

January 1982

Classroom Management: Managerial Functions in Teaching

Richard Coatney

Western Australian Institute of Technology

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



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coatney, R. (1982). Classroom Management: Managerial Functions in Teaching. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 7(1).

<https://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1982v7n1.4>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol7/iss1/5>

- MOOS, R. H., & OTTO, J. The Community-Oriented Programs Environment Scale: A method for the facilitation and evaluation of social change. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 1972, 8, 28-37.
- OLIVERO, J. L. *Microteaching: Medium for Improving Instruction*, Ohio: Merrill, 1970.
- PETERSON, P. L., & WALBERG, H. J. (Eds.). *Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.
- PIERCE, W. D., TRICKETT, E. J., & MOOS, R. H. Changing ward atmosphere through discussion of the perceived ward environment. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1972, 26, 35-41.
- RENTOUL, A. J., & FRASER, B. J. Conceptualization of enquiry-based or open classroom learning environments. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1979, 11, 233-245.
- RENTOUL, A. J., & FRASER, B. J. Changes in beginning teachers' attitudes towards individualised teaching approaches in the first year of teaching. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 1981, 6, 1-13.
- SCHWAB, J. J. The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, 1969, 78, 1-23.
- STENHOUSE, L. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann, 1975.
- TRICKETT, E. J., & MOOS, R. H. Social environment of junior high and high school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1973, 65, 93-102.
- WALBERG, H. J. (Ed.). *Educational Environments and Effects: Evaluation, Policy, and Productivity*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.
- WALBERG, H. J., & HAERTEL, G. D. Validity and use of educational environment assessments. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 1980, 6, 225-238.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS IN TEACHING*

Dr Richard Coatney
Western Australian Institute of Technology

Classroom management has long been a concern of educators. Traditionally, the term has referred to the use of discipline by the teacher to minimize student disruptions in the classroom. Recently, conceptions of classroom management have emerged that are broader than the traditional one. For example, Berliner speaks of the teacher as an executive (1982).

... Today's teacher is best conceived of as an executive. The modern teacher does not just dispense information, he or she really manages access to information. The modern teacher doesn't just give love, he or she provides environments that provide students security and rewards so they can grow intellectually and emotionally. The teacher is a manager, an executive manager of the cognitive and affective dimensions of the classroom (pp. 1-2).

Also, the conceptions of classroom management put forth in the second volume of the seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Duke (1979), are equally broad. Duke himself defines classroom management as constituting "the provisions and procedures necessary to establish and maintain an environment in which instruction and learning can occur. Classroom management thus is considered to encompass more than the supervision of student behavior but less than everything that takes place in class" (p.xii). Duke's definition, then, is a broad one but does distinguish management from actual instruction.

Finally, Wallen and Wallen (1978), in their definition, conceptualize

*This paper was written as a result of professional leave taken at the University of Arizona with Dr David Berliner, whom I want to thank for generously giving his time in a busy schedule to provide thought-provoking discussions on a wide range of educational topics, including the one addressed in this paper, and for reviewing this paper. I also want to thank Dr Tony Ryan of the Western Australian Institute of Technology for his support both before and after this professional leave was taken.

classroom management broadly and also distinguish managing from instructing. "Instructing is teaching people something, such as reading, writing, arithmetic, music, or art. Managing, on the other hand, is organizing people and things so that instruction in group situations will be effective" (p. 2).

These and other educators, in forming new conceptions of classroom management, have drawn on a variety of sources, such as educational administration, social psychology, and organizational psychology. Johnson and Brooks (1979), in particular, have written a comprehensive chapter on the conceptualizing of classroom management drawing on several sources.

This paper will further examine the conception of classroom management by focusing on one source, the actual discipline of management. Its purpose is to examine the definitions and functions of management identified within the discipline of management, to relate them to classroom management, and to draw implications for teacher education and the status of teaching.

Examination of Management and the Relation to Classroom Management

Often the relation between management and teaching is not apparent to those outside of education. An example appears in the text on management by Huse (1979). He refers to U.S. education to illustrate levels of management.

A typical school system will have a school committee, a superintendent of schools, and a staff of people who specialize in a single area, such as curriculum development. Below the superintendents are the principals of the various grade and high schools. The teachers in each school report to the principal and may or may not supervise teachers' aides and others (p. 10).

Huse stops there, not mentioning that a teacher also plans and supervises every day the work of 25–35 students. Nevertheless, on examining the discipline of management, one finds there is a relation to classroom management.

