—The use of the videotape method should be superior to the lecture/discussion method since actually viewing behaviors, which have been controlled for the learning situation, is more realistic. Furthermore, the effect of the treatments needs to be demonstrated in the student teaching situation since the goal in training future teachers is to educate them to be effective in the classroom. Classroom control, being a prerequisite to learning, is necessary in order to become an effective teacher. This will be determined by the systematic observation of the teacher trainee in the classroom situation.
CHAPTER TWO
PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction
The methodology section is concerned with subject selection, instrumentation, sources of possible invalidity, and the procedures followed in data collection. The first part of the chapter describes the subjects used in the study and indicates some of the reasons for two completely separate samples. The second part of the chapter describes the instrumentation specifically created for and used in the study. The instruments include the Analysis of Classroom Behavior (ACB) and the Behavior Management Event Recording Sheet (BMERS). This section is followed by a description of the videotape used as the primary independent variable in the experimental treatment as well as information regarding the actual filming of the tape in secondary level classrooms for emotionally impaired. The next section of the chapter discusses the possible sources of invalidity in the study and the attempts to control them. The chapter concludes with a chronological presentation of the procedures followed in the experiments.

Description of Subjects
Teacher trainees chosen for this study in behavior management were students in the Special Educa-
tion Department at Western Michigan University who were in at least their junior year of college. They were also chosen because they had completed their regular education student teaching assignment and, therefore, had some experience with the management of pupil behavior in the classroom.

Trainees involved with Designs A and B (see Figure 1, p. 43) were randomly selected in the fall of 1975. The randomization occurred after the trainees had been initially observed by their supervising teachers at the time specified for the first observation. It was anticipated that this procedure would determine which of the supervising teachers would cooperate in the observation phase of the study. The trainees who had been observed were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control group. The remainder of the special education student teachers were then randomly divided into two groups and added to the experimental and control groups.

Because of subject mortality caused by supervising teachers failing to observe their student teachers and because a number of the student teachers or trainees failed to appear for their treatment sessions, it was decided to select another group of trainees to be given the treatments and to be observed during their student teaching situations (see
Students who were enrolled in a specific special education course, which was being taught in four sections, were chosen to be involved in this portion of the study. Students in one of the four sections had been previously exposed to the experimental treatment by participating in the field study and, therefore, were assigned to the experimental group. Students in the remaining three sections were then randomly chosen (by tossing a coin) to be in the experimental or control group—those in one section being assigned to the experimental group and two sections to the control group.

Table 1 describes the subjects used in all phases of the study.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Specialization Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design C₁</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design C₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design C₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design C₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Non-Special Education majors and graduate students in the Learning Disabled curriculum were not included in the specialization breakdown.

- **Design A** = Sample receiving treatment and observed before and after treatment.
- **Design B** = Sample receiving treatment only.
- **Design C₁** = Sample receiving treatment and observed after treatment only.
- **Design C₂** = Sample receiving treatment only.

The trainees to be observed, after the experimental or control treatments in Design C were established, were determined by the geographic location of their student teaching assignment. A map indicating the area of
southwestern Michigan in which the observations took place is included in Appendix A.

**Description of Instruments**

Instrumentation for this study was intended to determine: (a) if the treatments had an immediate effect on the trainees' skills in identifying pupil classroom behaviors which needed to be eliminated and to determine alternative strategies for dealing with these behaviors and (b) if the treatments had an effect on the trainees' ability to use these skills in an actual classroom situation. After an extensive investigation into the availability of instruments which could measure the treatment effects both immediately following the treatments and during a teaching situation, it was determined that the instrumentation for this study would have to be developed.

**Analysis of Classroom Behavior (ACB)**

The first instrument designed specifically for this study was the Analysis of Classroom Behavior (ACB) which was administered on a pretest-posttest basis to both the experimental and the control groups in the classroom on the day the treatments were administered. This instrument was utilized after the trainees had viewed a four-minute segment of a videotape showing an actual classroom situation involving pupils who had been diagnosed as emotionally impaired according to
the State of Michigan Special Education Code (1972). The instrument asked the trainees: (a) to list behaviors which they determined needed to be changed and (b) to list strategies (three if possible) which they might employ to deal with the identified behaviors. A copy of the ACB is found in Appendix C.

**Behavior Management Event Recording Sheet**

The instrument employed to determine the effectiveness of the treatments on a long-range basis was a tally-type instrument designed specifically for this study. The instrument, the Behavior Management Event Recording Sheet (BMERS), was used to record observational data during the student teaching assignment of the teacher trainees. Behaviors were listed along the abscissa, and strategies for dealing with these behaviors were listed across the ordinate. The behaviors which were chosen to be listed were taken from multiple behavior rating scales which are listed in Appendix B. Many of the strategies for dealing with these behaviors were suggested in the Barclay Classroom Climate Inventory (Barclay, 1971) and in a paper written by Smolak in 1969 (see Appendix B). The BMERS directs observers to place a mark "A" in the box in which the teacher trainee's reaction corresponds to a particular pupil behavior, another mark (A₂, A₃, A₄, etc.) is to be placed in the box in which the
trainee's strategy corresponds to that identified behavior. When another pupil behavior occurs, the observer places a "B" in the box in which the strategy corresponds to the behavior, etc. Observers were directed as to the time of day and the date during which the observations should take place and that, if a specified time period was not possible, to carry out the observations as close to that time period as possible. The length of time was set at one-half hour per observation. A second page of the BMERS requested the supervising teacher to rate the trainee as to usual reactions to various pupil behaviors which need to be extinguished. A copy of the BMERS is found in Appendix C.

Validation of Instrumentation

Although two attempts were made to determine the validity of the instrumentation, the results did not produce the data necessary to make a definitive statement about the instruments used. However, the attempts to validate the instruments were as follows. The first was a field study using the students in one section of a special education course. The field study results, which were highly significant (Table 2) indicate that the instrument, ACB, was sensitive to measuring the effects of the treatments.
Table 2
Field Study of ACB
Pretest-Posttest Correlated t Results
\( n = 22 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre. Beh.</td>
<td>2.864</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre. Strat.</td>
<td>4.182</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>8.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Beh.</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>5.288*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Strat.</td>
<td>8.636</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>6.433</td>
<td>5.728*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .001 \)
\( df = 20 \)

The second attempt to determine validity was carried out by conducting a correlational study with the results from the BMERS (as outlined in Design A) in which trainees were observed and rated on a pre- and post-observational basis. The results from the actual observations, as recorded on page one, were correlated with the results obtained from question one, in which the supervising teachers were requested to generally rate their student teachers as to the amount of classroom control they usually exhibited. On the pre-treatment observation, question number one failed to correlate significantly with any of the categories on page one—those categories being: (a) student teacher failed to notice pupil behaviors which needed
to be eliminated, (b) student teacher employed positive strategies to deal with the behaviors, and (c) student teacher employed negative strategies to deal with the behaviors. On the post-treatment observation, however, question one negatively correlated (< .05 level) with the student teachers' utilization of negative strategies to deal with pupil behaviors which needed eliminating (Table 3). This may indicate that the more classroom control the student teacher has, the less she must employ negative strategies in order to maintain classroom control.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Pre-Observation</th>
<th>Post-Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.513</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.554</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Both the ACB and the BMERS attempt to obtain information regarding the trainees' ability to identify unacceptable pupil classroom behaviors and their ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with the identified behaviors. Since these two factors are both important elements in the area of classroom
control, the content validity for the ACB and the BMERS appears to be high.

**Videotape**

An attempt was made to find a videotape that would: (a) help the trainees to learn realistically to identify unacceptable pupil behaviors, (b) simulate an actual classroom situation, and (c) provide the stimulus for responses on the ACB. After searching for this type of videotape without success, it was decided that one would have to be recorded specifically for this study.

Videotaping occurred on three separate occasions at a high school program for emotionally impaired pupils. This program was based on earning points for positive social and academic behaviors (behavior modification), and combined three types of environmental situations: (a) classroom, (b) group therapy, and (c) social/free time. Videotaping occurred during classroom and social/free time situations.

The classroom area was divided into two segments. One segment was designed so that individual assignments could be obtained by the pupils when they entered the room. The other segment was designed as a resource center in which pupils were free to choose from a variety of educational materials. During the time of videotaping the pupil/teacher ratio fluctuated.
between 2:1 and 3:1. Points were awarded to students when they: (a) used their own initiative in order to begin assignments, and (b) completed their assignments.

The social/free time situation occurred in the day room. Students could play pool or pingpong, smoke cigarettes, listen to records, read books or magazines, sit and talk, etc. This period of time appeared to be a buffer since it occurred between academic or possible stress situations. Students could earn points during this period of time for socially acceptable behavior.

The writer, as well as one staff member from the program, videotaped segments of this school program for emotionally impaired pupils. These two persons did the taping because they were both experienced teachers of emotionally impaired pupils. Therefore, they both: (a) knew what kinds of behaviors they wanted included on the videotape, (b) could deal with pupil behaviors that might disrupt the taping process, and (c) had established rapport with the pupils prior to the videotaping. The taping did not appear to have a reactionary effect on the pupils since: (a) the persons doing the taping were familiar to the students, and (b) the pupils were accustomed to being videotaped as part of their behavior remediation pro-
gram in which they analyze their own behaviors while viewing themselves during playback sessions of the tapes.

In order to be able to utilize this videotape, parental permission had to be obtained for the involved pupils. A copy of (a) the permission slip sent to parents and (b) the letter from the administration of the school where the videotaping occurred, indicating permission to use the videotape, is included in Appendix D.

