

THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-ANALYZED  
CLINICAL SUPERVISION ON IMPROVEMENT OF  
COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIOR

By

ROBERT L. TERRELL

Bachelor of Business Administration  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1969

Master of Business Administration  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1971

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  
July, 1992

Thesis  
1992D  
T325p

THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-ANALYZED  
CLINICAL SUPERVISION ON IMPROVEMENT OF  
COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIOR

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth H. Clair*

Thesis Adviser

*W. H. Latta*

*Thomas C. Collins*

*James P. Key*

*Thomas C. Collins*

Dean of the Graduate College

C O P Y R I G H T

by

Robert Louis Terrell

July 31, 1992

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express thanks and most sincere appreciation to Dr. J. Kenneth St.Clair, Chairman, for his help and guidance in the completion of my thesis. Thanks is also extended to all of the other members of my committee for their help and suggestions.

A sincere expression of thanks is also extended to the College faculty and students who participated in the study without whose help this project could not have been completed. Their care and concern during the information gathering phase of my research is most appreciated.

Finally, a great debt is owed to my wife, Kathy, and to my sons Robin and Jonathon. Their patience, love, and understanding has seen me through the most difficult phases of my professional growth and development.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	7
Significance of the Study . . . . .	8
Definition of Terms . . . . .	9
Research Question . . . . .	11
Assumptions . . . . .	11
Limitations of the Study. . . . .	11
An Additional Limitation of the Study . . . . .	12
Summary . . . . .	13
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	14
III. RESEARCH METHOD. . . . .	25
Introduction. . . . .	25
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	25
Instruments . . . . .	26
Research Design . . . . .	27
Procedures. . . . .	29
Data Analysis . . . . .	33
Summary . . . . .	33
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	35
Introduction. . . . .	35
Results of Pretests and Posttests . . . . .	37
Summary of Pretests and Posttests . . . . .	49
Results of Interviews - Faculty . . . . .	49
Summary of Interviews - Faculty . . . . .	53
Results of Interviews - Students. . . . .	55
Summary of Interviews - Students. . . . .	58
V. CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	59
Introduction. . . . .	59
Findings and Conclusions - Faculty. . . . .	60
Findings and Conclusions - Students . . . . .	66
Critique and Analysis of Research Method. . . . .	68
Implications for Future Research. . . . .	69
Implications for Application. . . . .	70

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	71
APPENDIXES. . . . .	81
APPENDIX A - TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . .	82
APPENDIX B - TEACHER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT . . .	84
APPENDIX C - QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT INTERVIEWS. .	86
APPENDIX D - SAMPLE OF TEACHER CONFERENCE AFTER THE PRETEST . . . . .	87
APPENDIX E - SAMPLE OF STUDENT INTERVIEW AFTER THE POSTTEST. . . . .	89
APPENDIX F - SEQUENCE OF EVENTS. . . . .	91

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 01, Section 1, Semester 1. . . .	38
II. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 01, Section 1, Semester 2. . . .	40
III. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 02, Section 1, Semester 1. . . .	43
IV. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 02, Section 2, Semester 2. . . .	44
V. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 04, Section 1, Semester 1. . . .	46
VI. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Teacher Image Questionnaire Professor 04, Section 1, Semester 2. . . .	47
VII. Summary of Mean of Means for the Teacher Image Questionnaire For Professors 01, 02, 03, 04, 05 and 06 .	48



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

It is important for the reader of this dissertation to be familiar with the researcher's background and attitude toward teaching as this will help to explain the researcher's values and potential biases regarding the importance of quality teaching and the process of clinical supervision. The need to improve the quality of teaching has been addressed by many authorities on the subject. There have been many studies, suggestions, and proposals made to identify the characteristics of good teaching and to improve teaching skills. However, the majority of the information has dealt with teaching at the elementary through high school levels. There has been little published research done at the university level concerning the means and methods of improving college teaching.

In an era when the importance of undergraduate education is being stressed by educators, the need for quality instruction becomes most apparent. There are new accrediting bodies being formed which emphasize quality of instruction over research. Ernest Boyer (1990) in Scholarship Reconsidered, puts forth the idea that the

research universities must aggressively support teaching. Boyer asks whether it is ethical to enroll students and not give them the attention they deserve. It is important for the research institutions to bring teaching and research into better balance. The problem of how to improve the effectiveness and quality of college teaching is the focus of my research. College teachers have traditionally enjoyed the benefits of academic freedom, including almost complete autonomy in the classroom. This is a major departure from teachers at the elementary and high school levels who are often subjected to review and evaluation by their superiors. This instructional supervision, as has been practiced for many years, has come under scrutiny. Elementary and secondary teachers have viewed their supervisors with trepidation when experiencing evaluation of their teaching skills.

Gainey (March 1990) puts forth the premise that school principals must endeavor to make teacher evaluation and supervision an ongoing growth opportunity instead of a purely summative process. Teachers must be engaged in the learning process within their teaching performance.

To put such a premise into action calls for a basic philosophy of teacher evaluation and supervision that gives support and assistance to the teachers. Gainey further states that the notion of evaluation is often viewed with much emotion and skepticism by teachers and principals alike. Teachers and principals do not perceive evaluation

as a means of professional growth and scholastic improvement. Supervision has been viewed as evaluation by a disguised name. While the implied goal of evaluation and supervision is the improvement of instruction, teachers and principals do not really believe that this is the goal of most schools. Until teachers are convinced that the implied goal of scholastic improvement is the real goal of supervision and evaluation, the feelings of skepticism and trepidation will remain. The college teacher must not only protect his or her academic freedom and individualism but must also be subjected to rules on promotion, tenure and periodic evaluation.

Smyth (Summer 1987) discusses the issue of why teachers view supervision of their teaching skills with trepidation when he states:

... the interface between supervision and teaching requires a serious consideration of the ethical, moral, and political questions concerning the nature of the social relationships among supervisors, teachers, and children. Above all, it involves asking why we are engaging in supervision. From my reading of the supervision literature, once we remove the rhetoric of "improvement," "teacher development," and "enhanced professional enactment" that tends to surround supervision, we are left with the threadbare notions of efficiency and effectiveness

that sound suspiciously like the business management canons of accountability, inspection, and quality control (p.578).

The process of supervision, as practiced in elementary and secondary schools, is often misunderstood by the supervisors and teachers alike. Both find it difficult to distinguish supervision for summative purposes from supervision for formative purposes. Under these constraints, there is little reason to expect college teachers to be anything but skeptical of supervision.

Morris L. Cogan developed a method of supervision he defined as clinical supervision in an attempt to relieve the problem of teacher anxiety. Goldsberry (April, 1984) described clinical supervision as more than a mechanical sequence of observations and conferences. Goldsberry identified five concepts crucial to clinical supervision that were often overlooked.

The five concepts are as follows:

1. Supervisors must understand what the teacher values in terms of educational goals and procedures.
2. Supervisors must continue observations that will permit a systematic development of information valuable to the teacher.
3. Supervisors must work to build a collegial atmosphere.
4. Supervisor must work with teacher to interpret

data.

5. Hypotheses are formed and then tested in subsequent observations.

Most educators would agree with the idea that the teacher has the ultimate responsibility for his own instructional self-improvement as derived from supervision, teacher evaluation and observation instrument development. Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops (1971) discussed the nature of supervision. They discuss the transition from imposed supervision as coupled with cooperative group endeavor to the quest for self-direction, self-guidance and self-supervision. The authors believe the transition culminates in the individual engaging in a form of self-improvement.

Beach and Reinhartz (Fall, 1982) quote Bailey, who defines teacher self-assessment as:

the process of self-examination in which the teacher utilizes a series of sequential feedback strategies for the purpose of instructional self-improvement... the purposes of teacher self-assessment are to enable the teacher to become aware of personal classroom effectiveness, learn how to control classroom instructional behaviors [and] become self-directed in improvement activities (Bailey, 1981, p. 9).

Smyth (1985) states that in order for schools to be the vibrant places we want them to be, we would expect all of us as teachers to be involved in a continual search for meaning

in our work, dialoguing and sharing with colleagues, and constantly asking engaging questions like:

What am I doing?

What are my reasons?

What effects do my actions have on students?

This inquiring mode is not part of the usual apparatus of most teachers.

Smyth focuses his attention on clinical supervision and asks what it might look like if we adopted a more "critical" perspective. Being critical and acting in a reflective way involves searching for meaning and patterns of thinking and acting, normally taken for granted in acquiring, classifying and organizing knowledge about ourselves. To act in a reflective manner is to pursue actively the possibility that existing practices may effectively be challenged, and in the light of evidence about their efficacy, replaced by alternatives. Reflection, critical awareness or enlightenment on its own is insufficient. It must be accompanied by action.

Smyth (Summer, 1987) argues that supervision, like other fields of professional endeavor, is suffering from a legacy of being affiliated with an outmoded interpretation of science and technology. Value-free objectivist views of science and the notions of technical rationality that accompany them have broken down in the face of protracted social problems. Smyth discusses the crisis in confidence in the professions generally, and in supervision and

research on teaching in particular.

Smyth proposes a dialectical possibility for supervision that opens up for contestation and debate implicit power relationships and the question of who has "the right to know" about teaching. Smyth labels supervision the Cinderella Syndrome because of its largely unrecognized and disregarded "transformative" potential. Given the exploitative relationship inherent in the traditional forms of supervision, Smyth proposes a dialectical notion that not only regards teaching problematically, but mobilizes teachers into dialogue among themselves, toward pedagogical consciousness about their teaching and the broader social context of their work.

The focus of this study has been to examine the perceived improvement in teacher effectiveness based on teacher self-assessment incorporating feedback from their students. The notion of the dialectical takes its fullest expression in "praxis," where the unity of theory is bound up with the inescapable moral and political nature of human activity. It is the critical nature of praxis and its concerns for consciousness, evaluation, choice, and decision that distinguishes it from other habitual routines and unreflective ways of life.

#### Statement of the Problem

Clinical supervision in the form of peer review and self-analysis, for the enhancement of teaching skills, is

not currently practiced at the college level. The objective of this study was to examine the impact of clinical supervision, at the college level, utilizing student feedback, to determine if teaching skills could possibly be enhanced.

#### Significance of the Study

Recognizing that not all instruction is effective and the knowledge about teaching improvement methods is as yet insufficient, this study adds to the body of knowledge concerning the enhancement of teacher effectiveness. The study also provides possible optional methods for instructional improvement. One of the most crucial areas under question is the quality of undergraduate instruction. As an example, this is a major priority among collegiate accounting educators.

At the annual meeting of the Federation of Schools of Accountancy in December of 1988, one of the issues discussed was teaching effectiveness and efficiency. The Accounting Education Change Commission issued a statement in November 1990, calling for a change in the educational focus from knowledge acquisition to learning to learn. Faculty must be trained to apply appropriate instructional methods. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants recently published a policy statement calling for cooperation from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business and other educational institutions, to address quality of



teaching in collegiate schools of business. More specifically the paper stated the following:

To meet the objectives of a quality accounting education, the academic establishment must redefine the three pillars of higher education: teaching must be improved, the definition of research broadened, and professional service encouraged.

