INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN STUDENT TEACHERS AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

by

Dan E. Ernst

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Professor Marilyn L. Grady

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 1997

DISSERTATION TITLE

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN STUDENT TEACHERS AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

BY

Dan E. Ernst

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

	APPROVED	DATE
Signature	Marilyn O'Grady	4-1-97
Typed Name	Dr. Marilyn Grady	
Signature	F. William Sesow	4-1-97
Typed Name	Dr. William Sesow	
Signature	Jack McKay	4/1/97
Typed Name	Dr. Jack McKay	
Signature	L. James Walter	4/1/97
Typed Name	Dr. James Walter	
Signature		
Typed Name		
Signature		
Typed Name		

GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN STUDENT TEACHERS AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

Dan E. Ernst, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 1997

Adviser: Marilyn L. Grady

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession. Student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions related to satisfaction were also examined to determine if there was a significant difference based on student teaching and first-year teaching experiences.

A survey was designed and administered to UNL student teachers who completed the student teaching experience during the Spring semester of 1996 and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 school year. The survey contained 61 items regarding teaching effectiveness, and respondents were asked for demographic information and to rate their satisfaction with their experiences.

Significant differences in teaching effectiveness were found for three of the four criteria: (1) teaching process, (2) the learners, and (3) the

curriculum. No significant difference was found for the fourth criterion, the profession. No significant difference was found between student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experiences.

Results of this study support use of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Model. However, as first-year teachers' self-rated perceptions of teaching effectiveness were lower than student teachers, additional support should be provided by teacher education programs.

For . . .

J. D., Ashley, and A. J. Ernst. You are special children, each with special talents. May your goals in life be achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to members of my committee for their assistance and support. Their ability to provide appropriate insight into this study was invaluable. Their abilities to assist in providing clarity and focus to this study helped make completion of this dissertation a reality. In addition to working with my committee members on the dissertation, I have had the luxury of working with them as a school administrator. Each committee member has assisted me along the way to become a better school administrator. They each have demonstrated an ability to listen and a willingness to assist, regardless of the issue. I have the utmost respect for their talents as educational leaders at the university level.

A special thank-you to Dr. Ron Joekel and Dr. Marilyn Grady, who encouraged me to pursue the doctoral program. Their willingness to demonstrate confidence in my abilities and to provide support throughout the program was reassuring. I credit each of them for my completion of the doctorate program.

A very gracious thank-you to the chair of my committee, Dr. Grady. Following Dr. Joekel's departure to Phi Delta Kappa, Dr. Grady willingly accepted me as an advisee. As a student in one of the first classes taught by Dr. Grady at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, I realized she was a talented professor. I have sincerely appreciated her encouragement. Her willingness to listen and provide appropriate feedback has been tremendously helpful to make this study a rewarding experience. I will always value her efforts as a great mentor and true friend.

A special thank-you to Suzie Sybouts. Her effort and abilities are truly amazing. Not only is she an expert in word processing; she is a very warm and caring individual. I truly have enjoyed our discussions. She has become a friend for life.

I could not have accomplished this educational goal without the support of my family. My wife, Dixie, provided me with unyielding support throughout the doctoral program. This degree would not have been possible without her understanding and support. J. D., Ashley, and A. J. have helped in many valuable ways. They have given much more than they realize to allow me to achieve this goal. I now have the opportunity to turn more attention to each of them as they pursue their individual goals. Now A. J., I don't have to work on my "paper" anymore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The teaching skills and knowledge acquired through preservice preparation do not prepare students to teach effectively. Student teachers often suggest that student teaching preservice experiences do not adequately provide them with the necessary expertise and skills to be successful in the "real world" classroom as a beginning teacher. Individuals assume first-year teacher positions with limited experience and independence to structure the educational environment in the classroom. New teachers often struggle to learn to make critical judgments concerning when and how to use a skill or strategy. Teachers must make judgments in an effort to balance classroom needs and maintain their pupils' attention on academic work. The student teaching experience is generally seen as a focal point in the preparation of teachers, for it provides the setting in which theories and methodologies learned can be applied. Teaching effectiveness is the critical element that promotes teacher satisfaction, successful evaluations from school administrators, and the desire to remain in education.

