

January 1980

Training Teachers to Plan

Philip Deschamp

Research Branch, Education Department of Western Australia

David Tripp

Murdoch University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Deschamp, P., & Tripp, D. (1980). Training Teachers to Plan. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 5(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1980v5n2.1>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol5/iss2/1>

TRAINING TEACHERS TO PLAN

*by Philip Deschamp
Research Branch, Education Department of Western Australia
and David Tripp
Murdoch University*

Introduction

As part of an attempt to understand why teachers use particular approaches to planning, this study addressed the question of how primary teachers are taught to plan by training institutions in Western Australia. The main reason for conducting this survey was the assumption that, although teachers' planning is influenced by other factors (such as the particular requirements of the schools in which they teach, what they believe to be their role as teachers, and the characteristics of the particular students) a major influence, especially if they are new to teaching, is how they were taught to plan during their initial training.

The survey collected data from teacher educators and their students, in the following manner:

- (a) questionnaires to the head of subject departments at each primary teacher training institution,
- (b) interviews with practice departments and sample of subject departments of each primary teacher training institution,
- (c) questionnaires to a 1 in 7 sample of graduating teachers from each primary teacher training institution, and
- (d) interviews with 5 randomly selected graduating teachers from each primary teacher training institution.

This paper reports the questionnaire and interview results from the graduating teachers. Responses to the questionnaire items have been tabulated, and quotations from the interviews have been selected to illustrate the different points of view.

Procedure

In order to obtain the collective impressions of what the seven hundred and eighteen new primary teachers who applied for employment with the Education Department of Western Australia in 1980 thought they had been taught about planning, one graduate in every seven from the larger teacher training institutions was selected from an alphabetical list and was posted a questionnaire. In the case of other courses that produce only a small number of teachers, questionnaires were sent to a higher proportion of the graduates. In the case of one institution, all graduates were sent a questionnaire. The response rate of almost 60% was acceptable in view of the fact that home addresses had to be used because some institutions had finished teaching for the year.

This response rate resulted in the number of respondees from the major teacher training institutions ranging from 11 to 16. The responses of graduates from other primary teacher training courses have been left in the totals shown in the tables that follow, however where figures are shown for any single institution they are from one of the four main teacher training institutions.

At the same time the questionnaires were sent, an outline of the study, an invitation to an interview, and a copy of the interview questions were sent to ten graduating teachers from each institution. To select these subjects, the first ten names with metropolitan addresses were taken from the alphabetical lists of graduating primary teachers from each institution. The first five to reply from each institution were interviewed.

The questionnaire and interview schedule contained basically the same questions adjusted to fit the respective formats. The interview schedule contained additional questions about the examples of plans that the interviewee had brought to illustrate the assignments, handouts or samples of teachers' plans collected during training.

The questionnaires were intended to provide a generalizable statement of the opinions of graduating teachers.

The interviews provided more detailed answers to suggest explanations of the questionnaire data. They also served as a validity check on the interpretation graduates were likely to make of the questions.

The actual questions used are shown above the tables. They were selected so as to ask about the role of planning in their courses in a simple and non-leading way. When it was in draft form the questionnaire was tested in an interview situation with three graduating teachers from different institutions and was refined in the light of their suggestions.

It was interesting to note the high degree of similarity between the interview comments and the questionnaire data combined by institution. During analysis of the questionnaires and interview transcripts it became clear that while there were very great differences between the opinions of students from different institutions, within individual institutions the opinions from both questionnaires and interviews were remarkably consistent. The consistency has resulted in many instances in which all of the respondees from a particular institution have expressed the same opinion (such that the questionnaire data for that institution shows zero or one hundred per cent). This high degree of consistency seems indicative of high reliability if the training institutions were taken as the unit of analysis.

It might be thought that questions, possibly perceived as coming from the major employing authority, might have received biased

treatment by graduating teachers anxious about employment. To guard against this possibility, the postal questionnaire contained an explanation of the purposes of the study and a guarantee that returned questionnaires and interview transcripts were strictly anonymous.

