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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there have been numerous reports by commissions and panels that have seriously questioned the quality of public school education in the United States. These reports have examined various factors that are thought to contribute to or detract from quality education. There is much research that points to good teaching as the single most important piece to solving the puzzle of achieving excellence in education (Porter, 1988). Prior to the 1980's, good teaching appears to have been taken for granted. In 1953 the Committee on Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness of the American Educational Research Association reported that after 40 years of research on teacher effectiveness there was little data that would be useful to teacher educators in improving teacher education programs (AERA, 1953). The Coleman Report (Coleman, 1966) and others (Jencks, 1972) concluded that teachers had very little impact on student learning compared to factors such as social class and student ability. When problems were found within the practice of teaching, the improvement of the teacher was not necessarily considered a solution to those problems. "Teacher-proof" curricula, which
included pre-planned objectives and activities with detailed instructions for delivery, were developed as attempts to improve student learning.

Over the years, an increased emphasis was placed upon research that examined teacher behaviors. During the 1980's, an increasing number of studies on effective teaching began to show that teaching does indeed make a difference; that effective teaching can be defined and measured; and that teachers can be trained to be more effective (Cruickshank, 1986) (Woolfolk, 1989).

Much inquiry has subsequently been conducted concerning the selection, preparation, certification, and continuing education of the nation's teachers. Each stage in a teacher education program has variables that may affect the eventual performance of its graduates.

Most discussion in this study concerns issues, problems, and research directed at the education of teachers in general. Those charged with the education of music teachers face these same challenges, as well as others unique to the discipline. Historically, music education programs that led to teacher certification came from three areas (Boardman, 1990). The conservatory of music based its music education preparation on a heavy concentration in music performance. The music education curriculum of a liberal arts college put more emphasis on academic studies of music and the liberal arts
core. Faculty in state teachers' colleges emphasized professional education courses and music methods courses as the principal focus of teacher education in music. Since a major university often assimilated its school of music faculty from all three sources, diverse opinions often existed within such a faculty as to the best approach to music teacher education.

The music education student must, like all other teacher education students, be successful in the core courses required by any institution. The music education student is likewise expected to demonstrate knowledge of educational theory, methods, and psychology. In addition, he must be learned in music theory, history and literature, be a proficient practitioner of at least one instrument and/or voice, be able to rehearse and conduct ensembles, and have a working knowledge of the other instruments. In many states it is required that all music educators be certified to teach in all areas and grade levels of music education because of the numbers of small school districts which can afford only a limited number of music specialists. These areas include courses ranging from elective performing groups to required general music classes. They involve students with varying abilities, including some with physical or developmental disabilities. Providing the music education student with skills in each of these areas and designing adequate and representative field experiences for
that student has become the difficult task of music teacher educators.

Three major areas of concern have evolved in the pre-service preparation of effective teachers: admission requirements, coursework, and field experiences.

The admission of candidates to a teacher preparation program in education is the first step toward developing a cadre of effective teachers. Prior to entry into the college or university, prospective music education students are usually subjected to the same standards of college entrance expected of all entering students. Through tests and auditions, they are further asked to demonstrate musical performance achievement and potential as well as musical knowledge.

Shellahamer (1984) surveyed 105 institutions of higher learning that train music teachers and determined that music education students must meet entrance or acceptance requirements set forth by both the music department and the college of education in seventy-five percent of those institutions. In addition to meeting the requirements of the college or university for acceptance in to the music education program, seventy-eight percent of the institutions require a vocal or instrumental audition and fifty-three percent require placement exams in areas such as music theory, music history, piano, and voice. In seventy-seven percent of those schools
requiring an audition, the standards for the music education major were the same as for the music performance major.

Brand (1987) reports that the music education faculty of the Cincinnati College-Conservatory of music require sophomore music education students to demonstrate a music lesson before final admission into the program. These demonstrations are viewed and evaluated by the faculty who will permit admission to the music education program.

Social and personal traits may also serve as predictors of success in a teacher education program (Zeichner, 1984). Philosophical background, socio-economic status, major field of study, academic ability, gender, and age have also been shown to be related to success in a teacher education program.

Teacher educators continue to discuss the balance in the curriculum between subject matter knowledge and general knowledge of education. In Medieval times to be liberally educated meant to be prepared to teach. With the growth of knowledge in the various disciplines, however, specialization of departments and their resultant struggles to gain acceptance in academia forced a change in this perspective and the debate began (Borrowman, 1965). Borrowman quotes Sewall, writing in 1899, that the training of teachers should be the sole responsibility of graduate schools of the University with the undergraduate curriculum being responsible for the liberal arts education and major subject education.
The issue of undergraduate or graduate education of teachers has been under scrutiny for economical reasons. Howey (1986) contended that the abundance of colleges which now prepare teachers has severely strained the resources available and therefore teacher education should be left only to the large research universities. However, when one considers the nature and economic status of those who enter the teaching profession, the cost of attending these large universities as a graduate student might serve as an obstacle, much as it has in the areas of law and medicine (Lortie, 1975).

Whether as an undergraduate or graduate student in teacher education there is still disagreement concerning the ratio of subject matter expertise to knowledge of the liberal arts. The amount of time spent on the development of specific teaching skills is the third factor to be considered. Much effective teaching literature recommends a balance of all (Woolfolk, 1989). However, measures of academic achievement such as college entrance exam scores, grade point averages, and teacher examinations alone do not serve as effective predictors of successful teaching (Olstad, 1987).

Conant (1963) wrote that he felt it possible that the arguments addressing locus of control and content of teacher education may mask non-educational concerns such as racial, economical, political, or ideological issues. Conant further questioned why it must be assumed that courses in education
will replace instead of supplement the courses in the liberal arts.

Teacher educators are also concerned with how much time in the program should be spent in the academics of a given subject and/or the theories of teaching and how much time should be spent in practical field experience. Practical field experience takes many forms. Many teacher education programs include field experiences early in the students' college careers. The earliest experiences may be nothing more than observations of classrooms with reflective discussion in seminars. In other field experiences, the education student may be required to perform non-teaching duties, individual instruction, and perhaps present one or a few lessons to a class. For most programs, the major field experience is student teaching. Student teaching generally lasts as long as one segment of the academic calendar (quarter or semester). During that time, the student teacher gradually assumes the duties of a full-time teacher while under supervision from a university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. When designing a major field experience such as student teaching, decisions must be made as to when student teaching will take place, who will be responsible for supervising the student teaching experiences, and how the student teaching experiences will be evaluated.
Statement of the Problem

It seems reasonable to expect that field experiences, including the extended time in student teaching, will continue to play a major part in the preparation of all teachers. Therefore it is imperative that the issues concerning field experiences for music education students be defined, the related research considered, and directions for further research be charted in order to answer the challenge of providing an effective program for preparing effective teachers. Teacher educators need to be able to base their practices of admission, coursework, and field experiences upon research findings whenever possible.

Johnston (1981) is concerned that the problems identified in a myriad of studies have remained basically the same. With such an apparently reliable accounting of problems of beginning teachers, new methods of incorporating this knowledge into future research designs should be sought.

Failure to do so could perpetuate what Sandefur (1982) sees as a basic chain reaction in many first-year teachers. There is a progressive-to-traditional shift in teaching perspectives. Teachers become embittered both against the teaching profession and the teacher education program in which they were prepared. Frequently, they leave the profession.
Problems in the admission of future teachers, their academic and theoretical coursework, their preservice field experiences, and their induction year experiences could potentially be lessened or alleviated through implementation of research findings.

**Purpose of the Study.**

The purpose of the study is to present the basic issues pertaining to the student teaching component of music teacher education, review and discuss the related research, report a study on the effect of classroom characteristics on student teaching evaluation, and present suggestions for further research.

More specifically, the investigation will

1. review issues in general student teaching as well as music student teaching.

2. review the research that addresses those issues.

3. conduct a study that examines the variable of classroom characteristics upon the evaluation of effective teaching skills exhibited by music student teachers.

4. suggest areas for further, extended research in music education.
CHAPTER II

The Issues and a Review of Related Literature

A central issue in the analysis of problems in teacher education continues to be the role and value of field experiences. Proponents of field experiences argue that such experiences are the best way to translate theoretical experiences into practice and to teach skills that cannot be learned in the college classroom. Most who question the worth of field experiences are concerned that field experiences are unique in themselves and therefore the learning acquired does not transfer to the initial teaching position. They claim that often the goals and philosophies of the cooperating teacher and others in the student teaching setting are not consistent with the goals of the teacher education program.

Another issue is the relative efficacy of the various types of teacher education programs, specifically as they relate to field experiences. Generally there are five types of teacher education programs that lead to unconditional certification for employment: a four-year baccalaureate degree program; a five-year baccalaureate degree program; a five-year graduate
degree program; programs that include an extended period of field experience, between the baccalaureate degree and certification; and programs that by-pass traditional routes to certification. Each of these types of programs contains an element of field experience, whether it is the short amount of time required in an alternative certification program, or the full-year internship included in a five-year or induction program.

Within any given field experience, and especially the longer ones such as student teaching, there are many influences which act upon the beliefs, attitudes, and skills of the student teacher. Researchers in teacher education continue to study the sources of influence, the direction of influence, and the relative permanence of that influence. The importance of influences upon the student teacher becomes more evident when one realizes that not every person or situation capable of being an influence is in agreement on matters of educational philosophy or practice.

Evaluation or assessment of persons and programs is a part of any educational process. Results from evaluation in student teaching are used to provide feedback to the student teacher, to recommend or deny certification to a teacher education student, to recommend employment of program graduates, and to guide decisions on future directions of
teacher education programs. Accurate and valid assessments of student teaching experiences are essential.

Issues in the assessment of student teaching include establishing the criteria for evaluation, determining what form(s) the evaluation should take, deciding who should conduct the evaluation, and examining variables that may affect the accurate assessment of student teaching.

Another issue, perhaps less directly related to student teaching, is the relative success of the first year teacher. Typical problems of the first year teacher are being defined. Inquiry is being made to determine if variables in the student teaching experience can be considered predictors of the problems.

The research or knowledge base that could provide direction for those who confront the issues of student teaching is not as fully developed as might be expected. In some instances, information simply is not available. In other cases, the quality of research needs to be improved. Virginia Koehler (1985) termed most research in teacher education as "bootstrap research". Very little funding has been provided for such research that would enable large-scale studies or surveys and follow-up studies. Most research funding has been small, university grants, often in the form of aid to graduate students completing projects or dissertations. Therefore, most of the research centers on course/methods evaluations where
students' skills are measured upon completion of the course and occasionally before taking the course. She also points out that teacher educators involved in research usually do so in addition to a large academic teaching load. Of necessity, the type of research must be inexpensive and require few people hours.

Those research studies of a large scale that are completed are frequently what Koehler labels "instrumental research". Such research is instrumental to the goals of an institution, a program, or a special interest group. Research conducted by individuals or institutions to legitimate a given philosophy, method, or program can be misleading.

The problems in teacher education research as defined by Koehler, such as poor funding, limited time, and biased reasoning, give cause to examine carefully the generalizations of the findings. Small numbers, inadequate monitoring of control groups, and short cuts to reliability and validity are common in teacher education research.

A review of the research literature as it relates to some issues of student teaching confirms Koehler's statements. However, signs of progress are evident in some areas. The current review is comprised of studies from 1970 to the present listed in ERIC files and dissertations listed in Dissertation Abstracts International from 1950 to the present. Also included were studies from extensive bibliographies of

Research on the Value of Student Teaching Experiences

The value of student teaching has been both supported and questioned in the literature. Concern has been expressed that a number of educational practices, including student teaching, have become institutionalized and thus immune to careful scrutiny (Cheney, 1990). Historically, the requirement of some type of apprenticeship to any profession or trade has been a mainstay since the Middle Ages. It is seldom questioned that a doctor or lawyer should spend time under the care of a mentor before practice begins. It is especially evident that skilled-labor positions require more "on the job" training than a teacher receives.

Perhaps the strongest argument in favor of the student teaching experience is that which supports the cliché that experience is the best teacher. Contending that teaching is an art rather than a science, Rubin (1985) wrote that only continued reflective practice could produce good teachers. He felt that theory and methods courses were not effective. Beyond learning the subject matter to be taught quite thoroughly, the novice teacher, like the apprentice artist or musician, should continue to refine his teaching techniques
while on the job in a continuous manner. Naturally, at the outset more supervision, such as that found in student teaching, would be needed.

Few would argue against the importance of the student teaching experience as an integral part in the training of teachers (Prell, 1968). Gage (1978) wrote that, in general, student teaching "has been considered to be the single best, although far from faultless, component of teacher education."

Yamamoti (1969) wrote that researchers concerned about the worth of field experience during pre-service education have concentrated on the merits of field experiences as being "better than nothing" or as providing the opportunity to learn and practice desired skills. Many surveys of student teachers have revealed that student teaching is seen as beneficial only when compared to academic course work. As alternatives to student teaching are few and relatively recent, little or no research in any form has been done that would compare student teaching to an alternative program such as a graduate program proposed by the Holmes Group or alternative paths to teacher certification for those with degrees in other fields.

Too much educational theory, without practice, is useless (Doyle and Ponder, 1975). Theory, often taught generically, is not easily related to the classroom environment and the preservice teacher is in need of close supervision to transfer the learnings of theory into the practice of the classroom. This
cannot be done without secure knowledge of the total environment of the classroom. With each classroom being different, it would be impossible to adequately discuss classroom environments in a theoretical setting.

Still there are studies which cite the student teaching experience as the best situation for using particular methods of teaching teachers. Duerksen (1985) contends that the best approach to the education of future teachers is through the modeling of desired techniques. This could be accomplished in a laboratory setting but most frequently is done in the field.

Ryan (1979) conducted a study of 18 first year teachers. This study included five structured interviews with each teacher, at least twelve hours of observation of each teacher, and written communications. His general conclusions were that teachers highly valued their first-hand experiences in student teaching. While these experiences were valued, the student teachers realized that a teacher education program, even with field experiences, cannot do everything; not all teaching realities can be duplicated in the student teaching setting.

Philosophical debate on the merits of field experience for preservice teachers has continued for many years (Conant, 1963). Each time the nation faces a shortage of teachers, the need for courses such as student teaching is called into question and routes to certification that bypass field experiences as a prerequisite are used (LeBlanc, 1984).
The student teaching experience is not without its detractors (Emans, 1983). Thomas Dewey wrote in 1904 that student teaching presented a deceptive sense of success related not to the principles the education student had acquired but to what the student teacher sees as success and failure from moment to moment (Feiman-Nemser, 1983). Brand (1986) concluded that the student teaching experience did little or nothing to influence the behaviors and practices of music teachers. Moreover, academic preparation has been shown to be a better predictor of success on the NTE than evaluations of student teaching performance (Pultorak, 1988).

Hoy and Rees (1977) see management type behaviors at the center of the student teaching experience and are concerned that many student teachers think, after the student teaching experience, that the only way to learn to teach is trial and error. Lortie (1975) was also concerned that student teaching can foster more managerial than intellectual behaviors on the part of the student teachers.

There are surveys and measurements of attitude that suggest that the student teaching experience can be harmful to the student teacher. Joyce (1988) observed that a poor student teaching experience can worsen the attitude of student teachers toward pupils. The student teacher often becomes more teacher-directed and less student response is solicited. The cognitive level of classroom discourse lowers.
Consequently, the student teacher often develops a suspicion of innovative teaching methods and a negativism toward theory and research.