An extensive review of the literature unveiled only a few studies focused on the development of teaching effectiveness of student teachers and first-year teachers. Walker and Richardson (1993) examined the changes in self-perception of efficacy of teacher education majors who were first surveyed as student teachers in 1992 and were again surveyed as first-year teachers in 1993. Walker and Richardson found that "the results

typically do not compare teaching effectiveness between the student teacher and first-year teacher." Findings from evaluations remain at the institutional level and do nothing to enhance the relationship between K-12 schools and universities; they provide minimal opportunities to improve the training and successful induction of teachers into the profession.

Researchers have documented the problem of inducting first-year teachers into the classroom. Blank and Heathington (1987) reported a comprehensive process was needed in teacher education that was consistent with the philosophy of growth toward independent, thoughtful professional actions viewed in the total social context. The comprehensive process promotes research-based supervision. Blank and Heathington concluded that research can build a solid foundation for instructional judgments.

Schlechty and Whitford (1989) suggested the invention of schools that are designed to fulfill the function of teacher induction. The schools could provide new teachers with the developmental support, arena for practice, and a safety net to assure the quality of education for children is not compromised.

Content and process were included in an initial-year-of-teaching program addressed by Carter and Richardson (1989). The program focused on two main points of teaching--establish and maintain social order and provide first-year teachers opportunities to acquire event-structured knowledge. The recommended program would use case studies and include networking opportunities with other beginning teachers and experienced professional educators. The traditional question regarding financial

support, however, must be answered by generating support from educators, administrators, and policy makers.

As a practicing administrator of fourteen years, personal experiences indicate that schools lack initiative or exercise minimal support in promoting continuous development and growth opportunities for student teachers and first-year teachers as they are initiated into the profession. Schools and universities have a vested interest in working with new educators to ensure a successful and rewarding career in education. Current trends in education promote partnerships where many individuals work together, with a commitment to meet the needs of the educational community. Leaders in schools and universities are most capable of understanding the educational needs of student teachers and first-year teachers and are best prepared to organize programs that will strengthen the teaching profession.

It was important to study this issue because student teaching is the first experience for aspiring teachers as they test their skills and identify their strengths and weaknesses. Many teacher training institutions provide pre-student teaching practicum experiences. The student teaching experience, however, remains the critical experience where student teachers assume all charges and responsibilities of the teacher over an extended period of time and on consecutive days. Success in student teaching should be a predictor of future teaching success (Wood & Eicher, 1989).

Cries for educational reform continue to be heard. As a result, the on-going problems receive daily attention in the media, journals, books,

and from special interest groups. Since the Nation at Risk report in 1983, proposals to solve the problem of developing quality educators and schools have come from business, industry, legislators, commissions, and special interest groups, in addition to educators. The sense of efficacy that educators hold for themselves relates to their abilities to teach successfully and fulfill their professional duties. To study this problem at its inception, from the perspectives of the student teacher and first-year teacher, affords the opportunity to make a significant contribution to the education literature. Student teachers and first-year teachers must learn how to assess teaching effectiveness in a manner that promotes educational harmony and continuous development and growth in the profession.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) has a structured teacher education program to evaluate student teacher performance. The evaluation of student teachers is based on the four areas of emphasis of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model which include (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession.

The knowledge base of the teacher education program is founded upon the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model. The Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model was adapted by members of the UNL Teachers College from the scientist-practitioner model and the work of Boyer (1990). The application of the model provides a common bond between departments and programs and offers students a clear picture of program focus and anticipated learner outcomes. Upon completion of a program in Teachers College, graduates should reflect the critical attributes of a scholar-practitioner. The result of the relationship is the

development and growth of the professional educator as an effective teacher.

