DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 230 SP 034 315

AUTHOR Walker, Linda
TITLE Perceptions of Preservice Teacher Efficacy.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Knoxville, TN, November 11-13, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Competence; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Performance Factors; Preservice Teacher Education; Rating Scales; Self Efficacy; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments; *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of student teachers' efficacy as measured by themselves, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors. A self-constructed instrument containing 30 items related to student teacher competencies was used for this evaluative measure. The sample consisted of 24 student teachers, 25 classroom teachers, and 8 university supervisors who completed surveys for the 34 student teachers enrolled during spring semester 1992. Several demographic areas were considered, but the area of interest was type which differentiated between the three groups listed above. One-way analysis of variance showed significant differences among the three types for the following items: using a variety of teaching methods, attending to routine tasks, demonstration of warmth and friendliness, evaluation of pupil progress, following school policies, maintaining accurate pupil records, and conferencing with parents. This study introduces a longitudinal study employing the instrument to measure perceptions of student teacher efficacy with future groups. Potential uses of the data include program modifications and/or additions as needed for specific competencies. Appendices include: Mississippi Teaching Competencies; the demographic survey instrument; and a oneway analysis of variance for item by type. (Contains 28 references.) (LL)

Perceptions of Preservice Teacher Efficacy

Linda Walker
Mississippi State University, Meridian

A paper presented at the Twenty-first Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association

Knoxville, Tennessee
November 11 - 13, 1992

Running Head: TEACHER EFFICACY

Perceptions of Preservice Teacher Efficacy

Linda Walker

Mississippi State University, Meridian

A paper presented at the Twenty-first Annual Meeting

of the Mid-South Educational Research Association

Knoxville, Tennessee

November 11 - 13, 1992

Running Head: TEACHER EFFICACY

Table of Contents

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of student teachers' efficacy as measured by themselves, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors. A self-constructed instrument containing 30 items related to student teacher competencies was used for this evaluative measure. Reliability for the instrument was a Cronbach alpha of .9507 with a standardized item alpha of .9561.

The sample consisted of 24 student teachers, 25 classroom teachers, and eight university supervisors who completed surveys for the 34 student teachers enrolled during Spring semester, 1992. Several demographic areas were considered, but the area of interest was type which differentiated between the three groups listed above. One-way analysis of variance (F probability = < .05) showed significant differences among the three types for the following items: using a variety of teaching methods, attending to routine tasks, demonstration of warmth and friendliness, evaluation of pupil progress, following school policies, maintaining accurate pupil records, and conferencing with parents.

This introduces a longitudinal study employing the instrument to measure perceptions of student teacher efficacy with future groups.

Potential uses of the data include program modifications and/or additions as needed for specific competencies.

Introduction

Perceptions of Preservice Teacher Efficacy

Controversy over the quality of teacher education programs and the products of such programs as they enter the professional educational setting, has generated a wealth of research studies on the problems of inducting a new generation of teachers properly into the classroom. Much media attention in the 1980's focused on education in the United States. Teacher education programs were criticized as being academically weak. The public demanded reform, stressing the need for competence in the teaching profession. Various groups have proposed solutions to the problem of developing quality educators. One such proposal is the utilization of a five-year program which gives a year-long internship under the supervision of a master teacher with the intern receiving reduced pay and reduced responsibilities. Furthering this premise were the Holmes Group with Tomorrow's Teachers, (1986), and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy with their publication of A Nation Prepared, (1986). Other programs proposed the reduction of teacher education courses and an increase in the number of arts and sciences courses required. Despite these proposals the

problem still exists; action has not kept pace with theory. In order to look at this problem from a different viewpoint, some researchers have addressed the attitudes of the student teachers themselves. Wood and Eicher (1989) made the following statement,

> How education majors feel about themselves concerning their abilities to teach effectively and their adequacies in handling professional procedures are important issues to consider in the preparation of future teachers. Preservice teachers get their first major opportunity to test their teaching skills when they student teach. The development of perceived teaching adequacies during this student teaching experience should be an effective predictor of future teaching success (p. 3).

One concern expressed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (1987) was the use of multiple sources of data, including feedback from preservice student teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of their teacher education program.

