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CHARACTERISTICS, ATTITUDES, AND PRACTICES OF TEACHERS
IN PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

by

Jerry M. Russell

The problem of this study was to compare selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in planning and implementing instructional strategies.

The study helped to identify desirable lesson planning characteristics of teachers, to uncover teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and to discover teacher lesson planning practices. This study explored the processes in public schools which help to identify effective instructional practices.

Literature was reviewed to determine what research had been done on the topic of teacher lesson planning. The literature revealed that a variety of research had been accomplished. Literature published in journals and periodicals that had been written by professionals and practitioners was used in the study. The review of literature was developed chronologically to fill the gap from 1962 through 1978.

The two hundred subjects of the study were randomly selected from a public city school system and a public county school system. A questionnaire was developed and validated to collect data from the teachers of the two samples. A 70 percent response was obtained from each sample. Data gathered on seven teacher characteristics included: (1) sex of the teacher, (2) marital status of the teacher, (3) degree held by the teacher, (4) number of years of experience of the teacher, (5) career or probationary teacher, (6) previous instruction in lesson planning, and (7) elementary or secondary teaching level. Data gathered on five teacher attitudes toward lesson planning included: (1) the number of teachers who felt a need for more lesson planning time, (2) the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, (3) the number of teachers who felt a need for in-service education in lesson planning, (4) the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators, and (5) the number of teachers who felt that it was desirable to use written lesson plans in instruction. Data gathered on four teacher lesson planning practices included: (1) the average time teachers spent per week in lesson planning, (2) the number of teachers who consistently used written lesson plans, (3) the basic parts of written lesson plans used by teachers, and (4) the use of revised and previously used lesson
plans. The selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in the two public school systems were compared.

Five hypotheses were tested using difference testing techniques. Five comparisons were made using data compiled on the selected teacher characteristics in relation to selected attitudes and practices. Five comparisons were made using the data compiled on the teachers' attitudes toward lesson planning. Five comparisons were made using the data compiled on teacher lesson planning practices in relation to selected attitudes and other practices.

The testing of five hypotheses revealed no significant differences between:

(1) the characteristics of teachers who used lesson plans in the public city school system and the characteristics of teachers who used lesson plans in the public county school system;
(2) the attitudes of teachers toward lesson planning in the public city school system and the attitudes of teachers toward lesson planning in the public county school system;
(3) the lesson planning practices of teachers in the public city school system and the lesson planning practices of teachers in the public county school system;
(4) the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public city school system and the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public county school system;
(5) the amount of time teachers spent in lesson planning in a public city school system and the amount of time teachers spent in lesson planning in a public city school system.

Among fifteen comparisons that were made between the data received from the respondents of the public city school system and the data received from the respondents of the public county school system, only few and minor differences were found. The data were tabulated in order to enable other analytical comparisons.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to compare selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in planning and implementing instructional strategies.

Significance of the Problem

The study helped to identify desirable lesson planning characteristics of teachers, to uncover teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and to discover teacher lesson planning practices. Teachers in a public city school system were compared to teachers in a public county school system.

This study explored the processes in public schools which help to identify effective instructional practices. The study identified some desirable factors in teacher candidates that would be valuable information for those who formulate hiring policies in school systems. The study should also help to bring about a better understanding of teacher attitudes and practices in lesson planning in public educational systems.\(^1\) Such understanding of the new knowledge would increase the chances of

---

improving the educational process.

Teachers live in an age of accountability. Those persons in public educational decision-making positions may profit from this study, especially in deciding the issue of requiring written lesson plans. Better insight into teachers' attitudes toward lesson planning could help the decision maker to decide whether to require written lesson plans throughout the system.

The practitioner in public education sometimes lacks such knowledge as this study was designed to obtain. The professionals who presently prepare teachers in higher education should find the study interesting and should also find added information useful in their own instruction of future teachers.

There is a trend in a number of states to increase the size of school systems by merging city and county systems. The result is fewer but larger public school systems. It is unlikely that the quality of instruction is always improved by such mergers. Considerable controversy sometimes exists during mergers because of the belief that the city-system teaching is superior to that of county-system teaching and vice-versa. This study can help to explore the learning process of both city and county school systems in a more objective manner. The comparison of the characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in the two public school systems should prove helpful in such circumstances.

This study generated data that give insight to the educator who seeks to answer the following questions:

---

1. How do the factors of sex, teaching level, tenure, experience, degree held, marital status, and previous instruction in lesson planning characterize the teachers who spent the greatest amount of time in lesson planning? The basis for selection of the factors of sex, teaching level, tenure, experience, degree held, marital status, and previous instruction in lesson planning came from a review of related literature. Researchers have considered the factors important and have used them in a variety of studies. Other writers have also dealt with these factors.

2. How much time is given to planning by classroom teachers?

3. How do the factors of sex, teaching level, tenure, experience, degree held, marital status, and previous instruction in lesson planning characterize the teachers who consistently use written lesson plans?

4. What proportion of classroom teachers use written lesson plans?

5. Do teachers who use written lesson plans write objectives, instructional activities, and evaluations into the plans?

6. What relationship exists between the time spent in lesson planning and the use of written lesson plans?

7. What basic parts of lesson plans are identified by the teachers who use written lesson plans?

8. What proportion of the teachers will identify:
   1. a need for more planning time
   2. a need for in-service programs in lesson planning
   3. no need for more planning time
   4. no need for in-service programs in lesson planning
9. Do the characteristics, attitudes, and lesson planning practices of classroom teachers differ in the public city school from those in the public county school?

Assumptions

The study was carried out under the following basic assumptions:

1. It is desirable for teachers to allot time to lesson planning.

2. It is desirable for teachers to use written lesson plans.

3. Teachers are basically self-motivated and need not be coerced into spending time in planning or in writing lesson plans.

4. Teachers as professionals are basically honest and will give accurate responses to questions concerning their characteristics, attitudes, and practices in lesson planning.

5. Teachers in a public city school system and a public county school system have similar biases toward lesson planning.

Limitations

The study had the following limitations:

The selected populations from which the samples were drawn were one large city school system and one large county school system in the same geographical area.

The findings of the study had a limited application to similar public school systems.

Selected teacher characteristics, attitudes, and practices that may influence lesson planning were used. The teacher characteristics,
attitudes and practices were selected from existing literature on the topic of lesson planning.

**Hypotheses**

The study tested the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the characteristics of teachers who use lesson plans in a public city school system and the characteristics of teachers who use lesson plans in a public county school system.

2. There is no significant difference between teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in a public city school system and teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in a public county school system.

3. There is no significant difference between teacher lesson planning practices in a public city school system and teacher lesson planning practices in a public county school system.

4. There is no significant difference between the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public city school system and the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public county school system.

5. There is no significant difference between the average amount of time teachers spend in lesson planning in a public city school system and the average amount of time teachers spend in lesson planning in a public county school system.

**Definitions of Terms**

Terms used in this study required special attention to clarify the intended meanings. The following definitions were given to explain
the specific use of the terms for solving the problem of the study.

**Characteristics**

For the purpose of this study, characteristics was used to refer to (1) teacher's sex, (2) marital status, (3) degree held by teacher, (4) experience, (5) tenure (career or probationary), (6) teaching level, and (7) previous instruction in lesson planning.

**Attitudes**

For the purpose of this study, attitudes was used to refer to how the teacher felt about (1) the need for more planning time, (2) the effectiveness of written lesson plans, (3) the need for in-service work in lesson planning, (4) the desirability of using written lesson plans, and (5) the requiring of written lesson plans.

**Practices**

For the purpose of this study, practices was used to refer to (1) the average time teachers spend in lesson planning, (2) the consistent use of written lesson plans, (3) the reuse of previously used lesson plans, and (4) the basic or main parts of lesson plans used by the teachers.

**Lesson Plan**

For the purpose of this study, lesson plan was the name given to the teacher's advance preparation for instruction in the classroom. Lesson plans consisted of three basic parts—objectives of the lesson, instructional activities of the lesson, and evaluation procedures. Lesson plans may be written or unwritten.
Career Teacher

For the purpose of this study, a career teacher was one who had been given tenure status and a continuing contract.

Probationary Teacher

For the purpose of this study, probationary teacher was used to identify the teacher who had not been given tenure status and whose contract had to be renewed annually.

Objectives

Objectives were performances acquired through particular instructional procedures. Objectives meant expected outcomes of a lesson to be taught. The term was used in the same manner as instructional objectives. Objectives were one basic part of lesson plans.3

Instructional Activities

Instructional activities described the teaching process. This term was used to refer to planned learning activities which are carried out by the classroom teacher to teach a lesson. The term was used in the same manner as instructional procedures or learning activities. Instructional activities were another basic part of lesson plans.4

Evaluation

Evaluation was used to assess the terminal results or outcomes of a lesson that had been taught by the classroom teacher. The

---

4DeCecco, p. 12.
evaluation included a variety of methods, but whatever method was used, the evaluation was necessary to determine if the lesson objectives had been accomplished. Evaluation was another basic part of lesson plans.\(^5\)

**Instruction in Planning**

For the purpose of this study, instruction in planning was used to identify the classroom teacher who experienced instruction in lesson planning at the undergraduate level in education and/or methods courses.