A limited discussion on teaching effectiveness of the student teacher and first-year teacher was found in the review of literature. This study would add to the existing literature regarding student teacher and first-year teacher professional development. The study will also provide useful new information to allow a greater understanding of student teachers' and first-year teachers' needs regarding the improvement of teaching effectiveness.

Purpose

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of the study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession.

Research Questions

The key research questions in this study were:

1. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers?

a. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the teaching process?

b. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on curriculum?

c. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the learners?

d. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the profession?

e. Is there a significant difference in perceptions between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience?

Theoretical Perspective

A noted scholar, Kerlinger (1986), defined theory as a set of interrelated constructs and propositions that specify relations among variables to explain and predict phenomena. The theory that was used in this study was systems theory. In its simplest form, systems theory is derived from understanding what constitutes a system. A system is an entity that is made up of parts that perform a function. Each part of a system contributes to the functioning of the entire system. Each individual part has a life expectancy, is dynamic, has inherent dimensions of

predictability, is self-preserving and logical, and relates to an external environment (Sybouts 1992). Systems theory can be used to analyze success or failure within educational organizations.

According to systems theory, the major components of the entire system must contribute to the successful functioning of the student teacher and first-year teacher. External or mediating variables that influence teaching effectiveness include the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, undergraduate academic performance of the student-teacher/first-year teacher, first-year teacher orientation and induction programs, special support or mentoring relationships, building administration support, and the number of students assigned to the student teacher and first-year teacher. The interrelated constructs and specific relationships among the variables can be used to explain and even predict teaching effectiveness. The parts of the educational system must provide appropriate and meaningful experiences to allow student teachers and first-year teachers to function as effective teachers.

Operational Definitions

Operational definitions were derived from The Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model that is used in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Teachers College programs and provides the educational knowledge base. Permission to use the following definitions was requested and granted from Dr. James O'Hanlon, Dean of Teachers College, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Scholar. One who understands the nature of a discipline and how new information is created and adapted.

Practitioner. One who understands the context and dynamics operating in the practical world of work.

Teaching process. An area of emphasis on planning, classroom management, teaching methods, and decision making. Students explore and internalize models of instructional planning and understand the research that underpins the development of planning skills. They learn how to manage students and the learning environment effectively in order to create an optimum learning climate. An understanding and mastery of varied teaching models is central to the development of the scholar-practitioner. Students learn to analyze information about content, learners, methodology, the school, and the profession in order to make rational and effective educational decisions.

Learners. Emphasizes the developmental level and cognition, special needs and equity, and assessment and evaluation of students. Child development and cognition is a major focus of the scholar-practitioner. The growing diversity of the student population requires educators who recognize and respond effectively to the special needs of individuals. The scholar-practitioner will respond appropriately to the uniqueness of all students and positively to the diversity of any school population. Teachers will demonstrate the ability to apply informal and formal means of assessment and use the findings to develop effective instructional plans to meet the needs of the learner. The continuous evaluation of learner progress remains an integral part of these criteria.

General education courses. The core of courses that is required of all students and is designed to ensure a background in the major domains of knowledge: science, math, social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

Specialty studies. Subject areas that the education student chooses to teach. Specialty studies are learned in greater depth through course selection in the major field of study.

Foundation courses. The basic courses that provide students with the major understanding of the history of education in the United States.

School curriculum. A focus on understanding the scope and sequence of curriculum in school and the appropriate application of the curriculum in a manner that impacts instruction and learner outcomes.

Profession. A component of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model that places an emphasis on equity, technology, society. and ethics. Education students must be exposed to multicultural schools and classrooms and as professionals confront the uniqueness of schools and students in a successful manner. Students in education learn how to use technology in learning and teaching experiences and develop an understanding of how technology increases learning.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study.

1. The sample was a true representation of the population as compared with current University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers.

2. There was a relationship between the teaching effectiveness of student teachers and first-year teachers.

3. Supervision by appropriate university and school officials was comparable for student teachers and first-year teachers.

4. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model was understood by student teachers and first-year teachers.

5. The instruments used in this study were valid and reliable.

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations

1. The population of this study was confined to spring semester 1996 University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and graduates of UNL who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 contract year.

