



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

<http://archive.org/details/studentteacherpe00nowa>

STUDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE TASKS FOR PLANNING OF DAILY LESSONS
AND FOR TEACHING OF PLANNED LESSONS

by *RF S*

MARGARET MARY NOWATZKI

B. S., College of St. Benedict, 1959

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:

Ellen M. Champoux
Major Professor

20
2668
15
168
169
12

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Ellen M. Champoux, assistant professor of Home Economics Education, College of Education, for help and guidance given throughout this study.

Appreciation is also due Dr. J. Harvey Littrell, professor of Education, College of Education, and Dr. Marjorie M. Stith, professor of Family and Child Development, College of Home Economics, who have graciously served on the graduate committee.

The writer is grateful to the university supervisors, the supervising teachers, and the student teachers who participated in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Purposes of the Study	4
Scope and Limitations of the Study	4
Procedure	4
Definition of Terms Used	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Research on Teacher Competence	7
Preparing Student Teachers for Depth Teaching	11
Identification of Depth Teaching	12
Planning for Depth Teaching	14
Cooperative Responsibilities of the University Super- visor and the Supervising Teacher in Student Teaching	21
Summary	28
III. PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY	30
Development of the Lesson Planning and Teaching Task	
Performance Scale (LPTTP Scale)	30
Identification of Student Teacher Competencies	30
Devising the Format for the Instrument	32
The Rating Scale	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Personal Data Sheets	37
Subjects for the Study	38
Administration of the Instrument	38
Procedure for Analyzing the Data	39
IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	40
Information From the Personal Data Sheets	41
The University Supervisor of Home Economics	41
The Supervising Teachers of Home Economics	42
Ratings Obtained with the LPTTP Scale	44
Planning of Daily Lessons: Major Tasks	44
Planning of Daily Lessons: Supportive Tasks	44
Teaching of Daily Lessons: Major Tasks	50
Teaching of Daily Lessons: Supportive Tasks	54
Comparison of Ratings Obtained with the LPTTP Scale	54
Supervisor Ratings: Planning of Daily Lessons	59
Supervisor Ratings: Teaching of Daily Lessons	63
Student Teacher Ratings: Planning of Daily Lessons.	66
Student Teacher Ratings: Teaching of Daily Lessons.	68
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
Summary	74

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Conclusions	77
Implications	78
Recommendations for Further Study	79
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDICES	86
Appendix A. The preliminary instrument: "Ranking of Student Teacher Competencies Related to Planning Daily Lessons and Teaching Planned Lessons"	87
Appendix B. The rating instrument: "Lesson Planning and Teaching Task Performance Scale"	93
Appendix C. "Personal Data Sheet: University Super- visors"	102
Appendix D. "Personal Data Sheet: Supervising Teachers"	105
Appendix E. Cover letter to university supervisors . .	108
Appendix F. Cover letter to supervising teachers . . .	110

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Concepts Emphasized in Professional Home Economics Education Sequences and in Preparatory Student Teaching Courses	42
II. University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher, and Student Teacher Ratings of Major Tasks for Planning Daily Lessons	45
III. University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher, and Student Teacher Ratings of Supportive Tasks for Planning Daily Lessons	48
IV. University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher, and Student Teacher Ratings of Major Tasks for Teaching Daily Lessons	51
V. University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher, and Student Teacher Ratings of Supportive Tasks for Teaching Daily Lessons	55

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Evaluation of student teacher competencies is a difficult but necessary process. A close working relationship between the university supervisor and the supervising teacher aids in evaluation of student teacher progress as well as contributes toward a successful student teaching experience. University supervisors and supervising teachers can better evaluate student teacher progress cooperatively when there is common understanding concerning the competencies being judged.

In recent years there has been emphasis upon the preparation of student teachers who could teach for depth in home economics. One way to achieve depth in teaching is through implementation of the concept approach. This involves teaching within a conceptual framework through which pupils are helped to formulate generalizations and relate them to new situations. Planning for depth teaching is one of the experiences provided home economics education students in their preparation for student teaching.

Realization by student teachers and their supervisors of the importance of good planning has been verified by many authorities. Brown stressed that the knowledge and the skill required for good teaching are

gained through planning.¹ Inherent in such planning is the ability to apply knowledge of objectives, concepts, generalizations, teaching methods and techniques, and evaluation. Fleck emphasized the necessity of adequate lesson preparation to successful home economics teaching when she said that "inadequate preparation leads to confusion."²

Teaching lessons is a major aspect in the process of guiding learning. According to Stratemeyer, when the supervising teacher helps the student teacher in study of the learners, in planning, in guiding, or in evaluation she is actually helping with guidance of learning.³

Instruments that provide only quantitative measurement no longer meet the needs for evaluation in student teaching. According to Boykin rating scales, checklists, questionnaires, anecdotal records, observational methods, and personal reports are among the techniques required to determine the comprehensive range of student teaching objectives.⁴

Some devices used in the assessment of student teacher performance can too easily be interjected with personal bias. Use of structured

¹Thomas J. Brown, Student Teaching in a Secondary School, p. 87.

²Henrietta Fleck, "Keys for Success in Home Economics," Forecast for Home Economists. 79:8, March, 1963.

³Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsay, Working With Student Teachers, pp. 240-243.

⁴Leander L. Boykin, "Principles of Evaluating in Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 21.

rating instruments is a means of trying to remove personal bias. Lucio stated that "the absence of sharp, stable criteria for what it is we are trying to predict or assess, as well as the need to validate predictive measures against the criteria" is the central problem in the lack of progress concerning evaluation of teacher competence.¹

Production industries and some service trades have utilized organization analysis, job analysis, job breakdowns, job descriptions, and job specifications in designing efficient programs for training and managing employees.

Welch applied the task-unit concept to the food service industry. He emphasized that task breakdowns were highly effective check-lists of employee job responsibilities for supervisors and management. Specifically, task breakdowns formed check-lists for the proper performance of each task.²

Analysis of the task-unit concept indicated possible adaptation of it to elements of teaching. Implementation of the task-unit concept in identifying student teacher performance tasks involved in components of teaching and in determining their relative degrees of importance, may provide a basis for evaluation of student teacher performance.

¹William H. Lucio, "Research Critique and a Forward Look," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 180.

²John M. Welch, A Task Unit Concept for On-The-Job Training in Food Service, p. 7.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were (1) to identify student teacher performance tasks involved in planning daily lessons and teaching planned lessons and (2) to determine the relative degree of importance attached to each task.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The subjects in this study were limited to college or university supervisors of home economics education, to Kansas supervising teachers of home economics, and to student teachers in home economics at Kansas State University.

PROCEDURE

Educational literature was reviewed (1) for selected aspects of teacher competence, (2) for the preparation of student teachers for depth teaching and (3) for cooperative responsibilities of the university supervisor and the supervising teacher in student teaching.

Student teacher competencies in the planning and in the teaching of daily lessons were identified and used in the development of a preliminary ranking scale. The preliminary instrument was used, the data analyzed, and the ranking scale was revised to a rating scale.

Personal data sheets for use with the university supervisors and the supervising teachers were developed.

The rating instrument was administered to three selected groups of subjects: university supervisors, supervising teachers, and student teachers.

Data obtained from administration of the instrument and the personal data sheets were analyzed.

Conclusions were drawn based on analyzes and recommendations for further study were made.

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined:

Lesson. A planned period of instruction that provides learning experiences for the development of concepts and for the formulation and/or the application of generalizations.

Student teacher. A student enrolled in a teacher education program in a college or university and who is receiving guided teaching experience in an off-campus student teaching center.

Student teacher performance task. An operation, process, or culmination of operations and/or processes involved in teaching by student teachers.

Supervising teacher. The experienced teacher in the student teaching center who guides the student teacher during the student teaching experience.

University supervisor. The university or college representative who regularly observes the student teacher and who works with the

supervising teacher in guiding and in evaluating the student teacher during the student teaching experience.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As background for this study, literature was reviewed (1) for selected aspects of teacher competence, (2) for the preparation of student teachers for depth teaching, and (3) for cooperative responsibilities of the university supervisor and the supervising teacher in student teaching.

RESEARCH ON TEACHER COMPETENCE

Teacher education seeks to produce highly competent teachers, yet one of the difficulties in this effort is the lack of a valid perception of what truly constitutes the competent, effective, or successful teacher. Because there has been extensive research on teacher and student teacher competence, a brief review of the status of the research and selected studies is presented.

Prior to 1950 studies centered around the problem of identifying and defining the qualities, traits, and abilities for teacher efficiency.¹

Since 1950 much of the research concerning teacher competence has centered around the relation between teacher personality and teacher effectiveness. Enumerable studies have attempted to correlate teacher

¹Walter S. Monroe (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, pp. 1414-1454.

and student teacher competence or effectiveness with criteria such as intelligence, knowledge of subject, psychological health, and personality traits. However, many of the studies of the last half-century have not produced significant results.¹

In assessing research pertaining to teacher competency, Getzels and Jackson reported that the most frequently used criterion in teacher effectiveness studies was the rating of teachers and of student teachers by administrators, supervisors, pupils, and numerous other observers. This basis is highly unreliable because raters differ on their conception of teacher effectiveness. In further research there was need for consideration of conceptual limitations, such as the framework of school objectives; and specific experimental limitations, such as treating teachers in various groups rather than in a single group.²

Turner and Fattu, in another appraisal of research on teacher effectiveness, concluded that in most studies there had been a search for a property of the teacher and that this search had not been successful. They suggested that educators think seriously of attaching less emphasis to personal characteristics as determining factors of teaching skill and place greater emphasis upon the development of intellectual

¹N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 506-582.

²J. W. Getzels and P. W. Jackson, "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," Handbook of Research on Teaching, p. 575.

skills related to the resolution of teaching problems.¹ Fattu further specified that problem-solving skills were the tasks which distinguished a professional person.²

In a study of effective teaching, Sprinthall, Whiteley, and Mosher focused on an outcome measure such as pupil-gain. Specifically, they attempted to relate cognitive flexibility-rigidity, aspects of openmindedness and adaptability, to effective/ineffective teaching. Their findings supported the hypothesis that effective teaching and cognitive flexibility were related.³

Medley was unsuccessful in identifying any aspect of a beginning elementary school teacher's behavior which was related to the teacher's ability to stimulate pupils to learn. In further study of student teachers he re-confirmed the fact that ratings of teacher effectiveness did not correlate with measured effects the teacher had on pupils.⁴

¹Richard L. Turner and Nicholas A. Fattu, "Skill in Teaching, a Reappraisal of the Concepts and Strategies in Teacher Effectiveness Research," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, 36:10, May, 1960.

²Nicholas A. Fattu, "Explorations of Interactions Among Instruction, Content, and Aptitude Variables," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:244, September, 1963.

³Norman Sprinthall, John M. Whiteley, and Ralph L. Mosher, "A Study of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education, 27:94; 104, Spring, 1966.

⁴Donald M. Medley, "Experiences With the OSCAR Technique,": The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:272, September, 1963.

Flanders predicted that during the next decades teacher education will become increasingly concerned with the process of teaching: emphasis will turn more and more to an analysis of teaching acts as they occur in spontaneous classroom instruction.¹ In one study Flanders analyzed teacher directness or indirectness or the degree to which freedom of student participation was encouraged or restricted. He found that over a long period of time every teacher balanced direct or indirect acts and that the more indirect teachers tended to be more flexible.²

Still another criterion used in the study of teacher effectiveness was that of "job targets" or performance objectives. In defense of this criterion Redfern stated that

appraisal is more effective when the emphasis is upon the performance of the teacher. If personality traits have a bearing upon the performance, they can be dealt with not as separate entities but as parts of teaching performance.³

To implement this criterion the nature of the teacher's job needs to be clearly identified and defined.⁴

¹Ned A. Flanders, "Intent, Action and Feedback: A Preparation for Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:260, September, 1963.

²Ned A. Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, p. 215.

³George B. Redfern, How to Appraise Teaching Performance, p. 17.

⁴Ibid.

For studies of the appraisal of student teaching and regular teaching the California Council on Teacher Education developed a definition of teacher competence in accordance with the abilities required in each of six teacher roles: (1) Director of Learning, (2) Counselor and Guidance Worker, (3) Mediator of the Culture, (4) Member of the Staff, (5) Liaison with the Community, and (6) Member of the Profession.¹ Research in measuring teacher competence in terms of these teacher roles resulted in the Stanford Appraisal Guide of Teacher Competence. This rating scale, used with Stanford interns, provides estimates of success in teacher roles clustered around four major factors: establishing aims, planning to meet aims, carrying out the plan, and evaluating outcomes.²

PREPARING STUDENT TEACHERS FOR DEPTH TEACHING

Building competency in the actual process of teaching is one of the primary purposes of student teaching. Meaningful teaching seldom "just happens." According to Redfern it usually results from a combination of carefully planned actions and reactions.³ Mitchell described teaching, especially good teaching, as not merely a concept, but rather

¹Ruth Bradley, et al., "A Criterion For the Appraisal of Student Teaching: The California Definition," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 51.