Beyer and Zeichner (1982) state that sufficient preparation in observation could alleviate many of these concerns. The student teacher must be able to observe and model, with scrutiny, the teaching behaviors encountered in the field.

The ability of a student teacher to adequately assess a given experience depends also upon his level of development (Brand, 1986). At the outset of a student teaching experience, the student teachers are primarily concerned with their needs. They seek acceptance of people and avoidance of criticism. Most student teachers pass through four stages. There are initial fears upon beginning that quickly dissipate and a sense of elation comes when the student teachers realize that they can succeed. Toward the middle of the experience, depression at the perceived lack of progress with the pupils in terms of academics or discipline sets in and is followed by a gradual growth to maturity.

The Major Field Experience Prior to Certification

Discussion continues on the best timing for the major field experience to occur. In many programs it is a part of the
undergraduate curriculum, in some instances within a four year schedule and in other instances during a fifth year. Other programs place the major field experience as a component of the masters degree curriculum. Alternative paths to certification such as those in New Jersey separate field experience or student teaching from academia altogether and conduct it as an internship under the direction of the public schools and the certifying state agency (Smith, 1990).

Until recent years, field experiences in teacher education primarily took place in the course of the four-year undergraduate degree program. A student teaching experience, as a part of the undergraduate degree, resulting in full certification, has traditionally been the most comprehensive form of field experience. Upon completion of student teaching and all other certification requirements, the newly-employed teacher is given the same, full responsibility as a veteran teacher. Most subsequent evaluation is conducted for the purpose of contract renewal or termination and is conducted by the district administration.

In music education, Shellahamer (1984) found that graduation from the music teacher education program resulted in automatic certification/licensure to teach in sixty-nine percent of the institutions surveyed. In programs where the certification was not automatic, the State required additional coursework in forty-one percent of the occurrences. Fourteen
states required the music teacher candidates to pass some type of examination before issuing a certificate and twelve states required teaching experience in the schools beyond student teaching before granting certification.

The alternatives to the traditional certification programs include proposals such as that of the Holmes Group which would delay a major field experience (as well as most educational theory and methods courses) until the graduate degree (Holmes, 1986). Still other programs would advocate the major field experience being at least one school year in duration and taking place completely in the field with the novice teacher being assigned the major responsibility for a class. Supervision and assessment would be conducted on site by building administrators, peers, mentor teachers, and, rarely, university personnel. Certification would not come until after successful completion of such a program. Some school districts have instituted this type of program, not as a path to certification, but as a prerequisite for continued employment within the district. These types of proposals have come in response to perceived shortcomings of the traditional undergraduate teacher education program.

Currently, the different programs are seen as traditional (four year), extended teacher education programs (five year baccalaureate degree, internship after baccalaureate degree, or graduate degree), and alternative certification programs. In
recent years the number of undergraduate student teachers has decreased while the number of non-traditional, pre-certificated teachers has increased (Ayers, 1990).

The descriptor terms "extended teacher education programs" and "alternative teacher certification programs" are new to the ERIC Thesaurus as of 1987. Since most of these programs are new, there has been little research on the relative effectiveness of these various routes to teacher certification. Even less research is available concerning the success of the teacher after the completion of the first year of employment outside of a given program (Boser, 1990a).

Special problems for these types of proposals occur in the area of music education. When some of music teacher education is moved to graduate schools or school districts, or when the number of undergraduate years required to be eligible for certification are increased, there may be a loss of students to other universities for economic reasons. Dropping enrollments in schools of music make it increasingly difficult to fill the varied, large ensembles which provide performance experience to the students.

Options or incentives for additional study in music education beyond the Master's degree in teaching are limited. A Master's degree for the purpose of certification would contain some course material that is currently considered to be undergraduate level material. With time being spent on
coursework for certification, the graduate student may not have time within the Master's program to cover the curriculum currently studied in a master's degree in music education. A doctorate, basically a research degree, would probably not be feasible or desirable for many teachers.

Beyond the colleges and universities, there are alternative paths to certification wherein the local school district, in cooperation with the state Department of Education, serves as the teacher training institution. In the New Jersey program previously cited (Smith, 1990), for example, the state Department of Education and the local district provide the training for these non-traditional teacher candidates. Twenty days of on the job training consists of observation time and teaching under supervision. Upon completion of this requirement, the candidate is given full teaching responsibilities.

In an extensive bibliography on teacher education programs and research on those programs, Ayers (1990) listed the following headings in the index with their corresponding number of articles: student teachers--184; early field experience--89; cooperating teachers--86; university supervisors of student teachers--45; internship programs--9; student teacher attitudes--5; fifth-year degree programs--1; music--0.
Two criteria seem to be the bases for research on timing of student teaching and alternative paths to certification. Through any number of measures, including principals' evaluations, teachers' self-analyses, NTE and other standardized scores, the evaluations of the teachers from four-year programs, extended programs, and alternative route programs are compared. Comparison data has also been collected from these programs concerning teacher retention.

Warner (1990) surveyed the faculties and graduate students of some Holmes Group institutions. When compared with non-Holmes Group counterparts, the faculties and students were more in agreement that reform in teacher education was necessary and were more in favor of extended teacher education programs, increasing the number of liberal arts courses, and increasing the amount of field experiences (Warner, 1990).

A ten-year comparison of graduates from four- and five-year baccalaureate teacher education programs revealed that five-year graduates enter teaching at higher rates and stay in teaching longer. They are happier with their careers, judge their teacher preparation as better, and rate their teaching abilities higher than do their four-year counterparts (Andrew, 1990).

On the basis of academic ability, however, there does not appear to be a difference between those who are traditionally
certified and those who follow an alternative program. Hawk and Schmidt (1989) found that teachers in the North Carolina Lateral Entry Program are as competent in school classrooms and as successful on NTE examinations as traditionally prepared students.

In a similar study in Texas, Brown (1989) found that a study of 63 Texas teachers who participated in an alternative certification program had similar academic and classroom performance abilities as traditionally certified teachers.

In another study in Pittsburgh, Eichelberger (1990) compared four-year education majors with students enrolled in a Master of Arts in Teaching program. He found no significant difference in measures of subject matter knowledge or professional education knowledge.

In a five-year comparison study at Siena University in New York, persons who made mid-career changes via alternate routes into teaching showed no significant differences from traditionally educated teachers on a variety of teacher behaviors. The alternatively certified teachers tended to bring more outside resources into their classroom (Murray, 1990).

A further study in Syracuse, New York, consisted of follow-up surveys of students who had finished the New York State Mentor-Internship Program and who had completed one, two, or, in a few cases, three years of independent teaching (Mager, 1990). The great majority of teachers reported a
positive impact on their teaching as a result of their participation in the program and stated that the mentor-intern relationship often continued after the program was officially completed.

Their mentors were in agreement that alternatively certified teachers were academically equal to traditionally certified teachers (Bey, 1990). This study also stated that alternatively certified teachers were pleased with their preparation and scored higher on the Teacher Performance Assessment than traditionally certified teachers. The mentors of this Georgia project, however, expressed serious concerns about the induction of alternatively certified personnel. These new teachers were overworked with extra coaching duties, required inservices, travelling between buildings and between rooms, more difficult classes, more different preparations, and larger student/teacher ratio. This left little time for planning and conferencing with the mentor. One teacher in this study actually resigned in mid-year due to the stress of the job.

Soares (1989) polled 25 undergraduate student teachers, 20 alternative certification candidates, and 30 graduate interns. Her findings included that the self-esteem of student teachers and alternative certification candidates declined during their initial classroom experiences while the self esteem of graduate interns remained constant. The interns were generally rated more competent in all areas by principals and teachers. The
alternative group was rated the lowest on communication skills, instructional skills, interpersonal skills, and the ability to establish a positive learning environment.

The standards for alternative certification may not always be met (Smith, 1990). Ninety-four teachers in the alternative certification program of New Jersey were asked to keep logs of their activities for ten of the twenty days they spent in preparation to become teachers. Required time in teaching, observing, conferences, and meetings was not being met in most instances.

Boser and Wiley (1990b) conducted a study in which nine former interns within a district received regular teaching jobs at the completion of their internships. Three traditionally educated teachers who had received the same undergraduate training from the same university were also hired as novice teachers. Six principals were interviewed concerning the relative importance of the internship in determining who would be hired and the relative success of the teachers to date. Internship was never the deciding factor to hire a person for a teaching position. It was considered an advantage only if all other criteria for hiring were considered to be equal. Principals depend on their own experience rather than the promises of an internship. Some actually preferred teachers who had not been through such a program. They preferred teachers who were not set in their ways. They further stated that those teachers
who came to them via an alternative or lateral certification route were often unsuccessful because they had unrealistic expectations of schools and students since they had been away from a school setting for so long.

Teaching anxiety levels were reduced significantly for students who participated in year-long internships during the undergraduate program but not for students who completed only traditional student teaching (Boser, 1990a).

Training within a traditional college of education, whether a four- or five-year program seems to promote longevity more than an alternative path to certification. A survey of 203 special education teachers showed that the more training they received, the longer they were apt to remain in the profession. Alternatively trained teachers, outside of a school of education were found to leave teaching earlier (Banks, 1987).

**The Influences Upon the Student Teacher**

A major concern in the student teaching process is what persons and what forces exert influence upon the behavior of the student teacher. The strength and permanence of that influence as well as the directions in which that influence moves the student teacher are further concerns. The principal sources of influence upon the student teacher appear to be the
cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Other areas of influence can be the ecology of the classroom, the pre-service attitudes and values of the student teacher, as well as gender, age, socio-economic status, and major area of study. Zeichner (1984) raised several questions concerning the strength of any one source of influence. His scrutiny of several research documents led him to categorize the classroom ecology of the student teacher into three areas: program features (structure and content of the field experience), settings (characteristics of the placement site), and people (characteristics, dispositions, and abilities of the student teacher and significant others). He wrote that the ecology of student teaching was too complicated to be explained by a single factor. One must understand the interaction of all of these various factors in order to understand the influence of one factor. Zeichner's conclusion was that the school and classroom in which both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher work is a more potent source of influence.

Surveys of the student teachers themselves, however, overwhelmingly label the cooperating teacher as the single greatest influence (Karmos and Jacko, 1972). Even though as many as thirty-two other types of persons have been identified as influential in the student teaching process, it is the cooperating teacher who heads the list.
The selection of a location for student teaching and the choice of a cooperating teacher can significantly affect the learning outcomes of the student teacher. Sadly, little formal thought is usually given to this matter (Kingsen, 1984) (Emans, 1983). The criteria used for selection of cooperating teachers by the public school administration is often unrelated to the university's goals for the student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers are often chosen by volunteerism, rotation of turns, or contractual agreements with a teachers' union.

Williams (1981) found a positive correlation between self-concept and student teacher effectiveness. Student teachers listed their cooperating teachers as the chief influence on their self-confidence, whereas pre-student teachers felt the pupils would provide that influence.

The influence of the cooperating teacher increases over time (Friebus, 1977). In the beginning, the student teacher seeks more feedback from the pupils in the classroom, perhaps this is because the cooperating teacher tends not to criticize too much at first. As the knowledge of the student teachers increase, they realize that they cannot get sufficient feedback from their pupils and turn to the cooperating teacher as the greater source of information.

This influence often takes the form of a shift from beliefs or ideals espoused by the teacher education faculty towards
those held by the cooperating teacher. Among the areas subject to this influence are educational philosophy, perceived roles of teachers, adherence to methods, curriculum content, the nature of learners, and the evaluation of students (Jansen, 1971).

The tasks given to a student teacher by his cooperating teacher may help determine the degree to which the student teacher will be influenced and may limit or distort the value of student teaching (O'Brien, 1974). The cooperating teacher in music is often so overworked that the student teacher is immediately pressed into service, often with the worst class. The student teachers do not know the ecology of their classes nor do they have sufficient strategies to change it. Student teachers may never get a chance to work with a large group as the cooperating teacher fears a student director might impede the musical progress of the pupils, especially if contests or major concerts are approaching. The student teacher is basically relegated to non-teaching duties such as roll-taking or band uniform and instrument maintenance. O'Brien recommends that the cooperating teacher be required to develop a syllabus of activities and experiences for the student teaching experience, complete with a schedule and evaluation process, much like any other college course the student teacher would encounter.
A survey of student teachers, supervisors, and cooperating teachers was conducted to enumerate the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher (Grimmett, 1986). It was considered essential that the cooperating teacher develop a well-balanced program of student teaching activities for the student teacher and must share with the student teacher information about pupil abilities.

The university supervisor is generally considered the second most powerful influence upon the student teacher. Often, however, the collegiate music teachers responsible for supervising the student teacher have little or no training for the job and see student teaching supervision as a peripheral part of their duties (Iannaccone, 1963) (D'Arca, 1985). The college music teachers teach others to teach as they were taught, creating a cycle of continued inefficiency and ineffectiveness (Meske, 1987). Concerns are also expressed by several parties that the college music education supervisor have adequate experience as a public school music teacher (Reeves, 1980).

The supervision of student teachers, while frequently a major part of a professor's teaching load, is rarely a significant factor in determining that professor's worth to the college or university or in determining tenure status. In many instances, the supervision of student teachers is assigned to graduate
students or adjunct faculty comprised of retired public school administrators.

McIntyre (1983) wrote that field experiences in teacher education are threatened by the lack of commitment from university personnel, the low status of clinical faculty, and the lack of objective evaluation criteria. The shift of control for field experiences to teacher unions and state legislatures and the lack of relationship between field and campus study are areas urgently in need of attention.

When teacher educators advocate teaching behaviors that do not seem sufficiently relevant to the context in which the student teacher is directed to participate, the student's success is threatened (Hoffman, 1986). The expectations of the university supervisor and the student teacher must be consistent with the capabilities and traditions of the context.

There are apparently, then, one of three roles the university supervisor may assume (Shaver, 1989). Nominal supervision occurs when the supervisor merely chooses to create a facade indicating that some sort of supervision is taking place. Prescriptive supervision is the type where the supervisor feels obligated to find fault with some aspect of the teaching and be able to offer a "quick fix" or prescription to remedy the situation. Reflective supervision is more complicated. It requires an espoused platform of philosophy and technique of education and teaching, a shared control of
the situation between the supervisor and the student teacher, a hypothesis of effect concerning teacher behaviors, and planning/reflecting conferences.

Others suggest that there needs to be a reconceptualization of the role of the university supervisor. Instead of trying to duplicate the role of evaluator that is already performed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor should be proficient and current in interpreting the research on teacher education and spending his time training the cooperating teacher concerning evaluation techniques and the goals and objectives of the university education program (Emans, 1983).

Zimpher (Zimpher, et al., 1980) suggested that the university supervisor does indeed influence the student teacher but perhaps in some less obvious ways. The university supervisor must communicate the goals and expectations of the university's field experience program to the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. At times, in her research, Zimpher found that the cooperating teacher would voice disagreement with goals and expectations but offer no alternatives. Furthermore, it was determined that if the university supervisor had low expectations for the field experience, low performance resulted. The participation of the university supervisor helped ensure that the student teacher would move more gradually from observation time to teaching.
Most cooperating teachers and student teachers saw little need for observation time; their goal usually being to have the student teacher assume full teaching responsibilities within one or two weeks. The university supervisor was more likely to provide constructive criticism and to improve the quality of three-way conversations. In the presence of the university supervisor, these conversations were better focused on educational issues. The university supervisor was seen as the watchdog who guaranteed the completion of university requirements and guaranteed a measure of quality control during student teaching.