In this section, the paper will address the following four questions.

(1) What is the definition of management?

- (2) In light of this definition, what is the definition of classroom management?
- (3) What functions are associated with managing?
- (4) Do these functions relate to classroom management?

As with most areas, there are many definitions of management (see Drucker, 1977; Flippo and Munsinger, 1978; Huse, 1979; and Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich, 1980). Drucker says the word management is "a singularly difficult one" (p. 10). First, it is an American term that "can hardly be translated into any other language, not even British English" (p. 11). And second, terms other than management are used outside of business. "Universities or government agencies have administrators, as have hospitals. Armed services have commanders. Other institutions speak of executives, and so on" (p. 11). Yet Drucker believes that common to all of these terms is a management function so that definitions of management would apply to them as well. (In this paper, the word management is used throughout in this generic sense. Berliner uses executive to connote that a teacher's decisions are important ones. The use of management here is intended to include this connotation.)

Drucker mentions other difficulties with defining management but does offer his own definition. "Indeed, if there is one right way to define management it is as the work and function that enables people to perform and achieve" (p.ix). According to Huse, "when used collectively, the term management refers to those people who are responsible for making and implementing decisions within the system or subsystems (work units) in order to coordinate the activities of people in accomplishing the objectives of the organization. An individual manager is a person who works to accomplish the goals of the organization and who directly supervises one or more people in a formal organization" (p. 8).

As Huse later notes, the main distinction between one who manages and one who does not manage is the supervision of people. This element is apparent in both the Drucker and Huse definitions, though Drucker is in disagreement with Huse as to its importance. Drucker says "the first criterion in identifying those people within an organization who have management responsibility is not command over people. It is *responsibility for contribution*" (p. 50). For example, one could be performing highly responsible managerial functions and be in command over relatively few people (or over no one if he or she is in charge of an area of knowledge). This point on responsibility of contribution will

be addressed further in the discussion on the status of teaching. In any event, supervision of people and responsibility for contribution are both important elements in the definition of management. Another important element is that managers supervise and make decisions about resources generally, including people. Using Suzuki's definition of resources (1975) as people, materials, equipment, and space used within the constraints of time and money, one can conclude that managers make decisions about all four of these resource factors within the two constraints.

From this general definition of management, it appears that most if not all of the elements of the definition can apply to teaching. Teachers supervise people, are responsible for accomplishing important educational goals, and make decisions about all resource factors. To define classroom management, then, one can apply the general definition of management to the classroom situation. With reference to the Huse definition, classroom management becomes the teacher activities of making and implementing decisions about all resources within the educational system in order to coordinate the activities of others (students, aides, parents as volunteers, etc) in accomplishing educational objectives. Such a definition is a broad one and is in agreement with other current definitions of classroom management, mentioned previously. The common thread in these definitions is that they go beyond the narrow definition of classroom management as the handling of discipline problems.

Kounin's definition of classroom management is also in agreement with broad definitions, and there has been research to support it (1970); see also Dunkin and Biddle, 1974). Kounin originally began with a narrow definition, using discipline concepts involving teachers' reactions to students' misbehavior. But when his research did not generate strong relationships between these concepts and students' deviancy and work involvement, Kounin expanded his definition. His revised definition incorporated the new discipline concepts of withitness and overlappingness and additional concepts such as smoothness and momentum (related to the pacing of a lesson), accountability (holding students accountable for their work), and variety (varying activities within a lesson).

Kounin's subsequent research, conducted at the primary level, did generate strong relationships between these concepts and deviancy (negative relation) and work involvement (positive relation). Some concepts were stronger than others, and their effectiveness varied as a function of students being engaged in seatwork or recitation. But overall, Kounin's

research showed the effectiveness of variables related to the broad definition of classroom management, both in minimizing students' disruptions and in maintaining students' involvement in their work.

Brophy and Evertson (1977), in their research relating teacher behaviours to student outcomes, included Kounin's classroom management variables that focused on "keeping students *actively engaged* in productive work" (p. 84) as part of the teacher behaviors analyzed. They found that these variables were positively correlated with student learning gains, giving further support to Kounin's conclusions. In addition, Brophy and Evertson also found that "variables dealing with teacher punishment methods and other aspects of reaction to misbehavior proved relatively *unimportant*" (p. 84).

