

1972


Report on faculty and student evaluation of instructors in direct service teaching at Portland State University Graduate School of Social Work

Janet Mansfield
Portland State University

James McDevitt
Portland State University

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

 Part of the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Janet and McDevitt, James, "Report on faculty and student evaluation of instructors in direct service teaching at Portland State University Graduate School of Social Work" (1972). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1706.

10.15760/etd.1705

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

REPORT ON FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS
IN DIRECT SERVICE TEACHING AT PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

by

JANET MANSFIELD

and

JAMES McDEVITT

A report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University

1972



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.	1
	Background.	2
	Sections of Questionnaire	2
	Major Assumption.	4
	Purposes For Study.	5
	Projected Outcomes.	7
II.	Methodology	9
	Rationale For Study	9
	Population Characteristics.	10
	Selection of Sample	10
	Questionnaire	11
	Pre-Test.	12
	Final Instrument.	17
	Organization and Analysis of Data	17
	Methodological Limitations.	23
III.	Results	24
IV.	Discussion.	30
	Question Response Section	30
	Evaluation Section.	32
	Problem Areas	36
V.	Conclusions And Summary	40
	Conclusions	40
	Summary	42
	References.	44
	Table I	45
	Table II.	52
	Table III	59
	Table IV.	60
	Table V	61
	Table VI.	62
	Appendix I.	63
	Appendix II	74
	Appendix III.	77
	Appendix IV	78
	Appendix V	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE DIRECT SERVICE METHODS

CLASS SURVEY

The classroom as a messenger of learning and awareness is an honored institution. Education promotes the spirit of inquiry. Concurrently, inquiry spearheads research. As students who have spent many hours in a classroom, we have wondered, inquired, into the spirit of the classroom. Our research is devoted to gaining and establishing a series of perspectives as to what occurs in the classroom.

Our research is concerned with specific characteristics of the teacher-learner relationship and outcomes of that relationship. Specific characteristics of the student-teacher relationship such as effective communication, clarity of course objectives, or the quality of class lectures, have been explored by the use of an evaluative tool. Outcomes of the teacher-learner relationship such as the achievement of course objectives, and their relevance to Direct Services were also explored.

As students in the School of Social Work, we saw a dearth of communication between students and their respective professors. By assessing the relative successes of Direct Service Methods classes, and by the processes that are necessary for assessment, we hope to serve students and those who teach them.

Background

In the spring of 1971, the student government and Direct Service Methods faculty members gave their consent and encouragement to a projected practicum that would deal with student evaluation of Direct Service Methods courses and corresponding instructors. The authors systematically designed a course reaction sheet survey for this purpose.

During the winter of 1972, faculty and graduate students in the School of Social Work, Portland State University, participated in this evaluation of Direct Service Methods classes. This study presents the instrument used for evaluation, and compares ways in which the faculty and students rated perceptions of classes, teaching methodologies, and what items used in the survey were identified and rated as important for use in classroom assessment by students.

Sections of Questionnaire

By choosing three major sets of questions: a) General Information; b) The Instructor As Rated By Students; and c) Students Feelings, the instrument provided perspectives as to student satisfaction with instructional quality, the success or suitability of course objectives, and how students perceived their instructors. Standard questions were used in one major section of the course reaction survey. The authors

also included questions that welled from their collective experiences as students in psychiatric social work at Portland State University. This is true throughout the questionnaire. Langen reports that student assessment of teaching has merit, but that the same items should not be used for all disciplines or for all levels of instruction. (Langen, 1966) To our knowledge, no questionnaire had been designed to identify student judgment and feeling about Direct Service Methods classes in graduate schools of social work.

Fourteen items in the General Information Section of the instrument are concerned with class description, atmosphere, method and effectiveness of instruction and instructional materials. There was a concerted effort through questions to ascertain student perceptions of course objectives. (See Appendix 1)

Sixteen items in the Instructor As Rated By Students Section are concerned with the identification of personal and professional behaviors of the instructor. Some questions are centered on student reaction to the personality of the instructor, and judgments about his effectiveness as a communicator. (See Appendix 1)

The Student Feelings Section is fundamentally a set of questions dealing with the acceptance or rejection of the

professor. These responses are based on student feelings and judgments of the professor as a person, his knowledge of social work, and his class conduct. (See Appendix 1)

Major Assumptions

Fundamental assumptions used in the research were not tested by the authors prior to the administration of the questionnaire. However, the assumptions presented are statements of belief from and by the authors in regard to the concepts of education and evaluation.

Bloom maintains that a major assumption of evaluation which must be made is that:

Education exists for the purpose of changing the thoughts, feelings, and actions of students so that the students, are different as a result of their experiences, and evaluation is conducted to appraise the extent to which the teacher is producing these changes in students. (Bloom, 1954)

The authors are assuming that a student observes identifiable teacher behaviors, and is capable of assessing the validity and worth of course objectives for his purposes. It is further assumed that feedback from students and course experiences may cause the teacher to re-examine or modify teaching methodologies if necessary.

Evaluation is defined as the assigning of a value to perceived behaviors or attitudes of Direct Service Methods

instructors. Measurement and the assignment of value are implemented by students of the teacher, and the teacher himself. Measurement refers to a student appraising his teacher's skills according to response alternatives offered in the instrument. This method was in contrast to evaluation by peers, administrators, or professional organizations.

Purposes For Study

There are those who feel that evaluation must be founded completely on objective, strictly observable kinds of teacher behaviors. The authors disagree. The authors feel that a classroom cannot be mechanized to the point where subjective kinds of issues are not accounted for. Classrooms, in the study, are seen as arenas of human relationships that spark "feelings" or subjective questions about educational processes.

We have attempted to identify, rather than measure specifically, perceptions of students about instruction and Direct Service Methods curricula.

There seemed to be a certain amount of dissatisfaction on the part of a number of students towards a variety of aspects about Direct Service Methods classes. This student perception could have derived from either institutional policy in regard to these classes, or from specific student-instructor rela-

tionships. The development and administration of the survey was a response to an atmosphere of student dissatisfaction, and as interpreted, little productive communication between students and respective instructors. The rationale for the research derived from a lack of data as to what the substance and content was of student feeling and judgment in regard to Direct Service classes. Therefore, the following statements are seen as purposes for this study:

- a) To elicit student judgments and feelings about the value and effectiveness of Direct Service Methods classes
- b) To discover if students and their instructors had similar or conflicting perceptions of the course, teaching effectiveness, and student acceptance of instructional objectives
- c) Identification of items on the questionnaire which were deemed as important for use in an evaluative instrument by students and teachers
- d) To elicit student judgment from the questionnaire in order to provide each Direct Service Methods instructor with feedback, which would enable them to gauge their effectiveness, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and thereby improve instruction
- e) To provide a tension reducing mechanism for students to use in identifying sources of frustration stemming from instruction or curriculum

Like others, we developed indices that were intended to reveal good or desirable teaching practices. The course reaction survey was developed in ways to identify, in part,

good teaching as perceived by each student. The instrument was administered to first and second year graduate students in social work who were currently enrolled in the classes to which they were responding. The authors encountered but did not resolve many reliability or validity factors. Additionally, there was no closure on defining any further, the concept of "good teaching" or criterion measures. In spite of these problems, it is agreed that course oriented student evaluation has merit, but that it should be used in combination with other approaches in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

Projected Outcomes

It is possible that the study may provide the School of Social Work with a series of questions that were identified as important for use in student curriculum and instructional evaluation. The items rated as important were identified by the student population by the use of a rating scale of importance implemented in the instrument.

We are projecting that there may be teachers who may revise teaching methodologies that were identified as dysfunctional by students. Individually or collectively, and if warranted, teachers may attempt to upgrade both instruction and curriculum to cause the substance of the social work

discipline to be functional in teaching procedures.

Unfortunately, there appeared to be a general lack of commitment from students participating in the evaluation. Factors of disinterest in the evaluation could be a result of student transiency, or possibly, a perception of the power structure as being resistive to implementing curriculum changes. It is also very probable that a large number of students assumed wrongly, that the evaluation was for the purpose of discovering the most popular teacher, or that the evaluation was subjecting the instructor to unfair practices. Therefore, it must be remembered that the instrument was useful only for identifying either breakdown or positive interaction in the instructional program, and does not deal with program or course substance.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

OF THE

DIRECT SERVICE METHODS CLASS SURVEY

METHODOLOGY

Rationale For Study

The instrument was designed to be multifunctional. A primary rationale for this survey was to discover how students felt and thought about their Direct Service Methods instruction from professors of the School of Social Work. A second focus of the survey was to determine whether professors and their respective students had similar or different perceptions of success of course objectives, teacher-student communication, and quality of instruction. An additional focus of the survey was to determine what kinds of questions graduate students and their teachers would deem as important for use in course surveys. By having students rate a set of questions dealing with common processes and characteristics of the teacher-learner relationship, it was assumed students could establish a hierarchy of questions which varied in importance. The "importance" of a question used in the evaluation of a teacher or course was defined by the authors as meaning the relative extent to which a question was perceived by the teacher or student respondents, as being worthwhile to use in a survey

which was intended to assess a course or teacher. Finally, there was a fundamental interest in determining if students and their professors were in agreement or conflict over the rated importance of questions used for evaluation in the survey.

Population Characteristics

The specific instructor population was defined as all faculty within the School of Social Work teaching courses in Direct Service Methods classes during the Winter quarter of 1972. In order to maintain confidentiality, the authors assigned the numbers one through seven to these faculty members. Their names are omitted from this report.

The student population was defined as all those first and second year graduate students within the School of Social Work who were enrolled and present in class at the time of the administration of the instrument.

Selection Of Samples

Fourteen students, approximately 10% of the population, were asked to respond to the pre-test. This first sample was representative and randomly selected from among the first and second year students.

The final instrument was distributed to one hundred and

twenty-nine of the one hundred and thirty-nine students enrolled in methods classes during the Winter quarter of 1972. Those students who were randomly selected for our pre-test were also included in this population. A total of eight students were absent when the final instrument was administered and these students were evenly distributed among the seven classes.