After completing three videotapes of classroom behavior, the tapes were edited so that only selected negative pupil behaviors remained. The end result was one forty-five minute videotape entitled "Behaviors to Change." The first four minutes of the videotape was selected for viewing by both the experimental and the control group to be utilized as the stimulus for responding to the pretest and posttest (AGE) at the time of the treatments. The remainder of the videotape was designated to be used as the independent variable in the treatment setting for the experimental group (see Appendix E for a complete description of the videotape).

Description of Treatments

The control as well as the experimental group were given treatments. Both groups: (a) were introduced to
the fact that they were involved in a study regarding instruction in classroom behavior management skills; (b) observed the first four minutes of the videotape and completed the pretest, ACB; (c) discussed specified behaviors which are considered to be unacceptable in the classroom; (d) discussed specified alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors; (e) viewed the first four minutes of the videotape at the conclusion of the treatments and completed the posttest, ACB; and (f) filled in evaluation questionnaires regarding the sessions. The difference between the two treatments occurred during the discussion phase. The control group discussed specified unacceptable pupil classroom behaviors and specified strategies for dealing with the behaviors. The experimental group discussed the same behaviors and strategies but viewed a videotape that showed pupils exhibiting many of the identified behaviors. A detailed account of the treatments and a copy of all handouts given to the teacher trainees are found in Appendixes E and F.

Control of Possible Sources of Invalidity

Most of the sources of possible invalidity were controlled in this study by randomization of individuals into two groups as indicated in parts A and B of the design and by randomization of groups as indicated by part C of the design (see Figure 1, p. 43).
Both history and maturation could have been sources of possible invalidity for that part of the study covering the second sample (Figure 1, Design C, p. 43), because there could be no pre-treatment observation of these teacher trainees while in a teaching situation. Therefore, between the time of the treatment and the time of the observations of their teaching in the classroom, the trainees could have gained both interest and skills in classroom management from being exposed to situations in which these skills were needed. They could have also learned these skills from their supervising teachers. However, both the control and the experimental group were exposed to the same sources of possible contamination. Therefore, the effect on one group may have canceled that same effect on the other group as far as the statistical comparison of the two groups was concerned.

The instrumentation for the classroom observations could also have been a source of possible internal invalidity. However, since the selection of student teaching sites was not possible in this study, control for the possible instrumentation source of internal invalidity—that of rating performance differently at different times because of: (a) observer attitudes, (b) pupil behaviors in the classroom at different times and in different situations, and
(c) student teacher attitudes—was attempted through the use of two separate methods. For Design A and B randomization of the treatment groups occurred after student teaching placement and after at least one observation time had passed so that the trainees whose supervising teachers had cooperated with the study could be randomized first. For Design C, the trained observers did not know in which treatment group the trainee they were observing belonged, and the observation schedule was randomized for each general geographic location (i.e., city, intermediate district) as much as was practical. Practical in this instance refers to planning within individual school schedules, school system schedules, and administrative decisions.

Another source of invalidity was experimental mortality. In order to compensate for this type of invalidity, which in fact occurred during the portion of this study under Design A and B, Design C was established and another sample was drawn. Controls were instituted in this instance to eliminate further mortality effects in this study. The controls included: (a) giving the treatments to classes that were scheduled on campus, and (b) training and utilization of observers who were unfamiliar with the study.
In general, external validity was assumed since the subjects used for this study were teacher trainees and the treatments could be programmed into teacher education courses. The results are especially applicable to training programs for students studying to be special education teachers, because the trainees were in fact studying to become this type of teacher.

However, some possible sources of external invalidity were considered. These include multiple-treatment interference, history effect, Hawthorne effect and a combination of pretest and posttest sensitization. Teacher trainees, when doing their student teaching, probably were being administered additional treatments in the use of behavior management skills by their supervising teacher. These practices are presumed to have occurred not only in the student teaching experience of the trainees in this sample but in this type of experience for any teacher trainee. A specified observation schedule for both the experimental and control groups in Design A and B and the randomization of the observation schedule in Design C were employed in order to control for any history effect which could have affected either group. Since both the control and the experimental groups received treatments, this fact alone controlled for any possible Hawthorne effects which might have affect-
ed one group and not the other. Also, both groups probably were sensitized by the pretest and posttest given at the time of the treatment sessions. However, since both groups were exposed to the testing, one group would have not been more sensitized than the other.

The experimenter effect, as a possible source of external invalidity, was controlled for in two ways: (a) one person gave both the control and experimental treatments in Design A and B, while another person gave both treatments in Design C, and (b) the observations were carried out by persons who were unfamiliar with the study and who had no information as to which subjects were in the control or experimental group. The first sets of observations were executed by the supervising teachers, and the second set of observations were performed by the trained observers.

Chronological Procedure of the Study

As indicated in previous sections of this paper, this study actually consisted of two experiments. The first, Design A and B, was the original plan and was executed during the fall of 1975. The second, Design C, was conceptualized because of the mortality problem in the initial experiment, as was indicated in the section of this paper covering possible sources of invalidity. Although this study was implemented as if
it were two separate experiments, the instrumentation and treatments, which were developed prior to the commencement of the 1975-1976 school year, were the same for both.

Experiment 1

During the first few weeks of the fall semester, a list of student teachers in the area of special education and their supervising teachers was obtained from the Directed Teaching Office of Western Michigan University. Also on this list were the school addresses of the student teachers and supervising teachers as well as those of their administrators. Letters explaining the study and the anticipated involvement of the student teachers and their supervising teachers were sent to these persons and to their administrators. A copy of each of these letters can be found in Appendix G. The tally-type instrument (BMERS) to be used by the supervising teachers in observing their student teachers was included with the letters of explanation. The directions to the supervising teacher indicated that they should observe their student teachers twice prior to Student Teaching Day and twice after Student Teaching Day. Student Teaching Day, held approximately mid-term, is a day when student teachers return to campus for inservice education, consultation, and interviewing. At the completion of
each of the observations, supervisors were to mail the completed forms to the writer. Each BMERS was to be mailed at the completion of each observation in order to assure that the succeeding observations would be independent of previous ones.

Prior to the mailing of these letters, the writer met with the student teaching coordinators from the Department of Directed Teaching at Western Michigan University to advise them of the anticipated involvement of student teachers and their supervisors in the study as well as to solicit their advice as to how to implement most effectively the observation phase of the study.

On Student Teaching Day the student teachers were requested to meet for a period of two hours for an inservice education session on classroom behavior management. The experimental group was asked to meet in the morning and the control group in the afternoon. Both groups were given a pretest, the ACB; both groups discussed a handout entitled "Behaviors to Change" (Appendix F); both groups discussed various alternative strategies to be employed in changing or eliminating specific behaviors; and both groups were given the ACB as a posttest. The only difference between the two groups involved the discussing of alternative strategies for dealing with specific behaviors. The experimental group viewed the specific behaviors on a
videotape, discussed them, and determined possible alternative strategies for dealing with these behaviors. The control group, on the other hand, did not view the videotape but did discuss the same behaviors as well as alternative strategies. The strategies discussed by both groups were determined primarily by the handout, "Behaviors to Change," and by the group participants.

Experiment 2

Because of the large percentage of supervising teachers who choose not to be involved with the study and because a large number of the control group did not appear for their inservice education session, an additional component was added to the research design (see Figure 1, Design C, p. 43). Teacher trainees who were to student teach during the winter semester were all enrolled in one course which was divided into four sections. It was determined that these sections would be randomly assigned (as indicated earlier in this chapter) to the control or to the experimental group. Treatments were then administered to the groups in the same way as they had been to the fall semester student teachers except that the students in each section were given their specified treatment (experimental or control) during their regularly scheduled class time. During the time in which each
of the four groups was involved with the inservice session, the students were asked about the possibility of observers visiting their student teaching sites for the purpose of observing their teaching and using the BMERS. They were also assured that all information would remain confidential and that the information would be utilized only in compiling data for this dissertation.

At the beginning of the winter semester the Department of Directed Teaching at Western Michigan University was again contacted so that: (a) school addresses of the special education student teachers and their supervising teachers could be obtained and (b) university supervising teacher coordinators could be advised as to the progress of this study and could also indicate any further advice or information that they felt the writer might utilize in order to be successful in the observation stage of experiment two.

Those special education student teachers who were assigned to student teaching sites in southwestern Michigan during the winter semester were those selected to be observed. A map indicating the geographic area used for observations is included in Appendix A. Administrators of the school districts housing these student teaching sites were then contacted by letter (Appendix G), followed by a telephone conversation, so
that permission to enter their schools and to collect data for research could be obtained. Supervising teachers were then contacted by mail (letter in Appendix G) in order to solicit their cooperation.

Three graduate trainees in the Special Education Department were then chosen to be the observers of these student teachers. The graduate trainees were given a short training session in: (a) the definition of positive and negative strategies which could be employed in dealing with unacceptable behaviors in the classroom, (b) what pupil behaviors are considered to be unacceptable, and (c) the use of the BMERS. An interobserver reliability check was then employed. The method used to obtain this check was the formula suggested by Sax (1968) because of the major difficulty in the percentages of agreement between observers automatically being "high if there are just a few categories in which persons may be rated. This fault may be corrected by using" (p. 190) the formula he indicated. The first interobserver reliability check showed that further training in the use of the BMERS was necessary in order to obtain a higher percentage of reliability. After another short training session, the following results were obtained (Table 4).
Table 4

Interobserver Reliability for BMERS

Design C
n = 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fails to Notice</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Strategies</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Strategies</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the trained observers were only instructed in how to use the first page of the BMERS. Page two was only used in the first experiment where the results were used: (a) to correlate question one referring to the student teachers' general level of classroom control with the results of the observations; and (b) to obtain general supervising teacher opinion regarding each student teacher's classroom control, lack of control, and usual positive strategies employed.