Colleges and universities must attach greater significance to activities of direct benefit to the student. More emphasis must be placed on the quality of classroom teaching (p.4).

As a result of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business's failure in addressing the importance of the quality of undergraduate programs a competing body has now been formed. The Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs is a new accrediting agency for Colleges of Business that has as one of its main goals the improvement of undergraduate instruction. If one accepts the need for improved quality of undergraduate instruction then it is logical to explore and examine suggested methods for such improvement. "Self-assessment is designed to foster instructional improvement" (Beach & Reinhartz, 1982, p.5).

#### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions

apply:

Clinical Supervision - "The rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies by improving the teachers' classroom behavior" (Cogan, 1973, p.9).

Peer Coaching - A process which utilizes a member or members of the teaching profession to work with another teacher for the purpose of improving teaching behaviors.

Peer Review - A process which utilizes a member or members of the teaching profession to analyze the performance of another teacher.

Self-analysis - See self-assessment.

Self-Analyzed Clinical Supervision - A process of self-examination in which the teacher uses student responses and peer review utilizing the conference approach in an effort to improve the teacher's classroom teaching behaviors.

Self-assessment - "The process of self-examination in which the teacher utilizes a series of sequential feedback strategies for the purpose of instructional self-improvement" (Bailey, 1981, p.9).

Supervisor - The supervisor is the researcher acting in

the capacity of a peer coach or peer supervisor to aid the subject teacher in the self-assessment process.

Teaching Behaviors - Those characteristic acts and performances evidenced by a teacher while engaged in teaching.

#### Research Question

Was there a perceived difference in teaching behavior and effectiveness, when the teacher participates in a peer review, as measured by teacher and student response to questionnaires and informal interviews?

#### Assumptions

For purpose, of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. All participants conducted the study as described and outlined.
2. All persons responding answered the questions and questionnaires accurately and honestly.

#### Limitations of the Study

The following were limitations of this study:

1. Data collection was limited to a small segment of the college teaching population in a southwestern state.
2. Data collection was limited to a College of Business that received accreditation in the

Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs.

3. The study was limited to a period of time spanning two college semesters.
4. The use of the author as the supervisor possibly biased the results of the study.

#### An Additional Limitation of the Study

It should be noted at the outset of this heavily qualitative study that the author participated as peer supervisor to the subjects, who were fellow professors. The researcher has been engaged as a teacher at the college level for the past 22 years. Student response to questionnaires concerning the researcher's teaching abilities have always been very favorable. For the academic year of 1990-1991 the researcher was awarded the first annual Teaching Excellence Award by the faculty of the College of Business Administration at the university under consideration. During the 1991-1992 academic year, the researcher was named the Outstanding Professor of the Year in the College of Business Administration by Mortar Board.

The researcher has been asked on several occasions to speak to business education classes concerning his philosophy and specific methods of teaching accounting courses.

## Summary

Clinical supervision which examines the perceptions of students concerning teaching behaviors exhibited by their teachers can be an important source of information. The teachers are able to analyze their own perceptions of teaching, knowledge of the subject matter, interactions with students, enthusiasm for teaching, and the various methods for stimulating student interest in the subject matter.

The major goal of this study was to determine if a perceived change in teaching behaviors would take place when teachers were given the opportunity to self-critique their teaching quality based on student response to the test instruments administered early in the semester.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature investigates research pertaining to teacher self-assessment. The purpose of this review was to examine and illustrate certain relationships among the concepts of clinical supervision, teacher self-assessment and the improvement of teacher behavior through analysis by means of student response.

Morris Cogan is often considered the father of clinical supervision. In his book Clinical Supervision he states:

...clinical supervision is focused upon the improvement of the teacher's classroom instruction. The principal data of clinical supervision include records of classroom events: what the teacher and students do in the classroom during the teaching-learning process. These data are supplemented by information about the teacher's and students' perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge relevant to the instructions (p. 9).

The term "clinical" is meant to suggest a face-to-face relationship between teacher and supervisor. The focus is on the teacher's behavior in the classroom. As Goldhammer states in his work entitled Clinical Supervision:

Given close observation, detailed observational data, face-to-face interaction between the supervisor and the teacher, and an intensity of focus that binds the two together in an intimate professional relationship, the meaning of "clinical" is pretty well filled out (p. 54).

Clinical supervision is not intended to be a "remedy" applied by the supervisor (Acheson and Gall, 1980, p. 8). Clinical supervision is a tool to be used to help teachers improve their teaching behaviors.

The concept of clinical supervision assumes that teacher behavior can be improved, and that student learning will then be enhanced. The role of the supervisor and teacher are prescribed and they participate in the supervision process by conferring, analyzing data, and establishing a program for teacher improvement. Clinical supervision involves analysis of performance rather than inspection of performance. The analysis may be performed by a supervisor or it may be performed through a method of self-assessment by the teacher.

Sullivan (1980) suggested that clinical supervision is based on propositions which stress teaching as a behavior. Sullivan further suggested that teaching is patterned and can be controlled. The implication being that teacher behavior can be improved and, when it is, opportunities for student learning will be enhanced.

The concept of self-assessment was emphasized in the

literature in the early 1970's. Self-assessment was derived from several different concepts prevalent in the literature. Gerald D. Bailey defined teacher self-assessment as: "The process of self-examination in which the teacher utilizes a series of sequential feedback strategies for the purpose of instructional improvement" (Bailey, 1981, p.9). He also noted that research studies involving self-assessment were virtually nonexistent. Bailey also noted that a major difficulty observed in the research was that many authors have defined self-assessment in different ways.

Bailey (1981) stated that the concept of teacher self-assessment has its roots in (1) supervision, (2) observation instrument development, and (3) teacher evaluation. Bailey further cites Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops (1971), in their discussion of the nature of supervision, noted the importance of self-supervision in the following manner:

The transition from imposed supervision coupled with the desirable modern emphasis upon cooperative group endeavor sometimes obscures one of the most important implications of modern philosophy and thinking in supervision; namely the possibilities for self-direction, self-guidance and self-supervision. The mature individual will not only serve as a leader in group enterprises and make contributions to group discussions and decisions; he often will engage in a program for self-improvement (pp. 18 & 19).



According to Bailey, a review of the literature in 1981 revealed that minimal effort had been expended in the area of self-directed supervision or self-assessment practices (Bailey, 1981, p.8).

Interest in self-assessment was also generated by the historical development of observation instruments. The pioneer work of Ned Flanders with Interaction Analysis gave substantial credence to the systematic study of teaching behavior (Bailey, 1981).

The value of self-assessment was addressed by Peck and Tucker (1973) when discussing the aspect of providing feedback to teachers:

The available evidence all indicates that teachers use such feedback to make instructive change in their teaching style only if another person participates in the feedback session. Apparently simply looking at one's own performance does not lead to much new insight as to what one is doing, or else it does not provide adequate motivation, to alter that pattern. The presence of another human being adds a potent factor which does induce positive change (p. 947).

Bailey (1981) came to a more positive conclusion in a followup study of approximately 200 teachers. He determined that teacher self-assessment, without third party intervention, was more successful than originally found by Peck and Tucker.

Self-assessment by teachers at the college level has been addressed by several authors. Brown and Thornton (1983) take the position that college teachers can evaluate themselves by such procedures as introspection, studying the product, and asking colleagues and student committee members to sit in on classes and evaluate class sessions.

If one accepts the idea that teacher behaviors can be improved it is necessary that the various teaching behaviors be identified. Teaching behaviors derived from comprehensive reviews of research (Walberg, Schiller, and Haertzel, 1979; Rosenshine and Furst, 1971; and Manatt 1981) should serve as the frame of reference for teacher self-improvement (Beach and Reinhartz, Fall, 1982). Walberg, Schiller and Haertzel (1979) identified fourteen teaching variables for which 90 percent or more of the studies reviewed indicated an impact on learning. Rosenshine and Furst (1971) identified nine variables associated with effective teaching. Manatt (1981) listed fourteen ascriptive teacher variables that correlate with effective teaching. The variables consist of such things as knowledge of the subject, clarity of presentation, fairness, effectiveness, enthusiasm, and control.

Beach and Reinhartz (Fall, 1982) developed a teacher self-assessment inventory (see Appendix B) based on certain of the behaviors identified as important by previous researchers. The authors believed their model provided a format for supervision that was both positive and non-

threatening. Wiles and Bondi concurred and summarized this approach to teacher supervision best by stating:

During the process of significant instructional improvement. . .building trust and clear communication are essential to. . .change. The traditional model of supervision. . .can make assessment of instructional improvement. . . subjective, artificial and non-productive. . . What is needed. . .is a form of classroom supervision that is positive in its orientation, non-threatening in its manner, open in its communication, and continuous in its application (Wiles and Bondi, 1980, p. 132).

Wilbert J. McKeachie is a pioneer in the study of teaching at the college level. In his work with Cohen (1980) the authors discuss the role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching. The article cites diminishing faculty involvement in classroom visits, examination of course syllabi, and expression of opinions concerning their colleagues. McKeachie further states that literature concerning colleague evaluation is not only sparse but also limited in scope.

Smith (1979) reports on a seminar that provides for an exchange of ideas on ways to improve teaching within institutions and disciplines. Such exchanges do not always occur on local college campuses or among colleges in the same state community college system. This activity can lead

to more creative solutions to local teaching problems.

In research considering part-time faculty at the community college level, Behrendt and Parsons (1989) find that in order for faculty evaluation systems to be effective they must contain suggestions for improvement and contain a self-evaluation component as part of the process. The system should be evaluated regularly and should be aimed at becoming a positive growth-oriented activity.

Piland (1984) suggests that administrations must develop a comprehensive faculty evaluation plan involving more than just student evaluation of instruction at the community college level. Classroom visitation by administrators, peer evaluation of instruction and faculty self evaluation are necessary components.

Robert C. Wilson (1986) reports the results of a study using student evaluations and outside consultants to aid in the improvement of teaching at the college level. The study reports that the consultation process was associated with statistically important change in overall teaching effectiveness ratings for 52 percent of the faculty clients. Items on which the faculty showed statistically important change were those for which the suggestions were most concrete, specific and behavioral. Of interest in this study was that the consultants were two psychologists and a sociologist who had no part in decisions affecting the faculty member's advancement.

Andrews (1987) notes that the evaluation of in-class

teaching should lead to a face to face opportunity to review the observations of the teacher. It should allow for interaction on the strengths observed as well as those needing improvement.

Eugene Arden (1989) discusses who should be judging the faculty. He cites the voluminous publications of Astin, Cashin, P.A. Cohen, Kulik, Marsh, and McKeachie as researchers whose work supports the validity of using student evaluations. He also states that peer evaluation, even though imperfect, remains a crucial tool in determining how good or how poor a job of teaching is being done. The author also points out that it can tell us a great deal about encouraging faculty members to improve.