²The Stanford Appraisal Guide of Teacher Competence," p. 6.

³George B. Redfern, How to Appraise Teaching Performance, p. 6.

"a complex of functionings which are intrinsically social, mutually interactive, and impregnated with human values."¹

Since 1961, the literature in home economics education has stressed the need for depth teaching and the preparation of teachers who could teach for depth in an era of rapidly expanding knowledge.

Identification of Depth Teaching

Lowe defined depth teaching as "a matter concerned with subject matter, objectives, a way of teaching and the teacher, herself."² The depth teacher was depicted as "a thinker, a reasoned observer, an organizer of learning and a performer noble in her profession."³ To Lowe the value of teaching for depth in home economics was providing the pupil with an undergirding level of understanding for making decisions in the future regardless of the situation and time.⁴

One way depth teaching can be achieved is through implementation of the concept approach. According to Dalrymple, the major purpose of the concept approach to teaching is the promotion of clear, conscious,

¹Frank W. Mitchell, "Some Notes on the Concept of Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:171, Summer, 1966.

²Phyllis K. Lowe, "Depth Teaching in Home Economics," American Vocational Journal, 37:22, November, 1962.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 23.

and directional thinking by students and teachers.¹ The concept approach involves identification of the fundamental concepts, principles, and/or generalizations of a subject and teaching in such a way that the learner will be able to relate them to situations outside the immediate realm in which they are learned.

Osborn stressed that identification of concepts enables the home economics teacher to help students develop a framework of the knowledge and understandings which are found in the many aspects of the field of study. She also explained that organization of content within a conceptual framework is the means whereby the teacher can guide pupils to see the "whole" rather than merely the "parts."²

Otto supported a belief often stated by educators and psychologists, "Students learn best the information that they organize into generalizations."³ Students can be guided to formulate generalizations through the process of problem-solving. Otto identified three steps in problem-solving: "identifying the needed background information or important facts and knowledge, organizing this information into generalizations, and using those generalizations in making decisions."⁴ She also

¹Julia I. Dalrymple, "Teaching for Concept Development," Journal of the American Dietetics Association, 45:25, July, 1964.

²Barbara Osborn, "More Concepts and Generalizations," Penny's Fashions and Fabrics, Spring/Summer, 1966, p. 12.

³Arleen Otto, "Family Finance Concepts--How to Teach Them," Practical Forecast for Home Economics, 9:56, February, 1964.

⁴Ibid.

stressed that using concepts and generalizations is one of the best ways of teaching pupils to think.¹ According to Neal there are many opportunities to incorporate problem-solving situations in plans for teaching.² Hollister believed that teachers should help pupils develop ability in problem-solving because it is needed by them "to prepare their minds for the coping techniques and the emotional stability required in modern living."³

Depth teaching is increased by teaching in accordance with carefully planned educational objectives that clearly identify pupil behavioral change at various levels of hierarchy in the cognitive, the affective, and the psychomotor domains.

Planning for Depth Teaching

There are many experiences provided in the professional preparation of education students for student teaching. Among these experiences is the planning for depth teaching. If home economics student teachers are to be prepared to teach in depth they need help in aspects concerning the planning of and the teaching of daily lessons.

¹Ibid.

²Charles Neal, The Student Teacher at Work, p. 83.

³William G. Hollister, "Preparing the Minds of the Future," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 50:40-41, December, 1966.

Hunziger's study of the Methods of Teaching Home Economics course taught in 1962-63 at Kansas State University identified the four major areas of study as effective and meaningful planning, assuming the role and responsibilities of the classroom teacher, meeting needs of specific groups of pupils having a variety of individual differences, and evaluating pupil learnings effectively.¹

The relationship of good planning and good teaching is amazingly high according to Richey.² Stratemeyer and Lindsey also pointed out that the student teacher must visualize planning as an integral part of teaching if he is to recognize it as an important part of a teacher's work.³ They likened a plan for teaching to a "service tool" to guide the teacher in working with pupils. It enables the teacher (1) to think through ways to work with and to help pupils achieve their goals, (2) to plan for implementation of educational principles, (3) to make necessary changes before use of the plan, and (4) to allow for the making of changes in the plan as work proceeds. They further stated that "student teachers need and want help in all kinds of planning."⁴ A study done by Shutsy, and

¹Maxine Lovell Hunziger, "An Exploratory Study to Identify Concepts and Determine Concept Attainment in a Home Economics Education Course," unpublished Master's thesis, p. 36.

²Robert W. Richey, Planning for Teaching, p. 165.

³Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working With Student Teachers, p. 222.

⁴Ibid., pp. 198-199.

reported by Tyson, Fauset, and Foster, showed that first-year and second-year teachers ranked "organizing daily lessons" as the most valuable experience in their student teaching program.¹

Burton identified two elements upon which plans for teaching must be based: characteristics of the group to be taught and necessities of the materials available.² In an issue of Tips and Topics in Home Economics concerned with planning for teaching, the recommendation was made that as the home economics teacher decides the what, the how, and the when to teach aspects of her subject, she needs to consider factors about society, the students, the community, the content of home economics, and the learning process.³

Although authorities generally agree about the elements desired in a lesson plan, they are not in consensus pertaining to its form. Brown reflected a common opinion: there is not one specific form for a lesson plan so long as the desired elements are included.⁴ Fleck,⁵

¹Ivernia Tyson, Charles E. Fauset and F. Gordon Foster, "Current Practices," Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-first Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 50.

²William Henry Burton, The Guidance of Learning Activities, p. 324.

³"Planning for Teaching," Tips and Topics in Home Economics, 6:1, February, 1966.

⁴Thomas J. Brown, Student Teaching in a Secondary School, p. 73.

⁵Henrietta Fleck, "Guidelines to Planning," Practical Forecast for Home Economics, 10:37, November, 1964.

Neal,¹ and Richey² are among the authorities who stressed that the lesson plan be flexible.

Neal listed the following advantages of having student teachers prepare written daily plans for teaching:

1. Helps give needed confidence and security.
2. Allows pupils' activities to be more carefully selected.
3. Allows one to save face if in later teaching one is required to turn in lesson plans.
4. Enables the cooperating teacher to give helpful suggestions.
5. Enables one to plan activities to coincide with those considered by the cooperating teacher in accordance with the teaching pattern of the total school year.³

Numerous elements, such as pupil involvement, instructional procedures, evaluation, and classroom control contribute to the actual teaching of lessons and also may influence the achievement of depth teaching. Involvement of pupils in lessons can also be attained through use of questions. Bush and Allen cautioned against teachers asking questions that are either too general or too specific. They further stated that "the ability to ask provocative, answerable, and appropriate questions, and thus to involve pupils actively, is one of the critical skills in teaching."⁴ Actual recording on lesson plans

¹Neal, op. cit., p. 47.

²Robert W. Richey, Planning for Teaching, p. 165.

³Neal, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

⁴Robert N. Bush and Dwight W. Allen, "Micro-Teaching--Controlled Practice in the Training of Teachers," p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

of key questions in accordance with content and pupils can help the teacher achieve depth in her lessons. According to Simpson, structured questions can thus help pupils develop concepts and formulate generalizations.¹

Instructional procedures are often discussed in terms of methods and techniques. Student teachers often question whether some techniques are preferred over others in particular instances. In answer to this, Schultz wrote that no one method would serve equally well in all situations and that the student teacher's personality and pupils' experience with various methods are important factors to consider when deciding upon the use of a technique or combination of techniques for a lesson.²

Joyce and Hodges stressed the need for helping teachers enlarge their repertoire of teaching behaviors; they said that "a teacher who can purposefully exhibit a wide range of teaching styles is potentially able to accomplish more than a teacher whose repertoire is relatively limited." They also advocated greater flexibility by teachers in their behaviors.³

A factor considered to be a vital part of all areas of good teaching is the assignment. Neal noted that the assignment should

¹Elizabeth J. Simpson, "Curriculum Development in Home Economics Education," Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 9:255-256, 1965-66.

²Raymond Schultz, Student Teaching in the Secondary School, p. 91.

³Bruce R. Joyce and Richard E. Hodges, "Instructional Flexibility Training," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:409, Winter, 1966.

never be resolved lightly; it should be alive and interesting. Neal further stipulated that pupils should always understand thoroughly what is expected of them in the assignment and what are the purposes or goals of the assignment.¹

Mersand listed the indispensable elements in planning for a single lesson or several related lessons in a series as "(1) the objectives--remote as well as immediate, (2) the nature of the class, (3) the content, (4) the material at hand with which to achieve the objectives, (5) the most effective teaching procedures, and (6) the learning activities of the students."² In addition to most of these elements of a lesson plan, Burton stipulated the following: summary, assignment, bibliography for teacher and pupils, and instructional aids.³

Otto outlined five steps necessary for developing a teaching plan which would result in conceptual understanding and help students generalize: (1) identifying behavioral objectives or desired outcomes on the learning level appropriate to most of the students in the class, (2) identifying and selecting concepts or generalizations to serve as the basic knowledge in bringing the learner to the behavioral objective designated, (3) listing and documenting background information needed

¹ Neal, op. cit., p. 85.

² Joseph Mersand, "How to Plan a Lesson," High Points, 47:5, June, 1965.

³ Burton, op. cit., p. 323.

to help the learner understand the concepts and their relationships, (4) planning learning experiences which allow the students to recognize the relationships among concepts and which provide meaning to the background facts and information, and (5) bringing the students to state generalizations in their own words.¹

Evaluation is often considered by teachers as the most difficult element of the total teaching process. Evaluation has been described as a continuing part of teaching and learning rather than a culminating part. It involves philosophy, objectives, methods, and materials.² Fleck suggested that at the closing of a daily lesson an evaluation be made to determine the extent to which the lesson's objectives were met and to aid in planning future lessons.³ Evaluation of pupil growth toward objectives can be done through listening, observing, and writing as well as by paper-and-pencil tests.⁴ Bruner considered it possible to construct objective and subjective type examinations to emphasize an understanding of broad principles of a subject.⁵

¹Otto, op. cit., pp. 82, 84.

²"Evaluation--What Is It?" Tips and Topics in Home Economics, 4:1, February, 1964.

³Fleck, "Guidelines to Planning," op. cit., p. 37.

⁴"Evaluation--What Is It?" op. cit.

⁵Jerome S. Bruner, Process of Education, p. 30.

Classroom control is a factor of teaching of particular concern to student teachers. According to Martin and Westcott, disciplinary problems tend to be eliminated by an exciting, stimulating classroom program. The conveyance of appropriate enthusiasm through use of voice can have a positive effect upon classroom control.¹ The teacher can also prevent misbehavior in the classroom through knowledge of pupils, good lesson planning, effective use of time and equipment, and recognition and commendation of pupils' good achievement and progress.²

COOPERATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR AND THE SUPERVISING TEACHER IN STUDENT TEACHING

Particular emphasis in this section is given to the relationship of the university supervisor and the supervising teacher in student teaching and to the evaluation of student teacher progress.

Student teaching is an accepted and important phase of teacher preparation programs. College or university and public school personnel, and in a sense parents and community members, are involved in a cooperative endeavor when student teaching is done in an off-campus student teaching center. The college or university supervisor of student teaching and the public school teacher who guide the prospective teacher are

¹R. Lee Martin and Alvin W. Westcott, Gateway to Teaching, p. 43.

²Lester D. Crow and Alice Crow, The Student Teacher in the Secondary School, p. 326.

the two individuals with the greatest responsibility for a successful student teaching experience. A close working relationship between these two individuals is desirable for student teaching experience to be successful.

According to Curtis and Andrews, policy and procedures of the college and public school influence the responsibilities that the university supervisor and the supervising teacher assume, but informality and flexibility could provide a basis for the building of a team spirit and frank discussion between the two supervisors.¹

Brown advocated that the college supervisor-critic teacher roles in supervision during student teaching be a team-teaching venture with the critic teacher or supervising teacher as the team leader. He justified this position by saying that

no matter how excellent college preparation for teaching is, the supervising teacher has the inescapable tasks of helping the student teacher under less artificial conditions plan effectively, understand individual pupils in terms of their potentials, and evaluate efforts and achievement in terms of long-range objectives. Admittedly, because of the herculean proportions of the task to be done, the college cannot do the job alone; the college can merely set the stage by preparing the practice teacher with certain necessary tools and experiences for the cooperative venture of team teaching in conjunction with the critic teacher.²

¹Dwight K. Curtis and Leonard O. Andrews, Guiding Your Student Teacher, p. 20.

