DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 647 HE 033 823

AUTHOR	Whittington, M. Susie
TITLE	Using Think-Aloud Protocols To Assess Cognitive Levels of Students in College Classrooms.
PUB DATE	2000-12-06
NOTE	14p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cognitive Processes; College Faculty; *College Students; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Protocol Analysis; *Student Attitudes; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The cognitive levels of instruction of professors from the Pennsylvania Governor's School for the Agricultural Sciences (PGSAS) and the cognitive levels of thought among students were studied. The classes of 4 of 16 PGSAS professors were selected for analysis, and researchers recorded the frequency of observable teacher behaviors from each level of Bloom's "Taxonomy" in 6-minute intervals. Professors also completed a questionnaire about teaching skills and knowledge of cognitive levels of teaching. The second target population for the study was 64 scholars at the PGSAS during the summer of 1998. These subjects completed a questionnaire for background information before completing think aloud protocols about their thought processes during class. Findings show that professors were generally teaching at lower cognitive levels, with the most common teaching behaviors being basic elicitation of facts, verbalizing from or about graphic representations, and making generalizations or conclusions. When professors did teach at higher cognitive levels, the most common behaviors were producing unique communication and divergent ideas, showing interactions and relationships, and applying abstract knowledge. Students, however, primarily thought "random nonsense thoughts" during lectures. The implications of these findings are discussed, and some recommendations are made for improved instruction. (Contains 2 tables and 24 references.) (SLD)

ED 450 647

USING THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS TO ASSESS COGNITIVE LEVELS OF STUDENTS IN COLLEGE CLASSROOMS

M. Susie Whittington

USING THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS TO ASSESS COGNITIVE LEVELS OF STUDENTS IN COLLEGE CLASSROOMS

Introduction

The need to have students graduate with a demonstrated capacity to think at the higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy is more urgent than ever (Newcomb, 1995). Recently, however, much concern exists that college and university students are not learning to their full potential. According to Whittington and Bowman (1994), several major national reports expressed the view that undergraduate education in general is incoherent and ineffective. The apparent foundation for these accusations is failure on the part of educators to challenge students to think. However, using Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) as a basis for examining cognitive levels of thought, it is possible to study both professors and students to determine the validity or lack of validity of these assertions.

Theoretical Framework

Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain

Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain provides a useful framework for documenting the various cognitive levels at which the brain operates. This framework gives focus and direction to teachers who are looking to improve the quality of learning in their classrooms (Whittington and Bowman, 1994).

Bloom's (1956) six-step hierarchical system of thinking moves from knowledge which emphasizes recalling subject matter, to evaluation which entails making judgments (Table 1). Each level is reflected through cognitive activities.

Review of Literature

Think-aloud Protocols

During the 1950's, the cognitive revolution initiated a new era of thinking about thinking by addressing fundamental questions about the human mind and by creating perspectives and tools to pursue the answer to those questions. Think-aloud protocols, the verbal reports produced by subjects who expressed their thoughts while engaging in some activity, has been one of the tools that allowed psychologists to explored previously inaccessible domains of cognitive processing (Kucan and Beck, 1997). Newell and Simon (1972) analyzed think-aloud protocols, and demonstrated how the pieces needed to fill-in the cognitive puzzle's vast and empty interior.

Higher-order Thinking

Higher-order thinking is defined as application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation (Bloom et al., 1956). Thomas (1987) further defined higher-order thinking as the ability to think critically, make ethically and intellectually defensive decisions, and reason.

Table 1

A Synopsis of Bloom's Hierarchy of Thought

Cognitive Level	Definition	Activity
Knowledge	Recalling subject matter	List, define, label, and match
Comprehension	Learners know information that has been communicated, but cannot apply in other situations	Explain, rewrite, paraphrase, summarize, and give examples
Application	Learners apply information to different situations and learning tasks	Compute, demonstrate, use, predict, discover, and solve
Analysis	Learners separate data into its component parts; these parts are differentiated and related based on their relationship	Differentiate, discriminate, relate, diagram, and distinguish
Synthesis	Combines learned elements to create a new whole; working into pieces and elements, arranging so as to create new forms, patterns, or structures	Create, compose, produce, and develop
Evaluation	Entails making judgment on the value of materials and methods for given purposes	Justify, compare, contrast, evaluate, and interpret

Note. McCormick, D. (1998). Adapted from Bloom et al., (1956).

