SELECTED TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL IN A SOUTHEAST KANSAS COMMUNITY

By

LESTA DIANE SWENDER

Bachelor of Science
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1980

Master of Science
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1981

Specialist in Education
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1985

SELECTED TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL IN A SOUTHEAST KANSAS COMMUNITY

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My appreciation and gratitude are extended to all those who made my study possible.

My sincere gratitude is expressed to the members of my committee: Dr. Randall Koetting, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Kenneth King, and especially to Dr. Russell Dobson, my advisor, whose advice and support guided me throughout this project.

Sincere appreciation and thanks are expressed to: Patrick Swender whose expertise on the computer served as a true blessing to me; Mark Watkins in critiquing, transcribing and typing; Debbie Mikulka, Lesta Swender, and Dean Dillard, who critiqued and proofread my paper; Dr. Robert Venturella and Dr. Harvard Riches from Pittsburg State University, who have helped and encouraged me throughout my undergraduate and graduate degrees; Donna Goff and Kay Porter for their help in the typing of this paper; and the veteran teachers of Royster Junior High School for their concern and support for my research.

Finally, eternal indebtedness and appreciation are expressed to my beloved family, mother, father, Mark, Debbie, Herb, Pat, Tom, Diana, Grandma, Grandpa, Tracy, Rex, Ralph, and Laura, whose love and support have been a constant source of inspiration for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent literature reveals a great deal of attention directed toward the administrative evaluation of classroom teachers (Crenshaw and Hoyle, 1981; Crews, 1981; Millman, 1981; Savage, 1982; Dunkelberger, 1982; Wuhs and Manatt, 1983; and Pace, 1984). Inherent in the task of evaluation of instruction is dialogue among educators regarding appropriate criteria to be used in evaluating instruction. (Dialogue will be used in the sense that Freire [1970] used the term; this is further discussed in Chapter III.)

Golomon (1977) cites that since the primary purpose of administrative evaluation of instruction is to aid in improving the quality of instruction, evaluators should discuss the outcome of the evaluation with the instructor and offer suggestions for improvement. In fact, in his same study, it was noted that 88 percent of the teachers agreed that feedback should occur as a part of the evaluative process.

Furthermore, other studies concerning evaluation support active teacher involvement in the evaluation process. For instance, Pace (1984) stated:

> Historically personnel evaluation procedures mainly have been determined by those responsible for evaluating their subordinates with minimal involvement of those being evaluated. It is the author's view that times have changed and that, regardless of position, those in

> the evaluation role should be involved in the process, since it is their personal and professional well-being that is at stake. Additionally, the involvement of several groups--teachers, administrators, support staff --enhances the credibility and ensures that the constituent views of an organization as complex as a school will be considered in the development process. Finally, the development process is too complex to remain the sole domain of any individual or particular group within the organization (p. 8).

The major consideration of this study is that of gaining new insights into the reality base of feedback sessions. The nature of the feedback experience is addressed from the internal frame of each participant, both evaluator and evaluatee. Further investigation into selected teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation of instruction appeared beneficial to this writer in determining the effectiveness of such evaluation.

Pinar (cited in Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Ed., 1981, p. 99) claimed that "between 85 and 95 percent of those who work in the curriculum field share a perspective that is either tied or closely related to the dominant technocratic rationality." Kliebard (cited in Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981, p. 99) had argued that:

> This form of rationality has evolved in a manner parallel to the scientific management movement of the 1920s, and that early founders of the curriculum movement such as Bobbitt and Charters warmly embraced the principles of scientific management.

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) concur with Peter (1977) that the curriculum field is becoming an increasingly highly skilled technology with a primary emphasis on method. Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) state:

> Researchers have by and large restricted their focus to areas amenable to this technology, thus creating a vocabulary insensitive to the human dimension of the teaching-learning experience. Narrowness of perspective for the sake of research effeciency does little to contribute to a needed body of knowledge (p. 65).

Accepting Pinar's claim to the prevalence of the technocratic rationale in the literature, the writer contends it is possible that perceptual differences among educators employed at a school relative to the theory base of that particular school can result in differing perceptions of reality. Likewise, if the theory base of a school administrator conducting the evaluation of teachers differs considerably from the theory base of the teacher being evaluated, the concerns expressed by Freire (1970) warrant examination. To elaborate, Freire states:

> Authentic education is not carried on by 'A' for 'B' or by 'A' about 'B', but rather by 'A' with 'B', mediated by the world--a world which impresses and challenges both parties giving rise to views or opinions about it . . . we simply cannot go to the laborers--urban or peasant--in the banking style, to give them 'knowledge' or to impose upon them the model of the 'good man' contained in a program whose content we have ourselves organized. Many political and educational plans have failed because their authors designed them according to their own personal views of reality, never once taking into account (except as mere objects of their action) the men-in-a situation to whom their program was ostensibly directed (p. 83).

Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) contributed another dimension to this discussion by concluding that an individual perceives reality from a value-laden perspective; an individual cannot separate himself from his values. In essence, one's values alter one's perceptions and vice versa; as values vary so do perceptions of reality. In this sense, the term reality is defined as a man-made invention. Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) stated:

> We believe there is value in confirming one's personhood rather than seeking to conform to vague expectations as expressed by others of what one should be. We believe that human beings are the inventors of ideas and value and that these ideas and values are the beacons that guide daily lives and ultimately affect the degree to which persons experience self as well as others. To succumb to an imposed reality is to experience the loss or prostitution of personal ideas and values, resulting in alienation from self as well as others, thus leading to role behavior which may be

> inauthentic. We believe that the climate of an institution is an expression of the consciousness level of the people therein and that most people know how they would like to interact for the good of themselves and others. However, due to the imposed reality of role expectation, they often behave in manners which are contrary to what they know and believe. We further believe that any real improvement in schooling will occur only when each person's practices and beliefs are in harmony (p. 21).

Considering the work of Freire (1970), Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980), and Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983), perceptual information is viewed in a somewhat different way. To elucidate, teachers -- all of whom are being evaluated by their administrators periodically--warrant closer examination in regard to their perceptions of administrative evaluation. The writer concurs with Harris (1975, p. 77) who stated, "to know what people think and feel, one must ask them."

By its nature, this research approach rewards the researcher for "knowing" how teachers perceive administrative evaluation of instruction; that is, "knowing" supporting an epistemological platform which defines "knowing" as a supersedence of the stated or the obvious focusing upon the authenticity of perception. This "knowing" has been recognized by such noted educators as Dewey (1916, p. 293) who asserted that "even if beliefs happen to be true, they do not constitute knowledge unless they have grown up in and been tested by personal experience."

"Knowing" transcends "not knowing" and, in turn, results in better understanding. In this sense, to understand is to know, and to attempt to rationalize the intent of a study of this nature is in itself condescending because of the <u>a posteriori</u> nature of the study. "Knowing" in itself is rewarding as it promotes better understanding. In this way, questions serve as their own rationale.

Considering the previous thoughts, this writer asserts that the

reason(s) for this research is/are to be found in the questions themselves. The writer maintains that "knowing" leads to better understanding and "knowing" transcends "not knowing". By acknowledging a set of conditions and by reporting what is experienced to be true through active participation on the part of the researcher (rather than by observing and concluding what is to be true without actively entering into the experience), a transcended "knowing" results. Research where the interviewer actively experiences the interviewee (by way of dialogics) serves to implement active participation.

In summary, what is to be done with the findings of this research and how the research is to be justified remains to be found in the answers to the questions posed. Concurring with the writings of Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980), an invidiual cannot separate himself from his values. The words of Dewey (1916, p. 341) support the thoughts of the writer stating, "Knowledge furnishes the means of understanding or giving means to what is still going on and what is to be done." This writer contends that the knowledge extracted from this study should precede what is to be accomplished with the results of this study; therefore, after establishing the knowledge base derived from the answers to the questions, this writer will be able to extrapolate what is to be done with the results of this study. In this way, "men educate each other through the mediation of the world (Freire, 1970, p. 13).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to better understand the perceptions of selected teachers in a southeast Kansas community regarding the administrative evaluation of instruction. Specifically, it will

investigate the perceptions of selected junior high school teachers using the semistructured interview.

Objectives

1. To better understand selected teacher's perceptions of administrative evaluation at the junior high level in a southeast Kansas community.

2. To better understand if the selected teachers in this study perceived the results of administrative evaluation of instruction as being influenced by the theory base values and perceptions of the administrator/evaluator.

3. To inquire if selected teachers perceive administrative evaluation of instruction as an important aspect of instructional improvement.

4. To better understand the degree to which teachers understand their own perceptions and attitudes toward administrative evaluation.

Limitations

No attempt will be made by the researcher to assess the availability of validity of teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation. The writer was only concerned with teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation and no other type of evaluation. Also, no specific attempt will be made by the researcher to identify grade level distinctions as far as the results of this research are concerned. With this study, the researcher was concerned with qualitatively researching the perceptions of selected teachers regarding the administrative evaluation of instruction in a southeast Kansas community. The researcher recognizes the limits imposed by the size and nature of the study and will make a

serious effort to honor these limitations in the dissertation (Lortie, 1975). Discussions will focus on the distribution of themes; where distributions are referred to it should be understood that they are tentative and require additional research (Lortie,1975). The writer includes those statements which in the writer's opinion merit attention rather than reporting all statements that resulted from the interviews.

Assumptions

The major assumptions underlying the present study were drawn from the work of Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

1. The way educators talk (word usage) affects others'perceptions. The phenomenon also works in a reciprocal fashion. Causal priority does not seem particularly important.

2. Perceptions and language are reflective of the philosophic posture (value system) of the person observing and talking.

3. The interplay of three variables--perception, language, and value system--determines the nature of the teaching-learning experience (communication).

4. The language of a profession can <u>a priori</u> determine perceptions and consequently human experience.

Definition of Terms

<u>Administrators</u> - Administrators are indivdiuals who are in charge of the management of one or more schools and who are personally responsible for the evaluation of teachers with whom they work.

Junior High Teachers - Junior high teachers are those teachers who teach grades seven, eight, and nine.

Evaluation - Evaluation is to appraise the teaching performance of teachers relative to certain criteria either preestablished or established at the time of the appraisal.

Veteran Teacher - Veteran teachers are teachers who have taught 15 years in one school district.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Prior to the review of literature, it should be noted this writer observed that a discussion of teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation would be incomplete without reviewing teaching effectiveness literature. Since the evaluation of instruction is often associated with the effectiveness of the classroom teacher and because effectiveness research influences the parameters in which competency research is conducted, each of these three areas--effectiveness, competency and evaluation--was considered in the review of literature.

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) maintained that "during the past two decades three distinctly different approaches to the study of teaching effectiveness have been established" (p. 77). The three approaches included: dominant, token and ignored research. These educators concluded, "the research currently dominating the field reflects a technical rationale." Moreover, "research efforts receiving token attention cluster around what is commonly referred to as humanistic teaching." Finally, "an almost totally ignored area of research can be appropriately labeled person-centered teaching" (p. 77). This writer utilized the approaches presented by Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting in reviewing the literature pertinent to the topic.

In order to better understand these three approaches--the dominant,

token, and ignored--and how they relate to the study of teaching effectiveness, a brief account of the historical roots of these three approaches is included in this chapter.

The Dominant Approach

This dominant approach to teaching effectiveness research has its philosophical home in logical positivism. This approach is dedicated to the improvement of the teaching effectiveness within the framework of the current institutional structure of schooling. Elaborating on this approach, Sergiovanni (1977) stated:

> Efficiency was to be maximized by defining objectives and outputs clearly, by specializing tasks through divisions of labor, and once the best way was identified, by introducing a system of controls to insure uniformity and reliability in workers' tasks, as well as standardization of product (p. 205).

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) wrote that most curricularists fall into this category. Concurring with this posture, Pinar (1978) claimed that "between 85 and 95 percent of those who work in the curriculum field share a perspective that is either tied or closely related to the dominant technocratic rationality" (pp. 5-11).

To further familiarize the reader with this approach, Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) stated:

> Studies of teaching of this nature have followed a technical-political model based on a scientific, rational explanation of human behavior. This approach to explaining effective teaching performance suggests that the proper blending of techniques and content will significantly increase student performance. This positivistic attitude views teaching as a scientific technology with identifiable, observable skills that are considered to be the 'practice' of teaching (p. 78).

In recent years, other educators have criticized the dominant approach to teaching effectiveness research. One such critic is Rogers (1983) who perceived eight negative characteristics of this approach.

These characteristics were:

1. The teacher is the possessor of knowledge, the student the expected recipient. Other means of verbal intellectual instruction are the major methods of getting knowledge into the recipient.
2. The examination measures the extent to which the student has received it.
3. The teacher is the possessor of power, the student the one who obeys.
4. Rule by authority is the accepted policy in the classroom.
5. Trust is at a minimum.
6. The subjects (students) are best governed by being kept in an intermittent or constant state of fear.
7. Democracy and its values are ignored and scorned in practice.
8. There is no place for the whole person in the educational system, only for her intellect (pp. 185-187).

In review, the roots of the dominant approach are traced to the 1920's, when scientism and scientific techniques from business and industry began to surface in the literature relative to educational theory and practice (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981). Subsequently it was at this time that managerial as well as administrative positions began to be viewed as appropriate for schools. A quote by Cubberly serves to emulate this dominant managerial perspective of curriculum:

> Every manufacturing establishment that turns out a standard product or series of products of any kind maintains a force of efficiency experts to study methods of procedure and to measure and test the output of its works. Such men ultimately bring the manufacturing establishment large returns by introducing improvements in process and procedures and in training the workmen to produce larger and better output. Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from the demands of twentieth-century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specificiations laid down. This demands good tools, specialized machinery, continuous measurement of production to see if it works according to specifications, the elimination of waste in manufacturing, and a large variety in the output (Cubberly, in Kliebard, 1975 (a), p. 52).

Commenting on this product-based orientation to curriculum, Wirsing (1972) of the University of Colorado Denver Center expressed opposition to this approach:

> In view of the fact that the approach regards students as finished products--or in the jargon of the systems analysts as 'inputs' and 'outputs'--the implications for standardization and stabilization of the human material with which the schools work are staggering. In my opinion, the programmed mentalities of growing numbers of engineers, technicians, and researchers of human behavior make the narcissistic flag-waving of the Daughters of the American Revolution insignificant by comparison (p. 17).

Emerging from the management orientation of the early 1900s, Taylor (1980) constructed a model articulating the phrase "scientific management" relative to the school. This model focused upon three general principles: efficiency, control and prediction (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981). Expanding Taylor's model, Bobbitt (1981) added that outcomes needed to be precisely predicted in order that maximum efficiency might result; therefore, the curriculum must be specified.

As a result of the type of attention directed toward schooling at this time, Eisner (1983) contended that "school administrators embraced scientific management" in the hope that it would reduce their vulnerability to public criticism and in the process make schools more efficient. In addition, with this type of educational posture Eisner expressed that:

> teachers were regarded as workers to be supervised by specialists who made sure that goals were being attained, that teachers were performing as prescribed, and that the public who paid for the schools were getting their money's worth. (p. 7).

Eisner concluded that the industrial metaphor (which he traced back to Thorndike and Taylor) "set the tone for American education that is still with us" (p. 7). Eisner criticized this approach to education

is that "personal ingenuity on the teacher's part" diminishes in the pursuit for the "one best method that scientific management of education would prescribe" (p. 7).

