Teacher Education: Student Teacher Views vs. Those of Cooperating Teachers

Richard Stahlhut
University of Northern Iowa

Lynn Williford
University of North Carolina

See next page for additional authors

Authors

Richard Stahlhut, Lynn Williford, Richard Hawkes, and Joseph Fratianni

ED 329 531   SP 032 922

AUTHOR   Stahlhut, Richard; And Others
TITLE   Teacher Education: Student Teacher Views vs. Those of
                Cooperating Teachers.
PUB DATE   Feb 91
NOTE   27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Association of Teacher Educators (71st, New Orleans,
                LA, February 16-20, 1991).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
                Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments
                (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary
                Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher
                Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program
                Evaluation; Questionnaires; Self Evaluation
                (Individuals); *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student
                Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS   University of Northern Iowa

ABSTRACT

                A survey was conducted on the quality of preparation
in teacher education of student teachers at the University of
Northern Iowa and their performance level during student teaching.
Student teachers were asked to assess teacher education program
contributions to 29 competencies relevant to teaching effectiveness,
plus their overall teacher effectiveness. Similarly, cooperating
teachers were asked to assess the same competencies as exhibited by
the student teachers they supervised. Of the 369 (78.5 percent)
questionnaires returned, 192 were from student teachers and 177 were
from cooperating teachers. Data analysis was based on matched pairs
of responses. An overall summary of the ratings by student teachers
and cooperating teachers is presented. In 29 items, cooperating
teacher ratings of student teacher competencies exceeded student
teacher ratings of program contributions to these competencies. No
significant difference was found to exist between process and
performance as rated by the two groups of matched respondents. It was
apparent that student teachers have "unrealistic optimism" because
they rated their "overall teaching performance" higher than any of
the 29 competencies that contributed to their skills. Two competency
areas appeared among the lowest five ratings of both groups:
"stimulating students to be independent learners" and "working
with/utilizing community resources." Although rather limited samples
of both student teacher and cooperating teacher ratings were involved
in this study, the results identify some concerns worthy of
consideration and point up the need for follow-up studies. A copy of
the questionnaire is appended. (JD)

Teacher Education:
Student Teacher Views vs. Those of Cooperating Teachers

Presented by

Dr. Richard Stahlhut, Associate Professor
University of Northern Iowa

Ms. Lynn Williford, Certification Officer
University of North Carolina

Dr. Richard Hawkes, Professor
University of Northern Iowa

Dr. Joseph Fratianni, Assistant Professor
University of Northern Iowa

A paper presented at the National Conference of the Association of
Teacher Educators in New Orleans, LA in February of 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The newest educational report, The Roundtable Report on World Class Schools, acknowledges that Iowa's education system today is nationally recognized as a leader and Iowa pupils continue to earn high marks on college entrance exams and standardized tests. The University of Northern Iowa (UNI) has trained many of the teachers through preservice and inservice programs in Iowa's educational system. It can be deducted that UNI should, therefore, accept credit for Iowa's pupils' success. But there are increasing demands being placed on teachers. Changes in the family structure, more need for home/school communications, and shifting demographics are creating more societal needs that are causing greater pressure on the public schools. Do these facts imply the UNI teacher training program should change? Previous surveys have found that, "...prospective teachers are eager to begin their adventure, they have a sense of mission, they have heard the call. But for many of them (their first year) will be one of despair and frustration." (Walk, 1990, page 3).

In an attempt to better prepare young teachers for their jobs, veteran teachers are mentoring first year teachers (Friedman, 1990) and cooperating teachers are mentoring student teachers (Stahlhut and Hawkes, 1990). These unstructured procedures help beginners adjust to current demands in classrooms. However, this help is not enough. Beginners are still having a difficult time adjusting. (Weinstein, 1989).

What are the university teacher training programs doing to prepare new teachers for new responsibilities in public school environments? This survey is one attempt to find out how well student teachers and their cooperating teachers feel young educators are being prepared and can perform in the reality of today's classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

This study, conducted at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI), was designed to examine the quality of preparation in teacher education of student teachers and their performance level during student teaching. In May of 1990, student teachers were asked to assess teacher education program contributions to 29 competencies relevant to teaching effectiveness, plus their overall teaching effectiveness. Similarly, cooperating teachers were asked to assess the same competencies as exhibited by the student teachers they supervised.

The major goals of the study were fourfold: (1) to secure follow-up program evaluations by students after they completed student teaching; (2) to gain more comprehensive, objective, supplementary evaluations of student teachers by cooperating teachers than is afforded by the standard evaluation/recommendation format; (3) to analyze and compare similarities and differences in the findings of these two sample groups; and (4) to examine any differences that may exist between ratings involving students representing secondary and special area majors and those in elementary-oriented programs.