The similarity of intra-institutional results, coupled with inter-institutional differences speaks against the presence of this possible bias because it is unlikely that each institution would have its own systematic bias across a random sample. Further evidence was provided by several of the interviewees who had already obtained employment outside the Education Department. Their comments were consistent with the general pattern for their institution. In the discussion that follows, the tables of results are based on the questionnaire data, and the quotations are extracts from interview transcripts.

All the people who received a questionnaire, or an invitation to be interviewed were given a short summary outlining the focus of the research so that they would be familiar with the terms used and be better able to assess the intent of the questions. In many cases, the interviewee had read the summary and had become so familiar with the interview schedule attached to the invitation that it was not necessary to ask the questions.

Where possible the interview comments have been selected so that they reflect the opinions implied by the tables; in some cases however, these comments do not represent the full range of opinion found in the survey data. When the comments seem biased towards either a positive or negative position in conflict with the survey data, it is indicative only of the limits of the interview data which were based on a smaller sample. An increasingly sensitive problem in educational research is the invidious comparison of results between research subjects.

To honour a pledge made in obtaining approval to conduct this research, the data is presented in a form that avoids specific reference to particular subject departments or training institutions and which prevents even deductive identification of institutions with their results. Persons from the West Australian Primary Teacher Training Institutions interested in obtaining the results that applied to their subject department, to compare with the average shown below, should contact the authors.

Each of the tables that follow show three columns of percentages. The first column shows the percentage of all the respondees that gave an affirmative reply to that item. These are the replies from all six training institutions including primary Diploma of Education graduates. These percentages are based on sixty eight replies. The second and third columns show the individual replies from the major primary teacher training institutions. As stated above, these percentages are based on

between 11 and 16 responses. In order to prevent deductive identification of institutions separate results for each institution have not been shown. Instead, the second column shows the lowest percentage from any of the major institutions for that item. The third column shows the highest percentage from any of the major institutions.

For example, in Table One the first column shows that for the area of mathematics, 72% of all respondees considered that planning programmes had been taught during their course of training. The second column shows that the minimum value for any individual

institution for this item was 25%. This indicates that only 25% (of those responding from one institution) answered that they had been taught about planning programming in mathematics. The third column shows that the maximum value for this item was 100%. Therefore, at least at one other institution all respondees considered that mathematics planning had been taught.

The difference between columns two and three indicates the range of opinion when the data is grouped by institutions.

The points of note in Table One are:

- (a) *the high rating given to Social Science.* (It has the highest rating in the data pooled across institutions (column one). The 67% in column two is the minimum of the responses from any institution. This indicates that, in the worst case, two thirds of the graduates considered that planning Social Sciences had been taught. In the best case (column three) all the graduates from that institution considered it had been taught).
- (b) *the low rating given to English and non-core subject areas.* (In the best case only 75% of respondees considered that planning English teaching had been taught; whereas at one institution only 33% considered it to have been taught. Music, Physical Education and Art, also received low ratings. At least at one institution no graduate considered that planning Music teaching had been taught and (perhaps at another institution) only 17% thought that planning Art teaching had been taught. It is important to note that at other institutions Music and Physical Education are considered to have been taught by 94%, 83% and 100% respectively (see column three). The highest rating given to the planning of English teaching was 75%. This was the lowest maximum rating for any subject.)
- (c) *the low rating given to Mathematics at one institution.* (As may be seen from column one, planning Mathematics teaching received the second highest over-all rating, yet at one institution, as shown by column two, it received the lowest rating of any of the core-area subjects.)

TABLE ONE

Question: In what subject areas was the planning of programmes taught?

Subjects	Total (%) Across Institutions	Minimum Value (%) Within any Institution	Maximum Value (%) Within any Institution
Mathematics	72	25	100
Science	65	33	100
Social Sciences	90	67	100
English (Language Arts)	59	33	75
Music	56	0	94
Physical Education	51	50	83
Art	53	17	100
Practice Teaching	62	8	91
All of these	4	0	19
Most of these	69	50	100
Few of these	24	0	33
None of these	1	0	8

The lower part of the table shows the responses grouped across subjects. That is (in column one) 4% of all the respondees considered that planning programmes of work had been taught in *all* of the subject areas during their course of training; 69% considered that it had been taught in *most* subject areas; 24% thought it had been taught in *few* subject areas; and 1% held that it had not been taught in any area.