The authors, although enrolled in methods class, did not answer the final instrument since it was thought that our responses might tend to bias or confound the study.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

Major categories of the questionnaire were centered on processes and characteristics of the learning environment in a Direct Service Methods class. Common elements of the teacher-learner relationship were primary points of departure for questions in the survey. Three sections provided a fundamental framework for the survey: a) General Information About the Course; b) Instructor As Rated By Students; and c) Student Feelings. Sixteen standardized questions were used in the Instructor As Rated By Students section. The format for

standardized questions was similar to an item pool in the Course Reaction Survey Sheet used by the University of Oregon at Eugene, Oregon. Four items in the General Information Section, and three items in the Student Feelings section are similar to those mentioned in Course and Teacher Evaluation. (Werdell, 1966)

Pre-test

A pre-test was administered in February, 1972. This was done in order to eliminate inappropriate questions or questions which tended to confuse the respondents. When mailed the pre-test, the respondents were given a rationale for the study and were told that all data derived from the survey would remain anonymous. The instrument was titled, "A Course Reaction Survey for Direct Service Methods Classes," and included five major sections entitled General Information About the Course, Instructor as Rated by Student, Student Feelings, Adjective Checklist, and Personal Information. A sample of this pre-test is appended (See Appendix I).

None of the instructors received a copy of the pre-test because it was thought that since they were few in number (N=7) an exposure to the pre-test might possibly bias their responses on the final questionnaire.

A representative sample of fourteen students was randomly selected from the total population of students enrolled in methods classes (N = 139). This sample was mailed a copy of the pre-test. Nine of these fourteen students returned the questionnaire and five did not. Since those who responded remained anonymous, the authors were unable to identify the five persons who did not respond, consequently the reasons for their not returning the pre-test remain unknown.

The pre-test was arranged so that students could respond to each item in the first three sections (General Information About The Course, Instructor As Rated By Student, and Student Feelings) in two ways. They were asked to answer the item and then on a scale of one through five, with one being the least important and five being most important, to rate their perception of the importance of the item. In addition to a brief rationale for the pre-test, these students were given the following directions:

All questions are to remain anonymous. Please answer all questions. We are asking you to respond in two ways.

- 1) Answer the question.
- 2) Rate the importance of the question, using a scale of one through five, with five being "most important" and one being "least important."

1 = Least important

2 = Less important

3 = Important

- 4 = More important
- 5 = Most important

- 3) Two blanks will be in the left hand margin of the survey. Use the first blank to answer the question, and the second to rate the usefulness (for a final instrument) of the question.

The above rating system was included in our final survey so that numerical values designating a question's perceived importance could be assigned by the respondents to each of the forty-one questions selected for the final questionnaire.

An adjective check-list of some teacher characteristics was the fourth section of the pre-test. Here, students rated their instructors on nineteen adjectives on a one through five scale with one being "low," and five being "high."

The fifth and final section of the pre-test was a personal information sheet. These were a list of questions concerning factors that could influence student evaluation of the course, the instructor, as well as his own classroom performance. This section was an attempt to measure outside factors that could affect evaluation (See Appendix V., p. 2).

As a direct result of this pre-test some items were eliminated from the final questionnaire. Those items eliminated from the student description sheet included the respondents race, his undergraduate major and his undergraduate G.P.A. They were eliminated because they tended to identify the respondents and for our purposes their significance was questionable.

Students in this pre-test determined the item pool for

the final instrument. On the pre-test each of the respondents was asked to assign a numerical value to each question they rated. Hence, each respondent assigned a value of one through five to each of the forty-six questions. By summarizing all of the student responses to each individual question the authors delineated the relative importance or weight of each of the forty-six items for the nine respondents. After this weight was determined, the authors added the values of each of the forty-six items and then divided by forty-six, to arrive at a mean value of 30.20 for these questions.

Upon inspection of the raw data the authors observed that all of the questions which fell below this mean were also rated at a value of two or less, by two or more of the nine persons responding to the question. Hence, the authors defined as inappropriate for use on the final questionnaire any questions which had a value of less than 30.20 and which was rated at less than 2 by two or more of the respondents. On this basis the following questions were eliminated from the final questionnaire:

While in the Graduate School of Social Work at P.S.U. have you taken courses in other graduate departments?

Would you like to take graduate classes outside the School of Social Work at P.S.U.?

Is the professor apathetic in this class?

Does his theoretical framework relate to yours?

Do you dislike the professor?

If exams are given in this course, are you satisfied with the quality of the exam?

After the pre-test had been formulated and administered the authors thought that some instructors did not take a personal interest in the progress of some students in their class, consequently they added the following question to the final form of the questionnaire:

Does the instructor take a personal interest in your class progress?

Also eliminated from the final questionnaire was the entire final section of the pre-test entitled "Personal Information." This section was eliminated because there was no variation in the responses of persons answering it.

Since only nine of the fourteen students surveyed through the mail returned their pre-test questionnaires, the authors decided that a greater proportion of students would return the final questionnaire if it were administered directly to students in their respective Direct Service Methods Classes. Instructor approval for this approach was secured prior to the administration of the final instrument.

Final Test

The authors distributed the questionnaires in each of the seven Direct Service Methods courses. Instructions for the survey were clarified by the authors for the respondents prior to the distribution of the questionnaire. When a need for clarification arose after the students had begun reading or responding to the survey, their questions were answered promptly.

Students and teachers were informed that only findings for the total population would be reported and that responses of specific individuals would not be revealed to anyone. A request was made for students to give their immediate reactions to each question. Instructions also requested the students to indicate the response closest to their reaction. In order to measure the importance of each question, the one through five scale used in the pre-test was printed across the top of each page. The instructions for the final instrument were more precise than on the pre-test and a sample student response was printed on the face sheet for added clarity.

Organization And Analysis Of Data

Only the factors and combinations of factors the authors

considered of immediate importance were assessed. For analysis, the data was organized into two major categories and together with the base data on each respondent, punched on IBM cards and sorted.

Category I: The first major category of analysis dealt exclusively with the student-teacher responses to each item on the questionnaire and appear in Tables I, II, and III.

A primary purpose of this category was to present the manner in which all of the students surveyed (N = 129) responded to each item. For example, on item number one "Is this class required?", ninety-one students reported that their methods class was required and thirty-five reported that theirs was not. Three students did not respond to this question. The authors compiled a frequency distribution for each of the forty-one items and it appears as Table I. The purpose of analyzing the data in this manner was to illustrate the students' opinions, as a group, towards their Direct Service Methods classes.

Another function of this category was to subdivide the one hundred and twenty-nine students into each of their seven classes and compare their responses with the responses of their respective teachers. For example, in response to ques-

tion number one, "Is this a required class?", teacher number two answered this question with a "Yes" response while nineteen of this thirty-four students answered with a "yes" and fifteen answered it with a "no". In analyzing this data the authors delineated a frequency distribution for student responses to each of the forty-one questions in each of the seven classes. From these distributions a mean and standard deviation were computed. In order to compare and determine whether there was a significant difference between the student responses and the responses of their respective teachers, the teachers' responses were treated as a z score. More precisely, this comparison was made by subtracting the teacher's response from the mean of the student responses thereby establishing a mean difference. From this mean difference and standard deviation of student responses a z score was computed. If the computed z score was greater than 1.96, the teacher's response to the question was considered significantly different by the authors at the .05 level of confidence. The purpose of analyzing the data in this way was to provide each individual teacher with feedback which would reveal student opinions towards his particular class and also enable him to observe his accuracy in forecasting or anticipating those opinions. This analysis is illustrated in Table II.

The third and final purpose of this category of analysis was to determine whether any of the seven teachers had a tendency to rate himself higher or lower than his students rated him. In order to identify which teachers under or over-rated themselves, the authors used a t-test in which the standard deviations and the grand means of the teacher and student responses to each of the forty-one items on the survey were compared. More precisely, in order to establish an individual grand mean for each of the seven teachers, the authors added each teacher's response for each question and divided this sum by forty-one. After computing the grand means for the seven classes of students and their respective teachers, the authors then derived a standard deviation for each grand mean. Finally, for each of the seven classes t-tests using the .05 level of confidence were used to compare the teachers' grand means and standard deviations with those of their respective students. This comparison is illustrated in Table III.

Category II: The second major category of analysis dealt exclusively with the measurement and comparison of student and teacher perception of the importance of each question on the survey. The concept of "importance" was defined by the

authors as meaning the relative extent to which a question was perceived by the student or teacher respondents as being worthwhile to use in a survey which was intended to assess a course or teacher. These measurements and comparisons of perceived importance of various questions are illustrated on Tables IV, V, and VI.

The primary purpose of this category was to delineate the questions which were considered most and least important to all of the teachers and students who responded to the questionnaire. In order to determine the importance of these questions the authors, as in the pre-test, asked the teacher and student respondents to assign a value of one through five, with one being least important and five being most important, to each question on the survey. In analyzing their data the authors separated the teachers' rating of each question from the student ratings of those same questions. The authors then viewed each group's response to the question individually and determined a teacher group (N = 7) - student group (N = 123) mean rating and standard deviation for each question. Then the means of the student responses were subtracted from the means of the teachers' responses and the mean difference between these responses were determined. These mean differences for each question are listed in Table IV.

A second purpose of this category of analysis was to identify which group, i. e. students or teachers, considered the survey to be most important. To assess each group's reaction to the importance of the items the authors determined the standard deviation and grand mean for both the teachers' and students' ratings of the 41 items. A t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference, at the .05 level of confidence, between the teachers' and students' rating of the importance of the questions on the survey.

The final purpose of this category was not only to identify the questions which were agreed upon by both teachers and students as being of high or low importance, but also to identify questions upon which there was disagreement between the teachers and the students regarding question importance. The authors inspected the variances and mean differences of the items on Table IV and isolated those items they considered most likely to differ significantly from each other. The means and standard deviations of these items was then computed and t-tests performed to determine if there were a significant difference between the manner in which teachers and students rated question importance. When no significant difference was found using the .05 level of confidence, the authors rank ordered and compared the questions which were rated high and

low in importance by both the teachers and students. Table VI shows this comparison, however, it should be remembered that this table exaggerates the differences between students and teachers and merely reflects trends among certain items.

