CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

Student Evaluation of Teachers:
The Impact On Teacher Effectiveness and Professionality

Linda K. Stroh

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

January 1986

© Linda K. Stroh, 1986

.ABSTRACT

Student Evaluation of Teachers:
The Impact On Teacher Effectiveness and Professionality

Linda Stroh

This study explored the issue of student evaluation of
teachers by comparing high school student evaluations of
high school student teachers with the classroom teacher
evaluation of the student teacher, and also the university
professor's evaluation of student teachers' effectiveness.
The study suggested the accepted traditional methods of
research in the area of teacher evaluation is limited by
a solely quantitative, empirical viewpoint. The study draws
on a qualitative, sociological perspective of high school
student evaluations of teaching, - by addressing Hoyle's
(1980) theory on professional teaching perspectives. The
results of this research suggested high school students can
appropriately evaluate teaching effectiveness when · the
students perceive their ratings are important to their
teacher (student teacher) and when the teacher (student
teacher) also respects the high school students' opinion and
intends to use the high school students' suggestions.   Two
issues became apparent in the research: 1) The high school
student- evaluations of teachers must be confidential, and 2)
The high school students were concerned with fairness to the
student teacher.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This thesis investigates two aspects of the high school teacher. First, the study is concerned with the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Student evaluations of teaching has become an important measure of teacher-effectiveness at the university level, but this issue has not been adequately addressed at the high school level. Secondly, this study suggests that a teacher's professional perspective must effect the acceptance/rejection of the use of research in general, and specifically effect the use of research regarding student evaluation of teachers. As will be noted in the following review of the literature regarding student evaluation of teachers, the accepted tradition of research in this area is almost entirely of a quantitative, empirical nature. Many researchers suggest that this form of student evaluation of teachers has rendered this field the most researched area of teacher evaluation (Marsh, 1984). However, MacMillan and Garrison (1984) criticize the sole use of empirical research on teaching and point to various reasons for their claim. For instance, these authors suggest the use of empirical research "constrains" research in the educational field because it limits investigation to quantifiable data. Secondly, causation suggests teacher behavior leads to some specific (also general) student outcome. Yet, these authors suggest this accepted tradition

1

of research does not allow for the "intentions" of the student or the teacher to be reflected in the data. Although these authors are criticizing the use of empirical research regarding the general topic of process/product research, the following quote also seems appropos regarding the sole use of empirical research in the area of student evaluations of teachers:

All too often the methods of process-product research focus on peripheral aspects of teaching rather than attempting to penetrate its core. The central issue is not whether process-product research is true or false, but whether it lives up to expectations one might have for any progressive research tradition. In the end, the health of a research tradition is to be gauged by its own questions, at solving its own problems, be they empirical or conceptual (MacMillan and Garrison, 1984, p. 19).

The following literature review suggests that we might question the progress of this accepted research tradition and attempt to establish an alternative perspective within this field. This qualitative research could, perhaps, allow room for the "intentions" and perspectives of the teacher and the student; thus, providing further insight in the

analysis of teacher effectiveness and teachers' professional perspectives.

These empirical educational researchers have, indeed, created a reliable form of data collection. Yet, with repsect to the educational field, one must be more concerned with reality. That is, , teachers, students, and educationalist do not live in the world that empirical theorists have created, but rather in one which is affected by both the perspectives' (intentions') of the teacher/student and the broader social context of the educational field. Social scientists must be concerned with the alternative implications one might discover when taking a broader view than that of the controlled experiments. For instance, student evaluation empirical scientists have often studied what teacher characteristics effect ratings. Some suggest that the number of years of experience make a difference in ratings (Sullivan and Skanes, 1974), while others claim this variable is insignificant (Tuckman and Oliver, 1968). Perhaps, by taking a step back and attempting a broader perspective, one may claim that it is not years of experience on the part of teachers, but rather a teacher's intentions to make use of the ratings. Possibly, if students think their teachers will actually use their ratings, the students will be more concerned with an accurate rating. The above example is merely one citation

3

of the way that empirical scientist might come up with valid, reliable data--data which perhaps, only presents half truths; data which can often perpetuate false impressions and stereotypical notions.

Persell (1977) claims "...any theory of educational outcomes must begin with an examination of education in its wider social context" (p. 5). Persell, therefore, suggests educational research must deal with four levels of analysis: 1) Societal (i.e. the structure of dominance and legitimating ideologies), 2) Institutional level (i.e. educational structure, educational ideology, and concepts), 3) Interpersonal level (i.e. the interaction process between the teacher and the student), and 4) Intrapsychic level (the individual interpretations and reactions of the teachers and the students). As will be noted in the review of the literature on student evaluations of teachers, this accepted tradition of the literature has mostly dealt with the institutional level (i.e. how the educational context effects evaluations by students) and also some aspects of the interpersonal level (i.e. how specific student or teacher characteristics interact or effect ratings). Due to the limited empirical nature of existing research, the societal level, some areas of the interpersonal level, and also the intrapsychic levels are nearly non existent.

4

Given that activities and beliefs are effected by one's accepted culture, an examination of how the basic societal structures effect ratings appears essential (Persell, 1977). This study attempts to partially deal with this issue by using a theory proposed by Eric Hoyle (1974, 1980). Hoyle claims that recent broad changes in the educational context have also changed the nature of the teaching profession. Hoyle begins by noting that professions, in general, are concerned with control and autonomy over their profession. However, Hoyle's work is concerned primarily with the professional characteristic of autonomy. He claims teachers have maintained a high level of autonomy within the classroom, but "...his autonomy operates within the constraints of a structure which is not of his own creating" (p. 15).

Hoyle (1980) suggests this situation is changing. He claims changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and broad socio-political trends have forced teachers to re-evaluate their professional teaching perspectives. According to Hoyle (1974), there is a wide-spread belief that "...those who are affected by decisions should play a part in making them" (p. 15). He claims this belief has created a situation where effective teaching may now encompass not only effectiveness in the immediate classroom situation, but also one's effectiveness in participating in policy and planning at the

institutional and societal level.

This alteration in the teaching context is not without its shortcomings. Hoyle (1980) points to three: 1) time, 2) the fact that teachers get their job satisfaction from classroom autonomy and pupil interaction and have little interest in theory or research,[4] and 3) greater control over the broader context of teaching (extended professionality) is gained at the loss of classroom autonomy (restricted professionality).

These are some of the problems confronting the high school teacher of today. Hoyle has developed two untested theoretical constructs which represent two professional perspectives of these contemporary teachers. Restricted professionality refers to the teacher whose skills, practices, and procedures are based on "intuition, experience, and common-sense knowledge", while extended professionality refers to that teacher whose skills, practices, and procedures are based on theory and research.

This study attempts to test for a theoretical construct validation of these two constructs, presented by Hoyle. As will be noted in the review of the literature on student evaluation of teachers, the empirical psychological literature does not link the effects of educational practices with the larger social context in which they occur. Does a teacher's professional perspective (imposed

by socio-political pressures) effect the notions about student evaluations of teachers?

Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963) suggest quantitative data does not present the full interpretation of an issue. Mere "rates" do not tell why the behavior takes place. These authors claim researchers must be concerned with the common-sense interpretations of social reality. Woods (1983) also notes: "It is the interpretation that counts as far as outcomes are concerned and therefore people's own thoughts and evaluations, not instincts, nor simply the 'objective' reality of the situation" (p. 3). He claims the manifest behavior is only one segment of the action. These notions are further supported by Dreeben (1968) who notes it is often the hidden agenda within a school system which is most powerful.

This study, therefore, presents a sociological critique of the present student evaluation literature by also addressing the interpersonal and the intra-psychic level of research. Questions regarding student evaluations of teachers are as follows: What is the "judgemental work" in teachers' and students' decision making regarding the reliability, validity, capability, and intentions for the use of student evaluations of teacher effectiveness? What knowledge do these students have? How can these subordinates adequately evaluate a professional's work? The

study deals with these questions through 1) quantitative, structured evaluation forms 2) qualitative, open ended questionnaires, and 3) informal interviews.

There is little way a quantitative, empirical analysis alone can interpret the intentions of both the instructor and the student. Needless to say, these intentions can have important relevance to the "objective data" analysis. The claim is, therefore, that any form of high school teacher evaluation must be premised in a context and structure of the role of the professional high school teacher as well as the teacher/student relationship. That is to say, the ways in which one assumes research can contribute to teacher effectiveness must be influenced by one's view of the role of the teacher.

For organizational purposes, this study is divided into three sections, beginning with the accepted traditional methods and practices of student evaluations of teachers and a review of the literature in this area. The second section of the study is concerned with teacher professionality. This section attempts to suggest that by using Eric Hoyle's (1980) proposed theory on the professionality of teachers, one might get a clearer perspective on teacher's intentions regarding the teaching profession.

And lastly, in Section III this study presents an alternative qualitative method of study to research the

impact of student feedback on high school teacher effectiveness. This alternative combines the teacher's and students' intentions regarding student evaluations of teachers by using data triangulation. That is, this study quantifies some aspects of data analysis, yet explains this data through qualitative interviews and observation.

Section I

Student Evaluation Of Teachers

Review of The Literature

Introduction

It is important to note that this review reflects the traditional style of research presentation in this area. Thus, the organization of this section is one which addresses the following headings: Bias In Student Ratings, Reliability of Student Ratings, Generalizability of Studies, Validity of Student Ratings, Type of Feedback, Self Evaluations, and Dimensions of Effective Teaching. As noted in the introduction, the purpose of this literature review is to emphasize the empirical domination of research in this field. As research regarding high school students' evaluations of teachers is limited, a review of the literature concerning universities is presented, however, one must continue to refer to the following differences when considering these comparisons.

Many researchers have examined the relationship between student evaluations and improved teacher effectiveness at the university and college levels, but have largely ignored this relationship at lower levels of learning (Overall and

Marsh, 1979). Most studies examining student evaluations of teachers are performed by an experimental pretest-posttest design. Data are collected near the middle of the course on either standardized forms or self-constructed forms. Instructors in experimental groups then receive a summary of the student feedback, while the control group receives no such feedback. Presumably, instructors will use this feedback to alter weak areas of teaching. The rating forms are once again administered at the end of the course, with improvements in scores suggested to be a measure of improved teaching. Typically, the effects of variables such as subject taught (Marsh, 1981; Gilmore, Kane, and Naccarato, 1978), sex of instructor (Doyle and Whitely, 1974), or correlations with peer or self evaluations (Blackburn and Clark, 1975; Centra, 1973) and also environmental conditions affecting student ratings (Abrami, Leventhal, Perry, and Breen, 1976) are examined.

According to Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983), the use of student ratings assumes: 1) the student is the best person to know when he/she has been motivated, 2) teaching is aimed at changing the student's behavior, 3) student rating is feedback to the teacher and 4) student recognition may motivate good teaching. These notions defend the use of student ratings as a form of teacher self development.

The literature suggests research on student evaluations at the high school level has not progressed. Yet when reviewing earlier studies on high school student evaluations, Centra (1973) and Rotem and Glasman (1979), suggest that these experimental studies (Bryan, 1963; Gage et al. 1963; Tuckman and Oliver, 1968) at the high school level on high school student ratings of teachers, show greater gains in student perceived teacher effectiveness in pre to posttest analysis, than do those experimental studies at the college and university level. Therefore, it seems logical that further research in this area is justified and long overdue (Aleamoni, 1981; Haefele, 1980; McNeil and Popham, 1973).

In addition, one might suggest student evaluations administered in the context of the high school setting will elicit more reliable and valid studies. For instance, researchers in the area of student evaluations encourage experimenters to ensure standardization of testing (Abrami, Perry, and Leventhal, 1982). Correspondingly, relative to the university setting, the high school represents more similar methods of teaching, texts, and course content, due to some courses which require provincial-wide standard exams. Also within this context, teachers have one priority--teaching students, as opposed to university instructors who are often divided in their job requirements

(i.e. research, administrative duties, etc.). Evaluations of teaching performance become an even more important percentage of the total teaching evaluation process of high school teachers. One might also suggest that the professional high school teacher, unlike the university professor, has gone through a lengthy evaluation process. That is, the high school teacher began his/her teaching career under the supervision and critique of an evaluative process in teacher education school, and therefore, the high school teacher is more accustomed to suggestion, criticism, etc. Whereas, a critique of the classroom practices of the university professor is a fairly recent event (Donald, 1985). For the above mentioned reasons, it seems logical that this line of research may elicit greater consistency of findings and further establishes a rationale for research on student evaluations at the high school level.

This study turns now to an analysis of the literature regarding student evaluations of teachers, focusing on the question: Are students capable of evaluating teachers' effectiveness, more fairly, are students as qualified to judge the practice of teaching effectiveness as well as professionals themselves?

Bias In Ratings

In order to determine if students are capable of

13

appropriately evaluating teacher effectiveness, one must be concerned with potential bias in the rating. That is, the ratings should appropriately represent differences in teacher effectiveness as perceived by the student, and not merely patterned differences between student, setting, or subject characteristics. The notion is that non teaching factors should not affect the student ratings. Much research in the area of student evaluation of teachers has attempted to define variables or conditions which affect student evaluations of teachers; the results of these studies are inconclusive. For instance, Centra (1973) suggests variations in sex of the teacher do not significantly effect ratings. On the other hand, Feldman (1975) suggests some studies show female students rate instructors higher than do male students.

Other variables such as rank of instructor, teaching experience, and student characteristics have also been studied with mixed results (Marsh, 1984). For example, most studies suggest the full-time professor is often rated higher than the part time or graduate student instructor. Sullivan & Skanes (1974) suggest this is due to the full time professor having a greater commitment to the goals of the course than does the part time professor, and also the fact that the full time professor often has greater control over course content and structure. But, a study by Tuckman

14

and Oliver (1968) claims the years of experience variable is an insignificant finding.

As noted above, student characteristics which may effect student ratings have also been widely studied. For instance, Follman (1975) suggests there is a relationship between student characteristics and student ratings. The opposite findings are set forth by Abrami et al. (1982). Two laboratory studies were done using video taped lectures which varied instructor expressiveness and lecture content. In addition, students rated themselves on an Adjective Check List to determine student characteristics. The findings suggest that no consistent relationship exists between student characteristics and student ratings. The strength of this study lies in the fact that these authors were able to randomly assign students to groups. One might, however, question if these laboratory studies can be generalized to the actual classroom situation. Therefore, these researchers performed a third field study to determine if there was external validity for their findings. They summarize their findings as follows: "Thus, the majority of the evidence we collected suggests that students form opinions about the teaching effectiveness of most instructors independently of student personality characteristics" (p. 122).

Reviews of the literature have summarized the

inconsistency of studies regarding bias in student ratings. McKeachie (1979), Centra (1979), Marsh (1980) and others concluded personal background characteristics such as noted above, have little effect on students' ratings.

