Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations | Graduate College

8-1971

An Analysis of Secondary Student Teachers' Effectiveness as Perceived by Self, Pupils and Supervising Teachers

Merle Bryan McDonald
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

 Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation

McDonald, Merle Bryan, "An Analysis of Secondary Student Teachers' Effectiveness as Perceived by Self, Pupils and Supervising Teachers" (1971). *Dissertations*. 3015.
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/3015

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS' EFFECTIVENESS AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PUPILS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS

by

Merle Bryan McDonald

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1971

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is difficult to recognize everyone who has been a source of assistance and encouragement in the development of this project. Appreciation is extended to principals, teachers and pupils in the Harper Creek and Springfield school systems who participated in this study.

The writer expresses gratefulness to the Mott Foundation for its financial assistance and to many colleagues at Western Michigan University who provided constant encouragement.

The writer is especially indebted to: Dr. Maurice Seay, Committee Chairman, for his direction and support; Dr. Uldis Smidchens, for his assistance in the research phase of the study; and Dr. Donald Weaver, for his guidance and inspiration throughout the study. The participation of Dr. Fred Hartenstein and Dr. Eugene Kirchherr as members of the advisory committee is acknowledged.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my family and especially to my wife, Eudoris, whose patience, understanding and assistance were instrumental in its completion.

Merle B. McDonald

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

72-2259

McDONALD, Merle Bryan, 1933-
AN ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS' EFFECTIVENESS AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PUPILS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1971
Education, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF TABLES

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educators involved in teacher education programs have long been aware of the need for improving the ways and means of preparing prospective teachers for the responsibility of teaching. Several areas of the student teaching program have increased in importance and deserve closer scrutiny. These areas include: (1) evaluation of the programs used to train professional educators; (2) evaluation of methods utilized during the student teaching experience; and (3) appraisal of the techniques utilized during the supervision of student teachers.

The problem of evaluation is especially acute today because responsible citizenship demands greater resources of information and understanding than ever before. In countless ways the demands on education have grown more complex. Many problems stem from the rapid developments in science and technology, the focus on schools as a primary means of social reform, and the shift of emphasis from academic excellence for a few toward a conception of excellence that maximizes the ability of the individual (Gardner 1961).

With education moving into a place of central significance, it is necessary that innovations and proposed changes be kept in the proper perspective. Some of the improvements in education can be brought about by: (1) building better schools; (2) introducing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

new courses of study; (3) providing new equipment; or (4) developing new standards. Really important changes, however, will come about as teachers change; because in the teacher-pupil learning process the teacher still remains the most important element. According to Combs (1965), it is the behavior of teachers in the classrooms that will finally determine whether our schools meet or fail to meet the challenge of our times.

During the past 15 years public scrutiny has been turned to teachers who are graduates of teacher-training institutions, but who have not been successful in the classroom. This scrutiny has resulted in a flood of criticism from within the ranks of education; Flesch (1955), Koerner (1963), Holt (1964), are examples of such critics. The substance of this criticism has been that the teacher-training institutions have failed to supply the schools with adequately prepared teachers.

The problem of inadequately trained teachers presents a challenge to educators who are responsible for teacher training. Thus, the evaluation of student teachers' effectiveness is of great importance to both teacher-training institutions and the prospective employing school systems. A basis for improvement in the evaluation of the student teacher is a comprehensive knowledge of the effectiveness of the student teacher. Little research has been done in the area of evaluating the perceptions supervising teachers and classroom pupils have of their student teachers. Investigation into the congruence of supervising teachers' and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher is important because both the supervising teacher and the classroom pupils are more closely associated with the student teacher than any other individuals during the student teaching experience. Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962) express the opinion that no problem area in education is as unstudied and as important as the student teaching experience. What these writers see as needed are studies which have as their aims detailed description of what goes on between student teacher and supervising teacher, an explanation of the principles which presumably underlie the ways in which this learning experience is structured and handled, the values implicit in these principles and their execution, the efficacy of the experiences which do or should precede student teaching and the development of procedures that would allow the evaluation of the effects of student teaching on the neophyte student teacher.

In most colleges and universities the only record kept concerning a student is his academic score. Only when he enters the student teaching experience are other facets of his personality evaluated. The student's academic record serves as an indicator of his mastery of courses he has taken. What is not known is whether the student is able to structure meaningful experiences for classroom pupils. In an attempt to discover how well the student teacher is able to provide meaningful experiences for classroom pupils he is required to complete a student teaching assignment. Following the completion of this training assignment

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most student teachers are employed as teachers by boards of education. In many instances the only evaluation available to the interviewing school officials concerning the student teaching experience is the evaluation made by the supervising teacher.

Sources which might provide further information relative to the potential success of a student teacher are the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's teaching behavior and the student teacher's self-perceptions of his ability as a teacher.

An individual's effectiveness as a teacher depends to a considerable extent on the nature of his perceptions (Combs, 1965). Teacher-education students take their self-perceptions with them wherever they go, and every experience they have makes its contribution by building up or tearing down positive self-perceptions (Lynch, 1961; McClendon, 1962). The development of effective teachers with positive self-perceptions will require helping each student explore and discover his personal meanings about subject matter, people, purposes, the nature of learning, teaching techniques and himself (Combs, 1965; Walberg, 1967). Perceptual psychologists are beginning to find out how to explore the nature of perceptions, but as yet there is no one simple measuring device, such as a paper and pencil test, to get at this aspect of human personality; therefore, at the present time, the alternative is to use procedures that involve judgment by observation (Combs, 1965). One form of judgment this study proposes to explore is self-evalu-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ation. Some of the richest possibilities for self-examination can be found in relationships with others; thus, it is within an interpersonal setting that one acquires most of the attitudes involved in one's view of oneself as expressed by Jersild (1955) and Zacharewicz (1953). The classroom training situation in which a student teacher is involved should have an impact upon the views of the pupils with whom he is working.

Pupils' opinions of their teachers are considered by educators and school administrators as indicative of teacher success (Bryan, 1941b; Callahan, 1949; Cobb, 1952; Hedges, 1954; Symonds, 1955). Hart (1934), in his collection of secondary school pupils' judgment of their teachers, emphasizes the importance of the pupils' regard for their instructors. The numerous studies which pertain to pupils' ratings of teachers support the importance of such judgments (Blair, 1953; Bryan, 1941; Callahan, 1949; Cobb, 1952; Dunn, 1953; Kearney, 1955; McCall, 1952; Symonds, 1955).

Research indicates that real value may be attached to pupils' perceptions of teacher effectiveness (Beck, 1957; Blair, 1953; Brown, 1965). Veldman and Peck (1963) state:

> Pupils have one major advantage over other observers: they see the teacher perform on many different occasions as he encounters a wide variety of problems, as he attempts quite varied tasks, and as he deals with individuals known personally to the observer. Not only does each pupil have the advantage of many separate observations upon which to base his judgments, the use of pupils as observers also affords the increased reliability and reduction of bias that multiple judges afford (p. 347).

Several researchers have demonstrated that there is a meaning-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ful relationship between pupils' perceptions of effective teachers and behaviors selected to measure teachers' effectiveness (Bryan, 1941, 1963; Coats, 1968). Both Bryan and Coats utilized a 12 question paper and pencil instrument that measured the classroom pupils' evaluations of their teachers' effectiveness. This study attempted to identify the student teachers' effectiveness by utilizing the same procedures used by Bryan and Coats in identifying teacher effectiveness. By using classroom students' evaluations of their teachers' strengths and weaknesses, one more source was utilized to identify successful teaching behavior.

The identification of patterns of behavior which differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers is important in developing and assessing teacher-education programs and as an aid in employing new teachers. Recognition of the importance of investigating teacher effectiveness, however, has not stimulated an adequate analysis of objective evaluation of teachers' classroom performances.

An Association of Accredited Colleges of Teacher Education study report (1953) on the quantity of previous research in teacher effectiveness indicated that during the past four decades the study of teacher competence is a unidimensional factor with the resultant thinking that the elements comprising teacher competence are the same regardless of the kind of teacher, kind of pupil, kind of educational goal, or type of situation in which education occurs; and that ratings of various types can be used as the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

criteria for determining the elements comprising unidimensional teacher competence.

Recent studies have challenged these assumptions. According to Cohen and Brawer (1967) teaching environments are extremely varied and personality is a complex and dynamic entity composed of many equally complex and dynamic forces. Due to these reasons, most searches for single qualities depicting effective teachers in various and nonspecific situations have been unfruitful.

Ryans (1952) indicates that the basic problem in the study of prediction of teacher effectiveness is one of determining in what way and to what extent various data descriptive of teacher behavior are either antecedents or concomitants of some specific criterion of teaching competence.

The majority of literature that has been reviewed in preparation for this area of investigation has been related to the classroom teachers. The same criteria and evaluation procedures used for classroom teachers should be applicable to student teachers in attempting to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of the student teacher before he enters a classroom teaching assignment. It is proposed in this study that there is a relationship among classroom pupils' perceptions, the student teacher's self-perceptions, and the supervising teacher's perceptions of certain student teaching behaviors during the student teacher's directed teaching experience. Through the study of these relationships new indicators of the student teacher's future

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

potential as a teacher may be revealed.

Statement of the Problem

The basic purpose of this study is to investigate certain relationships among the perceptions of the student teachers, supervising teachers and classroom pupils. These perceptions were of the student teacher's effectiveness as measured by selected teaching behaviors. These teaching behaviors were those exhibited by the student teacher in the classroom during his student teaching experience. The selected teaching behaviors observed were those utilized by Bryan (1958) in his study of teaching behaviors.

In this study the 12 teaching behaviors observed were:

1. Knowledge of subject
2. Clarity of explanation
3. Fairness
4. Classroom control
5. Attitude toward pupils
6. Ability to stimulate interest
7. Attitude toward subject
8. Attitude toward pupils' opinions
9. Variety in teaching procedures
10. Encouragement of pupils' participation
11. Sense of humor
12. Planning and preparation

With respect to each of the 12 behaviors the investigator

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wished to estimate the linear relationship between:

1. The student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher on each of the teaching behaviors.

2. The student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher on each of the teaching behaviors.

3. The supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher on each of the teaching behaviors.

Three relationships were studied for each teaching behavior. The study encompassed a total of 36 relationships investigated. The 36 specific questions which were investigated are listed in detail in Appendix A.

Definition of Terms

The definition of terms listed below were established for purposes of the study:

1. Student teacher: a senior at Western Michigan University who is completing Education 470 (student teaching) during the 1969 winter term.

2. Supervising teacher: a legally certified public school teacher in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, employed in the Harper Creek or Springfield school system.

3. Classroom pupil: a pupil in a public school enrolled in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 in the Harper Creek or the Springfield school system.

4. Teaching success: ratings on the pupil-opinion, supervising teacher-opinion, and student teacher-opinion questionnaires.