Methodological Limitations

When the final instrument was administered the authors encountered some questions about the rating scale. In retrospect, the authors think that the rating scale and the concept of question "importance" may have been insufficiently defined to the population. In discussing this possibility the authors agreed that their verbal instructions to each class probably varied.

When the authors administered the survey they seemed to have encountered more questions relating to student confusion about the adjective check-list than any other section of the survey. Student confusion about the meaning of this check-list was apparent to the authors. Consequently in their analysis of the data, the authors omitted this check-list. Unfortunately, the pre-test did not register this confusion.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE

DIRECT SERVICE METHODS CLASS SURVEY

RESULTS

The responses of all the students (N = 129) to each of the forty-one items were tallied and frequency distributions compiled. They appear in Table I. The purpose of presenting the data in this manner was to illustrate the student opinions, as a group, towards various items on the survey which measured their direct service methods classes or teachers. (See Table I, p. 45).

The authors inspected the frequency distributions of the student responses as listed in Table I and found the following items and distributions to be of interest. The numbers listed adjacent to each response choice indicate the number of students who answered the question with that response.

2. If Direct Service Methods Class were not required, would you take it?
- | | |
|-----------------|-----|
| (a) Yes | 103 |
| (b) No | 8 |
| (c) Not sure | 11 |
| (d) No response | 7 |

5. Which of these approaches helped you most to understand this class?

(a)	Lecture	60
(b)	Discussion	29
(c)	Reading	27
(d)	Other	10
(e)	No response	3

6. Which helped least?

(a)	Lecture	18
(b)	Discussion	41
(c)	Reading	32
(d)	Other	29
(e)	No response	9

7. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it useful?

(a)	Very comprehensive	27
(b)	Above average	46
(c)	Average	43
(d)	Below average	4
(e)	Not at all useful	2
(f)	Not applicable	4
(g)	No response	3

8. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?

(a)	Very much so	50
(b)	Moderately so	52
(c)	Neutral	11
(d)	Low	8
(e)	Very low	2
(f)	Not applicable	3
(g)	No response	3

9. Of all the courses you are taking this quarter, how much priority do you place on this one?

(a) Very high	80
(b) Moderate	30
(c) Neutral	3
(d) Low	4
(e) Very low	3
(f) No response	9

14. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for this course.

(a) 0-2	34
(b) 2-4	50
(c) 4-6	34
(d) 6-8	10
(e) Over 8	1

17. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?

(a) Very satisfied	52
(b) Moderately satisfied	38
(c) Average	22
(d) Below average	13-
(e) Not at all	4

Table II shows the student responses to their respective Direct Service Methods Classes teacher. It illustrates the mean of the students' rating (X) and the rating the teacher anticipated students would give him (Y). Those responses whose variances appeared to be high were selectively chosen from the forty-one items, and a standard deviation and Z score for each item were computed. These item responses of the instructors were treated as though they were a part of the student's distribution. A Z score was then used to indicate

distance of the instructor's rating from the mean of the students' on the selected items. An asterisk indicates those items on which the deviance is beyond the .05 level of significance (1.965). Some significant differences were found between the teachers' anticipated response of the students to him (Y) and the mean response of his students. These differences are noted on Table II with an asterisk (*). The direction of the differences is of interest as well as the degree. (See Table II, p. 52).

Table III compares the total mean response of the students in each class with the total mean response of their respective instructor. The purpose of this table is to identify whether any of the seven teachers under or over rated themselves when their responses to each of the forty-one items were compared to the responses which their students gave them. There was a trend for all of the teachers to rate themselves slightly lower than their students rated them. Teacher number five rated himself significantly lower than his students rated him. This difference, however, might be due to chance and a replication of this study is indicated to verify this outcome. (See Table III, p. 59).

Table IV illustrates the mean differences between the manner in which the seven Direct Service Methods teachers (Y)

and the one hundred and twenty-three students rated the importance of each of the forty-one items. Six of the student data cards were lost during processing and are not included in this table. (See Table IV, p. 60).

Both the teachers and the students gave a mean rating of important (3.00) or higher to all of the items on the questionnaire except items 15, 33 and 41. It is possible that the pre-test eliminated some questions which may have been considered of less importance than these items.

When means designating the importance of a question were calculated, both students and teachers agreed that the following items, listed in rank order, had a higher mean importance than other items on the questionnaire.

23. To what extent does the instructor encourage independent or creative thinking?
12. Are course objectives significant to you as a social worker?
20. Is the instructor intellectually stimulating to you?
5. Which of these approaches helped you most to understand this class?
22. Are your in-class questions answered satisfactorily?

Both the teachers and students agreed that Item Number 33 was of little evaluative importance. (See Table V, p. 61).

Table VI shows that, in general, the seven instructors

rated the importance of the forty-one items with a higher mean value (3.87) than did their students (3.46). A ratio of .5472384 indicated that this difference was not significant. (See Table VI, p. 62).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF

THE DIRECT SERVICE METHODS CLASS SURVEY

DISCUSSION

Question Response Section

Across six Direct Service Methods instructors, and seven sections of the same course, there was a significant discrepancy, or conflict in perception, for only six items. This would suggest that for a majority of items dealing with the course and instruction, students and professors have very similar perceptions as to the nature of the course and the quality of instruction. If this information is reliable, and it could be determined by re-testing, then we can say that students and professors have few differences in perception.

This means that instructors have a good understanding of the educational needs and objectives of students engaged in Direct Service Methods classes in the School of Social Work. This is supported by noting that students rated instructors, with five options for evaluation, in the first and second positions offered in the instrument. The first positions were adjectives like "most comprehensive," "very much," or "greatly." The second positions were adjectives like "moderately," or "above average." If students were to

have graded their professors using the same weighting scale as offered in the survey, instructors would have received grades of "A" or "B".

It is noted that varying degrees of student dissatisfaction were elicited from the instrument. However, this constitutes a very small proportion (10-15%). If a larger proportion of students are dissatisfied with instruction or curriculum, it may be with issues which were not included in the instrument.

The student response means to the survey may be partially contaminated. This again, would have to be tested to determine if contamination is present. The data from this study could be used to confirm or reject this possibility. It is possible that second year social work students are more familiar with the potentials of instructors, and actively select them for what they feel they can learn. This would bias the data or response means in favor of the instructor. First year students have little or no control over a choice of methods instructors, and in most cases, would remain relatively unbiased in this respect.

Fundamentally, it must be recognized that student-instructor relationships, from the body of the data, are seen to be strong and educationally sound. Teachers closely

approximated the perceptions of their students by anticipating their responses via the survey. In turn, students acknowledged the quality of instruction, and the value of the course at large with high ratings.

Evaluation Section

Our primary objective has been to contribute, to a degree, to the improvement of teaching at the School of Social Work by characterizing effective performance and providing a basis for the evaluation of teaching. "The Guide To Better Teaching" from the Department of Education, Bellingham, Washington, Western Washington State College offers this perspective of evaluation:

Evaluation of results provides information for you and your learners which answer the question: "What happened?" You must go a step further and deal with the question: "Why these results!" Then use this analysis to guide later teaching, learning, to verify, modify, or reject your preparation hypothesis for similar lessons, and to help develop your preparation for the next lesson. (p. 15)

Teaching as it describes the principle activity in the classroom must be regarded as something more than the transfer of information. It is an interaction between the teacher and the learner, and is therefore a series of human relationships. Evaluation focuses on the interaction between the individual teacher and the individual student. In that light

we can look at perspectives that have resulted from this part of our research.

Instructors rated the evaluative importance of forty-one items higher in importance than students did. However, these differences are not statistically significant. The difference in rating is in one sense understandable as teachers look more critically to teacher performance based characteristics and attend more to the importance of educational process. However, we could ask ourselves, is there more to it than professional devotion to teaching? Perhaps part of the answer rests with students and administrative systems.

Possibly, the real function of graduate schools in general, and schools of social work in particular, is not truly education; but is rather a skill orientation in which true learning is secondary. If this were true, students would under rate the importance of instructional and educational objectives as less important, because they actually are to them.

Relatedly, questions with a modal rating of 5.00 or "most important," with only two exceptions, dealt with the evaluation of teaching methodologies, rather than with questions geared to determining the success of course objec-

tives or questions of priority of the value of the course. In other words, students paid more evaluative attention to teacher techniques, and not relative successes or value of the class. Doctor Herbert Hite, Chairman of the Department of Education at Western Washington State College, writes in "Do Teachers Make a Difference?":

- 1) The object of teaching is to bring about learning
- 2) Teacher effectiveness is determined by the extent to which the student learning course objectives are achieved
- 3) But we have no evidence to prove that learning for large numbers of students had taken place

The two exceptions dealing with course objectives are elicited from students as to the value of these objectives for social work for this class by two similar items in one section of the survey.

Concurrently, both students and teachers rated questions dealing with techniques of teaching, as being highest in importance. Therefore, the principle agents in classroom interaction, teacher and learner, specific to this population, did not fundamentally rate questions highest that centered on learning as an outcome; but methodologies that would lead to learning. A case could be made for wondering why teachers and students aren't more concerned with what

was valuable and what was learned, rather than with the technology of teaching. If these factors are indeed true, further research with a specific focus would have to examine this phenomena in order to validate this perspective.

Questions in the Student Feelings Section that dealt with subjective issues related to the instructor and the class were rated as being 3.00 or "important" for use in student evaluation. These items were considered to be unconventional questions, but necessary for evaluation in the School of Social Work. For example, one item that was identified as an unconventional question was: To what degree does your professor threaten you?

It was felt that as students in social work, feelings and self-awareness would be more prevailing in this population than in other disciplines, and that this information would be useful for evaluation. This approach is also supported by educators who feel that not all items in a survey should be in the same vein as other fields or for different levels of instruction.