However, one must admit research focusing on these differences between teachers is interesting and informative. From a practical point of view, we must question its importance to this area of educational research. For instance, we can do little to change a teacher's sex, teaching experience, or a student's expected grade, but we can do a great deal about the context of the evaluation process (Rotem and Glassman, 1979). Therefore, a more worthwhile and also practical line of research regarding educational studies, must be concerned with characteristics and qualities that can be effected in the educational environment. Characteristics of teachers, students or the educational environment which promote teacher effectiveness are far more crucial to developing an understanding of the issue.

Reliability Of Ratings

Questions regarding the reliability of student ratings refer to such notions as student rating's stability and consistency over time, or inter-rater agreement on ratings of instructors. For instance, Feldman (1977) suggests

inter-rater reliability is quite low, and any one student's rating of the teacher is of minimal use. For him composite ratings are "dependable measures". However, Marsh (1979), when reviewing inter-rater reliability findings, suggests that when determining single rater reliability by using internal consistency measures, one actually underestimates student rater reliability. That is, internal consistency measures assume differences in ratings between students are attributed to error; yet Marsh (1984) suggests there are systematic differences between students which may not be attributed to error. By using test-retest reliability (stability over time), Marsh (1984) suggests single rater reliability is much higher than predicted by Feldman's (1977) internal consistency measures.

Therefore, one recognizes estimates of reliability must be clearly interpreted before making a judgement on either a high or low reliability coefficient. There is no ONE measure of reliability. As Gillmore, Kane, and Naccarato (1978) note, "The coefficient which is appropriate in a given setting depends upon whether one wishes to generalize over both students and items, or only over one or the other" (p. 12).

Other studies examining the reliability of student ratings are offered by authors such as Aleamoni and Hexner (1980), and Costin, Greenough, and Menges (1971). These

researchers study environmental factors which may influence the internal and external validity of students' evaluations of teachers. For example, findings suggest that institutions must use great caution in administering student evaluation forms, as factors such as sponsor of tests may alter outcome. These authors suggests uniform testing conditions for all subjects.

To summarize the notions regarding reliability of students' ratings, the literature appears to suggest the reliability is quite high (.80+) when considering class average reliability, or even single rater reliability overtime. Yet, the use of these forms of reliability might mislead the reader. That is, there is substantial disagreement in inter-rater reliability (.20) which appears to suggest a disagreement between students regarding teacher effectiveness. Therefore, the individual raters' score is indeed important to a teacher who is attempting to address individual concerns. But when making overall judgements on a teacher's effectiveness, a case can be made to use the appropriate reliability based on class averages.

Generalizability Of Studies

At this point one might question the generalizability of the findings of studies performed on university professor to high school teachers. Tuckman and Oliver (1968)

18

attempted to replicate a study done by Bryan (1963) which
indicated that teachers change their behavior after
receiving feedback from their students. Subjects were
chosen from New Jersey and surrounding out-of-state
counties, 286 teachers of vocational subjects at high school
or technical school level participated. One might
suggest that because this is a replication of a
previous study, the results might render greater support
for the generalizability of student rating's findings.

The authors note the following outcomes of their
research. Student feedback produced greater changes than
no feedback, while supervisor feedback alone produced no
effect. In addition, the authors suggest the years of
experience variable was an insignificant finding. The
study supported Bryan's findings to the extent that
student feedback leads to greater teacher changes in
behavior, and student evaluations do change teacher behavior
at the high school level. Tuckman and Oliver's (1968)
study has important relevance to this particular research on
high school student teachers. That is, their findings
suggest high school student teachers will benefit
more from high school student feedback than
supervisory feedback. If the findings are supported
by further research, then high school student ratings of
student teachers should be an important component to student

19

teacher programs for development.

Validity Of Student Ratings

The validity of student evaluations of teacher
effectiveness is difficult to establish, given the notion
that there is no single criterion of effective teaching
(Doyle, 1975). However, some authors using construct
validation have performed experiments which suggest that
student ratings are correlated with other indicators of
effective teaching (Marsh, 1984). For example, Sullivan
and Skanes (1974) present a study which attempts to
correlate student achievement with student ratings. These
authors claim that student ratings' items describing "task
orientation" were positively associated with a high level of
student achievement. They further claim that valid ratings
are easier to assess in experienced than non-experienced
instructors. For instance, their data collected on graduate
student teachers suggest the higher rated instructors are
often not those in which there was the highest achievement.
The rationale for these findings seems to be a lesser
commitment on the part of the graduate student teachers to
teaching those materials which the department or university
deems essential to measure student achievement.
A low correlation exists between ratings and the achievement
measure for this group of instructors. This claim is a

20

hypothetical guess on the part of Sullivan & Skanes (1974).

However, not all studies suggest a positive correlation between high ratings and achievement. A study performed by Rodin and Rodin (1972) indicates there was a negative correlation between ratings and achievement. That is, these authors argue that those instructors who were rated the highest by their students were instructors from which students achieved the least. However, the methodological flaws associated with this study have been well publicized and render these findings irrelevant (Cohen, 1981). For example, these researchers used graduate students as their sample. These graduate students had little control over the classroom objectives or instruction and, therefore, it was impossible to separate the achievement associated with the actual professor of the classroom from these graduate student teachers. More importantly, these findings have never been replicated in the literature (Doyle, 1975).

Some researchers provide reviews summarizing the findings regarding the validity of student ratings (Marsh, 1984), others use a procedure called meta-analysis to review the status of this literature. The meta-analysis is a statistical procedure which allows one to assess the validity of research findings. This procedure is a quantitative review of the literature which enables the reader to more critically examine findings. Abrami (1984)

21

suggests this procedure may clarify the current "ambiguous" findings regarding reliability, validity, etc. surrounding the student ratings' research.

Cohen (1981) offers a meta-analysis which met the following criteria: 1) The study had to describe a study conducted in an actual university classroom, 2) The study had to use the teacher as the unit of analysis, and, 3) The study had to use multi-section courses with a common achievement measure. The results of the meta-analysis provided support for the validity of student ratings. In fact, Cohen (1981) claims this meta-analysis suggests that the relationship between student ratings and achievement is greater than previously thought.

Cohen (1981) clearly informs the reader of the criteria to be met for his meta-analysis. This allows the reader to verify the research findings. Another meta-analysis on validity studies performed by Dowell and Neal (1982), using somewhat different criteria, suggests: "The fact remains that new studies of the validity of student ratings must show dramatically different results compared to these selected studies in order that we can regard ratings as good predictors of student learning" (p. 60). One might question how two meta-analyses of validity studies could come up with such opposite findings. However, as suggested before, the meta-analysis is a statistical procedure which can be

verified by the reader. Therefore, one could argue that Dowell and Neal (1982) did not adequately explain their literature review procedures and in fact, can be accused of an incomplete literature review (Cohen, 1983). Dowell and Neal (1983) found only six studies which met their criteria. However, in an attempt to replicate Dowell and Neal's (1982) study, but adding three additional criteria, Cohen (1983) identified 18 studies which met all of their requirements. Cohen's (1983) more recent meta-analytic study, once again, supports earlier findings that there is a positive relationship between achievement and student ratings. In fact, this reveiw suggested total achievement differences explained by instructor ratings were three times as much as that found by Dowell and Neal (Abrami, 1984). The purpose of Cohen's (1983) repeat meta-analysis of validity studies appears to be to suggest the danger of "selective reviewing", and Cohen (1983) cautions researchers against careless and incomplete reviews of the literature.

A review of these meta-analytic studies verifies the important contributions of the use of meta-analysis to research on student ratings. The greater precision of these quantitative reviews subjects researchers to more scrutiny within the field (Abrami, 1984). Possibly, "selective reviewing" will be less apparent in the future promoting a more objective representation of the data (Cohen, 1983).

Although there may be greater precision and control in
quantitative data analysis, we can only report the manifest
findings regarding student evaluations of teachers. Perhaps
the more relevant data is not reported through objective,
quanitified data.

Self Evaluations

Doyle (1975) claims the rationale behind relating
changes in teacher effectiveness to differences between self
evaluation and student evaluation is apparent in social-
psychological theory. That is, in order to restore
balance, teachers change in the direction suggested by
student evaluations--discrepancies between self and student
ratings serve as a catalyst for change. This issue becomes
the crux of the studies comparing self and student
evaluations.

Blackburn and Clark (1975) suggest that the relation
between student-judged teacher performance and student
learning is a positive relationship (also McKeachie 1969,
Gessner 1973). These authors note administrators continue
to ignore student evaluation when judgements on teacher
performances are measured. They state : "The
professor lives with an erroneous perception of how others
perceive and assess him" (p. 250). Blackburn and Clark's
study is of interest to this research study, given the

24

suspicion (based on the literature) that some high school teachers are unaware of students' feelings towards them and also their effectiveness in regard to student needs in the learning environoment (Warner, 1984; Branan, 1972). This notion is further supported by other studies indicating that individual professors are not a good judge of their role performance (Centra, 1979; Isaacson, McKeachie, and Milholland, 1963). However, Blackburn and Clark (1975) are not precise enough in their reporting of their research findings to fully benefit the reader or the field; thus, they are criticized on several grounds. For example, Blackburn and Clark's (1975) faculty self evaluations were based on the faculty's rating of their general teaching ability rather than self evaluations of the same specific classes which students' were evaluating teacher effectiveness (Marsh, 1984).

Not all studies support these negative views on instructor self evaluation. For example, Marsh, Overall, and Kesler (1979) suggest student evaluations show significant correlation with instructor self evaluations. Correlations as high as .65 were found between instructors' self evaluation and student evaluations in a study by Braskamp, Caulley, and Costin (1979). In addition, Doyle and Crichton (1978) provide a study comparing student, peer, and self ratings with measures of student performances.

These authors suggest student, peer, and self ratings are quite similar. These authors did not find significant correlations between any of these groups and student achievement. They suggest this lack of correlation between ratings and achievement may be due to the fact that the subjects were graduate student teachers. Doyle and Crichton (1978) also admit to an unexpected finding that teacher self evaluations were positively correlated with student evaluation. This was an unexpected finding because the literature often suggests self evaluations are higher than student evaluations. However, this "unexpected finding" could also have been predicted. This result supports other existing literature which claims less experienced teachers are more difficult to evaluate (Sullivan and Skanes, 1974). Also the studies whose subjects have a lack of total control over the classroom (e.g. Doyle and Crichton, 1978; Braskamp, Caulley, and Costin, 1979) are studies which the subjects and findings. can only be generalized to other teaching situations where graduate students are used.

However, Centra (1979), too, suggests teacher's self evaluations are not well correlated with student evaluations of teacher performance (.20 correlation). And Donald (1983) in a review of the research regarding criteria for evaluating university teaching presents data suggesting

professors are not a good judge of appropriate feedback required to improve their teaching.

Most of the literature on teacher self evaluations appears to suggest that the instructor is not a good judge of his/her own teaching effectiveness (Centra, 1979). However, the literature does not address the issue which questions whether instructors who are more receptive to suggestions for improvement, (have intentions to use them), will increase teacher effectiveness as perceived by the student.

Type Of Feedback

There are various forms of student feedback to teachers. For example, current research (Cohen, 1982; Mckeachie, 1980; Erickson and Erickson, 1979) suggests instructors who receive student feedback and are trained how to use the feedback will be more effective than either those who receive only printed feedback or those receiving no feedback at all.

Erickson and Erickson (1979) note that teachers who receive teaching consultation are perceived by students as improving teaching effectiveness more than those teachers without teacher consultations. In order to further establish their findings they performed two consecutive studies. Independent t tests were used to account for

statistical significance of all comparisons. No differences were detected between the experimental and control groups in the pretest stage. Posttest analysis found greater improvement in the three variables (i.e. evaluation, stimulation, and organization). In addition, the experimental group instructors were reported as agreeing that the consultation did in fact improve their teaching skills.

However, the operational definition of consultation in the study remains unclear and unaccounted for. Moreover, all students were told about the study before completing the questionnaire, suggesting some students may react unlike an unsuspecting population, therefore limiting the generalizability of this study. Also, the interaction of the authors as consultants with their peers as subjects could have caused the subjects to react differently than an unbiased subject might respond. Thus, once again, there exists a limitation in the generalizabitliy of the findings. However, a repeat study #2 followed up the instructors who had gone through the teacher consultation. This repeat study was performed with students who were unaware of any previous study. This study supported the former hypothesis by suggesting those instructors who had previously participated in consultations were again rated higher than those who had not, therefore confirming the durability of

28

the consultation/student feedback measures.

The following research project is a more controlled experiment, which suggests an alternative to feedback with consultation. Cohen (1982) states the literature suggests the use of consultants to improve college teaching is effective in doing so (also McKeachie 1980, Erickson and Erickson 1979). Cohen (1982) notes most university and college faculty do not make use of teaching consultants. The use of teaching consultants is not only expensive and time-consuming, but also may reflect a notion of "teaching remediation" or more importantly a resistance to this "high personal involvement". Therefore, Cohen (1982) suspects what is needed is a "feedback system that incorporates positive features of the consultation process without the high cost of face-to-face communication" ; that is, one which is self-directed and designed for self improvement (p. 138).

Cohen's (1982) hypothesis is that instructors who are properly trained to make use of student-rating data, will exhibit greater teaching improvement than those instructors who merely receive descriptive feedback alone or those who receive no feedback at all. The data for this study was analyzed by an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), and findings were as follows: Those instructors in the group that received a programmed feedback booklet designed

29

to help them review, interpret and use student data, were rated slightly higher than the group receiving only descriptive feedback. The most pronounced differences were between the groups who received feedback, regardless of the type, and the group which received no feedback at all. The author also claim that this study does not provide as positive results as those studies where consultation is used. In those situations where expensive instructor consultations are impossible, the use of programmed booklets and descriptive feedback are likely to lead to instructor improvement.

McKeachie et al.'s article, "Using Student Ratings and Consultations To Improve Instruction" (1980) provides an interesting insight into the subject of student evaluations of instructors. They hypothesize that teachers who are given feedback of student ratings of instruction and who are provided with encouragement and suggestions for improvement (i.e. consultation) will improve their teacher effectiveness more than those who receive either feedback alone or those with no feedback at all. The groups were randomly assigned as follows: 1) those receiving feedback of student ratings with consultation from an experienced teacher 2) those receiving computer print-out of student ratings and 3) those without any student ratings at all. As noted by the authors, most studies of this type are concerned with effect

of feedback on later student ratings. This study is concerned with the "ultimate criterion" of teaching effectiveness--student learning; and therefore, these researchers performed a correlation using student achievement measures (p. 168).