**In-service Education**

For the purpose of this study, in-service education included professional efforts to improve skills or performance of the classroom teacher through workshops or seminars directed by competent educational leaders.

**Planning Time**

For the purpose of this study, planning time was used to refer to the time the classroom teacher gave to advance preparation for instruction in the classroom (average planning time per week).

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 contains the statement of the problem with its significance, assumptions, limitations, and organization of the study. The hypotheses and definitions of terms are also included in Chapter 1. A review of literature related to the study is included as Chapter 2. Chapter 3 is entitled Procedures and includes the sample, instrument-

\(^5\)DeCecco, p. 12.
tation, data needed to solve the problem, sources of the data and a section on collection of the data. Chapter 4 contains the analysis of the data. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of related literature for this study covered the period of sixteen years from 1962 through 1978. The review of related literature is presented in two parts. The first part presents the most relevant research that had been accomplished in the area of lesson planning. The second part of related literature presents professional literature that had been written on the topic of lesson planning. Both parts of the review of related literature are presented in chronological order. Educational literature has presented a wide variety of approaches and beliefs about daily lesson plans.

Other Resources

In 1964, William F. Donny traced the historical development of the usage of daily lesson plans and the development and changes in concepts in theory and practice concerning daily lesson plans from 1923 to 1963. Specifically, the study attempted to trace the extent and nature of material devoted to daily lesson plans in textbooks, in general principles of secondary education, and the extent and nature of material devoted to daily lesson planning in professional literature. Donny sought answers to the following questions: (1) What forms of lesson plans were advocated or used in textbooks in general principles of secondary education
and in professional periodicals from 1923 to 1963? (2) What changing concepts concerning daily lesson plans could be identified in the texts in general principles of secondary education and in professional periodical literature from 1923 to 1963? These concepts were determined by the use of question criteria: Who planned the lessons or activities? When was the planning done—daily, weekly, monthly, never? What was planned—formal mastery of text-material, pupil-centered activity or group centered learning? (3) What were the attitudes toward lesson plans from 1923 to 1963 as revealed by the writers of theory texts of general principles in secondary education and the writers of the professional periodical literature?¹

Donny found that an extensive study had been completed in 1923 which traced the history of concepts concerning lesson planning in the United States from 1826 to 1923. Donny discovered that there had been no major research done on the subject of daily lesson plans since 1923 and the amount of research and publication of material on the subject of lesson planning was limited.²

Donny, by investigating a period of four decades from 1923 to 1963, found several distinctions in the strands of education as focused at the crucial lesson planning phase of teaching. It was found that there were two schools of thought in the approach to planning. One school held that planning was within the teacher's immediate control and was done prior to the class hour. This teacher planning was based


²Donny, p. 114.
on adequate transmission of textbook material for pupil mastery. The term most frequently used to denote this approach was "traditional" or "formal" and "Herbartian." Herbart's five formal steps were preparation, presentation, comparison and abstraction, generalization, and application. The other school of thought in the approach to planning held that planning was a part of the total educational process, where a student's learning plan became an increment of the school goal, thus lessening the teacher's exclusive responsibility for prior planning. This school, frequently called "progressive" or "liberal" or "Dewey Centered," focused on the pupil as the center of the classroom. Neither of these two schools of thought ever won a distinct or unanimous approval of the teaching profession but each school contributed the best of its beliefs to the field.

There is a need for research in the field of the emerging third school of approach to learning, the approach which seeks to combine the better elements of the traditional, systematic acquisition of knowledge, the best features of the child-centeredness approach, and the welding element produced by the technological advances of modern society.

The determination of what sort of lesson plans, if any, is advisable depends upon the concept of education. For many decades it has been written that planning is necessary in teaching, but research is needed to answer the age-old question: Is daily lesson planning vital to good teaching or is it not?

---

3Donny, p. 115.  
4Donny, p. 29.  
5Donny, p. 115.  
6Donny, p. 131.  
7Donny, p. 116.
Almost every author reviewed by Donny, both in textbooks of general principles in secondary education and in the professional periodical literature, conceded that planning was vital to good teaching. Yet only a limited amount of study has been accomplished on the subject. The research that had been done revealed little consistency or agreement as to what the basic components of a lesson plan should be. Studies before 1963 indicated more agreement on the importance of written advance lesson plans. There was little consistency in the percentage of schools requiring written lesson plans. Institutional preparation of teachers in the areas of lesson planning also varied from time to time. Donny revealed that attitudes toward lesson planning and practices in lesson planning were not stable in the years from 1923 to 1963.

Robert James Conrad carried out a study in 1969 to determine if the extent and quality of teachers' planning measurably influenced patterns of teacher-student classroom behavior. The research gave no evidence of measurable relationship between the quantity and quality of teacher planning and (1) flexibility of teaching modes or styles, (2) spontaneity of student response, and (3) the tendency of teachers to assume an authoritative or dominant role in the classroom. Years of experience related significantly with planning in that experienced teachers did more planning than less experienced teachers.

---

8Donny, p. 128.

Conrad found that subject areas and years of experience also proved to have definite influence on both planning practice and patterns of classroom behavior. Evidence of a definite relationship between extent of planning and attainment of objectives was found. Mathematics teachers were found to be doing less planning than teachers of social studies, science, and language arts. Language arts teachers were found to be low on attainment of objectives, but science teachers were found to be high on attainment of objectives.¹⁰

Planning was one of many factors related to teacher and student behavior in the classroom. It was one of a family of interacting forces which combined to produce the unique psychological climate in each classroom. Conrad's study identified a family or cluster of factors: subject area, grade level, and teachers' years of experience. The relationship of such factors to many classroom behavioral patterns was found to be as significant as teacher planning, and in some cases, other factors seemingly overshadowed or negated any measurable planning influence. Planning must be responsive to many more factors than those pointed out above. The role of planning in this interplay of classroom influence is yet to be fully established. An exhaustive ten-year study recently established some definite relationships between the teacher's personal characteristics and success or failure in the classroom.¹¹

Conrad grouped the teachers in the sample of his study by characteristics. The teachers were grouped by (1) grade level, (2) subject area, (3) years of experience, (4) educational attainment, and (5) sex.¹² Data relevant to these five characteristics were gathered

by use of a questionnaire. Conrad used the concept Extent of planning to refer to the time that teachers devoted to planning activities and to the volume of written detail and materials which resulted from this preparation.

Conrad pointed out that a number of experienced teachers commented that they had developed extensive plans either for a college course requirement or as a means to overcome uncertainty and anxiety during their first years of teaching. Through the years they had used these plans with slight modification and probably continued to do so for years to come. When asked to identify experienced teachers who planned extensively, administrators often responded that experienced teachers did very little planning. This was typical of a widely-held belief, yet this notion proved to be a variance with the findings of the Conrad study. It was true that many experienced teachers did not produce lengthy written plans in the classical form.

Conrad explained that the preactive (planning) - interactive (teaching) relationship typified the problem of reconciling theories of instruction with theories of learning. There were numerous scholarly theories as to what instruction was and should be about and likewise many creditable hypotheses as to how learning took place. Conrad found that neither a fully acceptable theory of instruction nor a unanimously endorsed theory of learning had been developed.

Conrad concluded that research did not support the notion of a perfect cause-and-effect relationship between planning and what

---

13 Conrad, p. 150.  
14 Conrad, p. 6.  
15 Conrad, pp. 132-133.  
16 Conrad, p. 38.
occurred in the classroom. He pointed out that additional research was needed to identify the forces which shaped a teacher's planning habits. Some examples of needed research were: (1) What relationship existed between personality types and patterns of planning? (2) What influence did teacher training exert on the long-term planning habits of experienced teachers? (3) Did each discipline have characteristics which required variations in teacher planning, or were there other influences which caused the variations in interdisciplinary planning?\(^17\)

There appeared to be widespread agreement not only on the value of planning but also on the substance and format of plans. The plan that had enlisted universal support contained the elements suggested by Ralph Tyler: purposes, experiences and their organization, and evaluation. This model for planning had continued to gain strength since Tyler suggested it. The notion that specific and thorough planning will give direction to teaching and result in worthwhile, efficient learning had considerable logical validity. It would seem that careful, detailed planning concerning purposes, experiences, and evaluation would result in useful and appropriate teacher behaviors in the classroom. But was this assumption valid? Did this type of planning have a beneficial effect on teaching? Were some types of planning more useful and more effective than others?\(^18\)

John A. Zahorik's 1970 report focused on one question of teacher planning: Was the teacher who planned a lesson less sensitive to pupils

\(^{17}\)Conrad, p. 135.

in the classroom than the teacher who did not plan? The study centered on the effect of a simple plan as opposed to no plan. Teacher behavior that was sensitive to pupils was selected as the behavior to be examined. From the results of the study it was concluded that planning (in terms of goals, experiences, and evaluation) and lack of planning were not unrelated to the pupil-sensitive behavior that the teacher used during the lesson. The study raised compelling questions. Why did the typical planning model result in insensitivity to pupils on the part of the teacher? The answer appeared to be that planning made the teacher's thinking rigid and put the teacher on a track from which he could not be derailed. Once a teacher decided what outcomes were wanted from the lesson and how they will be achieved, the goal was to produce these outcomes regardless of what pupils introduced into the teaching-learning situation. What were teachers to do if they valued teacher behavior that was sensitive to pupils? One course of action was to eliminate planning of the goals - experiences - evaluation type.