The second column in the lower part of table one shows the lowest ratings for the above categories. That is, at least at one institution no

respondee held that planning had been taught in all areas; at perhaps another institution only 50% thought it had been taught in most areas. The zeroes in the "Few of these" and "None of these" categories indicate that at least at one institution, no students responded that planning had been taught in few (or no) subject areas.

In the lower part of the third column the highest ratings for responses grouped across subjects are shown. It should be surprising that of all the major training institutions 19% was the largest percentage that considered planning had been taught in all subject areas. All respondees from at least one institution considered planning had been taught in most areas. This contrasts with 33% from another institution that held that planning programmes had been taught in few subject areas only.

Many of those interviewed considered that they had received insufficient instruction about planning methods. A typical comment was:

We received no real information about methods of programming. We were given some advice notes and on our long-term practice we were asked to prepare programmes for two subject areas. We were expected to follow the teacher's method of programming.

There was substantial agreement that the "discovery" approach to learning about planning was considered to be an inefficient use of time. Many interviewees indicated that they would have preferred direct instruction. For example:

We wasted a lot of time working out for ourselves what to do. The assignments were very time consuming. I don't believe that we need to work it out for ourselves. Early in the course we should be shown what programmes are for and what they look like and have opportunity to discuss them.

Some of the comments indicated that the courses had not shown ways of using the available syllabus material. One interviewee said:

We have been shown how to prepare expansion charts and how to use Source Books in some subject areas. We have not really been shown how to use the syllabuses at all. We have been shown what the syllabuses look like and some things about what's in them but not how a teacher should use them.

At one institution at least, all respondees indicated that they had been taught about planning in most subject areas. A matching interview comment was:

I think that overall we received quite adequate instruction about planning programmes.

TABLE TWO

Question: *In what subject areas have the suggested approaches incorporated breaking down the programmed material into actual lessons? (e.g., as in a Daily Workpad).*

Subjects	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
Mathematics	34	8	56
Science	28	8	64
Social Science	56	36	81
English	32	17	37
Music	40	0	67
Physical Education	43	8	62
Art	34	0	83
Practice Teaching	41	25	50
All of these	4	0	6
Most of these	32	17	67
Few of these	49	25	55
None of these	7	0	18

Again in Table Two the position of Social Science is noteworthy. It may be appropriate to mention that neither the questionnaire, nor the material accompanying it made any reference to Social Science so that it seems reasonable to assume that differences shown are as the respondees considered the situation to be.

It should be remembered that the zeros in the 'minimum' column each represent at least one situation in which all respondees from an institution have said "this was not done during my course". If only a few respondees had this opinion, it might be held that they had forgotten it or been absent. When all of the respondees from an institution hold the position that something was not taught, this is quite a powerful statement.

The main points of note in Table Two are:

- (a) *the percentages are much lower overall than Table One.* (This suggests that the style of planning teaching encouraged in many cases does not include breaking the planned material into lessons. This point is addressed further below.)

- (b) *the very low ratings at some institutions.* (Mathematics, Science, Music, Physical Education and Art each receive minimum rating below 10%. Therefore, 90% of respondees think that they were not shown how to break programmed materials into actual lessons in those subject areas.)

The results in the lower table show that almost two thirds of the respondees from one institution considered that breaking programmed material into lessons had been taught in most of the above subject areas (column three), whereas over half of those responding from another institution considered it had been taught in few areas and 18% from one institution held that it had not been taught at all.

The interview comments suggest that many trainee teachers had not developed a clear concept of the planning process. For example:

We have been shown how to break the syllabus into actual lesson plans in Language Arts and Spelling, but I've never really seen the connection between lessons, daily workpads and programmes with the syllabus until I read through the notes on the materials accompanying the invitation to an interview.