Vogt suggests that the widely observed shift from liberal to authoritarian views on the part of the student teacher may be attributed to being caught between opposing viewpoints of the university and the school. When placed in a triadic relationship, there is a tendency for two members to move closer together and exclude the third (Vogt, 1988). The status of being the third member is determined by which person has the least frequent contact with the others. In the case of student teaching this is almost always the university supervisor.

English (1958) studied various activities that helped to prepare students to teach music and from his surveys concluded that the student teaching experience should not occur during the final term of the student's education. He also
concluded that at least one follow-up seminar should be included in the curriculum for the purpose of debriefing the field experience at length and separated from the dailiness of the experience. This would seem one possible way for the university to reestablish itself as the dominant influence on the attitudes, beliefs, and skills of the student teachers.

There are those who would suggest that even when influences exist that change the thinking or behavior of a student teacher, the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor may not be the chief influence. The ecology of the classroom, the ecology of the total school setting, and the ecology of the community exert powerful influences upon the student teacher (Doyle, 1975). Classroom ecology may include the demographics of the class, the class size, the hidden curriculum of the cooperating teacher and others, the academic ability and behavior of the pupils in the class, and the subject(s) being taught. The cooperating teacher, however, does have the ability to modify the ecosystem to some extent to accept new behaviors (Copeland, 1980).

Beyer (1984) found that there was a general tendency for prolonged field experiences to produce and perpetuate strategies that are congruent with existing institutional and professional expectations, strategies compatible with the status quo.
Field experiences have been shown to worsen the attitudes of student teachers toward the children they teach, to develop suspicion of innovative teaching methods, and to create negativism toward theory and research (Joyce, 1988).

The personal characteristics of the student teacher appear to have some effect upon the amount of influence exerted. Gray (1962) found that those students rated higher by their university supervisors tended to change their views of teaching concepts to align with the cooperating teacher more than those students who were rated lower. According to Copeland (1980), the reasons for these shifts are usually attributed to the principles set forth in Bandura's social learning theory (Bandura, 1963). The motivational hierarchy of Maslow could also serve as an explanation for the power of the cooperating teacher's influence. The need to belong or to be accepted precedes the need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1970).

Krueger (1985) found that student teachers' perspectives toward their role were highly influenced by the existing structural organization of the school setting. This structure can include any of the thirty-two significant others mentioned earlier (Karmos and Jacko, 1972) as an individual or in combination. These factors combine to create what has been labeled the bureaucratic socialization of teachers (Hoy and Rees, 1977).
Fukui (1986) claims that this is not learning how to teach, but learning how to student teach. Learning how to student teach involves a different set of skills than teaching. Most noticeably observed of these "student teaching skills" is the ability to second guess the cooperating teacher when decisions are to be made (Mistretta, 1987).

Using four instruments and 35 subjects, Martin (1989) learned that, to a pre-service teacher, success in teaching meant pedagogical knowledge and skills. In examining the development of teaching skills during student teaching, it was found that the skills already understood by the student teacher prior to student teaching were also the skills that were best developed and strengthened.

The realities of student teaching on a daily basis do more to influence a student teacher than a cooperating teacher does (Mahan, 1976). Those realities may include the length of the field experience, the number of cooperating teachers, and the ecology of the school. Student teaching placements need to be examined to find the right balance between the need for a variety in teaching experiences and the need to spend enough time in a given situation to make it meaningful (Hoffer, 1987).

The learning outcomes of the pupils in a classroom do serve as a source of influence on the student teacher (Cross, 1988). While this is less formal, it is equally as important and comes in the form of student responses to assignments and
questions posed in class. Regardless of the feedback student teachers receive from their supervisors or cooperating teachers, they know they have been successful or unsuccessful according to the reactions of their students (Friebus, 1977).

The permanence of any influence is a factor which has received some attention. While Boschee (1978) cites several studies that verify the attitudinal shift of the student teacher toward the attitudinal posture of the cooperating teacher, he maintains that the stress and socialization factors involved in student teaching cause the student to act less freely than he would otherwise. He contends, and is supported by other researchers (Douge, 1984), that when these influences are removed or the ecology is changed, the student will return to previously held beliefs. In examining the philosophical beliefs of student teachers (progressive, perennial, essential, existential, or none) before, during, and after the student teaching experience, Boschee found that the pre-existing philosophical stance was the only predictor of the post-experience stance.

A study of secondary level student teachers revealed that discretely established values were present at the beginning of the field experience and evidenced little change at the end (Nelson, 1972). Instead it was personal variables that were related to educational values. These personal variables include philosophical background, the major field of study, academic
ability, gender, and age. For example, men were more likely to change their educational values as a result of student teaching than women and younger students changed more than older students.

**Evaluation of Student Teachers**

A principal reason for evaluation or assessment in student teaching is to improve teaching and learning. The results of assessment, in whatever form, bear directly on the actions of the student teacher and those charged with the supervision of that teacher. W. Turnbull, president of the Educational Testing Service in 1985, stated that the overriding purpose of gathering data is to provide a basis for improving instruction, rather than keeping score or allocating blame (Cross, 1988). In the student teaching process, the emphasis should be on assessment for improvement, a continuous flow of information, rather than assessment for accountability, a stop-motion, norm-referenced, public event.

In light of these concerns and the increased emphasis on teacher training, the evaluation of student teaching performance becomes more critical. Additionally, these assessments will serve as predictors of success, criteria for entry level hiring, and the need for remedial or additional preparation. The summative evaluation of student teachers
allows decision makers to make judgments about the student teacher's qualifications for teacher certification (Robertson, 1986).

The effective or useful evaluation of student teachers is an area in which researchers seem to be making progress. Research has been conducted to determine when and where evaluation should be conducted, what the content and format of evaluation should be and the strengths and limitations of those persons who provide feedback for evaluation. A wide variety of factors influence the ability of a person to accurately rate the performance of another. It is generally accepted that the purpose of the evaluation influences the accuracy of the appraiser (Hedge, 1988). The instrument or tool used for evaluation, time allowed for observation, situational constraints, and personality of the evaluator have been shown to affect accuracy.

Cross (1988) wrote that the most effective form of assessment is one that is continuous and that occurs as closely as possible to the scene of the action in teaching and learning. Regardless of the format, the assessment of success in field experiences can validate the worth of such activities only in the presence of objective evaluation criteria (McIntyre, 1983).

Evaluation or feedback, whether formal or informal, is considered to be more effective than merely modeling appropriate teacher behaviors (Daresh, 1989). The concept of
clinical supervision, whether it be for experienced teachers or pre-service teachers, is based on the process wherein teaching occurs and then feedback is given from one or more sources. Goals for further improvement are then established along with strategies to achieve those goals.

Three approaches to evaluation have been used over the years either exclusively or in varying combinations. Evaluations can be considered personality based, pupil-progress based, or product-moment based (Brand, 1984). Personality based evaluations include criteria such as ability to get along with others, sense of humor, appearance, and promptness. Pupil-progress based evaluations use measures of pupil achievement to evaluate teaching. Product-moment based evaluation looks at specific teacher behaviors under specific conditions. Those evaluation approaches that see the student teacher in a subjective role (accept criticism and act upon it) often include forms designed to find fault with teaching after it has occurred (Parsons, 1985). Such evaluations tend to cover only the surface aspects of teaching.

Feedback to a student teacher should be closely related to pupil learning (Clark and Bergstrom, 1983). Using learning outcomes of pupils in the classroom and pupil attentiveness as measures of student teacher effectiveness will be the most beneficial agent of change for the teaching behaviors of the student teacher. Even without knowing anything about a
teacher, a supervisor can make judgements about the quality of his or her teaching by observing the teacher's pupils (Acheson, and Gall, 1980). Time spent in evaluation or assessment on such things as personal appearance, promptness, or "voice quality", is not irrelevant but neither is it as helpful as other aspects such as pupil test scores, pupil time on task, and similar considerations.

Fant (1985), conducting a survey of 178 colleges, found that eighty percent used rating scales to evaluate student teachers and fifty percent used multiple types of assessment. She further found that these evaluation forms showed a shift from evaluative criteria such as "attends meetings", "follows school policies", and "sense of humor" to criteria established by effective teaching literature such as clarity of the teacher, on-task behavior of the students, use of feedback, task-oriented climate, a warm and supportive environment, high teacher expectations, and teacher enthusiasm.

Evaluation of the teaching of music, whether as a teacher or student teacher, has changed focus in a similar fashion. Music teachers are not as frequently evaluated on the strength of their ability to present public performances alone. In addition to being evaluated by the same general criteria used for teachers of other disciplines, music teachers are more frequently accountable for specific music teaching skills.
For example, Brand (1986) states that teachers of instrumental music must be competent in tuning an ensemble, rehearsal techniques, error detection and correction, and pacing. The choral music education student must demonstrate knowledge of voice physiology, concept of choral tone, conducting, choral literature, and demonstrate personal musical abilities (Lawrence, 1989). Any evaluation of music teaching, regardless of the format, is most accurate when skills such as these are assessed.

There has been a trend in recent years to evaluate student teachers using multiple assessment approaches (Fant, 1985). The practice of a single evaluation form used during a relatively few number of observations by the college supervisor is gradually being replaced by a larger number of observations using different forms for evaluation. These many evaluations are conducted by university supervisors, cooperating teachers, building administrators, peers of the student teacher, and the student teacher himself. Roughly eighty percent of colleges surveyed used some form of rating scale similar to the Likert Scale to measure observed versus expected behaviors. One half of the colleges use some form of multiple assessment and a lesser percentage also combine the rating scales with measures such as frequency counts of desired teacher behaviors.
A study of evaluation forms used for student teacher performance shows that many have relatively low levels of validity and reliability (Shapiro and Sheehan, 1986). These forms are often lengthy and ambiguous.

Student teachers have voiced the opinion that they prefer conferences prior to teaching wherein the instructional strategies to be used will be discussed with the cooperating teacher (Fukui, 1986). Cooperating teachers would prefer, however, to simply model the desired behaviors rather than explain them.

The use of video tapes is considered valuable to the process of self-evaluation in that student teachers are able to view themselves and recognize behaviors as they occur on tape rather than trying to remember what has happened in the past (Henderson, 1974).

Two other methods shown to be effective in changing the behaviors of student teachers are daily feedback on behavior rates and the training of intern peers and cooperating teachers to assume the role of the university supervisor (Siedentop, 1981). Peer supervisors have been shown to be particularly successful at behavioral observation and evaluation in a data-based competency approach (Dodds, 1975).

There are problems, however, with any evaluation or assessment program used as a part of student teaching. Menges (1988) suggests that the majority of such problems can
be overcome if it can be assured that all parties involved in the evaluation process understand the criteria and terminology to be used. To that end, considerable care needs to be given to insure that the cooperating teacher is familiar with the philosophy and goals of the teacher education program which is entrusting a student teacher to his care. The various components of teacher effectiveness must be understood by all and a reasonable amount of agreement on the relative importance of each component should be formulated.

A primary variable in the accurate assessment of a student teacher is the person(s) who conducts the assessment. Traditionally, student teacher evaluation has been the result of a combined effort of the university/college supervisor and the cooperating public school teacher. In recent years the addition of self- and peer-evaluation have been shown to be effective in the improvement of teaching skills during the field experiences.

There is a limited research base concerning the perception of feedback dependent upon its source, regardless of the medium used to convey it (formal or informal, written, oral or taped). Current research in this area centers upon concerns with the relative importance of any feedback irrespective of the source, the accuracy or validity of feedback according to the source, and inherent problems with feedback from each of the sources. Traditional sources of feedback to
the student teacher include, but are not limited to, the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, a building administrator, the student teacher, peers of the student teacher, and the pupils in the classroom.

Criticism of the university supervisor as an evaluator of student teachers usually centers around the remoteness of the university professor from the daily life of the schools in general and from limited contact with the student teacher in the field.

The reliability and effectiveness of ratings by the university supervisor have been the center of several studies. These supervisors appear to evaluate student teachers reliably and tend to perceive student teachers in terms of two major factors: preparation and presentation (Hattie, 1982). When comparing the university supervisors evaluation scores to scores on the NTE and the Education in Elementary School Specialty Area Test, the ratings of the university supervisor were shown to be a more valid predictor of employment (Brown, 1989).

Furthermore, the university supervisors were shown to encourage their students to participate more frequently in post-observation conferences than cooperating teachers did (Christensen, 1988). Their feedback was evaluative, prompting students to think critically about their teaching whereas
cooperating teachers were more focused on specific events with prescriptive solutions.

The cooperating teacher is often criticized for lacking knowledge sufficient to recognize weaknesses in a teacher's skill and for not being able to verbalize how, when, and why teaching strategies should be used.

Supervisors listed the ability to guide and reflect as an important competency for a cooperating teacher (Copas, 1984). Surveys of student teachers would indicate a need for additional competencies. An extensive survey of student teachers (Farbstein, 1964) produced twenty-seven desired qualities that need to be evident in a cooperating teacher. These include: allowing the student teacher certain freedoms during the experience (to teach alone, to try new methods, etc.); supervisory skills, modeling skills connected with classroom management, subject matter expertise, and individualized instruction skills; personal skills, and social skills.

In a study similar to that of Farbstien, Copas (1984) identified 1,490 cooperating teacher behaviors listed as important by student teachers. These behaviors were then reduced to 28 critical requirements in seven categories: orienting behaviors, inducting behaviors, guiding behaviors, reflecting behaviors, cooperating behaviors, supporting behaviors, and behaviors with children.
The student teachers specifically want their cooperating teachers to help them with orientation to the school ecology and with planning and instruction. They are concerned that the cooperating teacher be skilled in observation of teaching so that constructive feedback and evaluation is evident. The student teachers want to be included in the professional development of the staff member(s) (Grimmett, 1986).

Cooperating teachers often have difficulty in being able to provide appropriate feedback to their student teachers. This is attributed to the fact that often the cooperating teacher is unaware of the desired outcomes of the student teaching program. In the absence of well-documented observations of student teachers based upon pre-determined learning outcomes, cooperating teachers find it difficult to discern student teachers' professional growth (Melnick, 1989).

The expectations of others may influence how a student teacher is perceived to have performed. The cooperating teacher and university supervisor are not without their own biases as to what is the "best" way for a teacher to teach and what of the various effective teaching skills should be considered more important than others. Parsons (1985) writes about the hidden curriculum of student teacher evaluation. Often, the personal quality of student teachers which enable them to assume subjective roles and act upon criticism from authority is seen to be a positive asset. Frequently, evaluation
forms are designed specifically for the cooperating teacher or university supervisor to find fault with the interns' teaching and to show ways of improvement after the teaching has occurred. Hence, the evaluation covers only surface aspects of teaching.

A principal considering the employment of a pre-service graduate may view the evaluations with a slant to his own needs and criteria. Persons in the public and private schools desire new teachers to possess certain competencies and must depend upon the student teaching evaluations to assess the teacher candidates (Galbo, 1986).