The study indicates that "those teachers who were perceived as improving were also most effective in terms of student performance" (McKeachie, et al., p. 171). Positive correlations were detected between those professors rated highly by students and those students who performed more favorably on the attitude and psychology measures.

An obvious limitation in the study is that only those teachers who were already rated highly were used. The results might have been altered significantly if poorer rated teachers were also included in the study. Thus, the findings can not be generalized to another sample, population , or setting, where variations in teacher ratings exist. Furthermore, the generalizations of the findings is further hindered due to the lack of representativeness of the sample (i.e. A great majority of the teachers are teaching fellows rather than actual professors or teachers. The lack of tenure might force these teaching fellows to perform differently than would tenured professors),

These findings, regarding feedback, have important implications for student/teacher training. The question

remains: Is it possible that if high school student teachers are appropriately socialized and trained to make use of their student feedback, their practice of teaching will be more effective? The following studies address the issue of dimensions of student evaluation of teachers and provide an important summary for this literature review.

Dimensions Of Teacher Effectiveness

As noted above, experimental studies have researched the concept through teacher characteristics, methods, student characteristics, environmental conditions, etc., with contradictory and limited generalizations achieved (Kulik and McKeachie, 1975). For example, Feldman (1976) reviewed 60 factor analytic studies and identified three major clusters of teacher dimensions which are important to student perceived level of teacher effectiveness. Items in cluster one concerned instructor's presentation of material; cluster two, instructor facilitation of material; cluster three, instructor regulation of student (e.g. fairness). In addition, this research identified 19 characteristics of effective teaching, as described by students, in the studies they reviewed. Eight characteristics were usually ranked high: concern for students, knowledge of subject matter, stimulation of

interest, availability, encouragement of discussion, ability to explain clearly, enthusiasm, and preparation. Feldman (1976) determined that the rank importance of these characteristics varied within studies because of student sex, year in school, and academic field. Between study differences in rank of characteristics were due to the type of school, year of study, and whether it was a structured/unstructured format.

Feldman (1976) notes that when comparing the factor analytic studies to the descriptive list studies, there is a degree of compatibility between clusters one and cluster two and the highest student ranked instructor characteristics. Cluster three has no characteristics in which students consistently rate highly. For Feldman, the reason behind this lack of correlation is because descriptive list studies ask a different question than do factor analytic studies. That is, descriptive list studies question teaching characteristics that the student perceives to be important to effective teaching, while factor analysis studies seek patterns of relationship of characteristics of effective teaching as perceived by the students.

Another analysis of the differences found between teaching effectiveness studies, especially regarding student evaluation, is presented by Abrami (1985). Abrami (1985) suggests the failure of present research design on teaching

effectiveness is a basic lack of theoretical rationale for describing teaching effectiveness, selecting items for analysis, and determining areas of study. He further claims most studies use an improper unit of analysis, suggesting the only appropriate unit is classmeans. For example, by using individual students within a class as the unit of analysis, the results reflect student variation and not teacher variation. According to Abrami (1985), students pooled across classes is another inappropriate unit of analysis, due to a confounding of student and teacher characteristics. By using classmeans (with random assignment and sampling) Abrami (1985) suggests much of the unwanted variability present in most studies is removed, resulting in a more appropriate analysis of the experimental data.

Given the status of the literature, one might suggest that research designs must begin to incorporate the whole concept of teaching/learning rather than focusing on one aspect of teaching. A recent study by Murray (1983) presents a research design which considers an alternative way to study the effectiveness of student evaluations. Murray used observational methods to evaluate 60 teaching characteristics and correlated the previous student evaluations of his subjects with the observed teaching characteristics. Differences between low, medium, and

highly rated teachers were found to vary significantly, suggesting that high, medium, and low student ratings were measuring actual differences in teacher behavior, rather than just variances in personality etc. One might suggest that the greater use of this qualitative along with the present accepted methods of research on student ratings, might confirm the use of student evaluations as an adequate measure of teacher effectiveness.

Summary

As noted throughout this section, the student evaluation literature is immense and definitely quantitative and empirical in nature. The purpose of this chapter has been to point to how the literature pays little attention to a sociological interpretation of the quantitative data. This review only touches the surface of all available studies, and to make an ultimate summary statement regarding the status of this literature is difficult. Such a summary statement must reflect author bias in some way. Therefore, in conclusion, I return to the initial question of this study: Are students qualified to judge the practice of teaching effectiveness? It is suggested that a more appropriate question must be: Are students as qualified to judge teacher effectiveness as professionals themselves? This study seeks to further elaborate on this question

through a sociological framework ▮ analysis.   As noted in
the introduction, one purpose of this particular study is to
situate the issue of student evaluations of teachers in a
broader societal context by analyzing the relationship
between student evaluations and teacher professionality.

The following section focuses on the professional role
of the teacher and the teacher/student relationship.

Section II
The Professional Role Of The High School Teacher

High School Teaching As A Profession

Defining the professional teaching act is a controversial topic. Some authors (Becker, 1962; Goode, 1969; Freidson, 1970) suggest there are a set of characteristics typical of all professionals. These characteristics are most commonly: autonomy, systematic knowledge, altruism, authority, and recognition by the community and law that the occupation is a profession. The number and degree of these characteristics necessary for professionalization are undecided and controversial in the literature (Ritzer, 1977). However, this study supports Saadeh (1970), who states: "Although some mention other characteristics underlying the profession of teaching, the fact remains that only one characteristic (teacher effectiveness) is the "sine qua non" (p. 75).

If the professional teacher is defined in terms of teacher effectiveness, then the criteria which account for professional teacher effectiveness of this occupation must be clearly outlined.

What Is Professional Teacher Effectiveness?

As noted by Saadeh (1970) one must determine if the

criterion of teacher effectiveness "resides in the act itself or outside it" (p.75)? That is, is teacher effectiveness possessing the knowledge, or the ability to transfer the knowledge to another? The debate is regarding process (teaching style) or product (student outcomes) as the criterion of teacher effectiveness. Some suggest that student outcomes are the ultimate criterion (McKeachie, et al, 1980). Even as noted by Saadeh (1970), when using solely student learning as a measure of teacher effectiveness, one must be aware that as the situations become more complex (i.e. variances in student I.Q., background, etc.) the value of student learning alone, as a measure of teacher effectiveness, becomes harder to assess. It is important to note that it is not an argument against student learning as a measure of teacher effectiveness, but rather, as noted by Saadeh (1970), focusing on one variable in a complex situation is fruitless and researchers are better to concern themselves "with the whole situation in order to be able to define teaching effectiveness in terms of its effects" (p. 78). Furthermore, tests used to assess student outcome are often not standardized enough to be an accurate norm for student outcomes (Saadeh, 1970). Yet authors such as Donald (1985), claim measures used to assess teacher effectiveness are quite similar across disciplines. The most consistent methods used to evaluate

38

the high school teacher measure the teachers : 1) ability to motivate students, 2) teaching methods and procedures, 3) subject matter orientation, 4) and fairness (Bentley, and Starry, 1975). The question arises, can these professional teacher characteristics only appropriately be evaluated by the professional?

Professional Teachers

By definition the indeterminancy ratio, as associated with the concept of professionalization, demonstrates a relationship between that portion of an occupation's tasks which are technical, and that portion of an occupation's tasks which require indeterminant knowledge (Ritzer, 1977). By technical one refers to those tasks which can be taught to the masses, while indeterminant knowledge refers to attributes, personal qualities, or what professionals consider esoteric knowledge (Ritzer, 1977). It is this degree of indeterminant knowledge which society often deems characteristic of the professional teacher.

Some suggest that this level of indeterminant knowledge is a socially defined and legally supported concept. Roth (1974) suggests it is those professions, (such as teachers) which have gained control over their members and become legislatively active that have influenced laws, policies, and public interests. According to Roth, these

professionals have convinced the public that the professions
have knowledge, expertise, etc. which sets them apart from
the masses. He claims the subjective notion of qualitative
differences between the professions and other occupations
has been objectified and made real. That is,
professionalism is a socially constructed concept and can be
manipulated by those in power. Therefore, according to
Roth, the concept of indeterminant or esoteric knowledge,
with regard to the professional high school teacher, is much
better studied as a social, political concept, rather than
an objective difference between indeterminant knowledge and
technical skill. It is in this context that one recognizes
why the role and status of the professional teacher is often
in flux. One might further suggest that the definition of
teacher effectiveness may also be a socially constructed
phenomena; one which varies dependent upon the
political/social climate, and not a totally objective
measure. This seems evident in the long running controversy
over product (outcome) versus process (teaching style) of
teacher effectiveness. The controversy over the extent to
which each of these phenomena contributes to teacher
effectiveness is one of political debate within the
profession of teaching. The above notions further suggest
that those professional teachers who are most active within
their profession and who support notions which increase the

level of professionality within the profession, will be
those professionals who are rated highest by members of
society in terms of effectiveness.

However, the debate over whether increased
professionalization vs. deprofessionalization increases
teacher effectiveness continues. For instance, Newman
(1971) suggests teachers should become "Practitioners of
Education" and transformed from a figure of authority
controlling his/her students to a general practitioner
helping students develop talents, skills, and interests. He
suggests the "limelight" should be shifted from the teacher
to the student.

At the base of these arguments is a search for improved
teacher effectiveness. That is, a search for methods,
practices, and status which will further the goals of the
teaching profession, namely increase teacher effectiveness
(Saadeh, 1970).

Approaches To Increase Professional Teacher Effectiveness

The ways in which the literature suggests professional
teaching effectiveness can increase, vary. For example,
Hoyle (1980) claims a distinction can be made between
restricted and extended teacher professionality. The
concept of restricted professionality means that
professionality which is "intuitive, classroom-focused, and

based on experience rather than theory". According to Hoyle (1980), this type of professional teacher is not concerned with comparing his/her work with others and "tends not to perceive his classroom activities in a broader context, and values his classroom autonomy" (p. 49).

Hoyle (1980) defines the extended professional teacher as one who "is concerned with locating his classroom teaching in the broader educational context, comparing his work with that of other teachers, evaluating his own work systematically, and collaborating with other teachers" (p. 49). But more importantly, the extended professional teacher perceives teaching as a skill which can be improved on the basis of research and theory. Hoyle (1974) recognizes that "control" and "autonomy" are characteristics of most professions. He claims that although the classroom teachers have historically experienced a great deal of autonomy (especially within the classroom), the teacher has had "limited influence on school goals or administration and little opportunity to control the broader context within which he performs his professional activities. In short, his autonomy operates within the constraints of a structure which is not of his own creating" (p. 15). Hoyle further claims the social structure surrounding the school has changed and has altered the teachers' relationship vis-a-vis control, autonomy and professionality.

Hoyle (1974) notes these changes have a micro as well as macro level basis. For instance, at the micro teaching level, changes in pedagogy often require the teacher's use of "collaborative teaching", resulting in loss of control of the teachers' classroom. Secondly, at the macro level, changes in the social/political climate of society now affect the teacher's role in the classroom. For example, Hoyle (1974) notes societal changes now demand that the teacher be involved in macro level educational decision making. He suggests the prevalent notion is now, "the belief that those who are affected by decisions should play a part in making them" (p. 15). Hoyle notes that teachers, by increasing "participation", may lose their autonomy in the classroom, yet gain greater control through an interdependence with collegues. He claims this notion presupposes an "informed professionality".

It is here that Hoyle (1974) presents the notion that informed professionality requires that practice is established and improved upon by a "body of theory and research" (p. 17). He further suggests social organization has evolved to the point that in order for the teacher to be an "informed professional" the teacher must be able to make a contribution to policy and planning. These new tasks, therefore, require a new set of skills, knowledge and procedures which are of an "extended" nature. Yet, Hoyle

43

notes his own research suggests that "teachers response to the model generally indicates a belief that extended professionality is almost inevitably achieved at the cost of effective restricted professionality at the classroom level" (p. 19).

Accordingly, one might question whether the the extended professional teacher or the restricted professional would more readily accept student evaluations and be prepared to use research in this area to improve teacher effectiveness. However, one must first establish whether these two theoretical categories of professionality are distinctly present among teachers.

Although using different terminology, William Taylor (1980) suggests that teacher education is an ongoing process and a process which each professional teacher should nurture. Taylor further suggests the professional teacher must avail himself of the material which will ensure the ongoing professional, as well as personal, growth. Taylor concludes the teacher's greatest responsibility is to himself and that teacher effectiveness will increase when professional development:

> ...is not simply based on more courses and conferences, but which takes into account the contributions to improved teaching that can be made by library and information services, newspapers and

44

broadcasters, teacher self-centre and school based programmes, and all those other self-improving activities in which teachers participate as individuals or in groups" (p. 337).

Taylor's work suggests, once again, that those teachers who become politically and socially involved and have a personal commitment to continued self development in their profession, will be the most effective teachers.

Hoyle (1980) implies the lesson to be learned from this differentiation of teacher's perspectives, or different level of professionality, is a possible gap between possessing knowledge and the ability to use and practice this knowledge. That is, the teacher may possess expert knowledge--yet the expert practice is the issue. How does the teacher make use of the "expert" knowledge within the context of the classroom? This question organizes the next topic for discussion in this study.

Student/Teacher Relationship

One must recognize the impact that the professional high school classroom teacher has on students' lives; yet as noted by Branan (1972) teachers are either unaware or play down this aspect of the student/teacher relationship. Unfortunately, the potential to influence students' lives can have negative outcomes as well as positive. For

45

example, a study by J.M. Branan (1972) performed on 300 college students in the United States, suggests these college students' most negative life experiences were caused by teachers—more precisely, professional high school teachers (52%). These notions are further supported by the works of Warner (1984) which, once again, suggests teachers were involved more often than any other persons in one's most negative life experiences. Furthermore, Halamandaris and Loughton (1972) suggest "the ideal teacher must be first and foremost the possessor of empathy competence...the ability of a teacher to genuinely consider, as a first priority, the rights, feelings and achievements of the individual student in all teaching activities" (p. 21). These studies suggest the notion that teacher empathy and a concern for students' perspectives are an important component of student development and therefore, an important component to teacher effectiveness and even teacher education.

The educational field is bombarded with philosophical, sociological, historical, and psychological theories and suggestions for improved high school teacher effectiveness. One must note that regardless of the boundless theory and research, the teacher evaluation research is still unable to answer, what is teacher effectiveness and what contributes to its improvement. The present high school education

system has consistently ignored an obvious source of information in this process--the student.