5. Student teaching experience; directed teaching or student teaching assignment: a 15 week period of full time involvement in a teaching situation in a public school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from January 5, 1959 to April 18, 1959.

6. Relationship: the extent that two variables are related as measured by a linear correlation coefficient.

7. Teaching behavior: that which is measured by the supervising teacher-opinion questionnaire, pupil-opinion questionnaire, and the self-opinion questionnaire which has been adopted from Bryan (1958).

8. Perception: the awareness of the process of becoming aware of extraorganic or intraorganic objects or relations or qualities, by means of sensory processes and under the influence of set and prior experiences (English and English, 1958).

9. Respondent: a person answering a questionnaire. In this study, the respondent was either a student teacher, a classroom pupil or a supervising teacher.

10. Opinion: a formulated response by an individual to a question. Terms used by various authors reported in this study that were assumed to have like meanings included: evaluation, perception and concept.

11. Knowledge of subject: a thorough knowledge and understanding of one's present teaching field.

12. Clarity of explanations: assignments and explanations given in easily understood ways.

13. Fairness: dealing in just ways with all pupils.

14. Control: maintaining order and discipline in the classroom.

15. Attitude toward pupils: patient, understanding and considerate behavior toward pupils.

16. Ability to stimulate interest: skill in making classes interesting and challenging to pupils.

17. Attitude toward subject: interest and enthusiasm toward the subject taught

18. Attitude toward pupil-opinion: respect for ideas and opinions of pupils.

19. Variety in teaching procedures: diversity in teaching methods, materials and format.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

20. Encouragement of pupils' participation: to promote sharing of pupils' ideas, questions and opinions in class.

21. Sense of humor: ability to enjoy the amusing side of personal and classroom experiences.

22. Planning and preparation: well made plans, time well budgeted and spent.

Procedure

The following procedures were used in conducting the study:

1. A comprehensive survey was made of the literature and research studies relative to the following areas: (1) successful teaching behaviors, and (2) self-perceptions and pupil-perceptions of teaching behaviors.

2. In February, 1959, approval was obtained from the appropriate administrative head of each school in which the study took place.

3. In late March, 1959, the cooperation of the student teachers was solicited and obtained. At that time the purpose of the study and the procedure for completing it was explained.

4. The questionnaire was administered to the classroom pupils, student teacher and supervising teacher simultaneously. An envelope containing instructions and the questionnaire was given to the student teacher and the supervising teacher who were each asked to leave the room, complete the questionnaire privately and wait until summoned to return. The investigator then administered the questionnaire to the classroom pupils.

5. The questionnaires were administered during the final two weeks of the student teachers' assignments.

6. The administration procedures were standardized and respondents were given assurance of anonymity.

7. The purpose of the study was explained to the respondents and they were asked to be frank in their responses. To encourage honesty, respondents were instructed not to sign their names or mention the student teachers' names.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8. Instructions were given to the respondents with regard to recording their selected responses on the optical scanning sheet.

9. The student teacher completed Bryan's (1958) student-opinion questionnaire on himself.

10. The supervising teacher completed Bryan's (1958) student-opinion questionnaire on his student teacher.

11. The classroom pupils completed Bryan's (1958) student-opinion questionnaire on their student teacher.

12. The completed optical scanning sheets were tabulated and the answers were punched on data cards by the testing service bureau of Western Michigan University.

13. The data were subjected to appropriate tests for purposes of analysis by the computer center at Western Michigan University.

14. The findings of the study were summarized, analyzed and conclusions were drawn.

15. Recommendations and suggestions were made for further study in the area of student teacher evaluation utilizing perceptions of student teachers, classroom pupils, and supervising teachers.

In the next chapter relevant literature will be reviewed. The review is followed by a discussion of the methods and procedures utilized in conducting the study. The final chapter includes the data analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Examination of the literature disclosed an abundance of material concerning successful teaching behaviors, pupils' evaluations of their classroom teachers, and self-appraisal. There was little material that dealt directly with the student teacher in these specific areas. Since the student teaching experience is simulated teaching within a classroom setting it seems reasonable to assume that the same method utilized to identify good classroom teachers may be applied to student teachers. Therefore, much of the review of literature will discuss findings related to classroom teachers; however, the literature was selected on the basis of its relevance to the purposes of the current study or its support for the rationale upon which this study was developed.

Teaching Behaviors

Numerous studies have been made to determine what teacher behaviors are indicative of effective teaching performance. These studies indicate that there is a need to identify patterns of behavior that differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers. Barr (1952-1958) periodically summarized such studies, made over a 30-year period, for the American Educational Association and his summary has been continued by Ryans (1963) and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

others. Getzels and Jackson (1963) cited 800 references that have been completed since 1950 and Domas and Tiedman (1950) in a single review annotated more than 1,000 titles.

Although the importance of identifying patterns of behavior has long been recognized, such knowledge has not stimulated the analysis or objective evaluation of teachers' classroom performances. Kleinman (1966) pointed out that more than 50 years of research have not cast much light on knowledge of factors which have been associated with good teaching. Gage and Orleans (1952) reported a summary of findings which had been presented by the American Educational Research Association in a study designed to examine meaningful ways of studying teacher effectiveness. The committee which conducted the study was convinced that no single study could be made which would be definite in this area. A large number of well-planned, interrelated studies would be necessary to acquire the insights necessary to evaluate teachers' performances effectively. The report stressed that teacher effectiveness should not be thought of as consisting of any single fixed patterns of teacher behavior. Early writers thought that different patterns of teacher behavior might be required, as the situations change, for effective teaching to continue.

Blair (1963) employed the critical incident method developed by Flanagan (1954) to (1) study classroom effectiveness of teachers' (2) report specific incidents of teaching as perceived by pupils to be effective or ineffective, (3) report the critical requirements

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of teachers inferred from the data, and (4) present frequency of incidents occuring in the various high school areas. Reports of 542 effective and 537 ineffective classroom behaviors of teachers were obtained, reported by the pupils according to their own individually established criteria. Responses from the pupils, through personal interviews, established the highly effective or ineffective incidents. The major themes were identified through category formulation. The grouping of similar behaviors produced 30 categories of effective teaching and 38 categories of ineffective teaching. The categories of teaching effectiveness constituted the critical requirements of teaching in terms of behavior as perceived by classroom pupils.

Much has been written about the need to continue the search for criteria that might be employed to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Broudy (1967) noted that, at its current state of development, evaluation of teaching success usually reflects the prejudices of the rater; therefore, the evaluation criteria may vary with the time, the community and disposition of the judges.

Another problem in the study of good teaching has been whether to assume that "effectiveness" should be a statement about the results which come out of a teaching situation. According to Fatuu (1963), when examining the polar ends of this same continuum, there should be no reason to think that effectiveness depends entirely on variables operating in the situation or on the teacher. Fattu reasoned that both assumptions were valid, dependent on the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

attributes of the teacher and partly on the teaching situation.

Results of a cooperatively sponsored project by the American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association, and the National School Boards Association were summarized and reported by Ellena (1951). Pertinent findings of the relationship of diverse qualities of the teacher and teaching success included the following:

1. Analysis of cross-sectional data indicated that the teachers' rated effectiveness at first increased rather rapidly with experience and leveled off after five years.

2. Relationship of socioeconomic status of teachers to criteria of teacher effectiveness was low.

3. Effectiveness was relatively the same for men and women teachers.

4. Married teachers were found to be as effective as unmarried teachers.

5. Attempts to identify characteristics of successful and unsuccessful teachers by constructing lists of traits based on opinion were usually unfruitful in terms of applicability for evaluation or selective purposes.

The primary purpose of teacher characteristics studies has been to discover which traits or combination of traits have been closely enough associated with teacher competence to permit prediction of such competency. Ryans (1952) identified three questions related to the criterion and its definition that must be considered in any research concerned with problems of perdiction: (1) What specific data contributed to the standard? (2) By what means were the criterion data secured? (3) How were the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

criterion data structured or patterned?

The Teacher Characteristics Study of the American Council on Education, directed by Ryans (1960), has been described as the most extensive and significant contribution thus far in the study of teacher characteristics. Over a 6-year period the findings of more than 100 separate research projects were compiled, based on the findings from more than 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools and representing approximately 450 school systems. Data were collected from classroom observations by trained activities, preferences and attitudes.

These major objectives were utilized to coordinate the various phases of Ryans' longitudinal study. These were: (1) to identify and analyze patterns of classroom behavior, attitudes, viewpoints, and intellectual and emotional attributes which characterize teachers; (2) to develop paper-and-pencil instruments suitable for the assessment of certain patterns of classroom behavior and personal qualities of teachers; and (3) to compare various groups of teachers.

Much of the Teacher Characteristics Study was directed toward determining the correlates of teacher classroom behavior which could be used to predict teacher traits and behaviors. Instruments for this purpose were developed, revised and refined by Ryans (1960), culminating in the development of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule, a self-report inventory consisting of 300 multiple choice and check-list items of personal preferences,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

self-judgments, activities, and biographical data. Reliability coefficients for the various scales ranged between .70 and .80.

The data were analyzed to determine whether any patterns of teacher behavior could be identified. In separate factor analyses three patterns of teacher behavior emerged as especially significant:

1. Pattern X_0: warm, understanding, friendly, versus aloof, egocentric, restricted teacher behavior.
2. Pattern Y_0: responsible, businesslike, systematic, as opposed to evasive, unplanned, slipshod teaching behavior.
3. Pattern Z_0: stimulating, imaginative, versus dull, routine teacher behavior.

Ryans (1960) hoped that the findings from the study might help school systems identify teachers possessing characteristics of the type deemed desirable. In addition, it was hoped that the findings might help teacher education institutions to better understand teacher characteristics, this understanding to be used in the process of selecting teacher candidates.

Biddle (1964) has described Ryans' design as classical in the sense that characteristics of teachers were abstracted from the classroom context. In addition, Ryans' efforts to develop methodized sophistication and breadth of variables to be considered have contributed much to the ultimate significance of the Teacher Characteristics Study. It has continued to serve as the foundation for most of the subsequent studies in the area of teacher characteristics.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Anderson and Hunka (1963) questioned the validity of Ryans' approach of assessing teacher proficiency through the medium of teacher traits. First, they maintained that if situational determinants of reaching proficiency were strong, teacher characteristics would have little bearing, if any, on the evaluation. Secondly, it was concluded that the financial rewards for teaching have been such that most of the highly qualified men have excluded themselves from teaching, leaving only the dedicated few who could exhibit fairly unusual characteristics.