In a study to determine if student teachers, their supervisors, and their cooperating teachers agreed about the quality of student teacher performance, Tanner (1986) found that they did indeed agree on areas of difficulty. However, the supervisor and cooperating teacher often disagreed on overall performance. These disagreements often were of a pragmatic versus theoretical nature and left the student teacher feeling caught in between the supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

Stolworthy (1990) discovered that there were no significant differences between the evaluation efforts of 60 pre-service teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors when rating 25 teaching competencies. The greatest differences appeared in matters of professional
appearance and the student teachers' use of resources in planning.

Researchers have provided information that suggests that self-evaluation and peer evaluation are valuable complements to the traditional methods (Grashel, 1984). In one study (Wheeler, 1982), self-evaluations of the student teacher were compared with evaluations completed by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Results showed that student teachers' self-evaluations were significantly higher than either the college supervisors' or cooperating teachers' ratings.

The student teacher would need more preparation for self-evaluation than the practicing professionals (Keith, 1987). Given the limited experiences of student teachers, they will have a smaller number of constructs available by which they measure success. In interviewing student teachers, Friebus (1977) determined that, with regard to who provides a trainee with a sense of what constitutes a successful or failed lesson, there was really no discrepancy. The overwhelming response was that the pupils were the best source.

Student teachers, as stated earlier, have their own needs that must be met before they can accurately evaluate their teaching performances. Therefore, student teachers often see the greatest improvement between the onset of student teaching and the mid-point. The cooperating teacher, on the
other hand, sees the greatest improvement between the mid-
point and the conclusion of student teaching (Johnson, 1985).
Cooperating teachers suggest that the reasons for the earlier
perception of mastery may be that the student teacher had
become integrated into the classroom structure and that non-
teaching duties, more important to the student teacher than
others, were routine by the mid-point.

In a study of 60 pre-service teachers, Kagan (1986)
determined that the cognitive level of pre-service teachers
influenced the way they perceived and interpreted their
teaching competency. Students of higher cognitive ability set
higher standards and were more critical in self evaluations.

Self-evaluations of student teachers have been compared
with the ratings of their cooperating teachers (Briscoe, 1989).
The surveys were compared to determine whether there were
significant differences in the cooperating teachers' evaluations
and in the student teachers' perceptions of their own
performances in the classroom. Findings indicated that there
was a high correlation between the perceptions of both groups.

Saher (1982) found that groups given special training and
practice in handling classroom management problems
perceived themselves to be more effective in teaching than
those who did not. Observers watching the same student
teachers, however, saw no differences between the groups.
Unless the training was insufficient to make a notable
difference in the management skills observed, the results would question the validity of self-evaluation.

Johnson (1985) found that student teachers will view their own teaching with a set of standards perhaps different from others. Peers will evaluate their colleagues with criteria that perhaps are not always applicable to the situation at hand. Regardless of feedback from other sources to the contrary, the student teacher will often use pupil response as the barometer for teaching success.

Unfortunately, using standards of pupil achievement to measure teaching ability can be arbitrary at times. In student teaching, as in regular teaching, they are often based on measures that are not valid indicators of effective teaching. Indeed, one of the major concerns of those opposed to merit pay scales for teachers, based upon pupil achievement, is that teachers will be reluctant to work with pupils whose progress is slow or whose potential is limited. The fear is that the lack of progress will be seen as a direct and major result of poor teaching when, in fact, many other variables contribute to the end results.

In music education the success of performance groups has often been the standard for music teacher evaluation. Those music teachers most highly regarded by the pupils, administrators, colleagues in the building or in the discipline, parents, and the community at large, are usually those who
produce the best performing groups, even at the elementary level. Perhaps this appears nowhere more evident than in the State of Texas, where job attainment and retention are often based upon the results of pupil performances in contests. This could also be the case when evaluating student teachers.

Dramatic qualitative differences occur in the learning context or setting of student teaching. There are dangers when the student teacher accommodates his expectations of self and pupils to the context of the immediate classroom (Holmes, 1986). Instead, he should learn to analyze the realities of a classroom or school and make changes accordingly.

Doss (1987) learned that teachers will also respond and change behaviors as a result of feedback from other sources. One such source of feedback is the grade level of the class being taught. Different classroom teaching behaviors can be found in four grade-level groups. For example, there is a pattern of behaviors which suggests that beginning teachers in the lower grade levels offered praise more often and gave reasons for that praise than teachers in the upper grade levels. Lower-grade level teachers also have higher mean scores on classroom management measures.

In a study on influential factors of classroom management practices exhibited by student teachers, Wellhousen-Pugh (1988) found that the location of student teaching, the number of pupils in the classroom, the grade level
of the classroom, and the socio-economic status of the pupils were predictor variables to student teacher behaviors. In the classrooms where the socio-economic status was low, the student teachers became more custodial and directive than in other situations.

Programs such as TESA (Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement) have been designed to help novice as well as experienced teachers cope with the problem of differential treatment to pupils of lower income families (Steeg, 1982). TESA works to change the number of and improve the quality of positive teacher behaviors in the classroom.

Research also indicates that the self-concept of teachers, especially pre-service teachers, is related to the economic status of the pupils they serve (Smith and Smith, 1979). A group of 64 student teachers in Albuquerque, New Mexico, were placed into two groups: those schools with a high economic status and those with low economic status. In a pre-test, post-test designed experiment, the group of student teachers in the schools with a lower economic status showed a drop in their ratings of self-concept. The lowering of teachers' self concept may, in turn, affect their behavior toward students. The results of altered behaviors toward students may be seen in the achievement of the pupils.

The nature of the context, into which a student teacher must become socialized, will be a variable in the perception of
the student teaching experience (Liebert, 1988). The pupils in
the classrooms can positively or negatively affect the student
teachers' self-perceived development. If classroom
management becomes the overriding concern of the student
teacher, progress in other areas of effective teaching may be
overlooked.

Results from other surveys indicate that teachers, novice
or experienced, see the academic ability of pupils as being only
slightly or very slightly important to teaching success (Garrett,
1978). On one survey, socio-economic status and academic
ability were ranked numbers 19 and 20 respectively on a list
of variables affecting teacher effectiveness. Males, however,
had a tendency to rate these variables higher than females.
Robertson (1986) also failed to find significant changes in
individual teachers as they moved from one grade level to
another or changed to teaching situations with other variables.

Unfortunately, no study was found that specifically
addressed the possibility that within a given student teaching
placement, there may be differences in classroom
characteristics that may affect the accuracy of feedback to the
student teacher or the evaluation of teaching by others.
Problems of the Beginning Teacher

The ultimate goal of any teacher education program, regardless of its structure and content, is to produce persons who are ready to assume their places in the teaching profession. The creation of new programs with induction-year, apprentice, or probationary status for graduates of teacher education programs upon accepting their first employment suggests that there is a perceived need for more and continued training of the novice teacher. The desire to require further training may be a result of problems frequently observed during the first years of teaching. Study of these problems has continued for some time.

Gomez (1990) felt that much of the research on the problems of beginning teachers failed to look at the root causes and solutions to those problems, namely the teacher education program. Typical studies are initiated in the fall when a novice teacher begins employment and do not take into consideration student teaching and other pre-service experiences. There is seldom a connection between the challenges that a novice teacher faces and the strengths and weaknesses of his teacher education program and experiences. Gomez felt that various teachers may need different types of help depending upon their undergraduate program. Factors such as academic
emphasis, time spent on classroom management techniques, cultural and racial make-up of the college, and other factors may create unique problems for the different beginning teachers.

In their extensive review of research on the problems of first-year teachers, Johnston and Ryan (1980) examined the types of problems defined by research over a period of years. From the 1930's through the 1950's they repeatedly reported similar findings. The problems of first-year teachers included management skills, school equipment needs, student needs, and student motivation. They cite research by Drophin and Taylor in 1963 which lists the problems of beginning teachers as being discipline, parental relations, methods, evaluation, planning, materials and resources, and routines.

At first, the purpose of identifying these problems was to improve the supervision of beginning teachers. In the 1960's and 1970's the research focus shifted to identifying personality traits or characteristics that could predict success or failure in the early teaching years. By the end of the 1970's, challenged by the research of Cruickshank and Broadbent, the teacher education program became the center of attention for research that sought to reduce the problems of the first-year teacher (Johnston, 1980).

Within the teacher education program there are several areas which, if properly administered and assessed, could
identify potential problems for the beginning teacher and seek to remediate those problems. Johnston (1981) cautions that much knowledge about such problems and programs to remediate them is based mainly on opinions of experienced teachers and administrators, and surveys of current practice.

The types of studies concerning the problems of beginning teachers and solutions to those problems include: problems of teaching beginning teachers; psychological aspects of teachers; evaluation and follow-up studies; classroom management skills of beginning teachers; qualitative descriptions of beginning to teach (Johnston, 1981).

Cruickshank (1981) listed entry-level teachers' problems as being those of affiliation, control, parent relationships, student success, and time. Cruickshank was one of the first researchers to ask the beginning teachers themselves to identify problems. Defining a problem as a goal-response interference, he developed a teacher problem checklist to be completed. For example, if a teacher had to spend ten minutes discussing inappropriate social behavior with a student, that activity would have interfered with other goals set aside for that time. These problems, which he labeled affiliation, control, parent relationships, student success, and time, were found to be relatively stable from one beginning teacher to the next. He also found that some types of problems could be related to teacher personality, and that the problems were not unlike
those experienced by workers entering other fields. In later research, Cruickshank (1986) learned that while beginning teachers in some difficult schools saw the same problems more frequently, they did not consider those problems to be more difficult. Gordon (1990) categorizes the problems as inadequate instructional resources, difficult work assignments, unclear expectations, isolation, role conflict, and reality shock.

The type of pre-service supervision can affect the problem-solving techniques used by first-year teachers (Murphy, 1988). Twenty first year teachers were interviewed to determine the significant problems they encountered, the action to solve those problems that was taken, whether those actions reflected a rationalized technique or reflective problem-solving approach, and the relationship between student teaching evaluations and problem-solving techniques. Findings concluded that clinical supervision during student teaching produced better problem solving skills for the first-year teacher.

Summary. The issues of student teaching addressed in this review included: the efficacy of a student teaching program or other major field experience, the placement of a major field experience component within a certification program, the influences upon a student teacher, effective evaluation of student teachers, and the problems faced by a beginning teacher.
The literature suggests that field experiences such as student teaching are an important part of the teacher education process. Most student teachers see the student teaching experience as more beneficial than coursework and teacher educators feel student teaching is beneficial in helping the student of teaching to transfer theory into practice. Problems occur when the practices encountered in a field experience replace rather than complement the theoretical bases.

Research is limited as to which type of teacher education program, traditional, extended, or alternative, if any, is more effective. This is due in part to the fact that extended programs such as five-year undergraduate programs, internships, or five-year graduate programs, as well as alternative programs are relatively new and sufficient time has not elapsed to conduct long-term, follow-up studies. One finding that is gradually being confirmed is that persons who student teach as a part of a master's degree program tend to be more competent and remain longer in the profession than traditionally or alternatively certificated personnel. There appear to be no differences in the groups academically.

Research on the influences upon a student teacher point to the cooperating teacher as being the strongest influence, followed by the university supervisor. Other factors or persons that exert influence upon the student teacher include the ecology of the student teaching situation, peers, building
principals, other classroom teachers, and even persons not directly connected to the situation, such as family. A general shift in the beliefs and practices of the student teacher while in the field experience has been shown to occur. This is usually a shift away from the views held by the teacher education institution to the views held by the cooperating teacher and feedback from the classroom ecology. There is evidence, however, that this shift is not permanent and that beliefs and practices will adjust again as new situations are encountered.

Evaluation of or feedback on a student teacher's performance comes in several forms. More effective evaluation is that which is immediate, relevant, and reflective. In the absence of feedback from traditional sources, such as the cooperating teacher or supervisor, it has been shown that the student teacher will look to peers, pupils, or others as a source. It has also been shown that as a student teacher matures, he seeks different sources for feedback or evaluation.

Studies of the problems of first year teachers now point to the teacher education program as a possible source. For example, the type of supervision and evaluation encountered during student teaching may affect the problem solving skills of the first-year teacher.
CHAPTER III

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF
CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS ON EVALUATION
OF STUDENT TEACHING

Introduction.

As stated by Koehler (1985) in the previous chapter, the study of teacher education has been relatively limited. The principal causes of these limitations are lack of time on the part of the researcher and lack of funding which would provide for long-term and follow-up studies as well as ensure a sufficiently large sample. In addition, experiments must be designed that allow the researcher to do more than survey the current status of programs and interview the persons involved to solicit their perceptions of events and circumstances. A goal of this sample study is to show that if such limitations could be removed, studies can be designed that can examine variables in the student teaching process and contribute to a stronger knowledge base in teacher education.
The research question considered in this study was formulated from issues previously discussed in Chapter Two. Briefly summarized, these tenets are that effective teaching is a contributing factor to quality education/schools. There are measurable effective teaching skills which are universal to all teachers and other skills which are unique to teaching disciplines such as music. Student teaching is a universal, if not always effective, part of the teacher education process. There are many variables within the context of student teaching that may affect the perception of teacher competencies on the part of the student teacher, the supervisor, or the cooperating teacher.

The need for an accurate assessment within a given student teaching experience becomes evident as demand for better teachers in the public schools increases. The validity of field experiences such as student teaching, as well as the structure, format, and timing of those experiences, are best determined through appropriate assessments.

It is difficult to isolate the numerous variables involved in the assessment of student teaching. Systematic research into as many variables as possible, however, may help provide the best possible situations for field experiences. These experiences should provide the student teachers with clear and accurate assessment of their strengths and weaknesses and
provide prospective employers with useful evaluations of their
potential as teachers.

Specifically, this study would seek to answer the
following questions:

1. Do student teachers or professional observers rate
various effective teaching skills differently when observing
classes of differing characteristics?

2. Are the overall self-ratings of student teachers
different when observing classes of differing characteristics?

3. Are the overall ratings by professional raters different
when observing classes of differing characteristics?

4. Is there is a significant difference between ratings of
teaching when observing less problematic classes when
compared to ratings of more problematic classes?

The characteristics of a given music class vary widely
from one to the next. Size of the class, age of the pupils,
performance group or general music format, academic and
musical ability of the pupils, existence of private instruction,
and required versus elective status contribute to this variety.
If such variables do alter the perception of effective teaching
skills, problems are created that need to be addressed.

These problems are perhaps of more importance to the
music teacher than to teachers in other disciplines when one
considers the nature of the typical music teaching position. The
individual music teaching position often spans all twelve years
of public school grades and seldom encompasses less than the number of grades within a given building. It is highly unlikely that any music teacher will deal with less than two grade levels. In some areas, music for pre-school classes has also become a part of the elementary music teacher's assignment. The music specialist is usually expected to provide instruction for students with wide varieties of ability. Most elementary and middle school positions require the music educator to provide instruction for all developmentally and physically disabled classes, for gifted students, and for the general school populace. Performance classes, general classes, small ensembles, and extra-curricular groups comprise the bulk of a music teacher's load. Frequently, especially in smaller districts, these classes are not divided along the areas of general, vocal, and instrumental music but are a combination of two or more areas.

Student teachers in music are generally placed in such an assignment currently functioning in the public schools. Depending upon the exposure to all or part of a given teaching situation, then, it seems possible that a student teacher could get a distorted picture of what music teaching is.