Significance Of Student Input In The Learning Process

If students are truly an integral part of the teacher/student relationship, with students evaluating teachers as well as teachers evaluating students, students are more likely to accept and legitimize the learning experiences within the context of the high school. For example, Dewey (1933) notes: "teaching may be compared to selling commodities. No one can sell unless someone buys" (p. 35). This study suggests a paradox of the current student/teacher relationship. The present unidirectional model of evaluation creates a context in which students are unable to give feedback to improve teacher effectiveness. What is needed is an alternative style of student/teacher evaluation, one which suggests a reciprocal process between the "expert/nonexpert". The context in which the unidirectional model of evaluation was developed is no longer congruent with contemporary society. That is, taking a broad view, the professional high school teacher is now working within a context in which the student (regardless of class distinction) is more widely socially educated and more likely to question the professionals' knowledge, expertise, as well as authority (Ritzer, 1977). (This could

also be true due to greater media and peer interaction). It is simply the students' obligation to attend school and accept it as such. These notions are further supported by the works of Goodman (1956) who questions the concept of compulsory education under these circumstances. The student is characterized as a pawn in his/her own dilemma, possessing only deficiencies while neglecting the resources the student may possess.

Furthermore, high school students are in marginal statuses with conflicting expectations imposed on them by society and their schools. The practice of high school evaluations of teachers are of utmost importance to high school students, especially given the fact that these students have little or no choice over what courses, teachers, or schools they are assigned. The high school student has no recourse in an uncomfortable learning environment--student feedback to teachers may provide these students an opportunity for greater input into their learning process. And as suggested previously, this student participation in teacher evaluation may contribute to the legitimization of the work of the professional teacher; thereby increasing the teacher's professional status. For example, one of the often mentioned criteria of a professional is acceptance and legitimation by the client; student evaluation may increase this amount of legitimate

authority associated with the professional teacher. That is, possibly, by allowing student input (not control), students may recognize that teachers are interested in student perceived concerns, and therefore show greater support for teacher efforts.

The criticism of these notions as exemplified by B.F. Skinner (1978) must also be recognized. Skinner suggests the current downward trend of standardized scores is due to too much empahsis on empathy and not enough emphasis on skill and observable behavior. Needless to say, either extreme is undesirable. It is finding the appropriate mix of both teaching style and outcome which will maximize the learning experience. However, one might compare this controversy to the nature/nurture argument in the social sciences. Even though the contribution of each of these concepts to the notion of human development has been debated for many years, the most definitive response must be that the two concepts can not be separated in any situation (Vander Zanden, 1981). The same is true in the debate over process vs. product of teaching effectiveness. Social organization has now evolved to the point that knowledge alone is not enough to mcbilize resources, to get things done. In contemporary society, in order to be an effective participant, one must have the knowledge, and also the social skills and self image necessary for effective

participation. It follows that school systems must consider the implicit socialization of each and every student when determining teacher effectiveness.

Are Students Qualified To Evaluate The Professional Teacher?

Some might suggest that the student's untrained perceptiveness is no match for a teacher who has been trained in appropriate skills and practices. Eliot Friedson (cited in Hoyle, 1980) comments on how to measure whether laymen are qualified, in general, as judges of professional effectiveness:

> The activities can be judged by their faithfulness to the degree to which they are founded upon that knowledge. To evaluate the expert and his expertise, then , one does not only evaluate the knowledge of his discipline as such but also the relationship of his activity of being an expert to that knowledge. Thus we must ask, what is the substance of the expert's work as well as of his knowledge? Is systematic and reliabe knowledge involved in every facet of his work? Is objective knowledge involved rather than moral or evaluative preference? The answers to such questions allow us to determine the degree to which the work of the expert is justifiably and appropriately protected from the

50

evaluation and influence of laymen (p. 51).

The literature verifies the fact that the reason the teacher is so difficult to evaluate is precisely because of a lack of a systematic base to this profession (Roth, 1977). The teaching profession is often accused of being one of organized common sense, supporting Friedson's notions as stated above. Therefore, the layman (student) could be able to evaluate the expert practice of expert knowledge. For the most part, the student is surely capable of evaluating how he/she perceives the teacher's work. The next question might be when is one able to appropriately evaluate the teacher's work, grade 2, grade 3, or grade 11? This study's response is a student is immediately capable of evaluating how he/she perceives the teacher and these perceptions should be of value and not a threat to the teacher or the teaching profession. (Of course, the type and form of evaluation would vary depending on age). Another criticism of those opposed to student evaluations is that most evaluations have a central tendency and therefore are of little value. It is possible that these findings are an accurate appraisal of the teacher's average work, or possibly, questionnaire construction encourages these types of responses. However, the professional, comforted by the expert knowledge which he possesses, once again, may look to

the student as the scapegoat, why not look as well within to interpret these perceptions of the student? Again, this alternative approach legitimizes the work of the professional teacher by the consumer of the teacher's efforts, and therefore also increases the status of the professional teacher.

Needless to say, this alternative model of evaluation is on rocky ground. This model of evaluation begins to be consciousness raising in regard to the professional teacher status. Such esoteric knowledge, skills, and altruistic nature of this profession become suspect when one questions the benefits of the unidirectional approach to student/teacher interaction and the resistance displayed by some professional teachers in applying the less paradoxical approach as suggested by the student teacher evaluations. The apparent fear of deprofessionalization within the field surfaces as being a major concern.

Presumably, fear of deprofessionalization is a greater problem for the professional high school teacher because of the lack of a clear claim to a theoretical knowledge base as opposed to those professions whose knowledge is based on the hard sciences (Ritzer, 1977). Much of the esoteric (indeterminant) knowledge associated with the professional teacher might be classified as "organized common sense" and difficult to establish as a superior or esoteric

characteristic vis-a-vis lay knowledge. This lack of scientific based knowledge further intensifies. the teacher/student relationship dilemma as discussed above. A teacher's increased awareness and concern for students' perceptions might not only legitimize their authority and status within their profession, but ensure greater professionalism through increasing student's interest in entering this field.

Summary

Contemporary high school students are forced to make major life decisions associated with such things as drinking alcohol, even participation with drugs, sex, but are often considered incapable of offering appropriate suggestions for improved teacher effectiveness. This lack of evaluative participation on the part of high school students within the high school context, is representative of the greater social structure within which they live. Their marginal status--not children, yet not adults--creates a dilemma for this age group (Erikson, 1963). Is it possible that much of this dilemma is an unnecessary part of the developmental process and teenagers who can affect their environment will be less prone to unconventional means of exerting control over their lives; means as extreme as suggested by the current increase in teenage suicide? The literature often suggests the professional teacher lives

53

with a false perception of how students and others perceive him (Blackburn and Clark, 1975; Centra, 1979). For instance, McNeil and Popham (1973), suggest teachers will not change their performance unless they perceive a discrepancy between what they want to achieve and what they are actually achieving. These writers further claim that there is a tendency for teachers to overrate themselves and suggests there is a negligible relationship between teacher's self ratings and student's ratings or measures of student gains. Student evaluations of teachers may begin to alert the professional high school teacher to areas requiring improvement, and thereby increasing the expert practice as well as expert knowledge and ultimately increase the professional status of this field. As noted within this study, the present unidirectional model is accepted by society as just, thereby complicating their implementation.

However, if there is ever a situation where one is guilty before they have had a chance to prove their innocence, it is the case with research regarding the democratic practice of student evaluations of high school teachers. It appears from the literature that the focus within the majority of this research is not structured within the context of the schools as an institution provided for student learning, but rather structured within the context that schools are institutions providing and

protecting professional teacher employment. That is, the protection of the professional status of teachers are often guarded, regardless of outcomes for the student. This becomes an even greater concern in the high school setting where a professional teacher's job requirements are more specifically focused on the student and the student has little or no recourse in the matter. This clearly differs from the university setting where research and administrative duties are also a concern for the professional teacher.

In conclusion, the rationale for this research is to question whether students should become active participants in the evaluative process, with the students possessing a perception of being able to have an impact on their learning environment? Are students qualified to judge teacher effectiveness? The implications for teacher education are that if findings support student evaluation, the professional high school teachers should be more appropriately trained to analyze student feedback and the professional teacher training curricula should increasingly focus on teacher's ability to appropriately address student evaluations of teachers and on the teacher/student interpersonal relationships.

Thus, from the above review, it becomes apparent how a sociological perspective may provide a more comprehensive

analysis of student evaluation than a strictly psychological, quantitative analysis. Teacher intentions to make use of student evaluations becomes an important issue, as does student intentions regarding their impact.

In the following section, this study presents a new method of studying student evaluation of teaching.

Section III
Research Design And Conceptual Framework

Method

Given the accepted tradition of the literature on student evaluations of teachers, this methodology attempts to bridge the gap for qualitative research in this area. The study is a qualitative study which investigates two aspects of the teaching evaluation process at the high school level. The research investigates this process by examining the high school student evaluations of student teacher effectiveness as compared to student teacher self evaluations, classroom teacher evaluations, and the university professor (student teacher adviser) evaluations of student teacher effectiveness.

It was proposed that these student teachers would be interesting teachers to study because they would have recently been exposed to the theoretical perspectives of their university professors, but also exposed to the practical concerns of the classroom teacher. In addition, the researcher was able to compare the teacher evaluations of high school students with those who are generally thought of as capable of determining appropriate characteristics of effective teaching. Thereby, if the high school student evaluations are comparable to the "expert" opinions, one might suggest the study acts as a validation of student

57

evaluations and supports their use as an important measure of effective teaching.

The main thrust is to research the relationship between high school student ratings of student teacher effectiveness, student teacher self evaluations of effectiveness, and professional teacher effectiveness evaluations. These ratings must be effected by one's personal, professional perspectives on teaching. The main hypothesis is that high school student evaluations of student teachers will be similar to the professional evaluations of student teachers, and even more similar to professional evaluations than the student teacher self evaluations.

As noted throughout this study, the most important aspect of this methodology is the attempt to discover the perspectives and intentions of both the high school students, the high school teachers, the university professor, and also the high school student teachers. This qualitative methodology seeks to explore the issues surrounding the use of student evaluations and, therefore, uses enthographic techniques to describe these situations.

In addition, this study performed a theoretical construct validation for the professional constructs of extended and restricted professionality, as presented by Eric Hoyle (1980). Based on the literature, this study

(predicted to find empirical support for the professional teacher characteristics of extended professionality from the university professors and also the student teachers, yet the high school teachers would reject this category and claim to be more of a restricted professionality.

The independent variables examined in this study were: status of the evaluator, teacher self perceived level of professionality (student teacher, classroom teacher, and university professor), and student perceived level of impact. The evaluation variable has four levels as follows: 1) high school student teacher self evaluation 2) classroom teacher, 3) university professor 4) high school students. The self perceived level of professionality has two levels as follows: 1) extended professionality 2) restricted professionality. The last independent variable, student perceived level of impact, has two levels: 1) high 2) low.

The independent variables in this study are operationally defined as: 1) Level of professionality (student teacher, classroom teacher, and university professor) are determined by the level of professionality questionnaire (Appendix A), and qualitative interview to confirm self categorization of the construct. 2) Student Level of impact is defined by student impact questionnaire (Appendix B). 3) The level of evaluator is defined by one being either a student teacher, high school student,

classroom   teacher,   or .supervisor of student   teacher
(university professor).

Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from a North
American University with a high school student teacher
program within the education department. This university is
considered an outstanding North American university.   These
student   teachers came from the cooperation   of   four
university student teaching advisers; 1 female and 3 males.
These   student   teachers   taught in   the   following subject
areas: Biology/Science   (n=7), History/Economics   (n=4),
Physics/Math (n=6), and Home Economics (n=3).   In addition,
there   were 16 high school teachers contacted to participate
in the study. The first five respondents were to be used as
the   sample for student teacher evaluations.   These   high
school   teachers   were   the   cooperating   teachers   whose
classrooms the University education department used for the
practical   teaching experience of their   student   teachers.
There   were   a   total of nineteen student   teachers   in   the
study; ten males and nine females.   All-of these student
teachers were used for the construct validation, yet four
were randomly chosen from this group to be evaluated by all
levels of evaluators.   The first five classroom teachers to
respond were the ones' whose student teachers were studied.
(As it turned out, one of the student teachers was evaluated

by two high school teachers). All of these five classroom teachers are male. The five classroom teachers elicited 166 high school students which evaluated the student teachers. Twenty-seven of these students were used as a pilot test, since the student teacher did not actually teach them, but was a tutor and helper. This pilot study prepared the researcher for areas, in the student teacher evaluation form, which might require immediate clarification. Therefore, only the remaining 139 high school students evaluated the student teachers in this study. There were 67 females and 72 males in grades 8-11.

All of the high school teachers and high school students were from the Catholic School Board. As suggested in sociological literature, class background may effect one's perceptions of a good teacher (Becker, 1984). All of these students were from a middle class school district, therefore, comparisons between these similar groups seems appropriate. Based on the information provided by the head of the student teaching program, the four university professors represent 80% (N=5) of the total Population in these subject areas; the student teachers involved represent approximately 86% (N=23) of this total Population. Table 1 summarizes how each participant was used in this study.

Insert Table 1 about here

This sample also consists of a case study of one of the student teachers. This male student teacher was evaluated by 2 university professors (the student teacher taught both math and physics), 2 classroom teachers (math/physics), and 2 classes of high school students. In addition, this student teacher was the tutor for the additional 27 students who evaluated teaching performance for the pilot study.

Table 1

SAMPLE

INSTRUMENTATION	*UP	CT	ST	HSS
Profession Construct Validation	3	5	14	0
Interview (private)	4	5	19	0
Group interview	0	0	19	139
H. S. Student Profile	0	0	0	139
Student Teacher Evaluation (**One student provides two self evaluations.)	3	5	**20	139

*UP=University professor

CT=High school classroom teacher

ST=Student teacher

HSS=High school students

63

Procedures For Drawing The Sample

On the advice of Professor Hamalian, my thesis adviser,
I first approached the Chairman of the University High
School Student Teacher program, Professor Quinn (all
participants' names and schools have been changed to protect
the confidentiality of the study) to gain approval of this
research project. On his advice and recommendation, I was
to approach the professors within the department to seek
their individual interest in participating in this project.
Professor Quinn supplied me with a complete list of all
professors and student teachers within the department.
Professor Quinn was most cooperative and helpful in this
process. After meeting with Professor Quinn, I sent him an
abstract of my research project and a protocal form
(Appendix D) listing the objectives of my research proposal.
The suggested proposal was accepted via a phone call from my
thesis adviser, Professor A. Hamalian. Given this
confirmation, I proceeded to seek participants for my study.
There is a short amount of time allowed for student teaching
(6-9 weeks), I was, therefore, committed to using
professors who were readily agreeable to participating in
this study. Each professor was cautioned to seek the
approval of the participating high school student teachers
before consenting to participate.