On the basis of the findings from their studies, both Ryans (1960) and Turner (1965a) recognized that the different institutional settings have an effect on the kind of teacher behaviors considered effective. Aware of this problem, both researchers have attempted to determine which types of teacher behaviors or characteristics will be considered desirable in particular types of situational settings. Howsam (1963) emphasized the importance of such knowledge when he stated that in the future, attention must be given to the situational aspects of teacher performance and evaluation. Howsam identified three problems involved in attempting to rate or evaluate teachers: (1) the difficulty of establishing the criteria of satisfactory performance, (2) the problem of determining the nature of the evidence necessary to determine whether the criteria have been met, and (3) collecting and interpreting data.

McNeil (1967), proposed that one way to overcome these

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

problems would be for the observer-judge and the teacher to agree in advance what behavioral objectives would be sought for particular students and would be accepted as evidence that the teacher had or had not been successful in obtaining the desired outcome. McNeil conducted three separate but related experiments to determine empirically the validity and feasibility of this proposal.

The first experiment focused on supervision by objectives and supervisors' perceptions of teachers' effectiveness. This situation involved 77 secondary teachers. It was found that those student teachers who had received direction in stating their desired outcomes as behavioral objectives were perceived by their supervisors to have made the greatest gains. A second study examined the relationship between supervision according to predetermined behavioral objectives and pupil achievement. Forty-four elementary student teachers in an inner-city elementary school developed a creative writing exercise for punctuation skills. Those pupils whose teachers had stated their goals in the form of behavioral objectives exhibited the greatest growth. The final experiment attempted to assess the perceptions of student teachers of the supervisor process when supervision was based on behavioral objectives. The student teachers were nearly unanimous in their preferences for the use of pupil progress as the criterion for evaluation of their teaching efficiency. Ninety-eight per cent of the student teachers reported that the criterion "results in terms of pupil gain" was the best of five

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

bases for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Concomitantly, when the individuals being evaluated helped to determine the appropriateness of the goals, the practice of supervision by behavioral objectives did not seem to create any additional pressures upon the student teacher.

The results of the investigation by McNeil suggested that the degree of subjectivity involved in supervisors' ratings can be greatly reduced when the process of evaluation has been based on predetermined objectives cooperatively established by the rater and ratee. It was suggested that if such an approach was adopted by school systems, new insights might be gained concerning the effect institutional settings have on the evaluative process.

In a longitudinal study involving 13 school systems that were representative of Indiana systems, Turner (1965b) investigated selected characteristics of beginning teachers and their relationships to teaching efficiency. Three instruments were used to collect the data: (1) the Teacher Characteristics Schedule, (2) the Mathematics Teaching Tasks, and (3) the Teaching Tasks in Reading. Interviews were held with the supervisors of each teacher to gather data which might have relevance for predicting a teacher's success as observed by this supervisory official.

From an analysis of the data, Turner (1965b), identified three major categories or sets of variables that affected "teaching effectiveness": (1) those associated with the institutional context within which the teacher teaches, (2) those associated with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work tasks of the teacher, and (3) those associated with the personal context generated by the teacher. In this particular study, the set of variables associated with the "institutional context" dominated the other two sets in that they were found to control or moderate relationships among the variables of the three sets. He found that teachers with similar teaching behaviors but teaching in different types of settings were at polar ends of the success continuum as defined by supervisory appraisals. Turner (1965b) concluded that statements about the teaching skills, success, and effectiveness were statements about the relationship between the behaviors of a teacher and the institutional context within which he teaches.

Bryan (1962) conducted an investigation to determine the interrelationship of certain behaviors of raters and teachers. The Teacher Characteristics Schedule (TCS), and a teacher-rating device were administered to 18 principals and 111 teachers. Bryan found that: (1) teachers with high scores on scale X_o (warm, understanding, friendly), and scale Z_o (stimulating, imaginative) of the TCS were rated high on teaching performance, (2) a significant relationship existed between the quality of teacher appraisal and the degree of similarity between rater and teacher, and (3) raters who perceived themselves "inadequate" tended to rate teachers "inadequate" relative to educational viewpoint. On the basis of these findings, Bryan (1962) concluded that raters tended to evaluate teachers from an internal and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

very subjective frame of reference. Generally, these findings were consistent with those reported by other investigators who have explored the relationship of personal characteristics of teachers and their assessed effectiveness as teachers.

In an investigation reported by Kerlinger (1966), perceptions of the traits that an effective teacher should have were studied in relation to the attitudes of the rater-judge. The degree of importance of the traits was dependent on the attitudes of the individual doing the evaluating. The author hypothesized that perceptions of the traits of effective teachers were in part a function of attitudes toward education and; therefore, judges with "progressive" or "traditional" attitudes toward education would choose those characteristics corresponding with their educational beliefs. Kerlinger (1966) established congruency ranging from .71 to .92 between educational attitude factors and teacher-perception factors. The data from the three factors of the teacher were multidimensional, and among the 36 judges participating in the study there were three different perceptions of desirable traits of teachers. The data were supportive of the hypothesis being tested; perceptions of desirable traits of teachers appeared to be influenced by the judges' attitudes toward education. In addition, the evidence indicated that educational attitudes could be determinants of teacher behavior perceptions. On the basis of the judges' ratings, there were two more obvious factors behind perceptions of desirable traits of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teachers; "progressive" and "traditional" notions of teachers. Kerlinger (1957) found that the individual perceptions of desirable traits of teachers were often colored by the emphasis an individual might have given to such behaving styles as described by Ryans' (1960) X_o, Y_o and Z_o scales. From this he inferred that these effective sets were perhaps the basic factors contributing to what a particular individual or group of individuals believed to be desirable behaviors of teachers. Kerlinger (1957) pointed out that in attempting to determine what constitutes effective teaching, one must recognize that a rater's opinion about good or poor teaching would be a reflection of his basic educational orientation and, therefore, it would be essential to know the underlying criteria operating to predispose his opinion.

Sandefur and Hinely (1966) suggested that more descriptive data could provide prospective employers information relative to the particular types of teaching behaviors exhibited by the student teacher, and such information could be utilized for counseling with the student teacher concerning the particular types of situations for which he may be best suited. In addition, it was suggested that such information would provide a means of evaluating the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs.

Though teacher behaviors have been studied and measured by many individuals, very little research has been undertaken in the area of student teaching. It would seem quite logical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that the student teaching experience should receive a more thorough scrutiny since all individuals aspiring to become teachers must schedule time for such as experience. In most instances the student teaching experience is designed to provide the student teacher with an experience as near to the actual teaching situation as possible. If this is true the assumption should follow that the teaching behaviors the student teacher displays in the student teaching experience would also be evidenced in any future teaching situation in which he was to participate. The student teaching experience provides an excellent opportunity for an individual to test his teaching skills and for a teacher training institution to analyze training methods and provide a more detailed report for placement officials concerning the potentials of the teacher candidate.

Pupil Rating

In a survey of the literature it was found that investigators have followed a variety of research designs in their efforts to evaluate teacher behavior. Paraskevopoulos (1968) observed that four main sources of evaluation have been: (1) reports by supervisors, (2) observations by trained persons, (3) self-reports by teachers, and (4) ratings of teachers by pupils.

Though most investigators have concluded that many sources should be used in studies of teacher effectiveness they have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

also agreed that pupils' ratings are highly accurate indicators. Pupils have the major advantage over other observers because they see the teacher perform in a variety of situations and on a regular basis.

Bryan (1958) stated that a questionnaire designed to evaluate student opinion produces a valid measurement of students' opinions of their teachers. He stated:

> If the members of a class agree that a teacher is unsympathetic that verdict must be accepted as a true expression of their opinion. It could be accepted as little else. If pupils agree that the work is interesting, the verdict is probably a true representation of what they believe on that point. If pupils agree that they see no value in what is being taught, it is difficult to challenge that judgment. Students are capable both of having opinions and of giving reliable reports on these opinions. They are the final judges of what they think and feel (pp. 22, 23).

The opinions that pupils have of their teachers may be correct or incorrect according to the pupils' interpretations of the procedures that formulated the opinions. Since it is possible for pupils' opinions to be based on misunderstanding it would follow that this might be a common occurence. In Bryan's study (1941a) of 75 teachers who had twice obtained the written critical reactions of their pupils, the teachers were asked whether they thought their pupils had been fair in their judgments. Of the 75, 73 said they thought their pupils had been fair which seemed significant enough to discount the "misunderstanding factor".

Many studies have indicated that very real value may be attached to pupils' perceptions of teacher effectiveness as evi-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dence in evaluating teachers (Bryan, 1949b; Bush, 1954; Dunn, 1963; McCall, 1952; Symonds, 1955). McCall (1952) in dealing with teacher merit, reported that student reactions are the best available index to teacher effectiveness in the classroom and that pupils make more accurate judgments of teachers than that rendered by their peers or superiors. McCall (1952), Howsam (1963), and Webb and Nolan (1955) indicate with remarkable consistency that pupils are able to make more valid and reliable ratings of their teachers than any other group, including administrators, supervisors, and experts.

In a study when instructors were rated by their pupils and supervisors and by themselves, pupil-ratings and self-ratings were highly correlated and supervisors' ratings were not correlated with self-ratings, pupil-ratings and other measurements (Webb and Nolan, 1955).

Other investigators (Veldman and Peck, 1963; Goldberg, 1968) indicated the greatest value in using pupil-ratings is that they represent an adequate sample of observers. Pupils see more of the teacher's typical behavior on many different occasions, as he encounters a wide variety of problems, attempts quite varied tasks, and deals with individuals known personally to the observer. Veldman and Peck (1963) reported that not only do pupils have the advantage of many separate observations, but they also provide the increased reliability and reduction of bias that multiple judges afford.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bryan (1951b) approached pupil-rating in terms of the degree of agreement among pupils themselves. Bryan (1941b) discovered that the rate of agreement among pupils and among different groups of pupils, rating the same teacher, was significantly high. In analyzing the sets of reactions from three or more classes of many teachers, he found that there was very high agreement about what the pupils considered to be strong and weak qualities of their teachers. This kind of agreement was present for 95 per cent of the teachers.

Paraskevopoulos (1968) also utilized information about teachers' behaviors from pupils' points of view. The study attempted to explore the relationships between pupils' ratings of teachers' behaviors and the personality types of the teachers as well as their abilities in their knowledge of subject taught. Paraskevopoulos (1968) built the rationale for pupil-rating reliability from the study of other investigators such as Lynch (1961) who suggested that beyond the problem of reliability, pupil-ratings allow investigators to see how the pupils perceive and interpret the behaviors of their teachers. The subjective perception, more than the objectively assessed behavior by trained observers or supervisors, determines the interpersonal relationships within the classroom and sets the emotional climate conducive for learning.

Symonds (1955) indicated that one of the most important outcomes of education is the formulation of attitudes by pupils,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

particularly attitudes toward school, learning and teachers. Symonds (1955) devised a form to secure pupils' reactions to their teachers in answer to seven questions. After the teacher had been placed on a scale, according to the pupils' reactions or evaluations, they were observed directly by trained observers in order to ascertain the qualities which differentiate those that were reacted to favorably from those that were reacted to unfavorably. The results showed significant correlation among pupils' ratings of their teachers. Symonds' results agreed with a later report by Morsh and Burgess (1955) concluding that pupils seemed to know when they were well taught.