2. The study was delimited to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of UNL and were teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education.

3. The study was delimited to mediating variables that influenced teaching effectiveness.

Limitations

1. External or mediating variables other than those identified in the theoretical perspective may have existed.

2. Conclusions of this study were applicable only to those educational components included in this study and associated with the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

3. This study surveyed first-year teachers who were successful in securing employment.

4. This study was subject to the weaknesses inherent in survey research, including the influence of the participants' feelings at the time the survey was completed.

Significance of the Study

The study is significant because a better understanding of the perceptions of student teachers and first-year teachers toward teaching effectiveness can be gained. The study adds to the scholarly research in this area. The findings provide valuable information for student teachers, first-year teachers, local school officials, and teacher educators at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and provides a framework for future research. Information is provided that can be used to improve teacher preparation programs and afford teachers the opportunity to make positive impacts on the lives of students. The need for all educational organizations to work together for the improvement of education is validated by this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of the study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession. The review of literature includes discussion concerning the role of the university supervisor, the role of the cooperating teacher, the student teacher and student teaching experience, and the first-year teacher experience and programs to assist the first-year teacher. Additionally the chapter contains literature related to teaching effectiveness as applicable to the student teacher and first-year teacher.

In summary, a major theme evolves around the ability of all educational organizations to coordinate, cooperate, and plan meaningful induction experiences that will enhance teaching effectiveness and develop successful teachers.

The Role of the University Supervisor

The role of university supervisors and the appropriate supervision of student teachers are critical to the process of student teaching. Marrou (1989) stated that if teacher training institutions prepare student teachers effectively for the classrooms, they must first thoroughly prepare their first line of defense, their university supervisors. According to Marrou, the preparation of supervisors must take into account modern-day problems, such as social concerns and societal trends. The supervisor must invest a great deal of time, energy, and professional expertise in the preparation the new teacher. Many times, even with the most sincere efforts on the part of the supervisor, the student teacher does not realize he or she is not suited for the teaching profession until the end of the student teaching experience.

McIntyre (1984) reported the following criticisms and problems associated with the performance of supervisors. The university supervisor and cooperating teacher, although working for the good of the student teacher, rarely spend much time together. The major influence on the student teacher is the cooperating teacher and not the university supervisor. Although the university supervisor's role has been the one most often targeted for elimination, there has been no evidence to suggest that such a move would be advised. The method employed in McIntyre's research was inappropriate to identify the subtle, yet important influences university supervisors might have on student teaching performance.

In lieu of critics and problems, Blank and Heathington (1987) reported the need for a comprehensive process in teacher education,

consistent with a philosophy of growth toward independent and thoughtful professional actions viewed in the total social context. The authors noted that a comprehensive process promotes supervision that is research-based, since research can build a solid foundation for instructional judgments. The university supervisor can lead this charge and work for clarification and understanding of research via interaction with the student teacher. It is this interaction that reaffirms the trust and importance of the university supervisor.

Student teaching continues to be recognized by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors as an essential component of the teacher training course. Yates (1982) found that there were ways to improve practice. The university supervisor, as the institution representative, must work to develop a partnership in the supervision of student teachers. Additionally, Yates noted the need for further research that would allow a more systematic development of the knowledge and approaches necessary to improve future supervision practices of student teachers. Yates (1983) reported that in England, as in the United States, the quality of teacher training programs has continued to improve. The university supervisor must provide leadership and direction in a meaningful student teaching program.

The Role of the Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher is the second component of the triad that plays a significant role in the successful preparation of teachers via the student teaching experience. Richardson-Koehler (1988) concluded that the

cooperating teacher's efforts as supervisor, coach, and cheerleader truly make a difference in the professional development of the student teacher. Cooperating teachers felt that the strongest influence on their ability to teach was gained from their student teaching experience. In the Richardson-Koehler study, teachers reported that they learned to teach primarily from personal experiences and rarely from other teachers in their school. This supports the importance of quality supervision by the cooperating teacher. Since cooperating teachers understand the importance of student teachers learning from experience, feedback or lack thereof from the cooperating teacher may affect student teacher success. In the Richardson-Koehler study, some cooperating teachers demonstrated an unwillingness to allow student teachers to observe other classrooms. Cooperating teachers' lack of ability or unwillingness to engage in reflection activities in regard to classroom practices contributed to the poor quality of feedback received by student teachers. The attitudes and abilities of the cooperating teacher are critical in the student teaching experience.