²Charles I. Brown, "Make It a Team-Teaching Venture," The Clearing House, 37:341, February, 1963.

Martin and Westcott supported the team-type effort on the part of the two supervisors, but indicated there wasn't to be "any boss in the situation." They stressed that the college was responsible for the professional preparation of student teachers and maintained final responsibility for them.¹

The university supervisor and the supervising teacher each functions within respective roles. Because the role delineations are not completely distinct, problems of role conflict are likely to occur.

Leonard surveyed college supervisors, supervising teachers, and principals for opinions and cognition responses pertaining to guiding principles of supervision, role expectations, and perceptions of behaviors for the home economics supervising teacher.² One conclusion drawn was that

a large number of significant role expectation differences found among the three groups points up the need for both college and public teacher educators to cooperatively consider the behavioral dimensions of the job of supervision as well as the numerous elements of given supervisory tasks.

When working together during student teaching the university supervisor and the supervising teacher should each yield information

¹Martin and Westcott, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

²Thelma Hamilton Leonard, "Role Expectations and Perceptions of the Home Economics Supervising Teacher," unpublished Doctor's dissertation, p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 108.

to the other for the purpose of improving the student teacher and for planning future assignments, according to Wroblewski.¹

Stadermann felt that "the student teaching experience should be a fruitful one for all concerned if the college supervisor and the supervising teacher are secure in their relationships with each other and with the student teacher."² Reilly noted that a close communication between the university supervisor and the supervising teacher would serve to link the supervising teacher more closely to the college. He also stressed that an accurate reporting by the university supervisor of concepts taught in methods classes enabled the supervising teacher to implement and expand on them.³

A major responsibility for both the university supervisor and the supervising teacher in student teaching is that of evaluating student teacher progress. Johnson suggested that the college supervisor and the supervising teacher "confer in a cooperative effort to maintain agreement concerning the student teacher's progress."⁴ However,

¹Claudia Wroblewski, "A Student Teacher Views the Supervising Teacher," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:333, September, 1963.

²Helen Edwards Stadermann, "The College Supervisor in a State-Supported Institution in a Metropolitan Area," The College Supervisor-Conflict and Challenge, Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 75.

³Howard E. Reilly, Student Teaching: Two Years After, Association of Student Teaching Bulletin, No. 24, pp. 23-24.

⁴Larry K. Johnson, "Functions of a College Supervisor," The Educational Forum, 28:474, May, 1964.

Stratemeyer considered that

student teacher, supervising teacher, and college supervisor should be partners in the entire evaluation process--clarifying the goals to be achieved, determining the kinds of evidence that can and will be used in appraising progress, gathering and interpreting evidence, and planning action to be taken as a result of the evaluation.¹

Inlow contended that because grading tends to establish a barrier between the supervising teacher and student teacher, the supervising teacher should participate in, but not be totally responsible for, the final appraisal of student teachers.²

Corrigan and Garland maintained that university supervisors and supervising teachers may agree that a student teacher should be expected to perform in a certain way, but disagree on the extent or degree of importance they attach to the performance.³

University supervisors and supervising teachers have the responsibility of evaluating cooperatively and continuously all aspects of the student teacher's professional growth. As part of the total evaluation they would consider the student teacher's growth in the planning and teaching of lessons.

¹Florence B. Stratemeyer, "The College Supervisor: Guidelines for Action," The College Supervisor-Conflict and Challenge, Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 159-160.

²Gail M. Inlow, "The Complex Role of the College Supervisor," Educational Research Bulletin, 35:13, January, 1956.

³Dean Corrigan and Calden Garland, Studying Role Relationships, The Association for Student Teaching, Research Bulletin No. 6, p. 15.

Stratemeyer and Lindsey explained that because a plan is a projection of a teaching-learning situation the soundness of any plan, whether unit or daily, can be tested in terms of educational principles considered basic to a good learning experience.¹

They further said that through evaluation of lesson plans the omission of desired educational principles can be detected and modifications made.²

Consideration of pupil growth and the quality of learning experiences provided were advocated by Stratemeyer and Lindsey for evaluating a student teacher's growth in teaching. The growth of learners is contingent upon learning experiences which have been selected and carried out in accordance with basic educational principles.³

To enable the student teacher to assess progress being made toward effective teaching, it is important that methods, procedures, and techniques used in student teaching evaluation be sufficiently diagnostic.⁴ In regard to this Boykin stated that

¹Stratemeyer and Lindsey, op. cit., p. 233.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 436-438.

⁴Leander L. Boykin, "Principles of Evaluating in Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 14.

diagnosis is thus the "sine qua non" of the learning-to-teach process. It is the basic instrument through which the student teacher's growth is assured. It is the means by which the student teacher is guided to an awareness of his own strengths and weaknesses and a recognition of his own problems and needs.¹

One way for the student teacher, university supervisor, and supervising teacher to function cooperatively in evaluation of the student teacher's competencies is the three-way conference. Stratemeyer and Lindsey pointed out that because a conference is primarily a form of learning and teaching through discussion, it is guided by basic educational principles governing any high quality teaching-learning experiences.²

Many instruments, methods, and techniques have been used to evaluate student teachers. Rating scales are among the instruments commonly used in student teacher evaluation. Stratemeyer and Lindsey pointed out, however, that rating scales possess limitations imposed by the form itself, by the rater, and by the setting.³ Check-lists, charts, and numerous kinds of evaluation sheets can also aid the university supervisor and the supervising teacher in their evaluation of student teacher competencies. All evaluation of student teaching should ultimately lead to self-evaluation by the student teacher.

¹Ibid.

²Stratemeyer and Lindsey, op. cit., p. 407.

³Stratemeyer and Lindsey, op. cit., pp. 459-460.

SUMMARY

Enumerable studies have attempted to correlate teacher and student teacher competence or effectiveness with such criteria as intelligence, knowledge of subject, psychological health, and personality traits. However, many of these studies have not produced significant results. Recent bases for the study of teacher competence have been ratings of teachers, pupil-gain, teacher intellectual skills, teacher behavior, and teacher roles.

Building competence in the actual process of teaching is one of the primary purposes of student teaching. Since 1961, there has been particular emphasis in home economics upon the preparation of student teachers who could teach for depth.

Depth teaching involves the identification and teaching of fundamental concepts, principles, and/or generalizations of a subject so that pupils can relate them to other situations. Depth teaching can be achieved through implementation of the concept approach. Student teachers can be helped to teach in depth through planning lessons appropriately. Consideration of pupil involvement, instructional procedures, evaluation, and classroom control can also contribute to their achievement of depth teaching.

For student teaching to be a successful experience there must be a close working relationship between the university supervisor and the supervising teacher. Although the university supervisor and the

supervising teacher function within respective roles, they share many responsibilities. A major cooperative responsibility is that of evaluating student teacher progress, including that shown in the planning and teaching of lessons. A desirable characteristic of any means utilized in student teacher evaluation is that it be diagnostic, leading ultimately to self-evaluation.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

The concern of this study was to adapt the task-unit concept to selected elements of student teaching. Specifically, the purposes were (1) to identify student teacher performance tasks involved in planning daily lessons and in teaching planned lessons and (2) to determine the relative degree of importance attached to each task.

Discussion of procedure is organized around development of the instrument, selection of subjects for the study, administration of the instrument, and procedure for analyzing the data.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE LESSON PLANNING AND TEACHING

TASK PERFORMANCE SCALE (LPTTP SCALE)

The plan for development of the rating instrument is reported in this section. The steps involved were identifying student teacher performance tasks, devising the format for the instrument, and refining the instrument.

Identification of Student Teacher Competencies

Literature was reviewed for competencies and concepts associated with the achievement of depth teaching by student teachers in relation to planning and to teaching planned lessons. The major sources analyzed for identification of student teacher competencies related to the two

specified areas were the work of a national group of home economics educators¹ and Hunziger's study of concept identification and attainment in a Kansas State University Home Economics Education course.²

Two of the seven competencies specified as those needed by the beginning teacher of home economics in the bulletin Concept Structuring of Home Economics Education Curriculum most applicable to this study were:

1. Plans and implements effectively the part of the home economics program for which she is responsible.
2. Teaches effectively.³

In the 1962-63 academic year "An Exploratory Study to Identify Concept Attainment in a Home Economics Course" was done by Hunziger. This study analyzed the course Methods of Teaching Home Economics taught at Kansas State University in terms of four concepts and associated generalizations. The concepts identified for the course were:

1. Effective and meaningful planning helps the teacher as she guides pupils toward learning objectives.
2. Student teaching provides an opportunity for the student teacher to begin to assume the role and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.
3. Programs of learning are planned to meet needs of specific groups of pupils having a variety of individual differences.
4. A variety of means may be used to evaluate pupil learnings effectively.⁴

¹American Home Economics Association, Concept Structuring of Home Economics Education Curriculum.

²Maxine Lovell Hunziger, "An Exploratory Study to Identify Concepts and Determine Concept Attainment in a Home Economics Education Course," unpublished Master's thesis.

³American Home Economics Association, op. cit., pp. 17, 20.

⁴Hunziger, op. cit., p. 36.

Because Hunziger's concepts were broad, many of the related generalizations were also used as a source in identifying student teacher competencies.¹

Concepts and generalizations emphasized in the Methods of Teaching Home Economics course during Spring Semester, 1966, at Kansas State University also served as further basis for identifying student teacher competencies in planning daily lessons and in teaching planned lessons. Many of these concepts and generalizations were the same as those identified in Hunziger's study.

The identified competencies and concepts associated with the planning of and the teaching of planned lessons by student teachers were incorporated into student teacher competency statements.

Devising the Format for the Instrument

After study of several means for making evaluations of competencies, forced-choice was chosen for use. The preliminary steps in devising a forced-choice instrument include assembling statements relative to content, establishing categories, and determining rankings for statements in each category.²

The preliminary instrument, a ranking scale (see Appendix A), contained forty-four student teacher competency statements compiled into the following categories:

¹Ibid., pp. 37-42.

²Edwin R. Tolle and Walter I. Murray, "Forced Choice: an Improvement in Teacher Rating," Journal of Educational Research, pp. 680-683.

1. Category A: Planning of Content of Daily Lesson Plans
(9 competency statements)
2. Category B: Planning of Supportive Elements of Daily Lesson Plans
(11 competency statements)
3. Category C: Teaching of Daily Lessons
(12 competency statements)
4. Category D: Supportive Elements of Teaching
(12 competency statements)

A jury of two university supervisors and eight supervising teachers of home economics who were on the Kansas State University campus Summer Session, 1966, completed the ranking scale. Subjects were instructed to rank the competency statements separately in each of the four categories according to the importance they attached to the possession of each competency by student teachers. Suggestions for additional competencies were also requested.

Analysis of the data from use of the preliminary instrument revealed that there was no complete agreement by the two groups on the rankings of any competency statement. However, the two university supervisors agreed upon the importance of two of the forty-four statements: the competency statement in Category D concerned with maintaining an adequate climate for learning was ranked first; the competency statement "Plans lessons in accordance with school situations" was ranked last in Category A.

Some similarities in rankings by only the supervising teachers and by the university supervisors and supervising teachers combined were found, particularly in statements ranked as most and as least important in the categories. Two student teacher competency statements

in Category D, Statement 4 pertaining to the conveyance of enthusiasm while teaching lessons, and Statement 2 pertaining to maintenance of an adequate climate for learning were ranked as most important by four (50 per cent) of the supervising teachers and by five (50 per cent) of the combined subjects. The competency statement "Opens and closes classes on time" was ranked as least important in Category D by five (66.7 per cent) of the supervising teachers and by six (50 per cent) of the combined group of subjects.

The data showed more differences than similarities in rankings by and/or between the university supervisors and the supervising teachers. For example, Competency Statement 11 in Category B, "Has lesson plans completed at designated times," was ranked highest by one university supervisor and lowest by the other university supervisor. The statement was also ranked highest and lowest by an equal number (37.6 per cent) of the supervising teachers.

In some instances the university supervisors were in close agreement but the supervising teachers were not. An example of this was found in the rankings of Category A, Competency Statements 3 and 4 pertaining to writing major and supporting generalizations. Competency Statement 3 was ranked first and second in importance by the two university supervisors, and was ranked by the supervising teachers from first to eighth (second lowest rank) in importance. Competency Statement 4 received rankings of second and third in importance by the two university supervisors. The supervising teachers ranked the same statement

from the highest to lowest in importance.