The Mississippi Education Reform Act of 1982 instituted a program of teacher accountability through evaluation of competencies and indicators of the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI); this

instrument comprised of 16 competencies with 42 indicators (See Appendix A) is used to evaluate student teachers, career teachers, and first-year teachers who must satisfactorily complete two evaluations with the instrument to be fully certified. The competencies comprise three areas: teaching plans and materials, position skills, and interpersonal skills. The MTAI competencies and indicators were the sources of the items for the survey used in this study (See Appendix B).

The sample of 34 student teachers who were involved in Student Teaching during the Spring, 1992 semester were educated in a program which is comprised of a general education portion, dealing with theoretical and practical knowledge; professional studies, including practicum experiences, which prepare the students to work in their field; and specialty courses, which reflect their interest in counseling, music, elementary education, art, or other such courses. The spiral curriculum is integrated, with a holistic perspective, and offers a clinical, field-based emphasis. As students advance through the Core program, they are increasingly involved in actual classroom experiences. When they reach the practice teaching semester, they have already completed many hours of practical and real-life experiences in classrooms in nearby schools.

The Professional Seminar which runs concurrently with the student teaching activities gives students the opportunity to focus on what they are doing through sharing with peers and university personnel.

The study which was conducted with these student teachers began with the construction of an instrument to measure perceptions of their competencies, by themselves, by their cooperating teachers, and by their university supervisors. A 30-item survey was developed. The survey was checked for content validity by a team of university supervisors. The response scale was a Likert (1967) scale of 1 to 5. One represented Very Effective and 5 represented Very Ineffective. Students were surveyed after completion of the classroom component of their Student Teaching requirements. There were 24 student teachers who returned completed surveys; twenty-five classroom teachers completed surveys for their student teachers; and 8 university supervisors completed surveys for the total 34 student teachers. A Cronbach alpha of .9507 was obtained to determine internal consistency; the standardized item alpha was .9561. According to Cohen (1977), an alpha of .60 is sufficient for attitudinal surveys. With internal consistency established, a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if

there was a significant difference between the three groups for the various items. Three questions were derived from the literature and the MTAI:

1. How do student teachers perceive themselves in terms of the competencies and indicators of the MTAI?

2. How do cooperating teachers perceive student teachers in terms of the competencies and indicators of the MTAI?

3. How do university supervisors perceive student teachers in terms of the competencies and indicators of the MTAI?

The null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference among the perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors with regard to teaching competencies as measured by the MTAI.

The findings from this study can be used in a variety of ways. It is possible to evaluate both students and their program with this data. It is also possible to evaluate the supervision and to determine the utility of various cooperating teachers. Improvement in the quality of teacher education programs reflects the current emphasis upon teacher accountability and the public's awareness of the needs for increased

competency in the classroom. The following review of related literature supports the development and use of this study.

Literature Review

Research indicates both that student teaching is the most valued aspect of teacher education programs (Nosow, 1975; Haring & Nelson, 1980) and that the cooperating teacher has great influence on the student teacher during this experience (Karmos and Jacko, 1977; Alper and Retish, 1980; Dispoto, 1980). Book, Byers, and Freeman (1983) reported that preservice teachers felt that "on the job training and supervised student teaching experiences were the most valuable sources of professional knowledge." Guyton (1989) pointed out that quite often cooperating teachers are poorly trained to handle the task of supervising student teachers. Indeed, Goodlad (1990), indicated that "proximity and availability, more than recognized teaching competence, were frequently the criteria governing the selection of cooperating teachers." Student teachers are often assigned to teachers who do not model effective teaching strategies (Hollingsworth, 1988). These cooperating teachers are often poorly informed about the content and requirements of teacher education programs. Hoover, O'Shea, and

Carroll (1988) emphasized that clearly stated performance standards are often absent from clinical programs resulting in no clear agreement on expected competencies concerning students. McIntyre and Killian (1986) stated that often the cooperating teacher provides little or no feedback concerning the performance or effectiveness of the student teacher. Supervision is a complex task different from regular classroom teaching and often the best teacher is not equipped to be a good cooperating teacher. It is also a well-known fact that cooperating teachers are expected to serve as role models, share their expertise, and find time to talk with and counsel the student teacher, but rarely receive any compensation, (Sparks and Brodeur, 1987). This further demonstrates the need for study of this relationship and possible training as well as the institution of incentives or rewards for those who supervise the preservice teachers.