In other comments about the scientific managment orientation to education, Eisner (1983) noted:

> Unlike automobiles rolling down an assembly line where an additive model works fairly well, (interaction effects are small), the children a classroom teacher deals with are unique configurations that change over time. Unlike electrons or billiard balls, students have ambitions and purposes and refuse to be treated as lumps of clay or sheets of steel passively awaiting the impact of a scientifically based teaching technology that provides little or no scope in its assumptions for what the students make of all of this. Our roles as teachers are closer to those of negotiators than to puppeteers or engineers. And even when we succeed in shaping our students' surfaces, unless we touch their souls we will be locked out of their lives. Much of contemporary education in both the public school and the university seldom gets more than skin deep (p. 7).

Taylor and Bobbitt (cited in Eisner, 1975) were in company with other educational leaders, such as Snedden and Charters, who supported the efforts of the scientific management approach. In fact, Charters was asked to conduct a curriculum study for Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri, where he was asked to develop a program whereby women could be trained "for the specific job of being a woman" (Eisner, 1975, p. 60).

From Charters' work at Stephens College, many of the emphases that were designed and utilized for that particular program have been viewed as carry-over to the present day, dominant curriculum field, namely, in the form of behavioral objectives and observable and measurable competencies (Kliebard, 1975). Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1982) elaborated on the language employed by individuals approaching curriculum studies along "technical lines." With regard to the aspect of how

language affects teaching effectiveness. Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1982) stated:

> Educational words have power, the power to direct the procedures and purposes of research. Typical words used in research on teaching effectiveness are behavior (student and teacher), effectiveness, personality, achievement, outcomes, interaction, characteristics, behavioral measurements, and performance. More recently the literature is using such words as 'direct instruction', 'time on task', 'assignments', 'exception', 'monitoring', 'pupil task involvement', 'seat work', and a whole host of terms that reflect technical and political value bases. The metaphorical bases of these words are industrial, military, and disease (medical) . . . (p. 10).

Other components noted in the literature relatve to the dominant curriculum included: the ameliorative orientation, ahistorical posture, behavioristic allegiance, and technological orientation (Kliebard, 1975b). The dominant approach utilized theory exclusively to guide practice: theory anticipating and attempting to control practice. In fact, these "traditionalists" have been criticized for the degree to which this approach is ahistorical. For example, Kliebard (1975b) has cited that many Ph.D. programs subscribing to this view of curriculum do not require a course in the history of education. Kleibard (1975) commented on this ahistorical orientation:

> Generally speaking, the foremost scholars in other fields continually engage in a kind of dialogue with their ancestral counterparts--rejecting, revising, or refining the early formulations and concepts. No such cumulative approach to the content of the curriculum field has yet emerged, and this has had the telling effect on the relative permanence of curriculum thinking. Issues tend to arise de novo, usually in the form of a band wagon and then quickly disappear in a cloud of dust. Sometimes these issues have their counterparts in an earlier period, but this is rarely recognized. The field in general is characterized by an uncritical propensity for novelty and change rather than founded knowledge or dialogue across generations (p. 41).

In 1949, a brook written by Tyler posed four questions. Playing a most significant role in the theoretical development of the field itself, these questions came to epitomize the traditional scope of the curriculum field. These four questions posed by Tyler were:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?

2. How can learning experiences be selected that are likely to be useful in attaining these objectives?

3. How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction?

4. How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated (p. 1)?

The impact of Tyler's book was evidenced in the fact that it was widely purchased for use in college and university curriculum courses. Furthermore, these same four curriculum questions are currently being addressed in the literature. For example, Kemp (1977) expanded upon the framework established by Tyler's four curriculum questions and idenfified eight steps to guide curriculum planning.

Kemp's (1977, p. 3) model was written to remedy what was perceived by "an increasing number of individuals" as ineffeciency and effectiveness in education. To increase efficiency and effectiveness, Kemp's model was designed to provide answers to three questions that were considered to be "the essential elements of instructional technology" (p. 8). Kemp's questions were:

1. What must be learned (objectives)?

2. What procedures and resources will work best to reach the desired learning levels?

3. How will we know when the required learning has taken place (evaluation) (p. 8)?

Apple (1979) criticized several aspects of this approach, one of

which was the behavioral objectives movement which he contended has striven toward reducing student action to "specifiable forms of overt behavior so that the educator can have certitude of outcome" (p. 109). Apple (1979) concluded that "superficiality" of this type is most "disturbing" because of the fact that students are instructed as to how they are to think, act, and feel following the completion of a teacher-planned activity. Apple (1983) addressed the topic further and stated:

> My point is not to argue against the specific curricular of pedagogical content of this kind of material, though an analysis certainly would be interesting. Rather it is to have us focus on the form itself. What is this doing? The goals, the process, the outcome, the evaluative criteria for assessing them are defined as precisely as possible by people external to the situation. In the competency measure at the end of the module, this extends to the specification of even the exact words the teacher is to say (p. 255).

Also, Apple (1983) referred to the process of deskilling which involves the atrophy of skills "essential to the craft of working with children" (p. 256). Furthermore, he contended that because planning was separated from execution in that planning was carried out at the production level and execution was carried out by the teacher, there was room for the introduction of material which disregarded the specific individuals for whom it was quite anonymously designed to educate. In this way, the variability of learner characteristics was not addressed. Persons external to the situation oftentimes determined what was or was not to be taught in the classroom in the form of prepackaged materials without prior exposure to the students for whom the material was designed. In addition, after the deskilling of instructors has taken place, Apple (1983) cautioned against the reskilling of teachers that involved the substitution of the skills and ideological visions of measurement. With deskilling and reskilling, the language and

modification techniques are incorporated into the curricular material and "as teachers lose control of the curricular and pedagogic skills to large publishing houses, these skills are replaced by techniques for better controlling students" (p. 256).

Eisner (1979) expressed concern for the nature of this dominant approach to curriculum and noted that educational outcomes were not always predictable and could be limiting, thereby promoting preplanned goals rather than expanding the learning process to accommodate the learner. Eisner (1979) stated:

> There is, of course, a reasonableness in the desire to have objectives in order to evaluate the effectiveness of an educational program. Yet, the evaluative net one casts can and ought to be much wider than the particular objective or set of objectives specified by a particular curriculum. The outcomes of educational programs are not completely predictable, and hence to evaluate only for those goals one has intended can lead one to neglect equally important, and at times even more important, outcomes that were unintended. Using objectives to serve as criteria for evaluating educational programs has an important function to perform, but a conception of evaluation that limits itself to what has been preplanned in terms of goals or objectives is likely to be educationally thin (p. 174).

During the early 1950s, criticism mounted regarding the quality of American elementary and secondary education. Men such as Rickover and others decided that the schools were not strict enough. Responding to the criticism, men such as Zacharias of MIT were called into the schools to help reform the curriculum. Such noted individuals as Zacharias, however, were scientists and mathematicians, and therefore not affiliated with the dominant camp. It is because of their affiliation with another group of educators that the activities of these scientists (along with the launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik in 1957) accelerated the national curriculum reform in a different direction (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981).

It was noted that carry-over from the technocratic rationale remain viable and strong today (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981). Substantiating this stance:

> These principles persevere today as strong considerations in curriculum development, in selecting educational materials, in developing instructional systems, and in other aspects of the educational program administration (Sergiovanni, 1976, p. 205).

The Token Approach

According to Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) the second approach to research, which has received "token attention" in the literature has been "humanistic teaching." This statement by MacDonald (1977) assists in clarifying the humanistic educational perspective:

> Humanistic education reflects both a contemporary reaction to perceived negative school practices and the historically perceived implementation of more progressive educational practices. Movement toward behavioral objectives, instructional systems, performance contracting, test score accountability, and similar phenomena is often seen as a potential threat to the human educational process. This threat is, however, bracketed by the continuous concern for education of the 'whole person', education related to the development of individuals, and education that reflects awareness of the total dimensions of humanism (p. 346).

One author who has directed considerable attention toward this approach to effectiveness research was Combs (1964). It must be noted that from this research, the "self as instrument" concept, presented by Combs, depicted a personal view of teaching. Furthermore, Combs cited that, unlike the dominant approach, the effective professional worker (teacher or whoever) was "no longer regarded as a technician applying methods in a more or less mechanical fashion the way he has been taught" (p. 8). Combs continued by stating that the professional worker "is a person who has learned to use himself as an effective

instrument" (p. 8). To this extent, "creative individuals, capable of shifting and changing to meet the demands and opportunities afforded in daily tasks . . . will not behave in a set way" (Combs, 1964, p. 373).

Relative to the concept of the professional worker in teaching, Combs (1965, p. 8) suggested that "teacher education programs must concern themselves with persons rather than competencies." To continue Combs stated, "the good teacher has found ways of using himself, his talents, and his surroundings in a fashion that aids both his students and himself to achieve satisfaction--their own and society's too" (p. 8).

Combs wrote that "if the self as instrument concept of the professional worker is valid," (p. 8) then guidelines "for such a program" (p. 8) need to be known. Furthermore, Combs contended that in order "to provide the guidelines for such a program," (p. 8) these four concerns need to be addressed:

1. The nature of the self,
2. How it [the self] develops,
3. How it [the self] may be changed, and
4. What a good teaching self is like (p. 10).

Combs (1965) suggested that "modern humanistic psychology supplies us with just such kinds of understandings" (p. 10). He cited artists "who sometimes refer to the discovery of one's personal idiom and the expression seems very apt applied to teaching as well" (p. 9). Combs related this to a definition of effective teaching. He stated that the effective teacher is "a unique human being who has learned to use himself effectively and efficiently to carry out his own and society's purposes in the education of others." (p. 9). Combs concluded that this way of viewing people was a different approach than "most of today's

teacher educators grew up with" (p. 10).

Another individual who devoted considerable time and effort to writing about this approach to research was Rogers (1983). Rogers contended that the present educational system was not meeting the "real needs of our society" (p. 1). Furthermore, Rogers stated that the schools in this country "generally constitute the most traditional, conservative, rigid, bureaucratic institutions of our time, and the institution most resistant to change" (p. 1). Hall (1977) reinforced Rogers' thoughts and presented a similar perspective stating, "Somehow in the United States, we have managed to transform one of the most rewarding of all human activities into a painful, boring, dull, fragmenting, mind-shrinking, soul-shriveling experience." (p. 207).

Rahter than the "mind shrinking" approach to education that Hall (1977) has described in the literature, Rogers (1983) suggested there are qualities and/or attitudes which facilitate learning in a more humane fashion. These attitudes were expanded by Rogers and included: "realness or genuineness" (p. 123); "prizing, acceptance, and trust" (p. 124); and "emphatic understanding" (p. 125). To briefly expound on these attributes, Rogers contended that realness or genuineness was emulated by verbiage such as facilitating, which was defined as "entering into a relationship with the learner without presenting a front or facade." (p. 122). Furthermore, Rogers stated that realness or genuiness involves the teacher experiencing "a direct personal encounter with the learner meeting her on a person-to-person basis" (p. 122) whereby "she [the teacher] is a person to her students, not a faceless embodiment of a curriculur requirement nor a sterile tube through which knowledge is passed from one generation to the next" (p. 122).

Relative to prizing, acceptance, and trust, Rogers (1983) stated:

> I think of it as prizing the learner, prizing her feelings, her opinions, her person. It is caring for the learner, but a non-possessive caring. It it is an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in her own right. It is a basic trust--a belief that this person is somehow fundamentally trustworthy. Whether we call it prizing, acceptance, trust, or by some other term, it shows up in a variety of observable ways . . . . What we are describing is a prizing of the learner as an imperfect human being with many feelings, many potentialities (p. 124).

The third attitude cited by Rogers, empathic understanding, "establishes a climate for self-initiated, experiential learning" (p. 124). Donated as "sharply different from the usual evaluative understanding" (p. 125), this attribute surfaces "when the teacher has the ability to understand the student's reactions from the inside, has a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems to the student . . . ." (p. 125.

Rogers (1983) contended that a person-centered approach to teaching as opposed to the dominant approach, cited earlier in this chapter, can manifest itself if a precondition of trustworthiness existed because one is secure in himself and in his relationships with others. In this way, one "experiences an essential trust in the capacity of others to think for themselves, to learn for themselves" (p. 125). Rogers maintained that other aspects were possible if this precondition existed, and he expounded on these briefly: "in this growth-promoting climate, the learning tends to be deeper, proceeds at a more rapid rate, and is more pervasive in the life and behavior of the student than is learning acquired in the traditional classroom " (p. 125).

For 17 years, the National Consortium for Humanizing Education, with the assistance of Aspy and Roebuck (1975), conducted research in

42 states and seven foreign countries with this study revealing that many positive effects result from relating person-centered principles to daily school practice. The investigations included students of all age groups from the elementary to the college level. Summarily, the findings of this project disclosed that high levels of understanding, caring, and genuineness promote increased learning and better behavior in students. Illustrating the significance of interpersonal relationships revealed by this research, Aspy (cited in Weller, 1977) stated:

> Without stretching the data too far, it seems logical to infer for the foregoing that teachers do not have much intellectual respect for their students. This conclusion seems warranted by the fact that they rarely ask them to think in class. It may be that most teachers do not know how to elicit thinking behavior from students, and, thus, cannot do so. This rests upon the notion that teaching behavior is a function of response repertoire. These studies were successful in that they led to a broad confirmation of the position that positive interpersonal relationships facilitate learning (p. 130).

Goble (1970, p. 69) cited that, "Third force psychological theory calls for a new kind of education." He went on to note that Maslow suggested more emphasis needed to be placed on "development of the person's potential, particularly the potential to be human, to understand self and others and relate to them, to achieve the basic human needs, to grow toward self-actualization" (p. 69). Aspects of growth supported by this approach included those which implemented and nurtured spontaneity, self-discipline, creativity, democracy, firsthand observation, and experiential learning. Goble (1970) stated, "all too often the (teaching) process reduces rather than increases intuition and creativity, although some students have gained these characteristics through education" (p. 70).

In regard to "Third Force" classroom instruction, Goble (1970)

cited:

> Instruction in the classroom should be related to life. The student should learn to grow, learn the difference between good and bad and what is desirable and undesirable and what to choose and not to choose. To acquire wisdom, maturity, taste, and character requires experience, trial, and error, success, failure, disappointment, pain, marriage, having children. These are all important parts of the learning experience (p. 70).

Kolensnik (1975, p. 53) stated that "the purpose of education is considerably broader than passsing on the accummulated wisdom and experience of the past." He added that "its purpose, rather is to help each student learn to be himself, to relate to others, and to live happily here and now as well as to prepare him for a social role" (p. 53). Furthermore, Kolensnik (1975) stated:

> It is to help him learn how to learn, and to enjoy learning, and to want to continue learning. It is to help him learn to think for himself, to make his own decisions, to formulate his own system of values and beliefs. It is to help him learn to assume and carry out responsibilities, including the responsibility for his own education. It is to help him to learn to love and feel and create and express himself. It is to help him develop whatever limitations he might have. The purpose of education, in short, is to help the individual student become a fully-functioning human being. Its focus, therefore, according to the humanists, should not be on the heritage or the material to be learned, but on the student himself (p. 53).

Another educationalist, Trump (1972) discussed his view of humanistic schools and cited 12 qualities that he believed were commonly found in humanistic schools. In summary, selected examples of these 12 qualities included:

1. Focusing on options rather than uniformity.

2. Devising a program for each pupil in which he can move forward with success in terms of his own talents and interests, no matter how diverse they may be,

3. Making sure that every pupil is known as a total human being,

4. Creating an environment in which each teacher may make maximum utilization of his professional talents and interests, one that recognizes individual differences among teachers, one that provides differentiated staffing to identify better the role of the professional teacher,

5. Providing a variety of places in the school and the community where pupils may study and work with supervision so that each pupil may find learning strategies that suit him best,

6. Having continuous progress arrangements so that each pupil may proceed at his own pace under competent supervision with a variety of self-directing, self-motivating and self-evaluating materials and locations,

7. Substituting constructive reports of achievements for the threats of failure as the prime motivational device of the school (pp. 9-11).