McKeachie (1979) notes that significant positive changes in teaching generally require personal intervention and one-on-one consultation with a peer or an instructional expert. Carroll and Goldberg (1989) report on a teaching consultation program that they developed in 1983. The authors concluded that the consultation approach has great potential as a cost-effective technique for instructional improvement at the college level. It appeals to a wide range of faculty and engages them in the collegial process of professional renewal. The authors provide guidelines for providing a teaching critique that are adapted from several other studies. The guidelines include provision for a typical setting, a psychologically safe critique and prior agreement on the goals and behaviors to be focused on.

Martin and Martin (1989) present an article discussing the utilization of a behavioral observation scale to assess college-level teaching effectiveness in order to provide quality feedback to faculty in a non-threatening atmosphere. The items included in the scale were intended to reflect actual behavior. It was believed that this would prevent or reduce subjectivity and assure the faculty member of concrete feedback. The authors further identified the importance of distinguishing between teaching evaluations for formative feedback and those used for summative personnel type decisions.

Gitlin and Smyth (Winter 1990) contend that most teacher evaluation schemes foster similar patterns of interaction and communication. An analysis of these commonplace evaluation practices indicates that this tradition is guided by the following set of possibly erroneous assumptions:

1. what teachers do is the sole focus of the evaluation process;
2. evaluation judgments can be made without considering historical factors;
3. evaluation is a process of one-way declarations from the evaluator to the practitioner; and
4. evaluation is an individual undertaking.

The authors suggest alternative practices that encourage "educative" interests. One of the primary commitments underpinning an educative model is that people must change

their understanding of themselves and their world. This is the first step in radically altering the self-destructive patterns of interaction that characterize their social relationships. An educative model considers how behavior and understanding are intimately linked. Teachers are given an opportunity to decide for themselves, on the basis of lucid, critical self awareness, the manner in which they wish to operate.

McKeachie (1990) writes about the conclusions to be drawn from the history of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. McKeachie presents conclusions that indicate the validity of student evaluations. He also discusses the future of research on college teaching and he specifically mentions the next decade as one in which research on peer review, consultation, training and feedback can be combined to further the effectiveness of college teaching.

#### Summary

It is evident from the preceding information that a form of critical self-evaluation is possible when utilizing a method of clinical supervision based on an analysis of student perceptions of teaching behaviors. Evidence was presented that the teaching behaviors identified in the literature as being important for effective teaching may be validly analyzed through student feedback.

The importance of alternative practices that encourage "educative" interests are noted by Gitlin and Smyth (Winter

1990). It is important to note that teachers must change their understanding of themselves and their world. This represents the first step in altering their teaching patterns to enable them to improve their social relationships. Clinical supervision using student feedback can serve as the means to this end.

All the evidence and research experience regarding the worth of peer support and behavioral data for use in self-analysis of teaching is equally pertinent, relevant, and applicable to the college teaching arena.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHOD

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there was a perceived difference in teacher behavior and effectiveness, as measured by teacher and student response, by those who engaged in clinical supervision. The study emphasized the use of self-assessment techniques. This chapter describes the procedures and methods used in the selection of subjects, the selection and administration of two assessment instruments, the procedures applied for the collection of data, and data analysis.

#### Selection of Subjects

The subjects used in this study were from a population of approximately 16 college teachers from the Accounting Department of a four year College of Business Administration in a major metropolitan area. The university is a four year comprehensive institution which serves approximately 14,000 students. The university is a state supported institution that offers a wide range of degree programs through the Masters degree. The College of Business Administration

enrolls approximately 4700 students of which approximately 4200 are undergraduate. The average age of the student population is 28. The metropolitan area has a population of approximately 800,000 people.

#### Instruments (See Appendixes)

The self-assessment procedure developed by Beach and Reinhartz utilized the Teacher Assessment Instrument (Beach & Reinhartz, 1982). (See Appendix B.) This instrument was designed to help teachers make their own assessments regarding their effectiveness in the classroom. The Teacher Image Questionnaire (Acheson & Gall, 1982) has been used to rank certain teacher traits according to the opinions of their students. (See Appendix A.) This instrument was designed to measure student perception of teacher effectiveness. The researcher obtained permission from the authors to reproduce and use their respective instruments. The instruments used in this study have been derived from the research cited by Walberg, Schiller, and Haertzel (1979) in which seventy different variables associated with effective teaching were analyzed. The variables considered in the two instruments used in this study were identified as having an impact on learning and teacher effectiveness in 90 percent or more of the studies performed (Beach & Reinhartz, 1982, p.6).

The Teacher Image Questionnaire was developed by Roy C. Bryan for administration to junior high and high school

students. Bryan used the questionnaire format utilizing various teaching behaviors that had been previously identified in the literature as being important. Bryan provided the students an opportunity to list the "strengths" and "weaknesses" of their teachers and from this information Bryan refined the Teacher Image Questionnaire to its current content (Bryan, 1966, pp. 459-60).

The Teacher Assessment Instrument and the Teacher Image Questionnaire were used as the data-gathering instruments. The students were administered both the Teacher Assessment Instrument and the Teacher Image Questionnaire as pretests and posttests. The pretest was administered during the third or fourth week of the semester and the posttest was administered during the fourteenth or fifteenth week of the semester to student groups. The teachers were administered the Teacher Assessment Instrument as both a pretest and a posttest.

The Teacher Assessment Instrument has 12 items concerning teacher instructional behavior. Each of the 12 items is ranked on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is the optimum positive ranking and 5 is the most negative ranking. The Teacher Image Questionnaire has 16 items and each item is ranked from poor to excellent. (See Appendixes)

### Research Design

The study utilized a volunteer group of 6 business school accounting professors. The study also included

students in 2 undergraduate class sections taught by each teacher. The teachers received clinical supervision in the form of peer coaching utilizing the conference approach after the results of the student pretests were computed. Formal conferences with each participating faculty member were held on four separate occasions. Informal conferences were held at other times throughout the semester as deemed necessary by the faculty member. Informal conferences occurred in the hall between classes and at times in informal office conversations. The questionnaires were administered to the group at the end of the first three week period of each semester at the beginning of the study and administered at the end of the study, each semester, during the two weeks prior to the close of the semester. The questionnaires were administered to the students in each of two class sections taught by the instructors. The questionnaires were administered during regular class time while the professor left the room. The instructors were also administered pretests and posttests to provide a basis for discussion concerning their perceptions of their own effectiveness and their perceptions of clinical supervision. The study was conducted over two semesters utilizing the same instructors but with different groups of students.

A qualitative approach was used in the gathering of data. Qualitative analysis offered the benefit of providing a wider range of information and more in depth responses. The interviewing process was used to gather information from

the teachers and from a sample of the students who participated in this process. The interviews took place at the end of each semester.

### Procedures

The researcher made contact with the Dean of the College of Business Administration of the selected four year institution to seek permission to conduct research in the college. Upon approval of the Dean, permission was also sought from the Chair of the Department of Accounting. The researcher sought volunteers for the project from the Accounting Department faculty and selected 6 teacher volunteers. Volunteer teachers were selected such that the sample of teachers represented a varied number of years of teaching experience and educational background. The researcher informally instructed the teachers in the methods of clinical supervision and procedures of self-assessment for teacher improvement. The researcher then chose 2 sections of undergraduate courses taught by each instructor to be included in the test groups for the study.

The following procedures were used in conducting the research:

1. The teachers were individually informed that improvement of teaching effectiveness as perceived by their students and themselves was to be the focus of the study.
2. The researcher explained to each of the teachers

that the information would be held in strict confidence and would not be made available to anyone but themselves.

3. After completion of the first 3 weeks of a semester the 6 teachers and their student groups were administered the Teacher Assessment Instrument (Beach & Reinhartz, 1982). The students in each group also completed the Teacher Image Questionnaire (Acheson and Gall, 1981).
4. The results of the student responses were summarized by computing a mean and standard deviation for each question for each section, and the summarized results were made available to the teachers for their use in the self-assessment process. The teachers received a copy of the instruments for each section with the mean and standard deviation of the student responses indicated for each question. The researcher assisted them through clinical supervision by conducting personal conferences to discuss the results and offering advice and instruction as needed or requested. The researcher took a non-directive stance in the conference, allowing the teacher to perform self-analysis. The researcher asked the faculty participants to review the questionnaire results prior to the first conference of each semester. The purpose of this

request was to encourage self-analysis on the part of the faculty participants as the researcher desired to conduct this study in a non-directive manner. The researcher was available to answer any questions and offer help and assistance if requested. The conferences were held in either the researchers' office or the faculty members' office, whichever was more convenient for the volunteer. A sample of the teacher conference discussion format is included in Appendix D.

5. One week prior to the close of the semester the students were administered both questionnaires as a posttest. Simple written narratives were also solicited with the format shown in Appendix C. A post interview was also held with a volunteer group of students. The students were asked to volunteer and the interviews were held in the researchers' office or in the classroom, whichever was more convenient for the student. The volunteer group consisted of 12 undergraduate students. The student volunteer group consisted of 7 males and 5 females ranging in age from 19 to 36. A sample of the conference discussion format is included in Appendix E.

The student interviews focused on the students' attitude toward this approach to teacher assessment, trying to determine students'

perceptions of:

- a. whether the teachers' instruction improved;
- b. whether the teacher was more focused on teaching in the latter part of the semester;
- c. whether the students' attitudes concerning the teachers' performance improved; and
- d. any other ideas or perceptions they may have concerning the process.

The discussion and responses were carefully recorded in the form of field notes, kept in a research journal.

6. A post interview was held with each participating teacher to solicit their ideas about the strengths and weaknesses of clinical supervision. The post interview also focused on:
  - a. teachers' attitude toward and perception of clinical supervision and self-assessment,
  - b. teacher autonomy,
  - c. student achievement,
  - d. whether the teachers felt threatened during the process,
  - e. whether their academic freedom was abridged, and
  - f. whether their focus on teaching was improved.

These oral responses and discussion were carefully noted in a research journal. Appendix F includes a sequential listing of the procedures included in this



study.

### Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviation for responses to each question in both questionnaires were calculated for the pretest and the posttest responses to the standard questionnaires. Only these summary statistics were made available to the teachers. The final comparisons for each semester were made on the basis of matched pairs as determined by the last four digits of the student identification number. Students who had dropped the class, or did not participate in both the pretest and the posttest were not included in the final tabulations.

The qualitative data analysis of the interview responses and discussions describes the perceptions of both teachers and students. The descriptions focus on the questions raised during the interviews conducted at the end of each semester including teacher improvement, student improvement, and the benefits and drawbacks to clinical supervision as perceived by the participating teachers and a representative sample of students from each course section. Conclusions were drawn concerning whether the group saw merit and benefit in the process of clinical supervision for teachers at the college level.