Upon completion of the instrument, many subjects said they had difficulty in ranking the statements as they frequently desired to attach equal degrees of importance to more than one statement.

Findings from use of the preliminary instrument with the limited number of subjects indicated possible lack of communication between the university supervisors and the supervising teachers concerning the importance of the student teacher responsibilities in planning daily lessons and in teaching planned lessons. According to Myers and Botner, cooperative evaluation by the supervisors with the student teacher of his teaching is a stage in the developmental process leading to self-evaluation by the student teacher.¹ Such evaluation entails communication among the university supervisor, the supervising teacher, and the student teacher which can yield mutual benefits in the developmental program.²

The difficulties experienced by the university supervisors and the supervising teachers in ranking the competency statements and the differences in the rankings revealed from analysis of the data led to changing the format of the instrument from a ranking to a rating scale.

¹Robert Myers and Taft Botner, "Self-Evaluation: A Significant Force in the Evaluation of Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, pp. 170-171.

²Aleyne C. Haines, "Case Reports of Instructional Practices in Evaluating Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, p. 119.

The task-unit concept was used in refinement of the instrument. According to this concept a total job or task must be broken down to its operations and/or processes. In applying the task-unit concept to the food service industry, Welch defined a task as "an operation, process, or culmination of operations and/or processes forming a work sequence which culminates in an independent end or result."¹

Planning lessons and teaching planned lessons can be considered components or tasks of student teaching. Implementation of the task-unit concept in relation to these components of student teaching necessitated task break-down of these elements. Analysis of the competency statements in the preliminary instrument indicated that they were student teacher performance tasks.

The Rating Scale

In the rating instrument, Lesson Planning and Teaching Task Performance Scale (LPTTP Scale)², student teacher performance task statements were categorized into two major areas: (1) Planning of Daily Lessons, consisting of nineteen task statements and (2) Teaching of Daily Lessons, consisting of twenty-eight task statements. (A copy of the LPTTP Scale can be found in Appendix B.) Performance

¹John M. Welch, A Task Unit Concept for On-The-Job Training in Food Service, p. 7.

²The writer will hereafter use the abbreviated title.

task statements within each area were divided into major and supportive elements. Those student teacher operations and/or processes that completed and/or supplemented the planning of and the teaching of daily lessons were considered "supportive tasks." Student teacher performance statements were grouped into the following categories:

- 1) Planning of Daily Lesson: Major Tasks
(10 task statements)
- 2) Planning of Daily Lesson: Supportive Tasks
(9 task statements)
- 3) Teaching of Daily Lesson: Major Tasks
(12 task statements)
- 4) Teaching of Daily Lesson: Supportive Tasks
(16 task statements)

Columns headed "Great Importance," "Some Importance," and "Little Importance" were provided for subjects to designate the degree of importance attached by them to each specified student teacher performance task.

PERSONAL DATA SHEETS

Educational background, concepts studied or emphasized in teaching, and/or teaching and supervisory experience may influence a supervisor's philosophy and method of working with student teachers. Personal data sheets were developed for university supervisors and supervising teachers to better interpret ratings attached by them to the student teacher performance tasks in the LPTTP Scale.

The personal data sheet for university supervisors (see Appendix C) included items pertaining to teaching experience, to student teacher

supervisory experience, and to selected concepts and procedures emphasized in the professional education sequence for home economics education students.

The personal data sheet for supervising teachers (see Appendix D) included items relating to teaching experience, to supervisory education and experience, and to selected educational concepts studied.

SUBJECTS FOR THE STUDY

The subjects in this study were limited to (1) a selected group of college or university supervisors of home economics education programs where the concept approach was stressed; (2) supervising teachers of home economics for Kansas State University during Fall Semester, 1966; and (3) student teachers in home economics at Kansas State University during Fall Semester, 1966.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The LPTTP Scale was administered during Fall Semester, 1966. The instrument, a personal data sheet, and a cover letter (see Appendix E) were mailed to the six college or university supervisors in home economics education not residing in Kansas. During this same period of time the Kansas State University supervisors in home economics education responded to the instrument and the personal data sheets.

The instrument, a personal data sheet, and a cover letter (see Appendix F) were also mailed during this same period of time to each

supervising teacher.

The instrument was administered to home economics student teachers twice during the semester. Permission was granted by instructors to use class time prior to and following the seven-week student teaching period.

PROCEDURE FOR ANALYZING THE DATA

Data collected from each administration of the LPTTP Scale were analyzed separately. Comparisons were made between: (1) the ratings of the university supervisors and the supervising teachers on the LPTTP Scale and (2) the ratings of the student teachers before and after student teaching on the LPTTP Scale.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains (1) the information from the personal data sheets, (2) the ratings obtained with the LPTTP Scale, and (3) the comparison of ratings of tasks for the planning of and the teaching of daily lessons.

Nine college or university supervisors of home economics education were selected from colleges or universities where the concept approach to teaching was emphasized in the professional home economics course(s) taken prior to student teaching. Three were university supervisors of home economics education at Kansas State University; others were from Colorado, Missouri, Nebraska, and North Dakota.

The supervising teachers of home economics for Kansas State University selected to participate in the study were the fifteen who supervised student teachers during the seven-week off-campus student teaching period Fall Semester, 1966.

Student teachers selected to participate in the study were the fifteen Kansas State University students who were enrolled in the course Teaching Participation in the Secondary School during Fall Semester, 1966.

INFORMATION FROM THE PERSONAL DATA SHEETS

Information regarding personal background of the university supervisors and the supervising teachers was gathered for the purpose of interpreting the data obtained with the LPTTP Scale. Data were summarized to describe each group.

The University Supervisor of Home Economics

Five of the nine university supervisors had served as a college or university supervisor of home economics student teachers for seven or more years. Eight of the subjects had supervised thirteen or more student teachers each year.

All of the university supervisors had taught junior or senior high school home economics classes; five for six or more years. Seven of the subjects had supervised student teachers as a junior or senior high school home economics teacher; over one-half of that number had supervised ten or more.

Six of the university supervisors reported teaching college or university home economics education courses for one to ten years; two for eleven to fifteen years. One reported she had not taught a home economics education course.

Table I summarizes concepts the university supervisor reported as being emphasized in professional education sequences and in their teaching of a preparatory student teaching course. The planning of learning experiences and teaching methods and techniques to develop

TABLE I

CONCEPTS EMPHASIZED IN PROFESSIONAL HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION
SEQUENCES AND IN PREPARATORY STUDENT TEACHING COURSES

Concept	Professional Education Sequence (N=9)	Preparatory Course Taught by Super- visor (N=8)
Concept approach to teaching	6	6
Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations	9	8
Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations	9	8
Taxonomy of educational objectives	6	6
Evaluation of learning	6	6
Actual planning of lessons		7
Actual teaching of lessons		4

concepts and generalizations were emphasized in all programs and by all of the teachers.

The Supervising Teachers of Home Economics

Two-thirds of the fifteen supervising teachers had taught for eleven or more years; the remaining third for five or less years. Nearly two-thirds of the subjects (nine) had supervised ten or more student teachers. In addition to supervising home economics student teachers from Kansas State University, approximately half of the subjects had supervised home economics student teachers from other institutions.

Eleven of the fifteen supervising teachers had earned their Bachelor's degrees prior to 1951; four had done so since 1961. Nine of

the fifteen degrees had been granted by Kansas State University. All supervising teachers had done work beyond the Bachelor's degree and seven had completed the Master's degree. Four of the seven had done the major work in Home Economics Education for their Master's degree; three of the four had received the degree from Kansas State University. Five supervising teachers with a Master's degree had earned seven to thirty or more hours beyond that degree.

Ten of the fifteen supervising teachers had taken from one to three courses in the area of supervision. Six had taken a course in supervision of student teachers in home economics; five at Kansas State University.

Supervising teachers were asked to indicate from a selected list of educational concepts those they had studied in formal or had explored in informal situations during the last five years. Formal situations were defined as college courses or workshops; informal situations referred to school-, city-, or state-sponsored in-service meetings or meetings for supervising teachers. The subjects had studied or had explored the following:

<u>Concept</u>	<u>In Formal Situations</u>	<u>In Informal Situations</u>
Concept approach to teaching	11	11
Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generali- zations	9	12
Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generali- zations	10	13
Taxonomy of educational objectives	9	9
Evaluation of learning	8	8

RATINGS OBTAINED WITH THE LPTTP SCALE

This section presents the analysis of ratings obtained for each of the three groups of subjects on the major and the supportive tasks for the planning of and the teaching of daily lessons.

Planning of Daily Lessons: Major Tasks

Seven of the ten major tasks received only the "Great Importance" rating by all nine university supervisors. Each of the remaining three tasks was rated of "Great Importance" and of "Some Importance." (See Table II.)

The fifteen supervising teachers showed complete agreement on the "Great Importance" rating for three of the ten tasks. Five of the tasks were assigned "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings by the supervising teachers. Two tasks each received ratings of "Great Importance," of "Some Importance," and of "Little Importance."

The ratings before and after student teaching by the fifteen student teachers were the same: eight tasks received the two highest ratings and two tasks received all three ratings.

Planning of Daily Lessons: Supportive Tasks

Complete agreement on the "Great Importance" rating was shown for two of the nine supportive tasks by the university supervisors. Each of the remaining seven tasks was rated of "Great Importance" and of "Some Importance." (See Table III, p. 48.)

TABLE II

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR, SUPERVISING TEACHER, AND STUDENT TEACHER
RATINGS OF MAJOR TASKS FOR PLANNING DAILY LESSONS

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Before Student Teaching	After Student Teaching
1. Selects or develops guide questions and teaching notes appropriate to achieve depth in main points of lesson	3*	9	100	13	86.7	13	86.7
	2			2	13.3	2	13.3
	1						
2. Plans ways to relate class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences	3	9	100	13	86.7	14	93.3
	2			2	13.3	1	6.7
	1						
3. Plans way(s) to evaluate pupil achievement of lesson objective(s), if needed	3	8	88.9	10	66.7	12	80
	2	1	11.1	5	33.3	3	20
	1						

*3 = Great Importance
2 = Some Importance
1 = Little Importance

TABLE II (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)			
					Before Student Teaching		After Student Teaching	
	Rating	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Per cent
4. Plans to provide optimum learning experience within designated time	3 2 1	9	100	15	100	7 8	46.7 53.3	13 2 86.7 13.3
5. Selects or develops meaningful written major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s)	3 2 1	9	100	12 2 1	80 13 6.7	6 8 1	40 53.3 6.7	8 6 1 53.3 40 6.7
6. Plans lesson objective(s) in terms of expected behavioral change and content aspect of lesson	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	12 2 1	80 13 6.7	10 5	66.7 33.3	9 6 60 40
7. Plans way(s) for summarizing, formulating, and/or applying generalizations	3 2 1	9	100	12 3	80 20	9 6	60 40	12 3 80 20
8. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations	3 2 1	9	100	15	100	14 1	93.3 6.7	14 1 93.3 6.7

TABLE II (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)			Supervising Teachers (N=15)			Student Teachers (N=15)			
	Rating	Per cent		No.	Per cent		Before Student Teaching		After Student Teaching	
		No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		
9. Organizes content of lesson in logical manner and with meaning for pupils	3 2 1	9	100	15	100	14 1	93.3 6.7	14 1	93.3 6.7	
10. Selects or develops meaningful written generalizations to develop concept(s)	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	10 5	66.7 33.3	3 11	20 73.3 6.7	2 12 1	13.3 80 6.7	

TABLE III

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR, SUPERVISING TEACHER, AND STUDENT TEACHER
RATING OF SUPPORTIVE TASKS FOR PLANNING DAILY LESSONS

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Before Student Teaching	After Student Teaching
11. Plans lesson in accordance with daily school schedule and situation	3* 2 1	9	100	13 2	86.7 13.3	9 6	60 40
12. Identifies major lesson problem(s)	3 2 1	6 3	66.7 33.3	12 2 1	80 13.3 6.7	9 6 1	60 40 6.7
13. Plans meaningful assignment for next day(s), if needed	3 2 1	9	100	12 3	80 20	9 6	60 40
14. Has lesson plan completed at designated time	3 2 1	5 4	55.6 44.4	10 5	66.7 33.3	11 3 1	73.3 20 6.7

*3 = Great Importance
2 = Some Importance
1 = Little Importance

TABLE III (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)			Supervising Teachers (N=15)			Student Teachers (N=15)			
	Rating	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Before Student Teaching		After Student Teaching	
							No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
15. Plans effective approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils	3 2 1	7 2	77.8 22.2	12 3	80 20	14 1	14 1	93.3 6.7	12 3	80 20
16. Identifies the concept(s) of lesson problem(s)	3 2 1	7 2	77.7 22.2	12 2	80 20	7 8	7 8	46.7 53.3	9 6	60 40
17. Plans and develops visuals to add interest and/or to supplement lesson	3 2 1	4 5	44.4 55.6	8 7	53.3 46.7	5 10	5 10	33.3 66.7	10 5	66.7 33.3
18. Uses initiative in finding references, printed materials, and teaching aids for lesson	3 2 1	7 2	77.8 22.2	13 2	86.7 13.3	8 7	8 7	53.3 46.7	10 5	66.7 33.3
19. Acquaints self with and uses suitable materials and resources of the department, school, and/or community when planning lesson	3 2 1	6 3	66.7 33.3	12 3	80 20	9 6	9 6	60 40	12 3	80 20

Eight tasks were considered of "Great Importance" and of "Some Importance" by the supervising teachers. One task received all three ratings.