4

Method

The methodology used in this study was survey descriptive research. There were 470 questionnaires distributed. Of the 369 (78.5%) instruments completed and returned, 192 were from student teachers and 177 were from cooperating teachers. Data analysis was based on matched pairs of responses. There were 123 (52.3%) matched pairs returned.

Both sets of evaluation instruments (see appendices A and B) along with accompanying machine-scored answer sheets, were distributed and collected by university professors assigned to UNI's 10 student teaching centers located throughout the state of Iowa (Cedar Falls, Charles City, Clinton, Council Bluffs, Des Moines, Fort Dodge, Marshalltown, Ottumwa, Price Lab School (UNI), Waterloo). The anonymity of both groups of potential respondents was protected by utilizing like-numbered pairs of instruments; each student teacher and his/her cooperating teacher received evaluation forms identified only by the matched numbers appearing on their respective instruments.

Limitations

In making inferences from this data, it must be noted that the results reported are based on a net response rate of 52.3 percent of the target population of 235 student teacher/cooperating teacher pairs. While the individual return rates for student teachers and cooperating teachers were fairly high (81.7% and 75.3%, respectively), a number of these responses were declared unusable.

A Total of 112 student teacher/cooperating teacher pairs were excluded from the study for the following reasons: (a) no response from either member of a pair - 34; (b) response from only one member of a pair - 33; (c) cooperating teacher failed to identify teaching field as requested on the instrument - 37; and (d) both respondents identified teaching field - 8.

The instruments did not ask individuals to identify their specific teaching centers, and as a result, it was not possible to determine if the sample was proportionate to the population in terms of distribution across the ten teaching centers. This omission also prevented comparisons of responses from different teaching centers, which was potentially of interest given the differences in the communities in which student teachers and cooperating teachers worked during the practicum.

Not all the participants responded to all items on the instrument. For example, on item #25, only 73 of the 123 cooperating teachers gave any response. Although both instruments specifically offered respondents the option of indicating "not applicable" instead of assigning a letter grade on individual items, the category was rarely used by student teachers, and used only one time by one cooperating teacher. Therefore it is not known if the items were skipped by mistake, if the respondents did not consider the item relevant in the context of the evaluation, if the meaning of the item was ambiguous, or if there were other reasons for non-response.

The instruments were completed in close proximity to the final

student teacher/cooperating teacher conference, and in many cases on the same occasion. Therefore, it is possible that student teacher assessments of the teacher education program were influenced by the feedback they received from the cooperating teacher. Similarly, since the cooperating teacher had recently completed the standard evaluation of the student teacher, it is possible that the overall opinion formed of the student teacher made it somewhat difficult to differentiate the student's performance on a more comprehensive set of competencies.

It should be noted that the instruments were developed specifically for this study, and as such, had not been field-tested prior to their use here. No studies of reliability or validity have yet been performed.

Findings

(1.) An overall summary of the ratings by student teachers and cooperating teachers is presented in Table 1. The positive t values demonstrate in all 29 items that cooperating teacher ratings of student teacher competencies exceeded student teacher ratings of program contributions to these competencies. In 22 of the 29 items these differences were significant at the .01 level (p < .01). Although they are not presented in Table 1, the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were computed. They were low and did not demonstrate significant measures of association.

(2.) A ranking of the highest and lowest items by student teachers and cooperating teachers can be found in tables 2 and 3. Rankings are based on a conventional four point scale (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1,

F=0). GPA's for student and cooperating teacher evaluations of the 29 items were computed. Student teacher GPA's ranged from a low of 2.23, just below a C+ average (C+ = 2.33) to a high of 3.27, or just below a B+ average, (B+ = 3.33). The lowest competencies pertain to working with the community and global perspectives.

Cooperating teacher evaluations ranged from a low of 3.02, just over a B average (B = 3.00) to a high of 3.70, just over an A- average (A- = 3.67). In no instance did cooperating teachers rate any competency below a B average.

(3.) A comparison of student and cooperating teacher ratings can be found in table 4. The grand mean (on a four point scale) for cooperating teachers relative to the 29 competencies was 3.32 with a standard deviation of 0.77. Student teachers' grand mean was 2.83 with a standard deviation of 0.93.

The means and standard deviations were used to convert the respective ratings to z scores (the number of standard deviations above or below the grand mean for each set of ratings) to facilitate comparisons on an equal basis. The 29 competencies have been arranged in descending order according to the absolute discrepancies evidenced in the z score comparisons.

As can be noted in table 4, no difference was found in the z scores obtained in comparing the two groups' ratings for "oral communication" (z difference = 0.00). Differences of 0.10 standard deviations or less were observed in a total of 11 items. In other words, the relative quality of both process and product were perceived to be nearly equal by the two groups.