Dewey (1931, pp. 73-76) frequently criticized the dominant approach in regard to "mere receptive passivity on the part of a pupil and mere pouring in by textbook and teacher." He concluded that in the dominant approach "material is not committed to heart: it is only entrusted to some portion of the cerebellum" (p. 73). Therefore, "personal cultivation is not attained" (p. 74).

In pursuit of personal cultivation, Dewey cited the importance of another aspect of education which can help to nurture personal cultivation: appreciation. Dewey cited:

> Appreciation, in short, is more than immediate and transient emotional stir and turmoil. It shapes things that come home to us, that we deeply realize have possibilities, and that entail consequences. To appreciate is to trace mentally these outleadings, to place the possibilities before the mind so that they have felt significance and value. There is no fact and no idea or principle that is not pregnant, that does not lead out into other things. The greatest and the commonest defect in teaching lies in presenting material in such fashion that it does not arouse a sense of these leadings and a desire to follow them. There is then no appreciation, no personally experienced value, because what is presented is presented as if it had its meaning complete in itself, as if it were closed and shut.

> Think over the teachers that you would call inspiring and you will find that they were the teachers who made you aware of possibilities in the things which they taught and who bred in you desire to realize those possibilities for yourself (p. 73-76).

The Ignored Approach

The third approach to effectiveness research that was discussed by Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) was referred to as the "ignored approach". Reflecting on the 1970s, a group of educators questioned the assumptions underlying the existing modes of curriculum. To expound on this approach, Connerton (1976) explained that exponents "focus more upon critique in relation to the system of societal or organizational constraints which are humanly produced and which affect negatively the development of individuals, groups, and societies" (pp. 17-18).

To further explain the philosophy of this approach to curriculum Eurich (1969) commented:

> The key to reforming American education is new ideas: new ideas to challenge educational dogmas; new ideas to stimulate change; new ideas to suggest lines of research and development. And back of these new ideas a total 'innovative approach' which asks constantly: Why? Why are we doing things this way rather than another, possibly better, way? Why do we assume that students learn in such and such a fashion? Why do we limit our learning resources to such a slim sliver of the available technology and materials? Why do we organize our schools and colleges into self-contained classrooms and uniform-size classes each taught by a single teacher? Why, in fact, do we build schools, staff them with teachers, and attempt to education at all (p. 19)?

Leaders affiliated with the ignored approach included Greene, Kliebard, Giroux, Pinar, and Apple. Pinar (1975, p. 359) suggested that a common theme of this approach embraced "the contention that

the schooling experience is a dehumanizing one." Furthermore, "whatever native intelligence, resourcefulness, indeed, whatever goodness is inherent in man deteriorates under the impact of the school" (p. 359). Therefore, "the result is the one-dimensional man, the anomic man, dehumanized and, for some critics, maddened" (p. 359).

Freire (1970) contented that one practice which has occurred in the process of schooling has been the "banking concept." Two groups of individuals were included in the "banking concept": those individuals who were teaching and those individuals who were being taught. Freire stated:

> Education becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communique's and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the 'banking' concept of education, in which the scope of the action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits. They do, it is true, have the opportunity to become collectors or cataloguers of the things they store. But in the last analysis it is man themselves who are filed away through the lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system (p. 58).

Examining the roots of this approach, a curriculum conference in 1947 at the University of Chicago, was considered instrumental in delineating the ignored approach. More recent conferences at Ohio State University (1967) and Stanford University (1969), promoted a "reconceptualization" of major issues and concerns. Further support for these reconceptualized issues was drawn from such theories as existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, and neo-Marxism. Selected leaders affiliated with this camp maintained:

> Pinar has attempted to illuminate the importance of using a psychoanalytical framework in analyzing experiential and gender issues in the school process; Huebner has provided an extended critique of the technocratic rationality

> that permeates the underlying structural principles of existing curriculum thinking: Kliebard has written historical accounts of the 'scientism' that has not only influenced curriculum development but also lies at the center of the relationship that ties schools to the logic of capitalism; Greene has written extensively about the value of the arts for developing meaning in the classroom encounter; finally, MacDonald and Apple have voiced similar concerns about subjecting the curriculum field to political and social critiques (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981, p. 7).

At the close of the 1970s, growing influence regarding the "rejection of the positivistic and conservative nature of existing curriculum theory and practice" mounted (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981, p. 6). As can be noted, the primary focus of concern with this movement was the human subject. Combining theory and practice was perceived as being in the interest of "freeing individuals and social groups from subjective and objective conditions that bind them to forces and exploitation and oppression" (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981, p. 7).

Continuing, phrases such as "self-reflection" and "value-laden curriculum were incorporated by prominent writers affiliated with this approach. Also, this group of curricularists suggested a learning process whereby thought and education were "mediated by specific cognitive, affective, and moral dimensions" (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar, Eds., 1981, p.7). Highly critical of the concept of value-neutrality, this group of educators was in direct opposition to the dominant group in which value-neutrality was considered to be an objective stance from which to conduct research and schooling. Snarey (1981) substantiated:

> A 'value-neutral' position, based only on facts about child development or about methods of education, cannot in itself directly contribute to educational practice. Factual statements about what the processes of learning and development are cannot be directly translated into

> statements about what children's learning and development ought to be without introduction of some value-principles. In 'value-neutral' research, learning does not necessarily imply movement to a stage of greater cognitive or ethical adequacy (p. 172).

Another dimension which this group of educators chose to address was the effect of a teacher's personal philosophy upon the schooling process. In conjunction with this, Wirsing (1972, p. 4) contended that, "consciously or unconsciously, every teacher makes a myriad of decisions each day in terms of his particualr stock of underlying beliefs."

Wirsing continued by noting that the way in which a teacher "ascertains" objectives and then "selects, structures, and teaches" depends upon his "theoretical framework," that is, what he believes about "the good life, how people learn, and what they need to learn." Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) presented ideas complementary to this position:

> Inherent in a teacher's personal philosophy are assumptions about the purposes of schooling, the nature of knowledge, a view of society, and the person's position within that society. These views have an effect on what a teacher does in the classroom. How teachers organize curriculum, evaluate students, interact with students, and view themselves within the teaching-learning context are all affected by the basic philosophical orientation they bring to the classroom (p. 84).

Other dimensions of this "ignored" approach to curriculum include: examining important historically situated curriculum issues, consciously abandoning the technocratic mantality; a nonprescriptive stature; and providing educations with a variety of possibilities for developing more flexible and humanizing forms of pedagogy (Tanner and Tanner, 1979). It should be noted, however, that even though agreement exists relative to several of the major aspects of this approach, it has been cited that curricularists who have been affiliated with

this camp pursue uniquely individual avenues of thought (Tanner and Tanner, 1979).

Even with these differing opinions relative to the "reconceptualization of curriculum," by the end of the 1970's the works of Green and others attracted considerable attention as well as criticism from curricularists outside the boundaries of the reconceptualizing tradition (Tanner and Tanner, 1979).

Even so, these individuals with their somewhat different focal points were instrumental in reopening a heated debate in a field recently declared moribund (Tanner and Tanner, 1979). This type of discussion in itself was considered an accomplishment for this "ignored" group of educators, since it became evident, as a result of these debates, that the work of these individual was being read and discussed.

Other philosophical differences between the dominant and ignored approaches were very evident; the dominant approach accepted the present social order whereas the ignored approach did not. As stated by Giroux, Penna, and Pinar (1981, p. 94), "Because the difficulties . . . are related to difficulties in the culture at large, they are not 'problems that can be solved'." It was written that those individuals who agree with the ignored approach perceived that the concept created by the dominant approach was in itself problematic. Therefore, "a fundamental structural change in the culture is necessary" (p. 94). Furthermore, "what is necessary is a reconceptualization of what curriculum is, how it functions, and how it might function in emancipatory ways" (p. 94) Concluding, "it is the commitment to a comprehensive critique and theory development" that distinguishes this ignored approach to effectiveness research.

Competency and Evaluation

As previously discussed, the second major area affecting the evaluation of instruction was competency research. In brief, information relative to various states was included in the review of literature. However, since this study was conducted in a Kansas school, this review of literature will primarily be focused on Kansas schools.

A statement by Rogers (1983) delineated the framework from which this discussion was initiated:

> The schools of education throughout the country where young people receive their pre-service and in-service training, are, by and large, in a sorry state. They tend to be rigid bastions of conventional thinking and practice, and highly resistant to change. On many university campuses, education courses are looked down upon as a boring waste of time. Fortunately, there are exceptions, institutions where a human climate for learning is created, where prospective teachers experience the excitment of discovery--both in regard to themselves and the subject matter they will teach (p. 163).

A statment by Koerner (1963) also warrants consideration:

> The professional courses required of elementary and secondary teachers--courses that still constitute the main business of education--are not constructed around programs of proven worth. Rather, they represent a half century's haphazard accretions for which no very specific rationale, either theoretical or empirical exists (p. 50).

As a result of criticisms such as these, many changes in the structure of teacher education programs have been implemented. The major objective of the changes has been increased teacher competency. To illustrate the changes that are taking place at the state level, an article by Ervay and Bowers (1981) suggested that a new approach to the preparation of middle level teachers in the state of Kansas needed to be implemented.

Since September, 1982, Kansas certification standards have been revised, delineating clearer, more concise requirements for middle level

teachers. Prior to 1982, applicants were classified as elementary, secondary, or all-level teachers on their Kansas teaching certificates. Certification to teach "most of all middle school grades was granted by the state regardless of an applicant's classification (p. 11).

Furthermore, in accordance with the new certification standards, applicants for middle level certification are required to complete 200 clock hours of assignments in grades five through nine (Ervay and Bowers, 1983). In addition, a required course in reading in the content area and endorsements in two middle level teaching fields are specified.

Ervay and Bowers (1983, p. 11) state that these standards do not meet the needs of middle level teachers "to effectively understand and work with that unique age group." Therefore, Ervay and Bowers proposed a "non-prescriptive preservice program in the implementation of internships for first and second year teachers, with middle level schools, and area universities serving as joint sponsors" (p. 11).

Ervay and Bowers (1983) included the following components in their proposal to accomplish the task of preparing and certifying middle level teachers:

1. A competency-based preservice program suitable to the needs of the parent institution, which can provide evidence of its effectiveness

2. A sponsoring internship committee consisting of a building teacher-sponsor, a middle level administrator from another district, and a university middle level specialist

3. A progress chart based on specified competencies

4. Kansas' new 'Preservice and Inservice Education' plan to give the new teacher credit for recertification (pp. 11-12).

The article continued by stating that Kansas Governor Carlin proposed an internship plan "based on model programs already in existence in such states as Oklahoma and Nevada" (pp. 12-13). Essentially, the internship model for certification of middle level teachers included several elements. Upon completing an accredited teacher education program, individuals would receive a two-year regular teaching certificate in Kansas. Pending program approval, teacher education units would provide evidence of adequate preservice middle level teacher preparation.

Following the employment of a first-year teacher, a sponsoring committee would be assigned to evaluate that teacher. This committee would consist of a teacher-sponsor who also teachers in the building, an administrator from another district, and a middle level specialist from a university. This committee would use a well-defined procedure as well as specific criteria to assess the progress of the new teacher.

Furthermore, indicators of competence appropriate to the middle school teaching performance would be established. "Ideal behaviors would be compared to the performance of a new teacher" (Ervay and Bowers, 1983), pp. 12-13). A narrative description would be written and a nonsegmented continuum ranging from "some progress to minimum competency demonstrated to mastery" (pp. 12-13). It was cited that this concept is based on a holistic evaluation of teachers "as they seek an appropriate teaching demeanor or personality" (pp. 12-13). Members of the sponsoring committee would serve a support role in addition to their primary role as evaluator.

After the initial two-year certification period, this proposal

suggested the sponsoring committee retain the authority to grant adequate inservice points to allow recertification. Meeting regularly, sponsoring committee members would discuss and assess the new teacher's performance and would suggest methods whereby the "new teacher can move more rapidly toward specified performance objectives" (pp. 12-13). The building administrator may also be included in committee meetings when deemed necessary by committee members. The sponsoring committee would work with the new teacher a minimum of one year; two years if the committee deemed it necessary.

In addition to providing assistance for beginning teachers, the Kansas Plan, which was also discussed in "the Official Publication of the Kansas-National Education Association" (1983) cited three other target areas regarding teacher preparation. These three areas:

1. Provide continuous evaluation of student progress and establish professional examinations for prospective teachers.

2. Require teacher education faculty to maintan professional growth programs.

3. Establish a legally autonomous standards board (pp. 6-7).

An article by McIntosh (1982, p. 1) explored the possibility of "teacher-training institutions providing a warranty to school districts for new teachers graduated from the institutions and hired by the school district." The article continued by stating: "This is, in essence, a guarantee that the graduate will perform in the classroom according to criteria established by the institution. Should a graduate not be able to perform effectively, the college or university must institute a system for remedying the problem at no cost to the employing district."

In essence, "such a model will require teacher-training institutions to establish performance criteria for the teachers they graduate and to drastically change the ways teachers are taught and supervised (McIntosh, 1982, p. 1).

This trend toward "satisfaction guaranteed" has been called "The Maytag Warranty" (1984). The University of Virginia, for example, maintains that for the first year of teaching a graduate of Virginia's program who is employed in the state and is having "trouble on the job will have the help of a range of faculty members" (p. 64). The University of Northern Colorado has a two-year guarantee after a graduate acquires a teaching position whereby the university will assist the graduate in overcoming weaknesses identified by a teacher's supervisor.

In addition, the combined Schools of Education for Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College have "Quality Assurance Programs," which Dean Barr claims, "represents an accountability previously lacking in teacher education in the United States" (p. 64). It was cited that "an Oregon statute specifies the teacher evaluation systems school boards must establish" (p. 64). Furthermore, "if a teacher is not performing well, the evaluation procedures must include a written program of improvement and how to go about it" (p. 64). Further courses are available to individuals for consulting and/or program improvement.

It should be noted, however, that discrepancies exist as to exactly what is perceived to be the best method with which to prepare future teachers. Recently, there has been considerable attention directed toward the National Teacher Examination (NTE) given by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. It has been

cited that the NTE are:

> Described in the official Bulletin of Information as '. . . standardized, secure tests that provide objective measures of academic achievement for college seniors completing teacher-education programs, and for advanced candidates who have received additional training in specific fields' (Fox, 1984, p. 5).

Critics who oppose the testing of teachers to determine competency are numerous and verbal. For example, Koerner (1963) stated:

> Everywhere in the writing and research of the field, more so now than ever, is the drift toward quantification, toward classifying all things educational, measuring them, counting them, listing them, finding their modes, means, and medians, and coefficients of correlation. Only partly is this preoccupation a reflection of the educationists's belief in the ubiquitous usefulness of the scientific method; partly it is the old problem of concern for status and professionalism; and partly it is a refuge from the necessarily imprecise, intuitional, frustrating means that must be used in any effort to solve the really important problems of education. Not only does scientism in education produce little of value in relation to the numbers of people, time, and resources devoted to it, but it also has a great many harmful effects in the education of teachers. It diverts them from some of the most important professional problems that they might otherwise deal with, and encourages the pernicious belief that their teaching can be based on some kind of exact or scientific foundation. It tends to produce teachers who 'are afraid of offending the golden calf of empiricism' (p. 31).

Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1982) cautioned against teacher education programs that implemented "the xerox model of teacher education" and explained that "designing the means of determing teacher effectiveness and teacher competency becomes complex" (p. 12). To expound on this stance, West (1972) stated:

> By operating on the assumption that all teachers are alike in needs, abilities, and aspirations, the school has inadvertently sanctioned an organizational farce. That teachers are massively and indiscriminately lumped together is easily corroborated by a perfunctionary examination of the single salary schedule, which not only fails to provide for a differentiation and delegation of responsibilities

> but also recognizes competence and creativity as a natural outgrowth of coursework accumulation and years of service. And for these alleged attributes it pays accordingly. Viewed from this perspective, a teacher is, at best, a carbon copy of his colleagues. The individuality he possesses is submerged within the context of the group (p. 249).

Coker, Medley, and Soar (1980) have reported that "little evidence exists to show a relationship between mastery of a given set of competencies and effective teaching" (p. 131). It should be emphasized that research pertaining to the competence or incompetence of teachers is not conclusive at this time. However, research conducted by Coker, Medley, and Soar warrants examination. They stated:

> To frame an operational definition, we must ask whether a high score on a competence measure accurately indicates mastery of that competence. All, or virtually all, the competence measures used in current competency-based teacher education programs (e.g., University of Houston) or in certification programs (e.g., the pioneering Georgia State Department of Education program) depend on judgments by trained observers recorded in the form of ratings There are no 'objective' records of the behaviors observed. Evidence that the judgments reflect the behaviors accurately, so that a high rating may be taken as a dependable indicator that an individual possesses a specific competence, is rarely or never presented. It appears that all we can be sure of is that the teachers graduated or certified are competent to make a favorable impression on a rater (p. 131).

The term evaluation as defined by the Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Medley, 1982, p. 482) "signifies describing something in terms of selected attributes and judging the degree of acceptability or suitability of that which has been described." Within the context of this dissertation, the term evaluation will refer to evaluation of classroom instruction.

In addition to the diversity of opinions voiced by educators regarding the evaluation of instruction, lawmakers have addressed

the topic in the form of legislation thereby mandating teacher evaluation in many states. Millman (1981) reported examples of differing state regulations:

> Several state legislatures have mandated the evaluation of teachers and state boards have approved state regulations, which have usually been formulated by employees of the state's department of education. For example, California's legislation, commonly termed the Stull Act, requires the evaluation of all certified employees from district superintendent to credentialed teacher assistants. The Pennsylvania School Code mandates an annual rating of all professional and temporary professional personnel in the public schools. Various state regulations in New Jersey call for the evaluation of all certified public school employees, with different rules for tenured and nontenured staff (pp. 294-295).

Wuhs and Manatt (1983) reported that prior to 1977, limited mandatory action was taken regarding teacher evaluation; only six states required such an evaluation. However, in the last 12 years, the line of demarcation has been drawn in 26 states requiring that teachers be evaluated. Purposes for mandatory evaluation of instruction included: dismissal, improvement of instruction, and accountability. According to Wuhs and Manatt, most laws mandate that administrators as well as teachers be evaluated.

To illustrate the diversity of reasons cited for mandating teacher evaluation at the state level, a synopsis of evaluation requirements for Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas was examined. In terms of evaluation mandates, in 1973, Kansas adopted a statute which stated that the purpose of teacher evaluation was improvement of instruction. According to Wuhs and Manatt (1983) this statute has not been updated or changed since its adoption. Furthermore, administrators were required to be evaluated in Kansas that same year. It was noted:

> Under the law, every local school board in Kansas must have an up-to-date written policy of teacher evaluation on file at all time with the Kansas State Board of Education in Topeka. The factors in the evaluation normally include efficiency, personal qualities, professional conduct, ability, physical and mental health, and the ability to discipline students. During the first two years on the job, a teacher is evaluated twice a year. During the third and fourth years, teachers are formally evaluated at least once a year. After that, teachers are evaluated at least once every three years. All evaluations of teachers and administrators must be made in writing and kept on file at least three years. The files are available to local school boards and a few key, responsible representatives of the local school district, but not to the entire community (Kansas: The State of Education, 1983, p. 7).

In Oklahoma, a statute was adopted in 1977, which designated the purposes of teacher evaluation as dismissal and improvement of instruction. In the same year, Oklahoma adminstrators were also required to have mandated evaluations. At the time Wuhs and Manatt wrote this article, Missouri had no mandated evaluation requirements for teachers or administrators. However, in 1983, in Missouri, legislation was passed which required local school districts to implement teacher evaluation under guidelines established by the Missouri State Department of Education (Mallory, 1984). On the other hand, Arkansas adopted teacher evaluation in 1971 for the purpose of dismissal; administrators were not required to be evaluated in that state according to Wuhs and Manatt (1983).

It was acknowledged in the article by Wuhs and Manatt (1983) that states mandated evaluation of instruction for different reasons and implemented different techniques to accomplish this task. In recent years, evaluation has become a somewhat controversial issue as exemplified in a statement by Millman (1981):

> Initiation and development of state requirements for the evaluation of teachers within school districts are

> politically expedient. They are the state government's attempt to show the public that local districts are being held accountable for the quality of education. The regulations give the appearance that legislators and boards are concerned about teacher competence. They are held up to the public as though they alone will somehow improve instruction. Moreover, the state government is relieved of the responsibility for the implementation of the regulations, and no additional tax moneys are expended for programs that assist teachers to improve their performance. Riessman (1978) states that the temptation to tinker with public education is enhanced by the fact that state and federal officials are not, in the last resort, held responsible for what happens within local schools (p. 295).

A recent study of teacher evaluation was conducted by the Rand Corporation in 32 school districts across the United States. This study reported that "teacher evaluation presently is an underconceptualized and underdeveloped activity" (Funk, 1984, p. 5). Furthermore, it was cited that evaluation generally served these basic purposes: individual staff development, school improvement, individual personnel decisions, and school status decisions. It was noted that the former two purposes involve improvement while the latter two are concerned with accountability. Funk concluded by noting conditions necessary for successful teacher evaluation. These conditions included the adoption of an evaluation system complementary to the goals and the perception of the teacher in the community, a time commitment necessary, for teacher evaluation, trained evaluators, and teacher involvement in the design and oversight of teacher evaluation.

Coker, Medley, and Soar (1984) commented on problems inherent in evaluation criteria and stated that in the past, research focused on identifying characteristics as effective or less effective rather than identifying the best practices. These authors cited that no evidence suggested that scores on the National Teacher Examinations were

adequate predictors of teaching success. In fact, these writers oppose competency tests for state certification because "teachers who cannot pass such a test should never have been admitted to teacher education in the first place" (pp. 44-45). Furthermore, it was denoted that research has failed to establish the validity of written tests of professional knowledge.

Coker, Medley, and Soar (1984) perceived student achievement scores as potentially unreliable sources of evaluation criteria. These writers rejected the idea that student achievement was the most logical criterion from which to evaluate teachers. It was stated, "we reject this notion for three reasons; student variability, the regression effect, and the limitations of currently available achievement tests" (p. 45). Furthermore, Coker, Medley, and Soar contended, "We hold the teacher accountable for preexisting differences over which they have no control--not to mention the influence of home background and the peer group, over which teachers also have little or no control" (p. 45).

The authors (Coker, Medley, and Soar, 1984) also discussed two concepts frequently noted in the literature--the concepts of low inference and high inference. To briefly explain these concepts, low inference pertains to the use of a structured observation form and the recording of specific behaviors whereby a measurement instrument with a scoring key was utilized. On the other hand, high inference pertains to the use of rater scales whereby teacher ratings were abstracted from the behavior; therefore, a rater's personal standard of effective teaching served as a comparison to the composite of the teacher. Coker, Medley, and Soar preferred the low inference procedure:

> In summary, we question the validity of rating scales and of teacher evaluations based on them, primarily because such scales reflect the beliefs of the raters about the nature of competent teacher performance, not the actual competence of the teachers--and the two can vary considerably. The empirical data that exist indicate that teachers who are highly rated are no more effective, on the average, in producing student achievement gains than teachers who are rated low. And that nature of ratings makes it difficult, if not impossible, to discover whether any particular rating is valid or invalid, because the halo effect operates to obscure what is actually being rated and because the behavior from which a rating springs cannot be identified by an analysis of the rating itself (p. 47).

Roelle and Wood (1980) noted guidelines that might be helpful to a principal in the "role of evaluator." It was suggested that six guidelines be implemented in the evaluative process. These six guidelines were: preemployment evaluation; focusing on evaluation during inservice training; establishing a regular pattern of classroom visits; documenting everything; never overlooking an infraction of school policies and providing teachers with opportunities for self-evaluation. Roelle and Wood have expanded each of these suggestions to provide a clearer illustration of their ideas. These will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

First, preemployment evaluation involved the principal heeding evaluation criteria while reviewing applications and conducting interviews of the candidates. It was noted that "making the comparison between qualifications and expectations will help to indicate whether the candidate will measure up to standards applied to current staff and will increase the effectiveness of hiring decisions" (p. 36). It was also cited that the school system's evaluation procedure should be discussed with the applicants.

Second, the guidelines of focusing on evaluation during inservice

training was considered to be helpful to both teachers and administrators. It was suggested that at least one meeting should be devoted to explaining the evaluation process thereby affording an opportunity for teachers to discuss the process. Roelle and Wood (1980) stated that teachers should be informed of specific evaluation criteria, and it should be made clear to the faculty how the criteria will be utilized. Teacher rights relative to the evaluation process should also be explained by the administrator with his indicating "what rights they have to challenge a principal's evaluation of their performance" (p. 36).

Third, it was cited that a regular pattern of classroom visits needed to be established thereby promoting a more "informal, nonthreatening atmosphere surrounding staff evaluation" (p. 36). These authors contended that announced visitations were not as likely to remain necessary, therefore, allowing teachers to demonstrate a problem area rather than "showing the class's (and their) best side" (p. 41). If feasible, a minimum number of classroom visitations by the principal should be established. However, it was suggested that classroom visitations be made frequently during the school year; multiple visits would encourage teachers "to ask for help" (p. 41).

Fourth, the significance of documentation was stressed so that negative and positive feedback might be provided to the teacher (Roelle and Wood, 1980). By documenting strengths and weaknesses, it was cited that "meritorious acts and exemplary performances as well as infractions of rules and faulty performance" (p. 41) could be noted. Moreover, it was cited that documenation was mandatory in the dismissal of a teacher. The article suggested that a meeting should be scheduled immediately following a classroom visitation "to discuss the observation,

provide praise or criticism or both, and to make recommendations" (p. 41). Furthermore, Roelle and Wood maintained that a post-observation session should be "followed by a written review of the conference highlights and of the conclusions" (p. 41). In turn, teachers should receive copies of all reports for their own records.

Fifth, according to Roelle and Wood, a principal should not overlook an infraction of school policies. Moreover, a principal should be fair and consistent with all teachers.

The sixth and final point presented by Roelle and Wood suggested providing teachers with opportunities for self-evaluation. In this way, teachers are encouraged to assess their own skills through a separate self-evaluation form. This information could provide "an opportunity to help the teacher with identified weaknesses" (p. 41). Also, self-evaluation could be used to compare the observations made by others to those observations made by the individual teacher.

An article by Tuckman, Steber, and Hyman (1977) dealt with the perceptions of principals relative to teacher behavior and sought to answer the question: "Do principals at different grade levels have different ideas about what makes an effective teacher" (p. 2)? Thirty principals were questioned, then principals from each of the following levels: senior high, intermediate and elementary. Using the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (TTFF), a nine-point scale was utilized to rate a teacher's overall effectiveness.

For this study, it was cited that 300 teachers were asked to characterize their own styles using the TTFF, which measured the perceptions of four components of teaching style: creativity, dynamism (dominance plus energy), organized demeanor (organization plus control),

and warmth and acceptance. It concluded that the three levels of principals questioned perceived "dynamism" and "warmth and acceptance differently. Furthermore, at the elementary level those teachers rated "most effective" were rated lowest by their principals for dynamism and highest for warmth and acceptance. In contrast, dynamism was perceived by the intermediate and senior high principals as positively related to teaching effectiveness. It was found that senior high principals perceived warmth and acceptance as being negatively related to effectiveness.

Another finding that resulted from Tuckman, Stebers, and Hyman's (1977) research indicated that those teachers who were "rated by their principals as least effective rated themselves as high on all four TTFF dimensions as teachers rated by their principals as most effective" (p. 17). In conclusion, the least effective teachers (as rated by principals) do not perceive themselves as ineffective" (p. 17).

These three authors cited that the discrepancies between principal and teacher ratings are greatest for the least effective teachers at the senior high level. These authors suggested that a "communication gap" may exist at the senior high school level due to the larger, "more complex structure" of many senior high schools, "which tends to insulate teachers and principals from each other" (p. 16).

To summarize many of the concepts presented in this section, guidelines from the National Study of School Evaluation for the "process of establishing the organization and developing the charge of designing personnel evaluation means" can be noted (Pace, 1984, p. 4).

1. The development of personnel evaluation procedures should involve representatives from the primary constituent groups within the organization, specifically

to include those who evaluate and those who are evaluated.

2. The greater the balance (partly) in representation among groups, the more likely that all interests will be heard and accommodated fairly.

3. The validity and acceptance of the personnel evaluation means will be enhanced to the degree that those evaluated and those evaluating perceive their involvement to be meaningful.

4. Evaluation, as well as the process by which it is accomplished, is a political activity in that those involved will seek to influence its nature; and at times the criteria reference for decisions may become uniform malcontent rather than uniform acceptance among all groups.

5. The size of the group developing the means is critical; it should be an odd number, less than ten, in the interest of efficiency.

6. The time frames, reporting means and approval procedures should be established as a specific charge to the group prior to the initiation of the project.

7. When those assigned the responsibility of proposing personnel evaluation means cannot develop acceptable procedures, those who direct the organization--boards and administrators--should be expected to establish the means.

8. The professional credibility of the development process and those participanting in it will influence the quality of the evaluation process as much as any other facet.

9. External consultants may be necessary to provide direction in the interest of quality and efficiency of development (p. 9).

Summary of the Review of Literature

Three areas of research were considered in this review of literature: effectiveness, competency, and evaluation. This writer observed that evaluation of instruction is often associated with effectiveness

of the classroom teacher and also influences the parameters in which competency research is conducted.

An article by Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1983) served as the framework from which this writer reviewed the teaching effectiveness literature. Three approaches to effectiveness research were presented by Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting: dominant, token, and ignored research. In brief, the dominant approach was concerned with three general principles: efficiency, control, and prediction. The token approach was concerned with the qualities or attitudes which facilitate learning in a more humane fashion (Rogers, 1983). The ignored approach, on the other hand, focused upon critique relative to society and organizational constraints that are humanly produced and which negatively affect the development of individuals, groups and societies (Culbertson, 1981).

The second major area examined in this review of literature was teacher competency. As a result of criticisms such as those expressed by Rogers (1983) and Koerner (1963) changes in the structure of teacher education programs have been implemented with the major objective being increased teacher competency. Middle level certification changes for the state of Kansas were discussed as well as a trend toward the implementation of "satisfaction guaranteed" teacher education programs.

The third major area researched in this review of literature was evaluation. This section addressed the topic of mandated teacher evaluation, noting a report by Millman (1981), which referred to several state mandated evaluations systems. A recent study of teacher evaluation conducted by the Rand Corporation in 32 school districts across the United States was also considered. Evaluative criteria as

as well as several guidelines that might be helpful to a principal in the "role of evaluator" were also examined (Roelle and Wood, 1980, pp. 36 and 41).