Eight of the nine supportive tasks was assigned "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings by the student teachers before student teaching; one task received all ratings. Ratings made by the student teachers after student teaching showed that six of the tasks were assigned "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings; three tasks were assigned ratings of "Great Importance," of "Some Importance," and of "Little Importance."

Teaching of Daily Lessons: Major Tasks

Four of the twelve major tasks were rated of "Great Importance" by all nine university supervisors. Six tasks received the two highest ratings and two received all three ratings. (See Table IV.)

The fifteen supervising teachers showed complete agreement on the "Great Importance" ratings for five of the tasks. The remaining tasks were assigned "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings.

Complete agreement on the "Great Importance" rating was shown by the fifteen student teachers for one of the twelve tasks before and for four tasks after student teaching. Before student teaching, ten tasks received "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings; after student teaching, eight tasks received these two ratings. Before student teaching one task received all three ratings.

TABLE IV

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR, SUPERVISING TEACHER, AND STUDENT TEACHER
RATINGS OF MAJOR TASKS FOR TEACHING DAILY LESSONS

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)			
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Before Student Teaching		After Student Teaching	
						No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
20. Uses time effectively to attain objective(s) of lesson	3* 2 1	7 2 1	77.8 22.2	15	100	12 3	80 20	12 3	80 20
21. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses	3 2 1	7 1 1	77.8 11.1	15	100	14 1	93.3 6.7	15	100
22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations	3 2 1	9	100	15	100	14 1	93.3 6.7	15	100

*3 = Great Importance
2 = Some Importance
1 = Little Importance

TABLE IV (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)			Supervising Teachers (N=15)			Student Teachers (N=15)		
	Rating	Per cent		No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent	
23. Relates class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences	3	9	100	12	80	13	86.7	15	100
	2			3	20	2	13.3		
	1								
24. Uses planned evaluative procedures effectively	3	9	100	13	86.7	11	73.3	9	60
	2			2	13.3	4	26.7	6	40
	1								
25. Uses appropriate approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils	3	6	66.7	11	73.3	13	86.7	13	86.7
	2	3	33.3	4	26.7	2	13.3	2	13.3
	1								
26. Adapts pace of lesson to abilities, experiences, and interest of pupils	3	8	88.9	15	100	15	100	15	100
	2	1	11.1						
	1								
27. Has equipment and supplies ready for use during lesson	3	7	77.8	14	93.3	12	80	13	86.7
	2	2	22.2	1	6.7	3	20	2	13.3
	1								

TABLE IV (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)			Supervising Teachers (N=15)			Student Teachers (N=15)					
	Rating	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent	Before Student Teaching			After Student Teaching		
		No.	cent	No.	cent		No.	cent	Per cent	No.	cent	Per cent
28. Helps pupils summarize lesson	3 2 1	6 2 1	66.7 22.2 11.1	12 3	80 20		9 6	60 40		12 3	80 20	
29. Adapts lesson presentation to day's school schedule and to class situation	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	12 3	80 20		7 8	46.7 53.3		12 3	80 20	
30. Elicits pupil thinking by appropriate use of questioning technique	3 2 1	9	100	15	100		10 4 1	66.7 26.7 6.7		12 3	80 20	
31. Helps pupils formulate and/or apply generalizations for lesson	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	11 4	73.3 26.7		9 6	60 40		9 6	60 40	

Teaching of Daily Lessons: Supportive Tasks

Four of the sixteen supportive tasks received only the "Great Importance" rating by all university supervisors. Each of the remaining twelve tasks was assigned two ratings: "Great Importance" and "Some Importance." (See Table V.)

Seven of the tasks received only the "Great Importance" rating by all supervising teachers. The remaining nine tasks were given the two highest ratings.

Complete agreement on the "Great Importance" rating by the fifteen student teachers was shown on two tasks before student teaching. Twelve of the remaining fourteen tasks were assigned "Great Importance" and "Some Importance" ratings; two of the tasks received the three ratings. After student teaching seven of the sixteen tasks received only the "Great Importance" rating by the student teachers. Of the remaining nine tasks, five received ratings of "Great Importance" and of "Some Importance" and four received all three ratings.

COMPARISON OF RATINGS OBTAINED WITH THE LPTTP SCALE

Comparisons were made (1) between the ratings of the university supervisors and the supervising teachers and (2) between the before and after student teaching ratings of the student teachers.

Comparisons were limited to "Great Importance" ratings. Analysis is presented using the following definitions:

TABLE V

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR, SUPERVISING TEACHER, AND STUDENT TEACHER
RATINGS OF SUPPORTIVE TASKS FOR TEACHING DAILY LESSONS

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Before Student Teaching	After Student Teaching
32. Manages physical conditions of classroom for optimum learning	3*	4	44.4	9	60	2	13.3
	2	5	55.6	6	40	13	86.6
	1					7	46.7
33. Handles daily routines of class efficiently and effectively	3	3	33.3	12	80	9	60
	2	6	66.7	3	20	6	40
	1					5	33.3
34. Opens and closes classes on time	3	6	66.7	12	80	9	60
	2	3	33.3	3	20	6	40
	1					5	33.3
35. Conveys desired self-confidence when teaching	3	5	55.6	13	86.7	15	100
	2	4	44.4	2	13.3		
	1					1	6.7

*3 = Great Importance
2 = Some Importance
1 = Little Importance

TABLE V (continued)

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
36. Assumes responsibility for appearance of classroom	3	5	55.6	6	40	8	53.3
	2	4	44.4	9	60	6	40
	1					1	6.7
37. Properly cares for and puts away equipment and supplies	3	5	55.6	11	73.3	9	60
	2	4	44.4	4	26.7	6	40
	1						
38. Stimulates pupils to work to maximum abilities	3	9	100	15	100	13	86.7
	2					2	13.3
	1						
39. Controls class in a manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning	3	9	100	15	100	14	93.3
	2					1	6.7
	1						
40. Admits, without losing status, that answers are not known to questions and suggests ways to find them	3	7	77.8	10	66.7	12	80
	2	2	22.2	5	33.3	3	20
	1						
						15	100

TABLE V (continued)

Tasks	Rating	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)		After Student Teaching	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
41. Allows pupils freedom of choice concerning class-related work when appropriate	3 2 1	6 3	66.7 33.3	7 8	46.6 53.3	7 8	46.6 53.3	10 5	66.6 33.3
42. Conveys enthusiasm in presenting subject matter and in working with pupils	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	15	100	14 1	93.3 6.7	15	100
43. Makes definite assignments	3 2 1	6 2	75* 25*	15	100	11 3 1	73.3 20 6.7	14 1	93.3 6.7
44. Gives definite and clear directions to class	3 2 1	8 1	88.9 11.1	15	100	13 2	86.7 13.3	15	100

*This figure was computed on the basis of eight of the nine subjects who responded to this task.

TABLE V (continued)

Tasks	University Supervisors (N=9)		Supervising Teachers (N=15)		Student Teachers (N=15)			
					Before Student Teaching		After Student Teaching	
	Rating	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	Per cent
45. Uses communication skills effectively	3	9	100	15	100	14	93.3	100
	2					1	6.7	
	1							
46. Encourages pupils to be creative	3	7	77.8	12	80	9	60	73.3
	2	2	22.2	3	20	6	40	26.7
	1							
47. Maintains desired teacher-pupil rapport	3	9	100	15	100	15	100	100
	2							
	1							

<u>Level of Agreement</u>	<u>Group Percentage Rating</u>
Complete	100 per cent
High	Not less than 90 per cent
Strong	Not less than 80 per cent
Fairly strong	Not less than 70 per cent

Supervisor Ratings: Planning of Daily Lessons

Analysis of the data showed that the university supervisors and the supervising teachers reached complete agreement on the highest importance rating for three of the nineteen student teacher performance tasks for the planning of daily lessons. These major tasks were:

4. Plans to provide optimum learning experiences within designated time.
8. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
9. Organizes content of lesson in logical manner and with meaning for pupils.

The complete agreement may be explained by considering these tasks among the more concrete aspects of lesson planning. The rating of Task 8 relates directly to the reported experience of both the university supervisors and the supervising teachers with the concept.

In the professional education programs with which all university supervisors were affiliated extensive emphasis was given to teaching methods and techniques and to planning learning experiences for developing concepts and generalizations. During the last five years, nine of the fifteen supervising teachers had studied planning of learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations in formal situations and twelve had explored the concept in informal situations. The concept

"teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations" had been studied in formal situations by ten and explored in informal situations by thirteen.

No task for the planning of daily lessons was identified at the level of high agreement.

Below are listed the tasks for which strong agreement on the "Great Importance" ratings was shown by the university supervisors and the supervising teachers.

Major Tasks

1. Selects or develops guide questions and teaching notes appropriate to achieve depth in main points of lesson.
2. Plans ways to relate class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences.
5. Selects or develops meaningful written major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s).
6. Plans lesson objective(s) in terms of expected behavioral change and content aspect of lesson.
7. Plans way(s) for summarizing, formulating, and/or applying generalizations.

Supportive Tasks

11. Plans lesson in accordance with daily school schedule and situation.
13. Plans meaningful assignment for next day(s), if needed.

The Major Tasks 1, 5, 6 and 7 pertain to elements stressed in relation to planning for depth teaching. Ratings of these tasks reflect responses concerning the concept approach to teaching and the taxonomy of educational objectives on the personal data sheets. Two-thirds of the university supervisors reported those concepts were emphasized in professional education courses in their representative colleges or

universities. Over half of the supervising teachers had formally studied or had informally explored the concept approach to teaching (73.3 per cent) and the taxonomy of educational objectives (60 per cent) during the last five years.

A higher level of agreement was expected for Major Task 2 concerned with relating class experiences to individual needs or experiences. This is an accepted principle for meaningful teaching. Strong agreement also would be expected for Supportive Tasks 11 and 13. Attention to school schedule and situation is related to flexibility in teaching; the meaningfulness of lessons, as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of learning by pupils, is dependent upon the quality of the lesson assignment.

Although the strong agreement level was found by the combined supervisor group on the ratings for the seven tasks, all but Task 6 were rated of "Great Importance" by all of the university supervisors. Because planning lesson objectives in terms of expected behavioral change and lesson content is strongly advocated, it is surprising that Task 6 was not also considered of "Great Importance" by all of the university supervisors.

The three supportive tasks which revealed fairly strong agreement between the ratings by the two groups were:

15. Plans effective approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils.
16. Identifies the concept(s) of lesson problem(s).
18. Uses initiative in finding references, printed materials, and teaching aids for lesson.

It would be thought that a higher percentage of supervisors would expect student teachers to use initiative in finding the needed materials for lessons.

In two instances agreement on the "Great Importance" ratings by less than 70 per cent of the university supervisors and the supervising teachers for tasks is noteworthy. The ratings by less than all of the supervisors for Task 3, "Plans way(s) to evaluate pupil achievement of lesson objective(s), if needed," and for Task 10, "Selects or develops meaningful written major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s)," was not anticipated. The educational principle behind Task 3 is basic and would be expected to be considered of great importance by all educators. Task 10 is based on the concept of identifying, in writing, the major idea to be developed during a lesson and would be expected to be seen as of great importance by the subjects. However, the responses on the personal data sheets indicated that only two-thirds of the university supervisors placed emphasis on the concept approach in teaching a preparatory student teaching course and that approximately two-thirds of the supervising teachers had studied or explored this concept in the past five years. Another factor which may possibly explain the rating for the task was that only four of the fifteen supervising teachers had earned their Bachelor's degrees since 1961, the time when greatest emphasis upon the concept approach was begun.