Negative differences in the z scores signify higher ranking order by students, thus indicating that students attributed higher degrees of relative importance to program contributions in those areas than the cooperating teacher ratings attached to the resulting competencies performed by student teachers. Such was the case with 13 of the 29 competencies evaluated. These differences ranged from a low of -0.01 to a high of -0.38. In five of these instances, negative differences of 0.25 or more were observed. The following competencies were involved: (1) "understanding of child growth and development" (0.38); (2) knowledge and skills in major subject area" (-0.38); (3) "understanding and using different theories, models and strategies and strategies for teaching and learning" (-0.37); (4) "developing instructional objectives and devising lesson plans appropriate to their achievement" (-0.26); and (5) "evaluating and selecting instructional materials and media" (-0.25).

Positive differences favoring the competency ratings by cooperating teachers were observed with 15 items (ranging from 0.01 to 0.76). Six of the differences equalled or exceeded 0.25 of a standard deviation: (1) "working with students from differing social, economic and ethnic backgrounds" (0.76); (2) "communicating and working with parents/guardians and the school community" (0.47); (3) "working effectively with other teachers and administrators" (0.46); (4) handling the legal and ethical aspects of teaching" (0.40); (5) relating instruction in all areas to a global perspective (the world as a community)" (0.34); and (6)

"working with/utilizing community resources" (0.25). In these instances, it could be said that cooperating teachers rated the product of the competencies by student teachers as being higher than the students gave the program credit for developing.

(4.) In table 5 elementary ratings are compared to secondary/special area ratings. Of the 123 student teachers, 57 (46.3%) were elementary (K-6) majors. The remaining 66 (53.7%) student teachers were secondary or special area majors. Student ratings of program contributions to the development of teaching skills by elementary students rated 17 competencies higher than their counterparts in secondary and special areas. The differences on a four point scale exceeded 0.25 for 8 competencies: (1) "understanding/using different models for teaching and learning" (3.22 v. 2.85); (2) "understanding child growth and development" (3.28 v 3.00); (3) "developing appropriate objectives and lesson plans" (3.35 v. 2.85); (4) "motivating students to learn" (2.87 v. 2.56); (5) classroom management and discipline" (2.84 v. 2.37); (6) "handling the legal and ethical aspects of teaching" (2.75 v. 2.42); (7) "communicating/working with parents and the school community" (2.83 v. 2.77); and (8) "working with/utilizing communication resources" (2.70 v. 2.06).

Secondary and special area majors rated 12 program competencies higher than elementary majors but only 1 competency, "understanding/using technology" (3.21 v. 2.94) was 0.25 or higher.

Despite the differing views of students in elementary and secondary education, very little difference was observed in

cooperating teacher ratings of the qualities demonstrated by the two groups. In fact, the grand means (for all 29 skill areas) achieved by elementary and secondary/special area majors were identical, 3.31 in each instance. In only two areas did ratings differ by as much as 0.25 on a four-point scale: (1) "motivating students to learn" which favored the elementary group (3.41 v. 3.12); and (2) "understanding and using technology" which favored the secondary/special area group (3.21 v. 2.94).

Conclusions and Program Implications

No significant difference was found to exist between process and performance as rated by the two groups of matched respondents. But it is apparent that student teachers have "unrealistic optimism" (Weinstein, 1989, pg. 53) because student teachers rated their "overall teaching performance" higher than any of the 29 competencies that contributed to their skills.

The highest mean among competency ratings by cooperative teachers was achieved in the area of "Working effectively with other teachers and administrators" with a mean GPA of 3.70. This finding was not exactly unexpected because the onus is on student teachers to be cooperative with supervisors, other teachers and administrators if they hope to profit from the experience and gain favorable recommendations; to operate in a contrary manner without extreme provocation would border on professional suicide.

Considering the high marks cooperating teachers gave student teachers on the 29 competencies that contribute to effective teaching (mean ratings on a four-point grading scale ranged from

3.02 to 3.70 with an overall mean of 3.32) and the fact that the mean rating for "overall teaching performance" by student teachers was 3.33, few if any serious deficiencies in the University of Northern Iowa teacher education sequence were elicited by this study. However, this is not to suggest that no room exists for improvement.

As evidenced in tables 2 and 3, two competency areas appeared among the lowest five ratings of both groups: (1) "stimulating students to be independent learners" (tied for 25th among student ratings and 26th among cooperating teacher ratings. Considering the importance of promoting independent learning skills and the fact that this was rated low by both groups, it is readily apparent that additional attention needs to be given to the development of this competency within the UNI teacher education program. (2) "working with/utilizing community resources" (29th and last among student ratings and tied for 28th and last among cooperating teacher ratings). Despite its low rank among the ratings of both groups, it reasonably may be questioned whether "working with/utilizing community resources" is as deserving of attention as the matter of independent learning. This is because the very nature of the student teaching experience handicaps the student's ability to perform as capably in this area for a variety of reasons: (1) the relatively short duration of the student's assignment within a new community with which he or she has little time to gain familiarity; (2) the bulk of the student teacher's time and attention is focused on the implementation of an existing

12

instructional program designed and planned by the cooperating teacher; and (3) opportunities and success in the area of community involvement tend to be enhanced as one gains confidence and experience and becomes more familiar with community opportunities and with whom to establish productive contacts. The fact that student teachers, as a group, achieved a "B" average in this area during the course of this experience may be about as much as can be expected under the circumstances.

