

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 765

EC 305 417

AUTHOR Witham, Joan; Linehan, Patricia  
TITLE Pretesting: Is It a Strategy Used with Inclusion?  
PUB DATE Apr 95  
NOTE 5p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children (73rd, Indianapolis, IN, April 5-9, 1995).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Disabilities; Elementary Education; \*Elementary School Teachers; \*Inclusive Schools; \*Individualized Instruction; Mainstreaming; \*Pretesting; Special Education Teachers; Student Needs; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Elementary school teachers (N=109) were surveyed regarding their use of pretesting to determine individual student instructional needs prior to teaching units of the regular curriculum. Teachers varied in their amount of teaching experience and possession of specialized endorsements--33 teachers had an endorsement in gifted/talented education and 14 teachers had an endorsement in learning disabilities or other special education area. Slightly more than half the sample reported they felt that pretests were worth the time, give children a feel for what will be expected of them, and should be used more often. However, almost half of respondents felt that pretests are too time consuming, not necessary, only work in certain subjects, and are not practical. Thirty percent of respondents did not ever pretest classes in spelling or reading, 36 percent did not pretest in language arts/ grammar, 17 percent did not pretest in math, 52 percent did not pretest in social studies, and 47 percent did not pretest in science. (Contains 15 references.) (DB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## ABSTRACT

### Pretesting: Is it a Strategy Used with Inclusion?

Pretesting is a key to tailoring instruction for mainstreamed students and for others in need of differentiation of the regular curriculum. This study explores the issue of how often and for what purpose pretesting is being used in regular classrooms to meet the needs of these diverse populations.

### TWO SESSION PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Joan Witham, Assistant Professor  
Southwest Texas State University  
Curriculum and Instruction  
San Marcos, TX 78666  
512-245-3084

Patricia Linehan  
Wm. Penn College  
Psychology Department  
Oskaloosa, IA 50207  
515-673-1073

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Witham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

on three dimensions: years of teaching experience, the holding of specialized endorsements, and grade level taught.

<u>Subjects</u>	N =	109 working teachers
Grade Level Currently Teaching		
54		grades K-3
42		grades 4-6
8		all elementary grades (pullout/resource programs)
5		did not answer this item
Level of Teaching Experience		
35		1-4 years
42		5-14 years
35		15-36 years
3		did not answer
Specialized Endorsements		
62		no special endorsement
33		Gifted/Talented Endorsement
14		LD or other Special Education Endorsement

### Instrument

The instrument used to examine attitudes and practices involving pretesting was a researcher-designed questionnaire, entitled Pretest Survey. It consisted of 64 items. Three items asked group dimension questions on current grade being taught, years of teaching experience, and endorsements held. Twenty-five items addressed attitudes toward pretesting and training in the utilization of pretests. Examples: "Pretests are too time consuming for me to prepare and score." "My teaching methods classes stressed pretesting as a valuable technique." These attitude items were answered on a 5 point Likert Scale anchored in Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree. One item asked an open-ended question which was analyzed qualitatively: "Why do you pretest? What function does the pretest serve for you?" The remaining questionnaire items asked frequency of pretest usage questions for different populations and in different subject areas.

Internal reliabilities for 5 attitudes and utilization subsets were run using Cronbach Alpha:

Teacher Training for Pretesting .	.67
Pretesting .	.77
Endorsement Classes Taught Pretesting .	.78
Useful for Exceptional Learners .	.89

### Results

#### A. Comparison of Gifted Talented Endorsement/No Endorsement

Higher mean scores indicate higher agreement

T-Tests:

Subsets	Means		T Value	Probability
	Endorsement No	Yes		
Teacher training including pretesting	9.08	4.39	.762	.447
Negative attitude toward pretesting	15.45	13.42	2.254	.026*
Positive attitude toward pretesting	21.88	23.18	-1.189	.237
Useful for exceptional students	7.79	7.90	-.303	.762

Do you sometimes give INDIVIDUALS pretests rather than the whole class?

YES: 39                      NO    54

	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51
Spelling	17	8	2	3	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
Reading	13	16	6	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
LA/Grammar	15	16	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Math	8	16	5	2	3	2	2	1	2	0	0	0
Social Studies	23	6	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science	25	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Approximate number of individual pretests given per year at the lesson level:

	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51
Spelling	23	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
Reading	25	9	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
LA/Grammar	24	8	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Math	18	12	2	2	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	1
Social Studies	26	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science	26	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(Item #29) Why use pretests? What function does the pretest serve for you?