It appears, then, that classroom management can be defined in accord with the definition of management and that this definition is broader than that of classroom management as discipline. Also, from the research of Kounin and Brophy and Evertson, it appears, at least at the primary level of schooling and the correlational level of statistics, that teachers are more effective in increasing student learning gains, increasing student work involvement, and controlling their classes when they concentrate on a broad rather than a narrow definition of classroom management.

There is one final comment to be made on the definition of classroom management. There may be some who define, quite legitimately, classroom management broadly with regard to teacher variables but narrowly with regard to student variables, i.e. only focussing on student disruptions in the classroom. In this paper, classroom management is defined broadly with regard to both teacher and student variables. Additional student variables would include those studied by Kounin and by Brophy and Evertson, work involvement and learning gain, and also behaviors such as student interactions with the teacher, both in academic and personal interactions.

The next question to be addressed, what are the basic functions associated with managing, will be answered conceptually through a review of three current standard texts on management (Flippo and Munsinger, 1978; Huse, 1979; Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich, 1980). The texts are in general agreement on identifying the categories of managerial functions and the actual functions within each category. The four categories are planning, organizing, directing or leading, and controlling.

Two of the authors add additional categories (Koontz et. al, add one and Huse adds three), but these categories can be subsumed under the four basic ones, as was done by Flippo and Munsinger. Drucker's five objectives of management: setting objectives, organizing, motivating and communicating, measuring, and developing people, generally correspond with the four categories.

Within the major categories, the authors of the management texts delineate the functions of managing. Planning includes decision-making, setting objectives, and developing plans. Organizing includes the design of group structures, and those issues related to organizing, such as centralization versus decentralization of authority. Directing, or leading, includes styles of leadership, motivation, communication, staffing, and managing resources. Controlling includes monitoring and evaluating activities. In addition, under these categories or in separate sections, managing is related to the variables of creativity, conflict, and change and to political, economic, social, legal, ethical, and environmental factors.

Huse (1979) briefly discusses empirical studies of managerial functions, noting that "in spite of the importance of the manager to the organization, relatively few studies have directly examined what managers do" (p. 12). He reports one study of 160 managers that found "they had little time to spend alone to think. On the average, during the four weeks of the study, the managers were alone only nine times for a half hour or more without interruptions. True breaks were seldom taken. Coffee was drunk during meetings, and lunchtime was almost always devoted to formal or informal meetings" (p. 13). Huse also reports that about 60 to 80 per cent of the manager's time is spent in conversation. Finally, he lists basic characteristics that "seem to apply to managers in all types of organizations; they include hard work on a variety of activities, preference for active and non-routine tasks, direct personal relationships, and involvement in a series of communication networks" (pp. 12-13).

Do managerial functions, as delineated within management, relate to classroom management? Obviously, there are major differences between the functions of managing within a classroom and the functions of managing within an organization. Teachers do not hire and fire, though they do make important decisions that concern others' futures. Teachers are not involved in much formal budgeting, though they must budget resources and work within a budget. Teachers do not pay their students a salary, though they are required to evaluate them. Teachers do not

attempt to generate profit, though managers of non-profit organizations do not perform this function either. Teachers are not in charge of the manufacture of a product, though managers of most nonfarm businesses are not either. In the U.S., only 5% of nonfarm businesses are manufacturing organizations and 34% are service organizations (Huse, 1979). Finally, teachers view student development more as an end or goal in itself than managers view employee development as an end in itself, though on reading Drucker, one sees that the goals of management can be much broader and more oriented toward human development than usually conceived (see 1977, chapters 4 and 13). Thus there are major differences between managing within a classroom and managing within an organization, though some of the differences are not as great as they appear.

Even with these differences, teachers do seem to perform managerial functions. Teachers plan, organize, direct, and control. Within these categories, teachers set objectives, make decisions, develop lesson plans and often participate in curriculum planning. They are continually deciding how to organize their students into groups, which methods and activities to select, and how much decision-making to delegate. They lead, motivate, communicate, and manage resources. They monitor the activities of their students and evaluate their students' progress. And finally, teaching is related to the variables of creativity, conflict, and change and to all the factors mentioned in relation to management (political, economic, etc.).

Berliner (in press) has listed management tasks of teachers that reflect these managerial functions. His list includes planning work assignments, supervising the accomplishment of the work, assigning and supervising the work of aides, evaluating and providing feedback to aides and students, making decisions about scarce resources, scheduling, collecting and being responsible for funds, and keeping extensive records. Berliner concludes:

This list could go on. What is important to notice is that the list contains descriptions of common every day classroom events that require executive skill so that wise decisions may be made, thoughtful judgments provided, and satisfactory solutions found for the problems of classroom management (pp. 2-3).