Supervisor Ratings: Teaching of Daily Lessons

It was found that the university supervisors and the supervising teachers reached complete agreement on the "Great Importance" rating for six of the twenty-eight student teacher performance tasks for the teaching of daily lessons:

Major Tasks

- 22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
- 30. Elicits pupil thinking by appropriate use of questioning technique.

Supportive Tasks

- 38. Stimulates pupils to work to maximum abilities.
- 39. Controls class in a manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning.
- 45. Uses communication skills effectively.
- 47. Maintains desired teacher-pupil rapport.

The agreement level shown for Task 22 was in accordance with the level attached to the related task concerned with planning for use of suitable methods and techniques (Task 8).

Complete agreement shown for Tasks 39 and 47 reflects an accepted belief that teachers must maintain appropriate classroom control and desired teacher-pupil rapport if they are to be effective teachers.

The complete agreement rating by the supervisors for Task 45 would be expected because the ability to communicate effectively is necessary to convey lesson content well and to meet pupil needs.

Comparison of ratings placed none of the twenty-eight tasks at the high agreement level.

Strong agreement (not less than 80 per cent) in the ratings of six tasks was found:

Major Tasks

- 23. Relates class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences.
- 24. Uses planned evaluative procedures effectively.
- 26. Adapts pace of lesson to abilities, experiences, and interest of pupils.
- 29. Adapts lesson presentations to day's school schedule and to class situation.

Supportive Tasks

- 42. Conveys enthusiasm in presenting subject matter and in working with pupils.
- 44. Gives definite and clear directions to class.

Strong agreement on the ratings for Major Tasks 23 and 26 would be expected as an objective of all education is meeting of individual pupil needs. University supervisors and supervising teachers were consistent in the level of agreement found for the related planning Task 2.

Flexibility in teaching is of importance for the attainment of meaningful lessons. Therefore, the strong agreement level for Tasks 26 and 29, relating to adapting lesson pace and lesson presentation, would be expected.

Greater importance was attached to the use of evaluative procedures (Task 24) than to planning ways to evaluate pupil achievement of objectives (Task 3; less than 70 per cent agreement). This discrepancy may be partly explained by the responses to the emphasis on or the study made of the evaluation of learning concept on the personal data sheets. Only two-thirds of the university supervisors reported this concept was emphasized in the professional education programs with which they were

associated. Only slightly more than one-half of the supervising teachers had made either formal or informal study of this concept during the last five years.

Six tasks showed fairly strong agreement (not less than 70 per cent) on ratings between the university supervisors and the supervising teachers:

Major Tasks

- 20. Uses time effectively to attain objective(s) of lesson.
- 21. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses.
- 27. Has equipment and supplies ready for use during lesson.
- 31. Helps pupils formulate and/or apply generalizations for lesson.

Supportive Tasks

- 43. Makes definite assignments.
- 46. Encourages pupils to be creative.

The importance of time management is usually stressed in student teaching programs because of its relation to efficient and effective teaching. Thus, university supervisors and supervising teachers would be expected to reach at least the fairly strong agreement level for Tasks 20 and 27. However, two supportive tasks (32 and 36), related directly to management of physical conditions of the classroom, were found to be rated of "Great Importance" by less than 70 per cent of the supervisors.

The agreement level for Task 31, concerned with helping pupils formulate and/or apply generalizations, was greater than for the related planning Task 10 (selects written generalizations to develop concepts) and less than for the related planning Task 5 (selects written

generalization for daily lesson problem). If teaching in terms of the big ideas which pupils can relate to similar situations is valued, it would be expected that all the educators would consider these tasks the same level of importance.

Considerable difference in agreement level was found for two major tasks concerned with questioning in the classroom. Greater importance was found for questioning pupils (Task 30; complete agreement) than for responding to pupil questioning (Task 21; fairly strong agreement).

Student Teacher Ratings: Planning of Daily Lessons

Analysis of the data showed that nine of the nineteen tasks for planning daily lessons were considered of greater importance by the student teachers after student teaching, four tasks were seen as of the same importance, and six tasks were seen as of less importance.

No complete agreement or fairly strong agreement was found for the "Great Importance" ratings of the nineteen tasks by the student teachers either before or after student teaching.

High agreement (not less than 90 per cent before and after student teaching) on the "Great Importance" ratings was shown for the following major tasks for the planning of daily lessons:

8. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
9. Organizes content of lesson in logical manner and with meaning for pupils.

Three of the nineteen lesson planning tasks revealed strong agreement (not less than 80 per cent before and after student teaching):

Major Tasks

1. Selects or develops guide questions and teaching notes appropriate to achieve depth in main points of lesson.
2. Plans ways to relate class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences.

Supportive Tasks

15. Plans effective approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils.

The concepts in the five tasks received heavy emphasis in the methods class taken by the subjects prior to student teaching.

The low highest importance ratings received by one task and the degree of change in rating for two call for discussion.

On Task 10, "Selects or develops meaningful written generalizations to develop concept(s)," the before student rating was 20 per cent and the after rating was 13.3 per cent. Rating for this task may reflect incomplete understanding of the role of generalizations before and after student teaching.

Task 14, "Has lesson plan completed at designated time," showed a decrease in the highest rating by nearly one-third of the student teachers after student teaching. The student teachers were encouraged in methods class to have lesson plans completed in sufficient time to obtain the supervising teacher's suggestions for improvement of the lesson plan and for the security of being prepared to teach. Perhaps

difficulty experienced by student teachers in accomplishing this task influenced the negative change.

Task 17, "Plans and develops visuals to add interest and/or to supplement lesson," received an increase in the highest rating by one-third of the student teachers after student teaching. In the methods class limited emphasis was placed on planning and developing visuals. Through actual teaching experience student teachers seemingly discovered the value of planning to incorporate visuals in lessons.

Student Teacher Ratings: Teaching of Daily Lessons

Analysis of the data concerning the teaching of daily lessons showed that seventeen of the twenty-eight tasks were seen as of greater importance after student teaching, nine were considered of the same importance, and two were considered of less importance.

There was complete agreement on the "Great Importance" ratings for three of the twenty-eight tasks both before and after student teaching:

Major Task

26. Adapts pace of lesson to abilities, experiences, and interests of pupils.

Supportive Tasks

35. Conveys desired self-confidence when teaching.
47. Maintains desired teacher-pupil rapport.

However, before student teaching three additional major tasks for teaching lessons were seen of "Great Importance" by all student teachers:

21. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses.
22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
23. Relates class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences.

After student teaching five additional supportive tasks were rated of

"Great Importance" by all student teachers:

39. Controls class in a manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning.
40. Admits, without losing status, that answers are not known to questions and suggests ways to find them.
42. Conveys enthusiasm in presenting subject matter and in working with pupils.
44. Gives definite and clear directions to class.
45. Uses communication skills effectively.

The fact that complete agreement on the highest rating of importance was shown by student teachers before and/or after student teaching for more than one-third of the tasks concerning the teaching of daily lessons, but was not shown for any of the tasks concerning the planning of daily lessons, may be a reflection of student teachers' concern for competency in the immediate performance aspects of the teaching process.

Five of the eleven tasks pertained to a personal quality. For example, Task 35 concerning self-confidence was rated of "Great Importance" by less than 70 per cent of either group of supervisors. Self-confidence when teaching is a prime concern of student teachers. Supervisors usually realize this, but perhaps interpreted other tasks as evidence of self-confidence.

Task 47 was the only task in the LPTTP Scale which was rated of "Great Importance" by all the student teachers before and after student teaching and by all the supervisors. The rating for this task is not surprising because maintenance of desired teacher-pupil rapport is necessary for a productive teaching-learning atmosphere both in the classroom and in informal situations.

High agreement (not less than 90 per cent before and after student teaching) on "Great Importance" ratings was found for the following tasks:

Major Tasks

21. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses.
22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.

Supportive Tasks

39. Controls class in a manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning.
42. Conveys enthusiasm in presenting subject matter and in working with pupils.
45. Uses communication skills effectively.

The level of agreement for Task 22 was in accordance with that shown for related Task 8 concerned with planning suitable methods and techniques to help pupils give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.

Seven of the twenty-eight tasks for the teaching of daily lessons showed strong agreement (not less than 80 per cent before and after student teaching) on "Great Importance" ratings:

Major Tasks

- 20. Uses time effectively to attain objective(s) of lesson.
- 23. Relates class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences.
- 25. Uses appropriate approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils.
- 27. Has equipment and supplies ready for use during lesson.

Supportive Tasks

- 38. Stimulates pupils to work to maximum abilities.
- 40. Admits, without losing status, that answers are not known to questions and suggests ways to find them.
- 44. Gives definite and clear directions to class.

The level of agreement for Major Tasks 23 and 25 is consistent with the level of agreement shown for the related planning tasks (2 and 15 respectively).

Fairly strong agreement (not less than 70 per cent before and after student teaching) was shown for one supportive task:

- 43. Makes definite assignment.

Analysis of the ratings for this task reveals that nearly one-third more of the student teachers attached "Great Importance" ratings to this task after student teaching than before. However, similar Task 13, "Plans meaningful assignment for next day(s), if needed," was rated of "Great Importance" by less than two-thirds of the student teachers both before and after student teaching.

For the remaining twelve teaching tasks the agreement level was less than 70 per cent before and after student teaching. Consideration needs to be given to one of these, Task 24, "Uses planned evaluative procedures effectively." This task and its related planning task (3) showed a decrease in rating. As evaluation was given quite extensive

emphasis in the methods class, this level of agreement, as well as the negative change, was not anticipated. However, the finding that only two-thirds of the supervising teachers rated Task 3 of "Great Importance" may have been a reason for the change in the student teacher ratings of these tasks.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation of student teacher competencies is a difficult, but necessary, process which is aided by a close working relationship of the university supervisor and the supervising teacher. A common understanding of student teacher competencies provides a basis for cooperative evaluation of student teachers.

In recent years emphasis has been on the importance of preparing student teachers in home economics who are competent in teaching for depth. One way to achieve depth teaching is through implementation of the concept approach, which involves teaching within a conceptual framework so pupils are able to formulate generalizations and relate them to new situations.

Planning for depth teaching is one of the experiences provided home economics education students in their preparation for student teaching. Student teachers must visualize planning as an integral part of teaching. They also need to consider other aspects of the teaching process, such as instructional procedures, evaluation, and classroom control, as influential factors in the achievement of depth teaching.

Evaluation of student teacher progress includes judgment of progress made in both the planning and the teaching of lessons.

SUMMARY

The purposes of this study were (1) to identify student teacher performance tasks involved in planning daily lessons and in teaching planned lessons and (2) to determine the relative degree of importance attached to each task.

Literature was reviewed for competencies and concepts associated with the achievement of depth teaching by student teachers in relation to planning and to teaching planned lessons.

A ranking scale, containing forty-four student teacher competency statements related to planning and to teaching planned lessons, was developed. A jury of two university supervisors and eight supervising teachers of home economics who were on the Kansas State University campus Summer Session, 1966, completed the ranking scale. Analysis of the data showed no complete agreement on the rankings of any competency statement by the two groups of subjects and more differences than similarities in the rankings by and/or between the two groups. The differences in the rankings and the difficulties experienced by the university supervisors and the supervising teachers in ranking the competency statements led to changing the format of the instrument from a ranking to a rating scale.

The task-unit concept was used in refinement of the instrument. This concept, utilized by production industries and some service trades, requires job descriptions, in terms of tasks included, to provide effective check-lists of employee job responsibilities. Analysis of the competency

statements in the preliminary instrument indicated that they were student teacher performance tasks associated with the planning of lessons and with the teaching of planned lessons.

The rating instrument, Lesson Planning and Teaching Task Performance Scale (LPTTP Scale), consisted of ten major and nine supportive student teacher planning task statements and twelve major and sixteen supportive student teacher teaching task statements. Subjects were directed to rate each student teacher performance task according to one of three designated degrees of importance.

The LPTTP Scale was administered once during Fall Semester, 1966, to nine university supervisors of home economics from five states and fifteen supervising teachers of home economics for Kansas State University; and twice to fifteen student teachers of home economics at Kansas State University.

To better interpret ratings attached to the student teacher performance tasks, background information was obtained from the university supervisors relative to supervising and teaching experience and to emphasis given to selected educational concepts in their teaching and in the professional education sequences at their institutions. Information obtained from the supervising teachers dealt with educational background, teaching and supervisory experience, and with formal or informal study of the same selected educational concepts.

Specified educational concepts which were given extensive emphasis in professional education sequences were identified. Emphasis was further

identified for concepts taught by six of the eight. Many, but not all, of the supervising teachers had formally studied or had informally explored five of the concepts.