As a result, the logical connection between the various steps in planning had not become apparent to some students. Even the seemingly self-evident link between programmes and lesson plans was not clear to some. One interviewee said:

The college didn't really separate lesson plans from programmes in our minds. We've not had any instruction at all in how to break the completed topic programme into lessons to give. Of course when we went on practice, especially ATP, we had to figure out ways of doing this for ourselves.

Other comments suggest that many institutions begin teaching about planning at lessons, and work from the preparation of a lesson series to the concept of developing a programme of the work to be covered. One interviewee considered that the approach taught was essentially that of joining lessons together to form a programme.

We started off writing lessons and then we were taught a series of lessons constituted a programme. Therefore we really worked in reverse and did not break the programme into lessons but put lessons together into a programme.

Another interviewee thought that the approach taught did not synthesise lessons into a unit, rather that it resulted in a chain of separate lessons.

What we really did was to write out ten lessons on a programme sheet.

Perhaps as a result of this approach many respondees indicated that they found it difficult to reverse the process and break a unit of work into a series of lessons. Indeed many of the sample programmes that they had kept as models were in fact a lesson series without a cohering overview.

TABLE THREE

Question: *By which subject departments have you been given actual, or mock examples of Daily Workpads or programming approaches?*

Subject	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
Mathematics	41	8	75
Science	16	0	45
Social Science	71	42	100
English	47	33	69
Music	15	0	25
Physical Education	26	17	36
Art	16	8	19
Practice Teaching	54	25	92
All of these	3	0	8
Most of these	32	17	50
Few of these	56	44	67
None of these	4	0	8

Again Table Three shows a wide variation within and between institutions. Science, Music and Art Education courses received very low overall ratings. A corresponding interview comment was:

In mathematics we have not really had planning at all. We've had

some curriculum theory perhaps but no guide to practical programming.

Coupled with the comments on Mathematics from Tables One and Two, it must be considered amazing that over 90% of the responses from one institution indicate that they have not been given any examples of approaches to planning Mathematics teaching.

Column two shows that in most subject areas, at some institutions at least, very few examples are provided to the trainees. This picture is reinforced by column three which in the best cases examples are given to 45%, 25%, 36% and 19% of the trainees in Science, Music, Physical Education and Art respectively. This suggests that unless these subjects are taken as an optional study, it is likely that trainees will not be shown how to plan teaching them.

The lower part of Table Three shows that highest rating from any institution was that 50% thought they had been given examples of planning in most subject areas. At one institution 67% considered they had received examples in few subject areas.

The popularity of guide material on programming was powerfully illustrated recently when the issue of *Axis* (a magazine on Social Studies teaching) devoted to "programming" was reported to be selling at five dollars a copy on a student blackmarket. It is interesting to speculate as to whether the material available about planning Social Studies has contributed significantly to the high ratings the subject received in the questionnaire data. The graduates interviewed generally seemed keen to receive and look after the handout material on programming.

The English department gave us the only handout that we have received.

It was more common for trainees to be given suggested headings by the subject departments as a basis for an assignment on programming.

There was not much said to us about the purpose of programming or how to programme. We were given headings for each subject and given assignments to do.

The invitation to attend an interview requested those accepting to bring any file material on programming. Most of the "handout" materials brought to the interviews were assignment sheets showing headings to use in developing a programme. There were very few examples that suggested methods for developing a programme in either the "handouts" or lecture notes. However, in cases where an interviewee produced little or no material, this probably indicates more about that person's attitude, than the course of training.

TABLE FOUR

Question: *In which subject areas have you collected actual examples of teachers' programmes?*

Subjects	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
Mathematics	66	56	83
Science	48	25	67
Social Science	66	45	83
English	63	45	69
Music	32	25	67
Physical Education	34	19	58
Art	38	36	50
All of these	22	9	42
Most of these	22	12	33
Few of these	43	25	62
None of these	10	6	18

It is interesting to notice in Table Four, the high percentage that claim to have collected sample programmes in a few subjects only (62% at one institution) or in no subjects at all (18% in one case). A lack of interest in collecting sample programmes outside the core subjects seemed evident at some institutions. One interviewee said:

I have not seen any programmes worth copying and therefore have no copies of programmes or daily workpads.