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDRUES

The method utilized in this study to obtain information regarding teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation of instruction was the semistructured interview whereby dialogics were utilized to promote clarity and better understanding of teacher response. Individually, the veteran teachers at Royster Junior High School of Unified School District #413, Chanute, Kansas, were interviewed. Royster Junior High School has approximately 500 students, where 32 full-time faculty are employed. Of these 32 full-time teachers, there are nine veteran teachers as defined by this paper. Each teacher was asked a series of questions; their responses were recorded on cassette tapes and later transcribed.

Each teacher interviewed complied with this writer's definition of veteran teacher. A veteran teacher was defined as one who has taught for 15 consecutive years at Royster Junior High School. This definition of veteran teacher was purely arbitrary; the author realized that no such definition has been generally adopted by the Board of Education for Unified School District #413. After this writer obtained permission to conduct the study from the Superintendent of Schools and the Principal of Royster Junior High, the same principal assisted the researcher in identifying those veteran teachers qualified to participate in the study. Those teachers who met the criteria for this study

were contacted individually and asked if they would agree to be interviewed.

After obtaining permission from each veteran teacher, a list of participating teachers was compiled. All of the teachers who qualified to participate in this study did so with the exception of one who was unavailable for an interview. Examples of interview questions appear in Appendix A. To serve as written examples of interview responses, two transcripts were selected at random and included in Appendixes B and C of this dissertation. However, it must be noted that the transcript of each interview was critiqued by the writer. The results are reported in manuscript form in the Results Section (Chapter IV). Contrasts and comparisons are cited in the interview results in Chapter IV.

The interviews were semistructured in that several similar questions were asked of each teacher. There were two primary reasons for utilizing this interview format. First, the writer sought to obtain each teacher's expressed perception to each question rather than having a teacher select a response that was most acceptable from among a variety of choices, for example, on a questionnaire. In this way, each teacher provided some of the structure for his or her responses. Second, the interview method allowed for additional clarification and understanding by way of dialogics.

Morton and Kendall (cited in Harris, 1975) have described the semistructured interview (or focused interview as it is sometimes referred to) as possessing the following characteristics: the person interviewed has been involved in a known situation; the significant elements of the situation have been analyzed by the interviewer; an interview guide has been developed; and the interview is focused on

the subjective experiences of the interviewee.

Harris (1975) described some advantages of the semistructured interview stating, "feelings and needs that lie below the surface of the consciousness of the individual may require the semistructure of the focused interview" (p. 77). Furthermore, Harris commented, "the focused interview offers sufficient flexibility for the interviewer and interviewee alike to react in ways that reduce tension and threat" (p. 77).

A research study, which utilized the semistructured interview method, by Bullough, Goldstein, and Holt (1982) from the University of Utah served as a model for the methodology incorporated in this study. In their study, 20 teachers volunteered to be interviewed regarding a new curriculum management system (NEMS) implemented in a medium-sized school district in the western part of the United States. The participating teachers were questioned as to how the new system affected their teaching providing an opportunity for better understanding these teachers' perceptions of their work and the degree to which they had reflected upon the purposes behind their work.

To continue, Bullough, Goldstein, and Holt (1982, p. 132) wrote, "Our problem, stated simply, was to increase our understanding of how teachers view their work and to raise questions about how this view might be connected to alienation." Utilizing the semistructured interview, each of the 20 teachers who volunteered to participate in the study were asked the same series of questions with their responses recorded on video tape; later, interview responses were transcribed. The transcripts from each interview were then read independently by Bullough, Goldstein, and Holt who inferred from the teacher responses;

inferences were made by these readers separately and were compared.

The research methodology incorporated by these three researchers was expanded by Lather (1984). Lather maintained that dialectical theory building involves interactive and action-inspiring research design and is essential in that the goal of research is to promote self-reflection and deeper understanding on the part of the researched. In brief, Lather asserted, "it is a time when old paradigms for social inquiry prove obsolete and new visions are required" (p. 3). Lather questioned,

> How is a priori theory to function in research committed to open-ended, dialectical theory building which aspires to focus and resonant with lived experiences and yet insist that experience must be reconceptualized to include the need for struggle against privilege?

Lather (1984) continued by citing that the research process is a powerful place to go for praxis to the degree that research designs can be developed that change people by promoting self-reflection and a deeper understanding of their situations in the world. The significance of the interactive involvement of the participant's in the negotiation of meaning is crucial to this type of research design.

With a research methodology of this type where the interviewee plays an active part in the research methodology, dialogics play a crucial role moving the participants from an argumentative stature, which concentrates on issues, to a reasoning mode where issues are no longer the focal issue. To reiterate, dialogue is used in the sense that Freire (1970 used the term. Freire elaborates about dialogics:

> . . . dialogue is the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized, this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person's 'depositing' ideas in another, nor can it become a simple

> exchange of ideas to be 'consumed' by the discussants. Nor yet is it a hostile, polemical argument between men who are committed neither to the naming of the world, nor to the search for truth, but rather to the imposition of their own truth because dialogue is an encounter among men who name the world, it must not be a situation where some men name on behalf of others. It is an act of creation: it must not serve as a crafty instrument for the domination of one man by another. The domination implicit in dialogue is that of the word by the dialoguers; it is conquest of the world for liberation of men (p. 77).

Methodologically, participants are encouraged to consider how they are dealing with a particular concern. In the reasoning mode, as opposed to the argumentative mode, it is no longer important for the participants to confront issues; instead, participants transcend to a point where the answers to questions eventually are found within the questions themselves. Since value expressions are unavoidable, through dialogics the axiological base of an individual is exposed as a result of self-reflection, thereby affecting the participant's perceptions. Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) stated:

> A dialogical situation serves the purpose of clarifying teacher's thoughts with one another; in this process they no longer learn in isolation, but rather in a world context with their peers. This is not only a process involving the cognition of a given situation, but it is also a process of reconsidering their own ways of approaching the situation under study. When teachers reflect on their being through the building of new structures of meanings, they become aware that they are building themselves in the process (p. 105).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of teachers in a southeast Kansas community regarding the administrative evaluation of instruction. Specifically, it investigated the perceptions of selected junior high school teachers, using the semistructured interview. This chapter will present the results of those semi-structured interviews. Examples of questions posed during the interviews can be found in Appendix A.

The teachers interviewed will be referred to as Teacher A, B, C, and so on. The complete transcripts of the interviews of Teachers B and E are found in Appendixes B and C of this dissertation. These two transcripts were selected at random to serve as writing examples of interview responses. The remaining interviews appear in this section of the dissertation and have been paraphrased and/or quoted. In Chapter IV, the terms he/she will be used in a generic sense.

Teacher A

Teacher A was "fairly familiar" with the evaluation procedures established by the local board of education. This teacher personally did not perceive that teacher evaluation had any effect upon his teaching. In fact, after evaluation results were discussed, this teacher

felt a "little put out with some of the responses" made by the evaluator. Teacher A stated, "Evaluation is totally relative to the concept that the evaluator has." He felt the personality of the teacher and the evaluator's feelings about the teacher entered into the evaluative process, thereby affecting the evaluation results.

Furthermore, Teacher A suggested that the most appropriate evaluators might be former students rather than administrators. As an industrial arts teacher, he noted that many of his former students apply ideas and concepts learned in his classes to their various careers or chosen vocations. He felt that a follow-up study of former students regarding the application of skills learned in his class might be more useful in evaluating his teaching performance than a classroom visitation by an evaluator.

Next, this teacher expressed a belief that the majority of teachers would probably find a check sheet evaluation instrument somewhat upsetting, particularly when someone is observing and making comments with the check sheet in hand. While it does not affect him personally, he felt that some teachers have more of a tendency to be upset by the presence of administrators in their classroom than others. It was stated that teachers near retirement age might feel threatened by evaluation, possibly feeling as if they could be replaced by someone younger if they received low evaluation ratings.

This teacher shared that while he was teaching at a small high school several years ago, a young assistant pricipal, who also served as a classroom teacher, evaluated him. After the classroom observation was over, the teacher asked if he could attend the administrator's classroom to see "how it should be done." The young administrator

refused the teacher's request. As a result of this and other experiences, teacher A stated that a young principal may not have the experience and depth to fairly evaluate a teacher.

To continue, this teacher did not feel that a fair evaluation could be achieved in one classroom visitation. It appeared to this teacher that an administrator should spend "quite a lot of time at different intervals" observing the classroom of the teacher whom he is evaluating. He stated, "I have had some principals evaluate my classes, and they have gone to sleep during the time that they were in my class, which probably does not speak well of my lectures, but this is true."

Furthermore, this teacher perceived evaluation as an administrative tool for teacher dismissal. He stated, "there are many things that are evaluated that I do not think have a lot to do with the way a person teaches." He continued, "Evaluation is a relative thing, which the evaluator uses to measure your performance." Moreover, "He [the administrator] has no idea what is going on inside of you; he evaluates you on what he sees, on your outside at that particular point." Also, this teacher did not feel that teaching has "a whole lot to do with the clothes that a teacher wears to school." This teacher questioned, as well, whether dress should be included on the evaluation instrument.

In addition, Teacher A preferred that written comments be made during the evaluation process as opposed to a check sheet format. Teacher A shared, "I have been doing this so long--and maybe this is not right--but maybe sometimes I have better ideas on how I should be doing things than they do. I have done all the things that I teach and I probably know as much about that as they do or probably more."

Finally, this teacher asserted that he usually does not benefit a great deal from a post-evaluation conference and stating, "When they evaluate me, I just sit down and they show me what they wrote and I just say 'that is your business.'"

Teacher B

The complete transcript of the interview with Teacher B can be found in Appendix B of this dissertation.

Teacher C

Having taught for 25 years at the junior high school in Chanute, Teacher C was "familiar" with the evaluation instrument employed by Unified School District #413. He stated, "Evaluation makes a teacher more aware of his faults and keeps a teacher on his toes so if he does have something he is marked down on, it could help to improve upon his faults." However, this teacher stated that evaluation instruments are often too general and "do not go into the detail that could perhaps be more beneficial." This teacher perceived of record-keeping and other similar duties as a necessary part of the evaluation of instruction because "they are contributing factors to a teacher's job. If it is necessary to turn in required reports, the teacher may need to be evaluated on that too."

Teacher C felt that teachers are "more on their toes if administrators drop into their classrooms." Teacher C did not think veteran teachers felt as "threatened" by evaluation at the present time as they might have during the first years of mandated evaluations. Also, this teacher stated:

> I do not think that we should take it [evaluation] for granted, I mean just because we are veteran teachers; that is not to say that we are not going to be making mistakes and getting ourselves into a rut. Maybe we are doing the same things over and over and not realizing that we are doing them; whereas, somebody coming in from the outside might see that we are having problems.

This teacher stated that it would not bother him if he were evaluated by a younger administrator. "As far as that is concerned most of the administrators that are currently in the field are younger, so I would accept what they are saying. I feel that they are in that position, so you have got to do it more or less their way." However, this teacher continued by citing that the personality of the administrator evaluating the teacher is important and that if an administrator is sincere about what he is doing and does not act as if he is holding the position over a teacher "the evaluation will progress smoothly."

If a teacher and administrator do not agree on the evaluation results, Teacher C stated that they would "need to talk over their differences" and re-examine what the teacher was doing since "the teacher may not be coming across on his point of view or there may be a misinterpretation of what the teacher said." In addition, this teacher perceived that it would be beneficial for the evaluator and the teacher to review the results of the evaluation so that the teacher would have an idea of "what the administrator really wanted and know exactly where you stand." This teacher also thought that it was a good idea for different administrators to evaluate a teacher so that the teacher could benefit from a variety of opinions. Teacher C stated:

> The principal or assistant principal, rather than colleagues or students, would be the best people to evaluate classroom instruction because they more or less know what you are doing and know a little bit more

> about the field that you are teaching in; whereas, students may have gotten mad at you. Faculty are often so absorbed in their field that they do not know what you are doing. For an overall picture, I would say that the principal or vice-principal should be the one to evaluate.

This teacher felt that it was a good idea to see the evaluation instrument prior to evaluation in order to be more aware of what "you are going to be graded on." Teacher C stated that in some ways evaluators' preconceived opinions do affect evaluation results although this teacher did not believe that they should. Also, Teacher C felt that evaluation results could be affected if an administrator personally disliked a teacher. In that case, he felt the administrator would have to try harder to compensate for those feelings.

In terms of the evaluation instrument, this teacher preferred a check sheet format composed of satisfactory or unsatisfactory boxes with additional space for further comments by the evaluator. "Younger teachers are probably nervous right at first about evaluation because they are afraid it may jeopardize their job." This teacher stated that test scores should not be used as the "primary method of evaluation of instruction" because "one class may have slower learners in it, and if a teacher knows that there is an area that they will be evaluated in, then maybe that is all the teacher would teach about."

Teacher D

Teacher D was "familiar" with the evaluation form and had taught at this school for 15 years. In his opinion, evaluation did not help to improve his teaching in the classroom. Furthermore, it was his opinion that oftentimes administrators know "absolutely nothing" about some subject areas and tend to question techniques. This teacher felt

that the evaluator should be someone from a nearby university, trained in the particular subject area. Alternative evaluators might be former students who had majored in the area in which the teacher had taught.

To continue, the teacher could not think of any positive aspects that result from evaluation, commenting "not really, not too many at all." Elaborating on the negative aspects, this teacher stated:

> The evaluation tool boils down to a personal evaluation of one person by another person which I find very hard to understand. I do not see how one person can evaluate another person with his own eyes if he does not know anything about that area. It just boils down to a personal opinion of the person, and it is hard on the evaluator because it puts him on the spot; that they have to form a personal opinion. Preconceived prejudices are unavoidable and these can prevent a fair evaluation from taking place.

Next, this teacher stated that if preconceived personal biases and/or personality conflicts exist, they may be evidenced in the evaluation results. Continuing, this teacher also felt that the classroom climate is an important factor to consider in terms of evaluation results. For example, if "the administrator came from a more disciplined atmosphere into a less disciplined atmosphere, the administrator might look at things that bother him [the administrator]; whereas, things may not bother others."

Furthermore, this teacher expressed the opinion that having an evaluator in the classroom did not annoy him personally and, in fact, said he welcomed an administrator in his classroom. "Classroom observation is bound to be disruptive. When the administrator comes into the classroom and writes down notes, it interferes with the learning atmosphere, creating hard feelings because the teacher's mind is oftentimes more preoccupied with the evaluator than with the students.

In his opinion, evaluation is more threatening to a new teacher than to a veteran teacher. Furthermore, the students change when evaluators come into the classroom, and it is not a normal environment. This teacher felt that most students are apt to act better when the administrator is visiting the class.

If Teacher D disagreed with a young administrator regarding evaluation results, "the way that they presented the criticism would make a lot of difference." This teacher stated that the results of evaluation should be discussed on a one-to-one basis in a friendly, informal environment. He continued:

> What I mean by that is if they made a sarcastic, critical type of comment, I would probably say that I disagree with them and not get into a discussion so as not to get into a personal conflict type of thing. Yet, if it was done on a more personal matter where you could discuss it in a give-and-take type of atmosphere, it would be great to do whether it was a rookie or someone else; the presentation would make a difference.

This teacher did not think that student test results should be used in the evaluation of instruction; in fact, he preferred to "leave the students out of the evaluation." This teacher also preferred a written response format included in the evaluation instrument since it has more validity than a check sheet format. "On a scale of one to ten, what makes a seven rather than a six?" However, this teacher added that the evaluation critique does not necessarily need to be in paragraph form or complete sentences. Teacher D suggested that rather than transferring notes taken during a classroom visitation to a check sheet formatted evaluation instrument, it would be most beneficial for the teacher to see the original notes.