Additional areas which ranked low among cooperating teachers' ratings probably are more demanding of attention, notably the areas of "identifying and diagnosing physical, emotional, familial and social problems that may interfere with student learning", "promoting problem-solving and critical thinking skills", and the area of "classroom management and discipline." Although this last competency often takes time and experience to develop, continuing attention needs to be provided so the student has ample opportunities to build confidence and skill.

Based on the reports of both elementary-oriented majors and their cooperating teachers, continuing attention needs to be given to enriching the backgrounds of students in those areas in the realm of "devising, using, and interpreting student evaluations" and in the area "understanding and using technology." Based on the responses of secondary/special area majors and their cooperating teachers, the findings suggest a need for improvements in the areas of "student motivation" and "adjusting instruction to individual learner needs." Plans under way to increase field experience

13

opportunities for secondary majors could do much to improve opportunities for students to gain insights and experience in these two areas as well as "classroom management and discipline" which was cited as a concern by student an cooperating teachers in both groups.

Although rather limited samples of both student teacher and cooperating teacher ratings were involved in this study (123 student teacher-cooperating teacher pairs), the results identify some concerns that are worthy of consideration. Subsequent follow-up studies of a similar nature are needed to confirm or deny these implications as well as to suggest other program considerations and to guide improvement efforts. Plans call for doing just that.

Instructions: Indicate how well your educational experiences at the University of Northern Iowa prepared you for the general areas and teaching responsibilities listed below. Use an A, B, C, D, F rating scale just as if you were assigning grades. You may use N/A by selecting "G " if an item is inappropriate or not applicable to your situation.

Use a no. 2 Pencil to mark your ratings on the machine scored answer sheet provided. First, enter the number appearing on this rating sheet in the Special Codes section of the answer sheet (this will not be used to identify you as an individual--it simply will be used to match your answers with supervisory ratings).

When you are done with your ratings, return your answer sheet to your student teaching coordinator.

		High			Low	N/A	
1.	Effective oral communication	A	B	C	D	F	G
2.	Effective written communication	A	B	C	D	F	G
3.	General education background	A	B	C	D	F	G
4.	The ability to locate and use needed information	A	B	C	D	F	G
5.	Understanding and using different theories, models and strategies for teaching and learning	A	B	C	D	F	G
6.	Developing knowledge and skills in your major subject area	A	B	C	D	F	G
7.	Understanding child growth and development	A	B	C	D	F	G
8.	Developing instructional objectives and devising lesson plans appropriate to their achievement	A	B	C	D	F	G
9.	Motivating students to learn	A	B	C	D	F	G
10.	Stimulating students to become independent learners	A	B	C	D	F	G
11.	Promoting the development of students' problem-solving and critical thinking skills	A	B	C	D	F	G
12.	Classroom management and discipline	A	B	C	D	F	G
13.	Relating instruction in all areas to a global per-spective (the world as a community)	A	B	C	D	F	G
14.	Integrating mainstreamed students into regular classes	A	B	C	D	F	G

*** OVER ***

			High			Low	N/A

15. Adjusting/individualizing instruction according to differing learner needs (regular, gifted and handicapped students)   A B C D F G

16. Promoting students' confidence and feelings of self worth   A B C D F G

17. Working with students from differing social, economic and ethnic backgrounds   A B C D F G

18. Identifying/diagnosing physical, emotional, familial, social problems that may interfere with student learning   A B C D F G

19. Developing and interpreting tests and other means of evaluation   A B C D F G

20. Evaluating and selecting instructional materials and media   A B C D F G

21. Integrating library and media resources into instruction   A B C D F G

22. Understanding and using technology (computers, video, projectors, audio tapes, etc.)   A B C D F G

23. Working effectively with other teachers and administrators   A B C D F G

24. Handling the legal and ethical aspects of teaching (record keeping, disclosing information, dealing with students, etc.)   A B C D F G

25. Communicating and working with parents/guardians and the school community   A B C D F G

26. Working with/utilizing community resources (businesses, governmental institutions, social and educational agencies, other referral agencies, etc.)   A B C D F G

27. Self evaluation--evaluating your own teaching performance and making adjustments when desirable   A B C D F G

28. Understanding and applying the findings of educational research and the professional literature   A B C D F G

29. Taking advantage of professional opportunities (visiting other schools, membership in professional organizations, participating in conferences and workshops, etc.)   A B C D F G

30. Compared to other teachers of like experience in similar teaching positions, how would you rate your overall teaching performance?   A B C D F G

Instructions: Please indicate the context in which you are evaluating the person subject to this evaluation. Then rate the person on the professional qualities identified. Use an A, B, C, D, F rating scale just as if you were assigning grades; ratings should be based on comparisons with other persons of like experience in similar positions. You may use N/A by selecting "G " if an item is inappropriate or not applicable to evaluation situation.