Robert Reed McClune completed a study in 1970 to identify and classify certain aspects about the lesson planning practices of elementary teachers. Teaching level, years of teaching experience, educational degrees, and the types of systems in which the teachers were employed were used in conducting the study. McClune found that descriptive theory of teacher lesson planning as available in the literature included the major categories involved in classroom teacher planning. The major differences between that available in the literature and the practices

---

19Zahorik, p. 144.  
20Zahorik, p. 149.
of the population studied were in: (1) nature of processes involved; (2) kinds of data used for specific decisions; (3) emphases given certain data; (4) priorities and relationships involved; and (5) the fact that teachers do not necessarily perform all the tasks suggested. McClune found that most teachers identified objectives in planning but that most did not write the objectives down on paper. Most of the teachers used in the study were required to keep written lesson plans.21

McClune found that the teachers' concerns for evaluation in lesson planning related mostly to reporting of pupil progress for records, promotion, assignment to grade levels, classes, or other learning groups. The most reported limiting factor in range and scope of lesson planning decisions was obsolete physical facilities. The most reported facilitating factor making lesson planning easier was the availability of a wide range and variety of materials.22

McClune concluded that classroom teacher planning was a complex and involved process. Teachers planned in many different ways, places, and times. Many preferred to write down their planning decisions explicitly and in great detail. Others preferred to keep many of their decisions in mind, often writing notes in various places as reminders of what they intended to do.23

In 1972, Ralph Knight Ryder carried out a study to investigate and assess the effect of behavioral objective lesson planning instruction on

---


22 McClune, p. 163.

23 McClune, p. 121.
student teachers' planning and implications for including such instruction in a teacher education program. The study sought answers to several questions related to the practice of using objectives in lesson planning. The findings were: (1) There was no significant difference between student teachers who wrote lesson plans using behavioral objectives and those who did not use behavioral objectives; (2) student teachers who consistently planned their lessons using behavioral objectives were no more cognizant of expected student behavior than those who did not use behavioral objectives in planning; (3) student teachers who received specific instruction in writing behavioral objectives did understand the relationship between the behavioral objective, the concept or skill to be learned and the learning experiences they planned; and (4) There was some degree of correlation between what the student said in his objective and what his lesson plan actually contained in the objective, conceptual scheme, and learning activities.  

Emmy Lou Merriman completed a study in 1975 which explored aspects of planning practices of Oregon elementary public school teachers. The study also sought the opinions of teachers about the importance they assigned to planning and their opinions of the effectiveness of their professional preparation for planning. The study was specifically directed toward seeking answers to certain questions related to planning. How adequate was professional preparation for planning in each of six areas of the planning process? The six areas used were:

Area 1 Selecting and organizing content
Area 2 Determining pupil needs
Area 3 Formulating or deciding on objectives
Area 4 Selecting materials, equipment, resources and resource personnel
Area 5 Determining and measuring outcome
Area 6 Selecting and organizing learning experiences or activities

Did teaching experience make a significant difference in the way teachers responded? Did the amount of education make a significant difference in the way teachers responded? Were teaching plans required of most teachers? How much time was spent weekly in planning? Did primary or intermediate teachers differ significantly in their responses? The findings of Merriman's study were grouped and analyzed in three groupings: first, according to level of teaching assignment; next, according to educational attainment; and finally, according to years of teaching experience.25

An ordered list of the areas in terms of importance indicated by respondents of the study was as follows: Area 2, Area 6, Area 1, Area 3, Area 4, and Area 5. In indicating the sequence of areas customarily followed in planning, the largest percentages of respondents indicated the following sequence: Area 2, Area 3, Area 1, Area 4, Area 6, and Area 5. The largest percentages of the total group of respondents reported that their preparation had been "below average" in all six areas. Educational preparation apparently did have a bearing on

perceived ability to plan. On the basis of the study, planning preparation was considered to be inadequate and the respondents indicated that lack of time was a major deterrent to planning.26

Further findings by Merriman were that 83.9 percent of all responding teachers were required to prepare lesson plans in some form. Average planning time reported was from four to seventeen hours per week. Among teachers spending more than four hours weekly in planning, as education and experience increased, the amount of time reportedly spent in planning increased. One sometimes heard the opinion that teachers with experience no longer spent time in planning. Apparently this was something of a fallacy.27

Various individuals have suggested how teachers ought to plan lessons, class periods, units, or courses. Zahorik reported in his 1975 study of classroom planning models that teachers' decisions do not always follow logically from a specification of objectives. The prescription that has received the most attention is the one developed by Tyler in 1950 and since modified by Popham, Taba, and others. This planning model, in skeleton form, consists of (a) objectives, (b) learning activities, (c) organization of learning activities, and (d) evaluation. Given the long time availability of this model, the number of curriculum experts who supported it and its powerful appeal to rationality, it was reasonable to believe that the model was in widespread use at all levels of teaching. Others suggested, however, that in reality teachers did not begin their planning by first making a decision about objectives and then proceed to make decisions about activities, evaluation, and other

26 Merriman, pp. 222-230.  
27 Merriman, pp. 210-211.
matters. Zahorik attempted to find out what teachers actually did as they prepared to teach, and to determine if teacher planning decisions vary in relation to level of teaching and experience of the teacher. He selected his sample of teachers from a city school system and from a suburban school system.\textsuperscript{28}

Zahorik found that the kind of decision used by the greatest number of teachers (both elementary and secondary) concerned pupil activities. The decision made most often by the teachers pertained not to objectives but to content to be covered. Fifty-one percent of the teachers put content decisions first and objective decisions were put first by only 28 percent of the teachers. Few differences in planning were found to exist in relation to the variables of teaching level and teaching experience. The finding of the study indicated that neither planning model as prescribed by Tyler or by Popham was being used by the teachers to any great extent. Only one-fourth of the teachers began their planning with objectives. The study suggested that the breadth and depth of the content for a teaching-learning session was of primary concern to teachers.\textsuperscript{29}

A study of teacher planning carried out in 1976 focused on the current situation and gave an overview on the subject of lesson planning. Planning ahead is a basic virtue in the American society. We are surrounded with suggestions that the hallmark of wisdom is planning. We are also often reminded that plans do not always carry the day. An awareness of the unpredictability of the future is considered to be a character-


\textsuperscript{29}Zahorik, pp. 137-138.
istic of the wise individual. Such ideas about planning have become important in education as well as in society. It has been assumed that one of the most important aspects of teacher training is how to plan. Little attention has been given to what difference it makes whether a teacher plans or not. More recently a few educators are bothering to ask how teachers plan. There is much information to be gathered if we are to be able to answer the questions so often asked about teacher planning and its relationship to teaching effectiveness. It seems that most teachers do plan but such planning takes on many forms. It is altogether appropriate to gather data from teachers that will provide more insight or at least some clues to lesson planning that may be related to teaching effectiveness.30

The study raised two basic questions:

1. What type of things did teachers make notes about when planning for a particular lesson?

2. What types of information did teachers use in thinking about revising or extending a lesson that they had taught?

The area infringing on teacher planning which has been the most researched is the domain of educational decision-making. While the major focus in this area has tended to be on the processes of instructional decision-making in interactive classroom situations and on the contexts in which such decisions are made, some research referred to decision-making in the proactive phase. Little of this, however, gave any clues as to how teachers planned specifically for use of instructional materials and for

the instructional process itself. The topic of planning for teaching has mainly been dealt with on the prescriptive level attending more to idolized models and recommendations than how teachers actually prepare lessons. The importance of developing planning skills has been strongly argued and planning skills have been incorporated into numerous teacher training systems, but there was little research to support the basic notion that improved planning for instruction will improve the quality of teaching that ensues.31

A 1978 study by Penelope L. Peterson, Ronald W. Marx, and Christopher M. Clark investigated individual differences in teacher planning and the relationship of teacher planning to teacher behavior and student achievement. The research was conducted at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching which is supported in part by the National Institute of Education.32

Peterson, Marx, and Clark divided the teacher subjects of their study on the basis of male and female and used teaching level and years of teaching experience of the teachers as criteria in carrying out the study. The study dealt with two questions. The two questions were concerned with how teachers differed in their planning, and whether these differences remained stable or consistent from one day to the next. A "think aloud" technique was used to record the teachers' planning sessions.33 Recording as the teacher talked aloud what she

31Morine, pp. 14-17.
33Peterson, Marx, and Clark, p. 425.
thought as she planned had been used to describe what teachers did as they planned.\textsuperscript{34}

The study revealed that the largest proportion of teachers' planning statements focused on content. After content the teachers' planning statements concerned instructional process. Small proportions of planning statements concerned materials and the learner. The smallest proportion of planning statements were devoted to objectives. Individual differences related to differences in teachers' cognitive processing styles and abilities. The planning differences of individual teachers were found to be stable.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{Professional Literature}