> I am just not a believer in evaluation tools; again, we are here to help the kids, and teachers and administrators need to realize that. It often goes beyond that to a confrontation between the teacher and administrator. I do not see how they [evaluations] help the student that much, and do not think that they help the teacher be a better teacher. It boils down to a personal opinion, and that perhaps is the most distasteful things of all about it.

Teacher E

The complete transcript of the interview with Teacher E can be found in Appendix C of this dissertation.

Teacher F

This teacher was "familiar" with the evaluation instrument established by the local board of education. Teacher F felt that evaluation had not helped to improve his classroom teaching. He stated, "It could have the potential to help teachers' however, most evaluation instruments do not." This teacher perceived a weak point of evaluation to be that evaluation is "just the opinion of one person, and if an administrator likes that particular person and the things that he is doing, then he is going to get a good report." This teacher continued, "that is not to say that what you are doing is not good, it is just one person's opinion."

Teacher F preferred multiple classroom visitations because "I like the difference that the students respond with. They are definitely different most of the time toward the positive (when an administrator enters the classroom to evaluate) because they think they are performing for the principal and therefore do a much better job. This is kind of nice." He felt this was a positive aspect of evaluation.

Teacher F asserted that it was not necessary to be contacted prior to being evaluated. In fact, prior arrangements were perceived by this teacher as disadvantageous since an evaluator "would not be observing a real classroom situation as you would try to prepare something perhaps different that might not fit in with the program. Perhaps it is better that we do not know."

Having a principal in the classroom is a threatening situation to this teacher as it makes him feel uneasy. He stated that it makes a teacher have the "feeling that you cannot be trusted to do your work properly, and add to this the stress. I do not think that you do as good a job when you are worrying. I do not think that it shows the real teacher."

This teacher preferred a post-observation conference after each classroom visitation so that positive or negative points "could be discussed, providing immediate feedback, rather than at the end of the evaluation." The teacher stated, "there might be things that the evaluator does not like or things that I have not even noticed for the positive or negative, but by the time the final evaluation is turned in, specific suggestions or examples may not be remembered. Feedback should be immediate or I do not think it helps you as much." The teacher continued, "if they are going to evaluate you and they want some changes, then they need to let you know so that you can change before the evaluation is completely over." This teacher also preferred that an evaluator observe a variety of classes because "all classes are different." Otherwise, the administrator "does not get a clear picture of what actually is taking place in that classroom."

This teacher felt that personal biases, personality conflicts, and

philosophical differences "definitely" do surface in final evaluation results. In fact, this teacher commented, "A lot of it is set even before the evaluator visits--a lot is already decided." For this reason, Teacher F stated that perhaps the best people to evaluate classroom teachers would be "colleagues from nearby schools who teach in the subject area that you do."

Commenting on evaluation instruments, this teacher stated they are "opinionated; it just depends on who is evaluating you." For example, "an evaluator's opinion about my clothes and grooming is up to whether the person watching you approves of your appearance; who knows, he may not like your hairstyle or whatever." This teacher does not understand how "they could come into the classrom and evaluate health and vitality either." The teacher concluded that "an evaluation form should help the teacher, and I don't think that all of these questions deal with helping the teacher. There are too many that do not. Results of evaluation affect the rapport between the principal and the teacher regardless of whether they are good or bad."

Teacher F commented that the age of the evaluator, "if that is the administrator with whom you are working," would not make that much difference. He stated, "I would hope that a younger administrator could give me better, newer ideas because it has not been that long since he has been in school."

In closing, Teacher F stated:

> I do not think that evaluation has made me a better classroom teacher. It might have made me more aware, but as far as improving my teaching, no. If it were used correctly, it could, however, be a way to help teachers.

Teacher G

This teacher has taught for 17 years at Royster Junior High School. He was "somewhat familiar" with the evaluation instrument utilized by the school, and he has been evaluated with the current evaluation instrument one time. He stated that "evaluation could help; however, it has had no effect on my teaching because it has not been utilized extensively in my case."

In regard to the negative aspects of evaluation, Teacher G felt that evaluation was too subjective. He also stated that "teachers, in general, are often unfairly marked because personaltiy and rapport with the evaluator become such a significant part of the evaluation process." Teacher G suggested that "what one administrator considers to be a plus, another administrator might feel is a negative." He considered discipline to be an important factor in the evaluation process, and, "this is one area of evaluation that he does not enjoy."

This teacher stated that evaluation was a somewhat threatening situation to him. However, he thought that first year teachers were less threatened than those with more teaching experience "because the first year teacher would know and expect that it was going to happen, and they would be better able to handle constructive cirticism since they have not been in the profession for several years." Also, this teacher felt that a first year teacher was still in a learning process; therefore, he would be more open to suggestive criticism. Teacher G stated, "After 15 years of teaching, you do not want to be told to change your teaching methods."

Teacher G felt that the number of years of experience that the evaluator had as a principal was not as critical as the way in which

the evaluator "acted toward" the teacher in the post-evaluation conference. Teacher G did not like being evaluated, but he believed that if he were "in the position to evaluate others," he would "require it." He said, "I suppose that evaluation is good because it is one of the major areas of feedback, and it provides an opportunity for growth." Furthermore, Teacher G suggested that evaluation could be useful in improving morale within the system.

This teacher felt that there would be little merit in evaluation if a discussion of the results did not take place. However, Teacher G stated:

> A teacher can easily become defensive and less likley to accept evaluation results or the evaluator and his suggestions. As it stands now, it is basically the important factor because termination of employment is primarily based on evaluation as long as terminationis not based on a moral factor. The evaluator is normally in a position to require compliance, whether the individual agreed or not with the credibility of the evaluation and the value judgments of the evaluator.

He felt that a fair and comprehensive evaluation warranted multiple visits by the evaluator. Otherwise, he stated, "I do not think that one can consistantly determine that you had seen a fair example in one visit." The teacher maintained that the presence of the evaluator distorts the situation in the classroom considerably as students "tend to act differently in a classroom with an evaluator present. They are aware of what's going on, what is different." This teacher cited this example: The previous day an observer was present in his classroom, and the students' behavior was considerably different than usual. The students "became more considerate of one another and more observant of the rules and tended to participate better." Continuing, he felt that if the observer "were present more often, the students would be

less apt to act differently."

He had no preference regarding the format of the evaluation instrument. He reflected that the evaluator often did not write comments down even though it might be beneficial for the teacher. This teacher contended that "when something is written down, then there is a basis for discussion. To use competency scores to evaluate a teacher that would be acceptable if the teacher understood what would be evaluated at the outset, otherwise, no." Expanding on this, Teacher G said that the one being evaluated a teacher "should have some idea what it is the students are expected to learn."

This teacher suggested that the "most fair evaluators would be professional evaluators--people who traveled throughout southeast Kansas and evaluated all over." This, in turn, "gets the evaluation out of the district--gets it away from people who are personally involve with each other."

Teacher H

Teacher H has taught at Royster Junior High for 17 years. He was "familiar" with the USD #413 evaluation instrument. Teacher H stated, "When you are going to be evaluated, you become more aware of what you are doing, and it helps you to improve. It makes you start evaluating yourself."

A negative comment about teacher evaluation made by this teacher was that "the evaluator may not be qualified in evaluating everybody. There may be some hard feelings that come about from it. Teacher H maintained, "Students are not qualified to evaluate; it becomes a popularity contest. Furthermore, situations are too various, and one

evaluator cannot possibly be knowledgeable in all areas. Administrators can do some good, depending on the depth of the evaluation. The people in the field could be of some help, too."

Teacher H felt that if a teacher knew what the evaluator was looking for prior to evaluation, it would be most beneficial to the teacher. This teacher stated that it would be helpful to have a pre-evaluation conference to discuss those items that were to be evaluated and "to make it as painless as possible. Evaluation is threatening, anyone with his job on the line would feel threatened. Writing comments during lectures would make most people self-conscious." In his situation, this teacher thought that there would be no changes in lesson plans or such after he was notified that an evaluator was coming to class.

In addition, Teacher H stated that the presence of any evaluator affects student behavior as "they may pull things when he is not there as opposed to when he is present." As a result, the teacher questioned whether the evaluator was getting a clear picture of what was happening in the classroom. Teacher H commented, "Initially, the kids were a little tense, since the principal has authority over the kids."

Multiple classroom visitations were preferred by this teacher in determining evaluation results. However, in his opinion, evaluators should not question students when evaluating a teacher because "the information may be biased or untrue." He felt that teachers should be "evaluated professionally, as adults, and leave the kids out of it."

In regard to discipline in the classroom, he stated that "a teacher needs to make his own style of discipline work." Teacher H added that "the personality of, the evaluator definitely affects the evaluation a teacher gets." In addition, he questioned the importance

of some areas on evaluation instruments stating, "Are they relevant? Maybe it should ask whether you are getting to school when you are supposed to and staying the entire day. Are you in your classroom when you are supposed to be; are you working to try to improve your kids? If you are doing these things, then you should have a good evaluation; if not, then perhaps you should be elsewhere.

Teacher G stated that the age of the evaluator was not as important as the approach the evaluator used. This teacher felt that the evaluator "needs to be respectful, sincere, and listen to the teacher. The evaluator needs to be consistent in how he treats the teachers, and the administration." Teacher H stated, "First-year teachers are more intimidated [by teacher evaluation] than those who are not. A first-year teacher is more self-conscious. Later, he has more success and is more comfortable with his teaching." This teacher felt that discussing evaluation results was important so that "you know where you stand."

To summarize, in Chapter IV the writer has presented direct quotations and paraphrased material which was expressed during interview sessions with selected teachers form a southeast Kansas junior high school. The teachers interviewed were referred to as Teacher A, B, C, and so on. The complete transcripts of the interviews of Teachers B and E are found in Appendixes B and C, whereas Appendix A has examples of questions posed during the interviews. From these interviews, this writer has drawn conclusions which are discussed in Chapter V of this dissertation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of teachers in a southeast Kansas community regarding the administrative evaluation of instruction. Specifically, it investigated the perceptions of selected junior high school teachers using a semistructured interview. The objectives of this research study included:

1. To better understand selected teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation at the junior high level in a southeast Kansas community.

2. To better understand if the selected teachers in this study perceived the results of administrative evaluation of instruction as being influenced by the theory base values and perceptions of the administrator carrying out the evaluation.

3. To inquire if selected teachers perceived administrative evaluation of instruction as an important aspect of instructional improvement.

4. To better understand the degree to which teachers understand their own perceptions and attitudes toward administrative evaluation.

In Chapter I, the writer maintained that "knowing" leads to a better understanding and that "knowing" transcends "not knowing." This is true within a certain framework and by acknowledging a set of conditions and reporting what is experienced to be true first-hand

(rather than by observing and concluding what is to be true without actively entering into the experience), a transcended "knowing" results. Furthermore, research where the writer actively experiences the interviewee by means of dialogics serves to complement the first-hand approach.

Chapter II discussed three distinctly different approaches to the study of teaching effectiveness research, drawing from the work of Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1980). These three approaches included: dominant, token, and ignored research. Chapter II cited that the research currently dominating the field reflected a technical rational and therefore, was termed the dominant approach. However, research receiving token attention in the educational literature was referred to as the humanistic approach to teaching effectiveness research was labeled person-centered teaching. Two other areas of study relating to effectiveness research were reviewed in this study; the competency of teachers and the evaluation of instruction.

Chapter III contained a description of the method and procedures utilized by the writer in this study. Implementing the semistructured interview technique, the responses of the selected teachers were recorded and a video cassette tape was later transcribed. Chapter IV reported the findings of the semistructured interviews by way of contrasts and comparisons. Appendix A consisted of sample questions posed to the selected teachers interviewed in this study. Appendixes B and C contained transcribed manuscripts of two of the interviews that the writer conducted.

Conclusions

To recapitulate, the purpose of this study was to better understand the perceptions of selected teachers in a southeast Kansas community regarding the administrative evaluation of instruction. This purpose was accomplished through the semistructured interview. From the responses of the selected veteran teacher interviewed in this study the following conclusions were drawn:

1. These veteran teachers had varying perceptions of administrative evaluation of instruction.

2. These veteran teachers perceived the results of administrative evaluation of instruction relative to instructional improvement in different ways as exemplified in the selected quotations:

   a. "Evaluation could help; however, it has had no effect on my teaching because it has not been utilized extensively in my case."

   b. "Personally, it has not affected by teaching."

   c. "It could help to improve upon faults--evaluation makes a teacher more aware of their faults."

   d. "Evaluation has not helped to improve my teaching."

   e. "Yes, evaluation is beneficial."

   f. "Yes, I think it provides feedback."

   g. "It has the potential to do so, however, it has not."

   h. "I like evaluation because it makes you more aware of what you are doing and it helps you to improve. It makes you start evaluating yourself."

3. These veteran teachers perceived evaluation as subject to the personal biases of the evaluator. This was evidenced by the paraphrased or quoted statements below:

a. "Evaluation is totally relative to the concept that the evaluator has."

b. The personality of the teacher and the evaluator's perceptions of the teacher enter into the evaluative process, thereby affecting evaluation results.

c. Preconceived prejudices are unavoidable and can prevent a fair evaluation from taking place.

d. Personal biases, personality conflicts and philosophical differences "definitely" do surface in evaluation results. "A lot of it is set even before the evaluator visits--a lot is already decided." They are "opinionated", it just depends on who is evaluating you.

e. "Teachers, in general, are often unfairly marked because personality and rapport with the evaluator become such a significant part of the evaluation process. What one considers to be a plus, another administrator might feel is a negative."

f. "The personality of the evaluator definitely affects the evaluation a teacher gets."

g. "Administrators may not approve of your techniques, your classroom may be much looser than what the administrator thinks it ought to be, therefore, you cannot be an excellent teacher. Now, if an administrator believed in a loose classroom then maybe they would evaluate you as a better teacher, even though you did not change philosophies. An administrator may think that since 'I really feel that your classroom does not operate the way I think it should maybe this is why you got an average on attendance instead of an excellent'."

4. These veteran teachers perceived the personality of the administrator as critical to the post-evaluation conference.

5. These veteran teachers preferred multiple clasroom visitations for the purpose of evaluation.

6. These veteran teachers had divergent opinions regarding the most qualified individual to evaluate their teaching. Several different individuals were perceived by these teachers as most qualified: professional evaluators, colleagues, former students, the principal

or assistant principal, and professors from a nearby university who taught in the teacher's major field of study.

Continuing, this writer concludes that as long as opinions vary regarding effective instruction, evaluation will remain dependent upon the perceptions of the evaluator. Because of this subjectivity, evaluation is a very sensitive issue which evokes numerous responses from teachers. This study provided an opportunity for individual teachers to communicate and express their feelings about evaluation. Through this means of communication, two people experiences learning simultaneously via dialogics: the interview and the interviewee.

It has been stated, "It is obvious that there is more to communication than what meets the ear. There are many kinds of language, that of words, that of silence, that of action, and that of listening" (Buscaglia, 1984, p. 62). The "language" provided by the semistructured interviews allowed this writer greater flexibility and opportunity to explore and understand the selected teacher's perceptions since perceptions were not limited by a list of predetermined choices. The significance of this increased flexibility was expounded upon by Buscaglia:

> Though words are still the major source of communication, they are not the only source. We talk to each other with smiles, with handshakes, with hugs, with laughter, with eye contact, with touching, holding, enfolding, and a myriad of gestures. These too, are languages. Some of which may 'speak louder than words' (p. 65).

Furthermore, it has been observed by this writer that teachers' perceptions of evaluation are as critical to the evaluation process as the evaluation. It was necessary, in this writer's opinion, to better understand these perceptions since the teachers themselves are the focus of the evaluation. This observation was reinforced through the findings of this paper.