The value of collecting other teachers' programmes has been doubted by many teacher educators but carefully preserved folders presented at the interview attest to its value as perceived by many newly graduated teachers. The people who had examples seemed pleased to have them and to regard them as potentially useful. Many of the files had a carefully selected spread of subjects, however, there were few, if any, examples of daily work plans. One graduate said:

I have no examples of daily workpads, however, I have other teachers' programmes on mathematics, English, science, art, social studies, spelling, phonics and physical education.

Another interviewee, who had been particularly successful academically, produced the biggest bundle of sample programmes that I have seen. She had programmes on every subject area, in a variety of forms (but no examples of daily planning). Her comment was:

Yes lots of examples of programming but no examples of daily workpads.

When asked about why they had collected samples of programmes but not daily workpads, the general reply was that they had not heard enough about daily workpads to realise their role in the planning process and they had not been advised to collect them. This position seemed strongly supported by the evidence of some of the files produced. These graduates had built the files with careful diligence. Either collecting samples of daily planning had not been suggested or it had been misunderstood. Otherwise these trainees would have collected them.

TABLE FIVE

Question: *In which subject areas have you had to prepare a set of plans (programmes and lessons) for at least a four week period?*

Subjects	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
Mathematics	71	33	91
Science	44	12	100
Social Science	66	37	100
English	63	33	100
Music	57	9	94
Physical Education	46	33	75
Art	34	8	83
All of these	7	0	25
Most of these	53	50	91
Few of these	26	0	25
None of these	0	0	0

Table Five indicates a very wide diversity between institutions. Most trainees had to prepare a set of plans for all areas except Art and Physical Education. However, whereas at some institutions nearly all students prepared plans for most areas, at others only 12%, 9% and 8% had prepared plans for Science, Music and Art. It should be surprising that in some cases only 33%, 37% and 33% had prepared plans for Mathematics, Social Science and English.

Even the results across subject areas varied considerably. At one institution 91% considered that they had prepared plans in most subject areas, while at another institution, 25% had prepared plans in only a few areas.

Many interviewees felt that they had written more than enough sample programmes. One student had very clear ideas of a large number of approaches to programming and daily workpad. She had very clear ideas of different approaches to each subject. She had a very large file of ideas, examples, handouts, and models she had copied from other teachers or composed herself. When asked which approach she would use when teaching she replied:

Next year I expect to use those that I used on ATP but in more detail still.

However, many others had had very little experience. One graduate said:

There is lots of room in our course to be shown how to plan and programme. We need to be shown how to do it, not left to make up a way for ourselves. I have actually only ever written programmes for English and reading.

TABLE SIX

Question: *In which subject areas do you consider that it is important for a teacher to prepare programmes of work?*

Subjects	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
Mathematics	100	100	100
Science	99	92	100
Social Science	100	100	100
English	100	100	100
Music	87	64	100
Physical Education	90	91	100
Art	87	91	100
All of these	81	64	94
Most of these	18	6	36
Few of these	0	0	0
None of these	0	0	0

Table Six attests to the importance that most respondees gave to teachers preparing programmes of work. In the case of Mathematics, Social Science and English, all respondees thought planning to be important. With the exception of Music, nearly all respondees thought it important to plan all subject areas. Therefore in Table Six, in three cases the maximum and minimum values are 100% and all scores in the top of the table are higher than in other tables.

The lower part of the table shows that overall 81% think that teachers should plan in all areas (the lowest rating here for any institution was 64%) and no respondee thought teachers should plan in only a few (or no) areas.