Arthur A. Delaney, a New York teacher, contended that when a formal lesson plan outline was initiated and required of all teachers, both experienced and inexperienced, the net result was mediocrity and wasted effort on the part of most experienced teachers. The experienced teacher, like the novice, will have a lesson plan. The thoughts and processes involved in the formulation of the plan may be somewhat the same, but the written product may be achieved in several different ways, according to the individual teacher's personality and experience. As a teacher grows to professional maturity, increased latitude should be permitted in matters pertaining to the formally written lesson plan. Delaney further contended that no thinking educator could deny that there was a real acid test for a lesson plan, and that test was the

\textsuperscript{34}Morine, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{35}Peterson, Marx, and Clark, p. 425.
effectiveness of the plan in developing and facilitating classroom instruction. Delaney opposed the administrative practice of requiring teachers to turn in advance lesson plans for the purpose of evaluating the teacher and for the purpose of use by the substitute teacher.36

James B. Macdonald, a professor at the University of Wisconsin, expressed his views on planning divisions. In discussion concerning the decision-making process, Macdonald in "Myth About Education" pointed out the logical planning process of first selecting objectives; then selecting an activity from among a number of alternatives; next fit this activity into a scope and sequence pattern, then evaluate the outcome. Macdonald contended that teachers do not make a series of rational decisions about objectives, learning experiences, organization, and evaluation. He called it a myth in education. Some of the research bore out the accuracy of Macdonald's views.37

Henry I. Shrake, a principal, expressed the view that teachers had the responsibility of preparing lesson plans and that principals had the responsibility of reviewing and criticizing such plans. Shrake continued that the vast majority of sincere dedicated teachers were pleased when a principal asked them to submit lesson plans to him for review and examination. Such teachers desired the reassurance of the principal that they were performing their job well, and that they appreciated any suggestions which might help them to grow and improve in all areas including lesson planning. On the other hand, if a teacher had neglected


to meet the responsibility in planning work, it was certainly easy to understand why that teacher pretended to be insulted because the principal wished to look over his plans.\(^{38}\)

Carolyn H. Troupe, another principal, considered the submission of lesson plans to the principal a logical request. The practice of handing in lesson plans was, in itself, a good one in Troupe's opinion. Where a new or ineffective teacher needed help in upgrading classroom performance, a principal worked with lesson plans as a starting point for improvement.\(^{39}\)

Kenneth and Helena Hoover found that planning, like map making, enabled one to predict the future course of events. A plan was defined as a blueprint. Even though the best laid plans sometimes go awry, they were considered necessary for effective living. Each teacher personally involved his own particular approach in lesson planning, but there are certain basic essentials that should be included in most plans.\(^{40}\) Elizabeth Heese, another writer, supported lesson plans as guides to teachers in the new and exciting ways of making learning happen. Lesson plans then, tempered by educational innovations, were quite removed from the traditional ones.\(^{41}\)

---


A teacher, June Woods, reacted to the rule that required copies of lesson plans for the following week to be in the office before a teacher left the building on Friday evenings. Woods expressed the frustrations she experienced as she saw her fellow teachers' practices. Another teacher confided that she simply copied her plans for the year before and never followed them anyway. Another teacher planned so that every teaching minute was accounted for and deviations were not considered.42

Robert Dawe, a math teacher, called plan books a waste of time and argued that most teachers had a goal to do a good job. He reasoned that if plan books contributed to that goal, they would write them without coercion. For the teacher who was not trying to do a good job, merely going through motions did not improve one's competence. Dawe asked for teachers who read his opinions to express their own reactions. Some reactions follow.

1. "If the teacher does not consistently plan for good things to happen, they won't."

2. "Over the long haul, one cannot teach effectively off the top of one's head."

3. "What good teacher would enter his classroom without having carefully prepared plans?"

4. "Good plan books reveal only that the teacher can prepare and write good plans."

5. "If there is a spark of creativity or originality in the teacher, any resemblance between his classroom activities and his plan book is accidental."

6. "Written preparation frees the mind and soul to put students' needs first.

7. "The thinking that takes place during planning is a necessary and valuable element in effective teaching. Whether or not the plans are written down for others to see is inconsequential." 

Anne Richardson Gayles published a book on instructional planning in 1973. The premise of her book was that effective instructional planning was the key to good teaching and quality learning. Gayles stated that the key to improvement was better instructional planning on the part of the teacher. Gayles called instructional planning the major task of teaching and stressed the necessity of writing detailed lesson plans by the beginning teacher. Until a teacher had proved ability to do an effective job of instruction without such planning, it was advisable for the teacher to make written lesson plans. It was further pointed out that experienced teachers should not fall into the custom of using the same lesson plans year after year.

Aaron Friedmann called the lesson plan a popular topic in any teacher's room. He pointed out that some teachers considered lesson plans to be a slur on their integrity, as though the inference were that but for the plan they would do no teaching. Friedmann summarized that the specific format of the plan as well as the amount of detail required would not be identical for all teachers. He contended that the ingredients of the plan would likely vary according to the teacher's own background, experience, and ability. Friedman expected the teacher to prepare adequate plans and expected the supervisor, through conferences, observations, and other training devices to successfully

---


carry out a program to enable a teacher to carry out those plans. Friedmann, an assistant principal, viewed lesson planning as basic to good teaching.45

Robert J. Hanny, an associate professor of education, stressed two important steps in teacher planning. First, he advised the teacher to select a level of outcome and then choose a doing procedure for the students. The search for strategies must begin with identifying the outcome that was desired, from which strategies could flow. The strategy had to include an element of "doing" and the doing had to be worthwhile. Hanny admitted that choosing a strategy was not always easy but added that good planning could help relieve the anxiety many teachers had as they faced their classes.46

Zahorik's point of view was that a major curriculum problem existed because of the view that there was only one way of planning. The crystallized plan which was used in planning a lesson, a class session, a unit, a course, or a curriculum guide consisted of Tyler's four main divisions. The Tyler model began to take shape as early as 1936. In more recent years many variations of the objectives-experience-evaluation model have arisen. Zahorik admitted there was little doubt that the model worked and that it could result in effectiveness and efficiency of learning. Zahorik pointed to a problem with the model in that it imparted its separate ends-means value position to the curriculum that was funneled through it. Frequently the value

position of the model was inconsistent with and damaging to the type of learning activity the teacher wished to use, the kind of materials the teacher intended to employ, the teacher's own set of values, and other factors associated with the teaching-learning situation. Zahorik concluded that the Tyler model and open education were largely incompatible. Zahorik called for curriculum researchers to develop a specific planning model to compete with the Tyler model since it could not be the filter through which all programs and practices had to be processed.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

Sample

The sample for this study was randomly selected from two public school systems. A sample of one hundred teachers was selected from a public city school system, and a sample of one hundred teachers was selected from a public county school system. The teachers who comprised the two populations were assigned numbers, and those selected for subjects were chosen by using a table of random numbers. It was necessary to select a sample of teachers in two populations that were not part of a system or school that required written lesson plans. Permission to conduct the study and collect the data was obtained from the administrators of the two public school systems. A listing of the teachers in the two systems was obtained from the central offices with the permission of the administrators of the two systems.

Instrumentation

The information needed to solve the problem and test the hypotheses of this study was gathered by a questionnaire constructed and validated by the researcher.

The review of literature did not lead to the discovery of a questionnaire that was entirely adequate or appropriate to use to collect the data needed in this study. Several questionnaires found
in the literature furnished ideas for developing a questionnaire to be used in the study. Questionnaires used by Conrad\(^1\) and Merriman\(^2\) were analyzed in detail. Other valuable information on construction and using the questionnaire was obtained from Bruce W. Tuckman\(^3\) who devoted an entire chapter in a textbook to constructing and using questionnaires. On the basis of ideas gained from Tuckman and other researchers, a sample questionnaire was developed. Drawing ideas from the questionnaire used by Merriman,\(^4\) four categories were used in constructing the sample questionnaire. The four categories of data collected by the questionnaire consisted of selected teachers' characteristics, teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, teacher lesson planning practices and a category for the responding teacher subjects to report data about the systems from which the samples were randomly drawn.

The second step in developing the questionnaire was to gather informal reactions from fellow graduate students and other educators. The questionnaire was then revised upon the basis of the suggestions received.

---


\(^4\)Merriman, p. 235.
The third step in developing the questionnaire was to submit it to the doctoral committee for professional editing. Further revision and modification under the direction of such professionals with considerable experience in research made the questionnaire more acceptable.

The fourth step in developing the questionnaire was to test it on a pilot group of public school teachers. The pilot group consisted of twenty elementary and secondary teachers. Before the pilot test, it was necessary to submit the questionnaire to the East Tennessee State Institutional Review Board for approval since the questionnaire was to be used on human subjects. Further revision and refinement was accomplished as a result of the pilot test. Increased confidence and reliability in the final form of the questionnaire was attained as a result of the alterations derived from the pilot test.

Much consideration was given to develop an adequate, simple, and short questionnaire so as not to burden the teacher's time and to encourage a response from a greater number of teacher subjects that were randomly selected for the samples of the two populations under study. A 70 percent response was considered acceptable.