### Summary

The results of the pretests, posttests, and the

interviews provided the researcher with information which aided in understanding the effects of clinical supervision using student feedback. The information derived from faculty interviews and questionnaires aided in understanding the professors' attitudes toward maintaining their autonomy and freedom while being subjected to peer review using clinical supervision.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Introduction

The researcher contacted the Dean of the College of Business Administration at the institution and obtained his permission to conduct the research on campus. On the same day the researcher contacted the Chair of the Accounting Department to obtain his permission to conduct the research within his department. The Chair granted his permission and also suggested a group of faculty whom he thought would be willing to volunteer to participate in this study.

From this list the researcher chose 6 faculty members. The list included 3 men and 3 women. Their ages ranged between 31 years of age and 61 years of age. The number of years of teaching experience ranged from 11 years to 28 years. One of the participants in the study holds a Ph.D. in Accounting, another holds a Ph.D. in Business Education, still another is currently working on a doctoral dissertation in Accounting. The other participants hold one or more masters degrees.

Of the three men participating in the study, one expressed excitement at the opportunity to participate in

the study, another stated that it might be beneficial and the third expressed that he had little faith in student feedback for the purpose of clinical supervision. The three women volunteers included one who expressed some hesitation concerning participation in the process and two who were most anxious to participate.

The questionnaires were administered during the first three weeks of the first and second semesters and again in the last two weeks of both semesters. The faculty and students participated in a willing and professional manner, knowing that their identities would remain anonymous.

In the week following administration of the questionnaires the professors were contacted and the researcher shared the results of the survey with them. Each professor received a copy of the questionnaires with the mean and standard deviation of the responses to each question. Each professor was asked to identify areas in which they would concentrate their efforts on improvement and further indicated that they would also review the balance of the items on the questionnaires and attempt to make any adjustments they could. The most common area of concern among all volunteer teachers was on the problem of stimulation of student interest.

Each of the 6 volunteers expressed positive attitudes with respect to the concepts embodied in clinical supervision. The 2 professors who expressed any hesitation or resistance were positive in their overall responses in

our conferences to review the results of the questionnaires.

All of the volunteers have previously been subjected to a standard form of student evaluation used by the university at the end of each semester, and all have expressed their skepticism of that process. All of the volunteers agreed that this form of clinical supervision could be more beneficial because they would be able to adjust their methods and styles of teaching to accommodate the current students in each class. They expressed the belief that this could help the teaching and learning process.

The teachers who were selected as volunteers exhibit varying teaching styles. All of the instructors have received favorable student evaluations in the past, some more favorable than others, and each has his or her own area of expertise within the department.

#### Results of Pretests and Posttests

The teachers were assigned two-digit identification numbers by the researcher. The mean, standard deviation and the differences of the means and standard deviations were determined for the pretests and posttests for each of the 16 categories of the Teacher Image Questionnaire and for each of the 12 categories of the Teacher Assessment Instrument for the two semesters.

Professor 01 stated that he did not place much reliance on student feedback and accordingly did not place much

confidence in the worth or merit of this type of clinical supervision. Based on the review of the critical theory approach the researcher does not perceive a reflective attitude in this professor with respect to his teaching. Table I summarizes the findings in section one for Professor 01 for the first semester.

TABLE I  
SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
PROFESSOR 01, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 1

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	3.8	1.2	4.3	.4	.5	-.8
2 Clarity	3.3	1.4	2.9	.9	-.4	-.5
3 Fairness	3.9	1.3	3.8	.7	-.1	-.6
4 Control	3.7	1.4	3.6	1.0	-.1	-.4
5 Respect	3.8	1.3	3.8	.6	.0	-.7
6 Interest	2.6	1.3	2.3	.8	-.3	-.5
7 Enthusiasm	3.6	1.3	3.7	.9	.1	-.4
8 Respect Ideas	3.1	1.3	3.6	1.0	-.5	-.3
9 Encouragement	2.9	1.3	3.3	1.3	.4	.0
10 Humor	3.6	1.3	3.5	1.0	-.1	-.3
11 Assignments	3.5	1.2	3.1	1.0	-.4	-.2
12 Appearance	2.6	1.3	3.1	.9	.5	-.4
13 Openness	3.2	1.3	3.2	1.1	.0	-.2
14 Self-control	3.6	1.1	3.8	.6	.2	-.5
15 Consideration	3.2	1.3	3.3	1.1	.1	-.2
16 Effectiveness	3.2	1.2	3.3	1.0	.1	-.2

Despite the skepticism of Professor 01, 7 of the 16 means rose, 7 of the 16 means fell and 2 showed no change.

However, all of the standard deviations fell (except for 1 which showed no change) pointing out that the opinions of the students tended to consolidate during the semester. In addition, the mean of the means rose from 3.35 in the pretest to 3.41 in the posttest indicating that the direction of the change was slightly positive.

Based on his lack of confidence in the opinions of students, Professor 01 indicated that he was willing to target item 6 (concerning stimulation of student interest) and item 12 (concerning appearance and dress) for improvement. He was, however, willing to take the other items into consideration. Professor 01 teaches upper level classes which cover difficult material that becomes more difficult over the course of the semester.

The mean score of item 12, regarding appearance and dress, rose from 2.6 to 3.1, representing the largest increase in mean scores. Professor 01 and the students indicated that there was a noticeable improvement in his appearance. Since the evaluation system currently used in the university does not address appearance, this may have been the first time that this area of behavior was brought to the attention of the professor.

The mean score of item 6, regarding stimulation of student interest, did not improve. The pretest showed a mean of 2.6 and the posttest was 2.3. This may be due to an interaction because the students were anticipating the course material in the first three weeks and were fatigued

or disappointed in the course material by the end of the semester. This interaction may not be under the total control of the professor.

Other interesting observations from the first semester centered around items 1 (teacher knowledge of the material) and item 9 (encouragement of student participation). Item 1 rose from 3.8 to 4.3, showing the same magnitude of increase as item 12 on appearance. Item 9 rose from 2.9 to 3.3. Both of these items were under the control of the professor.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
PROFESSOR 01, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 2

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	3.5	1.2	3.4	1.3	-.1	.1
2 Clarity	3.5	1.3	3.2	.6	-.3	-.7
3 Fairness	3.6	1.2	3.4	.9	-.2	-.3
4 Control	3.6	1.2	3.7	.6	.1	-.6
5 Respect	3.5	1.2	3.1	.8	-.4	-.4
6 Interest	3.0	1.1	2.9	.8	-.1	-.3
7 Enthusiasm	3.8	1.4	3.7	.5	-.1	-.9
8 Respect Ideas	3.4	1.2	3.5	.5	-.1	-.7
9 Encouragement	3.6	1.2	3.4	.8	-.2	-.4
10 Humor	3.5	1.2	3.4	.7	-.1	-.5
11 Assignments	3.5	1.2	4.1	.3	.6	-.9
12 Appearance	3.4	1.2	3.3	.8	-.1	-.4
13 Openness	3.3	1.1	3.6	.5	.3	-.6
14 Self-control	3.2	1.6	3.8	.7	.6	-.9
15 Consideration	3.3	1.1	3.5	.7	.2	-.4
16 Effectiveness	3.6	1.2	3.5	.5	-.1	-.7



Table II contains the results of Professor 01 for a similar section in the second semester. The majority of the mean scores for Professor 01 declined during the second semester. It is interesting to note that the mean of the mean scores in the second semester is higher for both the pretest (3.46) and posttest (3.47) than the mean of the means for the posttest (3.41) of the first semester. This may indicate a carryover from the first semester or be indicative of a different group of students in the same course.

Professor 01 opted to target the same items in the second semester that he did in the first semester. Item 6 concerning stimulation of student interest shows a pretest mean of 3.0 compared with the pretest mean in the first semester of 2.6 and a posttest mean of 2.3. The second semester shows a decline in the mean from 3.0 to 2.9 which still represents a mean score higher than the pretest or posttest mean score from the first semester.

Item 12 concerning appearance shows a decline in mean scores for the second semester from 3.4 to 3.3. The mean scores for both the pretest and the posttest for the second semester are higher than the corresponding scores of the first semester. With both of these items the residual effect and the continued effort on the part of the professor may account for these differences.

Item 1 concerning teacher knowledge of the material shows lower scores for the second semester than was

indicated for the second semester. Item 9 concerning encouragement of student participation shows a decrease in scores from pretest to posttest from 3.6 to 3.4, but the scores of both the pretest and the posttest for this item are higher than those of the first semester.

Professor 02 entered this project with the most hesitation. Her hesitation was from personal reservations about her own performance instead of reservations about the worth of the process of clinical supervision. The results of her tests show marked increases in her overall mean scores and decreases in the standard deviations. When taken together, they indicate improved perceptions of her teaching behaviors in both semesters and more consensus among the student opinions. Professor 02 indicated to the researcher in the peer conference that she would not key on any particular element identified by the students, but that she would make a concerted effort to improve her teaching performance on an overall basis.

Professor 02 indicated to the researcher that she was entering into this project with the approach and beliefs of a critical theorist. Professor 02 indicated that she felt it was important to address all of the items on the questionnaire in order to provide the most benefit to the students and to enhance their learning as much as possible. Professor 02 also indicated the importance of questioning her own performance and taking a reflective approach concerning each of the items covered.

Table III indicates the results of the Teacher Image Questionnaire for Professor 02 for the first semester. The results for Professor 02 show that the means for all 16 questions increased and the standard deviations declined for all items which indicates less diversity among the student responses. Professor 02 appears to have been most successful in achieving the goals established at the start of the first semester.

TABLE III  
SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
PROFESSOR 02, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 1

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	3.2	1.9	4.4	.7	1.2	-1.2
2 Clarity	2.7	1.7	4.2	.8	1.5	-0.9
3 Fairness	3.4	2.0	4.7	.5	1.3	-1.5
4 Control	3.1	1.9	4.6	.6	1.5	-1.3
5 Respect	3.3	2.0	4.4	.6	1.1	-1.4
6 Interest	2.7	1.8	3.7	1.2	1.0	-0.6
7 Enthusiasm	3.0	1.9	4.2	.8	1.2	-1.1
8 Respect Ideas	3.2	2.0	4.7	.5	1.5	-1.5
9 Encouragement	2.9	1.9	4.3	.7	1.4	-1.2
10 Humor	2.9	2.0	4.4	.8	1.5	-1.2
11 Assignments	3.0	1.9	4.3	.7	1.3	-1.2
12 Appearance	3.5	2.1	4.7	.4	1.2	-1.7
13 Openness	3.3	2.0	4.5	.6	1.2	-1.4
14 Self-control	3.3	2.0	4.6	.6	1.3	-1.4
15 Consideration	3.4	2.0	4.6	.5	1.2	-1.5
16 Effectiveness	2.9	1.8	4.4	.7	1.5	-1.1

The researcher discussed item 6 concerning stimulation of student interest with Professor 02. This area was identified as one of the most difficult to improve; for her, and the mean scores for this item show an increase from 2.7 to 3.7. While this is the smallest increase in means for all 16 items it is important to note that Professor 02 indicated this item as one of great concern to her.