Students did successfully develop an evaluative hierarchy of questions that are important for use in assessment of instruction and the course. (See Appendix II) Professors and students had different perceptions on the importance of

some items (4, 6, 15, 16, 35). However, statistically the differences were not gross. Students and instructors also had similar perceptions as to the importance of several items used in the survey (23, 12, 20, 5, 22).

Problem Areas

The value of our work is dependent on the care with which the investigators and the readers of this research recognize the context in which the survey was designed, administered, and analyzed. The authors, have to a large degree, only identified perceptions of student interpretations of teacher competencies or characteristics that occurred within the bounds of the class room. In a fundamental way these perceptions have been subjected to measurement. However, in order for this kind of an undertaking to be truly valid and reliable, the whole question of definition of major concepts would have to be studied in depth.

The authors have essentially bypassed questions of definition of teacher effectiveness or competence. We have not assumed that the nature of teaching is nebulous, but rather that it would have been a research project unto itself to determine what it is, and what it is not. In fact, everything that must be measured, is every attribute that is significant to teaching effectiveness. The authors have arrived

at a fundamental sense of what teaching is: The ability to communicate, the ability to motivate, and to create learning experiences. Moreover, it is compassion plus competency.

For a more intensive search into evaluation, it is critical that a more meaningful definition of teaching be implemented. It is also necessary to foster tendencies to speak of constructs in operational terms as first steps to developing schemas of faculty evaluation. Until the desired traits of a teacher are decided upon no comprehensive definition of teacher effectiveness or worth is possible. Research on teacher characteristics and an evaluation of faculty members can have a definite impact upon schools of social work only if there is agreement upon terms used and upon definition of variables for which the terms stand.

This is noted because of a problem in our work has been that theoretical constructs were often confused with observational descriptions. Postulates assumed to underlie behavior are mentioned as though they were the behavior itself. For example, "teacher competence," a quality dependent on interpretation, cannot be observed directly. It can be inferred from descriptions of teachers actions, yet these terms were often used as though the construct itself could be observed. Moreover, using this survey approach, this is in a sense

unavoidable.

It has been mentioned before that the authors felt that students who participated in the survey, even though they did complete the questionnaire, had little commitment or enthusiasm for instructional and curriculum evaluation. We feel a drawback to this study has been in not gaining more direct student support for the evaluation.

So it is that student evaluation programs founder as much from lack of student involvement as from faculty opposition. On the other hand, the impact of evaluation may be fully as great upon the apathy of students as upon that of professors. Insofar as evaluation serves an educational purpose - and there is no defense for it if it does not - the faculty need concern itself with encouraging students in this and other endeavors aimed at increasing their responsiveness to teaching and learning. (Ebler, p. 40)

The authors had good support from faculty members, but perhaps this support was not communicated to students. Many students gave the authors verbal and written complaints about being subjected to "personality polling." As the intent of this study was in no way related to pinpointing popular teachers over unpopular teachers (if there were any), there seems to be a strong attitude on the part of some students, that evaluation is for this purpose. There was one item on the survey that dealt with liking the professor, yet many students over reacted in defense of their professor by

commenting that this kind of evaluation was unfair. Students in many cases, made an assumption for the purpose of this study that was in fact absent. Prior to the final analysis, the authors had automatically assumed, though not in writing, that learning is not contingent on the likeability of the instructor.

CHAPTER IV

**CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF
DIRECT SERVICE METHODS CLASS SURVEY**

CONCLUSION

The initial difficulty the authors encountered in formulating their questionnaire remains unresolved. There appears to be no consensus about the specific criteria to use in order to judge effective teaching in direct service methods classes. Consequently questions were not formulated which would specifically and objectively measure teacher effectiveness.

The purpose of this study was to provide for the identification of the subjective feelings, judgments and attitudes of graduate students towards their teachers. In the authors' opinion the element of subjectivity cannot, at present, be removed from the evaluation of teachers. The authors believe that student evaluation has merit but should be used in combination with other approaches in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

The authors originally developed this survey in order to delineate the nature of apparent student dissatisfaction with their direct service methods classes. In general, no significant degree of dissatisfaction was delineated by our survey. If students are dissatisfied it may be with factors which were not included in our survey.

As measured by the appended questionnaire, students and their instructors had similar perceptions of the course, teaching effectiveness, and course objectives. Table II of this study indicates that the direct service methods teachers are, in general, aware of how their students see them. Consequently, a periodic self-evaluation by instructors may be as informative to them as feedback from the questionnaire.

Our survey was intended to act as a tension reducing mechanism for students who could identify sources of frustration originating from their direct service methods classes. The generally positive ratings of these students towards their professors indicates that these classes were not the sources of frustration they were presumed to be by the authors.

Certain items on the questionnaire were judged higher than other items in their perceived evaluative importance. Item 33, alone, was judged as unimportant by both students and teachers.

Progress in the appraisal of student attitudes towards their teachers depends upon one's ability to build on past experience, avoiding mistakes of the past and profiting from success. In assessing the evaluative importance of these questions a factor analysis was not done nor was the rank difference coefficient of correlation computed. The limited

time available to us precluded our analyzing the survey in this fashion. Since the precise extent of the relationship which existed between various questions was not delineated, and since most of the questions were seen as relatively important; it is suggested that the questions which were mutually seen by the teachers and students as highly important be retained for any future evaluations of this type. The results and raw data from this survey will be left with Portland State University's Graduate School of Social Work for future use.

Summary:

Faculty and graduate students at Portland State University's Graduate School of Social Work participated in the evaluation of their direct service methods classes. A pre-test was administered to a representative sample of the graduate student population and subsequently a questionnaire tailored to identify the attitudes and feelings of first and second year graduate students in these classes. The teachers of these students also answered the same questionnaire. In general, they were able to anticipate the manner in which their students rated them.

An attempt was made to delineate the evaluative importance of each item on the questionnaire. Areas of agreement

or disagreement between faculty and students were noted. The analysis, results and raw data from this survey were left with the Portland State Graduate School of Social Work for future use and reference.

REFERENCES

- Bloom, B. S. How may the special contributions of liberal arts education be evaluated? *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1954, 281-283.
- Eble, K. E. The recognition and evaluation of teaching, *American Association of University Professors*, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Kent, L. Student evaluation of teaching. *The Educational Record*, 47 (Summer, 1966), 376-406.
- Langen, T. D. Student assessment of teaching effectiveness. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 14 (Winter, 1966), 22-25.
- Mood, A. Do teachers make a difference. *Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Professions Development*, February, 1970.
- Morton, R. K. Student views of teaching. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 13 (Summer, 1965), 140-142.
- Renner, R. R. A successful rating scale. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 15 (Winter, 1967), 12-14.
- Savitch, L. and Covington, R. *Guide to better teaching*. Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington, 1972.
- Van Waes, R. Student freedoms and educational reform. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1968, 73.76.

TABLES

TABLE I

QUESTIONNAIRE LISTING THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL
STUDENT RESPONSES TO THEIR DIRECT SERVICE METHODS CLASSES

N = 129

The number in parenthesis indicates the number of non-responses on that item:

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

A. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CLASS

- Q _____ 1. Is this a required class?
a) Yes 91
R _____ b) No 35 (3)
- Q _____ 2. If it were not a required class, would you take it?
a) Yes 103
R _____ b) No 8
c) Unsure 11 (7)
- Q _____ 3. In class which occurs most often?
a) Lecture 45
R _____ b) Discussion 32
c) Neither. They are about evenly split 50 920
- Q _____ 4. In your opinion, should more emphasis be placed on -
a) Class discussion 28
R _____ b) Lecture 29
c) Neither, adequate as is 27
d) Lecture and discussion satisfactory 41 (4)
- Q _____ 5. Which of these approaches helped you most to under-
stand this class?
R _____ a) Lecture 60
b) Discussion 29
c) Reading 27
d) Other 10 (3)

Q _____ 6. Which helped least?
R _____ a) Lecture 18
b) Discussion 41
c) Reading 32
d) Other 29 (9)

Q _____ 7. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it
useful?
R _____ a) Very comprehensive 27
b) Above average 46
c) Average 43
d) Below average 4
e) Not at all useful 2
f) Not applicable 4 (3)

Q _____ 8. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appro-
priate level for you?
R _____ a) Very much so 50
b) Moderately so 52
c) Neutral 11
d) Low 8
e) Very low 2
f) Not applicable 3 (3)

Q _____ 9. Of all the courses you are taking this quarter, how
much priority do you place on this one?
R _____ a) Very high 80
b) Moderate 30
c) Neutral 3
d) Low 4
e) Very low 3 (9)

Q _____ 10. Were objectives of the course made clear to you at
the beginning of the quarter?
R _____ a) Very clear 63
b) Moderately clear 49
c) Somewhat clear 11
d) Not clear at all 6 (1)

Q _____ 11. In your judgment are the course objectives being
achieved?
R _____ a) Very much so 44
b) Moderately 51
c) Average 21
d) Below average 9
e) Not at all 2 (1)

Q _____ 12. Are course objectives significant to you as a social worker?

R _____

a)	Very much so	81
b)	Moderately	25
c)	Average	11
d)	Below average	5
e)	Not at all	4

(2)

Q _____ 13. Aside from coverage of material in greater depth, does this course duplicate in whole or in part others you have taken?

R _____

a)	Very much so	1
b)	Moderately	31
c)	To a small extent	62
d)	Not at all	34

(1)

Q _____ 14. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for this course.

R _____

a)	0-2	34
b)	2-4	50
c)	4-6	34
d)	6-8	10
e)	Over 8	1

B. INSTRUCTOR AS RATED BY STUDENTS

Q _____ 15. Does the instructor offer criticism in a constructive way?

R _____

a)	All the time	30
b)	Frequently	41
c)	Average	40
d)	Below average	7
e)	Not at all	9

(2)

Q _____ 16. Are assignments given clearly?

R _____

a)	All of the time	60
b)	Most of the time	46
c)	Average	19
d)	Unclear most of the time	3
e)	Not applicable	1

Q _____ 17. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?