**Data Needed to Solve the Problem**

The kinds of data needed to solve the problem of the study were obtained by using the questionnaire. A cover letter and the questionnaire were mailed to each subject in the two samples. The randomly selected subjects who responded to the request for data were assured complete privacy of their responses. The cover letter guaranteed the subjects anonymity and established experimenter responsibility.
The first category of data gathered consisted of information relative to the seven teacher characteristics selected from the literature that were compared in the problem. The seven teacher characteristics about which data were gathered were: (1) sex of the teacher, (2) marital status of the teacher, (3) degree held by the teacher, (4) number of years teaching experience of the teacher, (5) career or probationary teacher, (6) elementary or secondary teaching level, and (7) previous instruction in lesson planning.

The second category of data gathered related to teacher attitudes that were compared in the problem. The information in this category enabled the researcher to compare: (1) the number of teachers who felt a need for more lesson planning time to adequately carry out their teaching duties, (2) the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, (3) the number of teachers who felt a need for in-service education in lesson planning, (4) the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators, and (5) the number of teachers who felt that it was desirable to use written lesson plans in instruction.

The third category of data needed to solve the problem of this study was information gathered on teacher practices that were compared. The practices compared were: (1) the average time teachers spent per week in lesson planning and preparation, (2) the number of teachers who consistently used written lesson plans, (3) the basic parts of written lesson plans used by teachers, and (4) the use of revised and previously used lesson plans.
A fourth category of data needed to solve the problem of this study was information gathered about the systems in which the teacher subjects were employed: (1) The type of public school system in which the respondent was employed was indicated as a public city school system or a public county school system; (2) it was necessary to determine if the systems in which the respondents were employed stressed teacher planning and/or written lesson plans; (3) it was necessary to determine if the administrators of the schools in which the respondents were employed stressed planning and/or written lesson plans; and (4) finally, it was necessary to determine whether or not any respondents were required to use written lesson plans.

Sources of the Data

The necessary data gathered by the questionnaire were obtained from the teachers that were selected for the study. An equal number of teachers to be used as subjects were selected from each of the two large public school systems. The public city school system had a teacher population of 337, and the public county school system had a teacher population of 1085. Both systems contained elementary and secondary schools. Both school systems were located in the same geographical region and each system was comprised of elementary and secondary teachers. The same correspondence and procedures were used to obtain the data from the subjects of both populations.

Collection of the Data

In order to solve the problem of this study to compare selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in instructional
planning, it was necessary to collect data that would enable the researcher to test the five hypotheses of the study.

The questionnaire used to collect the needed information gave the researcher statistical information:

1. To determine the time teachers spend in lesson planning
2. To determine what proportion of teachers used written lesson plans
3. To determine if teachers who gave the greatest amount of time to lesson planning also used written lesson plans
4. To determine which basic parts of lesson plans were being used by teachers who used written lesson plans
5. To determine what needs in lesson planning the teachers identified
6. To determine what combination of selected teacher characteristics more positively identified the teacher who gave the greatest amount of time to lesson planning and the teacher who used written lesson plans.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data collected by questionnaire for this study consisted of information on selected teacher characteristics, teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, teacher lesson planning practices, and information about the systems from which the samples were drawn. The four categories of data provided the information needed to solve the problem of the study and provided the numerical values used in the statistical testing of the five hypotheses. The testing of the five hypotheses enabled the comparison between the selected teacher characteristics, attitudes toward lesson planning, and lesson planning practices of teachers in a public city school system and teachers in a public county school system.

After a 70 percent return was obtained from the subjects of the study, a careful sorting of the data from each of the categories enabled the researcher to tabulate the findings of the study. Summary tables were used to tabulate the data gathered from the responding subjects of the two selected populations.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the selected teacher characteristics, teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and teacher lesson planning practices of teachers in the public city school system.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the selected teacher characteristics, teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and teacher lesson planning practices of teachers in the public county school system.
### Table 1

**Total Characteristics of Public City School System Respondents***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.*
Table 2
Total Reported Attitudes of Public City School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt a Need For In-service Work in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Felt That It is Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Should Be Required By Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week</th>
<th>Consistently Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Used Revised or Previously Used Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Listing of Basic or Main Parts by Teachers Who Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.*
Table 4
Total Characteristics of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 5
Total Reported Attitudes of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt a Need For In-service Work In Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Felt That It Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans In Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Should Be Required by Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 6
Total Reported Practices of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week</th>
<th>Consistently Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Used Revised or Previously Used Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Listing of Basic or Main Parts By Teachers Who Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours: 5</td>
<td>Minutes: 20</td>
<td>Yes: 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Tables 7, 8, and 9 show the total selected teacher characteristics, teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and teacher lesson planning practices of teachers in both the public city school system and the public county school system.

**Testing of Hypotheses**

After the data gathered from the respondents of the two populations were sorted and tabulated into the summary tables, the values needed to test the five hypotheses of this study were calculated from the tables. In the testing of each of the five hypotheses the numerical values sorted out of the appropriate tables enabled a comparison to be made between the teacher responses of the public county school system and the teacher responses of the public city school system. Numerical differences were obtained. To determine if the probability that the differences between the two populations was a real difference rather than a chance difference, the researcher used statistical difference testing tools and techniques. The results of the statistical testing is reported after each of the five hypotheses. The .05 level of significance was adopted in all cases.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between the characteristics of teachers who use lesson plans in a public city school system and the characteristics of teachers who use lesson plans in a public county school system.

The numerical values used to test Hypothesis 1 were obtained from Table 1, page 39, and Table 4, page 42. Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to calculate a chi-square value of 9.327. A
Table 7
Total Characteristics of Both Public City and County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 8
Total Reported Attitudes of Both Public City and County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt that It Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans In Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Should Be Required By Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 9

Total Reported Practices of Both Public City and County School Systems Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week</th>
<th>Consistently Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Used Revised or Previously Used Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Listing of Basic or Main Parts By Teachers Who Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours : Minutes</td>
<td>Yes : No</td>
<td>Yes : No</td>
<td>Used Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : 55</td>
<td>93 : 45</td>
<td>93 : 44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
distribution of chi-square probability was used to determine significances.

A chi-square value of 9.327 was not significant at the acceptable .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. The chi-square value of 9.328 was found to be significant at the .80 level.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in a public city school system and teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in a public county school system.

The numerical values used to test Hypothesis 2 were obtained from Table 2, page 40, and Table 5, page 43. Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to calculate a chi-square value of 5.225. A distribution of chi-square probability was used to determine significances. A chi-square value of 5.225 was not significant at the acceptable .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. The chi-square value of 5.225 was found to be significant at the .90 level.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between teacher lesson planning practices in a public city school system and teacher lesson planning practices in a public county school system.

The numerical values used to test Hypothesis 3 were obtained from Table 3, page 41 and Table 6, page 44. Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to calculate a chi-square value of 10.164. A distribution of chi-square probability was used to determine significances.
A chi-square value of 10.164 was not significant at the acceptable .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. The chi-square value of 10.164 was found to be significant at the .20 level.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public city school system and the number of teachers using written lesson plans in a public county school system.

The numerical values used to test Hypothesis 4 were obtained from Table 3, page 41, and Table 6, page 44, which show the number of teachers who reported a consistent use of written lesson plans. Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to calculate a chi-square value of .037. A distribution of chi-square probability was used to determine significances.

A chi-square value of .037 was not significant at the acceptable .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. The chi-square value of .037 was found to be significant at the .90 level.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference between the average amount of time teachers spend in lesson planning in a public city school system and the average amount of time teachers spend in planning in a public city school system.

The numerical values used to test Hypothesis 5 were obtained from Table 3, page 41 and Table 6, page 44, which show the average time reported as being spent per week in lesson planning. Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to calculate a chi-square value of 1.339. A distribution of chi-square probability was used to determine significances.
A chi-square value of 1.339 was not significant at the acceptable .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. The chi-square value of 1.339 was found to be significant at the .30 level.

Comparisons of Characteristics in Relation to Selected Attitudes and Practices

A number of selected comparisons were made to further analyze the data. Five comparisons were made using the data compiled on the selected teacher characteristics in relation to selected attitudes and practices.

1. The characteristics of teachers who give the greatest time to lesson planning in the public city school system were compared to the characteristics of teachers who gave the greatest time to lesson planning in the public county school system.

Among the teachers who gave the greatest time to lesson planning, it was found that the characteristics of sex, marital status, degree, experience, teaching status, and previous instruction in lesson planning were the same in the public city school system as they were in the public county school system. A difference was found in the characteristic of teaching level. In the public city school system there were more high school teachers in the group giving the greatest time to lesson planning. In the public county school system there were more elementary teachers in the group giving the greatest time to lesson planning. In both systems, the female teachers who were married, held bachelors' degrees, were tenured, had taught four years and above, and had previous instruction in lesson planning reported the greatest time given to lesson planning.
2. The characteristics of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in the public city school system were compared to the characteristics of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in the public county school system.

Among the teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans, it was found that the characteristics of sex, marital status, degree, experience, teaching status, teaching level, and previous instruction in lesson planning were the same in the public city school system as they were in the public county school system. In both systems the female teachers who were married, held bachelors' degrees, were tenured, had taught four years and above, taught at the elementary level, and had previous instruction in lesson planning reported consistent use of written lesson plans.

3. The characteristics of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable or should be required in the public city school system were compared to the characteristics of teachers who felt that written lesson plans are essential for effective instruction, desirable or should be required in the public county school system.