Studies of teaching have shown empirically that teachers perform managerial functions. Studies of process-product relationships have shown

management variables to be among the teacher variables significantly related to student academic achievement. Examples are the research of Brophy and Evertson, mentioned earlier in support of Kounin's management variables, and the research related to the model of direct instruction (see Berliner, 1979). The latter research has identified significant management variables such as teachers directing students to the tasks in which they should be engaged and teachers monitoring students at work.

Dunkin and Biddle (1974), in their review of findings on teacher roles, make the following conclusion. "We learn that teachers spend most of their time as recitation or discussion leaders, supervisors of action, and informers, or are not directly involved in classroom events. About half the time, teachers are emitters (suggesting that teachers are actually talking for several *hours* during the typical school day), and during most of the time teachers are members of the central classroom group" (pp. 215, 217). Thus, teachers do take a supervisory role and, like managers, spend much of their day in verbal interaction.

Finally, descriptive studies on what teachers do, though as in management there are relatively few, reveal the teacher performing managerial functions. Two detailed studies were conducted in Britain, one by Hilsum and Cane (1971) at the primary level and one by Hilsum and Strong (1978) at the secondary level. At the primary level, the seven categories of activities that occupied most of the teachers' time during formal school hours were, in order of frequency of occurrence, lesson instruction, organizing pupils for work, supervision, mechanical tasks, staff consultation, lesson planning, and marking (these last two activities were grouped together). Supervision included supervisory activities that were not part of lesson instruction, such as monitoring students outside the classroom. There were other supervisory activities, such as monitoring students' classroom work, but these were incorporated under the lesson instruction category. Discipline activities were treated as a separate category, taking up only 1.5 per cent of the teacher's time. An examination of the hundreds of activities actually observed that formed the categories, listed in Appendix Four of Hilsum and Cane, reveals numerous managerial functions.

At the secondary level, the same seven activities were most frequently occurring and in the same order, except mechanical tasks moved from fourth to second. Mechanical tasks included duplicating, setting up and repairing equipment, and preparing materials, tasks that a manager with

few resources might perform but with sufficient resources would delegate. (A case could be made that a teacher should be able to delegate these tasks as well). Again, discipline was a separate category and accounted for only one half of one per cent of the teachers' time. Thus, during formal school hours, a teacher is quite often involved in managing.

During break and lunch hours, at the primary level, only about 25% of the time was private time, which included time to oneself and conversations that were not work related. Another 25% was spent in staff consultation, conversations with staff that were work related. The other most frequently occurring activities were, in order, supervision, mechanical tasks, lesson planning/marketing, pastoral work (attending to personal welfare of an individual student) and organizing pupils. At the secondary level, again only about 25% of the time was private time. Supervision took up approximately another 25%. Then came, in order, staff consultation, mechanical tasks, pastoral work (including "social activities", i.e. work with school clubs, as well as attention to individual student welfare), organizing pupils, and lesson planning/marketing. Remembering what Huse reported on what managers do with their free time, one can see similarities to what teachers do with their free time. Neither one has much time to themselves, and both spend a lot of their free time interacting with others on work-related matters. (With regard to activities outside of school hours, teachers spent most work-related time on marking, lesson planning, mechanical tasks, taking professional courses relevant to education, and staff consultation). There is, then, an empirical basis to the statement that teachers perform managerial functions.

Managerial functions delineated within management generally correspond with recent conceptual models of classroom management that go beyond the view of classroom management as discipline. For example, many of the managerial functions are included in the conceptual model proposed by Johnson and Brooks (1979). It does appear, then, that one could formulate a conceptual model of classroom management using a conception of management as a guide. It is beyond the scope of this paper to formulate such a model, but it is suggested that this area would be a fruitful one to pursue, where a dialogue could be established between the disciplines of education and management. To conclude this section, one can state generally that managerial functions delineated within management are related to classroom management.

Implications for Teacher Education and the Status of Teaching

Since teachers perform managerial functions, the question arises whether they are trained in management? If one takes the broad view of management presented in this paper, then the answer is teachers are trained in at least some of the areas of management, though the training is not labelled "management". Teachers are trained to set objectives, develop plans, and to be familiar with theories and methods of group organization, motivation, and evaluation. Teachers seem less trained in areas of decision-making, leadership, and management of resources. Since these areas are also critical to teaching, they could receive more attention in teacher education. (Teacher decision-making is receiving more attention in educational research. See, for example, Clark and Yinger (1979), Doyle (1979), and Eggleston (1979)).