The timing of student teaching within a school year may affect the perceptions of the student teacher. The band or choral student teacher whose principal field experience comes in the spring may leave for his first teaching job without
realizing the extent of the teaching process that established rehearsal procedures, taught instrumental technique, or refined other aspects that by spring have become habit for the pupils. So too, a misconception is possible by the student teacher who is assigned only the less-skilled music classes by the cooperating teacher because that teacher is unwilling to relinquish the responsibility for instruction of the top group to the student teacher.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The review of literature for this sample study covers three areas, corresponding to the three main aspects relevant to conducting this study. First, in order to establish content validity for a form to evaluate the performance of student teachers in music, the qualities of effective teachers in music and other fields were reviewed. Secondly, a review of the research on the ability of a classroom teacher to evaluate the characteristics or abilities of a classroom was the basis for the decision to use classroom teacher input to describe the differences among classes within a student teaching setting. Finally, research that identifies classroom variables that influence perceptions of student teaching is examined. More specifically, problems with the classroom ecology of the student
teaching setting and problems with sources of feedback to the student teacher are discussed.

The effective teacher. As research in education has begun to show that teaching indeed does make a difference in pupil learning, the efforts to define the competencies and traits of the effective teacher have increased. Depending upon which of several authors one chooses to read, the number and labels for effective competencies and traits will differ.

Woolfolk (1989) discusses much of the current effective teaching research and distills it into five major components: knowledge of subject matter, knowledge of teaching skills or strategies, organization, clarity, and warmth and enthusiasm. Strengths in any one of these areas alone is not sufficient for improved student learning. A combination of all is necessary.

Fant (1985) writes that effective teaching is always related to the subject, the grade and the pupil. In addition, the teacher must give evidence of clarity when teaching, strive for on-task behavior of pupils, demonstrate the proper use of feedback, develop a task-oriented environment that is warm and supportive, maintain high expectations of pupils, and show flexibility, adaptiveness, and enthusiasm. She claims that this composite represents criteria established by effective teaching research. These criteria, she notes, are a shift from evaluative standards such as: attends meetings, follows school policies, sense of humor, or voice quality.
Calling effective teaching a pro-active approach to discipline, VanDerveer (1989) looked for quality plans, subject matter integrity and knowledge, pacing, discipline, and assertiveness, when evaluating a teacher.

Griffin (1986) writes extensively on the concept of the ideal teacher. The ideal teacher is seen as a leader and authority figure, a diagnostician of the pupils' cognitive and behavioral problems, and an expert on subject matter. In addition, the ideal teacher is able to interact with others in the school and community, he understands the importance of the home in a child's education, and values the importance of the teacher in the process. Siedentop (1983) succinctly describes the effective teacher as one who engages pupils in appropriate activities for an optimal amount of time at a high rate of success.

While there is little argument that any of these approaches to the definition of an effective teacher has merits, it must be understood that any given teaching situation, according to age-level and/or subject matter, will require additional competencies in order to be effective. Within the wide range of discipline known as music education there are several sub-disciplines that call for special competencies on the part of the teacher and yet there are many that are the same.

The effective music teacher, like any other teacher, is one who is able to bring about the desired learning outcomes.
Manny Brand (1984), in preparing a summary of music teacher effectiveness research, determined that this was a combination of intellect and intent upon the part of the teacher. He acknowledged that at times pupils will learn desirable concepts or skills that were not a part of the teacher's intended instruction. Care must be taken to avoid giving credit for effective teaching when the impetus for learning was some other source. He further stated that there are not sufficient measures to assess the broad range of desired musical outcomes.

When music teachers were asked to rate desired competencies their responses differed according to subject areas. Choral music educators listed their three most important competencies as musicianship, the ability to detect pitch and rhythmic errors, and the strategies to correct those errors. The general music specialist cited creativity, pacing, and enthusiasm as the three most important qualities of the effective teacher. Finally, instrumental teachers listed a basic knowledge of all instruments and classroom management skills as being of prime importance (Brand, 1984).

In a later study, Brand (1986) discussed the following skills he feels are necessary to be successful teaching music: skills in rehearsal technique that include warm-ups and tuning, the ability to diagnose and correct errors, knowledge of motivational techniques, the ability to create and use
appropriate analogies, pacing, and commanding student attention.

In instructing a principal on how to evaluate a music teacher, Merrion and Larsen (1986) caution that more should be considered than classroom management skills and public programs. The successful or effective elementary classroom music teacher should be one who provides a variety of activities in a variety of musical media and styles. There should be a high level of student participation evident in the classroom and different instructional modes (group and individual). The teachers should use strategies that include the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. They should be competent in all of the general teaching skills and display a high level of personal musicianship.

Lawrence (1989) divides the music teaching competencies she feels essential to the effective choral director into three categories: personal, musical, and pedagogical. The personal characteristics of an effective choral director include energy and enthusiasm, acting ability, concern for others, and a good self-concept. The musical knowledge of the effective choral director is comprised of a working knowledge of voice physiology, a concept of choral tone, conducting technique, and knowledge of the appropriate literature. The pedagogical competencies would include planning and organizational skills, motivational techniques, and classroom management.
Classroom teachers' abilities to rate students. For the purpose of this study, it was decided to ask the cooperating teachers to rate all of the classes within their teaching assignments to determine the overall abilities of each class. This method was chosen over using composite grade-point ratios of the students or test scores because it was felt sufficient information could not be determined to categorize the classes, especially in music. Aspects such as class size, elective or required status, performing ensembles or general music classes, and mainstreaming of disabled students, could also affect the difficulty of a given situation within an assignment.

In a study involving teacher ratings of 205 students, it was determined that, when compared with those same students' standardized test scores, apparently teachers' perceptions of their students are consistent. Teacher ratings, then, can be considered a feasible way to measure child classroom behavior (Solomon, 1977) Through the development of the Teacher's Assessment of Student Achievement Form (Gomes, 1976) it was determined that concurrent validity of teacher ratings could be established with the Battery of Tests of Differential Aptitude (BTAD).

Thus it has been shown that teachers can accurately describe the students or classes they teach. It can be assumed
from the literature that the teachers' ratings of academic and musical achievement and potential will be accurate. Further, the cooperating teachers are a reliable source of general information concerning the status and size of the classes in the student teaching setting that cannot be determined through composite test scores or grade point averages.

**Classroom variables that influence perceptions of student teaching.** The relative success of the student teaching experience seems to depend upon three related factors: the needs and interests of the student teacher, the characteristics of the laboratory situation, and the attitudes of the school and community (Stratemeyer and Lindsey, 1958). The person(s) making the field placement should be confident that the normal interests and abilities of the pupil-group are those which provide the experiences needed by the student teacher. A cooperating teacher must learn to relate the needs of the student teacher to the activities of the classroom.

Regardless of the setting, the student teacher must be allowed to gradually assume the full responsibilities of a teacher (Merrill and Schuchman, 1983). Relegating student teachers to tasks chiefly clerical or menial in nature (or assigning no such tasks), giving student teachers responsibility for only part of the classes (good or bad), failing to include them in the activities of the entire staff, or refusing to allow a
certain degree of autonomy in planning, methods, and assessment can create an incomplete atmosphere that prohibits student teachers from realizing their strengths and weaknesses, effectively defeating the purpose of student teaching.

A follow-up study of 151 recent graduates of a small liberal-arts college found the employment location (Idaho, California, Oregon, and Washington) was a variable in self-rating of teaching competencies (Frame, 1990). All students surveyed felt that they were competent in planning, and rated their training as good. However, abilities to discipline, abilities to understand diverse students, and empathy were related to geographic location. Some student teachers were not exposed to diverse settings during their field experiences. Those student teachers who encountered students of diverse cultures or abilities during their first year of teaching were likely to feel more inadequate than those who had yet to deal with such groups of students.

Several years ago, Fox (1964) recognized the importance of diversity in placement of student teachers but felt that the first experiences should be in the best schools possible before the student teacher began to move among situations of varying quality. His opinions were reached after having surveyed fifty student teachers concerning their experiences. These student teachers also felt that the first contacts in the field should be in
settings philosophically akin to those of the teacher training institution. Care should be made to pair student teachers with cooperating teachers of similar views.

To that end, the cooperating teacher should be expected to approach the student teaching experience as a formal class and prepare a syllabus complete with assignments delineated for the student teacher (O'Brien, 1974). There are four consecutive phases to the student teaching process: orientation, observation, practice lessons, and teaching the full assignment.

The sources of feedback may influence perceptions of the student teaching experience. In his model of teaching, Porter (1988) describes how short-term outcomes, as a result of teachers actions, will in turn affect the teachers' knowledge and beliefs upon which they will base future actions. The short-term outcomes are described as pupils' immediate responses (attention, interest, information processing competencies, etc.) and the teachers' perceptions of how their actions affected those pupil responses. Thus a cycle is created in which the teachers use previously acquired knowledge to determine what action to take in the classroom. The immediate feedback from the students (controlled to some extent by long-term factors such as motivation and aptitude) will cause the teachers to perceive the effectiveness of their actions in that situation and
perhaps alter their pre-existing beliefs about what should happen during instruction.

Recognizing that "temporary coalitions" occur among individuals with differing goals in a common situation, Liebert (1988) conducted an ethnographic study to determine the socialization factors of student teaching. In addition to the personalities of the persons involved, student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor, the context in which student teaching took place was shown to be an influence. Pupils in the classroom can affect the student teacher's development if behavior and classroom management become the dominant issues. When the pupils in the classroom shared with the student teacher the operative rules of the classroom the effect was positive.

McEwen (1990) conducted a study with teachers of business education. Fifty-one students participated in the study wherein information was gathered relating to problematic situations through a questionnaire completed by the cooperating teachers. The success of the student teachers was measured by college grades and student teaching evaluations. The best predictors of success in student teaching were found to be classroom management and subject matter competence. Problems related to those areas tended to negatively affect student teacher performance. Age, gender, class size, and the number of preparations within the field
setting had minimal effect on the nature or extent of problems encountered by the student teacher.

A study was conducted to determine effects of the socio-economic status of the pupils upon the student teachers. (Smith and Smith 1979) Sixty-four student teachers were randomly divided into two groups and randomly assigned to schools labeled "heights" and "valleys". These schools were categorized according to geographic locations. Heights schools were those in which a majority of student census cards listed the parents as white collar workers or professionals. The valley schools all met Title I poverty guidelines. The results led the researchers to conclude that a student teacher assigned to a low socioeconomic area school may be working with children whose achievement level causes the student teacher to feel a failure.

Studying the effect of several variables of pupil-control ideology on the part of the student teacher, Wellhousen-Pugh (Wellhousen-Pugh, 1988) used both qualitative and statistical methods. A regression model was designed for seven predictor variables which included the economic status of the classroom pupils. Analysis of variances was conducted to see if a difference existed between the ideology of the student teacher and that of the cooperating teacher. Finally, the critical incident technique was used to determine why those differences occurred. Among the results germane to this study, was the conclusion that student teachers attitudes toward pupil
control became more custodial as the economic level of pupils in the classroom declined.

The learning outcomes of the pupils also serve as feedback for a teacher (Cross, 1988). While results of formal tests and assignments will cause a teacher to change direction, less formal but equally important feedback comes during the immediacy of the classroom when students respond to assignments and questions posed during instruction.

The influences upon the student teacher concerning self-concept and perceived effectiveness change as time progresses. A pre-student teacher will look to pupils as the primary source for feedback while a student teacher in the field sees the cooperating teacher as the major influence, followed by the pupils (Williams, 1981). Less experienced teachers depend more on student feedback than more experienced teachers (Tuckman, & Oliver, 1968).

Perhaps, as the knowledge base of the teacher increases he realizes that the nature of the feedback he needs is greater than the pupils in the class can provide and thus he turns to professional sources for influence (Friebus, 1977). Student teachers also may rely on pupil feedback because they believe that interpreting feedback from students is a skill they will need to survive the early years of teaching.

Researchers looking into medical internships have noticed a similar phenomenon. Interns who trained in community
hospitals and were isolated from routine contact with their medical trainers often looked to individuals not in their occupation (e.g., nurses and patients) for definitions of how doctors should behave (Munford, 1970). Perhaps the isolation from university personnel and peers, combined with limited time available for reflection with the cooperating teacher, cause the student teacher to place undue emphasis upon the feedback received from students.

If indeed the perceived effectiveness of a music student teacher can be influenced by the context in which the experience is taken, student teaching placements need to be examined to find the right balance between the need for variety in teaching experiences and the need to spend enough time in a given situation to make it meaningful (Hoffer, 1987).

**METHOD**

**Sample:** The sample for this study was taken from student teachers who volunteered to participate in the research. Student teachers participating were students from The Ohio State University and Youngstown State University. The study was conducted during the winter, spring, and fall quarters of 1991. Twenty-eight students volunteered to participated in the study. However, for a variety of reasons, only seven subjects completed all phases the experiment.
The subjects and their respective areas of student teaching represented a wide range of music education settings. Examples were included from urban and suburban schools. The courses covered included instrumental and vocal music at all levels as well as general music classes at the elementary and middle school levels.

Each subject attended a presentation by the researcher who spoke to them of the activities they would need to perform to be a part of the experiment without revealing the final research question to be probed. Thus the subjects were blind to the purpose but not the procedures of the experiment.

The subjects then were given the opportunity to volunteer for the project and asked to sign a permission slip (see Appendix A) to use their tapes and evaluation forms for the study. It was made clear that participation or non-participation would in no way affect the grade the student teacher would receive for the course.

**Instruments:** Two instruments were developed for the purpose of this pilot study. The Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics form (see appendix B) was developed to assess relative competencies and difficulties among classes within a music teaching assignment. The categories used to determine these characteristics included the size, time of day, type (band, string, choral, or general music) and grade level of the class, student economic status, academic and social
behaviors, musical background of the pupils, and presence of mainstreamed, disabled pupils.

This form was submitted to twenty-two graduate students enrolled in the Introduction to Research In Music Education class at the Ohio State University during the Winter Quarter of 1991. These music educators were currently in the field of public school music education. An item-by-item, expert validity check was performed on the content of the form. No question or aspect of the form which failed to receive an agreement average of 3.5 or better on the Likert Scale appeared on the final form. (See appendices C and D.) Results of this validation of the form caused one item to be deleted from the final form.

The Evaluation of Teaching form was developed for this study using the following concepts of effective teaching as a framework for areas of evaluation: knowledge of subject matter, knowledge of teaching strategies, organization, clarity, enthusiasm. Within the five categories are a total of twenty-two statements that describe appropriate music teacher behaviors. Evaluation of those behaviors was indicated by a Likert Scale rating.

Since it is improbable that every possible music teacher behavior would be evident in a single lesson, space was provided to determine if the behavior was observed. If a specific behavior was observed, it was rated. If a specific
behavior was not observed, the evaluator was asked to decide if that particular behavior was not applicable or should have been observed.

The persons completing the evaluation form other than the student teacher were also asked to give a confidence rating for each of their ratings to determine their belief that their ratings would accurately describe the characteristics of the student teacher.

Finally, written comments beyond the structure of the form were encouraged.

**Procedure:** Upon receipt of the permission forms from the subjects, the researcher sent the cooperating teacher(s) of the subjects several copies of the *Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics* form to be completed by the cooperating teachers for each class in which the student teacher worked. The completed forms were then returned directly to the researcher via postage-paid return mail.

