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SUMMARY

Planning behaviour of teachers.
An empirical investigation into the planning of teaching in secondary education.

This piece of research provides a description and analysis of the way teachers generally plan their teaching. It deals with teachers in various streams of secondary education, and with the subjects Maths, Dutch and Social Studies. I took planning or preparation to mean: deciding on the teaching method, content and presentation, before this took place.

Chapter 2 discusses the relevance of empirical research into planning of teaching for several study areas. The study areas concerned are the following: decision making in connection with teaching planning; didactic planning models; the effectiveness of the teaching. I emphasise the need for empirical research into planning when developing planning models. For we can see from other research that teachers do not use existing models. I assume that these models do not take the practical situation sufficiently into account, and are theoretically too one-sided.

In chapter 3 there is a critical account of the research so far done in this area. The information is arranged under the following headings:
- how much is teaching (pre)planned;
- the cognitive structure used by teachers in planning;
- what information and aids are used;
- what stages/processes are involved;
- influence of variables connected with individual teacher;
- influence of school subject and school year (level) of pupils;
- influence of organizational and material circumstances.

So far no adequate explanatory theory has been provided. Not a lot of research work has been put into a context that will clarify the connections between planning variables. There is no integrated overall picture, and some basic information is lacking. In such conditions descriptive exploratory research should be done. At the end of the chapter the research questions are set out. I try to connect these with the available information to be discussed. The questions are:

- to what extent do teachers plan their lessons?
- what affects the planning of content and lesson form?
- to what extent can and do teachers decide on their own teaching content and presentation?
- to what extent are planning routines used?
- is the planning done in phases?
- what activities are involved with the planning itself?
- to what extent are teachers satisfied with their planning, and what are the difficulties preventing this?

Chapter 4 discusses the research design. A questionnaire was returned by 766 people, and several case studies were made. The following points are discussed: the construction and contents of the questionnaire; distribution of the questionnaire and replies; the type of pupils concerned (lower vocational, general secondary and pre-academic); the sample (1200 teachers) and some general information about this group; those who did not send in their questionnaire, who were then included in a non-response research. Finally the design of the case studies is discussed. Of primary consideration here were situational factors in planning lessons.

Chapter 5 deals with the research information; the following (amongst other things) emerges: in general teachers plan their lessons fairly carefully and precisely. This planning is restrictive, particularly about content and work forms. Not much consideration is paid to differences between pupils.

It is striking that a similar effect classed together content and work Math, Dutch and experience, personal.

In connection with their pupils interested in particular to school with the school teachers, material the autonomous teachers.

The majority of teachers problem solving: essence the same.

In the teaching as a teaching form (content, the main function programmatical programme own opinion suffice).

There are considerable Social Studies. Use opposites, and the Studies teachers precisely and use estimates, teachers than the other exercises and tests. Lies on the lesson attention to long phases, and then down their lesson useful and precisely rity of the teach.
It is striking that the planning factors which were investigated have a similar effect on content and work form. Presumably these two are classed together. This could be described as a routine connection between content and work form. Factors which were important for teachers of Maths, Dutch and Social Studies appeared to be the following: personal experience, personal outlook and variables connected with the pupils. In connection with the last mentioned I concluded that teachers take their pupils into consideration in a general sense, and that it refers in particular to group or class characteristics. Variables in connection with the school were not significant (for example, attitude of colleagues, material circumstances). This supports the image we have of the autonomous teacher.

The majority of the teachers use routine planning. Making choices and problem solving is not common. Over the years teaching remains in essence the same. Most planning activities are done when the nature of the teaching as such is no longer under consideration. Deciding on the teaching form (content and work structures) is not therefore seen as the main function of planning. Presumably an already existing educational programme is accepted. In spite of this, teachers have in their own opinion sufficient freedom to express their own point of view.

There are considerable differences between teachers of Maths, Dutch and Social Studies. Usually Maths and Social Studies teachers were absolute opposites, and the Dutch teachers were somewhere in the middle. Social Studies teachers spend most planning time on the contents, plan most precisely and use the least routine methods. According to their own estimates, teachers of Social Studies spend one third more time planning than the other groups. Maths teachers are mainly concerned with exercises and tests. They pay little attention to work forms. The emphasis lies on the lesson plan. In contrast, teachers of Dutch pay considerable attention to long-term planning. Their planning shows the most awareness of phases, and they spend more time than the other groups in writing down their lesson plans. The results suggest the hypothesis that careful and precise planning bears a negative correlation to the familiarity of the teacher with his subject.
I noticed an interesting difference between teachers of lower vocational streams, and those of general secondary or pre-academic streams. This is that teachers in l.v. education pay more attention to differential aspects of teaching. Undoubtedly this is partly because those pupils with learning problems have little or no possibility of changing stream of changing to a school where there is less pressure on them.

Chapter 6 provides a review of the situation. First the main research results are described. Then some evaluations are made, based on these results, about school-based curriculum development, planning routines and planning models. I make some critical remarks about school-based curriculum development as an innovative strategy. For the research indicates that teachers who are now qualified to decide on their school curriculum, do not make use of this opportunity. It is thus not clear why schools will carry out innovative processes if and when they are given more autonomy. And we cannot expect that teachers, given more opportunity to develop their own curriculum, will pay more attention to the wishes and potentials of the pupils. Indeed, there is probably little demand for greater opportunity in this area. Furthermore, those changes considered to be essential for the school-based curriculum development will probably meet opposition from within the school. These changes (innovations) such as an emphasis on the team work of teachers should be seen not only as essential prerequisites for innovation, but primarily as an end in themselves.

We see planning routines on the one hand as an essential part of the professionalism of a teacher. On the other hand, routine planning excludes the possibility of using alternative methods. This is a less positive situation. Teacher training colleges and similar institutes would be well advised to offer a wider range of didactic skills by means of practice periods. Further, when curricula are being developed, the routine approach of teachers should be taken more into consideration.

I suggest that planning models should not only be considered as if there were optimal teaching conditions for the pupil. The approach of the teachers should also play a role here. I suggest that the term "planning"
of lower vocational streams. This leads to differential treatment of those pupils or changing stream on them.

The main research is based on these planning routines but school-based research on their implementation is thus not clear and when they are carried out or how they are carried out, given more or less attention there is probably not enough. Furthermore, those pupils in special classes in the school. These are the main work of teachers for innovation, but they are also an integral part of the routine planning exercise. This is a less formal institutes and educational skills by teachers are being developed, but are not into consideration.

They are considered as if there is no approach of the activities and the term "planning"

as it is used at present, requires fuller definition.

Finally I make some suggestions for ongoing research. We need to have further clarification of those aspects which, on the basis of the research results, are evaluated in this last chapter.