R _____

a)	Very satisfied	52
b)	Moderately satisfied	38
c)	Average	22
d)	Below average	13
e)	Not at all	4

Q _____ 18. To what extent was class organized?
R _____ a) Always 35
b) Most of the time 50
c) Average 25
d) Below average 14
e) Never 4 (1)

Q _____ 19. To what extent were class meetings worth attending?
R _____ a) Extremely worthwhile 65
b) Moderately worthwhile 30
c) Average 19
d) Below average 13
e) Not at all 2

Q _____ 20. Is this instructor intellectually stimulating to you?
R _____ a) Very much so 62
b) Above average 34
c) Average 27
d) Below average 5
e) Not at all 1

Q _____ 21. To what extent can you communicate with your instructor in class?
R _____ a) Always 52
b) Most of the time 35
c) Average 26
d) Below average 9
e) Never 7

Q _____ 22. Are your in-class questions answered satisfactorily?
R _____ a) Always 33
b) Most of the time 69
c) Average 21
d) Below average 4
e) Never 1 (1)

Q _____ 23. To what extent does the instructor encourage independent or creative thinking?
R _____ a) Very much so 49
b) Moderately so 52
c) Neutral 18
d) Low 8
e) Very low 2

Q _____ 24. Is his teaching style effective for you?

R _____

a)	Very much so	43
b)	Above average	43
c)	Average	28
d)	Below average	13
e)	Not at all	2

Q _____ 25. Does the instructor take a personal interest in class progress?

R _____

a)	Very much so	46
b)	Above average	33
c)	Average	35
d)	Below average	9
e)	Not at all	2

(4)

Q _____ 26. Does the instructor take a personal interest in your class progress?

R _____

a)	Very much so	23
b)	Above average	40
c)	Average	45
d)	Below average	11
e)	Not at all	5

(5)

Q _____ 27. If you need personal counseling, how available is this instructor?

R _____

a)	Available most of the time	56
b)	Average amount of the time	40
c)	Below average	12
d)	Seldom	7

(14)

Q _____ 28. Does your instructor inspire class confidence in his knowledge of the subject?

R _____

a)	Very much so	83
b)	Moderately	28
c)	Average	14
d)	Below average	2
e)	Not at all	1

(1)

Q _____ 29. How would you rate this person as a teacher?

R _____

a)	Excellent	50
b)	Above average	49
c)	Average	24
d)	Below average	6
e)	Very poorly	1

- Q _____ 30. How do you see this person as a professional social worker?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|---------------|----|
| a) | Excellent | 71 |
| b) | Above average | 41 |
| c) | Average | 10 |
| d) | Below average | 2 |
| e) | Very poorly | 1 |
- (4)

G. STUDENT FEELINGS

- Q _____ 31. Extent to which you feel "Busy Work" is given in this class?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|
| a) | To a great extent | 2 |
| b) | Moderate amount | 12 |
| c) | Average amount | 13 |
| d) | Below average | 35 |
| e) | Not at all | 67 |

- Q _____ 32. Extent to which you feel threatened by the professor?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|---------------|----|
| a) | Very much so | 8 |
| b) | Moderately | 20 |
| c) | Average | 25 |
| d) | Below average | 28 |
| e) | Not at all | 48 |

- Q _____ 33. Do you like your professor?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|---------------|----|
| a) | Very much so | 74 |
| b) | Moderately | 30 |
| c) | Average | 17 |
| d) | Below average | 5 |
| e) | Not at all | 3 |

- Q _____ 34. Does he provide you with a valuable learning experience?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|---------------|----|
| a) | Very much | 65 |
| b) | Moderately | 34 |
| c) | Average | 20 |
| d) | Below average | 10 |
| e) | Not at all | |

- Q _____ 35. To what extent did you get the grade you felt you deserved?
- R _____
- | | | |
|----|--------------------|----|
| a) | To a great extent | 30 |
| b) | Above expectations | 4 |
| c) | About right | 58 |
| d) | Below expectations | 18 |
| e) | Not at all | 3 |
- (16)

Q_____ 36. To what extent would you change this course if you could?
R_____ a) Greatly 24
b) Somewhat 74
c) Not at all 29 (2)

Q_____ 37. If you had it to do over again, would you take this class?
R_____ a) Yes 99
b) No 14
c) Unsure 15 (1)

Q_____ 38. In your opinion was caourse pace -
R_____ a) Too slow 37
b) Satisfactory 74
c) Too fast 6
d) Not applicable 10 (2)

Q_____ 39. At what level did this class stimulate you to work in comparison with the level at which you usually work?
R_____ a) Greatly 17
b) Above average 50
c) Average 39
d) Below average 11
e) No difference 7 (5)

Q_____ 40. Do you enjoy this class?
R_____ a) Greatly 49
b) Above average 39
c) Average 22
d) Below average 17
e) Not at all 2

Q_____ 41. Did the instructor assume too much prior knowledge of basic subjects?
R_____ a) Yes 1
b) Somewhat 26
c) No 93
d) Not applicable 7 (2)

We would greatly appreciate your comments and questions regarding this survey. Are there any areas of interest which you feel are of importance which we excluded? If so please use the reverse side of this sheet for your comments.

Janet Mansfield
Jim McDevitt

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #1 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N - 19

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	O	Z (1.96)
1	1.95	2			
2	1.00	1			
3	1.31	1	.31	0.74926	.4137
4	3.27	1	.11	0.75190	.1462
5	1.84	2	.16	1.21395	.1318
6	2.75	9			
7	1.87	6			
8	1.78	2	.22	1.13426	.1939
9	1.37	2			
10	1.63	2			
11	1.68	2			
12	1.32	2			
13	2.74	2			
14	1.95	2			
15	3.33	3	.33	1.23669	.2668
16	1.53	3	1.47	0.77232	1.9033
17	1.68	3	1.32	0.88522	1.4911
18	1.47	2			
19	1.37	2			
20	1.58	3			
21	3.18	2	1.18	1.50977	.7815
22	2.28	2			
23	2.26	2			
24	1.89	3			
25	2.89	2	0.89	0.90025	.9886
26	3.61	3	0.61	1.19503	.5104
27	2.23	2			
28	1.33	2			
29	1.74	2			
30	1.78	2			
31	4.74	5			
32	3.26	3	0.26	1.52177	.1708
33	2.26	3	0.74	1.40799	.5255
34	1.47	2			
35	2.75	9			
36	2.26	2			
37	1.21	1			
38	1.89	2			
39	2.47	3			
40	1.71	2			
* 41	3.05	1	2.05	0.40465	

(An asterisk marks significant differences at the .05 level)

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #2 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N = 35

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z (1.96)
1	1.40	1			
2	1.44	1			
3	2.43	1	1.43	1.48097	.9655
4	2.94	1			
5	1.42	1			
6	2.66	2	0.66	0.88975	.7417
7	1.76	1	0.76	0.78078	.9733
8	1.49	1			
9	1.34	2	0.66	0.46840	.6815
10	1.40	1			
11	1.51	2			
12	1.34	1			
13	3.20	2	1.20	1.00251	1.1969
14	2.30	3	0.70	0.99325	.7047
15	1.94	2			
16	1.46	1			
17	1.86	2			
18	1.80	1			
19	1.37	2			
20	1.40	2			
21	1.74	1			
22	1.69	2			
23	1.71	1			
24	1.71	3			
25	1.49	2			
26	2.16	2			
27	2.06	2			
28	1.40	1			
29	1.40	2			
30	1.40	1			
31	4.49	3	1.49	0.74246	2.0063*
32	4.20	4			
33	1.34	2			
34	1.37	3	1.63	0.80752	2.0185*
35	2.25	3			
36	2.31	2			
37	1.11	1			
38	2.08	1	1.08	0.64024	1.6868
39	1.94	2			
40	1.49	2			
41	2.57	3			

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #3 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N = 14

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z Score
1	1.00	1			
2	1.00	1			
3	2.50	3			
4	2.79	1	1.79	1.12171	1.596
5	1.21	2			
6	2.54	9			
7	2.64	3			
8	1.84	1	0.84	0.89871	.9346
9	1.14	9			
10	1.86	2			
11	2.07	2			
12	2.78	1	1.78	0.97182	1.8316
13	3.14	2	1.14	0.66299	1.7194
14	1.86	1	.86	0.53452	1.6089
15	2.57	3			
16	2.14	2			
17	1.36	2	0.64	0.49724	1.2872
18	2.57	2			
19	1.29	2	0.71	0.46880	1.5145
20	1.21	2			
21	2.46	3	0.56	0.74322	.7534
22	1.93	2			
23	1.86	2			
24	1.43	1			
25	2.28	3			
26	3.14	3			
27	2.23	2			
28	1.07	2	0.93	0.26726	3.4797*
29	1.59	2			
30	1.21	2			
31	4.57	4			
32	2.43	2	0.43	0.93761	0.4586
33	1.57	2			
34	1.29	2			
35	2.92	9			
36	2.36	2			
37	1.00	1			
38	1.86	3	1.14	0.36313	
39	2.30	3			
40	1.64	3	1.36	0.84189	
41	2.64	2			

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #4 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N = 18

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z Score
1	1.17	1			
2	1.28	1			
3	2.06	2			
4	2.78	1	1.78	1.06027	1.6788
5	2.17	2			
6	2.78	1	1.78	1.21537	1.4645
7	2.35	3	0.65	1.11474	
8	1.67	2	0.37	1.13759	0.2689
9	1.78	1	0.78	0.80845	0.9648
10	2.11	2			
11	1.89	2			
12	2.61	2	0.61	1.46081	0.4175
13	2.72	2			
14	2.00	2			
15	1.67	2			
16	2.22	2	0.22	1.16596	0.1886
17	2.28	2	0.28	1.12749	0.2483
18	2.94	2	0.94	1.23659	0.7601
19	1.83	2			
20	2.06	2			
21	1.72	2	0.28	1.07405	0.2606
22	1.89	2	0.11	0.96338	0.1141
23	1.67	1			
24	2.11	2	0.11	1.13183	0.0834
25	1.61	1			
26	1.89	2			
27	1.50	2			
28	1.61	1			
29	2.00	2			
30	1.67	2			
31	4.38	2	2.38	0.97852	2.4322*
32	4.50	5	0.50	0.98518	0.5075
33	1.28	2			
34	1.83	2			
35	2.22	2			
36	2.28	2			
37	1.39	1			
38	1.94	2	0.06	1.34917	0.0444
39	2.67	3			
40	1.94	3	1.06	1.25895	0.8420
41	3.11	1			