Beecher (1949) reported that pupil-opinion and pupil-reaction clearly indicate the importance of appraising teacher qualities such as fairness, understanding, cheerfulness, enthusiasm, respect for the individual, and ability to hold interest. A study (Bledsoe and Brown, 1968) showed a highly significant positive correlation between pupil-ratings of the behavioral characteristics of teachers and pupil attitudes toward teachers. Hart (1934), in his collection of secondary school pupils' judgments of their teachers, is explicit in his emphasis of the importance of pupils' regard for their instructors. Other studies that have been reported, dealing with pupils' ratings of teachers, imply the importance of such judgments (Bryan, 1954a; Callahan, 1949; Cobb, 1952).

If the contention by Bush (1954) that one of the most power-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ful factors in bringing about effective learning situations is favorable pupil regard for their teachers, then it is important for educators to consider the study and use of pupil-ratings in the evaluation of student teachers as well as classroom teachers.

Researchers, in this review, seem to agree that pupil-ratings are valuable and possibly more accurate than any other evaluations of teacher behavior. This contention provides good reason for analyzing and devising ways of using pupil-ratings in determining the quality of the teaching behaviors of the classroom teacher.

Self-Concept

In psychological discussions the word "self" has been used in many different ways. Two chief meanings emerge: (1) the self as a subject or agent, and (2) the self as the individual who is known to himself (English and English, 1958). The term "self-concept" has come into common use to refer to the second meaning, and it is with the self-concept that this study is concerned.

Early in the history of American psychology, there was interest in the self. Ruth Wylie (1961) completed the first major attempt to review the literature in the area of self-concept in which she indicated that there was such writing on several theories during the 1940s and 1950s; however, there was very little empirical work done prior to 1949.

Throughout the development of self-concept theories the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

functionalists never gave up their introspective methods, and the Gestalt psychologists injected their phenomenological methods and theories into the area of general psychology. Also being explored was the possibility of an operational behaviorism involving complex cognitive and motivational intervening variables. All of these facts implied the possibility of fusing general psychological theories of cognition and motivation with the psychoanalytic or psychodynamic theories originating in the clinic. Thus, all of the theories of personality, which have been put forth within the last several decades, assign importance to the phenomenal and/or nonphenomenal self-concept with cognitive and motivational attributes (Wylie 1961).

The major difficulties seemed to center around the degree to which self-concept theorists wish to be consistently phenomenological. On several occasions Rogers (1951) in his publication seemed to imply that only when a feeling or item of information about self or environment comes at least dimly into awareness will it influence behavior. Rogers further explained:

> The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissable to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objectives; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence (p. 136).

Rogers, continuing, implied that this organized configuration serves

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to regulate behavior and may serve to account for uniformity in the personal behavior of an individual. Rogers stated:

> As long as the self-Gestalt is firmly organized, and no contridictory material is even dimly perceived, then positive self-feelings may exist, the self may be seen as worthy and acceptable, and conscious tension is minimal. Behavior is consistent with the organized hypothesis and concepts of the self-structure (p. 191).

The most important factor in an individual's life is the development of his phenomenal self (Snygg and Combs, 1949). An individual's actions and behaviors are determined by the concepts he has of himself and his abilities. If a man thinks he is Romeo, he will act like Romeo; at least like his concept of Romeo. Snygg and Combs (1949) define the phenomenal self as "including all those aspects of the phenomenal field which the individual experiences as part or characteristic of himself (p. 78)." The phenomenal self becomes the most permanent part of the individual's phenomenal field and is the point of reference for his behavior. Snygg and Combs (1949) state:

> The basic need of everyone is to preserve and enhance the phenomenal self, and the characteristics of all people of the field are governed by this need. The phenomenal self is so important in the economy of the individual that it gives continuity and consistency to his behavior (p. 78).

It should be pointed out that Snygg and Combs use the terms self-concept and phenomenal self somewhat interchangeably; however, they appear to explain the phenomenal self as the total universe of the individual's perceptions and self-concepts as only those

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

parts of the phenomenal universe that the individual has differentiated as definite and stable characteristics of himself. The phenomenal self developed by the individual will be found to have many elements of similarity with what other people think of him. Snygg and Combs would indicate that a teacher who has been told that he is competent by collegues and supervisors will tend to see himself as competent and, therefore, tend to do a competent job of teaching.

Space and time preclude a detailed discussion of Maslow's (1954) theory of human motivating and hierarchy of needs. Basically, Maslow's theory is that all people in our society have a need or desire for a stable, firmly based, and usually high evaluation of themselves for self-respect or self-esteem and for the esteem of others. Even if all these needs are satisfied, an individual may still experience new discontent and restlessness, unless he is doing what he is fitted for. Maslow states, "What a man can be he must be. This need we call self-actualization (p. 91)." Self-actualization refers to man's desire for self-fulfillment, namely, the tendency for him to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming (Maslow, 1954).

Extremely adequate, self-actualizing persons seem to be characterized by essentially positive views of self. Combs (1965) lists the following qualities for highly adequate persons:

1. They tend to see themselves in essentially positive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ways. That is to say, they see themselves as generally liked, wanted, successful, able persons of dignity, worth, and integrity.

2. They perceive themselves and their world accurately and realistically. These people do not deceive themselves. They are able to confront the world with openness and acceptance, seeing both themselves and external events with a minimum of distortion or defensiveness.

3. They have deep feelings of identification with other people. They feel " at one with" large numbers of persons of all kinds and varieties. This is not simply a surface manifestation of "liking people" or being a "hail-fellow-well-met" type of person. Identification is not a matter of polished social graces, but a feeling of oneness in the human condition.

4. They are well informed. Adequate people are not stupid. They have perceptual fields which are rich, varied, and available for use when needed (p. 70).

When Combs describes the adequate personality as feeling positive about himself, it is the individual's self-concept that Combs is talking about. Combs describes self-concept as: "the way in which an individual characteristically sees himself. This is the way he 'feels' about himself (ASCD, 1962, p. 51)."

In the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (1962), a committee of educators explored what the concept of the adequate personality meant for educational practice. They came to the basic conclusion that the goal of education is to produce persons that possess the qualities of the self-actualized persons as generally described by Combs in the preceding paragraph.

Jersild (1955) in his book, When Teachers Face Themselves, considered what concepts of self-understanding and self-accep-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tance mean for teachers. He discussed concerns teachers feel they must face in their personal and professional lives when they examine the meaning of what they are and what they teach and when they need to share the personal problems of their pupils. Jersild stated his position thusly:

> An essential function of good education is to help the growing child to know himself and to grow in healthy attitudes of self-acceptance.
>
> A teacher cannot make much headway in understanding others or in helping others to understand themselves unless he is endeavoring to understand himself. If he is not engaged in this endeavor, he will continue to see those whom he teaches through the bias and distortions of his own unrecognized needs, fears, desires, anxieties, hostile impulses, and so on.
>
> The process of gaining knowledge of self and the struggle for self-fulfillment and self-acceptance is not something an instructor teaches others. It is not something he does to or for them. It is something in which he himself must be involved (pp. 13-14).

The authors thus far have been discussing the self-concept in terms of one's total concept of himself. Brookover and Erickson (1969) approached self-concept in a different light: "From a sociological perspective, the self-conceptions which are most relevant are those by which we define our role in the situation which we wish to account for (p. 102)." Thus each individual learns the particular ways society, various groups, and certain persons expect him to behave in each of his roles. He also develops role expectations for self which are a function of his experiences with others. Brookover and Erickson (1969) state: "Whatever the role expectations for self as a student,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

goals, and so forth are, they are by definition self-concepts (p. 102)." Self-conceptions, therefore, vary with the situation.

The idea derived from this theory is that the functional limits of one's ability are in part set by one's self-conception of ability to achieve success in tasks relative to others. Brookover (1955) states:

> In this context, the self is the intervening variable between the normative patterns of the social group or the role expectations held by significant others, on one hand, and the learning of the individual, on the other. We hypothesize that, for the expectations of others to be functional in a particular individual's behavior, they must be internalized and become a part of the person's conception of himself. Although we recognize the relevance of self in all aspects of human behavior, our interest at this point is in a particular aspect of self as it functions in the school learning situation. We postulate that the child acquires, by taking the role of the other, a perception of his own ability as a learner of the various types of skills and subjects which constitute the school curriculum. If the child perceives that he is unable to learn mathematics or some other area of behavior, this self-concept of his ability becomes the functionally limiting factor of his school achievement. "Functional limit" is the term used to emphasize that we are speaking not of genetic organic limits on learning but rather of those perceptions of what is appropriate, desirable, and possible for the individual to learn. We postulate the latter as the limits that actually operate, within broader organic limits, in determining the nature or extent of the particular behavior learned (pp. 3-4).

Researchers have found that self-ratings are what may be considered fairly accurate judgments of one's ability and the self-concept may be considered the personal perceptions that are associated with the individual's experiences related to the specific concept (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954; Medley and Mitzel, 1959; McClendon, 1962).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Walberg (1967) studied the dimensions of self-concept in teacher trainees as they imagined themselves in the role of the teacher. He concluded that student teachers do not see themselves in the same dimensions that pupils see teachers. He also found that student teachers thought of the classroom teachers in terms of their general goodness and various forms of rigidity. However, when student teachers rated themselves in the role of teachers, they invoked the pupil-centered dimensions of empathy and continence.

In an attempt to look at the discrepensies that appear in how an individual sees a professional (teacher) and himself in that same role Zacharewicz (1963) measured the relationships between teaching attitudes of prospective teachers and their self-descriptions. Utilizing the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Guilford Zimmerman Temperment Survey, Zacharewicz suggested that there was a positive correlation between self-acceptance and effective teacher-pupil attitudes. He also found that student teachers with effective teacher-pupil attitudes, in describing their real self and ideal self, scored higher on such traits as emotional stability, ascendance, objectivity, friendliness and personal relations. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank was administered to both male and female student teachers that included both the "best" and the "poorest" of each sex. Most noteworthy of the relationships revealed was that the "best" students were interested in working with people, in selecting occupations

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

involving teaching, and in pursuing intellectual interests. The "poorest" students tended to avoid occupations related to teaching and to select those which offered personal gain. They considered salary the most important prerequisite for selecting occupations and they failed to identify themselves with interests requiring intellectual ability.

Before individuals can change their methods of teaching and how they feel about the types of problems which are of importance to them they must be able to identify and change attitudes, if needed, about themselves. The key person in guiding children through successful learning experiences is the teacher. The quality of these experiences rests largely on the kind of person the teacher is. His background, his insights, his sensitivity, and his effectiveness determine to a large extent the caliber of teaching performance in the classroom.