USE A NO. 2 PENCIL TO MAKE YOUR RATINGS ON THE MACHINE-SCORED ANSWER SHEET PROVIDED. THEN RETURN THE ANSWER SHEET TO YOUR STUDENT TEACHING COORDINATOR.

Evaluation Context:

A. Under "Identification Number" on the answer sheet, enter one of the following numbers to identify the general student teaching area:

001	Art	006	Foreign Language	011	Phys. Ed./Health
002	Business Ed.	007	Industrial Tech.	012	Science (7-12)
003	Driver Ed.	008	Lang. Arts (7-12)	013	Soc. Science (7-12)
004	E. Child. (NK)	009	Mathematics (7-12)	014	Speech Pathology
005	Elementary Educ.	010	Music	015	Other

B. Enter the number appearing on this form in the "Special Codes" section of the answer sheet. (This number will not be used to identify supervisory personnel or students; it simply will be used to match supervisory and student ratings.)

Professional Qualities:

		High				Low	N/A
1.	Oral communication	A	B	C	D	F	G
2.	Written communication	A	B	C	D	F	G
3.	General education background	A	B	C	D	F	G
4.	Ability to locate and use needed information	A	B	C	D	F	G
5.	Understanding and using different theories, models and strategies for teaching and learning	A	B	C	D	F	G
6.	Subject area knowledge and skills	A	B	C	D	F	G
7.	Scheduling learning activities	A	B	C	D	F	G
8.	Developing instructional objectives and devising lesson plans appropriate to their achievement	A	B	C	D	F	G
9.	Motivating students to learn	A	B	C	D	F	G
10.	Stimulating students to become independent learners	A	B	C	D	F	G
11.	Promoting the development of students' problem-solving and critical thinking skills	A	B	C	D	F	G
12.	Classroom management and discipline	A	B	C	D	F	G

*** OVER ***

		High	Low	N/A

13. Assessing class needs and adapting instruction to those needs   A   B   C   D   F   G

14. Integrating mainstreamed students into regular classes   A   B   C   D   F   G

15. Adjusting/individualizing instruction according to differing learner needs   A   B   C   D   F   G

16. Promoting students' confidence and feelings of self worth   A   B   C   D   F   G

17. Ability to work with students from differing social, economic and ethnic backgrounds   A   B   C   D   F   G

18. Identifying/diagnosing physical, emotional, familial, social problems that may interfere with student learning   A   B   C   D   F   G

19. Developing and interpreting tests and other means of evaluation   A   B   C   D   F   G

20. Evaluating and selecting instructional materials and media   A   B   C   D   F   G

21. Integrating library and media resources into instruction   A   B   C   D   F   G

22. Understanding and using technology (computers, video, projectors, audio tapes, etc.)   A   B   C   D   F   G

23. Working effectively with other teachers and administrators   A   B   C   D   F   G

24. Handling the legal and ethical aspects of teaching (record keeping, disclosing information, dealing with students, etc.)   A   B   C   D   F   G

25. Communicating and working with parents/guardians and the school community   A   B   C   D   F   G

26. Working with/utilizing community resources (businesses, governmental institutions, social and educational agencies, other referral agencies, etc.)   A   B   C   D   F   G

27. Self evaluation--ability to evaluate own teaching performance and making adjustments when desirable   A   B   C   D   F   G

28. Understanding and applying the findings of professional literature and educational research   A   B   C   D   F   G

29. Taking advantage of professional opportunities (visiting other schools, membership in professional organizations, participating in conferences and workshops, etc.)   A   B   C   D   F   G

30. Overall teaching performance compared to other teachers of like experience in similar positions   A   B   C   D   F   G

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF RATINGS BY STUDENT TEACHERS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS
(Groups: S identifies student ratings - C identifies cooperating teacher ratings)