Answers in this open-ended question were divided into 5 categories, which were developed from the data:

Total respondents to this item:	78
16	use pretesting to group
34	use pretesting to find a starting point
4	use pretesting to save time
16	use pretesting to change content
8	use pretesting to help individualize

### Discussion

Results of this survey research show elementary teachers have a fairly positive view of pretesting, though certainly not an overwhelmingly positive view. If one collapses Strongly Agree with Agree, and Strongly Disagree with Disagree, we see that almost half the sample (109) feel pretests are too time consuming, not necessary, only work in certain subjects, and are not practical. But over half the sample also feel pretests are worth the time, that pretests give kids a feel for what will be expected of them, that they are both good theory and usable tools and should be used more. Eighty-six percent of the respondents felt "Pretests help teachers prepare lessons that are more on target." Seventy-six percent of the respondents felt "Pretesting is necessary to individualize instruction." Seventy-nine percent felt "Pretests are helpful in planning instruction for gifted learners." Eighty-two percent felt the same way about pretests helping slow learners. Seventy-two percent felt that pretests should be used more.

### So why aren't pretests used more?

Large numbers of respondents did not report usage of pretests at all — even in those highly-pretest-compatible subjects, spelling and math. Thirty percent did not ever pretest classes in spelling, 30% did not pretest classes in reading, 36% did not in language arts/grammar, 17% did not pretest in math, 52% did not in social studies, and 47% did not pretest in science. When asked about pretesting individuals, the number of responses dropped dramatically and the percentages of

## REFERENCES

- Bloom, B.S. (1984, June/July). The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. Educational Researcher, 4-16.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1984). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In Third Handbook of Research on teaching.
- Davis, R. H., Abedore, A.J., & Witt, P.W.F. (1976). Commitment to excellence: A case study of educational innovation. East Lansing, MI: Educational Development Program, Michigan State University.
- Dick, W. (1986, May). The function of the pretest in the instructional design process. Performance and Instruction. 6-7.
- Fuchs, D. & L.S. (1995), March). What's special about special education? Phi Delta Kappan, 522-530.
- Gagne, R.M. (1985). The conditions of learning and theory of instruction. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gropper, F.,L. (1983). A behavioral approach to instructional prescription. In C.M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models: An overview of their current status, pp. 335-379. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hartley, J., & Davies, I.K. (1976, Spring). Preinstructional strategies: The role of pretests, behavioral objectives, overviews, and advance organizers. Review of Educational Research, 45 (2), 239-265.
- McIntosh, Ruth et al., Observations of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms. Exceptional Children, V. 60, pp. 249-261: and
- Orlich, Donald, et al. (1980). Teaching strategies: A guide to better instruction. Lexington, KY: D.C. Heath
- Renzulli, J. & Reis, S. (1991) The reform movement and the quiet crisis in gifted education. Gifted Child Quarterly, V. 35 (1), 324-326.
- Shinn, M.R. (1989). Curriculum-based measurement: Assessing special children. New York: Guilford.
- Yelon, S. (1985). Making decisions about pretesting: It's not a simple matter. Performance and Instruction, 24(9), 9-14.
- Zigmond, N. and Baker, J. M. (1994). Is the mainstream a more appropriate educational setting for Randy? A case study of one student with learning disabilities Research and Practice, Vol. 9, pp. 108-117.



**REPRODUCTION RELEASE**  
(Specific Document)

**I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:**

EC305417

Title: Pretesting: Is it a strategy used with inclusion?	
Author(s): Joan H. Witham & Patricia Linehan	
Corporate Source: CEC	Publication Date:

**II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:**

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.



Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document



**Check here**

Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ *Sample* \_\_\_\_\_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ *Sample* \_\_\_\_\_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

**or here**

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

**Sign Here, Please**

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: <i>Joan H. Witham</i>	Position: Asst. Prof.
Printed Name: Joan H. Witham	Organization: SWTSU
Address: Southwest Texas State Univer. Curriculum & Instruction San Marcos, TX 78666	Telephone Number: (512) 245-3084
	Date: 2/20/97

CEC ANNUAL CONVENTION (73rd, Indianapolis, IN, April 5-9, 1995)

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:
Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <b>ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON DISABILITIES AND GIFTED EDUCATION THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN 1920 ASSOCIATION DRIVE RESTON, VIRGINIA 22091-1589</b>
---

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Facility**  
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300  
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305  
Telephone: (301) 258-5500