Among the teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required, it was found that the characteristic of sex, marital status, degree, experience, teaching status, and previous instruction in lesson planning were the same in the public city school system as they were in the public county
school system. In the public city school system more high school teachers felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required. In the public county school system, more elementary teachers felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required.

4. The characteristics of teachers who identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used in the public city school system were compared to the characteristics of teachers who identify objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used in the public county school system.

Among the teachers who identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used, it was found that the characteristics of sex, marital status, experience, teaching status, and previous instruction in lesson planning were the same in the public city school system as they were in the public county school system. In the public city school system more teachers with a bachelor's degree and an equal number of elementary and high school level teachers identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used. In the public county school system, more teachers with a master's degree and more teachers in the elementary level identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used.
5. The characteristics of the teachers who indicated the use of revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school system were compared to the characteristics of teachers who indicated the use of revised or previously used lesson plans in the public county school system.

Among the teachers who indicated the use of revised or previously used lesson plans, it was found that the characteristics of sex, marital status, degree, experience, teaching status, and previous instruction in lesson planning were the same in the public city school system as they were in the public county school system. In both systems the female teachers who were married, held a bachelor's degree, were tenured, had taught four years and above, and had previous instruction in lesson planning reported that they used revised or previously used lesson plans. In the public city school system more of the high school teachers reported that they used revised or previously used lesson plans. In the public county school system, more of the elementary teachers reported that they used revised or previously used lesson plans.

Comparisons of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Lesson Planning

Five comparisons were made using the data compiled on the teachers' attitudes toward lesson planning.

1. The number of teachers who felt a need for more planning time in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who felt a need for more planning time in the public county school system.
In the public city school system, it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that forty-six of them indicated that they felt a need for more planning time. In the public county school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that fifty-two of them indicated that they felt a need for more planning time.

2. The number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans are essential for effective instruction in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans are essential for effective instruction in the public county school system.

In the public city school systems it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that forty-seven of them indicated that they felt written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction. In the public county school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that thirty-eight of them indicated that they felt written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction.

3. The number of teachers who felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning in the public county school system.

In the public city school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that seventeen of them indicated that they felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning. In the public county school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that nineteen of them indicated that they felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning.
4. The number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were desirable in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who feel that lesson plans were desirable in the public county school system.

In the public city school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that fifty-six indicated that they felt written lesson plans were desirable. In the public county school systems it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that sixty indicated that they felt written lesson plans were desirable.

5. The number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators in the public county school system.

In the public city school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that thirty indicated that they felt written lesson plans should be required by administrators. In the public county school system it was found that among the seventy responding teachers that twenty-six indicated that they felt written lesson plans should be required by administrators.

Comparisons of Lesson Planning Practices to Selected Teacher Attitudes and Other Practices

Five comparisons were made using the data compiled on teacher lesson planning practices in relation to selected attitudes and other practices.
1. The average weekly time spent in lesson planning in the public city school system was compared to the average weekly time spent in lesson planning in the public county school system.

The average weekly time reportedly spent in lesson planning by teachers in the public city school system was found to be six hours and thirty minutes. Among the sixty teachers who reported spending time in lesson planning, the time ranged from a low of one hour weekly to a high of twenty hours per week. The average weekly time reportedly spent in lesson planning by teachers in the public county school system was found to be five hours and twenty minutes. Among the sixty-four teachers who reported spending time in lesson planning, the time ranged from a low of fifty minutes to a high of twenty hours per week.

2. The number of teachers consistently using written lesson plans in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers consistently using written lesson plans in the public county school system.

The number of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in the public city school system was found to be forty-six of the seventy responding teachers. The number of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in the public county school system was found to be forty-seven of the seventy responding teachers.

3. The number of teachers using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school was compared to the teachers using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public county school system.
The number of teachers who reported using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school system was fifty-three of seventy respondents. The number of teachers who reported using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school system was forty of seventy respondents.

4. The number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public county school system.

The number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public city school system was twelve. Objectives were listed by thirty-three teachers, instructional activities by twenty-seven teachers, and evaluation by twenty teachers. The number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public county school system was seven. Objectives were listed by twenty-nine teachers, instructional activities by twenty-six teachers, and evaluation by nine teachers.

5. The number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans are essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in relation to the number consistently using written plans in the public city school system was compared to the number of teachers who feel that written lesson plans are
essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in relation to the number consistently using written lesson plans in the public county school system.

The number of teachers who reported that they felt written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in the public city school system was twenty-eight; however, forty-six teachers reported consistent use of written lesson plans. The number of teachers who reported that they felt written plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in the public county school system was twenty-two; however, forty-seven teachers reported consistent use of written lesson plans.

Reactions to Questions Raised in the Significance of the Problem

Nine questions were raised in the significance of the problem of this study. The data were analyzed further to enable the researcher to react to the nine questions. All reactions were based on the findings of this study.

Question 1. How do the factors of sex, teaching level, tenure, experience, degree held, marital status, and previous instruction in lesson planning characterize the teachers who spend the greatest amount of time spent in lesson planning?

It was found in combining teacher characteristics of both public school systems of this study that of the teachers who comprised the group who reportedly spent the greatest amount of time in lesson planning: (1) eighty-six percent of the teachers were females; (2) seventy-seven percent of the teachers were married; (3) sixty-eight percent held a
bachelor's degree; (4) eighty-six percent had four or more years of experience; (5) eighty-four percent were tenured or career status teachers; (6) fifty-three percent were elementary teachers; and (7) ninety-one percent had previous instruction in lesson planning.

In percentages of the total characteristics of teachers in the two systems who reported the greatest amount of time in lesson planning, there were: (1) eighteen percent of the males and 36 percent of the females; (2) thirty percent of the single teachers and 32 percent of the married teachers; (3) thirty-four percent held a bachelor's degree and 25 percent held a master's degree; (4) thirty-three percent had one to three years of experience and 31 percent had four or more years of experience; (5) thirty-five percent were of probationary status and 31 percent were of tenure status; (6) thirty-four percent were elementary teachers and 30 percent were secondary teachers; and (7) thirty-four percent of the teachers who had previous instruction in lesson planning and 18 percent of the teachers who had not.

Question 2. How much average time per week is given to planning by classroom teachers?

The average combined time of public city school teachers and public county school teachers was five hours and fifty-five minutes.

Question 3. How do the factors of sex, teaching level, tenure, experience, degree held, marital status, and previous instruction in lesson planning characterize the teachers who consistently use written lesson plans?
It was found in combining teacher characteristics of both public school systems of this study that the teachers who comprised the group who reported consistent use of written lesson plans: (1) eighty-three percent of the teachers were females; (2) seventy-four percent were married; (3) sixty-four percent held bachelors' degrees; (4) eighty-six percent had four or more years of experience; (5) eighty-six percent were tenured; (6) sixty-one percent were elementary teachers; and (7) eighty-four percent had previous instruction in lesson planning.

In percentages of the total characteristics of teachers in the two systems who reported consistent use of written lesson plans there were: (1) forty-eight percent of the males and 72 percent of the females; (2) seventy-three percent of the single teachers and 63 percent of the married teachers; (3) seventy percent of those holding bachelors' degrees and 63 percent holding master's degrees; (4) seventy-two percent of those having one to three years of experience and 67 percent of those with four or more years of experience; (5) sixty-five percent of the probationary teachers and 68 percent of the tenured teachers; (6) eighty-one percent of the elementary teachers and 54 percent of the secondary teachers; and (7) sixty-eight percent of the teachers who had previous instruction in lesson planning and 68 percent of the teachers who had not.

Question 4. What proportion of classroom teachers use written lesson plans?

The proportion of classroom teachers that consistently used written lesson plans in the public city school system and the public county school system was found to be 67 percent.
Question 5. Do teachers who use written lesson plans write objectives, instructional activities, and evaluations into the plans?

The proportion of teachers found to be using objectives, instructional activities, and evaluations in lesson plans in the public city school systems and the public county school systems was found to be 13.5 percent.

Question 6. What relationship exists between the time spent in lesson planning and the use of written lesson plans?

The relationship between the time spent in lesson planning and the use of written lesson plans was found to be positive. Among the forty-two teachers who reported above the average time of five hours and fifty-five minutes in lesson planning, thirty-two reported consistent use of written plans, ten reported no consistent use of written lesson plans. Seventy-six percent of the teachers who reported above the average time of five hours and fifty-five minutes in lesson planning also reported consistent use of written lesson plans.

Question 7. What basic parts of lesson plans will be identified by the teachers who use written lesson plans?

The basic parts of lesson plans reportedly used by the respondents of this study in the public city school system and the public county school system were: sixty-two teachers listed objectives, fifty-three listed instructional activities, twenty-nine listed evaluation, and nineteen listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation.
Question 8. What proportion of teachers in both public school systems will identify:

1. a need for more planning time?
   70 percent of the teachers responding to this study indicated a need for more planning time.
2. a need for in-service programs in lesson planning?
   25 percent of the teachers responding to this study indicated a need for in-service programs in lesson planning.
3. no need for more planning time?
   29 percent of the teachers responding to this study indicated no need for more planning time.
4. no need for in-service programs in lesson planning?
   74 percent of the teachers responding to this study indicated no need for in-service programs in lesson planning.