TABLE SEVEN

Question: *What are the main purposes you see in a teacher preparing written plans?*

Response	Total %	Minimum %	Maximum %
To show the Superintendent what you are doing	47	37	58
To show the Principal what you are doing	63	56	75
To enable a relief teacher to take the class in your absence	88	81	100
To give a teacher confidence about what will happen	60	25	92
To facilitate the teacher arranging an effective set of activities	93	83	94
To co-ordinate the curriculum across years	12	0	19
All of these	22	8	33
Most of these	51	44	73
Few of these	22	8	31
None of these	0	0	0

Comments on this question indicated a strong feeling that programmes are primarily to facilitate the teacher arranging an effective set of activities (93%) and for when a relief teacher is needed (88%), but "to show the Principal what you are doing" and "to give teachers confidence" were also given general support. It is noteworthy that the answer "to co-ordinate the curriculum across years" was not listed in the questionnaire but was written in by many respondees. It is interesting to speculate as to how it would have been weighted had it been listed.

TABLE EIGHT

Question: *For each subject area please show how you feel about the amount of time and emphasis given to planning Daily Workpad and programmes during your teacher education course.*

Subject	Total %		Minimum %	Maximum %
	More than Needed 1	Just about right 2	Not quite sufficient 3	No where near sufficient 4
Mathematics	1.9	2.8	3.4	
Science	1.9	2.9	3.5	
Social Science	1.3	1.9	2.4	
English	2.0	2.6	3.1	
Music	1.8	2.5	3.8	
Physical Education	1.6	2.3	3.2	
Art	2.0	2.6	3.1	

Table Eight is set in a different format. A mean response (as a scale where (1) shows "more than needed" and (4) shows "nowhere near sufficient") was calculated for each grouping. The number on the left in each row is the lowest weighting given by the combined response from any institution (equivalent to column two on the other tables). The number in italics is the weighting of all of the respondees (column one on other tables). The highest weighting from any institution is shown by the number on the right of each row (column three on other tables). The score of 3.8 on the far right indicates that at one institution almost all of the respondees considered that planning Music teaching received nowhere near enough attention. The high weighting of Social Studies is shown by the fact that all three means cluster to the left of the scale.

The table also shows that all mean ratings (except for Social Science) indicate a belief that more time and emphasis to planning should be included in the courses. The overall mean rating for time and emphasis on planning is 2.5. Therefore Mathematics and Science with overall means of 2.8 and 2.9 respectively are most generally shown as needing more attention.

Mathematics, Science, English, Music, Physical Education and Art are each given a mean rating between "Not quite sufficient" and "Nowhere near sufficient" by the responses from at least one institution. That this is not indicative of just a general cry for more is shown by the fact that these subjects receive ratings between "Just about right" and "more than sufficient" from other institutions. The fact that Music received a mean rating of 1.8 from one institution and 3.8 from another seems indicative of genuine differences in the courses.

The interview comments suggested a similar range of opinion. Some comments suggested the emphasis on planning was too great:

There seemed to be too much work at the time. Now I think it will be useful. I think we should prepare programmes. We should be shown what they are and how to do them, but allowed to do our own.

I felt satiated with doing it.

others thought it was too slight:

There should be a whole lot more. We are told so little. We should be told a lot more and not asked to write more. We are told that programming is important but we don't really see it as important until we are nearly finished.

but at least one thought it was about right:

Well I would have liked more, however, the course was full and therefore if we wanted to put more of that in, something else would have had to go, and I don't know what I would have suggested to go. We covered the matter incidentally in the course. It was always shown to be important. I really think we should have had more on daily workpads and their role in teaching. I think that we just came across that by chance. However, overall I feel that we received quite adequate instruction on programming. We did a lot of assignments. We could get further help in the preparation of an assignment if we felt that we needed it.

Daily Workpads

In addition to the above general comments on planning, there were a number of comments specifically referring to planning daily workpads. Almost all of these suggested that this aspect of planning received insufficient attention. One held that the matter of daily workpads had not been treated and that the suggested approach to lesson planning was impractical.

We received no instruction at all in preparing a daily workpad and we

certainly could not use the model suggested in the recording booklet. It was extremely impractical and quite unsuited for normal classroom use. I did not know what a daily workpad was until I was on Assistant Teacher Practice.

Another interviewee considered that the relationship between the programmes and the daily workpad was not discussed and that suggestions were needed regarding formats for the daily workpad.