TABLE IV  
SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
PROFESSOR 02, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 2

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	3.9	.6	4.5	.6	.5	.0
2 Clarity	3.5	1.0	3.9	.9	.4	-.1
3 Fairness	4.2	.7	4.7	.6	.5	-.1
4 Control	4.0	.6	4.4	.6	.4	.0
5 Respect	4.4	.7	4.6	.5	.2	-.2
6 Interest	3.5	1.0	3.7	.9	.2	-.1
7 Enthusiasm	4.3	.7	4.7	.6	.4	-.1
8 Respect Ideas	4.5	.6	4.7	.5	.2	-.1
9 Encouragement	4.1	.8	4.3	.9	.2	.1
10 Humor	3.9	.8	4.4	1.1	.5	.3
11 Assignments	4.2	.7	3.9	.9	-.3	.2
12 Appearance	4.7	.6	4.3	.6	-.4	.0
13 Openness	4.1	.8	4.3	.6	.2	-.2
14 Self-control	4.5	.5	4.7	.5	.2	.0
15 Consideration	4.5	.6	4.6	.7	.1	.1
16 Effectiveness	3.7	.9	4.1	1.0	.4	.1

Table IV showing a summary of results for Professor 02 for a representative section for the second semester is consistent with the results from the first semester. The means for 14 of 16 items again show increases while 2 of 16 items show decreases. The increases of the mean scores are not nearly as large in Table IV for the second semester as for the first semester, but the pretest means are much higher in the second semester. The mean of the mean scores for the first semester was 3.11 in the pretest and 4.40 in the posttest. The second semester resulted in a mean of the means of 4.13 for the pretest and 4.36 for the posttest.

The results for Professor 02 point out the effectiveness of her concerted effort at trying to improve her scores in all areas. The fact that the mean scores for the pretest for the second semester were all higher than the pretest scores for the first semester is noteworthy as this indicates the possibility of a carryover effect for Professor 02. What Professor 02 learned from self-analysis in the first semester could have had an impact on her teaching behavior in the second trial semester.

Professors 03, 04, 05, and 06 expressed willingness to participate in the study and all expressed similar positive feelings about their expectations concerning the results. Tables V and VI present the results of Professor 04 which are representative of the results of the 4 professors in this group. The researcher chose to group these four professors for reporting purposes. Their individual results

TABLE V  
 SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
 FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
 PROFESSOR 04, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 1

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	3.9	1.9	4.0	1.0	.1	-0.9
2 Clarity	3.3	1.8	3.1	1.0	-.2	-0.8
3 Fairness	3.7	1.9	4.0	1.0	.3	-0.9
4 Control	3.7	1.9	4.3	0.8	.6	-1.1
5 Respect	3.5	1.8	3.7	1.1	.2	-0.7
6 Encouragement	3.3	1.8	3.5	1.0	.2	-0.8
7 Enthusiasm	3.8	1.9	3.7	1.4	-.1	-0.5
8 Respect Ideas	3.6	1.9	3.7	1.2	.1	-0.7
9 Encouragement	3.6	1.9	3.6	1.2	.0	-0.7
10 Humor	3.7	1.8	4.5	0.8	.8	-1.0
11 Assignments	3.1	1.8	3.2	1.1	.1	-0.7
12 Appearance	3.4	1.7	3.8	0.8	.4	-0.9
13 Openness	3.3	1.7	3.7	1.1	.4	-0.6
14 Self-control	3.4	1.8	3.5	1.3	.1	-0.5
15 Consideration	3.5	1.8	3.6	0.8	.1	-1.0
16 Effectiveness	3.6	1.7	3.5	1.2	-.1	-0.5

did not reflect the disparity of results as demonstrated by Professor 01 and Professor 02. The researcher believed that any further presentation of results would not present meaningful data.

The scores in Tables V and VI show increases in mean scores and decreases in the standard deviations for the first semester. The changes in means and standard deviations for the second semester show more of a mix of increases and decreases for the second semester. It is interesting to note that the changes in means and standard

TABLE VI  
 SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
 FOR THE TEACHER IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE  
 PROFESSOR 04, SECTION 1, SEMESTER 2

Question	Pretest		Posttest		Difference	
	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.	Mean	S.Dev.
1 Knowledge	4.5	0.7	4.6	0.5	0.1	-0.2
2 Clarity	4.2	0.6	4.1	0.5	-0.1	-0.1
3 Fairness	4.1	0.5	4.5	0.5	0.4	0.0
4 Control	4.3	0.8	4.2	0.6	-0.1	-0.2
5 Respect	3.8	0.9	4.4	0.5	0.6	-0.4
6 Interest	4.0	0.9	4.1	0.5	0.1	-0.4
7 Enthusiasm	4.3	1.0	4.1	0.9	-0.2	-0.1
8 Respect Ideas	3.7	0.9	4.1	0.5	0.4	-0.4
9 Encouragement	3.5	1.0	4.1	0.8	0.6	-0.2
10 Humor	3.1	0.9	4.2	0.4	1.1	-0.5
11 Assignments	4.1	0.7	3.9	0.8	-0.2	0.1
12 Appearance	3.5	1.1	3.5	0.8	0.0	-0.3
13 Openness	3.6	0.8	3.9	0.7	0.3	-0.1
14 Self-control	3.9	0.9	3.8	1.0	-0.1	0.1
15 Consideration	3.9	0.9	4.1	0.7	0.2	-0.2
16 Effectiveness	3.9	0.9	4.4	0.5	0.5	-0.4

deviations for this group are not as dramatic as they are for Professor 01 or Professor 02.

Table VI illustrates one other significant piece of information in that the mean scores for 14 out of 16 items were higher for the pretests in the second semester than for the first semester. Once again, this fact indicates the possibility of the carryover effect from the efforts expended by the participants in the first semester.

TABLE VII  
 SUMMARY OF MEAN OF MEANS FOR THE TEACHER  
 IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROFESSORS  
 01, 02, 03, 04, 05 AND 06

Prof. #	First Semester		Second Semester	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
01	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5
02	3.1	4.4	4.1	4.4
03	2.5	3.9	4.1	4.4
04	3.5	3.7	3.9	4.1
05	2.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
06	2.7	4.2	4.0	4.0

Table VII lists the mean of the means for the Teacher Image Questionnaire for this group of four professors to illustrate the above mentioned characteristics.

The researcher has emphasized the results of the Teacher Image Questionnaire in the data analysis. The results of the Teacher Assessment Instrument back up the findings of the Teacher Image Questionnaire, but the results were not as dramatic, and it became evident to the researcher that the Teacher Image Questionnaire was more suitable for a university setting while the Teacher Assessment Instrument was better suited for a high school setting. The subjects of the study were provided the results of the Teacher Assessment Instrument, but all of the professors indicated that they preferred the items listed on



the Teacher Image Questionnaire for purposes of self-analysis.

#### Summary of Pretests and Posttests

Upon examination of the differences in the means and standard deviations it is evident that there were gains in the mean scores of each question for the majority of questions in each section and declines in the standard deviations for each question for all sections. Comparisons of the mean of the means indicate the same. Increases in the mean scores and declines in the standard deviations could indicate a positive effect on the perceptions of teaching behaviors as represented by student response.

The results of the Teacher Assessment Instrument corroborated all of the related findings in the Teacher Image Questionnaire, but the data derived from the Teacher Image Questionnaire were much more directly related to college teaching, and therefore the researcher focused all data analysis on the Teacher Image Questionnaire, faculty and student interviews and related faculty and student written responses.

#### Results of Interviews - Faculty

The interviews and written responses to questions provided additional information regarding the clinical supervision process. During the interviews, the researcher used the term "peer review" in place of clinical

supervision. The researcher was able to transcribe the interviews. All of the professors were asked to respond to 6 questions. Responses to the questions were as follows:

**Question 1. What is your attitude toward this type of peer review?**

Professor 01: "My attitude is positive toward this type of peer review. It should be understood that these are only student perceptions."

Professor 02: "I do not find it uncomfortable nor inhibiting. It probably focuses the students' thoughts about certain teaching aspects.

I don't consciously try to teach with the review in mind, but it does cause me to be mindful of what I am doing and how it may impact the student."

Professor 03: "I welcome it as a means whereby I can make positive improvements."

Professor 04: "I believe the results far outweigh the effort it would take to conduct it.

I believe it to be a very useful, credible, and intelligent way to approach the topic."

Professor 05: "I welcome either peer or student reviews. It should be a learning and growth process."

Professor 06: "Positive, non threatening way to find out what my strengths and weaknesses are so I can improve my effectiveness as a teacher."

**Question 2. Do you feel that peer review represents an infringement on teacher autonomy?**

Professor 01: "No I do not feel that peer review represents an infringement on teacher autonomy."

Professor 02: "No, I don't see it as forcing any changes on the way I conduct my class."

Professor 03: "Absolutely not."

Professor 04: "Absolutely not! What is there to be afraid of, so long as one is doing the job?"

Professor 05: "No."

Professor 06: "No. In fact many institutions have a peer review category on evaluations which often is left blank as none exists. This would provide additional information on teaching ability."

**Question 3. Do you feel that student achievement could be enhanced through such a process?**

Professor 01: "No I do not feel that student achievement would be enhanced through such a process."

Professor 02: "Perhaps, but the relationship seems tenuous to me. A class of students will vary in terms of abilities, interests and methods of learning. So changes in instruction will enhance some, but probably detract from others."

Professor 03: "Certainly - as the instructor makes positive adjustments."

Professor 04: "Yes, mostly, however, through the added insight received by the instructor."

Professor 05: "Hopefully as we improve, learning should also improve."

Professor 06: "Yes. Knowing and addressing my own weaknesses might help me communicate better, which could enhance student understanding and learning."

Question 4. Do you feel threatened by this process?

Professor 01: "No I do not feel threatened by this process."

Professor 02: "No not the way it is currently being done on a voluntary basis. Forced compliance, wrong emphasis or incompatible person administering the peer review could change the perception of being threatened."

Professor 03: "Not much."

Professor 04: "No."

Professor 05: "No."

Professor 06: "No. I don't feel that it should be used as the sole source of evaluation though. I do believe it might be better than current method because it removes the performance (grade) element from student opinion."

Question 5. Do you feel that your academic freedom was abridged by this process?

Professor 01: "No I do not feel that my academic freedom was abridged by this process."

Professor 02: "No, but I am not a big, avid believer in academic freedom."

Professor 03: "No!"

Professor 04: "Nope! You did not dictate any process to me."

Professor 05: "No."

Professor 06: "No. I didn't do anything different as far as course requirements or performance expectations because of this."

Question 6. Do you believe that your focus on teaching was improved by submitting to this process?

Professor 01: "No I do not believe that my focus on teaching was necessarily improved by submitting to this process."

Professor 02: "Probably, unconsciously, I believe I have changed my attitude about my conduct in class. I think I have become less autocratic in class. (Not much - but some. Don't ask me why?)"