Fields (1988) suggested the need for better supervision of student teachers by cooperating teachers. Suggestions included the need to examine information and techniques specific to supervision. Fields encouraged planning for extensive preparation of those who supervise student teachers. Fields concluded that student teaching can be more effective and more adequately further the goals of teacher education if preparation for supervision is coupled with immediate application to the student teaching experience.

The importance of quality cooperating teacher supervision was documented by Partington (1982). In one group in the study, one of six trained teacher tutors was responsible for all supervision of student teachers at the school, and no university supervisors were present. Traditional student teaching practices were utilized in three additional groups. The one group of student teachers who received the support of teacher tutors with additional training and no university supervisors demonstrated much greater acceptance and mutual trust in the school. The actions of this group of student teachers were more like probationary teachers. Partington stated the group integrated better with other teachers in the school and accepted a greater sense of involvement and responsibility. In addition, this group experienced a reduction in assessment anxieties. Increased benefits for the staff, students, and the student teacher were a result of highly trained, competent cooperating teachers.

According to the research, when preparation is provided the effectiveness of cooperating teachers is enhanced. Garland and Shippy (1991) designed a program to help cooperating teachers develop the specific skills needed to provide effective guidance and supervision to student teachers. The themes of the three courses that were designed included: The supervision of student teachers, contemporary development in education and implications for the supervision of student teachers, and linking research to practice.

Abel, Ausel, Hawiller, and Sparapani (1988) developed short-term in-service workshops to enhance the skills and abilities of cooperating teachers. A need for the workshops arose as a result of the vast distances

separating the university from the student teaching sites and the ability of university personnel to support the cooperating teacher at the local school. Training themes included effective teaching, reflection upon and composition of a lesson, observation guidelines, simulated supervision episodes, evaluation and conference feedback skills, and writing letters for student teacher placement files. Participants rated the workshops to be highly successful with an average rating near six on a seven-point Likert scale.

The Student Teacher and the Student Teaching Experience

The student teaching experience is generally seen as the focal point in the preparation of teachers, for it provides the setting in which theories and methodologies can be applied. Shapiro and Sheehan (1986) introduced a diagnostic tool to provide the linkage between the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor in order to best serve the student teacher. To be successful, the goals of the student teaching experience must be common to the student teacher, the host cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor. The student teacher must work to ensure that the goals remain focused on the student teaching experience and not the cooperating teacher or university supervisor.

MacKinnon (1989) concluded that conformity is not an unknown aspect of student teaching. Student teachers who wish to be successful and receive a good evaluation from the cooperating teacher feel pressured to conform to the ways and whims of the cooperating teacher. The student teaching experience must be structured to maximize the accomplishment of

providing an experience that reinforces the transfer of theory into practice. Although critical reflection is unlikely to overcome conforming tendencies among student teachers, student teachers must ensure that conforming actions do not follow them into their own classroom in the future.

Beynon, Geddis, and Onslow (1992) conducted a qualitative study and found that there is no one correct teaching strategy suitable for every teacher or pupil. Many teachers develop an eclectic approach, drawing on various philosophical paradigms. Rather than being dichotomous, teaching strategies should be part of a mosaic where the pieces blend into one another to meet the many and varied situations of classroom life. The student teacher, when preparing for the real world of teaching, must work to become a master in identifying the right strategies to be used at the right time.