The subject areas that I pursued to gain participants

64

were Biology/Science, History/Economics, Math/Physics, Home Economics, and Geography. These subject areas were chosen because there were fewer professors who evaluated in each area and therefore there would be a greater standardization of professional evaluation. There were two professors in the History/Economics area who evaluated student teachers for this term; one agreed immediately, the other required a more formal and structured qualification process within the education faculty before accepting. He represented a not unusual encounter in field work research--one where respondents feel threatened by inquiries into their domain of expertise (Supportive of the findings of the study, as seen in the following pages). There was one Biology and General Science professor, and he readily agreed and offered his own research as assistance for my project--of course, this was dependent on student teacher approval.

There were two Math Professors, one had all but one student teacher which was also represented in the Biology/Science subject area and, therefore, this professor was not approached. The other professor was approached and also agreed, given his students would not object. There was only one Home Economics professor who evaluated student teachers this term. This professor was extremely helpful and also had an interest in this project, and willingly accepted to participate in this study. There were two

professors in the Geography department, one was opposed to
agreeing to the study without qualification. The other
professor could not be reached. Therefore, only those
professors who voluntarily accepted to participate are
included in the study.

Instrumentation

The form used to measure high school student teacher
effectiveness is the University's student teacher evaluation
form (See Appendix C). This form was developed by this
University for evaluations of student teachers. The form
was a questionnaire addressing teaching skills in the
followings areas: 1) Lesson Preparation (subject knowledge,
objectives, methods, materials, and evaluation), 2) Lesson
Presentation (Language, explanation, questioning,
development, and adaptabiltiy), 3) Classroom management and
learning atmosphere (organization, pupil involvement,
cooperation), 4) Interpersonal relationships (interest,
consideration, openness, perception, and 5) Professional
qualities (self-assurance, voice, vitality, responsibility,
initiative, self-assessment, and flexibility).

At the bottom of each section, there was a checklist
where the professional evaluator was to determine if the
student teacher rating in this area was very satisfactory,
satisfactory, marginally satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

For greater standardization and use by both high school students, high school teachers, student teachers, and the university professors, all evaluators were asked to evaluate the student teacher's effectiveness by using the checklist rating for each of the sub-categories within each section and also addressing the open ended questions. Four points were given for a rating of very satisfactory, three points for a rating of satisfactory, two points for a rating of marginally satisfactory, and one point for unsatisfactory. Therefore, the maximum score possible was 96, the lowest score was 24. The open ended answers are used in the ethnographic descriptions of this research.

I asked questions regarding the psychometric qualities (i.e. reliability, validity,) of the form. The responses were that over the years of student evaluations, these criteria were those which the professional evaluators deemed important for effective teaching. Although no reliability or validity coefficients were availabe for my use, one must consider that an institution designed for effective teaching, must be using criteria which, in fact, appropriately measure those qualities. (More importantly, given the imposing nature of this study, I felt committed to use their standardized form rather than introducing a new one of my own choosing).

Teacher effectiveness is determined by the evaluation

scores. That is, the high school student teacher's class mean scores from each evaluator will be used as a measure of comparison between each evaluator.

The measure of self perceived level professionality is a questionnaire designed such that teachers not only construct the category, but also self categorize their own perceived level of professionality (see Appendix A). That is, both classroom teachers, student teachers, and university professional advisers were given a list of 18 statements related to Hoyle's untested theoretical concepts of extended and restricted professionality. These statements were purposely placed in an illogical ordering. The order of each question in the questionnaire was determined by placing a number representing each sentence in a 'hat' and then drawing, one by one, a number. Each sentence was placed on the questionnaire in the order it was drawn. The teachers, student teachers, and university professors were then required to sort the statements into two categories (A or B), based on a self perceived logical ordering. No sentence can be categorized in both categories. After completing this categorization, both teachers and students were asked to determine which category best fits their own self perceived notions about teaching, thus suggesting their self perceived level of professionality. Each "professional" was also allowed to

suggest which concepts did or did not belong in their own personal professional categorizations:

A teacher was categorized as restricted or extended, dependent on the greater number of statements which correspond to Hoyle's (1980) pre-designed categories. If the professional correctly categorized the constructs, yet suggested (in the open ended question) that these constructs did not relate to their true notions on teaching, this professional's categories were discussed as a separate case.

<u>Insert Table 2 about here</u>

TABLE 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR STUDY

CONCEPT	OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Independent Variables:

a) Level of professionality

1. Extended: When teacher's perceptions of professionality are most similar to Hoyle's definition of extended professionality (see Table 3). This self perception is determined by the Teacher Profile Questionnaire (Appendix A).

2. Restricted: When teacher's self perceptions of professionality are most similar to to Hoyle's restricted professionality (see Appendix A). This self perception is determined by the Teacher Profile Questionnaire (Appendix A).

b) Student Level of Impact

1. High when > than 50% of students report that student evaluations will have an impact on student teacher be- havior (Appendix B).

2. Low when less than or equal to 50% of high school

Table 2 cont'd.

		students report that student evaluations will have an impact on student teacher behavior (Appendix B).
	c) Level of Evaluator	1. Professional Evaluator (Student Teacher's Advisor)
		2. Classroom Teacher
		3. Student Teacher
		4. High School Students
Dependent Variable:		
	a) Teacher Effectiveness	1. High when in top 1/3 of student teacher ratings.
		2. Medium when in middle 1/3 of student teacher ratings.
		3. Low when in the lowest 1/3 of student teacher ratings.

Perceived level of professionality (see Table 3) is briefly defined as follows: Extended professionals: 1) suspect one's teacher effectiveness can be improved by suggestions from research findings, 2) seek to compare one's teaching with other teachers at the high school level 3) are willing to try new approaches to teaching when research/theory suggests new or better techniques are more effective. Restricted Professionals: 1) do not suspect one's teacher effectiveness can be improved by research findings 2) are not concerned with comparing one's teaching with others at the high school levels 3) are not willing to try new techniques or approaches to teaching when research/theory suggests new or better techniques are more effective and also prefer methods based on intuition and experience. The measure of professionality was designed using both the conceptual framework of Hoyle (1980), and on the work of Olson (1979) who suggests that by using teachers own construed concepts, one may achieve a more accurate picture of teacher's true perceptions.

In an effort to further validate and confirm each teacher's self categorized perceptions on level of professionality, a brief interview was be obtained from each teacher. The purpose of the interview was to ask questions based on the way the teacher constructed the two categories of professional teaching; testing for confirmation or need

72

for reorganization of the conceptual notions of extended and restricted professional. Table 3 on the following page represents Hoyle's own presentation of both concepts.

Insert Table 3 about here

Student perceived level of impact is defined according to the student profile questionnaire (Appendix B) as: 1) high, when high school student mean scores on student profile questionnaire suggest students think their ratings offered on the evaluation forms will increase teacher effectiveness. That is, when greater than 50% of students in a class think student evaluations will be used by the teacher and have an impact (yes), the score is high; when less than or equal to 50% of students in a class think student evaluations will not be used and will not have an impact (no), the score is low.

TABLE 3
HOYLE'S (1980) CONCEPTS OF
EXTENDED AND RESTRICTED PROFESSIONALITY

RESTRICTED PROFESSIONALITY	EXTENDED PROFESSIONALITY
Skills derived from experience.	Skills derived from a mediation between experience and theory.
Perspective limited to the immediate in time and place.	Perspective embracing the broader social context of education.
Classroom events perceived in isolation.	Classroom events perceived in relation to school policy and goals.
Introspective with regard to methods.	Methods compared with those of colleagues and with reports of practice.
Value placed on autonomy.	Value placed on professional collaboration.
Limited involvement in non-teaching professional activities	High involvement in non-teaching professional activities (esp. teachers' centres, subject ass., research).
Infrequent reading of prof. literature.	Regular reading of professional literature.
Involvement in in-service work limited and confined to practical courses.	Involvement in in-service work considerable, including courses of a theoretical nature.
Teaching seen as an intuitive activity.	Teaching seen as a rational activity.

Therefore, the instruments used for organization and collection of data may be summarized as follows:

Stage One (Level of Professionality)

The low inference descriptors were the questionnaire which:

1) Allowed student teachers, classroom teachers, and the university professors to construe their own theoretical constructs, given a set of 18 statements established by Eric Hoyle (1980).

2) Allowed each evaluator to increase the category, or elaborate on why they agree or disagree with this distinction.

The high inference descriptors are:

1) An interview with each evaluator to determine how they developed their own categorization of teacher professionality and detect if their verbal responses are in agreement with their written construct.

2) Also of intial concern was, were the responses elicited genuinely, or merely an exercise of "filling in the questionnaire".

Stage Two (student teacher evaluation comparison)

The low inference descriptor is:

1) A questionnaire designed to quantify each evaluator's notions of teacher effectiveness.

The high inference descriptors were:

1) The part of the questionnaire designed to allow the evaluator to offer suggestions for improvements.

2) The part of the questionnaire designed to allow each evaluator to give his/her feelings about student evaluations of teaching.

Procedures For Data Collection

All teachers and students were told the importance of the ratings was an attempt to compare high school student ratings of student teacher effectiveness with those of the student teacher self evaluation, the classroom teacher evaluation, and the university professors evaluation. An attempt was made to emphasize to high school students and teachers that honest comments were expected. The participants were also informed that all information received for this study is confidential. The teachers and students were also informed that the evaluator profiles were used to determine if certain characteristics effected ratings (e.g. professional perspectives).

All university professors filled in the forms measuring student teacher effectiveness, as well as the questionnaire regarding perceived level of professionality. This was done on an individual basis. The interview was either before or after this process (dependent on convenience of the

76

professor).

All student teachers filled in the forms measuring self ratings of student teacher effectiveness, as well as the questionnaire regarding perceived level of professionality, during the classroom period at the university. Short interviews (5-30 minutes) were performed with student teachers to assess the basis for categorization. At this time, these student teachers were also interviewed, as a group.

All classroom teachers filled in evaluation forms to measure student teacher effectiveness during the high school class period. In addition, they filled in the questionnaire regarding self perceived level of professionality, on an individual basis. This was done at least a week in advance of the interview with the teacher, in all but one case. This teacher sent in his form after the interview.

All high school students filled in the forms measuring student teacher effectiveness as well as the questionnaire regarding student perceived level of impact, during the classroom period.

The initial form of phase 1 of this study was pilot tested on one university professor and 4 student teachers in the history department at the University. There were minimal changes in the wording of the questionnaires used

for this study. These changes had to do with clarification of words used in the directions. As noted by Olson (1979), it is important that the participants in the study read and understand words, sentences, and concepts as intended by the data collector. Therefore, throughout the study, clarifications could be made regarding terminology and concepts. Regardless of the changes, this pilot study presented near 80% agreement in the theoretical construct as offered by Eric Hoyle. This initial finding suggested the study was one to be pursued.

Part two of this study (student teacher evaluation) was also pilot tested on one high school class. However, the student teacher involved was only a tutor and did not teach this class. Therefore, this class provided insight into potential areas within the questionnaire which might require immediate clarification.

In addition to the above procedures, I made contact and was given acceptance of 4 university professors who participated in this study. These professors were selected in the manner described under the heading SAMPLE. Each professor informed me of a time which would be convenient for me to meet with their class of student teachers. During this meeting, the intent of the study was explained. At this time student teachers were asked if they would agree to having their high school classroom teachers, univeristy

78

advisers, and high school students evaluate their teaching effectiveness. All students were free to make their own decisions in this matter. If students agreed, they were then asked to fill in the appropriate questionnaires for the study, after which a brief interview was conducted to determine the method of categorization. The student teachers were very helpful and appeared to take a real interest in the study. All but one student teacher agreed to participate (This seemed to be due to a very unpleasant morning which resulted in a $50 ticket rather than anything to do with the study, however, this student teacher already had a lot of experience in teaching and did appear to be uncomfortable about having the high school students evaluate her effectiveness, and also did not want to fill in the professionality questionnaire. This students' wishes were respected and no pressure was put on her to fill in the questionnaire). The student teachers were also interviewed as a group to get their notions about student evaluations of their teaching and their classroom teacher's teaching.

After a two week period, the student teachers were contacted by phone, to double check that they still did not oppose their classroom cooperating teacher and classroom student's participation in this study. All student teachers remained very willing for this participation. Having, once again, verified their approval of this research, a letter

was sent to each cooperating high school teacher (see Appendix D). Along with this letter, the professionality questionnaire was sent. After receiving the responses from the high school teachers, times were set up to meet with each classroom teacher and their high school students (As noted earlier, only the first five respondents were used).

At all times, the researcher welcomed questions regarding the questionnaires and clarified any concepts of which the students, classroom teachers, or university professors were uncertain. Each encounter helped clarify the next step, thus checking for validity and reliability (as much as possible), given the limited scope of this study.

Section IV
Presentation Of Results
Theoretical Construct Validation

University Professors

The first concern of this study was with Eric Hoyle's
(1980) untested theoretical constructs of extended and
restricted professionality. The first to fill in
questionnaires in this construct validation were the
university professors. There were four university
professors involved, however, complete data from only three
of the professors was received. As noted in Table 4, there
was an 85% confirmation of the constructs as determined by
the university professors. Eleven of the eighteen
statements had 100% correct classification. As suspected
through Hoyle's writings, the university professors
perceived themselves as extended professionals.

<u>Insert Tabel 4 about here</u>

During the informal interviews, the professors
confirmed these self categorizations. One professor, in
particular, made reference to how the climate of the
educational field has changed. In agreement with Hoyle,
this professor claimed: "the change has occurred both
pedogogically and at the societal level....The best teachers
are now those who think like managers and not like
employees". Throughout the interviews with the professors,
I became aware that these professors believed what is best

81

for the student is what is best for the teacher. These professors clearly suggested that the teaching profession, through greater professionalization, can increase their corner of the market. By having greater socio-political strength, these teachers can then "demand" smaller classrooms, better texts, etc. One professor suggested "some high school teachers do not use a broad enough repetoire of techniques and use merely the one's that have worked in the past...there are too many classroom technicians". These notions support Hoyle's concept of extended professionality. It is perhaps possible that these university professors, will indeed, attempt to pass this notion of extended professionality onto their student teachers.

Table 4   University Professors' Outcomes For
Level Of Professionality Questionnaire

Concept	Number of Responses	
	Extend.	Restrict.
Skills derived from experience. (R)	1	2
Skills derived from a mediation between experience and theory. (E)	3	0
Perspective limited to the immediate in time and place. (R)	0	3
Perspective embracing the broader social context of education. (E)	2	1
Class events perceived in isolation. (R)	0	3
Classroom events perceived in relation to school policies and goals. (E)	1	2
Introspective with regard to methods. (R)	1	2
Methods compared with those of colleagues and with reports of practice. (E)	3	0
Value placed on autonomy. (R)	0	3
Value placed on prof. collaboration. (E)	3	0
Limited involvement in non-teaching professional activities. (R)	0	3
High involvement in non-teaching professional activities. (E)	2	1
Infrequent reading of prof. literature. (R)	1	2
Regular reading of prof. literature. (E)	2	1
Involvement in in-service work limited to practical courses. (R)	0	3
Involvement in in-service work considerable inclusing courses of a theoretical nature. (E)	3	0
Teaching seen as an intuitive activity. (R)	0	3
Teaching seen as a rational activity. (E)	3	0
% Correct Categorization (N=3)		85%

83

Student Teachers

Fourteen of the student teachers filled in the professionality questionnaire. These fourteen students (6 males, and 8 females) had a 77% correct identification of Hoyle's theoretical constructs. Thirteen of the student teachers described themselves as extended professionals (4 males, 9 females) while one (male) described himself as a restricted professional.