Professor 03: "I think that, relatively, I am pretty well focused. Thus my focus was probably not significantly affected."

Professor 04: "Most definitely - and, I hope it improves not only my teaching abilities, but my approach and attitude toward the students."

Professor 05: "Yes."

Professor 06: "Yes. (The process) helped me see where my weaknesses were so I can focus on improving them."

#### Summary of Interviews - Faculty

A summary of the professors' responses might include the following:

Question 1. What is your attitude toward this type of peer review?

All professors indicated a positive attitude toward clinical supervision. Several seemed to welcome the idea. One professor felt that student responses to evaluation forms were not valid, but the process of clinical supervision utilizing peer review was perceived to be a potentially valid process.

Question 2. Do you feel that peer review represents an infringement on teacher autonomy?

All professors responded that they did not feel that peer review handled in this manner infringed on their autonomy.

Question 3. Do you feel that student achievement could be enhanced through such a process?

This question provides some disagreement. One professor thought that students would not benefit from the clinical supervision of the faculty. Three professors thought that students would benefit and two others hoped they might benefit from clinical supervision.

Question 4. Do you feel threatened by this process of peer review?

The participants were unanimous in expressing that they did not feel threatened by this process of peer review. One professor did comment that the specific manner in which the process was handled in that it was voluntary, did contribute to his positive feelings.

Question 5. Do you feel that your academic freedom was abridged by this process of peer review?

The participants were again unanimous in stating that they did not feel that their academic freedoms were abridged.

Question 6. Do you believe that your focus on teaching was improved by this process?

Three professors responded that their focus was improved. One stated that it was probably improved while two others stated that it was in no way improved.

#### Results of Interviews - Students

The students were asked to comment on their feelings concerning the process of clinical supervision as to whether they perceived it as being beneficial and worthwhile and if so why and if not why not. The following represent a sample of their responses.

Student 1: "If comments are relevant and change follows then this type of review is worthwhile."

Student 2: "It is a good idea to learn students' views of their professors. Would these reviews be used in any way to provide future students with information regarding the faculty member?"

Student 3: "I don't think it is worth it to have to have a faculty peer review process. Sometimes it may cause conflict. Maybe someone doesn't want his peers to know about him and his teaching."

Student 4: "It is always good to have a review of a persons' weak and strong points. Without any feedback we

continue making the same mistakes possibly without knowing there is a problem."

"Any faculty member who cares about their teaching skills would consider this process very helpful."

Student 5: "This would be a wonderful tool for a faculty member who is striving to better his classroom appearance and technique."

Student 6: "I don't know if peer review per se is especially helpful. However, sharing of ideas, teaching strategies etc. can be very rewarding for the teachers involved."

Student 7: "I think that this is an excellent way to improve or provide positive feedback. I have some instructors who need desperately to be reviewed this way."

Student 8: "I think that the faculty peer review process is an excellent idea. I would like to see more exchange of ideas between instructors and students. Most instructors really want to do a good job and any objective help given in a non critical manner would be good. Suggestions given each semester, no matter how small, could make a more effective instructor."

Student 9: "I think it gives students in classes a chance to express their opinion of faculty without it being related to them personally. I personally had a horrible experience with several professors in the 1990 fall semester. I ended up dropping two classes and no one seemed to want to hear about the attitudes of the professors."



"If this information is taken seriously, I believe it would greatly improve our chances at being good students and learning much more."

Student 10: "I like this idea a lot. It is good for the students to have a say and be listened to. It's too bad that all of the teachers are not required to do this."

Student 11: "I think they (peer reviews) are a very good thing, but I also think it is very hard for people to change."

Student 12: "Those who want to improve should find this helpful."

Student 13: "Probably no value."

Student 14: "It depends on what is done with the reviews and if they are taken seriously."

Student 15: "I believe as human beings, professors may or may not use this information constructively, though those that are concerned will probably review these more open mindedly than those who are not. Some people are not able to take constructive criticism."

Student 16: "Excellent tool if it is not used in a tenure or retention type review. Should not be made available to administration or department chair or college dean."

Student 17: "I think this type of review would be wonderful if the instructor actually paid attention to the results. I do not feel that this particular instructor will change his teaching techniques as a result of any type of

evaluation. I had this instructor for another course several semesters ago and I feel sure he's been evaluated but nothing has changed."

Student 18: "Peer review such as this could be very valuable to faculty members who are genuinely interested in improving their teaching skills and effectiveness."

#### Summary of Interviews - Students

Most students expressed the idea that the process of the clinical supervision method peer review is a positive and worthwhile process. Several students expressed their feelings that the process of peer review may cause conflict among faculty members. With only rare exceptions, student attitudes were overwhelmingly positive concerning the benefits to be derived by both students and faculty. The students also expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present their views concerning the peer review process.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS

#### Introduction

As identified in Chapter II there are many different variables involved with effective teaching. The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a change in students' perceptions of teaching behaviors based on clinical supervision of teachers using student feedback. Clinical supervision has been shown to be an effective method of positively influencing teacher behavior as it relates to the variables associated with teaching. This study has provided evidence to support the usefulness of clinical supervision using peer evaluation and student perceptions as identified through student feedback in a business college setting within a university setting.

Another impact of this study was the perceived effect of a reflective approach by the faculty members participating in the study. The professors who participated in this study indicated that the process gave them the ability to think about what they were doing and to question how they were accomplishing the task. Improvements in teacher commitment to the teaching profession and to their students can occur when one approaches the teaching

profession from the perspective of critical theory. The critical theory approach to the practice of teaching appears to have merit and several of the participants expressed ideas that flow directly from the critical theorist's view.

Professor 02 engaged in reflection on her teaching methods and purposes. Professor 02 indicated to the researcher that she was interested in examining her impact on students by looking at each element of the Teacher Image Questionnaire to enhance student learning. Professor 02 stated: ..."it (the results of the questionnaire) does cause me to be mindful of what I am doing and how it may impact the student."

#### Findings and Conclusions - Faculty

When analyzing the changes in the mean scores and the standard deviations from the pretests to the posttests, one is able to see evidence of positive changes in the students' perceptions of teaching behaviors. It is also worthwhile to note that in the personal interviews held with teachers and students there was almost unanimous agreement in their beliefs based on the questions that were asked.

The researcher concludes from the tables presenting the changes in mean scores and standard deviations that the most drastic positive changes in student perceptions occurred with Professor 02 who exhibited and expressed more of the characteristic thinking of the critical theorist. Professor 02's comment in which she discussed being mindful of her

teaching and the impact upon her students serves as evidence of a reflective approach to teaching. The researcher further concludes from the tables that the least favorable changes in student perceptions occurred with Professor 01 who expressed doubt and reservation about the use of student feedback in the clinical supervision process. The mean scores for Professor 01 exhibited a greater number of declines than did any other teacher.

It becomes obvious that when peer review in the form of clinical supervision is utilized for a teacher who is interested in improving their performance and takes a positive approach to the process, positive results are more likely to occur. Another conclusion to be drawn from the results is that the less the professor believes in the validity of student feedback for the process of peer review the less successful the process will be. This conclusion is evidenced by the results reported in Tables I and II which report the results for Professor 01.

Professor 01 indicated to the researcher that he had little confidence in using student feedback in the peer review process. Professor 01 stated: "... It should be understood that these are only student perceptions." This statement further points out his distrust of student perceptions contrary to the research which points out the validity of student feedback.

A similar conclusion to be drawn from the results is that a professor who approaches this process from a critical

theory approach will be the most successful. This conclusion is evidenced from the results in Tables III and IV which summarize the results of Professor 02 who is most closely associated with the utilization of the critical theory approach.

Professor 02, in her responses, provides insight into her reflective approach. When asked about her attitude toward clinical supervision in the form of peer review she responded: "... It probably focuses the students' thoughts about certain teaching behaviors. It does cause me to be mindful of what I am doing and how it may impact the student." Professor 05 also exhibited a reflective attitude when he stated: "... it (clinical supervision in the form of peer review) should be a growth process."

Upon review of faculty responses to the 6 interview questions the following conclusions may be drawn. With respect to faculty attitude toward peer review all participants shared a positive attitude and respect for the process. One faculty member expressed his skepticism of the validity of student feedback for the purpose of clinical supervision, and one faculty member specifically made a point of the need for the process to be voluntary so as not to be invasive. The conclusion reached from the responses to the first question is that faculty members in the Department of Accounting are positive in their feelings concerning the process of clinical supervision in the form of peer review.

The second question concerning an infringement on faculty autonomy was answered identically by all faculty participants. Not one member of the group felt that their autonomy had been threatened. The conclusion to be drawn is that faculty members in the Department of Accounting do not perceive clinical supervision in the form of peer review to threaten their autonomy.

The responses to the third question concerning whether the faculty participants expected to see student improvement as a result of clinical supervision process utilizing peer review were more mixed. One faculty participant did not think that the students would benefit from clinical supervision utilizing peer review. Two other faculty participants were just as strong in their beliefs that students would benefit from the process of faculty peer review, and two others hoped that the process would be beneficial. The conclusion reached based on this response is not quite so easy to draw. The faculty was split on their responses to this question, and it may be necessary to conduct more research to satisfy the faculty as to the impact on students.

The fourth question concerned the teachers' feelings of being threatened by the process of clinical supervision. The faculty participants were unanimous in stating that they did not feel threatened at all by this experience. One faculty member did comment that with the process being totally voluntary there was no reason to feel threatened.

The conclusion can be drawn that the faculty participants did not feel threatened by the voluntary process of peer review which utilizes the clinical supervision approach and takes student feedback data into account.

The fifth question concerned the teachers' feelings on whether their academic freedoms were abridged by this process. Once again the responses were unanimous in that the faculty did not feel that their academic freedoms were abridged in this process. The conclusion can be drawn that the faculty does not believe that their academic freedoms are abridged in any way by using student feedback in the peer review process.

The sixth question asked of the faculty concerned the issue of the faculty member's focus on teaching being improved. Three faculty members responded positively; they felt their focus on teaching was improved. Two others stated that they felt that their focus on teaching was probably not improved as they perceived their focus on teaching to be already well developed. One faculty member responded that his focus on teaching was probably improved. The conclusion reached based on this question is rather interesting. Three of the six participants felt that their focus on teaching was enhanced, and their mean scores and standard deviations prove them to be correct. Two others did not believe that their focus on teaching was enhanced, but their mean scores and standard deviations also showed that the student perceptions of the teaching variables



improved. This would indicate the possibility that they did give thought to the process and took some remedial actions to improve their skills.

It is interesting to note that the research reported in the literature indicates that the biggest impairments to the use of clinical supervision in higher education have been the potential abridgement of academic freedoms and the threat to teacher autonomy when this method of supervision is used for summative evaluation. When one looks at the results of the faculty survey it is apparent that not one of the faculty believed these issues to be a problem, when the clinical supervision approach is being used solely for formative evaluation.