The Columbia University program called "January Experience" was strongly advocated by Schwartz (1995). In this program, interdisciplinary teams of student teachers combine with interdisciplinary teams of experienced teachers to form expanded teams of educators who work as professional colleagues to meet the educational needs of children. Through this experience, the most critical factor for the success of future teachers is the understanding of the complex concepts regarding collaboration and collegiality in schools that create the opportunity for many little miracles to occur simultaneously in the classroom. This teaming approach to professional development enables teachers to implement new creative and challenging approaches to teaching and learning under the direct supervision of experienced professionals.

In a recent study, Deno and Schelske (1994) found that student teachers and their pupils benefited when a content-specific seminar training program was implemented in conjunction with their student teaching program. Deno and Schelske concluded that establishing a highly competent teacher work force requires intervention with teachers that will allow them to assist student teachers develop their teaching potential early in their careers. The content specific development of personal coping skills and effective classroom management behavior significantly enhanced the student teachers' professional development.

The student teaching experience is complex and requires coordination and cooperation among many to make the experience rewarding and successful. Kremer-Hayon (1992) studied the interpersonal relationships of student teachers with other teachers and their satisfaction with the student teaching experience and the cooperating teacher's supervision. The lack of communication between cooperating teachers and student teachers has often been mentioned as the most frequent problem in student teaching. Student teacher satisfaction relates to the guidance received from the cooperating teacher in the cognitive and affective domains of teaching, as well as in the field of classroom management. The leadership style of the student teacher is an important consideration used by the cooperating teacher to determine the opportunity for the student teacher to assume direct responsibility in the classroom.

In their study, Sudzina and Knowles (1992) examined the phenomenon of failure in the student teaching experience. The foremost difficulties the student teachers faced related to issues of classroom

management, teaching effectiveness, ability to organize, and communication abilities. Conditions that promoted "failure" revolved around incongruent placements, poor interpersonal relationships, content problems, and difficulty understanding specific student or community populations. In addition to the recommendation for further study on teacher failures, Sudzina and Knowles suggested the replacement of the single student teaching placement. Students would have multiple placements of shorter duration over the entire course of the teacher preparation program. Other recommended modifications included more selective admission criteria, early remedial activities or direct exit counseling, more intensive supervision, and responsible placements with appropriate cooperating teachers.

The leadership style of the student teacher is an important consideration used by the cooperating teacher in determining the opportunity for the student teacher to assume direct responsibility in the classroom. Kremer-Hayon (1992) concluded student teachers must work to develop interpersonal skills that promote an environment in which student teacher satisfaction and success are generated.

The First-Year Teacher Experience and Support Programs

Schlechty and Whitford (1989) suggested that school officials with effective beginning teacher programs recognize the need to develop human resources while assuring that the quality of education for children is not compromised. They recommended that schools be designed to fulfill the function of teacher induction. School officials should strive to create a

system that affords new teachers the developmental support, an arena for practice, and a safety net in which the quality of education for students is not compromised.

Carter and Richardson (1989) addressed the content and process to be included in an initial-year-of-teaching program. The program centered on two main points of teaching: to establish and maintain social order and provide first-year teachers opportunities to acquire event-structured knowledge. The recommended design for such a program would utilize case studies and networking with fellow beginning teachers and experienced professional educators. According to Carter and Richardson, the traditional question regarding financial support must be answered by generating support from educators, administrators, and policy makers.

The effects of a planned induction program on first-year teachers was studied by Kozisek (1988). In the combination qualitative and quantitative study, Kozisek focused on first-year teachers and their perceived level of functioning on selected teacher behaviors. Several important findings were revealed: (1) a conflict existed between what beginning teachers expected to happen and the reality of teaching; (2) job-embedded supports were not readily provided by the school; and (3) teachers were disappointed with the lack of administrative support and assistance. Kozisek offered the following recommendations: (1) opportunities should be provided for first-year teachers to reflect about teaching; (2) since first-year teacher needs varied, individual inservice should be provided; and (3) a definitive plan of action should be incorporated into the first-year teacher orientation.