Upon receiving the *Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics* forms from the cooperating teachers, the individual Likert-scale ratings for each item on the form were then totaled and an average rating for each class within a situation was calculated. This average was then compared with averages from the other classes within the same situation. In most situations the highest and lowest rated classes scored at
least one standard deviation above or below the mean for the classes in a given student teaching assignment. (See Appendix F.)

As stated earlier, research by Cruickshank (1981) defined a teaching problem as any factor that interfered with the attainment of a goal set by the teacher. The factors included in the Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics form describe the typical problems that might be encountered in a music classroom: time of day, required versus elective, performance versus general, class size, evidence of private instruction, and so on. The average score taken from information on this form is meant to describe the more or less problematic situations that occur within one given situation. While a class of beginning instrumentalists may seem problematic to a teacher whose main responsibility is high school band, that same class may not seem problematic to a music teacher whose assignment perhaps involves mainly required general music courses. However, most student teachers will have experiences with only one or two settings and these limited experiences would limit their abilities to determine relative problematic situations.

In this study, classes within a given situation will be referred to as more problematic and less problematic. For the sake of brevity in tables, the terms "more" and "less" will be used.
The subjects were asked to prepare a video tape of a lesson for the class that was rated the most problematic in their teaching assignment and another video tape of the class that was rated the least problematic within their assignment. (The subjects did not see the Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics forms after their completion, nor were they told why specific classes were chosen for video taping.) In all cases, the taping never occurred before the eighth week in a ten-week quarter. It was necessary to delay the taping to that point in order to allow for a stable and predictable pattern of teaching responsibility to be established. This late date in the Spring Quarter caused the loss of some subjects as many music classes apparently had ceased to provide instruction as much as one or two weeks prior to the closing of school.

The subjects then viewed the video tapes they had made and evaluated the teaching experiences viewed by completing the Evaluation of Teaching form. When the subjects had completed the self-evaluation, the tapes and the completed forms were returned to the researcher.

The tapes were next forwarded to two doctoral students in music education serving as professional raters who viewed the tapes and completed the same Evaluation of Teaching forms that were done by the subjects. Like the subjects, the graduate student evaluators were blind to the purpose of the experiment.
**Data Analysis:** The first step in the analysis of data was to establish a reliability between the two observers who viewed the tapes of the student teachers. For the purposes of this study, a percentage of agreement formula was used. Each of the twenty-two questions, on all fourteen tapes was examined for agreement or disagreement between the observers. A total of 308 agreement points were checked. If the numbers were exactly the same at any given point, it was counted as two agreement points. If the numbers were within one of each other (e.g. 2 and 3) one agreement point was given. If the numbers were two apart (e.g. 1 and 3), one disagreement point was given. When the numbers were more than two apart (e.g. 1 and 4) two disagreement points were given. When neither observer recorded a rating at any given point because they did not observe the behavior, it was considered an agreement point. When one observer rated a behavior while the other observer failed to observe that same behavior it was counted as one disagreement. The formula for determining the percentage of agreement was constructed so that the percentage of agreement was equal to the number of agreements divided by the number of agreements plus disagreements \( \%A = \frac{A}{A+D} \).
A question-by-question analysis of how the student teachers and observers rated the more and less problematic classes was made. Mean scores of the seven student teachers' ratings were compared between their more and less problematic classes. Mean scores of the observer ratings were also compared between the more and less problematic classes and then with the ratings of the student teacher. A descriptive analysis of the entire evaluation form was completed that compared the student teachers among themselves, the observers among themselves, and finally the two groups together as they rated the high and low classes.

Data were then analyzed using the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Rank Test. This non-parametric measure was used to look for significant differences between the more or less problematic rated classes as they appeared in the effective teaching categories on the evaluation form: knowledge of subject matter, knowledge of teaching strategies, organization, clarity, and enthusiasm.

The Wilcoxon test was again used to test for significant differences between more and less problematic class ratings by student teachers across the entire content of the evaluation and by the observers across the entire content of the evaluation.

A two-tailed t-test was used to compare the more or less problematic class ratings across the entire evaluation form.
combining the ratings of both the student teachers and the observers.

Discussion of the observers' confidence level ratings and written comments on teaching concluded the data analysis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Inter-rater agreement. Two music education doctoral candidates served as professional raters for this study. Each rater viewed and evaluated all completed tapes independently. Inter-rater agreement was established using a percentage-of-agreement formula on each question of each evaluation, giving a total of 308 points to check for agreement. Using the procedure described in Chapter III (\( \% = \frac{A}{A+D} \)), a percentage of inter-rater agreement of 73% was calculated for the evaluations of the less problematic classes and a percentage of inter-rater agreement of 69% was found for the evaluation of the classes rated more problematic. A total inter-rater agreement of 71% was reached. (See Table 1.)

For the purposes of this study, the inter-rater agreement was deemed sufficient to combine the ratings of both raters into a single, mean professional rater score. This mean rating was then used for the remainder of the data analysis to represent rater data.
TABLE 1. Inter-Rater Percentage of Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Inter-Rater Agreement Percentage = 71%
Analysis of individual questions. An examination of the mean ratings given by the student teachers for each question indicates that on fifteen of twenty-two questions the student teachers rated themselves lower when teaching the classes designated as more problematic than they rated themselves when teaching the classes rated less problematic. On three questions, they recorded no difference. On four questions, the mean rating of the student teachers was higher for the more problematic class than it was for the less problematic class (See Table 2). The distribution of instances wherein the student teachers rated themselves higher on the less problematic class than on the more problematic class appears to be even throughout the effective teaching categories. There was one instance in each category where such a rating failed to occur and only in one category, knowledge of teaching strategies, were there three instances in which the student teachers failed to rate themselves higher on the less problematic class than on the more problematic class.

The student teachers collectively rated themselves higher while teaching the more problematic classes in the areas of student involvement in the lesson (teaching strategy question #4); appropriate classroom management skills (teaching strategy question #6); providing appropriate feedback to social
skills (teaching strategy question #9); and use of vocabulary (clarity question #1).

The mean difference in ratings wherein the student teachers rated themselves higher on the more problematic class than they did on the less problematic class was 0.15. The largest such difference, 0.18, was on the teaching strategy question (#9) which observed appropriate feedback for social behavior. The smallest such difference, 0.09, was in the teaching strategy question (#4), student involvement in the lesson.

The student teachers saw little difference in their ability to detect errors in students' answers on questions of musical knowledge (subject matter question #3); their expectations for social behavior (clarity question #3); and their enthusiasm for music (enthusiasm question #1).

The mean difference between the ratings of the less and more problematic classes by the student teachers when the more problematic classes received the lowest rating was 0.27 on a five-point Likert scale. The largest such difference was 0.5 on the teaching strategy question (#2) that dealt with the student teacher's ability to provide appropriate activities for pupils in the affective domain. The smallest such difference, 0.06, was recorded on the question in the category of enthusiasm (#3), sensitivity to the individual needs of the students.
An examination of the mean ratings given by the raters for each question indicates that on nineteen of twenty-two questions the raters rated the student teachers lower when teaching the classes designated as more problematic than they rated them when teaching the classes rated less problematic. On three questions, the mean rating of the student teachers by the raters was higher for the more problematic class than it was for the less problematic class (See Table 2). The distribution of instances wherein the student teachers were rated higher on the less problematic class than on the more problematic class appears to be even throughout the effective teaching categories. There was one instance each in three of five categories where such a rating failed to occur.

The raters rated the student teachers higher when the student teachers were teaching the more problematic classes in the areas of error detection skills (subject matter question #2); appropriate use of academic materials, teaching aids, and classroom instruments (teaching strategy question #5); and providing appropriate feedback to social skills (teaching strategy question #9).

The mean difference between the ratings of the less and more problematic classes by the raters, when the more problematic classes received the lowest rating, was 0.32 on a five-point Likert scale. The largest such difference was 0.76 on the teaching strategy question (#3) that dealt with the student
teacher's ability to provide appropriate activities for pupils in the psychomotor domain. The smallest such difference, 0.01, was recorded on the question in the category of knowledge of teaching strategy (#8), timely and appropriate feedback on student musical behavior.

The mean difference in ratings wherein the raters rated the student teachers higher on the more problematic class than they did on the less problematic class was 0.2. The largest such difference, 0.55, was on the subject matter question (#2) which observed error detection in the musical performance of students. The smallest such difference, 0.02, was in the teaching strategy question (#9), appropriate feedback for pupils' social behavior. (See Table 2.)

In summary of individual question analyses, both the student teachers and the raters rated various teaching skills higher when the student teachers were observed in less problematic classroom situations. The raters did this more frequently than the student teachers and with greater differences in the ratings. There appears to be no one of the five categories of effective teaching in which the ratings do not follow the same tendency.
Table 2. Mean Ratings by Student Teachers and Raters for Each Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Subject Matter:</th>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Teaching Strategies:</th>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Student Teacher</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization:

| 1          | Less     | 1.14    |         | 2.21  |
|            | More     | 1.57    |         | 2.29  |
| 2          | Less     | 1.14    |         | 2.00  |
|            | More     | 1.50    |         | 2.36  |

Clarity:

| 1          | Less     | 1.86    |         | 2.12  |
|            | More     | 1.71    |         | 2.29  |
| 2          | Less     | 1.43    |         | 2.43  |
|            | More     | 1.67    |         | 2.79  |
| 3          | Less     | 2.00    |         | 1.75  |
|            | More     | 2.00    |         | 2.33  |
| 4          | Less     | 2.00    |         | 2.29  |
|            | More     | 2.33    |         | 2.73  |
Table 2 continued

Enthusiasm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall mean score from the student teachers for their performance while teaching the less problematic class was 1.52 with a range of 1.11. While teaching more problematic class, however, they gave themselves a mean score of 1.67 with a range of 1.13. (See table 3.)

Table 3. Comparison of Student Teacher Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( X_1 ) : More</th>
<th></th>
<th>( X_2 ) : Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>167.227</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>31.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>6.381</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>6.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>895.603</td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td>17.898</td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td>20.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>3679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td>634041</td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td>529162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 NOTE: In each of the following tables, the statistics were figured using the Stat-View SE+Graphics\textsuperscript{TM} computer program. Data in program must be in whole numbers, so all Likert scale averages were multiplied by 100 to avoid decimals.
The mean score for the less problematic classes as determined by the raters was 2.18 with a range of 1.17. They rated the more problematic classes on a mean score of 2.42 with a range of 1.08 (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Comparison of Professional Rater Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X₂ : More</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242.318</td>
<td>23.228</td>
<td>4.952</td>
<td>539.561</td>
<td>9.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5331</td>
<td>1303129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X₁ : Less</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219.318</td>
<td>27.681</td>
<td>5.902</td>
<td>766.227</td>
<td>12.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4803</td>
<td>1064673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the ratings of all questions as observed by the student teachers and the observers were combined the less problematic classes received a mean score of 1.85 with a range of 1.56. The mean score for the more problematic classes was 2.04 with a range of 1.88. (See Table 5.)
Table 5. Comparison of All Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X₁: More</th>
<th>X₂: Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>204.773</td>
<td>185.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td>46.297</td>
<td>44.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>6.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>2143.436</td>
<td>1983.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td>22.609</td>
<td>24.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>9010</td>
<td>8146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td>1937170</td>
<td>1593410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of these three analyses, by student teachers, by raters, and combined scores, the more problematic classes received a lower mean score than the less problematic classes. Raters scored all classes lower than student teachers did. The raters also showed a wider range in their ratings of the student teachers in both the high and low classes than the student teachers' own evaluations produced.

Analysis of categories. Each of the five effective teaching categories was subjected to the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs, Signed-Rank Test to check for significant differences in ratings between the more and less problematic classes. In each category the mean score for the more problematic class was lower on the Likert scale than the mean score for the less
problematic class. In three categories, knowledge of teaching strategies, clarity and enthusiasm, the differences between scores of the more and less problematic classes were shown to be significant at $p \leq .05$. The category of organization showed a specific confidence level $p = .07$, and the category of knowledge of subject matter achieved a confidence level of only $p = .24$. (See tables 6,7,8,9, and 10.)

Table 6. Analysis of the Category "Knowledge of Subject Matter".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1$ : More  $Y_1$ : Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 cases eliminated for difference = 0.

| $Z$ | $-1.183$ | $p = .2367$ |
| $Z$ corrected for ties | $-1.185$ | $p = .2359$ |
| # tied groups | 1 |
Table 7. Analysis of the Category "Knowledge of Teaching Strategies".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1$ : More</th>
<th>$Y_1$ : Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\Sigma$ Rank:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks 5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks 13</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Z corrected for ties</th>
<th># tied groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.199</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p = .0279$  
$p = .0278$

Table 8. Analysis of the Category "Organization".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1$ : More</th>
<th>$Y_1$ : Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\Sigma$ Rank:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Z corrected for ties</th>
<th># tied groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.826</td>
<td>-1.841</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p = .0679$  
$p = .0656$
Table 9. Analysis of the Category "Clarity".

Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1$ : More  $Y_1$ : Less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>$\Sigma$ Rank:</th>
<th>Mean Rank:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 cases eliminated for difference = 0.

Z = -2.197  p = .028

Table 10. Analysis of the Category "Enthusiasm".

Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1$ : More  $Y_1$ : Less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>$\Sigma$ Rank:</th>
<th>Mean Rank:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 cases eliminated for difference = 0.

Z = -2.023  p = .0431
Apparently in the category of knowledge of subject matter, student teachers and their raters are best able to separate observed teaching skills from the abilities and characteristics of the classroom.

**Analysis by student teachers and raters.** A Wilcoxon Matched-pairs, Signed-rank test was performed on the mean ratings of all seven student teachers on all twenty-two questions. The data used to conduct this test is the same data used to compile Table 3. These results show a significant difference between the ratings given to the more and less problematic classes at the $p = .011$ level. (See Table 11.)

### Table 11. Significant Differences Student Teacher Ratings for the More and Less Problematic Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank</th>
<th>$X_1$ : More</th>
<th>$Y_1$ : Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>$\gamma$ Rank:</td>
<td>Mean Rank:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3 cases eliminated for difference = 0.

| $Z$                  | -2.535      | $p = .0112$ |
| $Z$ corrected for ties | -2.536      | $p = .0112$ |
| # tied groups        | 2           |    |
The scores given by the rater were subjected to the same statistical procedure and significance was obtained at the $p = .001$ level. (See table 12.)

Table 12. Significant Differences in Rater Ratings for More and Less Problematic Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank $X_1 : More$</th>
<th>$Y_1 : Less$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Σ Rank:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks 3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks 19</td>
<td>227.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $Z$                               | -3.279      | $p = .001$ |
| $Z$ corrected for ties           | -3.28       | $p = .001$ |
| # tied groups                    | 3           |

As the final step in the data analysis, the combined ratings of the student teachers and raters were used to conduct a $t$-test on the more and less problematic classes. Highly significant differences were found between the more and less problematic rated classes when comparing the ratings of both the student teacher and the professional raters combined. (See Table 13.)
Table 13. Significant Differences in All Ratings for the More and Less Problematic Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired t-Test</th>
<th>X_1: More</th>
<th>Y_1: Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF:</td>
<td>Mean X - Y:</td>
<td>Paired t value:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.636</td>
<td>4.856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raters were also asked to give each observation point a "confidence level" to express their confidence in the assessment they have given. A Likert scale was used to label the confidence of each evaluation as "very confident", "confident", "somewhat confident", "uncertain", or "very uncertain". Comparing the confidence of evaluations between the levels of the less problematic class and the levels of the more problematic class no significant difference was found (See table 14.). In fact, in ten of fourteen instances (7 pairs of lessons x 2 raters) the confidence level was higher for the more problematic class, but not significantly so.
Table 14. Confidence Levels of Professional Raters Compared by More and Less Problematic Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon signed-rank X₁ : Less</th>
<th>Y₁ : More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Sum Rank:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ranks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ranks</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2 cases eliminated for difference = 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.745</td>
<td>.4561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining written comments on the form, it was found that most dealt with explanations of what was happening in the lesson—"students were sight-reading new music", "students were listening to a tape", and the like. The student teachers made no written comments.