Item	Grp	A	B	C	D	F	NA	GPA	z	t	2-tail Prob.
1. Oral communication	S	25	51	30	6	0	1	2.85	0.02	5.47	.000
	C	57	44	12	3	0	0	3.34	0.02		
2. Written communication	S	35	57	19	5	0	0	3.05	0.24	3.03	.003
	C	53	44	11	2	0	0	3.35	0.03		
3. Gen. educ. background	S	34	58	16	3	0	0	3.11	0.30	5.61	.000
	C	74	34	7	0	0	0	3.58	0.34		
4. Ability to locate and use needed information	S	37	48	21	9	0	4	2.98	0.17	4.47	.000
	C	66	37	12	0	0	0	3.47	0.20		
5. Understand/use tchg/lrng theories and strategies	S	39	53	17	7	0	0	3.07	0.26	1.31	.193
	C	51	44	14	5	0	1	3.24	-0.11		
6. Knowledge/skills in major subject area	S	51	47	16	2	0	0	3.27	0.47	1.57	.120
	C	61	42	10	3	0	0	3.39	0.09		
7. Understanding of child growth & development	S	40	59	13	4	0	0	3.16	0.36	1.27	.206
	C	55	40	13	4	0	0	3.30	-0.02		
8. Developing appropriate objectives/lesson plans	S	46	38	26	2	0	3	3.14	0.34	1.82	.071
	C	62	33	15	2	0	0	3.38	0.08		
9. Motivating students to learn	S	22	51	29	11	0	2	2.74	-0.09	6.12	.000
	C	53	46	13	3	0	0	3.30	-0.03		
10. Stimulating students to be independent learners	S	12	48	38	13	1	2	2.51	-0.34	5.41	.000
	C	37	50	25	2	0	0	3.07	-0.33		
11. Promoting problem-solving & critical thinking skills	S	15	60	25	12	1	1	2.67	-0.17	3.14	.002
	C	34	53	21	5	0	0	3.03	-0.38		
12. Classroom management & discipline	S	21	41	32	13	0	5	2.65	-0.19	3.91	.000
	C	39	44	23	7	0	0	3.02	-0.39		
13. Relating instruction to a global perspective	S	11	38	35	20	1	3	2.36	-0.50	7.36	.000
	C	44	48	20	1	0	0	3.19	-0.16		
14. Integrating mainstreamed students in reg. classes	S	23	28	38	9	0	3	2.66	-0.18	2.18	.033
	C	27	22	11	1	0	0	3.23	-0.12		
15. Adjusting instruction to individual learner needs	S	22	35	41	12	0	3	2.61	-0.23	4.86	.000
	C	42	40	20	4	0	0	3.13	-0.24		

(Table 1 continued on next page)

19

Item	Grp	------ Ratings ------						GPA	z	t	2-tail Prob.
		A	B	C	D	F	NA				
16. Promoting students' con-	S	43	44	18	8	0	0	3.08	0.27	5.30	.000
fidence & self worth	C	79	25	10	0	0	0	3.61	0.38		
17. Working with students of	S	21	30	34	20	1	3	2.47	-0.38	9.35	.000
differing backgrounds	C	71	30	6	0	0	0	3.61	0.38		
18. Identifying problems that	S	18	36	38	15	0	1	2.53	-0.32	4.66	.000
interfere with learning	C	35	43	17	1	0	0	3.17	-0.27		
19. Developing/interpreting	S	25	50	28	9	0	1	2.81	-0.02	2.71	.008
tests/evaluations	C	36	50	16	3	0	0	3.13	-0.24		
20. Evaluating & selecting	S	37	51	19	4	0	2	3.09	0.28	2.59	.011
learning materials/media	C	48	48	8	2	0	0	3.34	0.03		
21. Integrating library/media	S	33	53	20	4	1	1	3.02	0.21	3.00	.003
resources into instruction	C	49	42	11	3	0	0	3.30	-0.02		
22. Understanding & using	S	41	44	20	6	1	1	3.05	0.24	2.76	.007
technology	C	54	35	14	2	0	0	3.34	0.03		
23. Working effectively with	S	38	34	29	12	0	1	2.87	0.04	7.40	.000
other teachers/admin.	C	91	16	6	2	0	0	3.70	0.50		
24. Handling legal and ethical	S	21	43	26	18	1	6	2.60	-0.25	6.58	.000
aspects of teaching	C	61	34	14	0	0	0	3.43	0.15		
25. Communicating/working with	S	17	42	28	19	1	3	2.51	-0.34	3.60	.001
parents & school community	C	29	32	11	1	0	0	3.22	0.13		
26. Working with/utilizing	S	9	28	40	19	2	5	2.23	-0.64	2.97	.005
community resources	C	10	28	9	0	0	0	3.02	-0.39		
27. Self evaluation and making	S	34	51	21	6	1	1	2.98	0.17	4.83	.000
adjustments when needed	C	69	33	11	2	0	0	3.47	0.20		
28. Understanding/applying	S	24	46	28	14	1	0	2.69	-0.15	4.36	.000
prof. literature/research	C	33	48	19	0	0	0	3.14	-0.23		
29. Taking advantage of pro-	S	37	41	22	9	0	2	2.97	0.16	4.11	.000
fessional opportunities	C	53	35	6	1	0	0	3.47	0.20		
30. Overall teaching perform-	S	44	59	10	0	0	0	3.33	----	1.25	.213
ance	C	68	31	14	2	0	0	3.42	----		