A study conducted at Texas A & M University evaluated an induction-year mentorship program. Kueker and Haensly (1990) matched 80 teacher education graduates with master teachers who served as mentor teachers and participated in mentorship orientation programs. Kueker and Haensly concluded that formalized mentorship programs must be appropriately implemented. Key ingredients of the implementation should consist of orientation, training, and continued support. With proper direction, the mentorship program can improve the effectiveness of the first-year teacher, assure quality instruction, and increase the retention of prospective quality educators.

Education is one of the few professions in which a beginner steps in as a first-year teacher and is expected to manage the same responsibilities as a veteran. Sindelar (1992) developed a mentor teacher program since he believed new teachers deserve better induction into the profession than a pat on the back in addition to teacher handbooks, gradebooks, and textbooks. Sindelar's process for developing a mentor teacher program included (1) establish the rationale/need; (2) select mentors and protégés; (3) train mentors; (4) monitor mentor progress; and (5) evaluate and revise the program. Sindelar concluded both first-year teachers and the mentors benefited from the program. The mentors shared years of experience with others, reviewed the most current research on effective instruction, and received recognition for being an excellent teacher and asset to the district. The stages in the mentor teacher program were flexible, yet provided for a necessary structure and highlighted the need for effective planning and monitoring throughout the mentorship program. The critical factor of the

program was that new teachers receive positive feedback, effective guidance, and the sense of confidence to be the best.

Jarmin and Mackiel (1993) focused their study on the mentor's perception of patterns of contact with the new teacher. Eighty teachers participated as mentors in the year-long training project. A week-long training session, in which the focus was on the needs of beginning teachers, the skills of teaching, and strategies for working with beginning teachers, was provided. The authors concluded that mentors need to be willing to initiate most of the contacts with their beginning teachers at the start of the year. As the year progressed, a collective responsibility developed between the mentor and the beginning teacher. Most meetings of the mentor and beginning teacher were conducted before or after the instructional portion of the day. Jarmin and Mackiel found the majority of mentors established mentoring relationships that provided frequent contacts between mentors and beginning teachers. However, 16 percent of the mentors rarely had substantive contact with the beginning teacher, and the authors recommended that teachers' time constraints and the physical proximity of mentor and beginning teacher should be addressed as priority issues for school mentoring programs.

Nodie Oja (1990) reviewed developmental theories and the professional development of teachers. According to Nodie Oja, developmental theory has powerful implications for teacher improvement as well as staff development. Schools should offer programs, projects, and activities to attract teachers at different stages of development. The first-year teacher has professional development needs that differ from the

veteran teacher. The value in knowing the progressions in developmental theory can help school officials become less dogmatic about a single staff development solution. Administrators can provide appropriate and meaningful growth activities for all teachers with an understanding and appropriately applying developmental theory. First-year teachers and new teachers to a district derive benefit from programs and activities designed in accordance to individual needs.

Gehrke (1991) suggested that educators seem determined to detect unique aspects of beginning teaching and exclude its commonalties with other beginnings. First-year teacher programs are genuinely aimed at easing the well-known trauma of entry into teaching. Exploration experiences should provide both the particularistic and the universal view to help first-year teachers. Implementers of beginning teacher programs should make sure that helping communities are created within each school and given equal or more attention than technical training programs. The helping communities should be created based on knowledge from education and also from other social sciences. Gehrke advocated that schools planned as helping communities will more likely ensure that beginning and veteran teachers become successful educators.

In a study of first-year teachers in Catholic schools, Brock (1988) analyzed the participants' perceptions of undergraduate preparation, entry-level assistance, and problems associated with the first-year teaching experience. Brock found no differences in perceived adequacy of undergraduate preparation in public and Catholic colleges/universities.

Conversely, Brock concluded teacher training that is adequate for teachers in public schools is inadequate for teachers in Catholic Schools.