Earlier in Chapter I, the justification for this research was to be found in the perceptions of the teachers interviewed. Moreover, in concluding this study, the writer maintains that the findings of Dobson, Dobson, and Kessinger (1980) were supported by the selected teachers' perceptions such that an individual, in this instance the evaluator, cannot separate himself from his values in the evaluation process. The findings indicated that selected teachers' perceptions varied concerning all aspects of evaluation.

Despite the fact that imperfect methods are being used to "objectively" evaluate teachers professional classroom performance, the selected teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation appeared surprisingly positive. Well-intentioned, "objective" evaluations are in themselves subjective since value judgments of a teacher's performance remain subject to the personal interpretation of the evaluator. In spite of biases, several of the teachers interviewed felt that evaluation did serve some useful function. In differing ways, this study made these teachers more aware of themselves and administrators relative to the evaluative process. There were common opinions voiced and similar suggestions offered; however, it became apparent to this writer that the greatest benefit derived from these interviews was the dialogical self-reflection of the part of the teachers occurring during the interview process.

So that the interviewee and the interviewer could both benefit from the interaction provided by this study, a closure session was conducted. The writer invited the participants to her home for an informal gathering. Seven of the eight teachers were present. The teacher who was unable to attend did express an interest in the

results of the study and this writer spoke with this teacher individually. The findings disclosed during this session were identical to those discussed in Chapter V. These veteran teachers appeared most receptive to discussing the findings of this study at this informal gathering. As a result of this receptiveness, they continued to dialogically disclose their feelings during the feedback session reinforcing Freire's (1970) concept of dialogue.

After completing this study, this writer maintains that before the administrative evaluation process can fulfill the purpose of the improvement of instruction, several changes must occur. First, teachers must perceive evaluation as beneficial to the improvement of instruction. The use and misuse of evaluation results, coupled with vague and uncertain purposes, unskilled evaluators, and poorly developed evaluative instruments has contributed to the misconceptions of evaluation. These misconceptions must be recognized and addressed. Furthermore, the threat of the evaluation process, implicitly and explicitly suggested in the interviews, must be channeled from a negative to a positive factor.

Earlier, this writer contended that perceptual differences among educators in the same school could result in differing perceptions of reality despite the specific theory base of that particular institution. As evidenced in the interviews, these selected teachers did, indeed, believe that individually perceived realities affected the evaluative process. In brief, if the evaluator's theoretical perspective is not in agreement with the theoretical perspective of the teacher, differing perceptions of reality may result.

Finally, further study of teacher's perceptions of the evaluation

process is necessary in order to "know" more about teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation. As important as the findings, the methodology employed in this study also encouraged self-introspection on the part of the interviewer (writer). As a result of the study, this interviewer (writer) was afforded the unique opportunity to better understand the perceptions of the selected veteran teachers and in the process was able to better understand her own perceptions regarding administrative evaluation of instruction. For this reason, the writer concurs with Lather (1984) and others who concluded that this type of methodology should be incorporated more extensively into current educational research. A restatement of a quote by Harris (1977) exemplifies this writer's concept of how this task might best be accomplished, "To know what people think and feel, one might ask them" (p. 77).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, Michael W. Ideology and Curriculum. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Apple, Michael W. and Lois Weis (Editors). Ideology and Pratice in Schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1983.

Aspy, David N. "An Interpersonal Approach to Humanizing Education." In Humanistic Education, Ed. R. H. Weller. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Aspy, David N. and Flora N. Roebuck. "Client Centered Therapy in the Educational Process." Invited Paper for the Proceedings of the European Conference on Client Centered Therapy, Wurtzberg, Germany: University of Wurtzburg Press, 1975.

Barnett, George (Editor). Philosophy and Educational Development. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Bartky, John. Supervision as Human Relations. Boston, MA: D.C. Health and Company, 1953.

Bennett, John B. and Shirley S. Chater. "Evaluating Faculty Performance of Tenured Faculty Members." Educational Record, Vol 65 (Spring, 1984), pp. 38-41.

Bobbitt, Franklin. The Curriculum. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918.

Bruner, Jerone S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Bullough, Robert V, Stanley L. Goldstein, and Ladd Holt. "Rationale Curriculum: Teachers and Alienation." The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Vol. 2 (1982), pp. 132-143.

Buscaglia, Leo. Love. New York, NY: Fawcett Crest, 1972.

Buscaglia,Leo. Loving Each Other. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1984.

Coker, Homer, Donald M. Medley, and Robert S. Soar. "How Valid Are Expert Opinions About Effective Teaching?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 62 (October, 1980), pp. 131-149.

Combs, Arthur W. "The Personal Approach to Good Teaching." Educational Leadership, Vol. 21 (March, 1964), pp. 369-378.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Combs, Arthur W. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington, DC: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.

Comfort, Alex. Realty and Empathy: Physics, Mind, and Science in the 21st Century. Albany, NY: State University Press of New York, 1984.

Connerton, P. (Editor). Critical Sociology. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1976.

Crenshaw, Harrison M and John R. Hoyle. "THe Principal's Headache--Teacher Evaluation." National Association of Secondary School Principals (February, 1981), pp. 37-45.

Crews, Carole. "Rush to Judgment--No Time for Teacher Evaluation? Make Time." National Association of Secondary School Principals (February, 1981), pp. 12-16.

Culbertson, Jack A. "Three Epistomologies and the Study of Educational Administration." UCEA Review, Vol. 22 (Winter, 1981), pp. 1-6.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1916.

Dewey, John. Harvard Teachers Record, Vol. 1 (April, 1931), pp. 73-76.

Dobson, Russell, Judith Dobson, and John Kessinger. Staff Development: A Humanistic Approach. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1980.

Dobson, Russell, Judith Dobson, and Randall Koetting. Looking At, Talking About, and Living with Children: Reflections on the Process of Schooling. (Unpublished manuscript, 1983). Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University, 1983.

Dobson, Russell, Judith Dobson, and Randall Koetting. "The Language of Teaching-Effectiveness and Teacher-Competency Research." View points in Teaching and Learning, Vol. 58 (Spring, 1982), pp. 9-19.

Dunkelberger, Gary E. "CLassroom Observation--What Should Principals Look For?" National Association of Secondary School Principals (December, 1982), pp. 9-15.

Eisner, Elliot W. The Educational Imagination. New York, NY: Mac-Millian Publishing Company, Inc., 1979.

Ervay, Stuart and Janice Bowers. "Middle Level Teachers and Certification by Competency." Kansas School Board Journal, Vol. 22 (1983), pp. 11-13, 22.

Eurich, Alvin C. Reforming American Education. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1969.

Flesch, Rudolf. Why Johnny Still Can't Read. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1981.

Fox, David J. NTE, National Teacher Examinations. New York, NY: Arco Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York, NY: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Funk, Richard S. (Editor). "Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices." KASB Journal (Fall, 1984), pp. 5-6.

Giroux, Henry A. Theory and Resistance in Education. Boston, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Giroux, Henry A., Anthony N. Penna, and William Pinar (Editors). Curriculum and Instruction. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1969.

Goble, Frank G. The Third Force: The Psychology of Abraham Maslow. New York, NY: Washington Square Press, 1970.

Golemon, R. B. Deans of Instruction and Faculty Development in Four Small Rural Junior Colleges in Texas. (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1977.)

Good. H. G. A History of American Education. New York, NY: The MacMillian Company, 1962.

Graduate College. Thesis Writing Manual. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University, 1982.

Greene, Maxine. Teacher as Stranger. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Hall, E. T. Beyond Culture. New York, NY: Doubleday Publishing Company, 1977.

Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Kansas: The State of Education. Edited by Creative Productions, Topeka, Kansas. Topeka, Kansas: Confidence in Kansas Public Education Task Force, 1983.

Kelley, Earl C. and Marie I. Rasey. Education and the Nature of Man. New York, NY: Harper and Brother Publishers, 1952.

Kemp, Jerrold E. Instructional Design. Belmont, CA: Fearon-Pitman Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory." In Curriculum Theorizing. Ed. W. Pinar. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975(a).

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Persistent Curriculum Issues." In Curriculum Theorizing. Ed. W. Pinar. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975(b).

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Techers. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Kolensnik, Walter B. Humanism and/or Behaviorism in Education. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Lather, Patti. "Research as Praxis." A Paper Presented at the Sixth Curriculum Theorizing Conference, Dayton, Ohio, November, 1984.

Lortie, Dan C. School Teacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

MacDonald, James B. "Toward a Platform for Humanistic Education." In Humanistic Education, Ed. R. N. Weller. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Mallory, Arthur L. "Commission of Education." Guidelines for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation in Missouri. St. Louis, MO: The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1984.

McIntosh, Dean K. "It's Time to Provide a Warranty with Every New Teacher." Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, Vol. 58 (Spring, 1982), pp. 1-8.

Manlove, Donald C. (Editor). K-12 Evaluative Criteria. Falls Church, VA: National Study of School Evaluation, 1983.

"The Maytag Warranty." Education U.S.A., Vol 27 (October, 1984), p. 46.

Medly, D. N. "Teacher Effectiveness." Ed. H. E. Mitzel. Encyclopedia of Educatioal Research. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1982.

Millman, Jason (Editor). Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Saga Publications, 1981.

Morris, Van Cleve. Philosophy and the American School. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.

Mouly, George J. Psychology for Effective Teaching. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Pace, Vernon C. A Self-Directed Program for Developing Teacher and Administrator Evaluation Procedures. Falls Church, VA: National Study of School Evaluation, 1984.

Peter, R. S. "Need an Educator Have an Aim." In Curriculum and Evaluation, Ed. A. Bellack and H. Kliebard. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Peterson, Donovan and Annie Ward. Due Process and Teacher Evaluation. Washington, DC: University Press of America, Inc., 1980.

Pinar, W. F. (Editor). Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.

Pinar, W. F. "Notes on the Curriculum Field 1978." Educational Researcher (September, 1978), pp. 5-11.

Pomarico, Michael George. "Recommended Criteria and Reported Practices of the Evaluation of Building Principals in the State of Kansas." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1984.)

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingarner. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York, NY: Delocorte Press, 1969.

Roelle, Robert J. and Phillip A. Wood. "Six Ways to Improve Teacher Evaluation." The American School Board Journal (September, 1980), pp. 36, 41.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1983.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Ryan, K. and D. H. Phillips. "Teacher Characteristics." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Ed. H.E. Mitzel. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1982.

Sanchez, Bonnie M. About Staff Evaluation: A Brief Highlighting Important Litrature Since 1966 to Community College Staff Evaluation. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1981.

Savage, John G. "Teacher Evaluation Without Classroom Observation." National Association of Secondary School Principals (December, 1982), pp. 41-44.

Schmuck, R. "Some Relationships of Peer Liking Patterns in the Classroom of Pupil Attitudes and Achievements." The School Review, Vol. 71 (1963), pp. 337-359.

Schmuck, R. "Some Aspects of Classroom Social Climate." Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 3 (1966), pp. 59-66.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "The Odyssey of Organizational Theory and Implications for Humanizing Education." In Humanistic Education. Ed. R. H. Weller. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Snarey, John R., Terrie Epstein, Carol Sienkiewics, and Philip Zodhaites (Editors). Conflict and Continuity. Montpelier, VT: Capitol City Press, 1981.

Tanner, D. and L. Tanner. "Emancipation from Research: The Reconceptualist Prescription." Educational Researcher, Vol. 8 (June, 1979), pp. 8-12.

Taylor, Frederick, W. The Principles of Scientific Management. Darby, PA: Arden Library, 1980.

Taylor, Frederick, W. and Frank B. Gilbreth. Principles of Scientific Management: 1911. Easton, PA: Hive Publishers, 1982.

"The Kansas Plan." Issues. Topeka, KS: Official Publication of the Kansas-National Education Association,1983.

Travers, Robert M. W. (Editor). Second Handbook of Research and Teaching. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally Publishing Company, 1973.

Trump, J. Lloyd. "On Humanizing Schools: Point of View and Basic Issues." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 56 (1972), pp. 9-11.

Tuckman, Bruce W., James M. Steber, and Ronald T. Human. Teacher Behavior is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Perceptions of Principals. New York, NY: April, 1977.

Tyler, Ralph. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Weller, Richard H. (Editor). Humanistic Education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

West, Philip T. Self-actualization Resolving the Individual-organization Conflict. The Clearing House, Vol. 47 (1972), pp. 249-252.

Wirsing, Marie E. Teaching and Philosophy: A Synthesis. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Wuhs, Susan K. and Richard P. Manatt. "The Pace of Mandated Teacher Evaluation Pick Up." The American School Board Journal, Vol. 170 (1983), p. 28.

Zais, Robert S. Curriculum Principles and Foundations. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1976.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SELECTED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How many years have you taught at Royster Junior High School?

2. Are you familiar with the evaluation instrument that Unified School District #413 uses to evaluate teachers?

3. Does evaluation help to improve your classroom teaching? If so, how? If not, why?

4. Please describe any positive results that come about because of teacher evaluation.

5. Please describe any negative results that come about because of teacher evaluation.

6. Discuss your feelings when an administrator enters your classroom to evaluate your teaching?

7. What do you most dislike, if anything, about teacher evaluation?

8. What is your preference for room visitation procedures?

9. How are personal biases, values, philosophy, or personality conflicts reflected, if at all, in evaluation results?

10. Discuss the value of a post-evaluation conference.

11. Who do you think could best evaluate your teaching?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER B

Interviewer: The interview with Teacher B.

Are you familiar with the evaluation procedure that Unified School District #413 uses to evaluate teachers?"

Interviewee: Yes, I understand it and I am familiar with it as I have been evaluated on numerous occasions.

Interviewer: Do you think that evaluation of your teaching by an administrator helps to improve your teaching in the classroom?

Interviewee: Yes, I think it provides feedback. I think it helps an individual to be evaluated. A lot of it depends on how the teacher looks at the evaluation and it also depends on how the evaluator looks at it. In my own case, I feel it is good to perhaps have an outsider give an opinion on what I am doing in the classroom. I may not totally agree with it but at least it is food for thought. In a particular area, I may get some ideas and possibly correct what they may think is a deficiency in that area.

Interviewer: Discuss your feelings when an administrator enters your classroom to evaluate your teaching.

Interviewee: Well, it doesn't bother me to have someone come in the classroom. I once told an administrator that I would never invite him into a classroom and he was always welcome. I didn't want him to feel that I had any one particular thing planned for a given day. I realize as a teacher I have good days, I have bad days, my students have good days and they have bad days and I believe that an administrator or evaluator should come in and see just a typical school day.

Interviewer: Do you think that in the ideal situation, it would be best to have someone other than the school principal evaluate you?

Interviewee: My own thought is that the administrator does an effective job there, I see no problems. As far as evaluation goes, he would have to observe you several different times in

a classroom or in a given situation to really understand that particular area. An effective administrator probably will be in and out of the classroom any number of times. If someone else were evaluating you, maybe they would not be able to go in and out of the classroom area like that, or at least as often.

Interviewer: How is the evaluation process handled in your school?

Interviewee: From the evaluation, the principal will fill out a form and then you go in and have a conference with him. He goes over this form with you. If you have any questions about it, you can discuss it. It is filled out before you get there. You do have a chance to look it over and, as I said, you may not wholeheartedly agree with it but I think on this point it would probably depend on the evaluator and how he or she would get along with that particular individual. Some people may feel real ill-at-ease on evaluating someone where others wouldn't.

Interviewer: Do you think that an administrator could grade down a teacher who had a very different philosophy of effective teaching?