It was found that similarities and differences existed between ratings by the university supervisors and the supervising teachers on the student teacher performance tasks. The university supervisors rated the major and supportive tasks for planning daily lessons in the highest two of the three rating categories; the supervising teachers in all rating categories. The major and supportive tasks for the teaching of daily lessons were rated in the three categories by both groups. Complete agreement was shown on the highest importance rating on 16 per cent of the tasks for the planning of daily lessons and on 21 per cent of the tasks for the teaching of daily lessons. A fairly strong level of agreement (no less than 70 per cent of the ratings by the university supervisors or the supervising teachers) on the highest importance rating was shown for approximately two-thirds of the planning tasks and the teaching tasks.

Complete agreement was shown on the highest importance rating by the student teachers on 11 per cent of the teaching tasks before and after student teaching. The ratings made before and after student teaching showed that nearly one-third of the planning tasks and over one-half of the teaching tasks were rated of highest importance by no less than 70 per cent of the student teachers.

Slightly less than half of the tasks for the planning of daily lessons and over half of the tasks for the teaching of daily lessons

were considered by the student teachers to be of greater importance after student teaching than before. Almost one-third of the tasks for planning were seen of less importance.

Only one task, the supportive teaching performance task concerned with maintaining desired teacher-pupil rapport, was rated of "Great Importance" by all university supervisors, all supervising teachers, and all student teachers before and after student teaching.

Less differences occurred among university supervisors in the highest importance ratings for the tasks associated with lesson planning than among the supervising teachers or among the student teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusion, based on the limitations of this study, seems warranted:

Student teacher performance tasks were identified by the relative degree of importance associated with the tasks by university supervisors and supervising teachers. These tasks, which showed complete agreement on the highest importance rating, were:

Planning Daily Lessons

Major Tasks

4. Plans to provide optimum learning experiences within designated time.
8. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
9. Organizes content of lesson in logical manner and with meaning for pupils.

Supportive Tasks

None

Teaching Daily Lessons

Major Tasks

22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
30. Elicits pupil thinking by appropriate use of questioning technique.

Supportive Tasks

38. Stimulates pupils to work to maximum abilities.
39. Controls class in manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning.
45. Uses communication skills effectively.
47. Maintains desired teacher-pupil rapport.

IMPLICATIONS

Below are listed implications relating to the findings of this study:

1. The differences in the ratings by university supervisors, supervising teachers, and student teachers on some of the student teacher performance tasks may indicate the possibility of problems in communication in evaluation of the performance of student teachers.
2. The instrument appears to offer a means for determining degrees of importance for student teacher performance tasks. With a larger sample and appropriate statistical treatment it may be possible to identify more tasks more precisely.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Because of the limited nature of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. Use the LPTTP Scale with a larger number of subjects as a step in developing a forced-choice instrument for evaluation of student teacher performance.
2. Determine the association between student teacher ratings before student teaching and those of their university supervisors. Association can also be determined between student teacher ratings after student teaching and those of their supervising teachers.
3. Determine the association between student teacher ratings before and/or after student teaching and grades earned in student teaching.
4. Identify student teacher performance tasks in other areas of the student teaching experience.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Home Economics Association. Concept Structuring in Home Economics Education Curriculum. Washington: The American Home Economics Association, 1964.
- Boykin, Leander L. "Principles of Evaluating in Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, pp. 8-27. Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1960.
- Bradley, Ruth, et al. "A Criterion for the Appraisal of Student Teaching: the California Definition," Evaluating Student Teaching, pp. 46-56. Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1960.
- Brown, Charles I. "Make It a Team-Teaching Venture," The Clearing House, 37:340-342, February, 1963.
- Brown, Thomas J. Student Teaching in a Secondary School. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Burton, William Henry. The Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962.
- Bush, Robert N. and Dwight W. Allen. "Micro-Teaching--Controlled Practice in the Training of Teachers." Paper read at the Santa Barbara Conference on Teacher Education of the Ford Foundation, April 20, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Corrigan, Dean and Calden Garland. Studying Role Relationships, Association for Student Teaching Research Bulletin No. 6. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1966.
- Crow, Lester D. and Alice Crow. The Student Teacher in the Secondary School. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.
- Curtis, Dwight K. and Leonard O. Andrews. Guiding Your Student Teacher. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

- Dalrymple, Julia I. "Teaching for Concept Development," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 45:22-25, July, 1964.
- "Evaluation--What Is It?" Tips and Topics in Home Economics, 4:1-2, February, 1964.
- Fattu, Nicholas A. "Exploration of Interactions Among Instruction, Content, and Aptitude Variables," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:244-250, September, 1963.
- Flanders, Ned A. "Intent, Action and Feedback: A Preparation for Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:251-260, September, 1963.
- _____. "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, pp. 196-231. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Fleck, Henrietta. "Guidelines to Planning," Practical Forecast for Home Economics, 10:13, 36-37, November, 1964.
- _____. "Keys for Success in Home Economics," Forecast for Home Economists, 79:8; 58, March, 1963.
- Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1963.
- Getzels, J. W. and P. W. Jackson. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 506-582, Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1963.
- Haines, Aleyne C. "Case Reports of Instructional Practices in Evaluating Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, pp. 116-138. Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1960.
- Hollister, William G. "Preparing the Minds of the Future," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 50:30-50, December, 1966.
- Hunziger, Maxine Lovell. "An Exploratory Study to Identify Concepts and Determine Concept Attainment in a Home Economics Education Course," Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State University, Manhattan, 1964.
- Inlow, Gail M. "The Complex Role of the College Supervisor," Educational Research Bulletin, 35:10-17, January, 1956.

- Johnson, Larry K. "Functions of a College Supervisor," The Educational Forum, 28:469-475, May, 1964.
- Joyce, Bruce R. and Richard E. Hodges. "Instructional Flexibility Training," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:409-416, Winter, 1966.
- Leonard, Thelma Hamilton. "Role Expectations and Perceptions of the Home Economics Supervising Teacher," Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1965.
- Lowe, Phyllis K. "Depth Teaching in Home Economics," American Vocational Journal, 37:22-23, November, 1962.
- Lucio, William A. "Research Critique and a Forward Look," Evaluating Student Teaching, pp. 179-191. Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1960.
- Martin, R. Lee and Alvin W. Westcott. Gateway to Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1963.
- Medley, Donald M. "Experiences With the OSCAR Technique," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:267-273, September, 1963.
- Mersand, Joseph. "How to Plan a Lesson," High Points, 47:5-26, June, 1965.
- Mitchell, Frank W. "Some Notes on the Concept of Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:162-171, Summer, 1966.
- Monroe, Walter S. (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Myers, Robert and Taft Botner. "Self-Evaluation: A Significant Force in the Evaluation of Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, pp. 166-178. Thirty-ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1960.
- Neal, Charles D. The Student Teacher at Work. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1959.
- Osborn, Barbara. "More Concepts and Generalizations," Penny's Fashions Fabrics, p. 12, Spring/Summer, 1966.

- Otto, Arleen. "Family Finance Concepts--How to Teach Them," Practical Forecast for Home Economics, 9:56, 81-84, February, 1964.
- "Planning for Teaching," Tips and Topics in Home Economics, 6:1, February, 1966.
- Redfern, George B. How to Appraise Teaching Performance. Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1963.
- Richey, Robert W. Planning for Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.
- Reilly, Howard E. Student Teaching: Two Years After, Association for Student Teaching Bulletin No. 24. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1965.
- Schultz, Raymond E. Student Teaching in the Secondary Schools: A Guide to Effective Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1959.
- Simpson, Elizabeth J. "Teaching for the Development of Concepts and Generalizations," Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 9:238-254, 1965-66.
- Sprinthall, Norman A., John M. Whiteley, and Ralph L. Mosher. "A Study of Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Teacher Education, 27:93-106, Spring, 1966.
- Stadermann, Helen Edwards. "The College Supervisor in a State-Supported Institution in a Metropolitan Area," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge, pp. 64-90. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1964.
- "The Stanford Appraisal Guide of Teacher Competence." Stanford: Stanford University, n.d. (Mimeographed.)
- Stratemeyer, Florence B. "The College Supervisor: Guidelines for Action," The College Supervisor--Conflict and Challenge, pp. 149-165. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1964.
- Stratemeyer, Florence B. and Margaret Lindsey. Working With Student Teachers. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

- Tolle, Edwin R. and Walter I. Murray. "Forced-Choice: An Improvement in Teacher Rating," Journal of Educational Research, 51:679-685, May, 1958.
- Turner, Richard L. and Nicholas Fattu. "Skill in Teaching, A Reappraisal of the Concepts and Strategies in Teacher Effectiveness Research," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington: Indiana University, May, 1960.
- Tyson, Ivernia, Charles E. Fauset and F. Gordon Foster. "Current Practices," Outlook in Student Teaching, pp. 49-79. Forty-first Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1962.
- Welch, John M. A Task Unit Concept For On-the-Job Training in Food Service, Manual 66. Columbia: Extension Division, University of Missouri, February, 1966.
- Wroblewski, Claudia. "A Student Teacher Views the Supervising Teacher," The Journal of Teacher Education, 14:333, September, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RANKING OF STUDENT TEACHER COMPETENCIES RELATED TO PLANNING DAILY LESSONS AND TEACHING PLANNED LESSONS

Introduction: An attempt has been made to group student teacher competencies related to planning and teaching daily lessons into four categories, two pertaining to planning daily lessons and two pertaining to teaching planned lessons. In order to use the competency statements in an evaluative device that is being developed for use by supervising teachers, it is necessary to obtain judgments on them. You may assist with this by ranking the competencies according to the directions below.

Instructions: Read each list of competencies, then rank each competency statement in terms of the importance you attach to it by placing its number on the appropriate line across from the rank number, under the designated category. For example: On the line in the Category A Column that is across from 1 in the Rank Column place the number of the competency statement for Category A that you think is most important for student teachers to possess in order to plan the content of daily lesson plans. Continue ranking all the competencies in Category A, then do the same with Categories B, C, and D.

Rank	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Please write any suggestions for additional competencies (specify category) on the reverse side of this page.

STUDENT TEACHER COMPETENCIES RELATED TO
PLANNING DAILY LESSONS AND TEACHING PLANNED LESSONS

Category A: Planning of Content of Daily Lesson Plans

1. Writes guide questions and teaching notes appropriate to develop depth in main points of lessons.
2. Organizes points of lessons in logical manner and with meaning for pupils.
3. Writes meaningful major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s).
4. Writes meaningful supporting generalizations to develop concept(s).
5. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
6. Plans lessons to achieve optimum learning within designated time.
7. Plans lessons in accordance with school situations.
8. Plans way(s) to summarize, formulate generalizations, and/or evaluate pupil learning.
9. Plans ways to relate class experiences to pupils' personal and home situations and/or to associated school experiences.

Category B: Planning of Supportive Elements of Daily Lesson Plans

1. Identifies major lesson problem(s).
2. Identifies the concept(s) of lesson problem(s).
3. Plans lesson objective(s) in accordance with lesson problem(s) appropriate for needs, interests, and abilities of pupils.
4. Uses initiative in finding references, printed materials, and teaching aids.
5. Plans approaches for effective introductions of lessons and motivation of pupils.
6. Plans meaningful assignment for next day(s), if needed.
7. Plans and develops visuals to add interest and to supplement lessons.
8. Acquaints self with and uses suitable materials and resources of the department, school, and community when planning lessons.
9. Plans way(s) to evaluate pupil achievement of lesson objective(s), if needed.
10. Organises learning experiences in accordance with lesson objective(s).
11. Has lesson plans completed at designated time.

Category C: Teaching of Daily Lessons

1. Uses appropriate approaches for interesting and motivating pupils.
2. Elicits pupil thinking by appropriate use of questioning techniques.
3. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses.
4. Admits without losing status, that she does not know the answers to questions.
5. Helps pupils summarize lessons.
6. Helps pupils formulate generalizations for lessons.
7. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations.
8. Adapts pace of lessons to abilities, experiences, and interest of class.
9. Adapts lesson presentations to school schedule.
10. Uses time effectively to attain objective(s) of lessons.
11. Uses planned evaluative procedures effectively.
12. Relates class experiences to pupils' personal and home situations and/or to associated school experiences.

Category D: Supportive Elements of Teaching

1. Conveys desired self-confidence when teaching.
2. Maintains adequate climate for learning by controlling classes in an appropriate manner.
3. Handles daily routines of class efficiently and effectively.
4. Conveys enthusiasm during teaching of lessons.
5. Uses effective communication skills.
6. Assumes responsibility for appearance of classroom.
7. Manages physical conditions of classroom for optimum learning.
8. Gives definite and clear directions to classes.
9. Makes definite assignments.
10. Allows pupils freedom of choice when appropriate concerning class-related work.
11. Encourages creativity among pupils.
12. Opens and closes classes on time.