Teaching behaviors that are successful, the effects of a positive self-concept and the role of the pupils' reactions to their teacher, all meshed together, contribute to a well organized and productive group. Each of these areas has been studied in various manners and degrees. However, to the knowledge of this investigator, no effort to the present has been made to evaluate the relationship among these areas during the period of time that a student is undergoing his student teaching experience. The intent of this research was to explore some of the teaching behaviors of the student teacher in much the same manner that the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classroom teachers' behaviors were studied. The mode of exploration was through the perceptions of the student teacher, classroom pupils, and supervising teacher. These perceptions were measured by use of a paper and pencil test administered by this researcher. The intent of this study was to substantiate the validity of pupil evaluations thus identifying another source for use in screening future classroom teachers. The results may also provide information for teacher training institutions that would be beneficial in planning future training programs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Review of the Problem

The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine the pairwise relationship between student teachers', classroom pupils' and supervising teachers' perceptions of selected teaching behaviors demonstrated by the student teacher.

Selection of the Teaching Behaviors

The twelve teaching behaviors utilized by Bryan (1963) were used to indicate the possible teaching success of student teachers. These characteristics were placed into two broad areas of teaching skills: (1) classroom methods and (2) relationship to pupils. The twelve teaching behaviors selected included: (1) knowledge of subject, (2) clarity of explanation, (3) fairness, (4) classroom control, (5) attitude toward pupils, (6) ability to stimulate interest, (7) attitude toward subject, (8) attitude toward pupils' opinions, (9) variety of teaching procedures, (10) encouragement of pupils' participation, (11) sense of humor, and (12) planning and preparation.

The reliability of Bryan's scale had been checked frequently and those scales with low reliabilities had been replaced with scales with higher reliabilities. As indicated in Table 1,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the reliability coefficients for the items on Bryan's (1968) questionnaire ranged from .82 to .97.

TABLE 1

Reliability of Items on Bryan's Student-Opinion Questionnaire

item number	reliability coefficient
1	.87
2	.82
3	.84
4	.95
5	.88
6	.87
7	.90
8	.86
9	.97
10	.77
11	.91
12	.90

The preceding reliability coefficients of the 12 items listed in Table 1 were based upon the responses given by 24 to 32 pupils per class. The correlation coefficients were based on the chance halves of the pupils' responses from 50 randomly selected classes and were converted to the reported coefficients for whole classes by reliability (Bryan 1968). On the basis of what has been presented it is felt that Bryan's questionnaire is a reliable instrument.

Bryan's questionnaire was modified to the extent that it contained appropriate wording for each group that was selected to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

respond to it without changing the intent or meaning of the question asked. The supervising teacher-opinion questionnaire contained the same wording in each of the questions, only the instructions to the respondents differed. The self-opinion questionnaire contained only changes in wording that related to the question to one's self such as: "does he....? to "do you....?" A sample of each questionnaire is found in the appendix C, D, E respectively.

Selection of Schools

Two school systems were selected for inclusion in this study. Both systems were in suburban communities in the state of Michigan. Each school system had a working agreement with Western Michigan University in regard to the student-teacher-training program. Both school systems were familiar to the investigator and were receptive to the objectives of the study. It was for these reasons that the Springfield and Harper Creek school systems were selected as the locations in which to conduct this study rather than any other school system that is involved with Western Michigan University in the training of teachers.

Selection of Sample

The student teachers that were included in this study were those assigned to the selected school systems; they were seniors

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

at Western Michigan University who had registered in Education 470 (student teaching) for the 1969 winter term, they were assigned to the Springfield and Harper Creek school systems by the Western Michigan University directed teaching office. Table 2 indicates, among other facts, that only secondary (grades 7-12) student teachers were included in this study; a total of 25 was selected, 17 males and 8 females. The following subject areas were represented: social studies, English, art, speech, typing, business education, foreign language, psychology, mathematics, science, industrial arts, physical education and community living. The amount of time a student teacher taught the class selected for the study varied from 8 to 13 weeks.

The supervising teacher sample was determined by his acceptance of a student teacher. All supervising teachers were on tenure; there were 16 males and 9 females.

The classroom pupil sample was determined by; (1) the inclusion of their student teacher in the study, (2) whether the student teacher had taught the class a minimum of six weeks, (3) whether the class size was greater than 15, and (4) if the student teacher had taught more than one class that met all the criteria, then the investigator selected one at random. The two main contributing factors that limited this study to secondary pupils were: (1) the instrument selected for evaluation had been standardized on grades 7 through 12, and (2) it was thought that this age pupil would be better able to interpret his percep-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tions, thus, giving more credence to his responses.

Grade levels selected were as follows: 2 seventh-grades, 3 seventh- and eighth-grade combinations, 8 eighth-grades, 1 ninth- and tenth-grade combination, 4 tenth grades, 3 eleventh-grades, and 1 twelfth-grade. The total number of classroom pupils selected was approximately 600.

TABLE 2

Population Characteristics

student teacher	sex of student teacher	sex of critic teacher	subject taught	grade level	time taught*	number of pupils
A	M	M	SS	8	11	30
B	F	F	English	8	13	32
C	M	M	Art	7&8	10	22
D	M	F	Bus. Ed.	8	9	30
E	M	M	English	8	9	34
F	F	F	English	8	13	30
G	M	F	Speech	7&8	11	24
H	M	M	Bus. Ed.	11	12	23
I	M	M	Science	9&10	12	29
J	F	F	Bus. Ed.	12	8	18
K	M	M	Ind. Arts	7&8	8	25
L	M	M	SS	11	12	30
M	F	F	SS	7	11	25
N	M	M	Psy.	12	12	22
O	M	M	SS	12	11	20
P	F	F	Spanish	10	9	30
Q	F	F	English	7	11	24
R	M	M	Shop	10	9	16
S	M	M	SS	12	11	25
T	M	M	English	11	11	34
U	F	F	Home Ec.	10	13	27
V	M	M	Science	8	9	26
W	F	M	Bus. Ed.	10	13	30
X	M	M	Phy. Ed.	8	11	34
Y	M	M	SS	8	11	33

*Time student teacher taught in weeks

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Selection of Evaluation Instrument

A questionnaire was selected as the type of instrument to be used in collecting the desired data. Bryan, former director of the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University, had worked for over 30 years in the area of student opinion. A reliable procedure and instrument, the Student Opinion Questionnaire, had been carefully developed and employed by Bryan (1968) during his directorship of the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University.

Since Bryan's instrument had been proven to be reliable and useful in measuring student perceptions of classroom teachers, on the secondary level, it was selected as the most appropriate instrument to be adopted for use in the measurement of perceptions concerning secondary student teachers. On the questionnaire an individual could indicate his perception of the following 12 items:

1. Knowledge of subject
2. Clarity of explanation
3. Fairness
4. Classroom control
5. Attitude toward pupils
6. Ability to stimulate interest
7. Attitude toward subject
8. Attitude toward pupils' opinions
9. Variety of teaching procedures

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

10. Encouragement of pupils' participation
11. Sense of humor
12. Planning and preparation

Collection and Organization of Data

The collection of the data required for the design of this study was initiated during the winter term of the 1958-59 academic year. During February, 1959, the investigator met with the appropriate school officials to explain the study and to obtain permission to carry out the study. The construction of the questionnaire (Appendix C, D, E) and an optical scanning sheet were completed and presented during the months of February and March. It was decided to collect the data during the last two weeks of the student teaching experience; thus allowing for maximum time for the student teacher to demonstrate and the observer to view the teaching behaviors being measured. The reader is reminded that none of the participants in the study were aware of their involvement until a week prior to the evaluation period. During the last week of March, all the secondary student teachers were called to a group meeting. At this time, the study was explained to them and their cooperation was sought. One-hundred per cent participation was obtained. The student teachers were asked to provide the following information: (1) the classes they had taught or were teaching, (2) the time of day the classes had met, (3) the number of pupils that had been in the class, and (4) the period of time in which they had been responsible for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teaching each class. From this information, a class was selected for the study and a time schedule set for administering the questionnaire.

On the date and at the time agreed upon, the investigator arrived at the classroom selected for use in the study. The questionnaire was administered to the student teacher, supervising teacher, and the classroom pupils simultaneously. An envelope containing the appropriate questionnaire, pencil and optical scanning sheet was given to each student teacher and supervising teacher. After brief instructions, the student teacher and the supervising teacher were asked to leave the room, complete the questionnaire in private, place the completed questionnaire in the envelope, and return to the classroom in 10 to 12 minutes. During the student teacher's and supervising teacher's absence from the classroom, the investigator administered the questionnaire to the classroom pupils. The purpose of the study was explained to the pupils and the procedure for filling out the optical scanning sheet was demonstrated, by the administer, on the chalk board. The pupils were assured of anonymity and asked to be frank and honest in their answers. In order to encourage honesty, the pupils were asked not to sign their names or to mention the student teacher by name. Each pupil was given a 2-H pencil, pupil-opinion questionnaire and an optical scanning sheet. When finished, pupils were instructed to place their completed optical scanning sheets, questionnaires, and pencils on the front

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of their desks. The investigator placed the completed optical scanning sheets in an envelope, thanked the pupils for their cooperation, and returned the classroom pupils to the student teacher who had been waiting in the hallway. The envelopes containing the completed information were also obtained from the student teacher and supervising teacher by the investigator before proceeding to the next assignment.

The administration procedures were standardized and carried out by the investigator in an attempt to reduce the errors that can occur when multiple administrators are utilized.

One-hundred per cent participation was obtained from the student teachers, supervising teachers and classroom pupils. The completed optical scanning sheets were taken to the testing bureau at Western Michigan University. There the testing service bureau transferred the information from the answer sheets to data cards. The data cards were used as input devices for the computer.

Treatment of Data

The data collected in this study included: (1) the responses of student teachers, (2) the responses of supervising teachers, and (3) the responses of classroom pupils to the instruments used to measure their perceptions of the selected teaching behaviors exhibited by the student teacher. The classroom pupils' responses were averaged for each of the classrooms involved in the study. Therefore, all references to classroom pupils' responses are mean

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

score responses for that class.