Teacher efficacy is comprised of two dimensions: personal teaching efficacy and teaching efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Personal teaching efficacy is defined as the "belief that one has the necessary skills and abilities to bring about student learning", while teaching efficacy takes into account other variables and is defined as the

"belief that any teacher's ability to bring about change is significantly limited by factors external to the teacher, such as the home environment, family background, and parental influences," (Gibson and Dembo, 1984, p. 573-574). These beliefs contribute to the overall feelings of self-confidence and influence the self-perception of preservice teachers in regard to their competency and adequacy in various areas. Teacher efficacy and student achievement were found to be significantly related in numerous research studies, including those of Armor, 1976; Ashton and Webb, 1986; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly and Zellman, 1977; and others, (In Guyton et al, 1991). A study by Kazelskis, Kazelskis, and Kersh (1991), proposed that this sense of efficacy quite often affects teaching performance, thus establishing the need for determining the impact of the student teaching experience and its accompanying attitudes and perceptions on future teaching performance. Teacher efficacy also has been shown to be related to more effective teaching practices with low-achieving students in studies by Gibson and Dembo, 1984; and Ashton and Webb, 1982, (Guyton et al, 1991). Evans and Tribble (1986) indicated that further research is necessary to show

relationships between student teaching and the perception of teaching problems.

There have been conflicting results obtained from studies attempting to link the preservice teachers' skills and attitudes to the effect of student teaching. A study by Pigge and Marso (1990) with 153 preservice teachers attempted to measure anxiety, attitude, concerns, and confidence about teaching at the onset and the culmination of their student teaching experiences. The findings revealed that many teachers had positive perceptions of themselves as becoming very effective teachers. Contrary to these findings, Adams, (1982) found that preservice teachers often were overly concerned about their abilities as teachers, even after completion of student teaching. Weinstein, (1988) stated that preservice teachers may indeed have an unrealistic view, often bordering on overconfidence, about their ability to become effective teachers. He further proposed that because of this optimism, they often disregard some of the information and assistance offered in courses. This idea is reiterated by Lanier and Little (1986), who point out this same unrealistic optimism on the part of preservice teachers in regard to their potential as effective classroom teachers. In a study done by McCutcheon, Schmidt,

and Bolden (1991), student teaching was examined from the point of view of supervisors' ratings as well as personality characteristics. They recommended further research defining successful classroom performance to help define programs and other factors relating to teacher education.

A study by Wood and Eicher (1989) examined perceived teaching adequacies of 139 elementary preservice teachers at the University of South Dakota on thirty-one teaching competencies, very similar to the MTAI competencies. The preservice teachers were surveyed prior to their student teaching experience and immediately following the completion of that experience. The cooperating teachers also rated their student teachers on those same competencies at the culmination of student teaching. The results of that study revealed that student teachers perceived themselves to be highly competent in all areas. The results also indicated that student teachers perceived themselves as cooperating teachers tell them they are. This conclusion agreed with previous research which has found the classroom cooperating teacher to be a major influence in the professional development of successful student teachers. This study emphasized the need for careful selection

of classroom cooperating teachers, not only to serve as effective role models but also to provide feedback that is honest, open, and constructive.

A comparable study using the format of self-evaluation was conducted by Stolworthy (1988) in regard to teaching abilities of student teachers, with a rating scale utilized by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. This study included data from 58 preservice teachers using a survey that included 25 teaching competencies. In most instances, there were no significant differences for the three groups of evaluators. The differences that were discernible were mainly between the ratings of student teacher and university supervisor, not between those of the student teacher and cooperating teacher, leading once again to the conclusion that more research needs to be done in this area to determine whether accurate evaluations are taking place, and whether those evaluations can be used to improve the teacher education program in regard to perceptions, efficacy, program revisions and/or modifications, and overall improvement of the quality of the profession.

Methodology

Sample and Setting

This sample was comprised of 34 preservice teachers enrolled in EDE 4886, Spring semester of student teaching at Mississippi State University-Meridian Campus. Of these 34 preservice teachers, 24 completed and returned their surveys. There were 2 males and 32 females. All of the respondents were white. There were 15 respondents ages 20-29; 7 were 30-39; 1 was 40-49; and 1 was over 49 years of age. Twenty-one respondents were planning to teach at the elementary level, and 3 were planning to teach at the secondary level.

The teacher education program at MSU-Meridian is comprised of core course and practicum experiences throughout the junior/senior years, culminating in student teaching, usually in the final semester of the senior year. The student teaching experience is coupled with the Professional Seminar and lasts for an entire semester. This program meets certification requirements for the state of Mississippi.