A tentative schedule for classroom observations was set up by: (a) randomly selecting the order of districts to be visited and then (b) randomly determining the order in which the student teachers would be observed within each district. This order was not rigidly adhered to, as indicated earlier in this chapter, because of scheduling difficulties and administrative decisions. The following procedure was used for each
observation: (a) telephone conversations confirming permission, day, and time were made preceding the visitation, and (b) two of the three observers viewed each of the student teachers simultaneously for a period of \( \frac{1}{2} \) hour. In experiment one the student teachers were observed four times throughout the semester by their supervisors, with the treatments occurring between the second and third observation. In experiment two the observation was carried out on a one-time basis and occurred the semester following the treatment sessions.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Introduction

The research in this study on classroom management addressed two problem areas in giving instruction to teacher trainees in the skills of identifying unacceptable pupil behaviors and in determining alternative strategies for dealing with the identified behaviors. The first concern was the effectiveness of the traditional lecture and discussion method to teach these skills, and the second concern was the effectiveness of the same traditional methodology with the addition of a videotape of classroom behaviors used as a teaching tool. The study, in considering these concerns, randomized teacher trainees into two treatment groups and presented them with information about the identification of unacceptable classroom behaviors and about possible alternative positive strategies for dealing with the unacceptable behaviors. In order to determine the efficacy of these two methods of instruction, a pretest and posttest were administered to the trainees and some of them were also observed while in a teaching situation.

Methods of Analysis

Analysis of Classroom Behavior (ACB)

For analysis of the ACB it was determined that all
experimental groups be combined into one group and that all control groups be combined into a second group—thus combining Designs A, B and C. This was done: (a) because the subjects were involved, or about to be involved, in the student teaching phase of their special education teacher training, (b) because the subjects had been randomly assigned to their treatment groups, and (c) because of the high mortality rate in experiment one. In order to assess the pretest to posttest change within each group (experimental and control) that occurred because of the treatments, a correlated t-test was performed. This statistic was selected because the sample satisfies the basic assumptions necessary for the correlated t-test (Glass & Stanley, 1970). These assumptions include that the samples are randomly drawn from "normal populations with the same variance" (p. 297).

A t-test was also selected to analyze the pretest results between the experimental and control groups in order to determine if the groups were the same prior to the administration of the treatments. Because the t-tests computed on both the identification of unacceptable classroom behaviors and the determination of alternative strategies were significant beyond the .05 level, an analysis of covariance was used in order to adjust the means for statistical analysis.
For further information regarding the statistical design employed to determine the effect of the ACB, refer to Appendix H.

**Behavior Management Event Recording Sheet (BMERS)**

A t-test was selected to analyze the post-observation differences between the experimental and control groups on the BMERS as indicated by Design C. Because two trained persons observed each member in the geographically determined portion of the sample, the t-test was computed on the mean result of each subject's two observations. This statistical technique was chosen because the basic assumptions needed to run this test were satisfied (Glass & Stanley, 1970; Kerlinger, 1973). The assumptions include that the scores for each group are normally distributed, the two groups have the same variance, and the groups are independent. For further information regarding the statistical design employed to determine the effect of the BMERS in Design C, refer to Appendix H.

Due to the mortality factor affecting the data collected in Design A, it was determined that only central tendency information could be reported. With only five members in the experimental group and two members in the control group, it was not possible to employ inferential statistical techniques. For further
information regarding the statistical design employed in Design A, refer to Appendix H.

Results

Hypothesis Testing Results

Twelve research hypotheses were presented in order to determine the effect of the experimental and control treatments. For purposes of statistical testing, these hypotheses have been restated in null form. These hypotheses are related to both the short and the long term effects of the treatments. In all instances the .05 level of significance was employed in testing the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make no significant gains in their ability to identify unacceptable behaviors. Hypothesis one is rejected based on the analysis of the data (Table 5).

Table 5

Control Group Pretest-Posttest ACB t-test Results

Identification of Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>5.90*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001
The behavior management treatment given to the control group in which the subjects were taught to identify unacceptable classroom behaviors was successful (<.001 level) as indicated by the increase in scores between the pretest and posttest administered at the time of the treatment session.

Hypothesis 2. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make no significant gains in their ability to identify unacceptable behaviors. Hypothesis two is rejected based on the analysis of the data (Table 6).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

The behavior management treatment given to the experimental group in which the subjects were taught to identify unacceptable classroom behaviors was successful (<.001 level) as indicated by the increase in scores between the pretest and posttest administered at the time of the treatment session.
**Hypothesis 3.** Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make no significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies. Hypothesis three is rejected based on the analysis of the data (Table 7).

**Table 7**

Control Group Pretest-Posttest ACB t-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Strategies Determined</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>8.07*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

The behavior management treatment given to the control group in which teacher trainees were taught to determine alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable classroom behaviors was highly successful (< .001 level) as indicated by the pretest and post-test administered at the time of the treatment session.

**Hypothesis 4.** Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make no significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies. Hypothesis four is rejected based on the analysis of the data (Table 8).
Table 8
Experimental Group Pretest-Posttest ACB t-test Results

Alternative Strategies Determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>8.81*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

The behavior management treatment given to the experimental group in which teacher trainees were taught to determine alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable classroom behaviors was highly successful (< .001 level) as indicated by the pretest and post-test administered at the time of the treatment session.

**Hypothesis 5.** Teacher trainees taught by the lecture/discussion method will make no significant gains in their ability to identify behaviors when in the teaching situation. Hypothesis five cannot be tested from the data collected.

Due to the small number of teacher trainees in this control group (n = 2), only measures of central tendency can be reported. There was no change from pre-observations to post-observations of teacher trainees in the student teaching situation (Table 9).
Table 9
Reporting of Data on Central Tendency
Design A - BMERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group n=9</th>
<th>Control Group n=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>Post Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID of Behaviors (Failure to Identify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.5$</td>
<td>$s = 2.06$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 1.7$</td>
<td>$s = 2.12^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Strategies (Number employed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 11.0$</td>
<td>$s = 6.89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 7.8$</td>
<td>$s = 9.36^-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Strategies (Number Employed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = .8$</td>
<td>$s = 1.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = .2$</td>
<td>$s = .45$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1 (Has classroom management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.6$</td>
<td>$s = .44$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6.1$</td>
<td>$s = 1.88^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 (Uses punishment) (Effectively handles behavior problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6.9$</td>
<td>$s = 2.36$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 6.5$</td>
<td>$s = .5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.3$</td>
<td>$s = 1.89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Data</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.5$</td>
<td>$s = .55^+$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x} =$ mean  
s = standard deviation  
$^+$ = direction of change from pre to post BMERS
The small number of teacher trainees in this control group (n = 2) necessitated the reporting of the data by central tendency. Table 9 indicates that there was an increase in the number of positive strategies employed in the student teaching situation. However, the number of negative strategies employed also increased—although only by a small number. The positive and negative strategies employed during the observational period tend to indicate a directionality toward the use of more positive strategies after the treatment session. The data obtained from the supervising teachers' responses as to their opinions regarding the behavior management skills, supported this indication. The amount of punishment generally used in the classroom increased as indicated by the answers given to question two. This group's ability to effectively deal with behavior problems dropped slightly but the degree of their classroom management increased. The number of positive strategies generally employed increased. The positive and negative fluctuation of the supervising teacher opinion data found on the pretest to posttest results probably also indicates a directionality toward more positive use of strategies employed in dealing with behaviors—although it is definitely not conclusive.

**Hypothesis 7.** Teacher trainees taught by the
videotape method will make no significant gains in their ability to identify behaviors when in the teaching situation. Hypothesis seven cannot be tested from the data collected.

The small number of teacher trainees in this experimental group (n = 5) necessitated the reporting of the data by central tendency. The directionality indicated from the available data shows a decrease in the unacceptable behaviors which this group failed to notice from the pretest to the posttest observation period (see Table 9).

Hypothesis 8. Teacher trainees taught by the videotape method will make no significant gains in their ability to determine alternative strategies for dealing with behaviors when in the teaching situation. Hypothesis eight cannot be tested from the data collected.

Again the small number of teacher trainees in this experimental group (n = 5) necessitated the reporting of data by central tendency. The number of positive strategies employed during the observation period decreased, but the number of negative strategies also decreased. When the general opinions of the supervising teachers were added to this observational data, the directionality indicated a change in a positive direction regarding the student teachers' behavior.
management in the classroom. The amount of classroom management, the effective handling of behavior problems, and the number of positive strategies employed increased and the use of punishment decreased (see Table 9).

**Hypothesis 9.** The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the identification of unacceptable behaviors will be equal to or less effective than the lecture/discussion method as determined by the pretest-posttest. Hypothesis nine is retained based on the analysis of the data.