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #5 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N = 22

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z Score
1	1	1			
2	1.72	1			
3	2.36	3			
4	2.47	1	1.47	1.21876	1.2061
5	2.45	2			
6	1.14	1	.14	0.68534	0.2042
7	2.45	2	.45	1.10096	0.4087
8	1.76	2			
9	1.90	2			
10	2.54	1	1.54	1.05682	1.4572
11	2.00	2	0.00	1.02353	0.0000
12	2.31	3			
13	2.40	3	0.60	1.00754	0.5955
14	2.18	2	0.18	0.79500	0.2264
15	2.23	2			
16	2.50	2	0.50	1.01183	0.4945
17	2.90	3			
18	2.77	2	0.77	1.06600	0.7223
19	2.63	2			
20	2.45	2	0.45	0.91168	0.4935
21	2.32	2			
22	2.05	2			
23	2.68	2	0.68	0.94548	0.7192
24	2.36	2			
25	2.27	3			
26	1.82	2			
27	1.90	1	0.90	1.01929	0.8829
28	2.45	2			
29	2.18	2			
30	2.14	2			
31	3.36	2	1.36	1.39882	
32	2.63	3	0.67	1.32899	
33	1.90	2			
34	3.00	2	1.00	0.97590	
35	2.09	2			
36	1.45	2	0.55	0.5958	
37	1.91	1			
38	2.81	2	0.81	1.29601	
39	2.95	2	0.95	0.92066	
40	2.95	2	0.95	0.95005	
41	2.00	2			

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #6 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N =

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z Score
1	1.00	1			
2	1.66	1			
3	2.16	1			
4	2.41	1	1.41	1.37895	1.0225
5	2.41	2			
6	2.45	3	0.55	1.29333	0.4252
7	2.17	2			
8	2.33	2			
9	2.33	2			
10	1.75	3	1.25	0.86602	1.4433
11	1.92	4	2.08	0.90033	2.3102*
12	2.50	1	1.50	1.50755	1.001
13	3.17	3			
14	2.17	1			
15	2.25	2			
16	2.33	3			
17	2.25	2	0.25	1.05528	0.2369
18	1.83	2			
19	2.42	3			
20	2.17	3			
21	2.08	2			
22	1.50	2			
23	2.42	1	1.42	0.99620	1.4254
24	2.50	3			
25	2.08	2			
26	2.73	1	1.73	0.90453	1.9125
27	1.50	1			
28	1.50	2			
29	2.17	2			
30	2.17	2			
31	2.33	3			
32	3.25	3			
33	1.92	3	1.08	1.08362	1.001
34	2.42	2			
35	3.08	1	2.08	0.79296	2.6230*
36	1.67	2			
37	2.00	3			
38	1.83	4			
39	2.50	4			
40	2.75	3			
41	2.92	2			

TABLE II

Difference between teacher #7 perception of anticipated student responses (Y) and actual mean student responses (\bar{X}) N = 10

Question	\bar{X}	Y	Difference	σ	Z Score
1	1.10	1			
2	1.10	1			
3	2.60	1			
4	1.70	1			
5	2.20	2			
6	2.30	1	1.30	1.05934	1.2380
7	2.80	3			
8	2.80	2			
9	1.44	2	0.54	1.01379	0.5326
10	1.90	3	1.10	0.9942	1.1061
11	2.70	3	0.30	1.15950	0.2587
12	1.80	2			
13	2.90	2			
14	3.00	2	1.00	0.81649	1.2247
15	2.60	2	0.60	1.26491	0.4761
16	2.20	3	0.80	1.03279	0.7746
17	2.90	3			
18	2.80	2			
19	2.80	2			
20	2.20	3			
21	1.70	3	1.30	1.25166	1.0386
22	2.20	2			
23	2.10	2			
24	2.70	3			
25	2.20	3			
26	2.50	3			
27	1.77	2			
28	1.80	2			
29	2.50	3			
30	1.70	1			
31	3.40	4			
32	3.60	4			
33	2.40	3			
34	2.30	3			
35	2.90	4			
36	2.70	2			
37	1.80	1			
38	1.50	2	0.50	1.26929	0.3939
39	2.50	3			
40	2.90	3			
41	2.5	1			

TABLE III

A comparison of the total mean response of the students (\bar{X} of X) with the total mean response of their respective teachers (\bar{X} of Y)

Teacher Number	\bar{X} of X	\bar{X} of Y	T Score
1	2.17073	2.11236	0.15470
2	1.94500	1.90840	0.22578
3	2.02951	1.92682	0.55704
4	2.11366	1.90244	1.34418
5	2.26414	1.97561	2.47641
6	2.21951	2.17073	0.3102684
7	2.32951	2.31707	0.075836

*

TABLE IV

Mean difference between teacher-student perception of the importance of each question

	Teacher Group (\bar{Y})	Student Group (\bar{X})	Difference
1	4.00	3.00	1.00
2	4.28	3.48	.80
3	4.14	3.34	.80
4	4.42	3.48	.94
5	4.14	3.44	.70
6	4.28	2.98	1.30
7	3.71	3.26	.45
8	4.00	3.44	.54
9	3.57	3.67	.10
10	4.28	3.59	.69
11	4.42	3.87	.55
12	4.28	3.90	.38
13	4.28	3.32	.96
14	3.71	4.40	.69
15	3.85	2.47	1.38
16	3.85	3.41	.44
17	3.85	3.88	.03
18	3.57	3.29	.79
19	3.85	3.88	.03
20	4.14	3.85	.29
21	4.00	3.77	.23
22	4.00	3.79	.21
23	4.28	3.90	.38
24	4.00	3.67	.33
25	3.71	3.39	.32
26	4.14	3.44	.70
27	3.85	3.35	.50
28	3.57	3.77	.20
29	3.85	3.93	.08
30	3.28	3.66	.38
31	3.28	3.54	.26
32	3.14	3.25	.11
33	3.00	2.87	.13
34	3.71	3.06	.65
35	4.00	3.25	.75
36	3.57	3.59	.02
37	3.71	3.82	.11
38	3.42	3.35	.07
39	3.85	3.58	.27
40	4.14	3.42	.72
41	2.17	3.30	.59

TABLE VI

A comparison of the mean teacher (N = 7) student (N = 123) perception of the evaluative importance of forty-one items on questionnaire.

Teacher Mean (Y)	Student Mean (X)	T-Score
3.87731	3.46684	.5472384

APPENDIX

APPENDIX NO. I

COURSE REACTION SURVEY FOR DIRECT SERVICE

METHODS - CLASSES

We feel there is a need to identify student feelings and thoughts about Direct Service Methods classes and corresponding instructors at the School of Social Work at Portland State University.

This questionnaire contains forty-one items concerning: a) general information about your course; b) the instructor as rated by students; c) student feelings; and d) teacher characteristics.

Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential; only findings for the total sample will be reported and responses of specific individuals will not be revealed to anyone.

Please give your immediate reaction to the question. Indicate the response closest to your reaction.

Use this reaction survey only for your current Direct Service Methods class. Your instructor will also be responding to the questionnaire.

We are asking you to respond in two ways:

1. Answer every question.
2. Rate the importance of every question using a scale of 1-5, with 5 being "most important," and 1 being "least important."
 - 1 - LEAST IMPORTANT
 - 2 - LESS IMPORTANT
 - 3 - IMPORTANT
 - 4 - MORE IMPORTANT
 - 5 - MOST IMPORTANT
3. Two blanks will be in the left hand margin of the page. Use the first blank line to answer the question (question response) - and the second blank line to rate the importance of the question (rating response).
4. Q = question response
R = rating response
For example: Q b 1) Do exams accurately measure your knowledge of the subject?
R 3
 - a) Very comprehensively
 - b) Moderately
 - c) Average

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

COURSE REACTION SURVEY

Course Title _____

Instructor _____

Age _____

Sex _____

Graduate Area of interest (check one):

- _____ Direct Service
- _____ Facilitative Service
- _____ Community Organization
- _____ Other (please explain)

First Year _____

Second Year _____

Year graduated from undergraduate school _____

Years of paid experience in the field of social work _____

Did you have this instructor last quarter? Yes No

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

A. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CLASS

- Q _____ 1. Is this a required class:
R _____ a) Yes
 b) No
- Q _____ 2. If it were not a required class, would you take it?
R _____ a) Yes
 b) No
 c) Unsure
- Q _____ 3. In class which occurs most often?
R _____ a) Lecture
 b) Discussion
 c) Neither. They are about evenly split.
- Q _____ 4. In your opinion, should more emphasis be placed on
R _____ a) Class discussion
 b) Lecture
 c) Neither, adequate as is
 d) Lecture and discussion are satisfactory
- Q _____ 5. Which of these approaches helped you most to under-
R _____ stand this class?
 a) Lecture
 b) Discussion
 c) Reading
 d) Other
- Q _____ 6. Which helped least?
R _____ a) Lecture
 b) Discussion
 c) Reading
 d) Other
- Q _____ 7. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it
R _____ useful?
 a) Very comprehensive
 b) Above average
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all useful
 f) Not applicable

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

- Q _____ 8. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?
R _____ A) Very much so
 b) Moderately so
 c) Neutral
 d) Low
 e) Very low
 f) Not applicable
- Q _____ 9. Of all the courses you are taking this quarter, how much priority do you place on this one?
R _____ a) Very high
 b) Moderate
 c) Neutral
 d) Low
 e) Very low
- Q _____ 10. Were objectives of the course made clear to you at the beginning of the quarter?
R _____ a) Very clear
 b) Moderately clear
 c) Somewhat clear
 d) Not clear at all
- Q _____ 11. In your judgment are the course objectives being achieved?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Moderately
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all
- Q _____ 12. Are course objectives significant to you as a social worker?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Moderately
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all
- Q _____ 13. Aside from coverage of material in greater depth, does this course duplicate in whole or in part others you have taken?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Moderately
 c) To a small extent
 d) Not at all

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

- Q _____ 14. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for this course.
- R _____
- a) 0-2
 - b) 2-4
 - c) 4-6
 - d) 6-8
 - e) Over 8

B. INSTRUCTOR AS RATED BY STUDENTS

- Q _____ 15. Does the instructor offer criticism in a constructive way?