Instrument

The instrument (See Appendix B) was constructed for the purpose of determining student teachers perceptions of their efficiency and efficacy while in the classroom. It consisted of 30 items, stated as phrases and drawn from the competencies and indicators of the MTAI

(See Appendix A). The survey was used to measure the self-reported perceptions of efficacy and to compare their perceptions with those of their cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Content validity was determined by a team of university supervisors. Internal consistency was a Cronbach alpha of .9507 and the standardized item alpha was .9561. This demonstrated high internal consistency according to Cohen (1977). A Likert scale of 1 to 5 was used for responses; 1 represented Very Effective and 5 represented Very Ineffective.

Data Collection and Analysis

The instrument was mailed to 34 student teachers; 34 cooperating teachers; and 8 university supervisors in May, 1992. A follow-up letter and another copy of the survey were mailed to those who did not respond after 15 days. Telephone calls were made to communicate with remaining non-respondents after 30 days. The response rate was 70.5 percent for student teachers (Group 1); 73.5 percent of cooperating teachers (Group 2) completed surveys; and 100 percent of the university supervisors (Group 3) completed surveys.

A one-way analysis of variance was completed to compare type (Groups 1, 2, and 3) by item (1-30). One-way analysis was suitable

based on the Cronbach alpha and because population means differed with respect to only one dimension. The statistical package employed was SPSS-PC, licensed to MSU.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 (See Appendix C) shows the F Ratio and F Probability of the significant items revealed in the analysis.

A significant difference was found for Item 5: Uses a variety of teaching methods.

1 Very effective
2 Moderately effective
3 no opinion/unable to determine
4 moderately ineffective
5 very ineffective

Item 5: Uses a variety of teaching methods

Student Teachers:

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Responses	24	0	0	0	0	24
Percent	100%	0	0	0	0	100%

Cooperating Teachers:

Responses	20	5	0	0	0	24
Percent	80%	20%	0	0	0	100%

Supervisors:

Responses	22	12	0	0	0	34
Percent	65%	35%	0	0	0	100%

The F probability was .0039. Examination of the percentages of responses from the scale yielded the following responses: 100 percent of the student teachers selected a rating of I (Very Effective); 80 percent of the cooperating teachers selected I, 20 percent selected 2 (Moderately Effective); 65 percent of the university supervisors selected 1; 35 percent selected 2. The student teachers obviously felt that they had mastered the use of teaching methods. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors perceived this item much differently. Because of interrater reliability established by the MTAI training required for all supervisors, it appears that the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors had a much more objective perception of the skills demonstrated in the classroom. Because the student teachers were self-reporting on the survey, less credibility can be assigned to their ratings. The MTAI calls for student teachers to demonstrate acceptable usage of a variety of methods of teaching during their lesson presentations for evaluation; a rating of 3 on this item is acceptable; the 3 indicates that the student

teacher used two methods of teaching effectively during the presentation of the lessons which were evaluated. The cooperating teachers perceived less effectiveness; the university supervisors perceived even less effectiveness on the item. Student teachers did not use methods of teaching as effectively as they perceived themselves to use them.

A significant difference was found among the responses to Item 11:

Item 11: Attends to routine tasks

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	23	1	0	0	0	24
Percent	96%	4%	0	0	0	100%
Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	15	9	0	1	0	25
Percent	60%	36%	0	4%	0	100%
Supervisors:						
Responses	23	8	3	0	0	34
Percent	68%	24%	8%	0	0	100%

The F probability was .0210. Student teachers rated themselves highly on this item: 96 percent gave themselves a l, while 4 percent gave themselves a 2. Cooperating teachers rated the student teachers much differently; 60 percent received a 1, 36 percent received a 2, and 4 percent received a 4 (Moderately Ineffective). The university supervisors rated somewhat higher: 68 percent received a 1, 24 percent received a 2, and 8 percent received a 3 (No opinion/unable to determine). Cooperating teachers had more opportunity to observe the student teachers in their attention to duties in the classroom and at the school; therefore, their rating of this item probably reflects a closer approximation to the actual facts related to student teachers' attention to routine tasks. University supervisors normally make 4-5 visits; during these visits, the student teachers may have made extra efforts to impress the people who were assigning the grades for student teaching. Daily observations of student teachers doing the little, unwritten tasks of the classroom provides a more accurate appraisal.