Berliner has suggested (through personal discussion) that one could formulate a model of teacher education based on management. This model could then be used to identify areas of strength and weakness in teacher education programs. Dunkin and Biddle (1974), in their review of Kounin's concepts and research related to classroom management, and Brophy and Putnam (1979) speak of the absence of and need for a systematic theory of classroom management. Such a theory would give focus to the training of teachers in management, to research, and to the practice of managing in the classroom. Finally, concepts within the area of management may in part have relevance to teaching and teacher education. For example, Drucker (1977) discusses the importance of a manager's sideways relations with colleagues and upward relations with superiors. Often teachers are viewed as fairly autonomous, interacting solely with their students. However, a teacher maintains important relationships with colleagues, parents, principals, and others. Perhaps these relationships should receive more attention in teacher education than they currently receive.

In addition to the question of whether management is taught within teacher education, it is also important to ask how teachers perceive management. In my own experience, many teachers do not view themselves as managers and think of the term as being cold and related only to business. It is an unfortunate and inaccurate view of management. Managing is central to many occupations where decisions are made about people and other resources. Teachers and parents continually make management decisions and do so, or at least should do so, in an atmosphere of warmth

and love. And in fact, teachers and parents who are good managers should have more time to establish positive relations.

Good managing and positive human relations are thus not antithetic. The previously mentioned research in support of the model of direct instruction is relevant to this point (see Berliner, 1979). This research has shown that certain variables are positive predictors of student achievement. These variables are: an academic focus within the classroom, a classroom environment that is warm, democratic, and convivial, and management variables (already described). In other words, these variables can coexist successfully. Teachers can show warmth, be good managers, and be academically oriented.

Berliner's point (1982) about the "factory" metaphor being applied to classrooms with a high academic orientation is equally relevant to classrooms that are well managed.

The metaphor of a classroom as a "factory" need not be used when thinking about classes that have a high academic orientation. A productive classroom focuses on academic accomplishments but must do so in a warm, democratic, convivial atmosphere wherein students learn to take personal responsibility for their efforts and cooperate with their peers. A teacher must learn to monitor his or her own classroom and balance the various forces in the class such that a pleasant and a productive environment is created (pp. 27-28).

Finally, good managers should not be perceived as bureaucrats. Good managers are not ones who are caught up in organizational detail nor ones who can concentrate only on their work, unaware of the work and progress of others. Rather, they must attend to broad objectives and plans and be oriented to the work and progress of others as well as to their own. One can conclude, then, that the teacher's perception of management should receive attention within teacher education.

With regard to the status of teaching, traditionally, occupations requiring managerial skill are accorded high status and rewards. Teaching requires managerial skill, but traditionally teaching has not been accorded the accompanying high status and rewards. If the managerial functions of teaching were more recognized, then perhaps this situation would change.

The argument could be made that teachers should not receive higher

status and rewards because they are at a low level of management. But as Drucker has said, a manager is not defined solely by power (command over people) but also by responsibility for contribution. One may manage only a few people or manage an area of knowledge rather than people but be accorded high status and rewards because of the importance and responsibility of one's function. Teaching does carry a great responsibility and is considered an important profession within society. Berliner recognizes this point when he refers to the teacher as an executive. Thus, teaching is more than a low level of management; it carries a great responsibility for contribution. Teaching is not the same profession as being a principal, with simply a lower level of responsibility; there are qualitative differences.

That teaching is viewed as important was shown by a recent poll taken in Britain by the magazine *Engineering Today* (reported in the Sydney Morning Herald, 13 May, 1981). The poll asked which professions were most essential to Britain's future prosperity, which were best performed, and which were most underpaid. Teaching was first as "most essential" (75% of the sample included teaching in their choices), tied for second, with bank managing, as "best performed" (38%) and first as "underpaid" (37%). Teaching, then, involves assuming managerial responsibilities in an area viewed as essential by others and is thus deserving of high status and rewards.

To conclude, managerial functions should be given more attention by teachers, teacher educators, and researchers of teaching, and should be given more recognition by the community at large as part of a profession of high importance and responsibility. Drucker (1977) makes a worthy comment on managing and teaching that is appropriate as a close to this paper. With the possible exception that teaching, and perhaps managing as well, can be viewed as both science and art, the word teaching could replace the word managing in every instance without altering the truth of the statement.