Prior to testing this hypothesis, a t-test on the pretest (ACB) differences between the experimental and control groups combining Designs A, B and C was administered. This was done to determine the equivalence of the groups on this variable prior to the treatments. It was found that a significant difference between the experimental and control groups did exist on the pretest (Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

ACB Pretest Differences Between Experimental and Control Groups Using t-test to Determine Posttest Statistical Analysis for Identification of Behaviors Subtest
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Since the control group was significantly superior to the experimental group on the pretest, an analysis of covariance was employed to equate the pretest means and test hypothesis nine. The results (Table 11) indicate no significance between the two treatment groups. The trend is slightly in the direction of the experimental group identifying more unacceptable classroom behaviors than the control group but the results are inconclusive.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Adjusted Treatments</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>560.60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>567.15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental Group n = 64
Control Group n = 37

Hypothesis 10. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors is equal to or less effective than the lecture/discussion method as determined by the pretest-posttest.
Hypothesis ten is retained based on the analysis of the data.

The t-test run on the pretest (ACB) differences between the experimental and control groups combining Designs A, B and C was significant beyond the .01 level (Table 12). This was done to determine the equivalence of the groups on the variable prior to the treatments. It was found that a significant difference between the experimental and control group did exist on the pretest (Table 12).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the control group was significantly superior to the experimental group on the pretest, an analysis of covariance was employed to equate the pretest means and test hypothesis ten.

The results (Table 13) indicate no significant differences between the experimental and the control groups in the determination of positive strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors. However, there is
a slight trend in favor of the control group.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Adjusted Treatments</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2178.46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental Group n = 64
Control Group n = 37

**Hypothesis 11.** The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the identification of unacceptable behaviors will be equal to or less effective than the lecture/discussion method in an actual teaching situation. Hypothesis eleven is retained based on the analysis of the data.

For Design C two observers rated each subject's classroom interaction. The mean of these two ratings was employed as the criterion measures. The difference between the mean ratings for experimental and control subjects was analyzed by a t-test for independent means (Table 14).
The difference between the ability of the experimental group and the control group in identifying unacceptable classroom behaviors during the time they were observed by the trained observers was not significant. The experimental group failed to notice the behaviors more frequently than the control group but this is only a slight trend.

Due to the small number of subjects in Design A (N = 7), only central tendency analysis could be employed. As indicated in Table 9, the experimental group again failed to notice the unacceptable behaviors more frequently than the control group. However, when considering the pretest observation data, the experimental group tended to improve more in their identification ability than did the control group as evidenced by a lower mean score on the post-observation.

Hypothesis 12. The videotape method used to instruct teacher trainees in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with unacceptable be-
haviors will be equal to or less effective than the lecture/discussion method in an actual teaching situation. Hypothesis twelve is retained based on the analysis of data.

For Design C two observers rated each subject's classroom interaction. The mean of these two ratings was employed as the criterion measures. The difference between the mean ratings for experimental and control subjects was analyzed by a t-test for independent means (Table 15).

Table 15
BMERS Post-Treatment Observation Results for Determining of Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the results indicated no significance, the trend here is definitely in favor of the control group as far as the use of more positive strategies for dealing with unacceptable behaviors. However, the control group also used more negative strategies during the observation period.

The trend shown by the control group is supported when analyzing the data in Design A which was reported by central tendencies only. The control group (Table 9) showed more positive strategies but again it demonstrated more negative strategies. The responses to the questions regarding classroom control indicated that the control group used more punishment techniques and less effectively handled behavior problems. This group was also rated slightly lower in the degree of classroom management exhibited and was rated the same as the experimental group in the number of positive strategies commonly used to control behavior in the classroom. The data collected for Design A or C only shows slight trends and in no way indicates that the lecture/discussion method or the videotape method is superior for teaching alternative strategies for dealing with behavior in the classroom as demonstrated in the actual teaching situation.
Summary

Within Group Results

Hypotheses one through four were highly significant, indicating that both the experimental treatment and the control treatments used to teach the identification of unacceptable classroom behaviors and the positive strategies with which to deal with these behaviors were highly successful on a paper and pencil pretest-posttest basis.

Evaluation Results

At the time of the treatments additional evaluation information was collected in order to further assess these inservice sessions. The questions asked may be found in the handout form found in Appendix F. In general, subjects in both experiment one (Design A and B) and experiment two (Design C) indicated that they felt the session was beneficial. Participants in experiment two appeared to be more positive about the experience than did those in experiment one. They may be due to (a) the subjects in experiment one feeling they were forced to participate while those in experiment two indicated that the information fulfilled their need to increase skills in behavior management, or (b) the group in experiment one having had different discussion leaders than did the group in experiment two.
When asked what they liked best about their sessions, both groups liked the handouts and the discussion about the identification of unacceptable classroom behaviors and the alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors. Many subjects in the experimental group liked the videotape as did a considerable number in the control group. In response to how the session could be improved, most subjects indicated that the videotape needed improvement (a) in the mechanical area, (b) in the presentation of the medium by either the teacher trainees actually knowing the pupils on the tape or at least knowing more about them, or (c) in taping a more varied age grouping of pupils (only high school emotionally impaired pupils were filmed). Many of the students expressed a need for more information in the area of behavior management. A few students in experiment one, who were student teaching when their treatment session occurred, indicated that this type of session should have been presented to them during courses on campus and prior to any student teaching experience.

Between Groups Results

Although both the experimental and control treatments produced highly significant results, there was no support for one treatment being more effective than the other either in the classroom situation (hypotheses
nine and ten) or in the actual teaching situation (hypotheses eleven and twelve). Due to insufficient data it was not possible to determine if a change occurred between the two groups in the actual teaching situation based on pre-treatment and post-treatment observation (hypotheses five through eight).
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Introduction

The analysis of the data collected for this study on classroom management supports the effectiveness of instructing teacher trainees to identify unacceptable pupil behaviors and to determine alternative strategies for dealing with these behaviors by the lecture/discussion method, with or without the addition of the videotape as a teaching tool.

The teacher trainees also supported the efficacy of this instruction through their comments on the evaluation form completed by them at the time of the treatment sessions. For example, (a) most of their comments suggested that they found the discussion of behaviors which are unacceptable in the classroom and the strategies with which to deal with the behaviors to be very beneficial and (b) many of them considered the videotape a medium that aided their learning by adding realism and clarity. The treatments, however, may or may not have an effect on the trainees' behavior management skills in the classroom, since the study failed to obtain evidence in support of this long-range effect.
Conclusions and Implications

1. Teacher trainees indicated that the treatments fulfilled their need for instruction in behavior management in the classroom.

2. The research in this study demonstrates that either the lecture/discussion or the videotape treatment provides trainees with knowledge in behavior management through information on techniques to be used in the identification of unacceptable classroom behaviors and on the determination of alternative strategies.

3. The BMERS may not be sensitive as a measure of behavior management if only used for one 1/2 hour observation. It does, however, indicate the positive and negative strategies employed by the teacher trainee. Also to be considered is the possibility that a low number of positive strategies employed may be an indication of having the classroom under control; therefore, a low number of negative strategies employed and the lack of failing to notice unacceptable behaviors should be considered in conjunction with the number of positive strategies used instead of considering each measurement in isolation.

4. The ACB, which utilizes the videotape as a stimulus for listing unacceptable behaviors and positive strategies, may in itself either be a part of the
treatment or, when used as a pretest, may sensitize subjects to the treatment that follows. Therefore, in the future the ACB should be considered as a possible portion of the treatment in using either the lecture/discussion method or the videotape method.

5. It follows, therefore, that if the videotape is an element in the lecture/discussion method, this study may have investigated two versions of the same videotape treatment. The evaluation comments from the trainees support this possibility, since fifteen of the thirty-seven members of the control group commented that they either thought the videotape was what they liked most about the presentation or that they would have liked viewing more behaviors on this medium.

6. The videotape itself could be improved. Since the taping was not professionally recorded, it was at times difficult to interpret the pupil behaviors: (a) partly because of the lack of background information on the students and (b) partly because of mechanical difficulties. However, the teacher trainees evaluated the use of the videotape for instruction of behavior management as highly constructive.

7. The quality of the videotape could also have been instrumental in the results not indicating significance between the experimental and control groups. The evaluation part of the results section (Chapter
Three) supports this possibility since the teacher trainees indicated the quality of the videotape was not good and needed improvement.

8. The analysis of hypotheses eleven and twelve comparing the long-range effects of the treatments on the teacher trainees' ability to identify unacceptable behaviors and their use of positive strategies in the classroom might have indicated greater differences had there been pre-treatment observations. This implication is supported by the significant results of the t-test employed on the pretest results of the ACB between the experimental and control groups, which were then manipulated by adjusting the mean difference in order to analyze the posttest differences between the groups. Since the two groups which combined subjects from Designs A, B and C (Figure 1, page 43) were significantly different on the ACB prior to treatments, the two groups from Design C only might have been different on the BMERS if pre-treatment observations could have been considered in the analysis of the post-treatment observations.

9. Pre-observation--post-observation data were collected for Design A (Figure 1, page 43). However, due to the high mortality rate for both the experimental and control groups, only central tendency information could be reported. It was noted that the
experimental group employed less positive strategies on a pre-observation to post-observation basis; and that during the same time interval, they employed fewer negative strategies. Perhaps the experimental group had learned to control the behavior in the classroom better and had less need to use strategies of either a positive or negative quality.

**Recommendations**

1. More research is needed in the area of classroom management instruction for teacher trainees in order to determine methodologies which are effective in teaching skills to be used in their actual teaching situations. More specifically, the use of the videotape as a classroom tool for instructing teacher trainees in the area of behavior management needs to be explored further.