Item 15: Demonstrates warmth and friendliness also proved to be significantly different.

Item 15: Demonstrates warmth and friendliness

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	24	0	0	0	0	24
Percent	100%	0	0	0	0	100%
Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	21	3	0	1	0	25
Percent	84%	12%	0	4%	0	100%
Supervisors:						
Responses	21	8	0	5	0	34
Percent	62%	24%	0	14%	0	100%

The F probability for this item was .0048. A rating of 1 was assigned by 100 percent of the student teachers. The cooperating teachers gave only 84 percent to a rating of 1, 12 percent to 2, and 4 percent to 4. University supervisors rated this much differently. They gave a 1 to 62 percent, a 2 to 24 percent and a 4 to 14 percent of the student teachers. This is an affective area of consideration; however, it was possible to determine if the student teachers smiled often, were openly accepting of their students, and did not appear to have favoritism toward any

individual or group. The cooperating teachers perceived that most of these student teachers were effective in demonstrating qualities of warmth and friendliness. The university supervisors, on the other hand, did not credit as many of the student teachers with this quality. The rating of Moderately Effective and Moderately Ineffective by the university supervisors demonstrated a need for the student teachers to reassess themselves and their personal characteristics.

Item 20: Evaluates pupils progress proved significantly different at the .05 level.

Item 20: Evaluates pupils progress

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	21	3	0	0	0	24
Percent	88%	12%	0	0	0	100%
Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	16	8	0	1	0	25
Percent	64%	32%	0	4%	0	100%

Supervisors						
Responses	16	12	6	0	0	34
Percent	47%	35%	18%	0	0	100%

The F probability for this item was .0052. Student teachers rated themselves 1 by 88 percent and 2 by 12 percent. Cooperating teachers gave 64 percent a 1, 32 percent received a 2, and 4 percent received a 4. The university supervisors gave a 1 to 47 percent, a 2 to 35 percent, and 3 to 18 percent. The large percentage of 3 (No opinion/unable to determine) demonstrated a lack of opportunity to observe some of the students doing this; however, because the lesson plans that student teachers were required to turn in to university supervisors contained their evaluation components, this appears to be nonconversant with standard practice. Six students were not observed on this particular item. Had the observation been made, it is possible that the percentage of students receiving a 1 or 2 rating on this item would have increased. A rating of 1 for only 47 percent of the students is low; this means that less than half of the student teachers were perceived as Very Effective on this item. Future observations must be more structured and student teachers must be encouraged to develop adequate methods of evaluation. There is

also a possibility that this particular group of student teachers did not internalize the materials presented in their course on evaluation of learning.

A significant difference was found for Item 23: Follows school policies.

Item 23: Follows school policies

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	24	0	0	0	0	24
Percent	100%	0	0	0	0	100%
Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	23	2	0	0	0	25
Percent	92%	8%	0	0	0	100%
Supervisors:						
Responses	20	3	11	0	0	34
Percent	59%	9%	32%	0	0	100%

The F probability for this item was .0000. One hundred percent of the student teachers rated themselves as Very Effective on this item. Cooperating teachers gave a Very Effective rating to 92 percent, and a

Moderately Effective rating to 8 percent. University supervisors gave a rating of Very Effective to only 59 percent, a Moderately Effective rating to 9 percent, and a No Opinion/Unable to Determine rating to 32 percent. Once again the limited nature of the visits paid by the university supervisors makes the perception of the cooperating teachers seem to be more accurate. Daily observation by the cooperating teachers provided more opportunities to observe the student teachers following the school policies. Also, the Professional Seminar which opens the semester of practice teaching provides information about school policies and professionalism during the student teaching experiences; this should account for the high ratings given by the student teachers to themselves, and the higher ratings given by cooperating teachers.

A significant difference was found for Item 24: Maintains accurate pupil records.