According to Thomas, a higher-order thinker asks questions that probe what is known, deducts possible outcomes of a particular situation using principles, and tests one's own line of thinking and reasoning. Higher-order thinking requires the use of basic thinking skills such as knowledge recall, comprehension, and application, but analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are its primary cognitive requirements (Bloom, 1984). Since information is only useful when it can be applied and used for solving problems and making predictions (Underbakke et al., 1993), higher order thinking provides a foundation for effectively dealing with information (Halpern, 1984).

However, compared with educated students of other nations, our students are falling behind academically (Sternberg, 1985) due to underdeveloped higher-order thinking skills. For U. S. students, performance on moderately complex and scientific tasks has not changed in almost a decade, and only a small number of students, merely 7 % of 17 year olds, demonstrate such higher-level skills (Paul, 1992).

Thus, a lack of correspondence exists between that which is needed to develop higher-order thinking, and that which is actually being offered to students. Lecture, the most commonly used instructional method in the university system, often only offers students the opportunity to develop higher-order thinking skills on their own (Bostick, 1996). Most students, though, do not have the background in thinking skills development or metacognitive analysis to develop their own thinking skills (Paul, 1992). Ericksen (1984) concluded that students will learn what they find interesting and only remember what they understand.

Previous studies have stated that professors often concern themselves with the content of their lectures, but spend less time thinking about student performance and the cognitive level their instruction reached (Whittington and Newcomb, 1991). In reality, the necessary higher-order thinking skills needed by students can only be developed through a learning environment that consciously teaches thinking skills and provides opportunities for interaction (Thomas, 1987).

However, a study by Cano and Newcomb (1990) showed that 60% of teacher instructional methods focused on knowledge and comprehension; 20% on application and analysis; and another 20% on synthesis and evaluation. Whittington (1995), in a study of 30 professors from The Pennsylvania State University, found that nearly 80% of discourse in college classrooms was at lower cognitive levels.

Engaging Thinking in Classrooms

The outcome of a curriculum should be to engage students in thinking at higher cognitive levels (Whittington and Bowman, 1994). Cano and Newcomb (1990) recommended that "teachers of agriculture should further develop a curriculum which appropriately challenges students at all levels of cognition" (p. 75).

Not only will a cognitively challenging curriculum enhance cognitive thinking levels in students, but the way in which the curriculum is taught will make the difference (Whittington and Bowman, 1994). Underbakke, et al. (1993) suggested that the teacher is the most powerful control factor that influences students' development of higher order thinking skills. Cano and Martinez (1991) concluded that "agricultural educators [need] to challenge students to develop cognitive abilities and critical thinking skills at higher levels via the instruction they provide" (p. 28).

An earlier study of strategic teaching methods concurred with recent research (Ogle, 1989) which concluded that teachers should establish goals for their instruction, and should consider teaching topics which are meaningful, applicable, and useful in students' lives. Ogle stressed the importance of feedback between students and teachers, and also suggested using application and integration activities following the lesson in order to promote a deeper understanding of the subject.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to assess and compare the cognitive levels of instruction among professors from the Pennsylvania Governor's School for the Agricultural Sciences (PGSAS), and the cognitive levels of thought among PGSAS scholars. Specifically, the research questions which guided this study were:

- At what level of cognition were professors actually teaching?

- At what level of cognition were students actually operating?

Methods/Procedures

Professors

Population and Sample

The target population in this study was 16 professors from the PGSAS at The Pennsylvania State University. Four professors' classes were randomly selected for analysis.