The raw score on each item, for each respondent, was transferred to a data card, which is a computer input device. Other information, such as sex, grade level, and subject area was also coded on the data cards, even though these were not criteria for the study. The information was recorded for personal evaluation and possible future use. All the subsequent operations were implemented through the use of appropriate equipment at the Computer Center at Western Michigan University. The investigation was designed to measure the correlation between the perceptions of the student teacher and supervising teacher, the student teacher and classroom pupils, and the supervising teacher and classroom pupils of certain selected teaching behaviors demonstrated by the student teacher during his student teaching internship.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was used to determine the correlation for each pair-wise set of respondents to each of the 12 selected teaching behaviors. To determine whether a correlation score was significantly different from zero, the .05 level of confidence was chosen. The .05 level of significance was tested by using the Fisher r to Z transformation (Hays, 1963). It was determined that for the sample size of 25 a correlation coefficient must be greater than .40 to reject the null hypothesis of zero correlation using the .05 level of significance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Teacher assessment and evaluation has been a complex and controversial subject. The assumptions and perceptions of researchers with respect to the criteria to be employed when analyzing teacher effectiveness have changed as new knowledge has been gained in this area of study. It is generally agreed that there is no single teaching characteristic that is superior to all others. Instead, a combination of traits has been identified as contributing to the effectiveness of teachers.

In comparison, little research has been done in the area of student teaching success or lack of teaching success. Student teachers, except for not having completed their student teaching assignments, can be thought of as qualified teachers. If this assumption is correct, the techniques applied in researching teacher behaviors should be applicable to student teachers, thus helping to identify strong and weak teaching behaviors before individuals enter the professional teaching ranks.

The fundamental problem in the study of perceptions of student teacher effectiveness was one of determining in what way and to what extent various data, descriptive of teacher behaviors are either antecedents or concomitants of some specific criterion of student teacher competence. The potentially positive effects of early identification of the strong and weak teaching behav-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

iors upon the quality of instruction and the need for further knowledge concerning the perceptions about these behaviors led to the development of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of the investigation was to determine the relationship between the student teacher, supervising teacher and pupil-perceptions of the selected teaching behaviors exhibited by student teachers as measured by the pupil-opinion questionnaire, the supervising teacher-opinion questionnaire and the self-opinion questionnaire.

The Sample

The sample population utilized in the investigation consisted of 25 secondary student teachers who enrolled in Education 470 during the winter term at Western Michigan University. For purposes of this study, usable data were obtained from 25 student teachers, 25 supervising teachers and 590 classroom pupils.

The Source of Data

The data, essential for the design of the study, were gathered during the winter term of the 1968-69 academic school year. During April, 1969, a packet containing the material and instructions for completing the questionnaire was given to each student teacher and supervising teacher. At the same time the question-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

naire was administered to their classroom pupils. The instrument was administered to obtain opinions on the following 12 teaching behaviors of the student teacher: (1) knowledge of subject, (2) clarity of explanation, (3) fairness, (4) classroom control, (5) attitude toward pupils, (6) ability to stimulate interest, (7) attitude toward subject, (8) attitude toward pupils' opinions, (9) variety of teaching procedures, (10) encouragement of pupils' participation, (11) sense of humor, and (12) planning and preparation. Usable data were obtained from 25 (100 per cent) of the supervising teachers, and 590 (100 per cent) of the classroom pupils.

The Analysis of Data

The data for analysis in this study were comprised of, (1) responses of student teachers, who did their student teaching during the 1958-1959 winter term, to the self-opinion questionnaire, (2) the responses of the supervising teachers, who supervised the student teachers, to the supervising teacher-opinion questionnaire and (3) the responses of the classroom pupils, taught by the student teacher, to the pupil-opinion questionnaire. The responses of the classroom pupils were averaged for each class involved in the study and the averages were utilized in computing the correlation coefficient scores. The respondents selected one of five choices: (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) average, (4) good, or (5) excellent. Each choice was assign-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ed a numerical value ranging from zero to four. The data were coded, scored, tabulated, organized and placed on data cards to facilitate the treatment of the data by a computer. The subsequent statistical procedures were completed through the facilities of the Computer Center at Western Michigan University. A mean score was computed for the responses of each group of respondents (student teacher, supervising teacher and classroom pupil). The mean scores were used in computing the correlations of the responses.

A Pearson r was computed for each pair of responses on each of the 12 behaviors measured. For example, on the behavior "knowledge of subject" the paired scores were (XY), (XZ), and (ZY), where X= student teacher, Y= classroom pupils and Z= supervising teacher. These correlations indicated two things: (1) the magnitude of the relationship and (2) information about the direction of the relationship. To determine whether the null hypothesis, that the correlation coefficient is zero, may be rejected the .05 level of significance was chosen. The null hypothesis was tested by converting r to R.A. Fisher's Z function. It was determined that for the sample size of the study a correlation coefficient must be greater than .40 to be significant at the .05 level.

The design of an investigation of this nature dictates that several variables, which could affect the findings, not be controlled. Therefore, no attempt was made to relate the findings to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the male-female relationship between student teacher, supervising teacher, classroom pupil, nor the respective subject areas taught. Another variable that was not controlled was whether the student teacher was teaching in his major or minor area of preparation.

Table 2 indicates that some characteristics of the populations studied were:

1. The student teacher population consisted of 68 per cent males and 32 per cent females.

2. Defining junior high as grades 7 and 8, 52 per cent of student teachers taught in the junior high and 48 per cent taught in the senior high.

3. The junior high student teacher population consisted of 70 per cent males and 30 per cent females. At the high school level 66 per cent were males and 34 per cent females.

4. The supervising teacher sample consisted of 16 males or 64 per cent of the sample, and 9 females or 36 per cent of the sample.

5. Fifty-four per cent of the junior high supervising teachers were males and 46 per cent were females. At the high school level, 75 per cent of the supervising teachers were males and 25 per cent were females.

6. The student teacher, supervising teacher sex combinations consisted of 60 per cent male-male, 28 per cent female-female, 12 per cent male student teacher-female supervising teacher.

7. The classroom pupil sample ranged in number from 16 to 34.

Findings

In this section the major findings of the study are described and analyzed. The presentation follows the sequence of the "Specific Question to be Investigated" listed in Appendix A. A

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

complete table of the basic statistics for all combined groups is presented in Appendix B.

Question 1 investigated the extent of relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject". "Knowledge of subject" was examined as three related questions:

1A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

1B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

1C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

The correlation coefficients in Table 3 indicate that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the student teacher and supervising teacher, while the least relationship was between the supervising teacher and classroom pupils. The extent of the relationship between student teacher and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. The nature of these relationships seemed to indicate that there was the greatest agreement between the student teachers and classroom pupils, while the least agreement appeared between the supervising teacher and the classroom pupils.

Speculation might suggest that the reason for the low correlation among classroom pupils, student teachers and supervising

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teachers is that the classroom pupils view the subject matter presented in the classroom as not being relevant to the problems of today, while on the other hand, the student teacher knows what the supervising teacher expects of him and consequently attempts to live up to that expectation in the classroom.

TABLE 3

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Knowledge of Subject

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.754*
student teachers- classroom pupils	.179
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.089

r= correlation coefficient
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 2 investigated the extent of relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of student teachers' "clarity of explanation". "Clarity of explanation" was examined as three related questions:

2A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanation"?

2B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanation"?

2C. What is the relationship between the supervising

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanations"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 4 indicates that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. The greatest relationship appears between the classroom pupils and supervising teacher, while the least relationship appears between the supervising teacher and the student teacher on "clarity of explanations".

The correlation between student teachers and supervising teachers may be small because of the way in which the supervising teacher views the methods of explanation used by the student teacher. The student teacher's novice explanations to pupils may be viewed with dissaproval by the supervising teacher because they do not parallel the supervising teacher's methods or because the student teacher's methods appear to be unclear to the supervising teacher.

TABLE 4

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Clarity of Explanation

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.037
student teachers- classroom pupils	.203
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.229

r= correlation coefficient

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Question 3 investigated the extent of relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness". "Fairness" was examined as three related questions as follows:

3A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

3B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

3C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 5 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the supervising teachers and classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the student teacher and classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between student teachers and supervising teachers was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

One might speculate that the reason the lesser relationship appears, in both comparisons where the student teacher is involved, is that the student teacher as a novice attempts to be fair with all pupils and consequently may create other impressions in his attempt.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 5

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Fairness

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.158
student teachers- classroom pupils	.095
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.284

r= coefficient of correlation

Question 4 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "control" in the classroom. "Control" was examined as three related questions:

4A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "control"?

4B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "control"?

4C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "control"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 5 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between supervising teachers and student teachers, while the least relationship was between student teachers and classroom pupils. The extent of relation-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ship between supervising teachers and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

It is possible that the reason the supervising teachers' and student teachers' correlations are high is that both envision maintaining discipline as one of the major roles of a teacher, thus, concluding that all methods utilized by the teacher to communicate to classroom pupils are conceived with the idea of classroom control. Classroom pupils on the other hand would consider only the obvious disciplinary procedures as methods of classroom control.

TABLE 6

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Control

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.550*
student teachers- classroom pupils	.319
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.321

r=coefficient of correlation
*=significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 5 investigated the extent of relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils". "Attitude toward pupils" was examined as three related questions as follows:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils"?

5B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils"?

5C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 7 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appeared, however, that the greatest relationship was between the supervising teachers and classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between student teachers and classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between student teachers and supervising teachers was in the size between the other two pair-wise comparisons. Through speculation it might appear that the reason for the lesser relationship, in both comparisons where the student teacher is involved, is that the student teacher in his new role of "teacher" thinks of himself as apart from the classroom while the supervising teacher and classroom pupils consider him a part of the classroom unit with his age and ideals being close to those of the classroom pupils.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 7

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Attitude Toward Pupils

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.232
student teachers- classroom pupils	.176
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.616*

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 6 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest". "Ability to stimulate interest" was examined as three related questions:

6A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

6B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

6C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 8 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the supervising teachers and the classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between student teachers and supervising teachers was in size between the other two

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pair-wise comparisons.

It is possible that the reason student teachers' and classroom pupils' correlation is high is that the student teacher is anxious to make his presentations relevant to the needs of the classroom pupils. In attempting to bridge the communication gaps the student teacher utilizes new teaching techniques and at the same time displays great amounts of enthusiasm. Classroom pupils realize what the student teacher is attempting to do and they react accordingly giving each a sense of accomplishment. The supervising teacher may at the same time view the procedures as attempts by the student teacher to be a "well liked friend" of the classroom pupils and not as having value in stimulating interest and learning in the subject area taught.

TABLE 8

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Ability to Stimulate Interest

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.352
student teachers- classroom pupils	.522*
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.257

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 7 investigated the extent of the relationship be-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tween pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject". "Attitude toward subject" was examined as three related questions:

7A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

7B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

7C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 9 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the student teachers and the classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the supervising teachers and classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between the student teachers and supervising teachers was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

One might speculate that the reason the lesser relationship appears, in both comparisons when the supervising teacher is involved, is that the supervising teacher views the student teacher's enthusiasm displayed as youthful zeal rather than as the tried and true skill and devotion that the veteran has for his subject. Conversely, the student teacher and classroom pupils view the enthusiasm of the student teacher as positive stimulation toward the subject.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 9

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Attitude Toward Subject

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.371
student teachers- classroom pupils	.504*
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.284

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 8 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions". "Attitude toward pupils' opinions" was examined as three related questions:

8A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

8B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

8C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 10 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the student teachers

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and the classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the student teachers and supervising teachers. The extent of relationship between supervising teachers and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

Speculation might suggest that the reason for the lesser relationship, in both comparisons where the supervising teacher is involved, is that the supervising teacher may tend to view the student teacher's acceptance of the classroom pupil, as an individual, as a way of attempting to be liked rather than as genuine acceptance and regard.