2. Videotapes need to be created which are of professional quality and which present background information on the pupils.

3. Instrumentation needs to be constructed which is more sensitive to measuring the degree of classroom management skills exhibited by teacher trainees.

4. Teacher trainees need to be observed while teaching prior to being instructed in the area of classroom management as well as being observed afterwards in order to determine the effect of the instruction.
If observations are only considered on a post-instruction basis, it is impossible to determine if the training had the desired effect.

5. Behavior management training needs to be included in the teacher-training program in order that the trainees can effectively identify unacceptable pupil behaviors and then determine positive alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors.

Summary

The literature review indicated that much research is needed regarding the efficacy of possible uses of the videotape as a teaching medium. The research employed in this study tends to support the fact that a videotape is a useful tool for instructing student trainees in the identification of unacceptable behaviors and in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with the identified behaviors. Treatment groups were randomly selected and then trained in these skills of classroom management by either a lecture/discussion method or by this method with the addition of a videotape. Both methods were highly effective on a short-range basis; but it appears as though the videotape, which was shown as a part of the pretest (ACB), may have been one factor in affecting the results of both treatments.

However, since both methods have proven to be
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successful in the instruction of classroom management skills, since teacher trainees have expressed a need for this type of instruction, and since control of the classroom is necessary in order to teach pupils effectively, teacher educators must investigate and employ methods which effectively instruct teacher trainees in the skills of behavior management.
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APPENDIX A

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF OBSERVATIONS

DESIGN C
MAP OF LOWER MICHIGAN SHOWING GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN WHICH STUDENT TEACHERS WERE OBSERVED

See Research Design Part C
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APPENDIX B

BEHAVIOR RATING SCALES BIBLIOGRAPHY

SMOLAK, LAWRENCE. TECHNIQUES OF BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION
Instruments from which these behaviors were taken include:

Burks, Harold. **Behavior rating scale.** California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children, P.O. Box 604, Main Office, Los Angeles 53, California.

Cassel, Russell N. **The child behavior rating scale.** Western Psychological Services, Box 775, Beverly Hills, California.

Holovka, E.A. **Behavior problem checklist and pupil behavior inventory** (Modified), (Derived from Sultana, Gaisar. *An Analysis of the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist as an Instrument to Screen Emotionally Disturbed Children*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1974 thesis, University of Georgia at Athens.)

Miller, L.C. **School behavior check list (SBCL); An inventory of deviant behavior for elementary school children,** *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1972, 38, 134-144.

Spivack, George; Spotts, Jules; Haimes, Peter E.

Devereux adolescent behavior (DAB) rating scale.
Devereux Foundation, Devon, Pennsylvania, 1967.

Vintner, Sarri, et. al. Behavior problem checklist and pupil behavior inventory. (Derived from Sultana, Gaisar. An Analysis of the Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist as an Instrument to Screen Emotionally Disturbed Children, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1974 thesis, University of Georgia at Athens.)
TECHNIQUES OF BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION

or as Fritz Redl and W. Wattenberg would suggest:

Influencing Techniques

1. **Planful Ignoring**: "Planful Ignoring" is useful when the type of behavior exhibited is temporary in nature.

   The technique is merely one of selective ignoring; when ignoring the behavior will tend to extinguish the situation rather than eliciting or encouraging it.

   This technique is valuable when the teacher realizes the child is acting up merely for attention sake; when he receives no reaction he will cease his activity.

2. **Signal Interference**: Indicate to the child by means of signal words; to which prior significance or warning have been attached, when such behavior is inappropriate.

   Examples of this would be: dimming the lights, frowning, waving a finger, etc.

   By catching the eye of the misbehaving student the teacher allows the child to control his own behavior.

3. **Proximity and Touch Control**: This is an indirect appeal for self control. The teacher utilizes a reassuring touch, a relaxing influence to help children control their impulses.
4. **Emotional Drainoff:** Unexpressed emotion creates a surplus of energy and should be drained off. This situation can be best handled by encouraging honest discussion and by allowing true expression of emotion.

However, gripe sessions, as such, are not the best means of handling this problem because they have the tendency to get out of control.

5. **Counter Expectational Evidence:** The youngster who is acting up expects to provoke the adult to anger and upset him. Since he expects to produce this reaction in the adult; if he does not, he will discontinue the misbehavior.

   a. **Predicament Sympathy:** Indicate to the child that you are sympathetic with the situation he is involved in. By being helpful, instead of angry, you may avoid further trouble.

   b. **Tension Decontamination:** Interject humor into a situation—if you can smile you can change the situation.

6. **Hurdle Help:** By helping the child over a problem—inordinate behavior on his part becomes unnecessary.

Disorder often occurs because a child does not understand some phase of the work. By being explicit and clarifying issues a teacher can avoid frustration.
and anxiety in a class and eliminate inappropriate behavior.

7. **Diversion and Restructuring:** Often trouble occurs because a class has been sitting too long at the same task. By understanding and knowing the limit of their attention, a teacher can anticipate a situation and change the activity, by substituting different goals and shifting the center of attention.

8. **Direct Appeal:** Influence the behavior of the child through some part of the child's personality.
   a. Appeal to decency factors.
   b. Appeal to his fairness standards (In terms of peer group).
   c. Appeal to his ego.
   d. Appeal to his self image.
   e. Appeal to the role legitimacy of adult behavior.

9. **Limitation of Props, Space and Activities:** In certain instances a object may have a seducing effect upon a child. In such cases where the child's lack of attention may be attributed to a prop or object it is wise to remove the object. Let the child know, however, that the removal is only temporary.

10. **Bouncing Situational Elimination:** When a child's behavior becomes unmanageable it is wise to remove him from the situation.
Reasons for removal would be indicated by a high state of excitability, extreme behavior, or inability to stop his behavior.

11. **Physical Restraint**: This is not punishment. Sometimes, as so often happens, a child loses his head. When this happens the child must be physically restrained in order to protect others and to protect the child. It should be understood that when this happens the teacher should not scold or shake the child because it will only induce hostility and aggression.

This is intended to be a supportive technique and not a punitive exercise.

12. **Encouragement and Criticism**: Both should be utilized with objective understanding in appealing to the child's perception of his self image.

In criticism we deal with what the youngster is like and in encouragement we endeavor to show him what he should be like.

13. **Promises and Rewards**: Offering future gratification in the hope that awareness of it will influence his behavior.

In effect the use of promises and rewards is a "positive approach" to influence behavior. However, the problem arises when too much emphasis is placed upon such extrinsic motivation.

14. **Threats**: In order to get children to do some-
thing which does not necessarily attract them it is necessary to impress upon them unpleasant experiences or consequences which may be forthcoming if they do not conform.

The dangers inherent in this approach are: evasion, the threat may be an empty one and the teacher will lose control.

15. *Punishment:*

Lawrence Smolak
5-24-69
Ed. Psych.
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR (ACB)

BMERS DIRECTION SHEET

BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT EVENT RECORDING SHEET (BMERS)
ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

Student Teacher: ________________ Date: ____________

Pretest    Posttest  (Circle One)

DIRECTIONS: You will be shown a videotape of an actual classroom situation. The children in this videotape are involved in the filmed program because of difficulties in the regular classroom. Your task is to:

1. List the behaviors which you feel need to be changed or eliminated.

2. Determine alternative strategies for modifying or removing these behaviors. List three alternative strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIORS</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT EVENT RECORDING SHEET

DIRECTIONS

1. Please fill in the information on the top of the Behavior Management Event Recording Sheet. It is for identification purposes only -- as all information received as a result of this recording sheet will be kept in strict confidence.

2. Observe your student teacher for a period of ½ hour during his or her first contact with the pupils after lunch period on:

   Tuesday, September 23, 1975
   Tuesday, October 14, 1975
   Tuesday, October 28, 1975
   Tuesday, November 18, 1975

3. Unacceptable pupil behaviors are listed down the left hand side of the page and the possible student teacher reactions to these behaviors are listed across the top of the page.

   a. Each time a pupil displays one of the unacceptable behaviors, mark in the box which corresponds to the student teacher’s reaction to that behavior.

   b. The behaviors should be marked A, B, C, etc. in the order in which those behaviors occur. In other words, the first behavior any pupil demonstrates which is unacceptable is marked A, the second behavior is marked B, etc.

   c. Should the teacher change strategies in her reactions to one particular behavior, the letter used to indicate that behavior (A, B, C, etc.) should be rewritten under the new strategy but corresponding with the same pupil behavior. Subscripts are used to indicate the order in which these strategies occurred. For example:
In the above example pupil behavior A, which is "Attention Seeking" is marked three times because the student teacher changed strategies three times. The subscripts (A₁, A₂, A₃) were used to indicate in what order those strategies were tried. When behavior B occurred, the student teacher did nothing because the behavior went unnoticed.

4. Please answer the questions following the behavior recording portion of this instrument by placing an X on one of the short lines along the continuum which best fits the answer to the question regarding the student teacher’s management of the classroom. Question #4 is self-explanatory.

Please return the instrument (rating sheet) each time you fill it out to myself:

Florence Taber
Special Education Department
Western Michigan University
Sangren Hall
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Your assistance in filling out this instrument four times throughout the semester is greatly appreciated. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
PUPIL UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIORS

ATTENTION-SEEKING -- the pupil is attempting to get the attention of another pupil or the student teacher.

DISRUPTIVE -- the pupil is disrupting the class or the teaching situation but it is not thought to be for attention-seeking purposes.