Instrumentation

In 1968, Webb used Bloom's Taxonomy to create the FTCB to assess the cognitive level of classroom discourse (the formal speech or conversation delivered during class) professors use when they teach. The FTCB utilizes 55 observable behaviors indicative of the various cognitive levels identified by Bloom's Taxonomy. In the "knowledge" category, 17 observable behaviors are listed on the instrument; for "comprehension," 12 observable behaviors are listed; for "application," four observable behaviors are listed; for "analysis," 11 observable behaviors are listed; for "synthesis," nine observable behaviors are listed; and for "evaluation," two observable behaviors are listed.

Validity for this instrument was based upon its direct development from Bloom's Taxonomy and the support generally given to this hierarchy of cognitive behaviors. Reliability for this instrument was established by coding audio tapes of lectures and establishing Spearman Rho reliability coefficients. Inter-rater reliability was approximately $r = .97$. Intra-rater reliability between previous researchers and the researchers in this study was approximately $r = .96$.

Data Collection

While attending each professor's class, the researchers recorded the frequency of observable teacher behaviors in six-minute intervals. Examples of observable behaviors at each level of Bloom's hierarchy include: "defines meaning of a term" (knowledge level); "shows cause and effect relationship" (comprehension level); "applies previous learning to new situations" (application level); "shows interaction or relation of elements" (analysis level) "formulates hypothesis" (synthesis level); and "evaluates something from evidence" (evaluation level).

In order to collect data on each professor's background, teaching skills, and knowledge of cognitive levels of teaching, professors completed a questionnaire. Each professor was also videotaped during the lecture.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1990). Frequency of behaviors observed across all cognitive levels was totaled. Then the frequency within each cognitive level was divided by the overall total to acquire percentages of classroom discourse at each cognitive level. Cross-tabulations, frequencies, and means were calculated.

Students

Population and Sample

The second target population for the study was 64 scholars who attended the PGSAS during the summer of 1998. The 64 scholars were previously randomly divided into four sections of 16 scholars each for the school's administrative purposes. The researchers were members of section one; therefore, for access to the students, section one was utilized.

Since there was a limited amount of time in which the researchers could interview scholars immediately after class, the four days in which there was at least a one-hour block of time immediately following class were chosen. Four scholars were randomly drawn for each interview date, followed by two alternates for each date.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire designed by the researchers provided insight into potential reactions of the scholar to being interviewed, classes previously taken that would give background in the material being taught, and information about the scholars' interests and reasons for attending PGSAS. Scholars completed the questionnaire prior to the interview.

Data Collection

To understand how students are responding to teachers who teach to higher cognitive levels, researchers used think-aloud protocols (verbalization of thought processes). Verbal reports were long used as data for psychological research because they provided information as to "what is going on in the mind" (Bowen, 1994). Piaget validated the use of verbal reports when he used them to test hypotheses based on subjects' responses (Abraham and Renner, 1986). Successful use of think-aloud protocols for verbal reports to collect and analyze human thoughts has been legitimized by psychologists and intelligence researchers.

In this study, subjects knew prior to class that they would be interviewed about their thoughts during class. The subjects were told the objectives of the study. Immediately following class, students were given a hand-held tape recorder and asked to watch the videotaped lecture, listen, and audibly recall and describe their thoughts during class.

Data Analysis for Students

The audiotapes of cognitive processes were transcribed by a staff assistant. Thoughts of students were sorted into six research-generated categories and then classified into Bloom's cognitive levels. The researchers categorized the thoughts as:

- Thoughts or observations about the professor
- Nonsense or unrelated thoughts
- Thoughts connected to previous learning
- Thoughts about past experiences prompted by class subject matter
- Deeper learning/questioning thoughts
- Thoughts about behavior that got/maintained attention

Findings and Results

Assessment of Cognitive Levels Reached by Professors

Professors in this study taught 43% (see Table 2) of the time at the knowledge (compilation of first three categories) level of cognition (range = 8-18%), 30% at the comprehension (translation and interpretation) level, (range = 10-20%), 7% at the application level, (range = 4-9%), 7% at the analysis level, (range = 6-8%), 7% at the synthesis level, (range = 4-10%), and 6% at the evaluation level, (range = 2-12%). The most frequently utilized classroom discourse was at the "knowledge of specifics" level. The least frequently utilized classroom discourse was at the "application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation" levels.