Question 9. Do the characteristics, attitudes, and lesson planning practices of classroom teachers differ in the public city school from those in the public county school?

   No significant differences were found in this study between the characteristics, attitudes, and lesson planning practices of classroom teachers in the public city school system and the public county school system.

   **Analysis of Lesson Planning Emphasis In the Two Systems**

   The subjects of the two samples responded to three questions about their systems, individual schools, and teaching assignments. The
questions are stated below and the findings are reported after each.

1. Does the system in which you are employed stress teacher planning and/or written lesson plans? ___ Yes ___ No

Among the seventy teachers of the public city school system, fifty-two responded yes and twelve responded no. Among the seventy teachers of the public county school system, forty-four responded yes and twenty responded no.

2. Do the administrators of the school in which you are employed stress teacher planning and/or written lesson plans? ___ Yes ___ No.

Among the seventy teachers of the public city school system, fifty-five responded yes and eleven responded no. Among the public county school system, fifty-nine responded yes and nine responded no.

3. Are you required to use written lesson plans in your teaching assignment? ___ Yes ___ No.

Among the seventy teachers of the public city school system, thirty-eight responded yes and twenty-nine responded no. Among the public county school system, thirty-nine responded yes and twenty-nine responded no.

Chi-square difference testing techniques were used to determine if the teacher responses to the three questions were significantly different between the public city school system and the public county school system. A chi-square value of 3.047 was obtained and was not found to be significant at the acceptable .05 level. The chi-square value of 3.047 was
found to be significant at the .70 level. The numerical differences in
the responses of teachers in the two public school systems to the three
questions were not significantly different.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to compare selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in planning and implementing instructional strategies. Four categories of data needed to solve the problem were obtained by a questionnaire developed and validated by the researcher. The data needed to solve the problem were obtained from seventy respondents of a randomly selected sample of one hundred teachers in a public city school system and seventy respondents of a randomly selected sample of one hundred teachers in a public county school system. Both systems were located in the same geographic area. The comparisons of the selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of the teachers in planning was made by testing five null hypotheses. Fifteen selected comparisons were made to further analyze the data. Statistical difference testing techniques (chi-square) were used to determine significant differences between the two samples. Statistical analysis was performed manually and by computer services. The review of related literature extending from 1962 through 1978 was performed manually and by computer searches. The study began in May 1977 and was completed in November 1969.

The testing of Hypothesis 1 revealed no significant difference between the characteristics of teachers who used lesson plans in the
public city school system and the characteristics of teachers who used lesson plans in the public county school system. Hypothesis 2 revealed no significant difference between teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in the public city school system and teacher attitudes toward lesson planning in the public county school system. Hypothesis 3 revealed no significant difference between teacher lesson planning practices in the public city school system and teacher lesson planning practices in the public county school system. Hypothesis 4 revealed no significance between the number of teachers using written lesson plans in the public city school system and the number of teachers using written lesson plans in the public county school system. Hypothesis 5 revealed no significant difference between the amount of time per week that teachers spent in lesson planning in the public city school system and the amount of time per week that teachers spent in lesson planning in the public county school system. The .05 level of significance was adopted in all cases.

A comparison of the characteristics of teachers who gave the greatest time to lesson planning in the public city school system was made to the characteristics of teachers who gave the greatest time to lesson planning in the public county school system. The characteristics were found to be the same in both systems except for teaching level. In the public city school system more high school teachers were found in the group giving the greatest time to lesson planning. In the public county school system more elementary teachers were found in the group giving the greatest time to lesson planning.

A comparison of the characteristics of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in a public city school system was
made to the characteristics of teachers who reported consistent use of written lesson plans in a public county school system. The characteristics were found to be the same in both systems.

A comparison of the characteristics of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required in the public city school system was made to the characteristics of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required in the public county school system. The characteristics were found to be the same in both systems except for teaching level. In the public city school system more high school teachers felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required. In the public county school system more elementary teachers felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, or should be required.

A comparison of the characteristics of teachers who identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans in a public city school system was made to the characteristics of teachers who identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans in a public county school system. The characteristics were found to be the same except that in the public city school system more teachers with a bachelor's degree and an equal number of elementary and high school teachers identified objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used. In the public county school system more teachers with a master's degree and more teachers in the elementary level identified objectives, instructional activities,
and evaluation as basic parts of written lesson plans being used.

A comparison of the characteristics of the teachers who indicated the use of revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school system was made to the characteristics of the teachers who indicated the use of revised or previously used lesson plans in a public county school system. The characteristics were found to be the same except that in the public city school system more of the high school teachers reported that they used revised or previously used lesson plans. In the public county school system more of the elementary teachers reported that they used revised or previously used lesson plans.

A comparison of the number of teachers who felt a need for more planning time in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt a need for more planning time in the public county school system. In the public city school system forty-six of seventy respondents indicated that they felt a need for more planning time. In the public county school system, fifty-two of seventy respondents indicated that they felt a need for more planning time.

A comparison of the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction in the public county school system. In the public city school system forty-seven of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction. In the public county school system, thirty-eight of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction.
A comparison of the number of teachers who felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning in the public county school system. In the public city school system seventeen of seventy respondents indicated that they felt a need for in-service in lesson planning. In the public county school system nineteen of seventy respondents indicated that they felt a need for in-service work in lesson planning.

A comparison of the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were desirable in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were desirable in the public county school system. In the public city school system fifty-six of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans were desirable. In the public county school system sixty of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans were desirable.

A comparison of the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans should be required by administrators in the public county school system. In the public city school system thirty of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans should be required by administrators. In the public county school system twenty-six of seventy respondents indicated that they felt written lesson plans should be required by administrators.

A comparison of the average weekly time spent in lesson planning in the public city school system was made to the average weekly time spent in lesson planning in the public county school system. In the public
city school system the average weekly time reportedly spent in lesson planning was six hours and thirty minutes. In the public county school system the average weekly time reportedly spent in lesson planning was five hours and twenty minutes.

A comparison of the number of teachers consistently using written lesson plans in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers consistently using written lesson plans in the public county school system. In the public city school system forty-six of seventy respondents reported consistent use of written lesson plans. In the public county school system forty-seven of seventy respondents reported consistent use of written lesson plans.

A comparison of the number of teachers using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers using revised or previously used lesson plans in the public county school system. In the public city school system fifty-three of seventy respondents reported using revised or previously used lesson plans. In the public county school system forty of seventy respondents reported using revised or previously used lesson plans.

A comparison of the number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who listed objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of lesson plans in the public county school system. In the public city school system twelve teachers listed all three parts. In the public county school system seven teachers listed all three parts.
A comparison of the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in relation to the number consistently using written lesson plans in the public city school system was made to the number of teachers who felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required in relation to the number consistently using written lesson plans in the public county school system. In the public city school system twenty-eight felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required, but forty-six teachers reported consistent use of written lesson plans. In the public county school system twenty-two felt that written lesson plans were essential for effective instruction, desirable, and should be required, but forty-seven teachers reported consistent use of written lesson plans.

The following information was summarized from the various comparisons in the study:

1. Seventy-six percent of the forty-two teachers who spent above the average time of five hours and fifty-five minutes in lesson planning per week reported that they consistently used written lesson plans.

2. Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they had some previous instruction in lesson planning.

3. In the public city school system sixty of seventy respondents reported the amount of time spent per week in lesson planning, and in the public county school system sixty-four of seventy respondents reported the amount of time spent per week in lesson planning.

4. Seventy-five percent of the teachers in the two public school systems reported that they felt written lesson plans were essential for
effective instruction and were desirable.

5. Seventy-four percent of the teachers reported that they felt no need for in-service.

6. Fifty-six teachers responded that they felt written lesson plans should be required by administrators. Seventy-nine teachers gave negative responses, but 41 percent of the respondents felt that written lesson plans should be required.

7. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers in the two public school systems consistently used written lesson plans. Sixty-seven percent used revised or previously used lesson plans.

8. Only 13.5 percent of the teachers in the two public school systems used objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation as basic parts of the plans wrote and used.

9. Seventy percent of the teachers in the two public school systems reported a need for more planning time.

10. A considerable number of teachers volunteered unsolicited remarks that were both positive and negative at the bottom and back part of the questionnaire used in this study.

11. Responses were inconsistent in the two public school systems in stressing, planning, and requiring written lesson plans at the systems level and individual school level. Seventy-five percent of the respondents reported that the system in which they were employed stressed planning and/or written lesson plans. Eighty-five percent of the respondents reported that the school in which they were employed stressed planning and/or written lesson plans. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents reported that they were required to use written lesson plans in
their teaching assignments. Forty-three percent of the respondents reported that they were not required to use written lesson plans in their teaching assignments.

Conclusions

1. The teachers in the two public school systems who spent the most time in lesson planning also used written lesson plans.

2. Most of the teachers in the two school systems received some previous instruction in lesson planning.

3. Most of the teachers in the two public school systems spent some time in lesson planning.

4. Most of the teachers in the two public school systems had a favorable attitude toward written lesson plans.

5. Most of the teachers in the two public school systems stated that they did not have a need for in-service in lesson planning. Based on such teacher attitudes toward in-service compared to teacher attitudes toward lesson plans, the teachers were apparently negative in their attitudes toward in-service rather than toward lesson planning.