TABLE 2: PREPARATIONAL AREAS RATED HIGHEST AND LOWEST
BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Rank	Preparational Area	GPA	z
1.	Knowledge and skills in major subject area	3.27	0.47
2.	Understanding of child growth and development	3.16	0.36
3.	Developing appropriate objectives and lesson plans	3.14	0.34
4.	General education background	3.11	0.30
5.	Understanding/using learning theories and strategies	3.07	0.26

Lowest Ranking Area

Rank	Preparational Area	GPA	z
25.5	Stimulating students to become independent learners	2.51	- 0.34
25.5	Communicating/working with parents and school community	2.51	-0.34
27.	Working with students of differing backgrounds	2.47	-0.38
28.	Relating instruction to a global perspective	2.36	-0.50
29.	Working with/utlizing community resources	2.23	-0.64

TABLE 3: COMPETENCY AREAS RATED HIGHEST AND LOWEST BY
COOPERATING TEACHERS

Rank	Competency Area	GPA	z
	Highest Ranking Areas		
1.	Working effectively with other teachers and administrators	3.70	0.50
2.5	Promoting students' confidence and self worth	3.61	0.38
2.5	Working with students of differing backgrounds	3.61	0.38
4	General education background	3.58	0.34
5.5	Ability to locate and use needed information	3.47	0.20
5.5	Self evaluation and making adjustments when needed	3.47	0.20
	Lowest Ranking Areas		
25.	Identifying problems that interfere with learning	3.17	-0.27
26.	Stimulating students to become independent learners	3.07	-0.33
27.	Promoting problem-solving and critical thinking skills	3.03	-0.38
28.5	Classroom management and discipline	3.02	-0.39
28.5	Working with/utilizing community resources	3.02	-0.39

TABLE 4: RELATIVE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN RATINGS
BY STUDENTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

Item	Teacher Ratings		Student Ratings		Difference	
	GPA	z	GPA	z	GPA	z
1. Working with students of differing backgrounds	3.61	0.38	2.47	-0.38	1.14	r '6
2. Communicating/working with parents & school community	3.22	0.13	2.51	-0.34	0.71	0.47
3. Working effectively with other teachers/admin.	3.70	0.50	2.87	0.04	0.83	0.46
4. Handling legal and ethical aspects of teaching	3.43	0.15	2.60	-0.25	0.83	0.40
5. Understanding of child growth & development	3.30	-0.02	3.16	0.36	0.14	-0.38
6. Knowledge/skills in major subject area	3.39	0.09	3.27	0.47	0.12	-0.38
7. Understand/use tchg/lrng theories and strategies	3.24	-0.11	3.07	0.26	0.17	-0.37
8. Relating instruction to a global perspective	3.19	-0.16	2.36	-0.50	0.83	0.34
9. Developing appropriate objectives/lesson plans	3.38	0.08	3.14	0.34	0.24	-0.26
10. Working with/utilizing community resources	3.02	-0.39	2.23	-0.64	0.79	0.25
11. Evaluating & selecting learning materials/media	3.34	0.03	3.09	0.28	0.25	-0.25
12. Integrating library/media resources into instruction	3.30	-0.02	3.02	0.21	0.28	-0.23
13. Developing/interpreting tests/evaluations	3.13	-0.24	2.81	-0.02	0.32	-0.22
14. Promoting problem-solving & critical thinking skills	3.03	-0.38	2.67	-0.17	0.36	-0.21
15. Written communication	3.35	0.03	3.05	0.24	0.30	-0.21

(Table 4 continued on next page)

23

TABLE 4: RELATIVE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN RATINGS
BY STUDENTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS
(Continued)

	Item	Teacher Ratings		Student Ratings		Difference	
		GPA	z	GPA	z	GPA	z
16.	Understanding & using technology	3.34	0.03	3.05	0.24	0.29	-0.21
17.	Classroom management & discipline	3.02	-0.39	2.65	-0.19	0.37	-0.20
18.	Promoting students' confidence & self worth	3.61	0.38	3.08	0.27	0.53	0.11
19.	Understanding/applying prof. literature/research	3.14	-0.23	2.69	-0.15	0.45	-0.08
20.	Integrating mainstreamed students in reg. classes	3.23	-0.12	2.66	-0.18	0.57	0.06
21.	Motivating students to learn	3.30	-0.03	2.74	-0.09	0.56	0.06
22.	Identifying problems that interfere with learning	3.17	-0.27	2.53	-0.32	0.64	0.05
23.	Taking advantage of professional opportunities	3.47	0.20	2.97	0.16	0.50	0.04
24.	Gen. educ. background	3.58	0.34	3.11	0.30	0.47	0.04
25.	Ability to locate and use needed information	3.47	0.20	2.98	0.17	0.49	0.03
26.	Self evaluation and making adjustments when needed	3.47	0.20	2.98	0.17	0.49	0.03
27.	Stimulating students to be independent learners	3.07	-0.33	2.51	-0.34	0.56	0.01
28.	Adjusting instruction to individual learner needs	3.13	-0.24	2.61	-0.23	0.52	-0.01
29.	Oral communication	3.34	0.02	2.85	0.02	0.49	0.00