- R _____
- a) All the time
 - b) Frequently
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

- Q _____ 16. Are assignments given clearly?

- R _____
- a) All of the time
 - b) Most of the time
 - c) Average
 - d) Unclear most of the time
 - e) Not applicable

- Q _____ 17. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?

- R _____
- a) Very satisfied
 - b) Moderately satisfied
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

- Q _____ 18. To what extent was class organized?

- R _____
- a) Always
 - b) Most of the time
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Never

- Q _____ 19. To what extent were class meetings worth attending?

- R _____
- a) Extremely worthwhile
 - b) Moderately worthwhile
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

Q _____ 20. Is this instructor intellectually stimulating to you?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Above average
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all

Q _____ 21. To what extent can you communicate with your
instructor in class?
R _____ a) Always
 b) Most of the time
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Never

Q _____ 22. Are your in-class questions answered satisfactorily?
R _____ a) Always
 b) Most of the time
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Never

Q _____ 23. To what extent does the instructor encourage inde-
pendent or creative thinking?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Moderately so
 c) Neutral
 d) Low
 e) Very low

Q _____ 24. Is his teaching style effective for you?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Above average
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all

Q _____ 25. Does the instructor take a personal interest in
class progress?
R _____ a) Very much so
 b) Above average
 c) Average
 d) Below average
 e) Not at all

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

Q _____ 26. Does the instructor take a personal interest in
your class progress?
R _____ a) Very much so
b) Above average
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all

Q _____ 27. If you need personal counseling, how available is
this instructor?
R _____ a) Available most of the time
b) Average amount of the time
c) Below average
d) Seldom

Q _____ 28. Does your instructor inspire class confidence in
his knowledge of the subject?
R _____ a) Very much so
b) Moderately
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all

Q _____ 29. How would you rate this person as a teacher?
R _____ a) Excellent
b) Above average
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Very poorly

Q _____ 30. How do you see this person as a professional social
worker?
R _____ a) Excellent
b) above average
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Very poorly

C. STUDENT FEELINGS

Q _____ 31. Extent to which you feel "Busy Work" is given in
this class?
R _____ a) To a great extent
b) Moderate amount
c) Average amount
d) Below average
e) Not at all

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

Q _____ 32. Extent to which you feel threatened by the professor?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Moderately
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 33. Do you like your professor?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Moderately
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 34. Does he provide you with a valuable learning experience?

- R _____
- a) Very much
 - b) Moderately
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - f) Not at all

Q _____ 35. To what extent did you get the grade you felt you deserved?

- R _____
- a) To a great extent
 - b) Above expectations
 - c) About right
 - d) Below expectations
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 36. To what extent would you change this course if you could?

- R _____
- a) Greatly
 - b) Somewhat
 - c) Not at all

Q _____ 37. If you had it to do over again, would you take this course?

- R _____
- a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Unsure

1 = LEAST IMPORTANT 2 = LESS IMPORTANT 3 = IMPORTANT
4 = MORE IMPORTANT 5 = MOST IMPORTANT

Q _____ 38. In your opinion was course pace

- R _____
- a) Too slow
 - b) Satisfactory
 - c) Too fast
 - d) Not applicable

Q _____ 39. At what level did this class stimulate you to work in comparison with the level at which you usually work?

- R _____
- a) Greatly
 - b) Above average
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) No difference

Q _____ 40. Do you enjoy this class?

- R _____
- a) Greatly
 - b) Above average
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 41. Did the instructor assume too much prior knowledge of basic subjects?

- R _____
- a) Yes
 - b) Somewhat
 - c) No
 - d) Not applicable

We would greatly appreciate your comments and questions regarding this survey. Are there any areas of interest which you feel are of importance which we excluded? If so, please use the reverse side of this sheet for your comments.

Janet Mansfield
Jim McDevitt

SECTION D: Check one box that indicates your perception of how the instructor rates on each characteristic.

HOW DOES THIS TEACHER RATE ON THESE CHARACTERISTICS?

	Low	Moderate			High
	1	2	3	4	5
Scholarship	()	()	()	()	()
Wit	()	()	()	()	()
Ease of Communication	()	()	()	()	()
Flexibility	()	()	()	()	()
Coldness	()	()	()	()	()
Nervousness	()	()	()	()	()
Stability	()	()	()	()	()
Ambiguity	()	()	()	()	()
Creativity	()	()	()	()	()
Likeability	()	()	()	()	()
Preparedness	()	()	()	()	()
Illustrations	()	()	()	()	()

Accessibility	()	()	()	()	()
Fairness	()	()	()	()	()
Concern	()	()	()	()	()
Excitement about Social Work	()	()	()	()	()
Depth of insight	()	()	()	()	()
Theoretical strength	()	()	()	()	()
Technical strength	()	()	()	()	()

APPENDIX NO. II

EVALUATIVE HIERARCHY OF QUESTIONS

The following items were given a modal rating of 5.00 or "most important" by students:

12. Are course objectives significant to you as a social worker?
19. To what extent were class meetings worth attending?
20. Is this instructor intellectually stimulating to you?
29. How would you rate this person as a teacher?
34. Does he provide you with a valuable learning experience?
37. If you had to do it over again, would you take this class?

The following items were given a modal rating of 4.00 or "most important" by students:

4. In your opinion, should more emphasis be placed on. . .
9. Of all the courses you are taking this quarter, how much priority do you place on this one?
11. In your judgment are the course objectives being achieved?
17. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?
21. To what extent can you communicate with your instructor in class?
22. Are your in-class questions answered satisfactorily?
23. To what extent does the instructor encourage independent or creative thinking?
24. Is his teaching style effective for you?
26. Does the instructor take a personal interest in your class progress?

28. Does your instructor inspire class confidence in his knowledge of the subject?
30. How do you see this person as a professional social worker?
31. Extent to which you feel "Busy Work" is given in this class?
36. To what extent would you change this course if you could?
37. If you had it to do over again, would you take this class?
40. Do you enjoy this class?

The following items were given a modal rating of 3.00 or "important" by students:

1. Is this a required class?
2. If it were not a required class, would you take it?
3. In class which occurs most often?
5. Which of these approaches helped you most to understand this class?
6. Which helped least?
7. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it useful?
8. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?
10. Were objectives of the course made clear to you at the beginning of the quarter?
13. Aside from coverage of material in greater depth, does this course duplicate in whole or in part others you have taken?
14. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for this course?
15. Does the instructor offer criticism in a constructive way?
18. To what extent was class organized?
25. Does the instructor take a personal interest in class progress?

27. If you need personal counseling, how available is this instructor?
32. Extent to which you feel threatened by the professor?
33. Do you like your professor?
35. To what extent did you get the grade you felt you deserved?
38. In your opinion was course pace. . .
39. At what level did this class stimulate you to work in comparison with the level at which you usually work?
41. Did the instructor assume too much prior knowledge of basic subjects?

APPENDIX NO. III

QUESTIONS ELIMINATED FROM
FINAL INSTRUMENT

GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION

1. While in the graduate School of Social Work at Portland State University, have you taken courses in other graduate departments?
2. Would you like to take graduate classes outside the School of Social Work at Portland State University?
9. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it useful?
10. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?

INSTRUCTOR AS RATED BY STUDENTS

7. Is the professor apathetic in this class?
9. Does his theoretical framework relate to yours?

STUDENT FEELINGS

4. Do you dislike the professor?
7. If exams are given in this course, are you satisfied with the quality of the exam?
8. Does it accurately measure your knowledge of the subject?

APPENDIX NO. IV

STANDARD QUESTIONS USED IN INSTRUMENT

- Q _____ 7. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it useful?
R _____ a) Very comprehensive
b) Above average
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all useful
f) Not applicable
- Q _____ 8. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?
R _____ a) Very much so
b) Moderately so
c) Neutral
d) Low
e) Very low
f) Not applicable
- Q _____ 13. Aside from coverage of material in greater depth, does this course duplicate in whole or in part others you have taken?
R _____ a) Very much so
b) Moderately
c) To a small extent
d) Not at all
- Q _____ 14. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for this course.
R _____ a) 0-2
b) 2-4
c) 4-6
d) 6-8
e) Over 8
- Q _____ 15. Does the instructor offer criticism in a constructive way?
R _____ a) All the time
b) Frequently
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all

- Q _____ 16. Are assignments given clearly?
R _____ a) All the time
b) Most of the time
c) Average
d) Unclear most of the time
e) Not applicable
- Q _____ 17. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?
R _____ a) Very satisfied
b) Moderately satisfied
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all
- Q _____ 18. To what extent was class organized?
R _____ a) Always
b) Most of the time
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Never
- Q _____ 19. To what extent were class meetings worth attending?
R _____ a) Extremely worthwhile
b) Moderately worthwhile
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all
- Q _____ 20. Is this instructor intellectually stimulating to you?
R _____ a) Very much so
b) Above average
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Not at all
- Q _____ 21. To what extent can you communicate with your instructor in class?
R _____ a) Always
b) Most of the time
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Never
- Q _____ 22. Are your in-class questions answered satisfactorily?
R _____ a) Always
b) Most of the time
c) Average
d) Below average
e) Never

Q _____ 23. To what extent does the instructor encourage independent or creative thinking?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Moderately so
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Low
 - e) Very low

Q _____ 25. Does the instructor take a personal interest in class progress?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Above average
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 26. Does the instructor take a personal interest in your class progress?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Above average
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 27. If you need personal counseling, how available is this instructor?