6. A substantial number of teachers in the two public school systems felt that written lesson plans should be required.

7. Teachers in the two public school systems who consistently used written lesson plans also used revised or previously used plans.

8. More of the teachers in the two public school systems used objectives and instructional activities in the written lesson plans they used. Less use was made of evaluation as a basic part of lesson planning.
9. Few teachers in the two public school systems used and planned lessons employing objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation.

10. Most of the teachers in the two public school systems felt a need for more planning time.

11. Strong feelings toward lesson planning existed in the two public school systems.

12. There was a disparity in the two public school systems in stressing, planning, and requiring written lesson plans at the systems level and individual school level.

Recommendations

1. Decisions based on the notion of a presumed differing of characteristics, attitudes, and practices between the public city school system and the public county school system should be closely scrutinized.

2. Further research using other selected characteristics, attitudes, and practices of teachers in lesson planning would give greater insight into the state of instructional planning in public schools.

3. Further research that would compare administrator or supervisor attitudes toward lesson planning would add to understanding the divergent attitudes and various practices in existence in public schools.

4. In-service in the two public school systems merits investigation. Revamping the in-service programs could result in a more positive teacher attitude.

5. If the teachers are expected to plan lessons using objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation, ways should be explored to facilitate and motivate such practice.
6. Providing more planning time in the scheduling of the teachers' instructional responsibilities might be worth experimentation.

7. Caution should be exercised in attempts to characterize teachers likely to have a particular attitude toward planning or in attempts to characterize teachers likely to carry out a particular planning practice. Research to identify factors that influence teacher attitudes and practices in lesson planning is recommended.

8. The findings of this study and other studies revealed that teachers planned at different times and places. Planning habits differed. It may be essential or advisable for educators to make greater use of the terms "planning style" in referring to teacher planning.
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University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  (313) 761-4700
Dear Supt. Miller:

I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. My work for the past eighteen years has been in public education as a teacher and principal in the public schools of North Carolina. Throughout my work in schools of various levels I have been concerned about teachers' lesson planning attitudes and practices. Under the direction and leadership of Dr. Clyde L. Orr, I am engaged in a study that involves teacher lesson planning, characteristics, attitudes, and practices. You will no doubt agree that studies which explore learning and teaching processes which help to describe or identify effective instructional practices are of great significance.

I request permission to collect data in your public school system. A cover letter of request and a data gathering instrument will be mailed to randomly selected teachers of your system. The instrument will collect data from teachers on their lesson planning, characteristics, attitudes toward lesson planning, and lesson planning practices. In gathering such data you may expect and be assured of researcher responsibility to insure the teacher respondents the right of anonymity, the right to privacy, and the right to confidentiality. The study will involve only a few minutes of the teacher's time and all expenses of postage will be paid by me.

I will appreciate your assistance in carrying out the study. Please let me know by your letter in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Jerry M. Russell
Department of Supervision and Administration
Mr. Donald Jones, Superintendent
Asheville City Schools
Asheville, North Carolina 28807

Dear Superintendent:

I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. My work for the past eighteen years has been in public education as a teacher and principal in the public schools of North Carolina. Throughout my work in schools of various levels I have been concerned about teachers' lesson planning attitudes and practices. Under the direction and leadership of Dr. Clyde L. Orr, I am engaged in a study that involves teacher lesson planning, characteristics, attitudes, and practices. You will no doubt agree that studies which explore learning and teaching processes which help to describe or identify effective instructional practices are of great significance.

I request permission to collect data in your public school system. A cover letter of request and a data gathering instrument will be mailed to randomly selected teachers of your system. The instrument will collect data from teachers on their lesson planning, characteristics, attitudes toward lesson planning, and lesson planning practices. In gathering such data you may expect and be assured of researcher responsibility to insure the teacher respondents the right of anonymity, the right to privacy, and the right to confidentiality. The study will involve only a few minutes of the teacher's time and all expenses of postage will be paid by me.

I will appreciate your assistance in carrying out the study. Please let me know by your letter in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Clyde L. Orr
Chairman
Department of Supervision and Administration

Jerry M. Russell
Doctoral Fellow

June 1, 1979
APPENDIX B

LETTERS GRANTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY
July 2, 1979

Mr. Jerry H. Russell
Route 4
Weaverville, N. C. 28787

Dear Mr. Russell:

This letter authorizes you to administer the questionnaire to a randomly selected population of Buncombe County Public school teachers.

Best of luck on your doctoral dissertation at East Tennessee State University.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. N. E. Yarbrough
Associate Superintendent
July 2, 1979

Mr. Jerry H. Russell
Rt. 4
Weaverville, NC 28787

Dear Mr. Russell:

This letter authorizes you to use Asheville City Schools' teachers as subjects for collecting data for your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Donald D. Jones
Superintendent

ASHEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO RESPONDENTS
Dear Fellow Teacher:

You have been selected at random as a source of data that relates to the teaching and learning process. Will you please take a few minutes of your time to complete the enclosed data-gathering instrument and return it in the self-addressed and stamped envelope? No one in your school system knows of your selection. The responses you give will remain anonymous, your privacy will be safeguarded, and the data you contribute will be treated with confidence. Your honest and frank responses to what you actually do are most appreciated and a prompt response is encouraged. Responses from the teachers who do not write and use written lesson plans are of as much value as responses of the teachers who do.

As a professional, the teacher is anxious to contribute to any efforts to explore teaching and learning processes in public schools which help to describe or identify effective instructional practices. The responses you give will help to identify desirable lesson planning characteristics of teachers, help to uncover teacher attitudes toward lesson planning, and help to discover teacher lesson planning practices. A realistic assessment of such factors could very well influence future decisions concerning instruction and result in improved quality. Thank you so very much for your participation in this endeavor.

The study to which you are contributing is being done by a doctoral student of East Tennessee State University and one who has eighteen years of experience in several public school systems, Dr. Clyde L. Orr is chairman of the doctoral committee which endorses this study. The study will be completed by the end of the Fall Quarter 1979, and you may obtain the results of the study by request.

Thank you for your very important contribution to this study.

Sincerely yours,

Clyde L. Orr, Chairman
Department of Supervision and Administration

Jerry M. Russell
Doctoral Student
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex of teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teaching Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teaching Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you received instruction in lesson planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you feel a need for more planning time to adequately carry out your teaching duties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you feel that written lesson plans are essential for effective instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you feel a need for in-service work in lesson planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you feel that it is desirable to use written plans in instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you feel that written lesson plans should be required by administrators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much time do you average per week in lesson planning and preparation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you consistently use written lesson plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you revise and reuse previously used written lesson plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you use written lesson plans, please list the basic or main parts of the plans you write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In what type of public school system are you employed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does the system in which you are employed stress teacher lesson planning and/or written lesson plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do the administrators of the school in which you are employed stress teacher planning and/or written lesson plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you required to use written lesson plans in your teaching assignment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Fellow Teachers:

A few days ago a letter of request and a data-gathering instrument were mailed to you. If you have not already responded, will you please fill in the form and return it? Your contribution to the study of teacher lesson planning attitudes and teacher lesson planning practices is very important. Will you take a few minutes of your time to complete the form enclosed and mail it back?

Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. You were selected at random for the study and you will remain anonymous. Complete privacy and confidentiality will be given to your honest and frank responses.

Thank you for your help and contribution to this study.

Sincerely yours,

Clyde L. Orr, Chairman
Department of Supervision and Administration

Jerry M. Russell
Doctoral Student
APPENDIX F

TABLES OF RESULTS
Table 1F
Total Characteristics of Public City School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 2F
Total Reported Attitudes of Public City School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That It is Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans That Should Be Required By In Instruction Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 3F
Total Reported Practices of Public City School System Respondents*

| Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week | Used | Consistently Revised or Used Previously Listing of Basic or Main Parts By Teachers Who Used Written Lesson Plans |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hours Minutes | Yes | No | Yes | No | | Yes | No |
| 6 | 30 | 46 | 22 | 53 | 15 | 33 | 27 | 20 |

Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 4F
Total Characteristics of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 5F

Total Reported Attitudes of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That It Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans In Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That It Was Required by Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 6F
Total Reported Practices of Public County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week</th>
<th>Consistently Used</th>
<th>Listing of Basic or Main Parts By Teachers Who Used Written Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 70, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 7F
Total Characteristics of Both Public City and County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teacher</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Tenure Status</th>
<th>Previous Instruction in Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary (nontenured)</td>
<td>Career (tenured)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
### Table 8F

Total Reported Attitudes of Both Public City and County School System Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt a Need For More Lesson Planning Time</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Were Essential For Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Felt a Need For In-service Work In Lesson Planning</th>
<th>Felt That It Was Desirable To Use Written Lesson Plans In Instruction</th>
<th>Felt That Written Lesson Plans Should Be Required By Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
Table 9F

Total Reported Practices of Both Public City and County School Systems Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Lesson Planning Time Per Week</th>
<th>Consistently Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Used Revised or Previously Used Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Listing of Basic or Main Parts By Teachers Who Used Written Lesson Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours 55 minutes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where totals do not equal 140, some respondents did not include an answer.
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