HITTING -- the pupil is physically contacting another person.

DESTRUCTIVE -- the pupil is destroying something.

HYPERACTIVE -- the pupil is moving constantly either while sitting or moving around the room.

HYPERSENSITIVE -- the pupil is bothered by things which ordinarily should not bother a pupil.

FEARFUL -- the pupil is frightened and will not attempt to do something.

IRRITABLE -- everything seems to leave the pupil angry.

DEPRESSED -- the pupil appears to feel very low.

WITHDRAWN -- the pupil has escaped from the classroom psychologically and is looking down, out of the window, etc.

BIZARRE STORIES -- the pupil is telling stories which are unrealistic.

NERVOUS HABITS -- the pupil bites his or her fingernails, twists hair, etc.

INAPPROPRIATE EMOTION DISPLAYED -- the pupil cries when he should laugh, etc.

OFF-TASK BEHAVIOR -- the pupil is not doing his assignment or whatever he is supposed to be doing.

OTHER -- the pupil is displaying some behavior which is unacceptable and which does not fit into a category which has been listed. Please indicate that behavior and rate it.
STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH BEHAVIORS

FAILS TO NOTICE -- the student teacher does not notice or is not aware of the behavior that a pupil is displaying.

RESTRUCTURING -- the classroom situation is changed (a physical rearrangement of the room or the moving of a student or students).

REVVERSE OF THE EXPECTED -- the pupil who is displaying the behavior expects the student teacher to become angry and he or she has an opposite reaction to that behavior.

PUSHING OR HITTING -- the student teacher actually pushes or hits the pupil.

HURDLE HELP -- the student teacher helps the pupil over a problem thus avoiding frustration and/or anxiety on the part of the pupil.

SIGNAL INTERFERENCE -- the student teacher indicates to the child by means of some signal that a particular behavior is inappropriate (eye contact, pointing to him, dimming lights, etc.)

DIRECT APPEAL -- the student teacher asks the pupil to please stop the behavior in which he is engaging.

ADJUST GOALS -- the student teacher changes the goals of the situation to be more realistic.

PHYSICAL RESTRAINT -- the student teacher holds the child in order to help him gain control of himself (This is not punishment.).

THERAPEUTIC REMOVAL -- the teacher temporarily removes the child from the situation (eg, sitting in a time-out booth or in a section of the room which makes him feel he is not directly a part of the class).
Strategies for Dealing with Behaviors continued, p. 2

BELITTLEING — the student teacher tells the child he is stupid, a baby, etc.

LIMITATION OF SPACE — the student teacher limits the activities or space temporarily that is disturbing the pupil. This is different from Restructuring in that Restructuring is on more of a permanent basis.

YELLING -- the student teacher raises her or his voice to the extent that it is considered to be yelling.

LOSES CONTROL -- the student teacher obviously is not in control of the situation between she and a pupil or pupils.

INAPPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT -- the student teacher has the child stay in the class instead of going to art class, stay after school, write something 500 times, etc.

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION -- the student uses Behavior Modification techniques such as ignoring inappropriate behavior, etc.

PROMISES -- the student teacher offers future gratification of a desired goal of a child or indicates that when this less desired activity is completed a more desired activity will commence.

ENCOURAGEMENT -- the student teacher considers the pupil's self-concept and encourages him to complete a task.

DISCUSSION -- the student teacher discusses the behavior with the pupil in a non-judgmental manner.

SETTING UP CONTINGENCIES -- the student teacher sets up contingencies or contracts with the pupil which are specific as to what is expected and to what will occur.
Strategies for Dealing with Behaviors continued, p. 3

if the expected behavior is carried out.

PROXIMITY CONTROL -- the student teacher indirectly appeals to the pupil to control his or her behavior by standing near him or lightly touching him or her.

THREAT -- the student teacher indicates verbally to the pupil that if he does not stop an unacceptable behavior, something will happen. This should be a threat which can effectively be carried out.

OTHER NEGATIVE REACTION -- the student teacher demonstrates a behavior strategy in dealing with a pupil or pupils which the observer believes could be detrimental to the pupil.

OTHER POSITIVE REACTION -- the student teacher demonstrates a behavior strategy in dealing with a pupil or pupils which the observer believes is positive (such as cognitive stimulation, interest motivation, psychodrama, feedback through audiovisual channels, etc.).
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**BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT EVENT RECORDING SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Behaviors</th>
<th>Fail to Notice</th>
<th>Restructuring</th>
<th>Reverse of the</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Punishing</th>
<th>Handle Help</th>
<th>Signal Interference</th>
<th>Direct Appeal</th>
<th>Physical Restrained</th>
<th>Restraint Removal</th>
<th>Pleading</th>
<th>Limitation of</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Yelling</th>
<th>Loses Control</th>
<th>Inappropriate Punishment</th>
<th>Behavior Modification</th>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Setting Up</th>
<th>Contingencies</th>
<th>Proximity Control</th>
<th>Other Neg. Reaction</th>
<th>Other Pos. Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

**Attention-Seeking**
**Disruptive (to class and others)**
**Hitting**
**Destructive**
**Hyperactive**
**Hypersensitive**
**Fearful**
**Irritable**
**Depressed**
**Withdrawn**
**Bizarre Stories**
**Nervous Habits**
**Inappropriate Emotion Displayed**
**Lying Behavior**
**Off-Task Behavior**
**Other (please indicate)**

**Name of Student Teacher:**
**Supervising Teacher:**
**Observation Date:**
**Time:**
**School & System:**
**Type of Program:**
**Age Level of Class:**

**DIRECTIONS** found on separate sheet.
DIRECTIONS: Please place an X on the line under each statement that best describes how your student teacher usually deals with behavior management. Then list the five strategies or ways your student teacher usually employs in handling unacceptable behaviors in the classroom.

This information will be kept in strict confidence since no names or school systems will be mentioned in the report written regarding this study.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Name of Student Teacher: ________________________________

Supervising Teacher: ________________________________

Date of Report: ________________________________

School Name & System: ________________________________

Type of Program (E.I., E.M.I.) etc.: ________________________________

Age level of class: ________________________________

1. This student teacher has classroom control

   __ __ __ __ __ __ __ ___
   NEVER MUCH OF THE TIME ALL THE TIME

2. This student teacher punishes

   __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
   NEVER SOMETIMES OFTEN

3. This student effectively* handles behavior problems

   __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
   NEVER SOMETIMES OFTEN

*effectively means to be able to obtain and maintain classroom control.
Using your best judgment, list the FIVE strategies most frequently used by your student teacher in dealing with unacceptable behaviors in the classroom:

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
5. __________________________
APPENDIX D

PERMISSION FOR VIDEOTAPE

PERMISSION FORM

LETTER FROM ADMINISTRATION
You have my permission to show a video tape of my child. These tapes will be shown to teachers and teacher trainers so that they may improve their teaching techniques.

Sincerely,

Leonore Ittmann

PARENT SIGNATURE

Please sign the above.

Thank you,

Leonore

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
October 7, 1975

Ms. Flo Taber
Special Education Department
Sangren Hall
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Mich. 49008

Dear Flo:

This is to confirm in writing that we have the permission slips from the students enrolled in our Summer School Program stating that it is all right to show the video tapes that were taken of them.

Sincerely,

Leonore Ittmann
Teacher/Coordinator
Northshore Center School

LI/pap
APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTION OF VIDEOTAPE
DISCUSSION LEADER INSTRUCTIONS FOR

"Behaviors to Change"

I. General Instructions:

A. The treatment groups will need this information prior to the pretest.

1. The videotape was taped at a school for emotionally impaired teenagers. This is a day school situation and the goal of the program is to return as many students as possible to their "regular" classrooms.

2. The school is on a behavior modification system. Points can be earned for completion of assignments as well as socially acceptable behaviors. Students are expected to be on-task when in a classroom situation. Their academic work is prescribed for on an individual basis.

3. The physical facilities are located on one wing of a community mental health center. Two classrooms and one day room were the areas which were chosen for videotaping. There is a considerable amount of hallway between the three rooms. The two classrooms are very small and the day room is comparatively large. In classrooms, there is no smoking and students are expected to be on-task. Students are scheduled in the day room when not in classes. They may smoke in this area and their behavior is expected to be socially acceptable.

B. General Information for the Discussion Leader:

There are two treatment groups.

1. Treatment Group meets in room 3204 from 9:30 to 11:30 on Wednesday, October 22. The videotape will be used throughout this session. The treatment will consist of a pretest, the passing out and discussing of a handout ("Behaviors to Change"), the showing of segments of videotapes (see
Section II of these directions), a posttest, and an evaluation of the session. During the time when the videotaped segments are being shown, point out unacceptable pupil behaviors and any other information you feel is appropriate. At the conclusion of each segment, discuss the unacceptable behaviors that need to be changed or extinguished and alternative strategies for dealing with the behaviors. NOTE: Discuss many strategies for each behavior.

2. Treatment Group meets in room 3204 from 1:30 to 3:30 on Wednesday, October 22. The videotape will not be used throughout this session. The treatment will consist of a pretest, the passing out and discussing of a handout ("Behaviors to Change"), discussion of a list of behaviors (those unacceptable behaviors which are demonstrated on the videotaped segments), a posttest, and an evaluation of the session. In discussing the list of unacceptable behaviors which were demonstrated on the tape segments but not seen by this group, the leader should attempt to follow the procedure followed in the morning as closely as possible. The only difference between the two treatments is the use of the videotape which is utilized in the morning session only.