TABLE 5: RATINGS PERTAINING TO ELEMENTARY
SECONDARY/SPECIAL AREA MAJORS

Item	--- Student Means ---			--- Teacher Means ---		
	Elem	Sec/SA	Diff	Elem	Sec/SA	Diff
1. Oral communication	2.83	2.87	-0.04	3.32	3.36	-0.04
2. Written communication	3.00	3.11	-0.11	3.32	3.38	-0.06
3. Gen. educ. background	3.02	3.24	-0.22	3.56	3.61	-0.05
4. Ability to locate and use needed information	2.96	3.02	-0.06	3.40	3.56	-0.16
5. Understand/use tchg/lrng theories and strategies	3.22	2.85	0.37	3.26	3.20	0.06
6. Knowledge/skills in major subject area	3.28	3.25	0.03	3.34	3.46	-0.12
7. Understanding of child growth & development	3.28	3.00	0.28	3.26	3.36	-0.10
8. Developing appropriate objectives/lesson plans	3.35	2.85	0.50	3.39	3.37	0.02
9. Motivating students to learn	2.87	2.56	0.31	3.41	3.12	0.29
10. Stimulating students to be independent learners	2.57	2.41	0.16	3.06	3.09	-0.03
11. Promoting problem-solving & critical thinking skills	2.71	2.61	0.10	3.01	3.05	-0.04
12. Classroom management & discipline	2.84	2.37	0.47	3.03	3.00	0.03
13. Relating instruction to a global perspective	2.35	2.38	-0.03	3.20	3.19	0.01
14. Integrating mainstreamed students in reg. classes	2.58	2.70	-0.12	3.19	3.25	-0.06
15. Adjusting instruction to individual learner needs	2.67	2.52	0.15	3.17	3.08	0.09

(Table 5 continued on next page)

25

TABLE 5: RATINGS PERTAINING TO ELEMENTARY
SECONDARY/SPECIAL AREA MAJORS

Item	--- Student Means ---			--- Teacher Means ---		
	Elem	Sec/SA	Diff	Elem	Sec/SA	Diff
16. Promoting students' confidence & self worth	3.10	3.04	0.06	3.65	3.54	0.11
17. Working with students of differing backgrounds	2.39	2.57	-0.18	3.54	3.68	-0.14
18. Identifying problems that interfere with learning	2.64	2.40	0.24	3.22	3.10	0.12
19. Developing/interpreting tests/evaluations	2.77	2.87	-0.10	3.05	3.23	-0.18
20. Evaluating & selecting learning materials/media	3.13	3.04	0.09	3.28	3.42	-0.14
21. Integrating library/media resources into instruction	3.01	3.02	-0.01	3.34	3.25	0.09
22. Understanding & using technology	2.94	3.21	-0.27	3.23	3.50	-0.27
23. Working effectively with other teachers/admin.	2.95	2.75	0.20	3.72	3.68	0.04
24. Handling legal and ethical aspects of teaching	2.75	2.42	0.33	3.37	3.50	-0.13
25. Communicating/working with parents & school community	2.83	2.27	0.56	3.24	3.20	0.04
26. Working with/utilizing community resources	2.70	2.06	0.64	3.00	3.03	-0.03
27. Self evaluation and making adjustments when needed	3.00	2.96	0.04	3.48	3.46	0.02
28. Understanding/applying prof. literature/research	2.65	2.75	-0.10	3.13	3.15	-0.02
29. Taking advantage of professional opportunities	2.96	2.98	-0.02	3.45	3.49	-0.04
30. Overall teaching performance	3.35	3.29	0.06	3.39	3.42	-0.03

References

1. Duea, J. (1991). A Comparison of Process and Product Ratings by Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers at the University of Northern Iowa (work in progress).

2. Freedman, S. (1990). "The Veteran and The Beginner: Teacher Magazine, April, 60-65.

3. Hawkes, K. and Gardner, W. (1983). The Education of Teachers: A Look ``head. New York: Longman.

4. ISEA, (1991). "They Listened", ISEA COMMUNIQUE. Dec.-Jan., 1-2

5. Stahilut, R. and Hawkes R. (1990). "Mentoring Student Teachers: A Conceptual Model." (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 320864).

6. Stahlhut, R. (1988). "Mentoring: It Works in Student Teaching." Iowa Educational Leadership, 5(1), 27-30

7. Weinstein, C. (1989). "Teacher Education Students' Preconceptions of Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, Mar.-Apr., 53-60.

8. Wolk, R. (1990). "Profession in Waiting." Teacher Magazine, April, 3.

9. Wood, R. and Eicher, C. (1989). "Self-perceived Adequacy of Student Teaching and its Relationship to Supervising Teacher Ratings: Another Look. (ERIC Documentation keporduction Service NO. ED 310 073).