There were fourteen written comments by the raters taken from the lessons while teaching classes rated more problematic that spoke specifically of teaching competencies. Three of those comments could be considered positive—"good piano skills, eye contact good while conducting, good attention to social behavior". The remaining 11 comments (or 69% of the comments) were critical of teacher behavior—"feeble attempts at classroom management, needs work on conducting skills, no concept is apparent, not much reinforcement of behaviors, didn't work, humor came off as insensitivity".
In the lessons that were conducted for the less problematic classes, four of ten written comments were positive—"much better than morning group, reinforced correct behavior, clear expectations, good preparation". The nature of the negative comments (60%) was centered more on subject matter skills and planning than classroom management—"musical knowledge inaccurate, not much feedback, no music, seemed unprepared, no logical sequence, teaching strategy did not work, often missed incorrect musical behaviors."
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The discussion section will center on two main areas: a summary of the issues in music student teaching with challenges for further research and the limitations and results of the study of the effects of classroom characteristics on evaluation of effective music teaching.

Summary of the Issues. While the sample study described in Chapters III and IV dealt with the effects of classroom characteristics on evaluation of music student teaching, the larger purpose of this study was to review the major issues current in music teacher pre-service field experiences and to suggest avenues of investigation into those issues.

The major issues described centered upon the efficacy of student teaching, the placement of the major field experience within a teacher education/certification program, the influences upon the music education student, the evaluation of field experiences, and the problems of the first year teacher
that may be related to or influenced by the student teaching experience.

The usefulness or necessity of some sort of field experience apparently will go unchallenged for some time. All of the various routes to certification call for some time in the field under closer supervision than the initial year of teaching will entail. The assumption of teaching responsibilities in field experiences is gradual. The challenge is to design field experiences that are comprehensive, relevant to the needs of the teacher, timely, and economically feasible for the student of education, the university or college, and the public school district. Pilot studies need to be developed through which researchers may examine the worth of programs that gradually introduce education students into the field experience. Beginning as early as their freshman year of college, student teachers need to learn how to observe other teachers so that they may better assess their own strengths and weaknesses. They should be gradually introduced to the many tasks of teaching, perhaps beginning with clerical duties and moving to instructional planning and service over time.

Other studies could be conducted to assess the worth of seminars which are concurrent with or follow student teaching experiences. These seminars should allow the student teachers to debrief and analyze their time in the field. In music education, the opportunities to work with church groups,
summer camps, senior citizens, band camps, and private instruction could be shown to give the prospective music teacher an advantage in accurate self-evaluation.

The fact that alternatives to the traditional four-year undergraduate teacher certification programs are relatively new suggests several areas for future study. Studies that examine the amount of support given to teachers during the induction years through inservice and graduate education could measure the growth of teachers after leaving the university. This might shed some light onto the relative worth of preservice field experiences.

Some research, as noted in Chapter II, has shown that there are differences in self-appraisal, initial-year competencies, and retention in the profession, among teachers who received their field experiences through undergraduate education, graduate education, or alternative certification routes. If there are indeed advantages to one type of field experiences over another, what may be the problems associated with opting for one route over another?

Is it financially advantageous or prohibitive to choose one method of teacher education over another? Certainly, a Holmes Group approach that requires a master's degree for certification would cost more than the traditional undergraduate teacher education program. Perhaps the temporary loss of salary while between jobs, that may be commonly associated with
alternative certification programs, might keep otherwise successful candidates from entering the profession. Financial concerns might dictate the approach one takes to education and certification in music education.

Researchers should question the relative quality of preparation among teachers who have achieved certification through the various routes. It is conceivable that the field experiences required in an alternative certification route may not be sufficient to assess the candidate's knowledge and demonstration of musical information, pedagogical skills, and skills in evaluation of student achievement. On the other hand research has yet to be conducted that demonstrates the benefits of extended field experiences that involve a fifth year or master's degree. Do the extended field experiences show that these teachers have significantly improved teaching skills when compared to graduates of a traditional four-year program?

The influences upon the student teacher have been adequately identified through research and, to some extent, the qualities of those who exert strong influences have been identified. Pairing a student teacher with the best possible influences, whether a university supervisor or cooperating teacher, however, is not always easy. The challenge to researchers here, regardless of the field of education, is to develop training programs that improve the quality of
supervision from the university and the quality of support and understanding provided by the cooperating teacher.

As previously noted in Chapter II, the supervisor needs to be able to assess teaching performance and to understand the realities of teaching in the public schools. Likewise, the cooperating teachers must be cognizant and in agreement with the philosophical and practical goals of the teacher education program that is placing students with them. Certainly training programs for supervisors and cooperating teachers could be devised that address these needs. Participants in such programs could be compared with non-participants by means of student teacher ratings as well as observations of the student teachers who worked with trained personnel as opposed to those who worked with untrained personnel.

In addition to research on the nature and strength of influence exerted by the university supervisor or cooperating teacher, other influences, such as previous course work, prior experiences with the subject matter or with teaching, and classroom ecology might be subjected to the same types of investigation and analysis.

The evaluation of student teachers has been examined with respect to content and format of evaluation, source of evaluation, and timing of evaluation. Still there seems to be discrepancies in what is considered to be the content of music teaching evaluation and the practice of music teaching
evaluation. The results of the sample study indicate that evaluation is affected by classroom characteristics and, if additional research confirms these findings, perhaps other variables need the same exposure to inquiry. Studies need to be conducted that compare evaluations of persons who have been trained in using the effective teaching categories as a basis for evaluation with those of evaluators who have received no special training. If differences occur, then the need for training of evaluators will be evident.

It has been noted that student teachers do better in self-evaluation when they have had training in teacher observation. Perhaps a study similar to the sample study, done as a part of this project, could show that student teachers who had been trained to observe and evaluate effective music teaching skills, prior to their own student teaching, would evaluate their own student teaching more accurately than those who had no such training.

Investigation into the relationships between student teaching and the problems of first year teachers of music should serve two purposes. First, the enumeration and definition of specific problems would indicate issues or concepts that need to be addressed in student teaching. Secondly, research is needed to determine if the first-year teacher is better able to cope with these problems having confronted them during student teaching than the teacher who
has not. If a correlation is found between certain aspects of student teaching experiences and the problems of first year teachers, changes in the student teaching program or development of inservice programs to alleviate such problems must be considered.

The issues and problems of music teacher education are many. However, once these problems have been defined, research can be conducted to provide a basis for change. These changes may take the form of alterations in the student teaching program, the preparation prior to student teaching, or inservice programs after employment.

Discussion of the study. The limitations of the sample study are many, thus care must be exercised in interpreting the results. The chief obstacle to the strength of the sample study is the small number of student teachers who completed the various steps in the study. Initially, twenty-eight students had agreed to participate in the study while only seven student teachers actually finished. Reasons for failing to complete the study included lack of time within the quarter, unwillingness of the cooperating teacher to be a part of the study, and lack of available video cameras. Some potential subjects completed their tapes and returned them without completing the evaluations of their teaching.

Were this study to be conducted as a full-scale research project, several steps could be taken to increase the number of
subjects who finished the process. It is unreasonable, in some cases, to expect student teachers to take the time needed to complete the taping and forms when student teaching is often their last quarter of school. Since the taping did not take place until at least the eighth week of the quarter, many student teachers were often more concerned with finishing their work, job hunting, graduating, and possible relocation. Perhaps incentives in the form of cash stipends could be offered to each student teacher who completes the tapes and returns them with completed evaluation forms.

Another potential obstacle to representative sampling of student teacher may have been the various quarters of the student teaching experience. The given quarter or semester of student teaching caused some loss of subjects. Some student teachers started student teaching in the fall as early as August, before the start of the University quarter. They were finished with their student teaching experience before tapes could be made. This was particularly true of those student teachers involved with marching bands. There was not sufficient time for tapes to be made in student teaching situations where the public school-year concluded before the university quarter finished in the spring or cooperating teachers ended their music activities prior to the official close of school.

A large-scale study should make provisions for sampling student teaching situations conducted throughout the school
year and perhaps include situations where the student teaching process occurs on a semester rather than quarter calendar.

Some student teachers who were potential subjects had difficulty in finding equipment or personnel to complete the taping. Ideally, technicians to do the taping should be provided so that neither the student teacher or cooperating teacher need be concerned about securing equipment and providing for its operation.

Another concern for a full-scale study should be the representation of the sample from the general population of student teachers in music. In the sample study, elementary level student teachers tended to complete the process more often than secondary student teachers. Student teachers in general music classrooms were more likely to complete the study than those working with performance groups and those student teachers with instrumental groups were more likely to finish the tapes and evaluations than those involved in choral music.

As a by-product of information gathered on the Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics form for this sample study, it was observed that within a given teaching situation, music teachers tended to rate general music classes as having more difficulty than performing groups. Often the younger-aged classes were seen as more difficult. While this is probably often the case, there certainly exists a possibility of exceptions.
A large sample of student teachers in a variety of situations may negate this tendency to see performing ability and maturity as indicators of relative ease or difficulty in teaching.

Two comments by the raters appeared in the written comments which suggested possible limitations that would need to be addressed when preparing a study such as this in the future. At one point one rater was not sure how to rate the student teacher's ability to choose appropriate literature because it was impossible to tell from the tape if the student teacher had chosen the music that the band was playing or if, in fact, it had been chosen earlier by the cooperating teacher. On one tape, the cooperating teacher gave the expectations for social behaviors before the student teacher began to teach, thus making it difficult to rate the competency of the student teacher in that area.

The inter-rater agreement level of 71% could be seen as a limitation to this study. Investigation might indicate that a different selection process for raters or additional training for raters would improve the percentage of agreement. It is possible that raters would be biased in evaluation proportionally to their own areas of expertise. In this study, the difference between the more or less problematic classes was greater in professional rater scores than it was in the student teacher self-ratings. Perhaps the raters, who did not know the student teacher or the classroom ecology, were more
objective and therefore less empathetic concerning the problematic classes. The raters may prove to be more lenient or, conversely, more stringent in their evaluations.

A cooperating teacher, a university supervisor, or a perceptive student teacher might more readily assess the characteristics of a classroom setting because they are more familiar with it than a professional rater such as those used in this study. This familiarity may cause allowances for the relative ease or difficulty of a specific classroom to be given to the student teacher when rating teaching competencies. A further study might examine the ability of the university supervisors, the cooperating teachers, and any others charged with the responsibility of accurate and meaningful evaluation to assess teaching behaviors in a variety of given situations. The inclusion of other observers who are involved in the student teaching process such as university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and peers, as raters could strengthen the findings of such a study.

These severe limitations notwithstanding, the findings of the sample study are convincing enough to encourage further investigation on a larger scale, perhaps with the aid of research grants to overcome the obstacles of numbers, time, cost of materials, and the like.

The most compelling finding of the sample study was the overall comparison of the ratings given to the less problematic
classes over the more problematic classes. Research question #4 (see Chapter III) asked if there is a significant difference between ratings of teaching less problematic classes when compared to ratings of teaching more problematic classes. The data confirmed \( p < .0001 \) that teaching is evaluated differently when the characteristics of the class are the variable. While the observed differences in student teacher performance were frequently small, they were consistent among raters and across situations. Thus the assumption is strengthened that evaluation of effective music teaching in a field experience setting such as student teaching is affected by the nature of the classroom. It would not be surprising to find that the general characteristics of the placement (e.g., urban vs. suburban) might have a corresponding effect on evaluation.

Affirmative answers were given to research questions #2, ("Are the overall self-ratings of student teachers different when observing classes of differing characteristics?") and #3, ("Are the overall ratings by professional raters different when observing classes of differing characteristics?"). The student teachers, in general, rated themselves higher than the raters, regardless of the condition of more or less problematic classes. Furthermore, when they did rate themselves lower on the more problematic classes, the differences in ratings were not as great as those obtained from the rater's scores.
The first research question asked if student teachers or professional raters rate various effective teaching skills differently when observing classes of differing characteristics. It would appear that the student teachers, as well as the raters, do not notice differences in subject matter knowledge when confronted with classes of differing abilities, interests, or challenges. This is not surprising if one considers that subject matter knowledge is a characteristic of the teacher, not an interaction skill. Further, it appears that the organization and planning skills remain similar regardless of the characteristics of the classes taught.

Problems do appear evident in the student teacher's ability to adjust teaching strategies, express ideas and instructions clearly, and demonstrate enthusiasm for the task at hand when teaching classes that present greater difficulties to the music teacher.

The only individual question in which both the student teachers and the raters rated the teaching behavior higher for the more problematic class than for the less problematic class was the question that evaluated the student teacher's ability to provide timely and appropriate feedback to social skills. Perhaps this phenomenon was observed because attention to social behaviors was more evident in the more problematic classes. A more comprehensive study might show different results. For example, studies of classrooms at the beginning of
the public school year, when social behaviors are being established and practiced in all classes, might provide more complete data that would enable more accurate evaluation of the student teachers skills in dealing with social skills.

Further research into other areas is suggested by information obtained in this study. The effect of the classroom ecology upon the final, grade given to the music student teacher, is one such area. If the supervisor or person in charge of assigning the final grade should happen to evaluate teaching only in those classes with more problems (perhaps even intentionally) it is conceivable that the composite grade for the student teacher could be biased.

The final impression of self as a student teacher, perhaps as a result of positive or negative classroom ecology, may influence a decision to enter into the profession or to continue over time. It is possible that a student teacher, greatly motivated to teach because of tremendous success with an already accomplished high school performing group, would become discouraged enough to quit the profession after his first year (or first few years) with a less-advanced music program. Likewise, a poor sense of self-ability, caused by a difficult student teaching assignment, may convince the student teacher never to enter the profession.

Several factors may contribute to putting any music student teaching experience in perspective. Perhaps those
students who demonstrate better musicianship are more or less capable of judging their teaching competencies, regardless of the situation. The opinions and skills of the cooperating teacher or university supervisor could possibly be helpful or harmful in allowing the music student teacher to assess his strengths and weaknesses. Increased observation time and training in observing teacher skills may help the student teacher to adequately assess his own performance. Inservice education or graduate education might serve to compensate for opportunities missed in student teaching or for misconceptions of self or situation created in the student teaching environment.

Again, considering the limitations of this study, application of the findings into practice should await more exhaustive research. However, should such research be conducted, and the findings of this study reinforced, there would be several applications of the results that could be made to student teaching in music education.