The most common type of thought expressed by students (68%, see Table 3) was "random or nonsense thoughts" (metacognitive processes unrelated to class subject-matter). An example was, "It makes me mad when I can't find a parking place." The second most common category of thought (12%) was "thoughts about past experiences prompted by class subject-matter." An example was processed while the professor was discussing the way pork is currently being bred for leanness. The student thought, "It doesn't matter how lean they make pork, I still won't like it." The least used category of thought was "deeper learning/questioning thoughts" (3%). An example was, "If they can put windows into cows' stomachs to measure nutrient absorption, what can we learn to help people" ?

Table 2

Assessed Level of Cognitive Instruction

Level of cognition	Range (%)	Total (%)	Range (f)
1.0 Knowledge of specifics	8 - 18	17	45 - 81
1.2 Knowledge of ways and means of dealing with specifics	5 - 12	11	27 - 63
1.3 Knowledge of universals and abstracts	4 - 18	15	29 - 84
2.0 Translation	10 - 18	14	43 - 63
3.0 Interpretation	11 - 20	16	48 - 70
4.0 Application	4 - 9	7	11 - 38
5.0 Analysis	6 - 8	7	18 - 36
6.0 Synthesis (Creativity)	4 - 10	7	16 - 42
7.0 Evaluation	2 - 12	6	7 - 63

Note. 1.0+1.2+1.3 = Bloom's "knowledge" level; 2.0+3.0 = Bloom's "comprehension" level.

Table 3
Students' Categories of Thoughts

Categories of thoughts	Range	% of Time
Thoughts or observations about the professors	1 - 5	3
Nonsense or unrelated thoughts	37 - 86	68
Thoughts connected to previous learning	6 - 20	10
Thoughts about past experiences prompted by class subject matter	2 - 25	12
Deeper learning/questioning thoughts	2 - 7	3
Thoughts about behavior that got/maintained attention	0 - 6	4

Students' Cognitive Level of Thoughts

The most common cognitive level of students' thoughts in class was "knowledge level" (12.7%, see Table 4). Knowledge was considered in two different forms: a) searching for, and b) expressing the recognition of basic knowledge. For instance, when the professor was showing students the uterus of a pig, one student thought, "Which way do they come out [when they are born]"? This example is a search for knowledge. However, when the professor was discussing the domestication of different plant crops, and the student thought, "When I saw that blueberries were domesticated in North America, I remembered other fruits that were domesticated in the U. S," the student was demonstrating an expression of basic knowledge.

Table 4

Comparison of Professors' and Students' Cognitive Level of Thought During Class

Cognitive level	Professors (%)	Students (%)
Knowledge	43	12.7
Comprehension	30	11.8
Application	7	2.0
Analysis	7	4.5
Synthesis	7	<1
Evaluation	6	1
Other	0	68
Total	100	100

The next most used level of cognitive thinking was comprehension (11.8%). Comprehension involves two forms: a) to understand information, and b) to question the information given. For instance, with regard to understanding information, a professor was describing the antibodies in a human mother's milk, and the student thought, "If the mother is malnourished, the children will be [malnourished] as well because there won't be enough nutrients in the milk." The questioning form of comprehension is shown in the following situation: A professor was examining the uterus of a pregnant cow, and there were no ovaries attached to the uterus. The student thought "Why are the ovaries missing? If they were missing her whole life, could she reproduce artificially"?

The application level of thought involved an average of 2% of the students' thoughts in class. For example, while the professor was discussing the effects of obesity on cancer rates, a subject thought, "My mom is a health nut, so she'll have a better chance of not getting [cancer]."

The analysis level of cognition consumed an average of 4.5% of the thoughts in class. For example, when discussing evolution in class, a student was reminded of learning about evolution and creation, and wondered, "What are the components of evolution and creation that can be combined"?