It may be argued that every occupation — the doctor, the lawyer, the grocer — requires integrity. But there is a difference. The manager lives with the people he or she manages, the manager decides what their work is to be; the manager directs their work, trains them for it, appraises it and, often, decides their future. The relationship of merchant and customer, professional and client requires honorable dealings. Being a manager, though, is more like being a parent, or a

teacher. And in these relationships honorable dealings are not enough; personal integrity is of the essence.

We can now answer the question: Does it require genius, or at least a special talent, to be a manager? Is being a manager an art or an intuition? The answer is: "No". What a manager does can be analysed systematically. What a manager has to be able to do can be learned (though perhaps not always taught). Yet there is one quality that cannot be learned, one qualification that the manager cannot acquire but must bring with him. It is not genius: it is character (pp. 58 — 59).

References

- BERLINGER, D. C. *Tempus educare*. In P. L. Peterson & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1979.
- BERLINGER, D. C. *The Teacher as Executive: Administering a Learning Environment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the South Pacific Association for Teacher Education, Perth, Australia, May, 1980.
- BERLINGER, D. C. Instructional variables. In D. E. Orlosky (Ed.), *Introduction to Education*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1982.
- BROPHY, J. E., & EVERTSON, C. M. Teacher behaviour and student learning in second and third stages. In G. D. Borich (Ed.), *The Appraisal of Teaching: Concepts and Process*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- BROPHY, J. E., & PUTNAM, J. G. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Classroom Management*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.
- CLARK, C. M., & YINGER, R. J. Teachers' thinking. In P. L. Peterson & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1979.
- DOYLE, W. Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Classroom Management*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.
- DRUCKER, P. F. *People and Performance: The Best of Peter Drucker on Management*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- DUKE, D. L. (Ed.), *Classroom Management. The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.
- DUNKIN, M. J., & BIDDLE, B. J. *The Study of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

- EGGLESTON, J. (Ed.), *Teacher Decision-making in the Classroom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- FLIPPO, E. B., & MUNSINGER, G. M. *Management* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.
- HILSUM, S., & CANE, B. S. *The Teacher's Day*. Windsor, Berks, England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971.
- HILSUM, S., & STRANGE, C. R. *The Secondary Teacher's Day*. Windsor, Berks, England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1978.
- HUSE, E. F. *The Modern Manager*. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1979.
- JOHNSON, M., & BROOKS, H. Conceptualizing classroom management. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Classroom Management*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.
- KOONTZ, H., O'DONNELL, C., & WEHRICH, H. *Management* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.
- KOUNIN, J. S. *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- SUZUKI, W., SHALTRY, P., & COATNEY, R. *The Product Engineering of a System for Upgrading High School Career Planning Programs: A Technical Report of a Case Study in Educational Technology*. Columbus, Ohio: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1975.
- WALLEN, C. J., & WALLEN, L. L. *Effective Classroom Management*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

A RESEARCH BASE FOR ART CURRICULA IN TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

Rob Fielding

James Cook University of North Queensland

In the early 1970's, Eliot Eisner, Professor of Art and Education at Stanford University, conducted a study which was designed to gain a clearer picture of the achievements and attitudes of college and university students in the visual arts. He developed two instruments – the Eisner Art Information and Art Attitude Inventories (Eisner, 1972, pp. 146-152) – which could be used to test students' accumulated knowledge of the visual arts; and their attitudes towards, and involvement in, the visual arts.

His conclusions, based on the results of this study, indicated that U.S. schools had generally failed to provide students with the art education which he thought was desirable. It was found that students' knowledge of their culture contained in the visual arts was severely deficient; and their attitudes were based on narrow opinion and shallow foundations.

It is interesting for those involved in art education in Australia to speculate on the degree to which these findings might be coincidental with student achievements and attitudes in this country. Eisner's findings certainly strike a familiar chord with candid observations made by teachers of the visual arts in Australia. In order to determine the general achievements and attitudes of incoming student teachers into the Institute of Advanced Education at James Cook University, the author designed a series of tests which were used to indicate the achievements of students in terms of their knowledge and skills in the visual arts and the attitudes which they held towards this field. The information obtained in the author's opinion, is most helpful in the development of courses which most appropriately prepare student teachers for the role of teaching art in the schools.

The Study

Since the research was designed to gain some understanding of school-based *visual literacy* attainment of commencing student teachers, it was necessary to firstly develop a clear working definition of this term. The Oxford dictionary defines 'literacy' as 'the ability to read and write'.