Insert Tabel 5 about here

Written comments, suggesting areas of personal professional differences with the self-constructed constructs, were aimed at notions about the students (i.e. classroom students). For example, one student teacher suggested teachers "should have more interest in their students". Yet another student, proposes "effective' teaching involves going beyond the classroom and encouraging students to adapt as people and not simply as students".

Table 5   Student Teachers' Outcomes For
                 Level Of Professionality Questionnaire

Concept	Number of Responses	
	Extend.	Restrict.
Skills derived from experience.(R)	7	7
Skills derived from a mediation between experience and theory.(E)	14	0
Perspective limited to the immediate in time and place.(R)	2	12
Perspective embracing the broader social context of education.(E)	12	2
Class events perceived in isolation.(R)	2	12
Classroom events perceived in relation to school policies and goals.(E)	8	6
Introspective with regard to methods.(R)	8	6
Methods compared with those of colleagues and with reports of practice.(E)	13	1
Value placed on autonomy.(R)	1	12
Value placed on prof. collaboration.(E)	12	2
Limited involvement in non-teaching professional activities.(R)	3	11
High involvement in non-teaching professional activities.(E)	8	6
Infrequent reading of prof. literature.(R)	1	13
Regular reading of prof. literature.(E)	11	3
Involvement in in-service work limited to practical courses.(R)	0	14
Involvement in in-service work considerable including courses of a theoretical nature.(E)	8	6
Teaching seen as an intuitive activity.(R)	5	9
Teaching seen as a rational activity.(E)	11	3
% Correct Categorization (N=14)		77%

In contrast to the theoretical constructs presented by the univeristy professors, these student teachers' personal professional categorizations appear to be torn between the theoretical notions taught at the university and the practical concerns they were exposed to in the high school classroom. For instance, one student teacher focuses on the importance of "interchange with the students in a personal way, that is, being a friend to the students".

It is interesting to note that the open ended question ("In what ways do you differ from this category? What other statements would you add to characterize your teaching style?") elicited entirely different comments from these two levels of "professional teachers". One focuses on macro, societal level responses (i.e. the univerity professors), and one focuses on micro level, day-to-day concerns. This is not to say that the university professor does not also suggest the importance of personal interaction with the student, or that the student teacher is not also concerned with socio-political issues, but rather that the initial/primary concerns for developing skills, knowledge, and procedures for effective teaching, differ in this regard.

The informal interviews - confirming self categorization often suggested the student teachers' personal professionality had not yet been totally

established. The need to suggest their future teaching practices would be based on theory, frequently appeared to be a "programmed statement" and one which the student teacher thought was the most acceptable response. Even though most of these student teachers claimed to be extended professionals, many of them will presumably become restricted professionals, given their daily routine tasks. Perhaps another example supports this claim. One student teacher noted:

> Although teaching skills <u>can</u> be taught, theoretically, I do feel that it (teaching ability) is largely inherent to the person himself--charisma, vitality, capacity to communicate...these are things that cannot be learned from textbooks. Even though teacher X may be up on all the latest techniques (and theory), knows his subject matter etc., he may be a far poorer teacher than teacher Y who may not be as technically 'on top of it' as teacher X, yet communicates with students better. A good teacher must get involved in extra curricular activities (with students)!

The university background has obviously "taught" this student that theory is important, but given practical experience, this student is not convinced it works in the classroom. Intuition, for this person, becomes a factor in teaching students.

In summary, and once again in support of Hoyle's writings, the new teachers are in a dilemma about their professional stance. Balancing the practical concerns of day-to-day teaching with the theoretical issues at the societal level creates a paradox for these idealistic student teachers.

High School Teachers

This sample of high school teachers consisted of five male teachers. These teachers had been teaching from 15-27 years. These classroom teachers indicated only a 60% confirmation of Hoyle's categories, each making considerable changes within their own professional perspectives. As predicted by Hoyle, each of these teachers claim to be restricted professionals. This personal perspective was confirmed through lengthy interviews with each teacher. Interviews varied from one-half to one and one-half hour long. Teachers were extremely helpful, cooperative, and eager to see research that was truly relevant to practical concerns. That is, the hope was that the university student teacher program could be made aware of how irrelevant much of the student teacher's theoretical methodology was to the practical situation in the classroom. Each teacher was willing to meet again, or provide further data, if required.

<u>Insert Table 6 about here</u>

88.

Table 6   Classroom Teacher Outcomes For
Level Of Professionality Questionnaire

Concept	Number of Responses	
	Extend.	Restrict.
Skills derived from experience. (R)	2	3
Skills derived from a mediation between experience and theory. (E)	4	1
Perspective limited to the immediate in time and place. (R)	3	2
Perspective embracing the broader social context of education. (E)	4	1
Class events perceived in isolation. (R)	1	4
Classroom events perceived in relation to school policies and goals. (E)	2	3
Introspective with regard to methods. (R)	3	2
Methods compared with those of colleagues and with reports of practice. (E)	3	2
Value placed on autonomy. (R)	2	3
Value placed on prof. collaboration. (E)	2	3
Limited involvement in non-teaching professional activities. (R)	2	3
High involvement in non-teaching professional activities. (E)	3	2
Infrequent reading of prof. literature. (R)	2	3
Regular reading of prof. literature. (E)	4	1
Involvement in in-service work limited to practical courses. (R)	2	3
Involvement in in-service work considerable including courses of a theoretical nature. (E)	3	2
Teaching seen as an intuitive activity. (R)	2	3
Teaching seen as a rational activity. (E)	4	1
% Correct Categorization (N=5)		60%

The written comments to the open ended questions focus entirely on the high school student. As one teacher put it: "The child comes first--that is the name of the game". With few exceptions, most comments focused on an immediate concern and interest for the high school student. An example from one of the math teachers supports this claim: "A teacher must really get to know their students. To be insisting that a student 'shape-up' in math when his parents are in middle of a brutal divorce, is absurd"!

Another teacher suggested many of the construct validation statements "dealing with things like theory and professional teacher activities do not seem to fit into today's practicality of teaching". This teacher claimed all energies must go into the day-to-day challenges of the classroom.

One classroom teacher suggested all university professors, who are teaching university students how to teach at the high school level, should be required to have taught at the high school level. He suggested "things are not as they seem. All student teachers need to forget everything they learn at the university, except their subject knowledge, and then really learn how to teach (through practice)". This teacher further noted a teacher must have a committment to young people. He wished a greater respect could be attributed to teachers as a whole,

90

yet suggested: - "...but first teachers must earn it".   He
claimed that recently teachers have lost interest in
becoming better teachers; due to unions and tenure. In
addition, he stated:

> It has not really been the students who have
> become a greater 'discipline problem'—it is the
> teaching profession as a whole.   There are some good
> ones, but few.   And teaching schools, such as the
> University (used in this study) <u>continue</u> to teach a
> method which is <u>totally</u> irrelevant to what is going on
> here.   How can the students win?   The teaching
> profession can only get better quality teachers when
> <u>only</u> better quality students are passed on to the
> profession.   The bad one's should be weeded out by the
> 'professionals' at the University.

Without exception, these five classroom teachers
develop their teaching skills, knowledge, and procedures
from experience and from an interest which begins with the
student.   Contrary to the university professors, classroom
teachers claim increased teacher effectiveness and
improvement within the teaching profession begins with first
doing a good job in the classroom!

Summary

Perhaps the above examples are sufficient to suggest
the university professor definitely is more "extended" in

notions of how to best develop skills, knowledge, and procedures which increase professional teacher effectiveness. The university professors confirmed the theoretical constructs, as presented by Hoyle, with 85% accuracy. In addition to the quantitative confirmation of the constructs, both the open ended question, and the interviews support their personal classifications.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here

The student teachers present a somewhat different version, and interpretation of teacher professionality. Even though they confirm the theoretical constructs with 77% accuracy, and also perceive themselves as extended professionals (with the exception of one student teacher), their answers to open ended questions and informal interviews suggest that many of them are either presently, or are soon-to-be, restricted professionals. It would provide an interesting follow up to re-evaluate their professional perspective in five to ten years from now.

Not surprisingly, the high school classroom teachers only present a 60% confirmation of the constructs. Their self-categorizations are of a restricted nature, with both open ended responses and informal interview highly suggesting their self-categorizations are accurate. In

Table 7

Comparison of Self-Perceived Professionality
By Each Level of Professional Teacher

Level of Professional	Extended	Restricted
University Prof.	100% (n=3)	0% (n=3)
Student Teachers	93% (n=14)	7% (n=14)
Classroom Teachers	0% (n-5)	100% (n=5)

Table 8

Theoretical Construct Confirmation
By Each Level of Professional Teacher

Level of Professional	% Correct
University Prof.	85%
Student Teachers	77%
Classroom Teachers	60%

particular, these teachers were only vaguely interested in a theoretical construct validation and could see little practical usage for research based on theory rather than practical concerns. The high school teachers were much more interested in the research regarding student teacher evaluation.

The next section elaborates on the second main aspect of this study; that is, high school student, classroom teacher, university professor, and student teacher self evaluations of teacher effectiveness.

Presentation of Results
Evaluations of Student Teacher Effectiveness

As noted earlier, level of impact refers to one's feelings about the use of student evaluation for teacher self development. The university professors (self-categorized as extended professionals) all declared the use of student evaluations was appropriate and that they presently make use of their students' suggestions for improvement (100%, N=3,).

Insert Tables 9 and 10 about here

Eighty percent (N=5) of the classroom teachers (self-categorized as restricted professionals) also stated they would use student evaluation of their teaching

Table 9

Level of Impact
(Professional Response to Question, "Would You
Use Student Evaluations of Your Teaching?")

Level of Professional	Yes	No
University Professor (N=3)	100%	0%
High School Teachers (N=5)	80%	20%
Student Teachers (N=19)	100%	0%

Table 10

Student Level of Impact
(Either high school student
or university student response to question,
"Would your teacher use student evaluations of their teaching?")

Level of Professional	Student Response		
	Yes	No	Maybe
University Professor (Univeristy students N=19)	100%	0%	0%
Classroom Teacher (High School students N=139)	57%	41%	2%
Student Teacher (High school students N=139)	99%	1%	0%

effectiveness, while 100% of the student teachers (N=19) also suggest they would use and benefit from student evaluations.

Yet, an interesting finding was that while 99% (N=139) of the high school students thought the student teachers would use the ratings to improve their teaching, only 56% (N=139) thought the high school teachers would use them. This finding could be interpretted to support Hoyle's writings. That is, the majority of the high school students thought the classroom teacher would be offended by an attack on the classroom autonomy and authority by using the students' critique of the "expert knowledge and practice". Therefore, although these classroom teachers suggest they would make use of the student evaluation, these self-categorized restricted professionals' actions, throughout day-to-day interaction with their students, suggest the opposite is true.

Yet, 99% of the high school students thought the student teachers (self-categorized as extended professionals) would make use of the student evaluations. This fact also supports Hoyle's writings. The extended professional seeks to improve skills, knowledge, and procedures of teaching from external sources as well as internal.

To lend further support for these points, 100% (N=19)

96

of the student teachers claimed their student teaching advisers (university professors who self-categorized as extended professionals) would also make use of their student evaluations of the university professor's teaching performance.

The significant point here is that, in order for student evaluations to be accurate, effective, and useful, one must suggest that not only should the teaching professional accept and make use of the data, but their students must also have a perception that their teacher will use and respect the student evaluations. The intentions of both the teacher and the student become an issue. Perhaps if students have a perception that their evaluations are going to be used, they will take more time and consideration in appropriately evaluating the teacher's performance. On the other hand, if the teacher also intends to make use of the student evaluation (rather than feel threatened by it) then more time and consideration can be taken in determining which areas require additional efforts.

Given the above findings, that is the notion that the high school students in this study (99%, n=139) thought the student teacher would use the student evaluations appropriately and the notion that the student teachers (100%, n=19) also claimed they would make use of the evaluations, one might expect that these high school student

evaluations might be very accurate appraisals of the student
teacher's performance.

Insert Table 11 about here

The data on Table 11 supports the above hypothesis.
Student evaluations are consistently similar to the more
experienced evaluators. For example, the evaluation of
student teacher #1 presents data that shows the student
teacher self evaluation is 67, the classroom teacher
evaluation is 61, the university professor evaluation is
66, and the high school student mean evaluation is 68.55.
Given these scores are out of a total of 96 points, the high
school class mean evaluation scores appear to be an accurate
appraisal of student #1's teaching effectiveness.

Student teacher #2 presents another similar case. The
student teacher self evaluation is 87, classroom teacher
evaluation is 87, the university professor evaluation is 75,
while the high school student mean rating is 79.81. One
might note that the experienced evaluators' rating (e.g.
university professor rating increases 9 points, and the high
school teacher rating increases 17.5 points) of this student
teacher were considerably higher than those of student
teacher #1. The high school student ratings were also

Table 11

Student Teacher Evaluation
Comparison by Level of Evaluator

Student Teacher #1

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self	67	2.79
High School Teacher	61	2.54
University Professor	66	2.75
High School Students' Mean (N=29, 100% present)	68.55	2.85
	s=6.49	s=.24

Student Teacher #2

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self	87	3.62
High School Teacher	87	3.62
University Professor	75	3.12
High School Students' Mean (N=27, 1 student absent)	79.81	3.32
	s=6.69	s=.26

Student Teacher #3

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self	81	3.37
High School Teacher	58	2.41
University Professor	69	2.87
High School Students' Mean (N=29, 3 students absent)	72.68	3.02
	s=9.603	s=.4

higher (11.26 increase), suggesting students can differentiate appropriately between teaching skills.

The evaluations of student teacher #3 presents yet another case. The student teacher self evaluation is 81, the classroom teacher rating is 58, the university professor rating is 69, while the high school student evaluation is 72.68. There is a considerable variation between the two experienced raters in the evaluation of student teacher #3 (17 points) while in no case is the student rating ever an extreme. The findings seem to suggest the student ratings may be consistently the most accurate of all four levels of evaluators.