Less than 1% of students' thoughts could be classified at the synthesis level. An example of synthesis level thinking occurred during a class discussion on the differences between breast milk and formula. A student thought, "Why can't we make [breast milk and formula] the same? I don't know all the different hormones [contained] in milk. If I know the natural ingredients how could I combine them to make perfect synthetic breast milk"?

In this study an average of 1% of students' thoughts in class were devoted to the evaluation level. Over two-thirds (68%) of thoughts generated by students during class were "random nonsense thoughts"; these were not classified as part of the cognitive assessment.

Conclusions

Professors in this study were generally teaching at lower cognitive levels. For example, the most common teaching behaviors recorded among professors in this study were: basic elicitation of facts, verbalizing from and/or creating graphic representations, making generalizations about concepts or ideas, summarizing and concluding from what had been said, and giving reasons for facts. When professors did teach at higher cognitive levels, the most common behaviors were: producing unique communication and/or divergent ideas, showing the interaction and relationship among elements, and applying abstract knowledge in a practical situation.

Students, on the other hand, primarily thought "random nonsense thoughts" during lectures. They rarely thought at the higher cognitive levels no matter the cognitive level at which the professor taught.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of this study, the researchers recommend that professors:

- be made aware of cognitive levels of teaching by participating in faculty seminars and workshops, or by reading mailings sent to faculty.
- make students aware of the objectives of the lesson prior to the start of the lesson (Perrone, 1994).
- teach subject matter by linking knowledge with real-life situations and issues (Perrone, 1994).
- provide the opportunity for students' feedback of their performance relative to the goals of their instruction (Perkins & Blythe, 1994).
- discuss hypotheses within the body of the lecture and assist students in the formation of new hypotheses (Bloom et al., 1956).
- use more visual aids along with "user-friendly" terminology wherever possible to attract and maintain the attention and focus of students.

Based on the conclusions of this study the researchers recommend that students:

- discipline themselves to pay attention and focus on the materials presented.
- challenge themselves to think in-class about applications of classroom material to their everyday lives.
- analyze information as it relates to previous and future life situations.
- synthesize content to follow-through a problem and formulate new hypotheses.
- evaluate subject-matter to determine effectiveness of decision making in possible future situations in their lives.

Implications

Professors

Getting students to focus on the topic seems to be the first task. Professors need to make known the goals of the lesson before the lesson begins (Ericksen, 1984). Too often students do not connect the knowledge of the lesson with the reason for learning it until after the lesson has begun and at the time, without a frame of reference, they may not synthesize or evaluate this newfound information. The higher levels of cognition, which result from making the connection between new knowledge and intention, needs to take place throughout the lecture, so that every new piece of knowledge gained is synthesized into the "big picture" being formulated in the student's mind.

Students should receive feedback from professors throughout the duration of the class, so that students may then use the feedback to assess themselves (Terenzini et al., 1995). Self-assessment breeds a higher level of understanding of the material taught and of one's own cognitive processes, which theoretically leads students to perform at higher levels of cognition including analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

Most importantly, however, is the clear need for professors to become aware of cognitive levels of teaching (Whittington, 1995). When professors are aware of cognitive levels of teaching, they will become aware of those classroom behaviors or teaching techniques which help students to think at higher cognitive levels. They will, therefore, be able to assess their own teaching, plan their lesson, and revise their classroom behaviors in order to teach at higher cognitive levels.

<u>Students</u>

An interest in the subject material of the class played a large role in whether or not the student maintained attention (Ericksen, 1984). Although a plethora of thoughts were present during class, few were related to the material being presented. A large number of rhetorical questions were asked during class time. Information that could be applied to life or associated with recent circumstances, and was therefore easily understood, was more readily absorbed by students.

Certain teacher behaviors stimulate students' thought processes. When professors asked for input and ideas during class, students reported being more actively engaged in the learning process; when there was interaction with the professor, there was more motivation to pay attention and participate. Students were also motivated by visual stimulation. For example, when researchers asked students what they were thinking during a given point in class, they may not recall it until a visual aid from class was placed in front of them; at that moment students could recall what the professor was discussing and what they were thinking. Students were able to describe various gestures professors had used in reference to the subject matter. They stated that when the professor asked the class to figure out problems for themselves, more thought processes were engaged.