APPENDIX B

LESSON PLANNING AND TEACHING TASK PERFORMANCE SCALE

Many factors are included in determining the over-all performance of the student teacher. Evaluation of teaching performance includes the planning of daily lessons and the teaching of planned lessons. Numerous performance tasks are associated with these two aspects of teaching. The importance attached to specific student teacher performance tasks related to the planning of daily lessons and the teaching of planned lessons may vary among student teachers, supervising teachers, and university supervisors.

Student teacher performance tasks have been identified for the planning of daily lessons and for the teaching of planned lessons. Tasks have been written as statements and have been grouped as major and as supportive elements for each category. The statements are presented in random order.

Instructions: Rate each student teacher performance task statement according to the degree of importance you attach to that specific task. For example: If you believe that statement, "Selects or develops meaningful written major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s)," is of great importance to the planning of daily lessons, place a check (✓) on the corresponding line in the Great Importance column. If you believe that the task is of some importance or of little importance, place the check in the appropriate column.

PLANNING OF DAILY LESSON: MAJOR TASKS

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
1. Selects or develops guide questions and teaching notes appropriate to achieve depth in main points of lesson	—	—	—
2. Plans ways to relate class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences	—	—	—
3. Plans way(s) to evaluate pupil achievement of lesson objective(s), if needed	—	—	—
4. Plans to provide optimum learning experience within designated time	—	—	—
5. Selects or develops meaningful written major generalization or major idea suitable for daily lesson problem(s)	—	—	—
6. Plans lesson objective(s) in terms of expected behavioral change and content aspect of lesson .	—	—	—
7. Plans way(s) for summarizing, formulating, and/or applying generalizations	—	—	—
8. Plans suitable methods and techniques for providing pupil experiences that will give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations	—	—	—

PLANNING OF DAILY LESSON: MAJOR TASKS (continued)

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
9. Organizes content of lesson in logical manner and with meaning for pupils	—	—	—
10. Selects or develops meaningful written supporting generalizations to develop concept(s) .	—	—	—

PLANNING OF DAILY LESSON: SUPPORTIVE TASKS

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
11. Plans lesson in accordance with daily school schedule and situation	—	—	—
12. Identifies major lesson problem(s)	—	—	—
13. Plans meaningful assignment for next day(s), if needed	—	—	—
14. Has lesson plan completed at designated time . .	—	—	—
15. Plans effective approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils	—	—	—
16. Identifies the concept(s) of lesson problem(s) .	—	—	—
17. Plans and develops visuals to add interest and/or to supplement lesson	—	—	—
18. Uses initiative in finding references, printed materials, and teaching aids for lesson	—	—	—
19. Acquaints self with and uses suitable materials and resources of the department, school, and/or community when planning lesson	—	—	—

TEACHING OF DAILY LESSON: MAJOR TASKS

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
20. Uses time effectively to attain objective(s) of lesson	—	—	—
21. Permits pupils to ask questions and gives, or seeks to develop, adequate responses	—	—	—
22. Uses methods and techniques effectively to provide experiences that give meaning to concepts and/or generalizations	—	—	—
23. Relates class experiences to individual needs, home situations, and/or associated school experiences	—	—	—
24. Uses planned evaluative procedures effectively	—	—	—
25. Uses appropriate approaches to motivate and to gain interest of pupils	—	—	—
26. Adapts pace of lesson to abilities, experiences, and interest of pupils	—	—	—
27. Has equipment and supplies ready for use during lesson	—	—	—
28. Helps pupils summarize lesson	—	—	—

TEACHING OF DAILY LESSON: MAJOR TASKS (continued)

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
29. Adapts lesson presentations to day's school schedule and to class situation	—	—	—
30. Elicits pupil thinking by appropriate use of questioning technique	—	—	—
31. Helps pupils formulate and/or apply generaliza- tions for lesson	—	—	—

TEACHING OF DAILY LESSON: SUPPORTIVE TASKS

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
32. Manages physical conditions of classroom for optimum learning	—	—	—
33. Handles daily routines of class efficiently and effectively	—	—	—
34. Opens and closes classes on time	—	—	—
35. Conveys desired self-confidence when teaching	—	—	—
36. Assumes responsibility for appearance of classroom	—	—	—
37. Properly cares for and puts away equipment and supplies	—	—	—
38. Stimulates pupils to work to maximum abilities	—	—	—
39. Controls class in a manner appropriate to maintain optimum climate for learning	—	—	—
40. Admits, without losing status, that answers are not known to questions and suggests ways to find them	—	—	—
41. Allows pupils freedom of choice concerning class-related work when appropriate	—	—	—

TEACHING OF DAILY LESSON: SUPPORTIVE TASKS (continued)

Task Statement	Great Importance	Some Importance	Little Importance
42. Conveys enthusiasm in presenting subject matter and in working with pupils	_____	_____	_____
43. Makes definite assignments	_____	_____	_____
44. Gives definite and clear directions to class . .	_____	_____	_____
45. Uses communication skills effectively	_____	_____	_____
46. Encourages pupils to be creative	_____	_____	_____
47. Maintains desired teacher-pupil rapport	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX C

PERSONAL DATA SHEET: UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Instructions: Indicate responses to each question which is applicable to you by placing checks on the lines to the left of the appropriate terms or by writing in the blanks provided. More than one item may be checked. All information is confidential and will be used only in relation to this study.

1. How many years have you been a college or university supervisor of home economics student teachers?

_____ 1 to 3

_____ 7 to 9

_____ 4 to 6

_____ 10 or more

2. Approximately how many home economics student teachers have you supervised as a college or university supervisor each year?

_____ 1 to 6

_____ 13 to 18

_____ 7 to 12

_____ 19 or more

3. Which of the following concepts are emphasized extensively in the professional education sequence for home economics education students at your college or university?

_____ Concept approach to teaching

_____ Taxonomy of educational objectives

_____ Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Evaluation of learning

4. How many years have you taught home economics education courses?

_____ 1 to 5

_____ 16 or more

_____ 6 to 10

_____ None of the above

_____ 11 to 15

5. In general, to what extent do you implement the concept approach when teaching home economics education course(s)?

_____ Very much

_____ Very little

_____ Somewhat

_____ Not at all

6. If you teach a course that prepares home economics education majors for student teaching, to which of the following concepts or procedures do you give considerable emphasis?

_____ Concept approach to teaching

_____ Taxonomy of educational objectives

_____ Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Evaluation of learning

_____ Actual planning of lessons

_____ Actual teaching of lessons

Others (list):

7. How many years have you taught home economics classes at the junior and/or the senior high school level?

_____ 1 to 5	_____ 11 or more
_____ 6 to 10	_____ None of the above

8. Have you ever supervised student teachers in home economics classes at the junior and/or the senior high school level?

_____ Yes

_____ No

9. If you have supervised student teachers in home economics classes at the junior and/or the senior high school level, how many students have you supervised?

_____ 1 to 3	_____ 7 to 9
_____ 4 to 6	_____ 10 or more

APPENDIX D

PERSONAL DATA SHEET: SUPERVISING TEACHERS

Instructions: Indicate responses to each question which is applicable to you by placing checks on the lines to the left of the appropriate terms or by writing in the blanks provided. More than one item may be checked. All information is confidential and will be used only in relation to this study.

1. How many years have you taught home economics classes at the junior and/or the senior high school level?

_____ 1 to 5	_____ 16 to 20
_____ 6 to 10	_____ 21 or more
_____ 11 to 15	

2. How many home economics student teachers have you supervised?

_____ 1 to 3	_____ 7 to 9
_____ 4 to 6	_____ 10 or more

3. List all colleges and/or universities for which you have supervised home economics student teachers.

4. What college course(s) have you taken in supervision which pertain to:

_____ The general classroom
_____ The home economics classroom
_____ Student teachers in general
_____ Student teachers in home economics
_____ None

5. If you have taken a course in supervision of student teachers in home economics, at which college or university did you take it?

6. From which college or university did you earn a Bachelor's degree?

_____ When? _____

7. If you have done graduate work, how many semester hours have you earned beyond the Bachelor's degree?

_____ 1 to 6

_____ 25 to 30

_____ 7 to 15

_____ Completion of
Master's degree

_____ 16 to 24

8. How many semester hours have you earned beyond the Master's degree? _____

9. If you hold a Master's degree, from which college or university was it received?

_____ When? _____

10. If you hold a Master's degree, was the major work done in home economics education?

_____ Yes

_____ No

11. In formal situations (college courses, workshops) which of the following concepts have you studied during the last five years?

_____ Concept approach to teaching

_____ Taxonomy of educational objectives

_____ Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Evaluation of learning

12. In informal situations (school, city, or state-sponsored in-service meetings, short supervising teacher meetings) which of the following concepts have you explored during the last five years?

_____ Concept approach to teaching

_____ Taxonomy of educational objectives

_____ Planning learning experiences to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Teaching methods and techniques to develop concepts and generalizations

_____ Evaluation of learning

APPENDIX E

Manhattan, Kansas 66502

October 18, 1966

College of Education
Holton Hall

As a university supervisor of student teachers, you know that evaluation of student teaching is a necessary, but difficult, responsibility. This responsibility is often made even more difficult because those involved in the evaluation -- the university supervisor, the supervising teacher, and the student teacher, may attach different degrees of importance to the fulfillment of student teacher performance tasks.

As part of my Master's study, under the direction of Dr. Ellen Champoux, I am developing a means to help university supervisors and supervising teachers evaluate student teachers. Your assistance in determining the degree of importance of student teacher tasks related to the planning of daily lessons and to the teaching of daily lessons will be greatly appreciated. In order to interpret the answers to the rating scale, I need some information about you. Replies to all questions will be held in confidence.

I am sure you are very busy with numerous responsibilities during this part of the school year. However, it would be most helpful to me if you could complete the enclosed forms and return them in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by November 5.

Thank you for your assistance. I shall be glad to share results of the study if you so desire.

Sincerely,

Margaret Nowatzki

MN:lab

Enclosure

APPENDIX F

Kansas State University

111

Manhattan, Kansas 66502

October 18, 1966

College of Education
Holton Hall

As a teacher who supervises student teachers, you know that evaluation of student teaching is a necessary, but difficult, responsibility. This responsibility is often made even more difficult because those involved in the evaluation -- the supervising teacher, the student teacher, and the university supervisor, may attach different degrees of importance to the fulfillment of student teacher performance tasks.

As part of my Master's study, under the direction of Dr. Ellen Champoux, I am developing a means to help university supervisors and supervising teachers evaluate student teachers. Your assistance in determining the degree of importance of student teacher tasks related to the planning of daily lessons and to the teaching of daily lessons will be greatly appreciated. In order to interpret the answers to the rating scale, I need some information about you. Replies to all questions will be held in confidence.

I know you presently are very busy with student teacher responsibilities in addition to teaching. However, it would be most helpful to me if you could complete the enclosed forms and return them in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by November 5.

Thank you for your assistance. The results of the study will be shared with you.

Sincerely,

Margaret Nowatzki

MN:lab

Enclosure

STUDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE TASKS FOR PLANNING OF DAILY LESSONS
AND FOR TEACHING OF PLANNED LESSONS

by

MARGARET MARY NOWATZKI

B. S., College of St. Benedict, 1959

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

This study was done (1) to identify student teacher performance tasks involved in planning daily lessons and in teaching planned lessons and (2) to determine the relative degree of importance attached to each task.

A preliminary ranking instrument, containing forty-four student teacher competency statements related to planning and teaching planned lessons, was developed and administered. Findings and study of the task-unit concept led to revision as a rating scale containing forty-seven student teacher performance tasks.

The Lesson Planning Teaching Task Performance Scale was administered once during Fall Semester, 1966, to nine home economics university supervisors from five states and fifteen home economics supervising teachers for Kansas State University; and twice to fifteen home economics student teachers at Kansas State University.

Similarities and differences were found between ratings by the university supervisors and the supervising teachers on student teacher performance tasks.

Complete agreement was shown on the highest importance rating by university supervisors and supervising teachers on 16 per cent of the planning and on 21 per cent of the teaching tasks and by student teachers on 11 per cent of the teaching tasks before and after student teaching.

Only the task concerned with teacher-pupil rapport was rated of "Great Importance" by all the supervisors and all the student teachers before and after student teaching.

The conclusion drawn, based on limitations of the study, was that student teacher performance tasks were identified by the relative degree of importance associated with the tasks by university supervisors and supervising teachers. Nine tasks showed complete agreement on the highest importance rating.