Another conclusion that may be drawn regards the use of clinical supervision in the form of peer review and its effect from a critical theory point of view. Professor 02 made a point of saying that she did not specifically focus on any of the teacher variables identified in the Teacher Image Questionnaire, but that she did consider her students' perceptions and needs after seeing the results of the pretest. The researcher would conclude that just being made aware of the situation helps us to become more cognizant of the needs of others and thus forces us to question our own actions and respond accordingly in attempting to meet those needs. It seems appropriate to conclude that some teachers who participated in this study approach their teaching from the critical theorists'

perspective while others did not. The results presented in the previous chapter appear to bear this out.

Smyth (1985) posited that, in order for schools to be the vibrant places we want them to be, we would expect teachers to be involved in a continual search for meaning in our work, dialoguing and sharing with colleagues, and constantly asking engaging questions. Based on the faculty members' responses to the previous questions I believe that the ideas espoused by Smyth take effect as a result of peer review and that the faculty is encouraged by such a process to ask engaging questions of themselves and of their peers. Smyth (Summer 1987) proposed mobilizing teachers into dialogue among themselves, toward pedagogical consciousness about their teaching and the broader social context of their work. The results of this study point out that the ideas proposed by Smyth may have begun to take effect on the teachers who participated in the study.

#### Findings and Conclusions - Students

The students responded to the question of whether they believed that the process of peer review could be beneficial. Based on their responses there is evidence that the students do believe or hope peer review could be beneficial. Several students expressed the belief that clinical supervision would only help a faculty member if they really want to be helped and want to improve their teaching methods. The students may recognize the benefit of

and the need for clinical supervision better than the teachers themselves.

One conclusion that may be reached relates to the findings reported earlier which found the most positive result for peer review and its impact on both faculty and students is when both parties are engaged and take a positive approach to the process. If the students are convinced that the clinical supervision process is being utilized, and if they perceive a positive impact on teaching behaviors, then it stands to reason that peer review should provide positive results for both sets of participants. When one examines the results for Professor 02, it is possible that her practice of a reflective approach coupled with the students' knowledge of her participation in a peer review process might account for her results showing the most improvement.

There were several students who indicated that they did perceive an improvement in their teachers' in-class behaviors as a result of the clinical supervision process. One student even professed to perceiving an improvement in his teacher's appearance in the classroom.

The most noteworthy result of this study as to student perceptions of improvement of teaching behaviors is found in Tables I - VII presented in Chapter IV. There is presented evidence of the fact that student perceptions of teacher behavior were improved as a result of clinical supervision.

Responses of the 12 student volunteers to the questions

in Appendix C yielded interesting results. The only question which garnered favorable results was the question concerning overall teacher improvement. Even then the responses were split with approximately half of the respondents perceiving that it did and the other half perceiving that it did not improve. To the other questions most respondents indicated negative perceptions when asked about instruction and focus improving, but some did perceive that their professor was already excellent and very focused and could not perform any better.

The conclusions are rather difficult to draw as the responses of the student volunteers seemed to contradict the results obtained from the responses to the questionnaires. One reason for this may be that the volunteers were very vocal and had very definite ideas concerning their professors and the process of clinical supervision.

#### Critique and Analysis of Research Method

After spending 2 college semesters gathering data for this study, the researcher believes there are changes that he would make in future peer review studies utilizing clinical supervision. The researcher would eliminate the use of the Teacher Assessment Instrument as this instrument contains several questions which are not applicable to teacher behaviors at the college level.

The researcher would devote time to questioning each teacher participant in an attempt to determine whether they

understand the meaning of a reflective approach to teaching and whether or not they are using a reflective approach. This knowledge would help the researcher provide a more meaningful analysis of the results.

The reference to the use of the reflective approach has been used by the researcher to represent the view of a critical theorist. It is important for the reader of this paper to recognize that there are several different definitions of critical theory and the researchers reference is limited in its application to one who utilizes the reflective approach in their teaching.

While this study was intended to be a qualitative study, the researcher believes that the use of statistical analysis performed on the mean scores would be valuable. The researcher believes that this study has provided information which should add to the continually growing body of knowledge concerning the improvement of teaching at the college level.

#### Implications for Future Research

When one considers the evidence that has been set forth showing the improved student perceptions of teachers' teaching behaviors as a result of clinical supervision utilizing peer review, it should be readily apparent that this is an area of research that needs to be greatly expanded. Couple the results of improved student perceptions with the fact that the faculty was not

intimidated by the process, did not feel that teacher autonomy suffered or that academic freedoms were abridged, and it becomes obvious that the greatest perceived blocks to the use of peer review in higher education may be from traditional thinking instead of empirical proof.

The benefits to be derived from clinical supervision in the form of peer review appear to be too great not to be considered for further study. Combining clinical supervision with the ideas expressed by Smyth and Gitlin concerning a reflective approach on teaching the researcher feels that this is an area that not only can be studied further, but is an area that must be studied if we are to continue to strengthen the effects of teachers on their colleagues and their students.

#### Implications for Application

Based on the results of this study the researcher believes that there are important implications for the use of clinical supervision utilizing self-analysis and peer review at the college level. College deans and department chairpersons should be encouraged to educate themselves and their faculty members in the methods of clinical supervision as set forth above. Use of these methods could help improve the quality of teaching at the undergraduate level, and this would be a most positive step in response to the demands for improvement in the undergraduate instruction.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Robert D., Hess, Carla W., Nyquist, Jody D., Ropp, Vickie A. and Wulff, Donald H. "Satisfaction With Processes of Collecting Student Opinions About Instruction: The Student Perspective." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 201-206.
- Abrami, Phillip C., d'Apollonia, Sylvia, and Cohen, Peter A. "Validity of Student Ratings of Instruction: What We Know and What We Do Not." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 219-231.
- Accounting Education Change Commission Position Statement No. One. Objectives of Education for Accountants, September, 1990.
- Accounting Educators. Accounting Education: An AICPA Position Statement, II (2), November, 1990, pp. 4-5, New York, New York.
- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers, New York: Longman, 1980.
- Amidon, Edmond J. and Ned A Flanders. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis, MN: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963.

- Andrews, Hans A. "Part-Time Faculty Evaluation--A Mirage." Catalyst, 17 (3), Summer, 1987 pp. 22-25.
- Arden, Eugene. "Who Should Judge the Faculty?" The College Board Review, (152), Summer, 1989, pp. 37-39.
- Bailey, Gerald D. "Self-Made Classroom Observation Instruments: An Aid to Self-Assessment." Educational Technology, 17 (3), March, 1977, pp. 49-51.
- Bailey, Gerald D. "Teacher Self-Assessment: A Teacher Student Chain." Kappa Delta Pi Record, 15 (2), December, 1977, pp. 48-50.
- Bailey, Gerald D. "Improving Classroom Instruction with Student Feedback." Educational Technology, 17 (10), October, 1978, pp. 39-43.
- Bailey, Gerald D. Teacher Self-Assessment: A Means for Improving Classroom Instruction. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1981.
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. "Improving Instructional Effectiveness: A Self-Assessment Procedure." Illinois School Research and Development Journal, 19 (1), 1982, pp. 1-10.
- Behrendt, R. and Parson, M. "Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty." New Directions for Community Colleges, 41, 1983.
- Blumberg, Arthur. Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.



- Boyer, Ernest L. Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Brown, James W., and Thornton, James W., Jr. College Teaching. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963.
- Bryan, Roy C. "The Teacher's Image is Stubbornly Stable," Clearing House, 40, 1966, pp. 459-60.
- Carroll, J. Gregory, and Goldberg, Stella R. "Teaching Consultants: A Collegial Approach to Better Teaching." College Teaching, 37 (4), Fall, 1989, pp. 143-146.
- Cogan, M. L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.
- Cohen, Peter A., and McKeachie, Wilbert J. "The Role of Colleges in the Evaluation of College Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching, 28 (4), Fall, 1980, pp. 147-154.
- Cranton, Patricia, and Smith, Ronald A. "Reconsidering the Unit of Analysis: A Model of Student Ratings of Instruction." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 207-212.
- Deets, Norman R. and Tyler, Timothy. "How Xerox Improved Its Performance Appraisals." Personnel Journal, 65 (4), April, 1986, pp. 50-52.
- Flanders, N. A. "Interaction Analysis and Clinical Supervision." Journal of Research and Development in Education. 9(2), 1976, pp. 47-57.

- Gainey, Donald D. "Teacher Evaluation and Supervision for School Improvement: Myth or Reality?" NASSP-Bulletin, 74, March, 1990, pp. 14-19.
- Gangstead, Sandy K. "Clinical Supervision of the Student Teacher: An Applied Behavior Analysis Approach to the Evaluation of Teacher Behavior." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, October, 1983.
- Garman, Noreen Bank. "A Study of Clinical Supervision as a Resource for College Teachers of English (Doctoral Dissertation." University of Pittsburgh. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 6835A., 1971.
- Gitlin, Andrew. "Understanding Teaching Dialogically." Teachers College Record. 91(4), Summer, 1990, pp. 537-563.
- Gitlin, Andrew & Smyth, John. "Toward Educative Forms of Teacher Evaluation." Educational Theory. 40(1), Winter, 1990, pp. 83-94.
- Glickman, C. "The Supervisor's Challenge: Changing the Teacher Work Environment." Educational Leadership, 42(4), 1984-1985, pp. 38-40.
- Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. Clinical Supervision, (2nd ed.). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

- Goldsberry, Lee F., "Reality -- Really? A Response to McFaul and Cooper." Educational Leadership, 42(7), April, 1984, pp. 10-11.
- Joyce, Bruce, Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. "The Self-Educating Teacher: Empowering Teachers Through Research." ASCD Yearbook, 1990, pp. 26-40.
- L'Hommedieu, Randi, Menges, Robert J., and Brinko, Kathleen T. "Methodological Explanations for the Modest Effects of Feedback From Student Ratings." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 232-241.
- Manatt, Richard P. "Manatt's Exercise in Selecting Teacher Performance Evaluation Criteria Based on Effective Teacher Research", National Symposium for Professionals in Evaluation and Research (Albuquerque, N. Mex.) (Mimeograph) (b)., 1981.
- Marsh, Herbert W. "The Validity of Students' Evaluations: Classroom Evaluations of Instructors Independently Nominated As Best and Worst Teachers by Graduating Seniors." American Educational Research Journal, 14 (4), Fall, 1977, pp. 441-447.
- Martin, Beth Ann, and Martin, James H. "Assessing the Lecture Performance of University Faculty: A Behavioral Observation Scale." Journal of Education for Business, 64 (4), January, 1989, pp. 157-160.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. "Student Ratings of Faculty." AAUP Bulletin, 55 (4), Winter, 1969, pp. 439-444.