Care should be taken in providing a student teaching situation that allows the music education student the opportunity to experience a diversity of classroom settings with regards to subject matter and to classroom ecology. The student teachers in performance areas need contact with groups of students who are beginners in performance as well as those at the culmination of high school experience. Since
most music teacher positions will involve some non-performance groups, every student teacher in music should have some experience with general music classes.

Teaching situations of differing economic and cultural environments should be a part of the music education student's pre-service preparation. If the variable of classroom ecology can be shown to be a predictor of evaluation in student teaching, that variable must be considered when determining an appropriate placement for the student teacher.

It is realized that no teacher education program can provide all things to all student teachers. It would be virtually impossible to place a music student teacher in orchestral, band, and vocal settings across all grade levels as well as provide time to teach in the general music classroom; at the same time presenting a variety of classroom ecologies. In order to compensate in some way for the impossibility of preservice teaching experience in all of these situations, most music education programs provide for field experiences other than student teaching. There frequently is a concerted effort to diversify the observation experiences prior to student teaching. These other experiences however are more limited in time and responsibility than the major field experience of student teaching.

Logistics of time, money, and location may necessitate undesirable or inadequate placements of student teachers. The
availability of qualified and willing cooperating teachers and principals also keeps many student teaching settings from being ideal. Yet, as findings of this study indicate, the perception of one's own ability to teach, for better or worse, may be affected somewhat by the situation(s) in which one is asked to teach. Further, it may be that others are no better able to judge a student teacher's ability unbiased by classroom ecology.

If the teacher training institution accepts the challenge of providing the best possible preparation of its graduates, the dilemma becomes one of weighing the advantages of one field experience setting over another. Perhaps the best that can be expected in a less than perfect situation is that careful examination be made into as many variables as can be identified that affect the evaluation of student teacher competencies. These variables then need to become part of the working vocabulary of those entrusted with student teacher assignment, supervision, and evaluation. Whenever a choice can be made between two alternatives, then, the choice could be made, based upon research, for the better.

The findings of this study point to several conclusions. First, the specific questions posed for the study are given affirmative answers. The data analysis, whether by such simple methods as frequency counts or through the use of non-parametric and parametric measures, confirms that classroom
ecology does affect evaluation of student teachers in music. Student teachers and professional raters see various effective teaching skills differently when observing classes of differing characteristics. The overall self-ratings of student teachers are different when observing classes of differing characteristics as are the rating of professional observers.

Secondly, the design and results of this study underscore the need for and the potential success of research designs that do more than examine current practices through questionnaires completed by those involved in the process. That a sample study could provide results as clear as those achieved here, indicates that more research is needed much the same as a preliminary medical examination demonstrates the need for further diagnostic tests to determine the proper patient treatment.

Finally, even the limitations of this study point to areas of concern. If the student teacher is too busy during the quarter in which he student teaches to participate in the study because of part-time or full-time employment, job hunting, graduation, and the like, has he been able to devote sufficient attention to his student teaching? Do student teachers perform better when they are not also concerned with the major changes impending in their personal lives that come with graduation?

Many student teachers were not able to complete their participation in the experiment because their cooperating
teachers refused or neglected to complete the Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics form. If cooperating teachers are not willing to participate in research that perhaps may improve student teaching one must ask the reasons. If they do not have the time to attend to such matters, can the university be sure that the cooperating teachers have or are willing to give the needed amount of time to the student teacher? The cooperating teachers who do not want to be open to others about the nature of their classrooms may not be honest with the student teacher. Perhaps there is good reason why they would not want others to see what transpires within their teaching positions or schools.

Many student teachers did not complete their part of the experiment because, near the close of the school year, instruction was not being delivered. Time was spent on non-teaching duties such as inventory, students were gone on field trips, classes were not full due to parties and early dismissal of seniors. Many student teachers cited instances where no more rehearsals were conducted after the last concert and students were given study halls. If it is learned that instruction frequently ceases as much as two weeks before the end of the school year, student teachers should be encouraged to do their field experience at times other than the spring quarter.

Upon examination of the results of this sample study, and after considering all of the limitations discussed, it seems
reasonable to state that the variable of classroom characteristics may affect the evaluation of effective student teaching in music and thus warrants further research. Other issues in music student teaching presented in the review of literature are similarly deserving of further research.
APPENDIX A

Subject Permission Form

October, 1991

I hereby give permission for Mark W. Gallant, doctoral candidate at the Ohio State University, to use video-tapes of selected lessons and evaluations of my teaching, by myself and others, to be used for the purposes of his dissertation research.

It is understood that my name will not be used in connection with any published materials and that my participation will in no way influence the grade I receive for student teaching.

__________________________
(signed)

__________________________
(date)
APPENDIX B

Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics Form

October, 1991

Dear Colleague:

For my doctoral dissertation in music education at the Ohio State University, I am conducting a study of the influences that affect the evaluation of student teachers in music, both by the university personnel and the student teachers themselves. As a part of that study I need to be able to distinguish the differences in certain characteristics among the various classes that an individual teacher teaches. For example, if a middle school general music teacher has 5 sections of seventh grade general music, could they be ranked from highest to lowest in terms of musical ability, musical backgrounds, general cognitive ability, and other factors?

I am asking you to complete this form for each of the classes your student teacher will teach and return it to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope by October 20, 1991. While it is expected that you will have discussions with your student teacher about the individual differences among the classes he or she will teach, I would appreciate your not sharing these classroom evaluation forms with the student teacher.

Your help in this project is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Mark W. Gallant
540 Abbey Place
Zanesville, Ohio 43701

128
TEACHER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS
(Use a separate form for each class your student teacher will teach.)
General Information

Teacher Name __________________________________________School

________

Student Teacher Name _______________________________________

CLASS NAME ______________ PERIOD OR TIME OF DAY

________

_____ elementary _____ vocal/choral

_____ middle school _____ instrumental

_____ high school _____ general

STATUS: _____ elective _____ required

CLASS SIZE: ______ No. of days per week

________

* * * * * * * * * * *

* 

Please answer the following questions about each class you teach.

The average musical ability of the students in this class is:

1 exceptional 2 good 3 fair 4 poor 5 non-existent
The students in this class have had other musical experiences such as private lessons, other performance groups, or prior school music courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>less than 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interest level of the students in this class towards music is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discipline problems in this class are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>virtually non-existent</td>
<td>infrequent</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>continual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The socio-economic status of the students in this class is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general academic ability of the students in this class is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Above av.</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Below Av.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The musical ability of the students in this class as compared to their abilities in other subjects is probably:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>much higher</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>similar</td>
<td>not as good</td>
<td>much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANSWER ONLY IF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ARE MAINSTREAMED INTO THIS CLASS.

The presence of handicapped students (physically or developmentally) in this class presents:

1  2  3  4  5
no few some many severe
problems problems problems problems problems

Compared to the other classes you teach this class is:

1  2  3  4  5
the easiest easy average difficult most
difficult

Please feel free to make any comments that would explain or justify any of you answers. Thank you.
APPENDIX C

Pilot Letter For "Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics" Form

January 5, 1991

Dear Colleague:

For my doctoral dissertation in music education at the Ohio State University, I am conducting a study of the influences that effect the evaluation of student teachers in music, both by the university personnel and the student teachers themselves. As a part of that study I need to be able to distinguish the differences in certain characteristics among the various classes that an individual teacher teaches. For example, if a middle school general music teacher has 5 sections of seventh grade general music, could they be ranked from highest to lowest in terms of musical ability, musical backgrounds, general cognitive ability, and other factors.

I am asking you to review the form I will be sending to cooperating teachers in music this Winter and Spring. This form is intended to create a profile of each class the student teacher may encounter. Please examine each item on the Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics form and give your opinion as to the relative worth of each individual item in creating a profile of a music classroom. Use the following code to rate the importance of each to the intended purpose.

5. essential
4. important
3. moderately useful
2. little value
1. irrelevant
Please place your answer in the **bold-faced blank** below each item.

Your help in this project is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Mark W. Gallant  
540 Abbey Place  
Zanesville, Ohio 43701
APPENDIX D

Table 15. Pilot Results for "Teacher Evaluation of Classroom Characteristics" Form

(Column number is equal to the question number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 1</th>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>9.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum:</th>
<th>Maximum:</th>
<th>Range:</th>
<th>Sum:</th>
<th>Sum of Sqr.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 3</th>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.444</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>17.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum:</th>
<th>Maximum:</th>
<th>Range:</th>
<th>Sum:</th>
<th>Sum of Sqr.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 4</th>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.864</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum:</th>
<th>Maximum:</th>
<th>Range:</th>
<th>Sum:</th>
<th>Sum of Sqr.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 5</th>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>20.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum:</th>
<th>Maximum:</th>
<th>Range:</th>
<th>Sum:</th>
<th>Sum of Sqr.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 6</th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 7</th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 8</th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 9</th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 10</th>
<th>( X_1 ) : Column 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum: Maximum: Range: Sum: Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>253</td>
<td><strong>X1</strong>: Column 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Column 12</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column 13</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column 14</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column 15</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column 16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>34.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>3.842</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>29.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>39.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>26.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>12.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coef. Var.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Sqr.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Evaluation of Teaching Form
EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Using the attached forms, you are asked to complete a general evaluation of the teaching episode you have observed on the video tape. For each teaching characteristic listed, you are asked to record THREE (I, II, and III) different aspects pertinent to assessment. Please use the following codes for recording your evaluation:

FIRST (I): You will determine if the characteristic was demonstrated or not during the episode. If you must check "NOT OBSERVED", proceed further to report whether you think the characteristic "SHOULD HAVE BEEN" in evidence or whether the characteristic was properly "NOT APPLICABLE" in this episode. If you have checked "NOT OBSERVED", the second (II) part of the evaluation (QUALITATIVE) is skipped and you proceed to the third section (III), CONFIDENCE INTERVAL.

SECOND (II): This aspect of the evaluation is a qualitative assessment of the teacher characteristic. Using the 1-5 rating scale provided below, rate the characteristic by circling the appropriate number.

1=excellent  2=good    3=average  4=below average  5=poor

THIRD (III): This assessment concerns the degree to which you have confidence in your assessment above. Using the following rating scale, rate whether or not you are confident that what you observed is characteristic of the student teacher if you were to observe him/her during other episodes. You are to rate this aspect even for those characteristics which you recorded as being "NOT OBSERVED".

1=very confident  2=confident  3=somewhat confident 4=uncertain  5=very uncertain

DO NOT COMPLETE THE FORM UNTIL THE ENTIRE TAPED LESSON HAS BEEN VIEWED.
COMPLETED BY: _____STUDENT TEACHER _____RATER
Knowledge of Subject Matter

1. The student teacher displays evidence of basic musicianship.

I. _OBSERVED_ _NOT OBSERVED_ _SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED_ _NOT APPLICABLE_

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

2. The student teacher is able to detect errors in the musical performance of students.

I. _OBSERVED_ _NOT OBSERVED_ _SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED_ _NOT APPLICABLE_

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

__ (Confidence level)

3. The student teacher is able to detect errors in the students' responses to questions related to musical knowledge.

I. _OBSERVED_ _NOT OBSERVED_ _SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED_ _NOT APPLICABLE_

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

4. The student teacher chooses literature/activities for performance/listening/analysis/discussion that is appropriate to the musical concept being considered.

I. _OBSERVED_ _NOT OBSERVED_ _SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED_ _NOT APPLICABLE_

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5
Knowledge of Teaching Strategies

1. The student teacher provides appropriate activities for pupils that involve cognitive thinking skills.

I. ___ OBSERVED ___ NOT OBSERVED ___ SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___ NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

____ (Confidence level)

2. The student teacher provides appropriate activities for pupils that involve the affective domain.

I. ___ OBSERVED ___ NOT OBSERVED ___ SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___ NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

3. The student teacher provides appropriate activities for pupils that involve the psychomotor domain.

I. ___ OBSERVED ___ NOT OBSERVED ___ SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___ NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5

4. There is sufficient student involvement in the lesson.

I. ___ OBSERVED ___ NOT OBSERVED ___ SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___ NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5

III. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The student teacher uses academic materials, teaching aids, and classroom instruments for teaching that are appropriate for the age level and educational level of the pupils.

I. **OBSERVED** **NOT OBSERVED** **SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED** **NOT APPLICABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The student teacher shows evidence of appropriate classroom management skills.

I. **OBSERVED** **NOT OBSERVED** **SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED** **NOT APPLICABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The student teacher paces the classroom/rehearsal at a level appropriate to the age and ability of the group.

I. **OBSERVED** **NOT OBSERVED** **SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED** **NOT APPLICABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The student teacher provides timely and appropriate feedback to student MUSICAL behavior.

I. **OBSERVED** **NOT OBSERVED** **SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED** **NOT APPLICABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The student teacher provides timely and appropriate feedback to student SOCIAL behavior.

I. **OBSERVED** **NOT OBSERVED** **SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED** **NOT APPLICABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATION

1. The student teacher shows evidence of planning.

I. ___OBSERVED ___NOT OBSERVED ___SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

2. The student teacher has all materials prepared prior to teaching.

I. ___OBSERVED ___NOT OBSERVED ___SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

CLARITY

1. The student teacher uses vocabulary that is appropriate to the age level.

I. ___OBSERVED ___NOT OBSERVED ___SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

(Confidence level)

2. The student teacher gives clear instructions for academic or performance activities.

I. ___OBSERVED ___NOT OBSERVED ___SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___NOT APPLICABLE

II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The student teacher explains expectations for social behaviors.

I. **OBSERVED** __NOT OBSERVED__ __SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED__
   __NOT APPLICABLE__
II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

4. When presenting questions to the students, the student teacher indicates what type of response is required, i.e. oral group response, oral individual response, or internal response.

I. **OBSERVED** __NOT OBSERVED__ __SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED__
   __NOT APPLICABLE__
II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

**ENTHUSIASM**

1. The student teacher displays an enthusiasm for teaching.

I. **OBSERVED** __NOT OBSERVED__ __SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED__
   __NOT APPLICABLE__
II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5

2. The student teacher displays an enthusiasm for the subject matter (music).

I. **OBSERVED** __NOT OBSERVED__ __SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED__
   __NOT APPLICABLE__
II. 1 2 3 4 5
III. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The student teacher is sensitive to the individual needs and concerns of the pupils.

I. ___OBSERVED___NOT OBSERVED___SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBSERVED ___NOT APPLICABLE

II.  

III.  

(PLEASE ADD ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH ON BACK OF THIS PAGE)
### APPENDIX F

#### TABLE 16. COOPERATING TEACHER EVALUATIONS OF CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS

**Student Teaching Setting #1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.333</td>
<td>9.048</td>
<td>3.894</td>
<td>81.867</td>
<td>33.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum: 19  
Maximum: 43  
Range: 24  
Sum: 164  
Sum of Sqr.: 4892

**Student Teaching Setting #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4.159</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum: 20  
Maximum: 31  
Range: 11  
Sum: 133  
Sum of Sqr.: 3607

**Student Teaching Setting #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean:</th>
<th>Std. Dev.:</th>
<th>Std. Error:</th>
<th>Variance:</th>
<th>Coef. Var.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum: 21  
Maximum: 36  
Range: 15  
Sum: 218  
Sum of Sqr.: 6112
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Table 16 (continued)

Student Teaching Setting #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Teaching Setting #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Teaching Setting #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Teaching Setting #7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X₁ : Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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