In summarizing the ratings of the three student teachers presented in Table 11, one recognizes that the high school student evaluations are consistently very close to those of the more experienced and "knowledgeable" evaluators. In fact, the high school students' evaluations are (in 2 of the three cases) slightly higher than those of the professionals' opinions. This finding should comfort many teachers who fear the use of student ratings, thus suggesting students are reasonably fair in their appraisals. In fact, professional evaluations could conceivably be more of a threat to a teacher's job security than the students' evaluation.

A limitation in this study should be noted. University

professors had already spoken with their student teachers and appraised their performance. Therefore, the findings regarding self evaluations are biased and perhaps limited. Irrespective of this, one of the largest gaps between evaluations exists between student #3's self evaluation and the univerisity professors rating (a total difference of 12 points). This finding supports the student evaluation literature which suggest the student teachers might not benefit as much from the university professor's evaluation of their work, as they would from the. the high school students' evaluation (Tuckman and Oliver, 1968).

Insert Table 12 about here

The final student teacher rating is presented as a case study. This student teacher was evaluated by 2 university professors, 2 classroom teachers and 3 high school classroom (yet one classroom was a tutoring class and therefore this data was used as a pilot study). This case study appears to be a true test of student evaluations of teaching.

As noted by Table 12, one can, once again, suggest that the high school student evaluations are very near the ratings of the experienced evaluators. In fact, in class A the difference between the high school students' evaluation and the classroom teacher rating is only .7 of a point and the difference between the university professor and the

Table 12   Case Study
    Comparison of Evaluations of Student Teacher #4

Class A

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self	70	2.91
High School Teacher	87	3.62
University Professor	86	3.58
High School Students' Mean (N=11, 100% present)	86.3	3.59
	s=5.06	s=.17

Class B

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self (Class B&C eval. together)	68	2.84
High School Teacher	79	3.29
University Professor (Class B&C eval. together)	69	2.80
High School Students' Mean (N=21; 3 students absent)	84.24	3.06
	s=5.96	s=.05

Class C

Evaluator	Total Score	Unit Average
Self (Class B&C eval. together)	68	2.83
High School Teacher	84	3.50
University Professor (Class B&C eval. together)	69	2.80
High School Students' Mean (N=22; 4 students absent)	86.9	3.77
	s=6.17	s=.39

students' rating is only .3. When considering this is based on a total of 96 points, the margin of difference is even more phenomenal. If one could also make the assumption that a teacher's performance is fairly stable over different classes, the high school student ratings are also more similar from class to class than are the experienced evaluators (86.3, 84.24, 86.9).

In summary, this data support the use of student ratings for teacher evaluation purposes and acts as a validation of the use within the high school setting. Table 13 summarizes all of the student teacher evaluations by each level of evaluator, and clearly demonstrates the high school students' ratings are compatible with the experienced evaluator.

Table 13

Comparison of All Evaluator's Results

St. Teacher		Professor	Evaluator Class Teacher	Student	Self
#1		86	61	68.55	67
#2		75	87	79.81	87
#3		69	58	72.68	81
#4					
	A.	86	87	86.30	70.
	B.	69	79	84.24	68.
	C.	69	84	86.90	68

104

Discussion

This study presents data which supports the two major concerns of this research. The data confirms Hoyle's (1980) theoretical constructs in terms of the relationship between the extended and restricted professionals, and their perspectives on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The extended professional was more accepting of student evaluations, while the restricted professional was more intimidated by such a process. By using qualitative methodology, the data suggested an implicit finding. That is, the student teachers who presently claim to be extended professionals will most probably, through practical experience, become restricted professionals and perhaps even change their notions about student evaluations of their work.

At the same time, the research supports the use of student evaluations as a measure of teaching performance by suggesting the student ratings are very comparable to the experienced evaluators' appraisals of teaching effectiveness. The qualitative research further claims that an important issue in student evaluation research may be that students must perceive their ratings as useful. The study also indicates that in order for student evaluations to be effective, the teacher must feel they are worthwhile and "intend" to use them for professional self development.

Furthermore, the findings appear to suggest that those teaching professionals (extended professionality) who seek external sources for self development are those who will benefit most from student evaluations and also will benefit most from student evaluation literature (theory).

The review of the literature of student evaluations clearly presents the quantitative, empirical domination of this area of research. The main thrust of this study is to suggest this area of research, in order to present a more accurate representation of the data, must attempt a broader perspective, one which includes the intentions of both the student rater and the teacher being rated. That is, the researcher must have a concern for how the participants feel about student evaluations.

Perhaps more than any other area of education, teacher evaluation is a sensitive one (rightly so); one which must be effected by one's feelings on the subject. For example, my own project began with the university professors. The initial response by the professors was quite acceptable and helpful. In fact, the chairman of the student teaching program gave immediate approval and suggested a meeting with his students during the next class period. However, one professor declined to participate and approached the chairman of this department suggesting a research project which evaluates their student teachers might prove damaging.

The chairman became skeptical of the project and even though he had given his approval of the research, he became "unreachable". The political issue surrounding evaluation, in general, became apparent. Obviously, there was a concern for the quality of the research, as well as a concern for how the student teacher program would be presented. Even though this research project was not concerned with the appropriateness of the university student teacher program, it became an issue. Evaluation is threatening to those involved.

Contrary to some university professors, the student teachers were totally unafraid of the evaluation process. In fact, they were eager to have their students evaluate their teaching performance and suggested this was the most valuable in evaluating their work. While providing their own self evaluations and also the responses to the theoretical constructs, the student teachers took a great deal of time and interest and provided quality responses. Many questions were asked and responses made to the project. These student teachers were not intimidated by the research exploring their teacher effectiveness.

After meeting with the student teachers, I met with the high school teachers. Once again, these teachers were extremely helpful. But the issue is—these teachers themselves were not being evaluated or threatened in any.

way. The teachers also had a real interest in improving the status of their professional field and were quite concerned with the way in which student teachers might be better prepared for the practical teaching world. There was truly a gap between how the high school teachers thought student teachers should teach and how the university professors were teaching the student teachers to teach.

Lastly, I met with the high school students. These students took a lot of time and consideration in filling in the evaluation forms. The students were concerned with two obvious factors. First, students were concerned with confidentiality. In order to be able to give an honest appraisal, each class thought it was important that each rater would not be identified. These students thought 1) if the forms were not confidential, the rating might effect the mark the student teacher would give them, and 2) most thought it was (I quote one student) : "kind of uncomfortable to say something negative about the student teacher". Students agreed that if the student teacher did not know who they were, the evaluation would be easier and also more honest.

Secondly, the students primary concern was with fairness. The climate of each classroom was one of interest in improving the student teacher's performance. The following quote exemplifies this concern:

Will this rating effect the student teachers' grade?
I mean, like, I think now Mr. _____ isn't so self
assured, but I think he'll get better with more
practice. I don't want to say he is 'marginal' if it
will make him fail. I know he'll get better.

The researcher's response was that the high school students'
evaluations would not be seen by the student teacher's
adviser or the classroom teacher, and the high school
students' honest appraisal was important.

For most, evaluation is a frightening concept; not only
for the teacher being evaluated, but also for those doing
the evaluation. Regardless if the evaluator is a professor,
classroom teacher, or high school student, most appear to be
concerned with the outcome of their appraisals.

Through a sociological framework of analysis, this
study sought to further elaborate on the question of whether
students are as qualified as professionals to judge teacher
effectiveness. Based on the findings and the current status
of the literature, the answer is yes--but, the yes must be
qualified. This qualification is best described by Centra
(1977):

The evidence clearly indicates that no one method of
evaluating teaching is infallible for making personnel
decisions. Each source is subject to contamination,

109

whether it be possible bias, poor reliability, or limited objectives. And, of course, each shortcoming becomes especially important when the results are to be used in making decisions about people" (p. 104).

Whether these decisions are made for tenure, promotion, or self development, no one method is enough. The best decision is made only by using several methods whereby the "limitations of one method are balanced by the strengths of another" (Centra, 1977, p. 104). However, student evaluations have been the most highly scrutinized form of teacher evaluation and when used properly, are ,in fact, reliable, valid, and an effective means of teacher evaluation (Cohen, 1983). Given the method of research and findings, one might recommend that student evaluations of teaching at the high school level may make an important contribution to increased teacher effectiveness. Yet, it must be taken into account that this research is a case study and much more research is required in this area. Those being evaluated in this study are student teachers, and one might question if the findings are generalizable to actual high school teachers. This is a question which can only be answered through further research--one which incorporates not only the 'objective facts', but also the participants intentions and perspectives regarding these aspects. This study hopes to encourage further sociological

research in the area of student evaluations of teachers.

Bibliography

Abrami, P. C., Leventhal, L., Perry, R. P. and Breen, L. J. (1976). Course Evaluation: How? Journal of Educational Psychology 68, 300-304.

Abrami, P.C. (1985). Dimensions of effective college instruction. In Press, Feb.

Aleamoni, L. M., and Hexner P. Z. (1980). A review of the research on student evaluations and a report on the effect of different sets of instructions on student course and instructor evaluations. Instructional Science, 9, 67-84.

Aleamoni, L. M. (1981). Student ratings of instruction. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.

Becker, H. S. (1984). Social-class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship. In A. Hargreaves and P. Wood (Eds.), Classrooms and Staffrooms, England: Open Univerisity Press.

Bentley, R. R., and Starry, A. R. (1975). Purdue Teacher Evaluation Scale. Layfette: Purdue Research Foundation.

Blackburn, R., and Clark, M. J. (1975). An assessment of faculty performance: Some correlates between administration, collegue, student and self-ratings. Sociology of Education, 48, 242-256.

Blecke, A. E. (1982). Encouraging teacher support for teacher evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, 66, 16-21.

Bolster, A. (1983). Toward a more effective model of research on teaching. Harvard Education Review. 53, (3).

Branan, J. M. (1972). Negative human interaction. Journal of Counselling Psychology. 19, (1), 81-82.

Braskamp, L. A., Caulley, D., and Costin, F. (1979). Student ratings and instructor self-ratings and their relationship to student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 295-306.

Bryan, R. C. (1963). Reactions to teachers by students, parents, and administrators. United Stated Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 668. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University.

Bucher, R. and Stelling, J. G. (1977). Becoming professional. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Centra, J. A. (1973). Effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 63, (3), 395-441.

Centra, J. A. (1975) Collegues as raters of classroom instruction. Journal of Higher Education, XLVI, (1), May/June, 327-337.

Centra, J. A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey, Bass.

Chapey, G. (1983). Can we learn a lesson from Japan? _Clearing House, 56,_ (9), 394-396.

Cicourel, A. V., and Kitsuse, J. I. (1963). _The educational decision-makers._ New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co.

Cohen, P. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. _Research In Higher Education, 13,_ 321-341.

Cohen, P. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. _Review of Educational Research, 51,_ (3), 281-309.

Cohen, P. (1982). Using an interactive feedback procedure to improve college training. _Journal of Educational Psychology, 9,_ (3), 138-140.

Cohen, P. A. (1983). Comment on a selective review of the validity of student ratings of teaching. _Journal of Higher Education, 54,_ (4), 448-457.

Coker, H., Medley, D., and Soar, R. (1980). How valid are expert opinions about effective teaching? _Phi Delta Kappan 62,_ (2), 131-134.

Costin, F., Greenough, W., and Menges R. (1971). Student ratings of college teaching : Reliability, validity, and usefulness. _Review of Educational Research 41,_ 511-535.

Darling--Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., and Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context:

A review of the literature. <u>Review of Educational Research,</u> <u>53</u>, (3), 285-328.

Donald, J. (1983). Criteria for evaluating university teaching. <u>Proceedings of the Conference on The Evaluation and Improvement of University Teaching: The Canadian Experience,</u> Nov. 11-13, Montebello, Que., 74-86.

Dreeben, R. (1968). <u>On what is learned in school.</u> Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Dowell, D. A., and Neal, J. A. (1982). A selective review of the validity of student ratings of teaching. <u>Journal of Higher Education,</u> <u>53</u>, (1), 51-62.

Doyle, K. O. (1975). <u>Student evaluations of instruction.</u> London: D.C. Heath and Company.

Doyle, K. O., and Crichton, L. I. (1978) Student, peer, and self evaluations of college instructors. <u>Journal of Educational Psychology,</u> <u>70</u>, (5), 815-826.

Doyle, K. O., and Whitely, S. E. (1974). Student ratings as criteria for effective teaching. <u>American Educational Research Journal,</u> <u>11</u>, (3), 259-74.

Erickson, G. R., and Erickson, B. L. (1979). Improving college teaching: An evaluation of a teaching consultation procedure. <u>Journal of Higher Education,</u> <u>50</u>, 670-683.

Erikson, E. (1963). <u>Childhood and Society</u> (2nd Ed). New York: W.W. Norton.

Feldman, K. A. (1976). - The superior college teacher from the student's view. _Research In Higher Education_, 5, 243-288.

Feldman, K. A. (1977). Consistency and variability among college students in rating their teachers and courses: - A review and analysis. _Research in Higher Education_, 6, 223-274.

Friedenberg, E. (1959). _Vanishing adolescence._ Boston: Beacon Press.

Friedson, E. (1970). _Profession of medicine_. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co.

Gessner, P. K. (1973). Evaluations of instruction. _Science_, _180_, 568-569.

Gillmore, G. M., Kane, M. T. and Naccarato, R. W. (1978). The generalizability of student ratings: Estimates of teacher and course components. _Journal of Educational Measurement_, 15, 1-13.

Goodman, P. (1956). _Growing Up Absurd_. New York: Random House.

Haefele, D. L. (1980). How to evaluate thee, teacher--let me count the ways. _Phi Delta Kappan_, 61, (5), 349-352.

Halamandaris, P. G., and Loughton, A. J. (1972). Empathy competence: A search for new direction in canadian teacher education. _Educational Technology_, Nov., 21.

Hoyle, E. (1969). _The role of the teacher_. London:

Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hoyle, E. (1974). Professionality, professionalism and control in teaching. London Educational Review, 3, (1), 13-19.

Hoyle, E. (1980). Professionalization and deprofessionalization in education. In E. Hoyle and J. Megarry (eds.), World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers. New York: Kogan Page, London/Nichols Publishing Co.

Isaacson, R. L., McKeachie, W. J., and Milholland, J. (1963). Correlation of teacher personality variables and student ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology, 54, 110-112.

Kent, L. (1967). Improving college teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Teaching.

Kulik, J. A., and McKeachie, W. J. (1975). The evaluation of teachers in higher education. In F. Kerlinger (ed.), Review of Research In Education, 3, 210-240.

Levinson-Rose, J., and Menges, R. J. (1981) Improving college teaching: A critical review of research. Review of Educational Reserch, 51, (3), 403-434.