Item 24: Maintains accurate pupil records

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	16	5	3	0	0	24
Percent	67%	21%	12%	0	0	100%

Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	19	4	2	0	0	25
Percent	76%	16%	8%	0	0	100%
Supervisors:						
Responses	20	2	12	0	0	34
Percent	59%	6%	35%	0	0	100%

This item's F probability was .0495. Student teachers gave themselves somewhat lower ratings for this item. They assigned a 1 by 67 percent, a 2 by 21 percent, and a 3 by 12 percent. It is not apparent why student teachers assigned themselves a No Opinion/Unable to Determine rating on this item. The cooperating teachers assigned a 1 to 76 percent of the student teachers, a 2 to 16 percent and a 3 to 8 percent. The university supervisors gave a 1 to 59 percent, a 2 to 6 percent and a 3 to 35 percent. It is not unreasonable to expect that university supervisors would not necessarily take the time to examine pupil records. It is possible that this item did not accurately designate the student records to be considered. This item could include a grade book, or a grade sheet that the student teachers maintained for their period of teaching time, or might include the cooperating teachers' grade books if these

were used by the student teachers. The MTAI has certain standards for this area of assessment, specifying that the teacher maintains a record of individual learner progress on specified measurable objectives. Many student teachers would not be allowed to work with students permanent records, which are still kept by the individual teachers in certain districts in Mississippi.

Item 25: Conferences effectively with parents was also significant at the .05 level with an F probability of .0102.

Item 25: Conferences effectively with parents

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Student Teachers:						
Responses	9	5	10	0	0	24
Percent	37%	21%	42%	0	0	100%
Cooperating Teachers:						
Responses	6	4	15	0	0	25
Percent	24%	16%	60%	0	0	100%
Supervisors:						
Responses	3	3	28	0	0	34
Percent	9%	9%	82%	0	0	100%

The student teachers ratings were : 1 by 37 percent, 2 by 21 percent, 3 by 42 percent. This meant that most of the student teachers did not have an opportunity to conference with their pupils' parents during their student teaching experiences. The cooperating teachers assigned the following ratings: 1 by 24 percent, 2 by 16 percent and 3 by 60 percent. The university supervisors assigned these ratings: 1 by 9 percent, 2 by 9 percent and 2 by 28 percent. Though this item showed a significant difference among the three groups, there was a uniformity of responses in regard to No Opinion/Unable to Determine. The student teachers probably had little or no contact with parents in most of the districts where they were placed for their practice teaching experiences. Parents customarily wish to visit with the regular classroom teacher whenever there is a problem, since the cooperating teacher is the person who controls the classroom setting for both the student teacher and their pupils.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Student teachers rated themselves highly. The cooperating teachers were realistic in their perceptions. The university supervisors did not have sufficient time, in some cases, to formulate perceptions

about some of the items on the survey. One of the obvious conclusions about this rating would be that student teachers are idealistic about their expectations of their performance in the classroom. It would be interesting to ask those who have full-time jobs in classrooms this spring just how the items on this survey have been fulfilled in the reality of the classroom world. While it is not necessary to dampen enthusiasm, it would appear that student teachers need more skills in self-assessment. The course work of their program provided much theory and practicum opportunity; it would seem that a balance was lacking in some way. It is expected that student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors will perceive each element of the survey in somewhat different ways. The cooperating teachers always look at student teachers realistically, because their classroom is a microcosm of the real world. Pupils in the classroom are real students, not theoretical students. Events are real events. Everything that happens is for some objective that will provide sufficient expertise to the pupils to survive in the daily activities of the real world. The university supervisor, by contrast, must examine the activities of many classrooms and many students. Sometimes, this requires traveling across counties and going miles from

one school to another. This means that the frequencies of visits is less than might be helpful to the progress of the student teachers; and it, basically, provides an outsiders' view of the school and classroom situations. The student teachers may or may not know the entire reality of the district and classroom they inhabit for such a short length of time. Practice is just that; they practice for the day when they will be in the classroom with nothing between the pupils and themselves. The future examination of the items on this instrument will provide opportunities to examine what each new group of student teachers is really like. It will also provide opportunities to adjust programs, practicums, student teaching activities, and supervision activities to benefit the students in the classrooms of the future.

References

Adams, R. D. (1982). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions and behaviors across time. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 40-43.

Alper, S., & Retish, F. (1972). A comparative study on the effects of student teaching on the attitudes of students in special education, elementary education and secondary education. The Training School Bulletin, 69(2), 70-77.

Book, C., Byers, J. and Freeman, D. (1983, January/February). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we can and cannot live. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 9-13.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. (The report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Author.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical analysis for the behavioral sciences (rev. ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Dispoto, R. (1980). Affective changes associated with student teaching. College Student Journal, 14(2), 190-194.

Evans, E. E., & Tribble, M. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 80(2), 81-85.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 185-194.