II. Specific Directions for the Discussion Leader for both Treatment Sessions:

A. Pass out the "Behaviors to Change" Participant Directions and go over this sheet with the group.

B. Pass out the Pretest-Posttest form (Analysis of Classroom Behavior). Have them put their names (which are for identification purposes only) and date on the appropriate blank. Then have them circle the word Pretest and place a 1 or a 2 in the upper right hand corner of the paper (a 1 for the morning experimental group and a 2 for the afternoon control group).
1. Go over the directions with the group.

2. Show the first segment of the videotape. This segment is about four minutes in length.

3. Allow five minutes after the completion of this tape segment for the pretest to be completed.

4. Collect the pretest.

C. Pass out the handout, "Behaviors to Change" and discuss its entire contents.

D. Group 1 at this point will view the tape segments which follow the pretest as indicated on the attached sheets marked Treatment 1. Group 2 at this point will discuss the behaviors in the order they are listed on the attached sheets marked Treatment 2.

E. Pass out the Pretest-Posttest form (Analysis of Classroom Behavior) and have the participants fill out the top portion of same as before except circling Posttest instead of Pretest.

1. Ask the participants to please not refer to their handout, "Behaviors to Change" during the Posttest.

2. Review the directions for the Posttest.

3. Re-show the first segment of the videotape.

4. Allow five minutes after completion of this tape segment for the Posttest to be completed.

5. Collect the Posttest.

F. Ask the participants to fill in the evaluation questions on the participant direction sheet and turn the completed form in as they leave.

G. Thank them for their cooperation.

A special thanks to Dr. R. Hunt Riegel who was designated as the sessions' leader for the A and B section of the research design.
TREATMENT

VIDEOTAPE SEGMENTS OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

A Description

As each segment of the tape is viewed, have participants verbally identify the unacceptable pupil behaviors. If they fail to notice a behavior, the Session Leader should do so. The Session Leader should also mention other information which he feels is necessary in order for the participants to successfully identify these behaviors -- i.e., classroom or dayroom, students should be on-task, identification of a student who they should watch as his behavior is changing toward being unacceptable.

After showing each segment, discuss many alternative positive strategies for dealing with these behaviors. Input from the participants should be solicited.

The first segment is the Pretest and the Posttest. No discussion should occur during or after this segment regarding behaviors or strategies. It may be mentioned beforehand that it is a classroom situation and as the teacher what would he, the participant, identify as behaviors to change and what strategies would he use as techniques for changing the behaviors. This is in conjunction with those directions as indicated in the Discussion Leader Instructions for "Behaviors to Change".

Prior to showing the first segment it is important that the counter be set at zero.

Segment Descriptions:

Segment 1 -- This is the Pretest Posttest.

Segment 2 -- This segment is in the classroom and lasts about four minutes. Behaviors which may be noticed include:

Walking out of the classroom without permission.
Attention-getting behavior outside of the window.

Segment 3 -- This segment takes place in the dayroom and lasts about eleven minutes (two
breaks in the tape at about two and five minutes into this segment). Behaviors which may be noticed include:

Social withdrawal. (a girl is watching ping pong and wanting to play and a boy is on the couch who curls up in a tighter ball as time goes on).
A boy throwing a paddle.
Attention-getting behavior of a boy picking on another girl.

Segment 4 -- This segment takes place in the dayroom and lasts about six minutes with breaks in the tape after one, four, and five minutes. (This segment ends when a boy bullies another boy with a cue stick.) Behaviors which may be noticed include:

A boy being affectionate to the teacher by putting his arm around her.
A depressed girl sitting quietly in a chair (this isn't clear on the tape and will need to be pointed out).
A boy picking on another. This happens more than once in this segment.
An argument between two boys occurs over a cue stick.
A boy slams down a cue stick.

Segment 6 -- This segment takes place in a classroom and lasts for twenty-two minutes. There are two breaks in the tape at seven minutes and at ten minutes into the tape. If the Discussion Leader feels this section is getting too long, he may stop and discuss before going on and finishing the tape. He should also point out the boy wearing sunglasses as soon as he appears on the scene so that participants may watch his behavior build into being kicked out of school. Behaviors which may be noticed include:

Conversation which is off the topic.
Members of the group which are left out of the conversation.
Interruption of the teacher's conversation.
Verbal suggestions of anti-social behavior by one boy against another in the class.
Obvious undressing and dressing for attention.
A student mentioning that he received a reward for off-task behavior.
A verbal outbreak -- "Karen".
Smoking in the classroom.
Inappropriate language -- swearing, yelling, etc.
Withdrawn behavior on the part of Fred after his verbal outbreak.
Physical and verbal resistance to being expelled on the part of the boy who is being expelled.
Fearful behavior on the part of a student who observes the action going on in the classroom.
INACCEPTABLE BEHAVIORS TO BE DISCUSSED

Social withdrawal (Describe a girl watching a ping pong game and a boy who is on a couch curled up in a ball which becomes tighter as time goes on).

A child who throws a ping pong paddle.

Attention-getting behavior of a boy picking on another boy.

A boy being affectionate to his teacher by putting his arm around her.

A depressed girl sitting quietly in a chair doing nothing.

A boy picking on another for an extended period of time.

An argument between two boys over a cue stick.

A boy throwing down a cue stick.

Conversation by students which is off the topic.

Members of a class group are left out of the discussion.

Interruption of the teacher's conversation.

Verbal suggestions of anti-social behavior by one boy against another boy in the class (ie. "If the building burned down, I'd hold that guy in so he'd burn up.")

Obvious dressing and undressing behavior (ie. a boy pulling down his slacks, tucking in his shirt and leaving his zipper open).

A student talking about getting 25 points for off-task behavior so why work.

A verbal outbreak yelling, "Karen!"

Smoking in the classroom.

Inappropriate language -- swearing, yelling, etc.
Withdrawn behavior on the part of a boy when he knows he is being kicked out of school.

Physical and verbal resistance by the same boy to being kicked out of school when he is told in the classroom.

Fearful behavior on the part of another student who observes the action going on in the classroom of the boy being expelled.
APPENDIX F

TREATMENT HANDOUTS
"BEHAVIORS TO CHANGE"

PARTICIPANT DIRECTION AND EVALUATION FORM
"BEHAVIORS TO CHANGE"

By: Florence M. Taber
Fall, 1975

To be used by treatment groups for a study in the area of BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT
UNACCEPTABLE CLASSROOM BEHAVIORS

1. Restless, not able to sit still.
2. Attention-getting or "show-off" behavior. This could be verbal, running around the room, etc.
3. Steals.
4. Disruptive—the child annoys or bothers others.
5. Demonstrates feelings of inferiority—says, "I'm stupid," etc.
6. Fighting.
7. Throws a temper tantrum—yells and is generally out of control.
8. Disobeys the teacher.
9. Destructive of his own and/or other person's property.
10. Hypersensitive—his or her feelings are too easily hurt.
11. Preoccupied—is in a world of his own, daydreaming, etc.
12. Negative or tends to do the opposite of what the teacher or peer group tells him.
13. Anxious or generally fearful.
15. Inappropriate language—swearing, etc.
16. Irritable—hot-tempered and easy to anger.
17. Depressed—chronic sadness.
18. Masturbation and other unusual sexual curiosity, exhibitionism.
19. Socially withdrawn—prefers being alone.
20. Negativistic—"I won't", etc.
Unacceptable Classroom Behaviors

21. Displays infantile behavior—behavior which might be accepted if the child were younger. This could include crawling, whining, clinging, thumb sucking, chewing on objects.

22. Misinterprets simple statement given to him.

23. Excessively meticulous, exacting, formalistic, or pedantic.

24. Cries easily and often.

25. Erratic behavior—flighty or scattered behavior.


27. Often tells bizarre stories—it may be difficult here to determine what is real and what is not.

28. Nervous habits such as biting or picking fingernails, twisting hands, rubbing eyes, pulling hair, twitching, etc.

29. Shows no guilt or shame if he is caught doing something.

30. Shows inappropriate emotional response—giggles when nothing is funny, cries when he should laugh, etc.

31. Often makes alibis or excuses for mistakes—cannot accept the blame himself.

32. Often is very sleepy or restless during class.

33. Has a fixed facial expression that lacks feeling.

34. Intentionally lies.

35. Off-task behaviors.

36. Other disturbing behaviors—to the teacher, peers, self, etc.
POSITIVE STRATEGIES
FOR DEALING WITH UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIORS


from: Barclay, Classroom Climate Inventory.

1. Planful Ignoring: "Planful Ignoring" is useful when the type of behavior exhibited is temporary in nature.

2. Signal Interference: Indicate to the child by means of signal words to which prior significance or warning have been attached and the behavior is inappropriate; eye contact, dimming of lights, frowning, waving a finger, etc.

3. Proximity and Touch Control: This is an indirect appeal for self control.

4. Emotional Drainoff: Unexpressed emotion creates a surplus of energy and should be drained off. Express honestly to the child what you are doing and discuss same with him. In this situation you give the child something to do which will require energy.

5. Counter Expectational Evidence: The youngsters who is acting up expects to provoke the adult to anger and to upset him. When this does not occur, the child discontinues his behavior.

Predicament Sympathy--Be sympathetic with the situation in which the child finds himself.

Tension Decontamination--Interject humor or smile (this does not mean you laugh at him).