Interviewee: I definitely think that you might see some low marks on someone in a case like this. However, I think that the administrators understand that in different areas you have different reasons for doing what you do in a classroom. You take in a more traditional classroom, it may be more organized and so on. Where in a shop class or a physical education class, that which is non-structured, class could be sort of lackadaisical to some people. It could still be very organized and yet some people would look at it as being disorganized. But I think by just going into a classroom you can tell if the humanistic approach is being used. This in itself will tell you a great deal. Whether it is a loosely run classroom or not, I think there is a limit to how loose it ought to be. By the same token you know there are different ways to teach--different learning situations and everything like that.

Interviewer: If you could change anything about evaluation, what would you change?

Interviewee: To begin, as far as the form we have at U.S.D. #413, I think overall it's probably a pretty good form. However, I think there are parts of it

that possibly would not help me be a better teacher. It may improve me in the eyes of superiors, my image in some areas, but as far as improving me in the classroom, I'm not sure that it does that. As far as any great particular change in the form, I'm not sure just exactly how I would go about changing it. I know there are some drawbacks to it but I probably would have to give it some thought before I could give you a definite suggestion as to how I would change it.

Interviewer: What type of evaluation instrument would you prefer?

Interviewee: On our evaluation form, we have a combination check sheet and comment type of evaluation. We have a rating scale of one to five. One being poor, five being excellent. Actually on that one would be poor, two would be below average, three would be satisfactory or average. Of course, the term "average" is not too good so they put satisfactory in there instead. Then it has four as above average and five is excellent. Now, I like this part of the evaluation and also in the area to the right there is a place for a comment where the administrator, who does our evaluating, writes any additional comments that may be positive or negative, either way. So actually this is a combination of two types of evaluations. I think it is working out real good.

Interviewer: As a veteran teacher, would you be just as likely to accept the critiques of the young administrator as you would if a veteran administrator evaluated you?

Interviewee: I think that is a good question. First of all, it would come down probably to the attitude that he had when he was evaluating me. There is only one person that I know of that has all the answers and he is not evaluating me here in person. I think overall, probably I wouldn't mind being evaluated by a younger person, mostly because most of the people that have evaluated me have been younger than what I am. As far as being evaluated in my own classroom setting, I have faith in my ability as a teacher on presenting ideas, and so on, in the classroom. Regardless of the evaluator, I would feel that I am confident in my area.

Interviewer: How are personal biases, values, philosophy, or personality conflicts reflected, if at all, in evaluation results?

Interviewee: I definitely think that personal biases could have some bearing on evaluation. I know by the same token, that I don't mind being evaluated by administrators. I think this possibly could be an interesting area. I believe in evaluation of administrators and who evaluates administrators? Usually, it would be his superior and they do not see him in an everyday situation like a teacher does. Whereas, the principal or administrator, whichever the case may be, who is evaluating the teacher should see that teacher any number of times in a classroom setting. I think if a new person came in, and even if he knew all the answers, you ought to be able to get some good points out of an evaluation, even if you do not agree with it. We are not supposed to agree with everything, however, if you had a conflict of personality there is no doubt that it would have a bearing. That's why perhaps if you did have an extremely low evaluation, it is a good idea for teachers to be evaluated by different individuals so as to do away with this particular problem. Just having the same person evaluate you over and over again would not be helpful.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER E

Interviewer: How many years have you taught here at Royster Junior High?

Interviewee: I've been here 17 years.

Interviewer: Are you familiar with the evaluation procedure that the #413 school district uses to evaluate their teachers?

Interviewee: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you think that evaluation of your instruction helps to improve your teaching in the classroom?

Interviewee: Oh yes, I think instructional evaluation is beneficial. However, I think that the evaluation form itself is based a lot more on the knowledge that the evaluator has of the individual. There is so much material that if a stranger walked into the classroom and was asked to spend a couple of hours and evaluate that person, I think they would probably have a lot more difficulty than the building principal would that worked with that person both in and out of the classroom and had a background knowledge of the teacher. I don't think the form itself would do it for them.

Interviewer: Please describe any positive results that come about from teacher evaluation.

Interviewee: I really don't think I can give any particular results, at least that I recall right at the moment. I think in simply examining the evaluation procedure and realizing, or having knowledge of the areas that are considered in an evaluation process and realizing those are the areas that I should meet or excel in, that those are the things that you keep in mind when you are trying to set up your classroom as far as behavior and instruction. Realizing that you are a professional and that as a professional you have certain responsibilities to other members of the staff and this type of thing. Knowing that this is what most people base an evaluation on, then you tend to keep those things in mind when you are making decisions, either about your personal appearance, your personal qualities, or in dealing with other people. It doesn't make any difference whether I agree with what that person is doing. It is simply the fact that they may have a different method than I have, they may have

a different procedure so we simply trade ideas and use the ones that work and forget the ones that don't.

Interviewer: Would you just as soon know what was going to be on an evaluation instrument prior to your being evaluated?

Interviewee: I think that I would probably rather see the form. I'm not too sure. Again, I'm not too sure how much of a difference the outcome the of the evaluation is going to have because a person pretty well operates according to decisions that they have made. But again, I think the form should be open because, like I said, it gives you a chance to know what the evaluation is going to be based on. You know, therefore, what your district and your administrator considers to be an effective teacher and that is going to produce results in your district.

Interviewer: Discuss your feelings when an administrator enters your classroom to evaluate your teaching.

Interviewee: To begin, if you have feelings of inadequacy and you have a building principal or a superintendent of schools or a parent walk into the classroom, some teachers, I believe, would feel threatened. Most veteran teachers, I think, would feel very confident in regard to what they are doing in the classroom and they are not going to feel threatened unless they fall into that category of where they have a feeling of inadequacy. Which again is the basic purpose of evaluation and that person should be very aware of finding out exactly why they feel that way and where the inadequacy is and take care of it. I know from most of the people that I work with, the veteran teachers, they would invite the building principal into the classroom at any time. No problem because it is not going to be a threat. There may be a little bit of anxious moments in knowing whether or not Johnny is going to be himself or which personality he is going to be on that day. But, they know as well as the building principal knows that the student's reaction is not the teacher's reaction. What the building principal should be concerned about is what the teacher's reaction to the student reaction was like.

Interviewer: Who do you think would be most 'anxious', a first year teacher or a veteran teacher? Why?

Interviewee: Oh, absolutely the first year teacher. There

would be a big difference. Your first and second year teacher, I think, even a teacher that is both strong in subject and is strong in ability has to establish, shall we say, a reputation for themselves in that school and establish the proper rapport with the students, and the proper preparation for the classroom--lesson plans, whatever it takes. You see, they still haven't found out whether or not their methods are going to be accepted, whether their ideas are going to be accepted, and not necessarily just by the kids, either. They are going to want to be accepted by their fellow teachers. Also, is the building principal going to say, 'hey, the way you are doing this is not the way I think you ought to do it' or is your building principal going to let you do it the way that you think it will work best for you? They don't know that yet. You take a teacher that has been here for 15 or 20 years, they know what the principal expects, they know what works and what doesn't work. Plus, the student that comes into the classroom very possibly has had an older brother or sister that has gone through the classroom, particularly if you have been here for 17 years and they already have a preconceived notion of 'hey, who is Teacher E, well Teacher E is this guy that you can get away with murder,' or Teacher E, 'hey, in there you are going to work and you are going to do and you are going to learn.' In this case, students already know what to expect, so they go into there and say, 'okay, now then, I know this is either going to be play time because that is what it has always been in the past or this is going to be work time because that is what it has always been in the past.' A first or second year teacher doesn't have that to fall back on, so a first or second year teacher has to establish a reputation of 'hey, this is either play time or this is work time.' If I indicate that we are going to approach it from this direction and I have been here for a good number of years, the students know that it must work because he has been around and he knows what he is doing. With a new teacher, you know, the students are still questioning this teacher, 'does he really know anything about the subject matter yet.' So, yes, I believe this is true. That's not to take anything away necessarily from the process of evaluations, but I think that well, we all went through those first and second years, and I think it is more difficult for them than it is for the veteran teacher.

Interviewer: If you had a younger, less experienced administrator evaluate your teaching and he found it too inadequate, or found shortcomings with regard to several of the items on the evaluation format, would you be less likely or more likely to accept the results of the evaluation as a veteran teacher, than if the administrator were a veteran administrator also?

Interviewee: I don't think there would probably be a whole lot of challenge on that with your veteran evaluator or a younger evaluator. But when you move into the area of instructional skills, and school procedures it might be different. You have been here for 17 years, you have grown up with the school and here comes an administrator along and after being here one year he is going to explain to you what the school's procedures are. I have a feeling you are going to say 'now, just a minute here' because you are going to feel that you are pretty well-informed. So I think there that you would probably have a little bit of difficulty accepting a change. And, that may also be true in regard to instructional skills unless, well, just like that new teacher we were talking about, unless that administrator can convince me that there is a new idea that I have not heard of, or thought of, or considered using. Again, I am going to have to be pretty well convinced before I am going to accept very strongly their belief. So, I think in areas such as that, school procedure, and so on I think it would be difficult to accept. Professional qualities, to me, I think are always up in the air anyway. This is something which there is no fine line, only broad lines and they overlap quite a bit so you might find things of discussion on those. I think the big thing would be in certain areas yes, I would have difficulty, other areas I would accept their opinion because if I was evaluated by 30 different people in some areas I would figure all of them would fall within a general area, not a broad area but a certain limited area.

Interviewer: Who do you think could best evaluate your teaching, for instance, students, colleagues, or anyone else?

Interviewee: Well, junior high age level students are not, in my opinion, in a position to rate a teacher. The junior high age may be very interested in certain subjects and not in others. Junior high age may be very interested in satisfying the desires of all of the older generation.

A student may think, 'he is the teacher and my mother says I do whatever he wants me to do.' That does not necessarily evaluate the teacher. So, the junior high age student is not on the level, I don't believe, or in the position, to formally evaluate a teacher. However, if that teacher is effective, if that teacher really is aware, he can look out over his classroom at any given moment during a class period and those students, without ever knowing it, will tell that teacher of his effectiveness. And there are many different ways of doing that, behavior, educational response, we could make quite a list, but to say a formal evaluation, no. I'm simply saying that they have a very limited ability to formally evaluate the teacher. But any teacher that wants to know what the students think, all he has to do is stop at any given moment and examine what is going on in the classroom or what is not going on in the classroom and they will get their evaluation from the students right then, without too much difficulty. I think I would probably consider the most valuable evaluation and probably my toughest evaluation would probably come from the other teachers. Now, that is from my particular stand point. If I did not consider that I was, maybe if I didn't, wasn't sure whether or not I was an effective teacher, I might say that my toughest evaluation would possibly come from the principal but at least from my viewpoint, I think I would be more concerned and more anxious in regard to the evaluation given by fellow teachers than I would by the building principal. If the three teachers down the hall graded me down on something, I definitely would have to say my fellow teachers could probably best evaluate me.

Interviewer: Please describe the negative aspects of the evaluation.

Interviewee: The evaluation form used at #413 has four levels: five is excellent, four is above average, three is average, and of course below average and poor. So we have an item on here that says attendance and we have gone through a half year of school and I haven't missed a day yet so I get a three. three says average so I ask a very simple question in regard to why a three. Well, three is what is expected and what is expected is average so, therefore, you get a three on a perfect attendance. If that is true, how do you get a four which is above average

and a five which is excellent. Well, if the answer is, 'you can't' then what are they doing there? If the answer is 'you can', then how do I get better than perfect attendance? Here, I think you get into part of the fallacy of evaluation, not saying that all evaluation is a fallacy, but this is an example of part of it. Would you possibly be willing to agree with me if I drew a conclusion in regard to the fact that that administrator was trying to figure out some way to prevent me from being rated as an excellent teacher simply because he didn't think I was an excellent teacher!

Interviewer: Are personality conflicts included in the end results of evaluation or not?

Interviewee: In some cases, I'm sure there would be personality conflicts. Administrators may not approve of your techniques, your classroom may be much looser than what the administrator thinks it ought to be so, therefore, you can't be an excellent teacher. Now, if a different administrator believed in a loose classroom then maybe he would evaluate you as a better teacher, even though you didn't change philosophies. An administrator may think, 'since I really feel that your classroom does not operate the way I think it should maybe this is why you got an average on attendance instead of an excellent.'

Interviewer: Do you find any value in a post-evaluation conference?

Interviewee: Oh, yes I would, and not necessarily on the ones that I scored well on. For example, if an administrator marked me as being above average or excellent in regard to continually striving for improvement. Well, in what areas do you recognize that I have done this. If that administrator could not give me some particular examples, then I know what kind of an evaluation I have received and in asking a question such as that of course, you may have created a problem for yourself, too. Maybe that is why I didn't get an excellent in one of the other areas where it says tact and discretion. So anyway, I think it might be as interesting to discuss the ones in which you were achieving in as those you weren't, to determine whether or not there is a meaning behind some of the items that are being evaluated.

Interviewer: What type of evaluation instrument would you most prefer being evaluated by?

Interviewee: Most evaluation forms are designed--to be quite honest with you--for busy administrators. In other words, I can fill it out in 30 seconds. I am not necessarily putting down administrators but, 'I don't have time because I have to evaluate 30 other people today or this week or this semester. I don't have time.' The more complex the evaluation form, I believe, probably the more value it has as far as that's concerned. To be quite honest with you, I would think the toughest evaluation that could be made is one that I know is used. Fortunately, I never had to go through it but that would be for somebody to come into your classroom for two or three days and tape your classroom and then make you sit there and watch those tapes. I've heard of that happening, I wouldn't even want to do that because I think that would be the toughest form because who is doing the evaluating? I think that would be the toughest form of evaluation. No one is telling you this is good or that is bad. You are the one who has to make that decision.

Interviewer: Do you think that teachers should be evaluated, in part, on the basis of improved scores that their students have on standardized tests?

Interviewee: If I knew what kind of a test the students are going to take, in a few weeks I could probably raise their test scores. They may not be able to function any better in life than they could before, they still may not be able to read the stop sign at the corner but they may be able to score better on a particular type of test if I have them for a few weeks and I know what type of a test it is that they are going to be working on. To give you an example, ninth grade American History. As a history enthusiast, I know that in the past we used to teach history and no student in the classroom even had a book. What did we do? We simply spent the day or the hour or whatever memorizing. What happened in 1805, or in 1865, or in 1869? Now, there may have been a million things that happened in 1869, but I know one of them and whenever I hear 1869 I can tell you at least one thing that happened. I may not know why it happened, I may not know what happened because it happened, but I know what happened, and at that time we thought we were teaching history. The fact that nobody had books, that was about the extent you could go really because we didn't have the other material to allow the student to dig into trying to determine why it happened or what happened as a result of it.

So we did it through memorization. Unless there is a particular physical or mental problem, I can get a bunch of students to memorize most anything. I don't know though, did they learn something if they memorized it? So again, I think it is a two prong type of situation that I would have difficulty in measuring my teaching effectiveness by necessarily competency on a test. I just have difficulty with that.

VITA 2

Lesta Diane Swender

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: SELECTED TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL IN A SOUTHEAST KANSAS COMMUNITY

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Chanute, Kansas, May 28, 1958, the daughter of Lesta I. and Herbert J. Swender.

Education: Graduated from Chanute High School, Chanute Kansas, in May 1976; received Associate of Arts degree from Neosho County Community College in May, 1978; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from Pittsburg State University in May, 1980; received Master of Science degree from Pittsburg State University in May, 1981; received Specialist of Education degree from Pittsburg State University in July, 1983; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1985.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, Department of Biology, Pittsburg State University, August, 1980 to May, 1981; Instructor, Department of Math Sciences, Neosho County Community College, June, 1981 to present.