Guyton, E. (1989, Fall). Guidelines for developing educational programs for cooperating teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 11(3), 54-58.

Guyton, E, Fox, M. C., & Sisk, K. A. (1991, Summer). Comparison of teaching attitudes, teacher efficacy, and teacher performance of first year teachers prepared by alternative and traditional teacher education programs. Action in Teacher Education, 13(2), 1-2.

Haring, M., & Nelson, E. (1980). A five-year follow up comparison of recent and experienced graduates from campus and field based teacher education programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Hollingsworth, S. (1988). Making field-based programs work: A three-

level approach to reading education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(4), 28-36.

Hoover, N. L., O'Shea, L. J. and Carroll, R. G. (1988). The supervisor-intern relationship and effective interpersonal communication skills. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 22-27.

Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(5), 51-55.

Kazelskis, R., Reeves-Kazelskis, C., Kersh, M. E. (1991, November 12-15). Effects of student teaching on teaching concerns and efficacy. Paper presented at the twentieth annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Likert, R. A. (1967). The method of constructing an attitude scale. Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

McCutcheon, J. and others (1991). Relationship among selected

personality variables, academic achievement and student teaching behavior. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 24(3), 38-44.

McIntyre, D. J., and Killian, J. E. (1986, Autumn). Students' interactions with pupils and cooperating teachers in early field experiences. The Teacher Educator. 22(2), 2-9.

Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI) Office of Teacher Certification, (1992, January). Bureau of School Improvement, Jackson, MS: State Department of Education.

Nosow, S. (1975). Students' perceptions of field experience education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 16(6), 508-513.

Pigge, F. L., & Marso, R. N. (1980). A longitudinal assessment of the affective impact of preservice training on prospective teachers. Journal of Experimental Education, 283-389.

Sparks, S. S., and Brodeur, D. R. (1987). Orientation and compensation of cooperating teachers. The Teacher Educator, 23(1), 2-12.

Stolworthy, R. L. (October 1988). Preservice teacher education: The

application of Sheffe's LSD matrix of multiple comparisons to evaluation efforts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 250)

The Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Weinstein, C. (1988). Pre-service teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1), 31-40.

Wood, R. W., & Eicher, C. (July 1989). Self perceived adequacy of student teachers and its relationship to supervising teachers ratings: Another look. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310 073)

APPENDIX A

MISSISSIPPI TEACHING COMPETENCIES

Teaching Plans and Materials (TPM)

[Competencies I-IV; Indicators 1-12]

Competency I.	Plans instruction to achieve selected objectives.
Indicator 1.	Specifies or selects learner objectives for lessons.
Indicator 2.	Specifies or selects teaching procedures for lessons.
Indicator 3.	Specifies or selects content, materials, and media for lessons.
Indicator 4.	Specifies or selects materials and procedures for assessing learner progress on the objectives.
Indicator 5.	Plans instruction at a variety of levels.
Competency II.	Organizes instruction to take into account individual differences among learners.
Indicator 6.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their capabilities.
Indicator 7.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their learning styles.
Indicator 8.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their rates of learning.
Competency III.	Obtains and uses information about the needs and progress of individual learners.
Indicator 9.	Uses teacher-made or teacher-selected evaluation materials or procedures to obtain information about learner progress.
Indicator 10.	Communicates with individual learners about their needs and progress.
Competency IV.	Obtains and uses information about the effectiveness of instruction to revise it when necessary.
Indicator 11.	Obtains information on the effectiveness of instruction.
Indicator 12.	Revises instruction as needed using evaluation results and observation data.

Position Skills (PS)

[Competencies V-XI; Indicators 13-32]

Competency V. Uses instructional techniques, methods, and media related to the objectives.

Indicator 13.	Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners, and environment.
Indicator 14.	Uses instructional equipment and other instructional aids.
Indicator 15.	Uses instructional materials that provide learners with appropriate practice on objectives.

Competency VI. Communicates with learners.

Indicator 16.	Gives directions and explanations related to lesson content.
Indicator 17.	Clarifies directions and explanations when learners misunderstand lesson content.
Indicator 18.	Uses responses and questions from learners in teaching.
Indicator 19.	Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.
Indicator 20.	Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.

Competency VII. Demonstrates a repertoire of teaching methods.

Indicator 21.	Implements learning activities in a logical sequence.
Indicator 22.	Demonstrates ability to conduct lessons using a variety of teaching methods.
Indicator 23.	Demonstrates ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups.