TABLE 10

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Attitude Toward Pupils' Opinions

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.112
student teachers- classroom pupils	.295
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.156

r= coefficient of correlation

Question 9 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "variety of teaching procedures". "Variety of teaching procedures" was examined as three related questions:

9A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "variety of teaching procedures"?

9B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "variety of teaching procedures"?

9C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "variety of teaching procedures"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 11 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears, however, that the greatest relationship was between the student teacher and classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the supervising teacher and the classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between the student teachers and supervising teachers was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

One speculation might be that the reason for the lesser relationship, appearing in both cases where the supervising teacher is involved, is that the supervising teacher views the enthusiasm and fresh ideas of the student teacher as devices to gain the admiration of the classroom pupils rather than as evidence of skill in varied teaching procedures.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 11

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Variety of Teaching Procedures

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.366
student teachers- classroom pupils	.459*
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.242

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 10 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupils" participation." "Encouragement of pupils' participation" was examined as three related questions:

10A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupils' participation"?

10B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupils' participation"?

10C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupils' participation"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 12 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears that the greatest relationship was between the student teachers and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the supervising teachers and student teachers. The extent of relationship between the supervising teachers and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

It is possible that the reason the student teachers' and supervising teachers' correlation is small is that the supervising teacher may not view the student teacher's methods as those which encourage classroom pupils' participation in meaningful and legitimate ways. Instead the supervising teachers may view the student teacher's methods as attempts to prove that the classroom pupils are enthralled with the subject and teacher.

TABLE 12

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Encouragement of Pupil Participation

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.083
student teachers- classroom pupils	.400*
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.261

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 11 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor". "Sense of humor" was examined as three related questions:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

11A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

11B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

11C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 13 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears that the greatest relationship was between the student teachers and the classroom pupils, while the least relationship was between the student teachers and supervising teachers. The extent of relationship between supervising teachers and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

One might speculate that the reason the lesser relationship appears, in both comparisons where the supervising teacher is involved, is that the supervising teacher tends to view his role as teacher in a more routine and joyless manner. This attitude may have developed through years of experience.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 13

Correlation Coefficients Between Pairs of Respondents on Sense of Humor

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.234
student teachers- classroom pupils	.417*
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.359

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

Question 12 investigated the extent of the relationship between pairs of respondents based on their perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning", which was examined as three related questions:

12A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

12B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

12C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

The correlation coefficient in Table 14 indicated that all three pair-wise comparisons are positive. It appears that the greatest relationship was between the student teachers and the supervising teachers, while the least relationship was between the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supervising teachers and classroom pupils. The extent of relationship between the supervising teachers and classroom pupils was in size between the other two pair-wise comparisons.

It is possible that the reason the student teachers' and supervising teachers' correlation is the highest is that the student teacher knows what the supervising teacher expects of him and plans his teaching to meet that expectation.

TABLE 14

Correlation Coefficient Between Pairs of Respondents on Preparation and Planning

Pair	r
student teachers- supervising teachers	.602*
student teachers- classroom pupils	.224
supervising teachers- classroom pupils	.138

r= coefficient of correlation
*= significant at .05 level of confidence

In summary, 9 of the correlation scores were significant at the .05 level of confidence. Of the 9 significant scores, 5 were found in the student teacher-pupil scores, 2 in the student teacher-supervising teacher scores and 1 in the supervising teacher-classroom pupils scores.

The behaviors, with significant correlation scores between student teachers and supervising teachers were those that could be labeled "teacher centered": (1) knowledge of subject, (2) preparation and (3) classroom control. In contrast, the behaviors with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

significant correlation scores between student teachers and pupils were those that could be labeled "pupil centered": (1) encouragement of pupil participation, (2) variety of teaching procedures, (3) attitude toward subject and (4) ability to stimulate interest.

Perhaps the student teacher is able to identify behaviors important to his supervisor and classroom pupils. Supervising teachers expect emphasis on course content and classroom pupils desire material relevant to their current lives and interests. The student teacher would tend to be more pupil oriented.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this investigation, the following recommendations are made:

1. Follow-up studies should be conducted to determine the extent to which "good" and "poor" teaching behaviors exhibited by the student teacher, during his directed teaching experience, are related in his future classroom practices. Follow-up studies are suggested for the first, third, fifth and tenth year of teaching after college graduation. It must be recognized that part of the population will change yearly. The teacher will remain the same person basically, while his pupils change yearly. It is the researcher's opinion that all pupils know when they are well taught; therefore, the classroom pupils' perceptions would remain a valid factor in yearly evaluation.

2. Further research is needed to determine whether the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

relationships remain the same when certain behaviors are controlled such as sex of student teacher, sex of supervisor, age of supervisor, grade level of pupils, subject taught and the educational philosophy of the school system.

3. Further studies utilizing identical instruments should be made in an attempt to learn more about the effect that moderating or manipulating the variables may have on the relationship between teaching behaviors and evaluations of the student teacher's teaching behaviors.

4. Longitudinal research should be conducted to determine the types of instruments which will provide the most effective means of measuring the perceptions of the student teacher's teaching skills. Such knowledge should help student teachers maximize their abilities. Such research could establish guidelines that would indicate what experiences should be provided in a student teaching preparation program.

5. As a pilot study, with limited sample size, the findings cannot be termed conclusive. The study does provide a framework within which further study could be conducted to either support or reject the initial findings. In replicating the study a larger sample population is suggested.

6. A related recommendation is that the final evaluation instrument at Western Michigan University be studied, in light of the findings, to determine the value of developing an instrument that would include pupils' perceptions of student teachers' performance in the classroom.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, C.C., and Hunka, S.M. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal." Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII (Winter 1963), 74-95.

Association of Accredited Colleges of Teacher Education. Needed Research in Teacher Education. AACTE Study Series, No. 2, The Association, Washington, D.C., 1953.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1962.

Barr, Arvil S., and Jones, R.E. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency." Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (June 1958), 256-264.

_____. "Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency." Review of Educational Research, XXII (June 1952), 169-174.

Beck, William. "Pupils' Perceptions of Teacher Merit: A Factor Analysis of Five Postulated Dimensions." Journal of Educational Research, LXI (November 1967), 127-128.

Beecher, Dwight E. Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1949.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Ellena, William. Contempory Research on Teacher Effectiveness. Study Report of the American Association of School Administrators, National School Boards Association, Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association. New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Blair, John Robert. "Classroom Effectiveness of Teachers as Perceived by High School Students." Dissertation Abstracts, Michigan: University Microfilms Inc., XXIII (June 1963).

Bledsoe, Joseph C., and Brown, Iva D. "Role Perceptions of Secondary Teachers as Related to Pupils' Perceptions of Teacher Behavioral Characteristics." The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (May-June 1968), 422-429.

Brookover, Wilbur B., and Erickson, Edsel L. Society Schools and Learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

_____; Le Pere, Jean M.; Hamachek, Don E.; Thomas, Shailer; and Erickson, Edsel L. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement. Michigan: Bureau of Educational Research Services, Michigan State University, 1965.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Broudy, H.S. "Continuing Search for Criteria." American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Yearbook, XX (1957), 30-39.

Brown, I.D. "Role Perceptions of Secondary Teachers as Related to Pupils' Perceptions of Teacher Behavioral Characteristics." Dissertation Abstracts, Michigan: University Microfilms Inc., XXVI (May 1966).

Bryan, Q.R. "The Influence of Certain Characteristics of Teachers and Teacher Raters of the Quality of Formal Teacher Appraisal." Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1962.

Bryan, Roy C. "Eighty-Six Teachers Try Evaluating Student Reactions to Themselves." Educational Administration and Supervision, XVII (October, 1941a), 513-526.

_____. Reactions to Teachers by Students, Parents, and Administrators. Cooperative Research Project No. 558, sponsored by U.S. Office of Education, Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1963.

_____. "Reliability, Validity, and Needfulness of Written Student Reactions to Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, XVII (December 1941b), 555-565.

_____. Some Observations Concerning Written Student Reactions to High School Teachers. "Student Opinion Questionnaire." Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1958.

_____. Student Reactions and Merit Salary Schedules. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1958.

Bush, Robert Nelson. The Teacher-Pupil Relationship. New York: Prentice Hall Inc., 1954

Callahan, S.G. "Is Teacher Rating by Students a Sound Practice?" School and Society, LXIX (February 1949) 98-100.

Coats, William D. "Proposal for the Establishment of a Leadership Research and Development Center." Unpublished proposal, Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1958.

Cobb, Paul R. "High School Seniors' Attitude Toward Teachers and the Teaching Profession." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (January 1952), 140-144.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. "Adaptive Potential and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

First-Year Teaching Success." Journal of Teacher Education XVIII (1967), 179-185.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Domas, S.J., and Tiedman, D.V. "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography." Journal of Experimental Education, XIX, 1950, 101-218.

Dunn, J.A. "Multiple Description of Classroom Behavior via Pupil Report." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Division 15, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 29, 1963.

Ellena, William J.; Stevenson, Margret; and Webb, Harold V. Question: Who's a Good Teacher? Report of the American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association and National School Boards Association. Illinois: Evanston, Illinois, 1961.

English, H.B., and English, A.C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: David McKay Inc., 1958.

Fattu, Nicholas A. "Research on Teacher Evaluation." The National Elementary Principal, LXIII (November 1963), 19-27.

Flannagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Technique. Psychological Bulletin, LI (July 1954), 327-358.

Flesch, Rudolph. Why Johnny Can't Read and What You Can Do About It. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955.

Gage, N.L., and Orleans, Jacob S. "Guiding Principles in the Study of Teaching Effectiveness." Journal of Teacher Education, III (December 1952), 294-298.

Gardner, John W. Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper and Roe, 1961.

Getzels, J.W., and Jackson, P.W. "The teacher's Personality and Characteristics." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963

Goldberg, Janice B. "Influence of Pupils' Attitudes on Perception of Teachers' Behaviors and on Consequent School Work."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Journal of Educational Psychology, XIX (1968), 1-5.

Hart, Frank W. Teacher and Teaching. New York: Macmillan Co., 1934.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Hedges, W.D., and MacDougall, M.A. "Recording Student Perceptions of Teacher Behavior by Means of a Student Monitor." Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (1964), 163-166.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1964.

Howsam, Robert B. "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore." The National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November 1963), 5-18.

Jersild, Arthur. When Teachers Face Themselves. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1955.