- McKeachie, W. J., Lin, Yi-Guang, and Mann, William.  
"Student Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Validity Studies." Educational Research Journal, 8 (3), May, 1971, pp. 435-445.
- McKeachie, W. J., and Lin, Y. G. "A Note on Validity of Student Ratings of Teaching." Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (3), Fall, 1978, pp. 45-47.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J., and Lin, Yi-Guang. "Effective Teaching: Facilitative vs. Directive Style." Teaching of Psychology, 5 (4), December, 1978, pp. 193-194.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. "Student Ratings of Faculty: A Reprise." Academe, 65 (6), October, 1979, pp. 384-397.
- McKeachie, W. J. "Class Size, Large Classes, and Multiple Sections." Academe, 66 (1), February, 1980, pp. 24-27.
- McKeachie, Wilbert J. "Research on College Teaching: The Historical Background." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 189-200.
- Milam, Edward E. ed. Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting Federation of Schools of Accountancy. Chicago, Illinois, December, 1988.
- Miller, Robert, and Miller, Kathleen. "Clinical Supervision: History, Practice, Perspective." NASSP-Bulletin, 71 (N503), December, 1987, pp. 18-22.

- Mooney, Carolyn J. "University of Arizona Puts Limits on Who May Evaluate Professors for Promotion." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 36 (18), January 17, 1990, pp. 15-16.
- Olson, H. C., Barbour, C., & Michalak, D. A. The Teaching Clinic: A team Approach to the Improvement of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1971.
- Peck, Robert F., and Tucker, James A. "Research on Teacher Education." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Perry, Raymond P. "Special Section: Instruction In Higher Education Introduction to the Special Section." Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 1990, pp. 183-188.
- Piland, William E. "Student Evaluation: Perceptions of Community College Students, Faculty and Administrators." Community / Junior College Quarterly, 8, 1984, pp. 115-124.
- Rallis, S. F., & Bucci, J. A. "Staff Development as a Ritual: An Additional Perspective for In-service Education." Action in Teacher Education, 3 (1), 1981, pp. 19-26.
- Reavis, C. A. "Clinical Supervision: A Timely Approach." Educational Leadership 33, 1976, pp. 360-363.

- Reavis, C. A. "A Test of the Clinical Supervision Model."  
Journal of Educational Research, 70, 1977, pp. 311-315.
- Reavis, C. A. Teacher Improvement through Clinical Supervision. Bloomington, In: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.
- Reinhartz, Judy, and Don M. Beach. A Comprehensive Supervision Model for Promoting Professional Development. The Clearing House 60 (8), April, 1987, pp. 363-66.
- Roueche, John E., Baker, III, George A., and Rose, Robert R. Shared Vision. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1989.
- Rosenshine, Barak and Norma Furst. "Research in Teacher Performance Criteria" in Research in Teacher Education ed. B.O. Smith. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Rotem, Arie, and Glasman, Nataly S. "On the Effectiveness of Students' Evaluative Feedback to University Instructors." Review of Educational Research, 49 (3), Summer, 1979, pp. 497-511.
- Shark, N. D. "The Application of Immediate Secondary Reinforcement to Classroom Teaching Observations in Clinical Supervision" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 1140A., 1973.

- Smith, Al. "Promoting and Rewarding Good Teaching: Florida's Master Teachers Seminar." Community College Frontiers, Fall, 1980, pp. 18-20.
- Smyth, W. John. "Developing a Critical Practice of Clinical Supervision." Journal of Curriculum Studies. 17(1), 1985, pp. 1-15.
- Smyth, W. John. "Cinderella Syndrome a Philosophical View of Supervision as a Field of Study." Teachers College Record. 88(4), Summer, 1987, pp. 567-588.
- Sullivan, Cheryl Granade. Clinical Supervision: A State of the Art Review. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervisor and Curriculum Development, 1980.
- Thoracius, J. M. "Curriculum Implementation, Classroom Change and Professional Development: The Challenge for Supervision." Paper Presented at a Symposium on Supervision at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Guelph, Ontario, Canada, June, 1984.
- Walberg, Herbert J., Diane Schiller, and Geneva D. Haertzel. "The Quiet Revolution in Education Research." Phi Delta Kappan. 61, November, 1979, pp. 179-183
- Warner, A. R., & Scott, D. H. "Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness: Professional Dimensions." Action in Teacher Education, 2(1), 1980, pp. 27-34.
- Wiles, Jon and Joseph Bondi. Supervision: a Guide to Practice. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1980.

Wilhems, F. T. Supervision in a New Key.

Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and  
Curriculum Development, 1973.

Wilson, Robert C. "Improving Faculty Teaching Effective Use  
of Student Evaluations and Consultants." Journal of  
Higher Education, 57(2), March-April, 1986, pp. 196-  
211.



**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX A

TEACHER - IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Do not begin until you are told to do so by the person in charge:

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THIS TEACHER'S:

	POOR	FAIR	AVG	GOOD	EXC
1. Knowledge of subject: (Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the teaching field?)					
2. Clarity of presentation: (Are areas presented at a level which you can understand?)					
3. Fairness: (Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all students in the class?)					
4. Control: (Is the classroom strict but also relaxed and friendly?)					
5. Attitude toward students: (Do you feel that this teacher likes you?)					
6. Success in stimulating interest: (Is the class interesting and challenging?)					
7. Enthusiasm: (Does he show interest in and enthusiasm for the subject?)					
8. Attitude toward student ideas: (Does this teacher have respect for the things you offer in class?)					

9. Encouragement of student participation: (Does this teacher encourage you to raise questions and express ideas in class?)					
10. Sense of humor: (Does he share amusing experiences and laugh at his own mistakes?)					
11. Assignments: (Are Assignments sufficiently challenging without being unreasonably long?)					
12. Appearance: (Are his grooming & dress in good taste?)					
13. Openness: (Is this teacher able to see things from your point of view?)					
14. Self control: (Does this teacher become angry when little problems arise in the classroom?)					
15. Consideration of others: (Is he understanding, patient, considerate and courteous?)					
16. Effectiveness: (What is your overall evaluation of your teacher's effectiveness?)					

APPENDIX B

TEACHER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

As the teacher conducts instruction in the classroom does he or she do the following:

1.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Even tempered, friendly                   Moody, often cross
  
2.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Perceive students as capable of accomplishing                   See limited, narrowly defined success for students
  
3.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Open to student feedback                   Does not allow students to express likes and dislikes
  
4.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Present materials in appropriate ways for student understanding, needs, and abilities                   Does not plan instruction relative to student needs and abilities
  
5.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Follow up instructions with reasonable and interesting assignments                   Rarely gives assignments; if given, they are worksheets or terms and questions from textbooks
  
6.     1                   2                   3                   4                   5  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
Give individual help when students do not understand material                   Avoid individual help and rely on students to understand material

7.    1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Knowledgeable of concepts taught                    Lack adequate preparation for presentation of concepts
8.    1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Regularly state expectations for classroom conduct                    Rarely discusses rules of conduct and expectations for classroom behavior
9.    1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Enforce expectations strictly, but fairly                    Inconsistent in applying and enforcing rules of conduct
10.  1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Monitor classroom behavior closely through movement and nonverbal behavior to manage class                    Unaware of many behaviors in classroom and seldom move or use nonverbal behavior to manage class
11.  1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Have an ability to get things done; complete tasks                    Seldom finish a task during an assigned period and seldom get things done on schedule
12.  1                    2                    3                    4                    5  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 Help students accomplish objectives and produce achievement in students                    Seldom have students accomplish objectives and provide little evidence of student achievement

## APPENDIX C

### QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT INTERVIEW

1. Did you perceive that the teacher's instruction improved as the semester progressed? If so please explain.
2. Did you perceive the teacher becoming more focused on teaching as the semester progressed? If so please explain.
3. Did your attitude concerning your teacher's performance improve as the semester progressed?
4. Please provide any other perceptions or ideas you have concerning the process of peer review.

## APPENDIX D

### SAMPLE OF TEACHER CONFERENCE AFTER THE PRETEST

Researcher: "I have tabulated the results for each questionnaire for each section and I am providing each instructor with the mean and standard deviation for each question. I would like you to look over the results and ask any questions you might have. If I can assist you in any way in your attempts in any particular area please don't hesitate to ask."

Professor: "Thanks for sharing this with me. It always seems that I have trouble stimulating interest in the subject."

Researcher: "Everyone complains of this same problem. If it is possible you might try injecting a joke or try to find an amusing real life story that relates to the material."

Professor: "I'm not a very good joke teller."

Researcher: "Sometimes it's not the joke, but the idea of trying to relate the material to something outside the context of the book."

Professor: "Well, I'll definitely think about it and I will also go through the results carefully. I would probably opt to try to improve my overall performance rather than just try to focus on 1 or 2 items on the questionnaires."

Researcher: "That is great, but don't overwhelm yourself with it. If I can be of any assistance don't hesitate to let me know."



## APPENDIX E

### SAMPLE STUDENT INTERVIEW AFTER THE POSTTEST

Researcher: "Have you noticed any improvement in your teacher's instruction over the semester?"

Student: "Yes, he expands on subject being discussed and there is more class participation being encouraged. I think that is very important."

Researcher: "Do you feel that the teacher became more focused on their teaching as the semester progressed?"

Student: "No, The teacher's focus has been constant throughout the semester."

Researcher: "Do you feel that the overall performance of this teacher improved over the semester?"

Student: "Yes, because of greater student participation being called for. I still think this teacher needs to plan things a little more in advance (papers, exams)."

**Researcher:** "Do you feel or perceive that this method of peer review is beneficial and has merit?"

**Student:** "Yes, if the person being reviewed is open minded and responsive to input. I think this process can be beneficial to both teacher and student."

## APPENDIX F

### SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

#### Semesters I & II

- Weeks 3 & 4 - Administration of Questionnaires
- Weeks 4 & 5 - Analysis of Information
- Weeks 5 & 6 - Formal Conferences
- Weeks 6 - 14 - Informal Conferences
- Weeks 13 & 14 - Administration of Questionnaires
- Week 14 - Student Conferences
- Weeks 14 & 15 - Analysis of Information
- Weeks 15 & 16 - Formal Conferences

VITAE

Robert L. Terrell

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

**Thesis:** THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-ANALYZED  
CLINICAL SUPERVISION ON IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE  
TEACHING BEHAVIOR

**Major Field:** Higher Education

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Cincinnati, Ohio, May 16, 1947,  
the son of Robert L. and Theresa Terrell.

**Education:** Graduated from Bishop McGuinness High  
School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in May 1965;  
received Bachelor of Business Administration  
Degree in Accounting from University of Oklahoma  
at Norman in May, 1969; received Masters in  
Business Administration degree from University of  
Oklahoma at Norman in December, 1971; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at  
Oklahoma State University in July, 1992.

**Professional:** Certified Public Accountant, February,  
1971.

**Professional Experience:** Partner, Terrell & Terrell  
C.P.A.'s, November, 1972, to September, 1992,  
Adjunct Instructor, University of Central  
Oklahoma, September, 1974, to May, 1981, Assistant  
Professor of Accounting, University of Central  
Oklahoma, January, 1985, to Present.