Macklin, M. (1981). Teaching professionalism, to the teaching profession. Australian Journal of Education, 25, (1), 24-36.

MacMillan, C. J. B., and Garrison, J. W. (1984). Using the 'new' philosophy of science' in criticizing current

research traditions in education. <u>Educational</u> <u>Researcher,</u> Dec., 15-21.

Marsh, H. W. (1981). The use of path analysis to estimate teacher and course effects in student ratings of instructional effectiveness. <u>Applied</u> <u>Psychological</u> <u>Measurement,</u> <u>6,</u> 47-60.

Marsh, H. W. (1984). The influence of student, course, and instructor characteristics on evaluations of university teaching. <u>American</u> <u>Educational</u> <u>Research</u> <u>Journal,</u> <u>17,</u> 219-37.

Marsh, H. W., and Kesler, S. P. (1979) Validity of student evaluations of instructional effectiveness: A comparison of faculty self-evaluatios and evaluations by their students. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Educational</u> <u>Psychology,</u> <u>71,</u> (2), April, 149-160.

McKeachie, W. J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. <u>Academe,</u> Oct., 384-397.

McKeachie, W.J., Lin, Y-G., Daugherty, M., Moffetl, M., Niegler, C., Nork, J., Walz, M., and Baldwin, R. (1980). Using student ratings and consultation to improve instruction. <u>British</u> <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Educational</u> <u>Psychology,</u> <u>50,</u> 168-174.

McNeil, J. D., and Popham, W. J. (1973). The assessment of teacher competence. In R.M. Travers (Ed.). <u>Second</u> <u>Handbook</u> <u>of</u> <u>Research</u> <u>On</u> <u>Teaching.</u> Chicago: Rand

McNally.

Murray, H. G. (1983). Low inference classroom teaching behaviors and student ratings of college teaching effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 138-149.

Newman, S. (1971). The teacher as general practitioner of education. NASSP Bulletin, March, 114-122.

Olson, J. K. (1979). Understanding the status quo: Construing the work of teachers as part of evaluation activity. Annual Conference of British Educational Research Ass. Sept.

Ory, J. C., Braskamp, L. A., and Pieper, D. M. (1980) Congruency of student evaluative information collected by three methods. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72 (2), 181-185.

Overall, J. U., and Marsh, H. W. (1979). Midterm feedback from students: Its relationship to instructional improvement and students' cognitive and affective outcomes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 856-865.

Peterson, K. and Kauchak, D. (1982). Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises. Salt Lake City: Center For Educational Practice, University of Utah.

Ritzer, G. (1977). Working conflict and change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Roth, J. (1974). Professionalism: The sociologist's decoy. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1, 6-23.

Rotem, A., and Glasman, N. S. (1979). On the effectiveness of student's evaluative feedback to university instructors. Review of Educational Research, 49, 497-511.

Saadeh, I. (1970). Teacher effectiveness or classroom efficiency: A new direction in the evaluation of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 1, Spring.

Skinner, B. F. (1978). Reflections on behaviorism and society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Sullivan, A. M., and Skanes, G. R. (1974). Validity of student evaluation of teaching and the characteristics of successful instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 584-590.

Swanson, R. A., and Sisson, D. J. (1969). The development, evaluation, and utilization of a departmental faculty appraisal system. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 9, 64-79.

Taylor, W. (1980). Professional development or personal development? In E. Hoyle and J. Megarry (eds.). World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers. New York: Kogan Page, London/Nichols Publishing Co.

Tuckman, B. W., and Oliver W. F. (1968). Effectiveness of

feedback to teachers as a function of source. _Journal of Educational Psychology, 59,_ 297–301.

Vander Zanden, J. (1981). _Social Psychology._ New York: Random House.

Walberg, H. (1983). We can raise standards. _Educational Leadership._ Oct., 4–6.

Warner, R. E. (1984). Can teachers learn empathy? _Education Canada._ Spring, 39–41.

Wergin, J. F. Evaluating faculty development programs. _New Directions for Higher Education, 17,_ 57–76.

Woods, P. (1983) _Sociology and the school: An interactionist viewpoint._ Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

PROFESSIONAL UNIVERSITY TEACHER PROFILE
(also used for high school teacher and student teacher)

Name_____SEX_____

SUBJECT TAUGHT _____GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT _____

NAME OF SCHOOL_____YEARS OF TEACHING _____

The following questionnaire is, in part, designed to test for validation of a professional theoretical construct as presented by Eric Hoyle, which refers to the skills, knowledge and procedures used by teachers in the process of teaching.

Please divide the following statements into two logical categories. That is, below there are 18 sentences, by using the numbers preceding the sentence, place 9 of the concepts which you think have a logical ordering under column A and the remaining 9 concepts under column B. No sentence may be categorized in both columns. For example, if one were presented with the concepts of red, circle, blue, square, one might categorize red and blue together and circle and square together. However for this questionnaire, please use the following 18 statements and categorize them in either column A or column B, provided below the questions. (There are no right or wrong answers, however, after developing the categories, you will be asked which category BEST describes your professional perspectives on teaching).

1.   A teacher is introspective (looks within) when attempting to improve teaching methods.

2.   A teacher, as a part of developmental teacher effectiveness, takes courses which are of a theoretical nature.

3.   A teacher sees teaching as a rational activity which can be learned and improved upon by research and theory.

4.   A teacher regularly reads professional teacher literature.

5.   A teacher's skills are derived from experience.

6.   A teacher values classroom autonomy.

7.   A teacher due to time limitations, participates in few non-teaching professional activities.

8.   A teacher compares methods of practice with colleagues and with research which points to better ways of doing things.

9. A teacher perceives classroom events in relation to school policies and goals.

10. A teacher's involvement in developmental teacher activities is limited and confined to courses concerned with practical matters rather than theoretical ones.

11. Teaching is seen as an intuitive activity.

12. A teacher values professional collaboration.

13. A teacher perceives classroom events in isolation from external matters.

14. A teacher infrequently reads professional literature.

15. A teacher has high involvement in non-teaching professional activities (esp. teachers' centres, subject associations, research).

16. A teacher derives skills from a mediation between and experience and theory.

17. A teacher's perspectives embrace the broader social context of education.

18. A teachers's perspective is limited to the immediate in time and place.

CATEGORY A (PLACE NINE SENTENCE NUMBERS HERE.)	CATEGORY B (PLACE NINE SENTENCE NUMBERS HERE.)

Please respond to the following questions:

1.   Given these categories which you have created,   which column would   BEST describe your personal and professional   perspectives on   teaching.   (Which   column   has   the   most   statements   which correspond to your views on teaching).

    Category A ____   Category B ____

    a).   In what ways do you differ from this category? What other statements would you add to characterize your teaching style?

2.   Do   you think student evaluations of your teaching would be beneficial to your professional self development?

    Yes ____   No ____

    a) Why?

3.   How   do you feel about students evaluating your teaching for professional self development?

        approve____   disapprove____

    a) Why?

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT PROFILE

SEX: Male____   Female____   AGE:____

STUDENT GRADE LEVEL: _____

STUDENT APPROXIMATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE:

95+____   75+____

90+____   70+____

85+____   65+____

80+____   60+____

                           60 AND BELOW____

Do you think high school students are qualified to properly evaluate how well a high school teacher is teaching? That is, do you think high school students are a good judge of the teacher's knowledge, skills, and procedures used?

Yes____   No____

a). Why?

Do you think the high school student teacher that assisted in your classroom would use the evaluation you have just completed to improve weak areas of teaching?

Yes ____   No_____

Do you think your own classroom teacher would benefit from an evaluation from their classroom students, in order that they, too, may be made aware of weak areas of teaching?

Yes____   No_____

Do you think your classroom teachers would use high school students' suggestions to improve on weak areas of teaching?

Yes____   No_____

Why?

APPENDIX C
UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHER
EVALUATION BY UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR
(Similar form used for classroom teacher, student teacher self
evaluation, and the high school student evaluation).

Student Teacher_____ School_____

Cooperating Teacher_____ Year_____

Subject_____Supervisor_____

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In each section below: a) Please put a check in the column which
best determines your evaluation of the student teacher noted
above, b) Please offer suggestions for improvement in each area.

VS=   very   satisfactory,   S=   satisfactory,
MS=   marginally satisfactory, US= unsatisfactory

TEACHING SKILLS

	RATING			
	VS	S	MS	US
1. LESSON PREPARATION:				
Subject Knowledge				
Objectives				
Methods				
Materials				
Evaluation				

Suggestions for improvement:

2. LESSON PRESENTATION:				
Language				
Explanations				
Questioning				
Development				
Adaptability				

cont'd

Suggestions for improvement:

3. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT /LEARNING ATMOSPHERE:	VS	S	MS	US
Organization				
Pupil Involvement				
Cooperation				

Suggestions for improvement:

4. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:				
Interest				
Consideration				
Openness				
Perception				

Suggestions for improvement:

5. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:				
Self-Assurance				
Voice				
Vitality				
Responsibility				
Initiative				
Self-Assessment				
Flexibility				

Suggestions for improvement:

Mr. Ray Couture
St. Marys High School
Columbus, Ohio

Dear Mr. Couture,

I am a graduate student working on my Master's thesis in the Educational Studies programme at Concordia University. My research concerns the evaluation and improvement, of student teaching.

As a part of my thesis, I am interested in comparing high school student's notions of student teacher effectiveness with the professional evaluator's opinion (i.e. classroom teacher and student teacher advisor). I am also interested in professional teaching perspectives of the teacher.

As you probably know, Concordia University does not have a program for high school student teachers. My project requires a sample of high school student teachers and therefore, I am writing to ask for your assistance. I have permission of the student teacher, Cathy Brown, who student taught in your classroom, to request your participation in this study. Of course, the decision is entirely up to you, I only thought it necessary to get permission from the student teacher before requesting your participation. Both Cathy and Professor Miller (University student adviser) have filled in the necessary questionnaire for the purposes of this study. I only require your participation to complete my research project.

The extent of your participation would be filling in the attached questionnaire and returning it in the self-addressed and stamped envelope. If possible, I would also like you to allow me approximately 10-15 minutes of your class time to enable you and your classroom students to fill out a questionnaire regarding Cathy's student teacher effectiveness. Be assured that I am fully aware of your busy schedule and respect your decision on this matter. However, if you think this request is possible, I would be very grateful for your time.

Data from this project will be confidential, neither the student teacher, or student adviser have access to this data. Would you please indicate if you are willing to participate in this study, by completing the attached forms and returning them in the enclosed self-addressed and stamped envelope. I am grateful for as much or as little participation as you feel fit.

Please do not hesitate to phone me if you have any questions

regarding this study. If you agree to fully participate, I will be contacting you to further discuss the timing and details of the study. In addition, if you would like to see results of this study, I will send you a detailed description.

I am truly grateful for your time and consideration of this project, thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Stroh
M. A. Student

Professor A. Hamalian
Thesis Adviser

I am willing to volunteer my class for participation in the Student Evaluation Study.   Yes ___   No ___

Name: _____   Phone: _____

Subjects Evaluated _____   Class size: _____

Name of school involved: _____

(The following refers to a time which you think would be convenient for me to visit your class).

Hour of the day: from: _____   to: _____

Day of the week: _____   Date: _____

Please return completed questionnaire in enclosed and stamped self-addressed envelope.

129

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

SUMMARY PROTOCOL FORM

RESEARCH WITH HUMAN SUBJECTS

Please comment briefly on each item, using additional space if necessary.

1. ### Title of Research Project
   Student Evaluation of Teachers: The Impact on Teacher Effectiveness and Professionality

2. ### Granting Agency
   No granting agency. This is a Master's thesis project in the Educational Studies Program at Concordia University.

3. ### Sample of Persons to be Studied
   Volunteers from the High School Teaching Certification Program at the University. Supervising Professors, student teachers, classroom teachers of participating schools and students in these classrooms. Other key informants who are involved in the evaluation process and who would like to volunteer their expert knowledge and experiences as participants in the evaluation process.

4. ### Method of Recruitment of Participants
   Contact the Director of Student Teaching at the Univerisity, Professor Quinn. Based on his advice initiate contact with other supervising professors and look for volunteers who would like to participate in this project.

5. ### Treatment of Participants in the Course of the Research
   (A brief summary of procedure)
   They will be given a brief summary of the project. There is no deception involved in the design since we would like to obtain as much information as possible on the process of student evaluation of teachers and the evaluation process as presently practiced. Therefore, the project is described in detail. There are no other aims to the project other than those presented to all participants in the course of the research.

<u>Indicate briefly how the research plan deals with the
following potential ethical concerns:</u>

(a) Informed Consent:

The researcher meets with the student teachers and discusses
the project with them.   Then the researcher asks the student
teachers to fill in a number of short questionnaires (copies
attached to the thesis proposal).   The students are free to
add any other information or comment on the questionnaires.
If possible, the researcher will then have an interview with
the participant to discuss any further concerns.   This
procedure is repeated for all participants.

(b) Deception:

As explained under No. 5, there is no deception whatsoever.
The aims of the project are clearly outlined and the
participants are welcome to read the thesis proposal if they
with to do so.

(c) Freedom to Discontinue:

It is made clear to all participants that they are free to
participate and free to discontinue as they wish.

(d) Physical and Mental Stress:

A quick reading of the attached questionnaires will indicate
that they do not involve any situation of physical and mental
stress.   However,   this decision is also up to   the
participants.   Having agreed to participate they can also
stop at any stage if they feel under physical or mental
stress because of the type of questionnaires used or for any
other reason.

(e) Post-Experimental Explanation:

The result will be published in thesis form.   This will be
available   through   the department,   the author and the
Concordia libraries and graduate school.   Since this in not
really an experimental situation,   there is a free floating
discussion and exchange of information as the questionnaires
are being completed.

(f) Confidentiality of Results:

The identities of the individual participants will be kept confidential.

Please comment on any other potential ethical concerns which may arise in the course of the research

The major potential ethical concern will be the interference with the usual teacher training procedures. However, this interference does not take the form of an experimental situation. What we are looking for is information to better understand the evaluation process and the idiosyncracies and complexities involved in this process. As already explained in previous paragraphs, at each stage we shall seek the voluntary participation of the people concerned. The necessary letters of introduction, application for access to information or interviews etc. will be provided as the need arises.

Please comment on expected benefits to be derived from this research

There is a well developed literature and body of knowledge on teacher evaluation predominantly in the educational psychology field. Most of the literature is based on standardized questionnaires and tools that look for statistical significance and strive for further validity and reliability. This thesis will try to illustrate the idiosyncracies and complexities of the process. We shall also try to explore the area of classroom and student evaluation of the teacher; the high school students'input in the process of high school teacher evaluation.

_____

Signature of Project Director

Names of any Research
Associates or Assistants
involved in the project

_____

Date _____

_____

132