References

Abraham, M. R., & Renner, J. W. (1986). Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23 (2), 121-143.

Bloom, B.S. (1984). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 1 Cognitive Domain. New York: Longman.

Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay.

Bostick, T. L. (1996). Measuring cognitive levels of academic challenges in college classrooms. Unpublished Pennsylvania Governor's School for the Agricultural Sciences independent study paper. The Pennsylvania State University.

Bowen, C. W. (1994). Think-aloud methods in chemistry education: understanding student thinking. Journal of Chemical Education, 71 (3), 183-190.

Cano, J., & Newcomb, L. H. (1990). Cognitive levels of instruction and student performance among selected Ohio production agriculture programs. Journal of Agricultural Education, 31 (1), 46-51.

Cano, J., & Martinez, C. (1991). The relationship between cognitive performance and critical thinking abilities among selected agricultural education students. Journal of Agricultural Education, 32 (1), 24-29.

Ericksen, S. C. (1984). The Essence of Good Teaching: Helping Students Learn and Remember What They Learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Halpern, D. F. (1984). Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kucan, L., & Beck, I. L. (1997). Think aloud and reading comprehension research: Inquiry, instruction, and social interaction. Review of Educational Research, 67 (3), 271-299.

McCormick, D. F. (1998). Cognitive Assessment of Academic Challenges Provided by Professors in Colleges of Agriculture. Unpublished Master of Science thesis. University Park, PA. The Pennsylvania State University.

Newcomb, L. H. (1995). The genius of the agricultural education model for nurturing higher-order thinking. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 68 (6), 5-6.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). Human problem solving. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ogle, D.M. (1989). Implementing strategic teaching. Educational Leadership, 46 (4), 4-60.

Paul, R. W. (1992). Center for critical thinking and moral critique. 8 Regional Institutes On Critical Thinking Teaching Strategies Pamphlet. K-12 version brochure.

Perkins, D., & Blythe, T. (1994). Putting understanding up front. Educational Leadership, 51 (5), 4-7.

Perrone, V. (1994). How to engage students in learning. Educational Leadership, 51 (5), 11-13.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Teaching Critical Thinking Part 1: Are we making critical mistakes? Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (3), 194-198.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1995). Influences affecting the developing of students' critical thinking skills. Research in Higher Education, 36 (1), 23-39.

Thomas, R. G. (1987). Higher Order Thinking: Definition. Meaning. and Instructional Approaches. Washington, DC: Home Economics Education Association.

Underbakke, M., Borg, J. M., & Peterson, D. (1993). Researching and developing the knowledge base for teaching higher order thinking. Theory Into Practice, 32 (3), 138-44.

Webb, J. N. (1968). The Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behavior: A Working Manual. University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Whittington, M. S. (1995). Higher order thinking opportunities provided by professors in College of Agriculture classrooms. Journal of Agriculture Education, 34 (4), 3-39.

Whittington, M. S., & Bowman, G. L. T. (1994). Assessment of cognitive level of instruction, aspiration and attitude toward higher level instruction. The Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual National Agricultural Education Research Meeting. Dallas, TX.

Whittington, M. S., & Newcomb, L. H. (1991). Raising cognitive levels of college instruction. NACTA Journal, 36 (2), 8-11.

CE081369
ACTE 2000

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Using Think-Aloud Protocols to Assess Cognitive Levels of students in College Classrooms.	
Author(s):	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: Dec. 6, 2000

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 media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). 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 and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic 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.

Sign here, → please

Signature: M. Susie Whittington	Printed Name/Position/Title: M. Susie Whittington / Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: The Ohio State University 2120 Fyffe Rd Columbus Oh 43210	Telephone: 614-292-6321	FAX: 614-292-7007
	E-Mail Address: whittington.1@osu.edu	Date: 03-06-01

(over)