- R _____
- a) Available most of the time
 - b) Average amount of the time
 - c) Below average
 - d) Seldom

Q _____ 28. Does your instructor inspire class confidence in his knowledge of the subject?

- R _____
- a) Very much so
 - b) Moderately
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) Not at all

Q _____ 39. At what level did this class stimulate you to work in comparison with the level at which you usually work?

- R _____
- a) Greatly
 - b) Above average
 - c) Average
 - d) Below average
 - e) No difference

- Q _____ 41. Did the instructor assume too much prior knowledge of
basic subjects?
R _____ a) Yes
b) Somewhat
c) No
d) Not applicable

APPENDIX NO. V

PRE-TEST INSTRUMENT

We are interested in measuring student feelings and thoughts about Direct Service Methods classes and corresponding instructors.

This questionnaire is considered to be a pre-test. The data resulting from this study will be used in the formulation of a final instrument. All information and conclusions are for our research practicum.

All questionnaires are to remain anonymous. Please answer all questions. We are asking you to respond in two ways:

1. Answer the question.
2. Rate the importance of the question, using a scale of 1-5, with 5 being "most important" and 1 being "least important"
 - 1 - Least important
 - 2 - Less important
 - 3 - Important
 - 4 - More important
 - 5 - Most important
3. Two blanks will be in the left hand margin of the survey. Use the first blank to answer the question and the second to rate the usefulness (for a final instrument) of the questionnaire.

Please be sure to return the survey to Janet Mansfield or Jim McDevitt. We have student mail boxes in Social Work II.

NOTE: Please use this reaction survey only for Direct Service Methods class (current class). Please return them to our boxes as soon as possible.

Thank you.

B. PERSONAL

Often times dilemmas encountered outside of the classroom will influence one's perception of class. The following questions cover areas of common concern to most graduate students.

- | | Not at
all | Some-
what | Moder-
ately | Incapa-
citated |
|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1. Employment outside of school has hampered my performance in this class. | () | () | () | () |
| 2. The field experience I'm having has hampered my performance in this course, (if #1 is not checked, feel free to elaborate on back). | () | () | () | () |
| 3. Financial dilemmas have effected my performance in this course. | () | () | () | () |
| 4. Unsatisfactory interpersonal relationships (such as marriage, family, friends, peers, etc.) have hampered my performance | () | () | () | () |
| 5. Alcohol and/or drug problems have hampered my performance. | () | () | () | () |
| 6. My undergraduate education had not prepared me adequately for this course. | () | () | () | () |
| 7. If personal help were needed, how available is professor? | | | | |
| () Outstanding | | | | |
| () Above average | | | | |
| () Average | | | | |
| () Poor | | | | |
| () Can't decide | | | | |

COURSE REACTION SURVEY

Course Title _____

Instructor _____

Age _____

Sex _____

Race _____

Undergraduate Major _____ G.P.A. _____

Graduate Area of Interest (Check one)

- Direct Service
- Facilitative Service
- Community Organization
- Other _____

First Year _____ Second Year _____

Year graduated from undergraduate school _____

Years of paid experience in the field _____

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

- _____ 1. While in the graduate School of Social Work at PSU
_____ have you taken courses in other graduate departments?
_____ (a) Yes (b) No
- _____ 2. Would you like to take graduate classes outside the
_____ School of Social Work at PSU
_____ (a) Yes (b) No
- _____ 3. Is this a required class?
_____ (a) Yes (b) No

- _____ 4. If it weren't required, would you take it?
_____ (a) Yes
_____ (b) No
_____ (c) Unsure
- _____ 5. In your opinion, should more emphasis be placed on
_____ (a) Class discussion
_____ (b) Lecture
_____ (c) Neither, adequate as is
_____ (d) Lecture and discussion are satisfactory.
- _____ 6. In class which occurs most often?
_____ (a) Lecture
_____ (b) Discussion
_____ (c) Neither. They are about evenly split.
- _____ 7. Which of these approaches helped you most to under-
_____ stand this class?
_____ (a) Lecture
_____ (b) Discussion
_____ (c) Reading
_____ (d) Other
- _____ 8. Which helped least?
_____ (a) Lecture
_____ (b) Discussion
_____ (c) Reading
_____ (d) Other
- _____ 9. If a bibliography is supplied, to what degree is it
_____ useful?
_____ (a) Very comprehensive
_____ (b) Above average
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all useful
_____ (f) Not applicable

- _____ 10. Was subject matter from bibliographies at an appropriate level for you?
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately so
(c) Neutral
(d) Low
(e) Very low
(f) Not applicable
- _____ 11. Of all the courses you are taking this semester, how much priority do you place on this one?
_____ (a) Very high
(b) Moderate
(c) Neutral
(d) Low
(e) Very low
- _____ 12. Were objectives of the course made clear to you at the time classes began?
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 13. Are course objectives significant to you as a social worker?
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 14. Aside from coverage of material in greater depth, does the course duplicate in whole or in part others you have taken?
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) To a small extent
(d) Not at all
- _____ 15. Estimate the number of hours per week you spend studying for the course.
_____ (a) 0-2
(b) 2-4
(c) 4-6
(d) 6-8
(e) Over 8

B. INSTRUCTOR AS RATED BY STUDENTS

- _____ 1. Does the instructor offer criticism in a constructive way?
_____ (a) Frequently
_____ (b) Sometimes
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 2. Are assignments given clearly?
_____ (a) All of the time
_____ (b) Most of the time
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Unclear most of the time
_____ (e) Not applicable
- _____ 3. To what extent was the class well organized?
_____ (a) Very well organized
_____ (b) Above average
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 4. Are you satisfied with the quality of class lectures?
_____ (a) Very satisfied
_____ (b) Moderately satisfied
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 5. To what extent were class meetings worth attending?
_____ (a) Extremely worthwhile
_____ (b) Moderately worthwhile
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 6. Is this instructor stimulating to you as a student in this class?
_____ (a) Very much so
_____ (b) Above average
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all

- _____ 7. Is the professor apathetic in this class?
_____ (a) Extremely so
(b) Above average apathy
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 8. Extent to which instructor is difficult to talk to
_____ in class.
(a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all difficult to talk with
- _____ 9. Does his theoretical framework relate to yours?
_____ (a) Very highly so
(b) Somewhat above neutral
(c) Neutral
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 10. Are your questions answered satisfactorily?
_____ (a) Always
(b) Most of the time
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Never
- _____ 11. To what extent does instructor encourage independent
_____ or creative thinking?
(a) Way above average
(b) Somewhat above average
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 12. Is his teaching style effective for you?
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately so
(c) Neutral
(d) Low
(e) Very low
- _____ 13. Does the instructor take a personal interest in class
_____ progress?
(a) Very much so
(b) Above average
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all

- _____ 14. If personal help were needed, how available?
_____ (a) Available most of the time
(b) Above average
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all available
- _____ 15. Does he inspire the class confidence in his know-
_____ ledge of the subject?
(a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 16. How would you rate this professor as a teacher?
(a) Excellent
(b) Above average
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Very poor
- _____ 17. How do you see this person as a professional social
_____ worker?
(a) Excellent
(b) Above average
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Very poor

C. STUDENT:

- _____ 1. Extent to which you feel "busy work" is given in this
_____ class
(a) To a great extent
(b) Moderate amount
(c) Average amount
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all
- _____ 2. Extent to which you feel threatened by the professor.
_____ (a) Very much so
(b) Moderately
(c) Average
(d) Below average
(e) Not at all

- _____ 3. Do you like the professor?
_____ (a) Very much so
_____ (b) Moderately
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 4. Do you dislike the professor?
_____ (a) Very much
_____ (b) Moderately
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 5. Does he provide you with a valuable learning experience?
_____ (a) Very much
_____ (b) Moderately
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 6. To what extent did you get the grade you felt you deserved?
_____ (a) To a great extent
_____ (b) Above expectations
_____ (c) About right
_____ (d) Below expectations
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 7. If exams are given in this course, are you satisfied with the quality of the exam?
_____ (a) Yes
_____ (b) No
_____ (c) Unsure
- _____ 8. Does it accurately measure your knowledge of the subject?
_____ (a) Very comprehensively
_____ (b) Moderately
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Very inadequately
- _____ 9. To what extent would you change this class if you could?
_____ (a) Greatly
_____ (b) Somewhat
_____ (c) Not at all

- _____ 10. If you had it to do over again, would you take this course?
_____ (a) Yes
_____ (b) No
_____ (c) Unsure
- _____ 11. At what level did it stimulate you to work in comparison with the level at which you usually work?
_____ (a) Way above usual level
_____ (b) Somewhat above usual level
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 12. Do you enjoy this course?
_____ (a) Greatly
_____ (b) Above average
_____ (c) Average
_____ (d) Below average
_____ (e) Not at all
- _____ 13. In your opinion was course pace
_____ (a) Too slow
_____ (b) Satisfactory
_____ (c) Too fast
_____ (d) Not applicable
- _____ 14. Did the professor assume too much prior knowledge of basic subjects?
_____ (a) Yes
_____ (b) Somewhat
_____ (c) No
_____ (d) Not applicable

Please feel free to include additional questions you feel are of importance.

Thank you.

Janet Mansfield
Jim McDevitt

Check one box that indicates the amount of each trait

HOW DOES THIS TEACHER RATE ON THESE CHARACTERISTICS

	Low		Moderate		High
	1	2	3	4	5
Scholarship	()	()	()	()	()
Wit	()	()	()	()	()
Ease of communication	()	()	()	()	()
Flexibility	()	()	()	()	()
Coldness	()	()	()	()	()
Nervousness	()	()	()	()	()
Stability	()	()	()	()	()
Ambiguity	()	()	()	()	()
Creativity	()	()	()	()	()
Likeability	()	()	()	()	()
Preparedness	()	()	()	()	()
Illustrations	()	()	()	()	()

Accessibility	()	()	()	()	()
Fairness	()	()	()	()	()
Concern	()	()	()	()	()
Excitement about Social Work	()	()	()	()	()
Depth of insight	()	()	()	()	()
Theoretical strength	()	()	()	()	()
Tehcnical strength	()	()	()	()	()