6. Hurdle Help: Help the child over the problem in order to avoid frustration and anxiety. Be there as emotional support. Talk with him, help him determine his own solutions, etc.
Positive Strategies for Dealing with Unacceptable Behaviors, p. 2

7. Diversion and Restructuring: Restructure the classroom situation--academics, emotions, etc. A physical rearrangement may be in order.

8. Direct Appeal: Appeal to decency factors, fairness, to his ego. Ask the child to stop whatever it is he is doing.

9. Limitation of Space, Props, and Activities: Remove that which is having a negative effect on the child--a person, object, etc.--on a temporary basis. This is different from Restructuring in that Restructuring is more on a permanent basis.

10. Physical Restraint: This is not a punishment. The teacher holds the child in order to help him gain control of himself.

11. Bouncing Situational Elimination: Remove the child from the situation and temporarily isolate him. The child should not be sent to the office in most cases but the teacher may go for help if it is in the best interests of the child.

12. Encouragement and Constructive Criticism: Be objective and consider the child's self-image. Here you are letting him know his boundaries and that you feel he has exceeded them. You are also letting him know you feel he can stay within those boundaries.

13. Promises and Rewards: Offer the child future gratification (Premack Principle). In other words, if the child does the less desired activity, you will allow him to carry out the activity he desires more.

14. Threat: Only make threats that are realistic and can be carried out without belittling the child.

15. Contracting and Contingencies: Set up contingencies and/or contracts with the child. If he keeps his part of the agreement, the teacher is obligated to keep her part of the agreement.

16. Adjust the Goals of the Situation: If the goals are not realistic for the child, change them.
Positive Strategies for Dealing with Unacceptable Behaviors, p. 3

17. **Set limits for the child:** The child should be aware of the limits the teacher sets on his behavior; or in other words, he should know what the rules are and what they mean as far as his behavior is concerned.

18. **Behavior modification techniques:** rewards, extinction, etc. Reward his positive behavior and ignore that behavior which you want extinguished.

19. **Other positive techniques:** This could include techniques which do NO harm to the child—cognitive stimulation, interest activities, feedback through audio-visual channels, etc.
"BEHAVIORS TO CHANGE"

Participant Directions

This session will be devoted to assisting you in the identification of unacceptable pupil behaviors in the classroom and in the determination of alternative strategies for dealing with the identified behaviors.

1. Your leader will pass out a pretest for you to complete as you view a videotaped segment of an actual classroom in session. While viewing the tape, you are to:
   a. List behaviors which you feel need to be changed or eliminated — one per space on the left hand side of the page. If you need more space, you may use the back of the paper.
   b. List alternative strategies (3 if possible) for dealing with each of these behaviors on the right hand side of the page. The strategies you choose for each behavior are to be listed across from the behavior.

2. Your leader will pass out a handout which you may use during the session today — and which you are urged to use in your future teaching experiences. Please do NOT use this handout during the administration of the Posttest.

3. Your leader will lead in the discussion of some of the behaviors which need to be identified as unacceptable in the classroom as well as in assisting in identifying alternative strategies for dealing with these behaviors. Since this is a discussion period, please enter into the discussion.

4. Your leader will pass out a posttest at the conclusion of today's session. You will be asked, again, to list behaviors which you feel need to be changed or eliminated and to list alternative strategies (3 if possible) for dealing with each of the behaviors you identified. You may use the back of the paper if necessary.

5. After the posttest, please answer the following questions:
a. Do you feel this session was beneficial?
b. What did you like best?
c. How could it be improved?

6. Thank you very much for your cooperation. It was greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX G

EXAMPLES OF LETTERS
Special Education Department  
Sangren Hall  
Western Michigan University  
September 2, 1975

Dear

We in Special Education have always been concerned with the area of behavior management. Our student teachers have also indicated this concern. This is why I have chosen this area as the one in which to do a study for my dissertation. The study which is proposed is impossible without your assistance. Naturally, I will share with you the results of this study and hope the information which I intend to impart to your student teachers at a three-hour workshop will benefit their teaching.

Your assistance in this project will not take any time other than that in the classroom as it involves observing your student teacher. I need you to observe this person one half hour four times during the semester. Please do so in the afternoon during the student teacher's first contact with the children after the lunch period. The schedule of days on which to observe the student teacher is at the conclusion of this letter. During these brief observations, please fill in the enclosed tally sheet. The directions for this instrument are found on the tally sheet. As you complete each of the four observations, please mail it back to me --

Mrs. Florence Taber  
Special Education Department  
Sangren Hall  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

All information will be kept in strict confidence. Your student teacher should be receiving a letter from me the same time as you do. They will receive information as to the fact that the study is in the area of behavior management. They do not, nor should they, know what information is being requested on the tally sheet.
Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me at:

School - 616-383-1680
Home - 616-429-8360

or you may contact the person in your area in charge of Western Michigan University student teachers.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I'm sure it will benefit these individuals who will soon be joining our ranks in the teaching profession.

Yours very truly,

Florence M. Taber
Doctoral Student
Special Education
Western Michigan University

Please observe and record data the first contact the student teacher has with your class after lunch for a period of one-half hour on the following days:

Tuesday, September 23
Tuesday, October 14
Tuesday, October 28
Tuesday, November 18

Should any of these dates be impossible as far as observing your student teacher, please do your observation as close to that date as possible.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
Special Education Department  
Sangren Hall  
Western Michigan University  
September 2, 1975

Dear

Last spring some of you indicated that you felt uncomfortable in the area of behavior management. Therefore, it was decided that I would do a study for my dissertation in this area. Your supervising teacher will be observing you on occasion throughout the semester to determine how you react as "teachers" to situations in teaching.

On Student Teaching Day I am going to meet with you for a period of about three hours to give you an in-depth look at techniques to use in your teaching career for the management of behavior.

Naturally, all information received from your supervising teacher will be kept in strictest confidence. This is definitely NOT an evaluation of your teaching but of the techniques which I am going to use in my work with you on Student Teaching Day.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I hope the information you receive as a result of this study will help you in your teaching careers. Also, the results of the study could very well have an effect on the training of teachers in the future.

Yours very truly,

Flo Taber  
Doctoral Student  
Special Education  
Western Michigan University

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
Dear

This letter is written regarding the possibility of two trained observers visiting Western Michigan University's special education student teacher(s) that are located in your school(s) for the purpose of observing his or her skills in classroom management. Unfortunately, we do not know the exact day of our visit. We will, however, contact you by phone several days prior to our coming.

These visitations are in conjunction with a study I am doing on behavior management. Your Western Michigan University special education student teachers were given training in identifying classroom behaviors which are considered to be unacceptable as well as in determining a variety of positive strategies for dealing with the behaviors. In order to determine if this training has had the desired effect on their classroom management, we need to observe them for a period of one-half hour (one time only).

If you have any questions, please contact either Flo Taber or Morvin Wirtz at the Special Education Office, Western Michigan University, 383-1680.

Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

Florence M. Taber
Doctoral Student

Morvin A. Wirtz, Advisor
APPENDIX H

STATISTICAL DESIGNS

ACB--DESIGN A, B, C

FOR EMERS--DESIGN A

FOR EMERS--DESIGN C
Statistical Design for ACB

The Pretest-Posttest Used at the Time of the Treatments
Design A, B & C

Hyp. 1
Corr-t
Pre-Post
Control
re. ID

Hyp. 3
Corr-t
Pre-Post
Control
re. strat.

Hyp. 2
Corr-t
Pre-Post
Exper.
re. ID

Hyp. 4
Corr-t
Pre-Post
Exper.
re. strat.

Hyp. 9
\( t\)-test
Control-Exper. pre
re. ID

Hyp. 10
\( t\)-test
Control-Exper. pre
re. strat.

Yes
No

Yes
No

ANOVA
Contr.-Exper. on Pre for Post Results
re. ID

\( t\)-test
Contr.-Exper. Post
re. ID

ANOVA
Contr.-Exper. on Pre for Post Results
re. strat.

\( t\)-test
Contr.-Exper. Post
re. strat.
Statistical Design for BMERS

The instrument Used to Determine the Effect of Treatments in the Student Teaching Situation

Design A

Hyp. 6
Direct data report for X's of pre-post control

Pos. Strat.
Neg. Strat.
Quest. 1
Quest. 2
Quest. 3
Gen. Pos. Strategy

Hyp. 5
Direct data report for X's of pre-post control

ID

Hyp. 8
Direct data report for X's of pre-post exper.

Pos. Strat.
Neg. Strat.
Quest. 1
Quest. 2
Quest. 3
Gen. Pos. Strategy

Hyp. 7
Direct data report for X's of pre & post data comparing control-exper.

ID

Hyp. 11
Direct data report for X's of pre & post data comparing control-exper.

Pos. Strat.
Neg. Strat.
Quest. 1
Quest. 2
Quest. 3
Gen. Pos. Strategy

Hyp. 12
Direct data report for X's of pre & post data comparing control-exper.

Pos. Strat.
Neg. Strat.
Quest. 1
Quest. 2
Quest. 3
Gen. Pos. Strategy
Statistical Design for BMERS

The Instrument Used to Determine the Effect of Treatments in the Teaching Situation
Design C

Hyp. 11
- t-test control-exper.
  using $\bar{X}$'s of observations
  Post only

- ID

Hyp. 12
- t-test control-exper.
  using $\bar{X}$'s of observations
  Post only

- Pos.Strat.
  Neg.Strat.

- t-tests control-exper. for observer
  Post only

- ID

- Pos.Strat.
  Neg.Strat.