Competency VIII. Reinforces and encourages learner involvement in instruction.

Indicator 24.	Uses procedures which get learners initially involved in the lesson.
Indicator 25.	Provides learners with opportunities for participating.
Indicator 26.	Maintains learner involvement in lessons.
Indicator 27.	Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.

Competency IX. Demonstrates an understanding of the school subject being taught and demonstrates its relevance.

Indicator 28.	Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.
Indicator 29.	Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area.

Competency X.	Organizes time, space, materials, and equipment for instruction.
Indicator 30.	Attends to routine tasks.
Indicator 31.	Uses instructional time effectively.
Indicator 32.	Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.
Competency XI.	Demonstrates high expectations for learners' academic performance.
Indicator 35.	Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.
Indicator 28.	Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.
Indicator 27.	Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.
Indicator 19.	Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.
Indicator 31.	Uses instructional time efficiently.

Interpersonal Skills (IS)

[Competencies XII-XIV; Indicators 33-42]

Competency XII.	Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching and learning and the subjects being taught.
Indicator 33.	Communicates personal enthusiasm.
Indicator 34.	Stimulates learner interests.
Indicator 35.	Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.
Competency XIII.	Helps learners develop positive self-concepts.
Indicator 36.	Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.
Indicator 37.	Demonstrates sensitivity to the needs and feelings of learners.
Indicator 38.	Demonstrates patience, empathy, and understanding.
Competency XIV.	Manages classroom interactions.
Indicator 39.	Provides feedback to learners about their behavior.
Indicator 40.	Promotes comfortable interpersonal relationships.
Indicator 41.	Maintains appropriate classroom behavior.
Indicator 42.	Manages disruptive behavior among learners.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Your Name:_____

Student Supervised (if teacher):_____

Circle One:
Student Teacher Supervising Public School Teacher College Supervisor

Age:

_____ 20-29
_____ 30-39
_____ 40-49
_____ Over 49

Area:

_____ Elementary
_____ Secondary

College degree:

_____ Bachelors
_____ Masters
_____ Specialist
_____ Doctorate

Race:

_____ African-American
_____ White
_____ Other

Level:

_____ K-2
_____ 3-5
_____ 6-7
_____ 8-9
_____ 10-12
_____ Jr. College
_____ Sr. College/University

Years Teaching Experience:

_____ 0-5
_____ 6-10
_____ 11-15
_____ 15 or more

Please see reverse side for survey questions!

Please rate the following items in terms of the student teacher's effectiveness:

1 **very effective**
2 **moderately effective**
3 **no opinion/unable to determine**
4 **moderately ineffective**
5 **very ineffective**

****

_____ 1. uses appropriate teaching methods
_____ 2. communicates with learners
_____ 3. uses audio-visual equipment
_____ 4. uses acceptable written and oral expression
_____ 5. uses a variety of teaching methods
_____ 6. demonstrates ability to work with groups of varying sizes
_____ 7. provides all learners with opportunities for participating
_____ 8. maintains learner involvement in lessons
_____ 9. demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter
_____10. uses positive reinforcement techniques
_____11. attends to routine tasks
_____12. uses instructional time efficiently
_____13. demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching
_____14. stimulates learner interest
_____15. demonstrates warmth and friendliness
_____16. demonstrates sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others
_____17. manages classroom interactions
_____18. maintains behavior that enhances learning
_____19. plans for instruction
_____20. evaluates pupil progress
_____21. identifies and plans for exceptional learners
_____22. constructs teacher-made materials
_____23. follows school policies
_____24. maintains accurate pupil records
_____25. conferences effectively with parents
_____26. teaches reading/language arts effectively
_____27. teaches math effectively
_____28. teaches social studies effectively
_____29. teaches science effectively
_____30. promotes an acceptance of cultural diversity among learners

APPENDIX C

Oneway Analysis of Variance for Item by Type

	Item	F Ratio	F Prob
5.	Uses a variety of teaching methods	5.9614	.0039*
11.	Attends to routine tasks	4.0581	.0210*
15.	Demonstrates warmth and friendliness	5.7218	.0048*
20.	Evaluates pupil progress	5.6242	.0052*
23.	Follows school policies	11.8967	.0000*
24.	Maintains accurate pupil records	3.1226	.0495*
25.	Conferences effectively with parents	4.8587	.0102*

*Significant at .05 level

Type: Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, University supervisor