Kearney, Nolan and Rocchio, P.D. "Relation Between a Teacher Attitude Inventory and Pupils' Ratings of Teachers." School Review, LXIII (September 1955), 443-445.

_____. "The Factor Structure and Content of Perceptions of Desirable Characteristics of Teachers." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXVII (Autumn 1957), 543-555.

Kleinman, Gladys S. "Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: the State of Art." Science Education, L (April 1966), 234-238.

Koerner, James. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Kuhn, Manford H., and McPartland, Thomas S. "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes." American Sociological Review, XIX (February 1954), 68-74.

Lynch, W.W. "Person Perception: Its Role in Teaching." Indiana University School of Education Bulletin, XXXVLL (1961), 1-37.

Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954.

McCall, W.A. "Measurement of Teacher Merit." Bulletin No. 284, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1952.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

McClendon, P.E. "Teacher Perception and Working Climate." Educational Leadership, XX (November 1962), 104-108.

McNeil, John D. "Concomitants of Using Behavioral Objectives in the Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness." The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXVI (Fall 1967), 67-74.

Medley, Donald M., and Mitzel, Harold E. "Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness." The Journal of Educational Psychology, L (December 1959), 239-246.

Morsh, Joseph E.; Burgess, George G.; and Smith, Paul N. "Student Achievement as a Measure of Instructor Effectiveness." Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVLL (February 1955), 79-88.

Paraskevopoulas, Ioannis. "How Students Rate Their Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LXII (September 1968), 25-29.

Rogers, C.R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Ryans, David G. "Assessment of Teacher Behavior and Instruction: Observation and Assessment of Teaching." Review of Educational Research, XXXIII (October 1963), 413-441.

_____. "A Study of Criterion Data: A Factor Analysis of Teachers' Behavior in the Elementary School." Education and Psychological Measurement, XII (December 1952), 333-334.

_____. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal. Research Study Report of the American Council on Education. Washington, D.C., 1960.

_____. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, third edition, pp. 1486-1491, edited by Chester W. Harris, The Macmillan Company, 1952.

Sandefur, Walter, and Hinely, Reginald. "The Public School Teacher and Student Teacher Evaluation." Peabody Journal of Education, XLIII (January 1966), 228-232.

Sarason, Seymour B.; Davidson, Kenneth S.; and Blatt, Burton. The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Schultz, Raymond E., and Ohlsen, Merle M. "Interest Patterns of Best and Poorest Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (November 1955), 108-112.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Symonds, P.M. "Characteristics of the Effective Teacher Based on Pupil Evaluations." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (1955), 289-310.

Turner, R.L. "Characteristics of Beginning Teachers: Their Differential Linkage with School System Types." The School Review, LXXIII (Spring 1965a), 48-58.

_____. The Acquisition of Teaching Skills in Elementary School Settings, Bulletin of the School of Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, XLI, No. 1 (January 1965b).

Walberg, Herbert. "The Structure of Self-Concept in Prospective Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LXI No. 2 (October 1967), 84-85.

Webb, Wilse B., and Nolan, C.Y. "Student, Supervisor and Self-Ratings of Instructional Proficiency." Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (January 1955), 42-45.

Wylie, Ruth. The Self-Concept. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Zacharewicz, Mary. "Relations Between Teaching Attitudes of Prospective Teachers and Their Self-Descriptions." Dissertation Abstracts, Michigan: University Microfilms Inc., XXIV (August 1953), 875.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIXES

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS WHICH WERE INVESTIGATED

1A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

1B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

1C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "knowledge of subject"?

2A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanation"?

2B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanation"?

2C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "clarity of explanation"?

3A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

3B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

3C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "fairness"?

4A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "classroom control"?

4B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "classroom control"?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

4C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "classroom control"?

5A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

5B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

5C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

6A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

6B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

6C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "ability to stimulate interest"?

7A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

7B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

7C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward subject"?

8A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

8B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

8C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

student teacher's "attitude toward pupils' opinions"?

9A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "variety in teaching procedures"?

9B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "variety in teaching procedures"?

9C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "variety in teaching procedures"?

10A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupil participation"?

10B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupil participation"?

10C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "encouragement of pupil participation"?

11A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

11B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

11C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "sense of humor"?

12A. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the supervising teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

12B. What is the relationship between the student teacher's self-perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

12C. What is the relationship between the supervising teacher's perceptions and the classroom pupils' perceptions of the student teacher's "preparation and planning"?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B

CORRELATION SCORES ON EACH TEACHING BEHAVIOR
FOR EACH PAIRWISE COMBINATION

Teaching Behavior	ST -CT	ST-P	CT-P
1. Knowledge of subject	.754*	.179	.089
2. Clarity of explanation	.037	.203	.229
3. Fairness	.158	.095	.284
4. Control	.550*	.319	.321
5. Attitude toward pupils	.232	.176	.516*
6. Ability to stimulate interest	.352	.522*	.257
7. Attitude toward subject	.371	.504*	.284
8. Attitude toward pupil opinion	.112	.295	.156
9. Variety of teaching procedures	.366	.469*	.242
10. Encouragement of pupil participation	.083	.400*	.261
11. Sense of humor	.234	.417*	.359
12. Preparation and planning	.602*	.224	.138

* Statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence
ST= student teacher; CT= critic or supervising teacher; P= pupil

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX C

PUPIL-OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the instructions carefully before answering the questions. Your frank and honest answers will be greatly appreciated.

Do not sign your name. Neither your teacher, student teacher, or anyone else at your school will ever see your answers. This is a research study and no grades will be given as a result of your answers to these questions.

DO NOT MARK ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. Fill in the blank that represents your reactions to each question on the IBM scoring sheet. Thank you for your time and contribution to this study.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THIS STUDENT TEACHER'S:

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT? (Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his present field?)

2. CLARITY OF EXPLANATION? (Are classroom assignments and explanations given clearly?)

3. FAIRNESS? (Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all pupils?)

4. CONTROL? (Does he keep enough order in the classroom? Do pupils behave well for him?)

5. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS? (Is he patient, understanding, considerate, and courteous?)

6. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST? (Is this class interesting and challenging?)

7. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT? (Does he show interest in and enthusiasm for this subject? Does he appear to enjoy teaching this subject?)

8. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPIL OPINION? (Are the ideas and opinions of pupils treated with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even if a pupil disagrees with the student teacher?)

9. VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES? (Is much the same procedure used day after day and week after week, or are different and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appropriate teaching methods used at different times such as pupils' reports, class discussions, films, debates, field trips, guest lecturers, etc.?)

10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPILS' PARTICIPATION? (Do pupils feel free to raise questions and express opinions? Are pupils encouraged to take part?)

11. SENSE OF HUMOR? (Does he see and share with pupils amusing happenings and experiences?)

12. PLANNING AND PREPARATION? (Are plans well made? Is class time well spent? Is little time wasted?)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX D

SUPERVISING TEACHER-OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the instructions carefully before answering the questions. Your frank and honest answers will be greatly appreciated.

Do not give your name. No one other than the investigator will see your answers to these questions. This is a research study and no grade will be given as a result of your answers.

DO NOT MARK ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. Fill in the blank that represents your reaction to each question on the IBM scoring sheet. Thank you for your time and contribution to this study.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THIS STUDENT TEACHER'S:

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT? (Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his present teaching field?)

2. CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS? (Are classroom assignments and explanations given clearly?)

3. FAIRNESS? (Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all pupils?)

4. CONTROL? (Does he keep enough order in the classroom? Do pupils behave well for him?)

5. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS? (Is he patient, understanding, considerate, and courteous?)

6. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST? (Is this class interesting and challenging?)

7. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT? (Does he show interest in and enthusiasm for this subject? Does he appear to enjoy teaching this subject?)

8. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPIL OPINION? (Are the ideas and opinions of pupils treated with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even if a pupil disagrees with the student teacher?)

9. VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES? (Is much the same procedure used day after day, week after week, or are different and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appropriate teaching methods used at different times such as pupils' reports, class discussions, films, debates, field trips, guest lecturers, etc.?)

10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPILS' PARTICIPATION? (Do pupils feel free to raise questions and express opinions? Are pupils encouraged to take part?)

11. SENSE OF HUMOR? (Does he see and share with pupils amusing happenings and experiences?)

12. PLANNING AND PREPARATION? (Are plans well made? Is class time well spent? Is little time wasted?)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX E

SELF-OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the instructions carefully before answering the questions. Your frank and honest answers will be greatly appreciated.

Do not give your name. No other than the investigator will see your answers to these questions. This is a research study and no grade will be given as a result of your answers.

DO NOT MARK ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. Fill in the blank that represents your reactions to each question on the IBM scoring sheet. Thank you for your time and contribution to this study.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING YOUR:

1. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT? (Do you have a thorough knowledge and understanding of your present teaching field?)

2. CLARITY OF EXPLANATION? (Are your classroom assignments and explanations given clearly?)

3. FAIRNESS? (Are you fair and impartial in your treatment of all pupils?)

4. CONTROL? (Do you keep enough order in the classroom? Do pupils behave well for you?)

5. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS? (Are you patient, understanding, considerate, and courteous?)

6. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST? (Are you making this class interesting and challenging for the pupils?)

7. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT? (Do you show interest in and enthusiasm for this subject? Do you enjoy teaching this subject?)

8. ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS' OPINIONS? (Do you treat the ideas and opinions of pupils with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even when a pupil disagrees with you?)

9. VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES? (Do you use much the same procedure day after day and week after week, or are different and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appropriate teaching methods, used at different times, such as pupils' reports, class discussions, small-group discussions, films, debates, field trips, guest lecturers, etc.?)

10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPILS' PARTICIPATION? (Do pupils feel free to raise questions and express opinions? Do you encourage pupils to take part?)

12. PLANNING AND PREPARATION? (Are your plans well made? Is the class time well spent? Is little time wasted?)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX F

MARK YOUR ANSWERS ON THIS SHEET

DIRECTIONS: Use only pencil. Shade in the area between the dotted lines which represents your answer. If you change an answer be sure to erase thoroughly the incorrect answer.

Select one of the following choices to represent your answer: P-Poor, F-Fair, A-Average, G-Good, E-Excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

EXAMPLE:		P	F	A	G	E
KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT:	1	P	F	A	G	E
CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS:	2	P	F	A	G	E
FAIRNESS:	3	P	F	A	G	E
CONTROL:	4	P	F	A	G	E
ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS:	5	P	F	A	G	E
ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST:	6	P	F	A	G	E
ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT:	7	P	F	A	G	E
ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPIL OPINIONS:	8	P	F	A	G	E
VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES:	9	P	F	A	G	E
ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUPIL PARTICIPATION:	10	P	F	A	G	E
SENSE OF HUMOR:	11	P	F	A	G	E
PLANNING AND PREPARATION:	12	P	F	A	G	E

DO NOT MARK BELOW THIS LINE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.