At no time were we told what a daily workpad was, or how it fitted in with the programmes. We have received no format for constructing daily workpads. Until very recently I thought that the daily workpad was a lesson plan of the sort that we had filled in before teaching practices.

The beginning of year three was suggested by one graduate as the most suitable stage to introduce guidance on preparing daily workpads.

I think we really need more guidance on preparing daily workpads. The beginning of Year 3 would be an appropriate time. Before we probably would not know enough about the planning process to realise the importance.

It was quite commonly suggested that trainee teachers should be able to use wide range planning approaches so that they can find an approach with which they can feel comfortable.

It would be very useful for students to see lots of examples of programmes and daily workpads so that they can choose a style that suits themselves.

One comment however, indicated detailed practise in using a daily workpad:

We had to plan in some detail for the first month. We also had to prepare in great detail a daily workpad of everything we were going to do in the first week of term in 1980.

It was clear from the comments from many institutions that this was an area of concern for these newly graduated teachers.

Time Allocation

There was strong, unsolicited, feeling that budgeting school time between subject areas should receive more attention. Some interviewees indicated that the matter had received little or no attention. One said:

At no time during the course has time allocation for various subjects been discussed.

And another:

There has been no timetable allocation discussion at all.

Assignment Marking

There were also many suggestions that the style of marking of assignments on programming encouraged the preparation of program-

mes with an impractical degree of detail. Two relevant comments are:

On one of my practices the headmaster criticised my programmes as being too detailed for practical teaching.

One problem of the fact that the programmes are prepared for assignments in that students tend to prepare very detailed programmes in order to obtain high marks. Although the lecturers say that they want realistic programmes, they assign higher grades to more detailed work and students quickly learn this and put in (as you see in my social studies programme) eight sheets for a four weeks period. This is quite unrealistic. A teacher would not have time to do this.

At one institution it was observed that some very detailed assignments had been marked with the warning that it would be unreasonable to attempt to plan in such detail when teaching.

Summary

These results have indicated wide differences between institutions in the teaching of planning in particular subjects and between subjects within institutions. In many cases the graduating teachers have given their courses a firm vote of appreciation, however, other courses are clearly considered to be readily improvable.

The most consistently suggested improvements called for:

1. more initial instruction with less student "exploration",
2. instruction about breaking "programmes" into lessons in addition to the presently taught building lessons into topics,
3. ready access to examples of a variety of approaches to planning,
4. more encouragement to collect examples of other teachers' plans,
5. instruction about purposes and forms of "daily workpads",
6. instruction about time allocation between and within subjects, and
7. instruction about and practice with planning collective programmes in groups.

This last point is particularly interesting in view of the fact that it was not mentioned in the questionnaire or interview schedule and came spontaneously from the graduates. Many had been on teaching practice in schools (particularly open area schools) where teachers planned collectively, and had recognized the need for consideration of the steps and skills involved.

As is to be expected from the differences illustrated between institutions, there was a general suggestion from some institutions that students should prepare more programmes, however, students from other institutions considered that this had been extremely thoroughly covered.

There was a common call for those who marked "programming"

assignments to give more guidance about the degree of detail expected, and for them to avoid giving high grades to students who have prepared plans with an impractical degree of detail.

Almost all of the graduates approached regarded the matter of training teachers to plan as a very important part of their preparation for teaching. They saw planning "programmes" as preparing working documents to guide their teaching.

As mentioned earlier, the data shown here is part of a study of how teachers plan what they will do with their students. Other parts of the study will involve getting information from:

- a) the teacher training institutions about how they endeavour to teach students about planning,
- b) principals and superintendents about how they think teachers do, and should plan, and
- c) teachers about how they plan and why they use those particular approaches.

It is hoped that the study will result in:

- a) descriptions of a range of approaches to planning,
- b) information about the influences that determine how teachers plan, and
- c) a re-assessment of the relationships between traditional curriculum theory and practical curriculum development.

In 1980 the major focus of the study will be case studies of experienced teachers as they plan. Using Ethnographic research methods, the attempt will be made to develop profiles of the planning approaches used by teachers in a variety of schools and the influences that determine their situation.