Pigge and Marso (1992) conducted a study in which a 1990 sample of beginning teachers was compared with a 1985 sample of beginning teachers from Bowling Green State University. The study was designed to test the hypothesis that the 1990 sample of beginning teachers, which had been prepared with greater emphasis on field experiences and teacher induction programs, would report less job entry reality shock than the 1985 sample. Near the completion of their first year of teaching, the teachers rated 24 working conditions on a Likert scale. The teachers were asked to recall prior-to-job expectations and actual on-the-job work experiences. Teachers in the 1990 sample reported experiencing job reality shock for 3 of 24 working conditions, and teachers in the 1985 sample experienced job reality shock for 18 of 24 working conditions. The findings supported the hypothesis that an increase in field experiences and teacher induction programs may decrease job entry reality shock.

Teaching Effectiveness

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) has a structured program to evaluate student teacher performance. The evaluation of student teachers is based on the four areas of emphasis of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the learners, (3) the curriculum, and (4) the profession. Evaluation items for the student teaching progress report are derived from the four areas and include the themes of planning, classroom management, teaching methods,

decision-making skills, general education, specialty studies, foundations, curriculum, learner developmental needs, special needs, assessment, evaluation, technology, society, and ethics. A solid foundation to evaluate teaching effectiveness is provided by the UNL evaluation program .

Selected components of the UNL student teacher evaluation program that relate to teaching effectiveness have been studied. Glickman (1990) recognized that a goal of supervision is the improvement of instruction, and teachers will become more purposeful as they gain greater control over decisions for teaching improvement. Teachers will implement curriculum more successfully if they have been involved in its development and have the flexibility to adapt it to their specific classroom. Glickman concluded that teacher development must include a variety of learning opportunities to support a teacher's personal and professional goals, in addition to meeting the common goals of the organization. Teaching effectiveness evolves with appropriate developmental activities.

Walker and Richardson (1993) examined the changes in self-perceived efficacy of teacher education majors who were first surveyed as student teachers in 1992 and again surveyed as first-year teachers in 1993. Walker and Richardson found significant differences on the following items: manages classroom interactions, uses audio-visual equipment, identifies and plans for exceptional learners, teaches reading/language arts effectively, demonstrates ability to work with groups of varying sizes, maintains accurate pupil records, and uses acceptable written and oral expression. The authors concluded this research should be expanded to

analyze and evaluate what can be done to prevent teacher "dropouts" prior to the time they are able to function effectively in the classroom.

A follow-up study of potential first-year teachers conducted by Stolworthy (1987) involved undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University (Kansas). The undergraduates were surveyed as student teachers and as first-year teachers in accordance with their self-evaluation of 25 teaching competencies in the area of professional, instructional, and interpersonal effectiveness. The participants were also evaluated by cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and principals of the first-year teachers. Stolworthy found the ratings of university supervisors were very high, and the self-ratings of student teachers and first-year teachers were lower than others who were involved in assessing teaching competencies. Stolworthy concluded that all components of teacher development should be reviewed and enhanced in order to improve the success of teachers as they enter the profession.

Summary

Basic research about student teaching and the first-year teaching experience was provided by the literature review. A void in the discussion on teaching effectiveness as it relates to the student teacher and first-year teacher was found in the literature review. This study adds to the existing literature regarding student teacher and first-year teacher development and also provides new information about student teachers' and first-year teachers' needs related to the improvement of teaching effectiveness. In order for student teachers to be integrated into the profession and

demonstrate successful teaching effectiveness, it is important that the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, student teacher, first-year teacher, and school administrators become partners and stakeholders, committed to the improvement of teachers entering the profession. Working together, professional educators can improve the teaching profession. The end result will be successful student teachers and first-year teachers who become career educators capable of providing meaningful educational experiences and opportunities for students.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of the study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession.

The survey design was selected as the preferred method of data collection. The purpose of survey research is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of this population (Babbie, 1990). The survey design for this study provided a rapid turnaround in data collection and the ability to identify attributes of teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of UNL.

Review of the Literature

To begin the study, a review of the literature was conducted. As a result of the review of the literature, a basis for performing the proposed

research was determined. Furthermore, a focus and boundary for the study were established through the review of literature, which defined specific issues relevant to the study and existing perceptions of student teachers and first-year teachers.

Approval

The University of Nebraska's Institutional Review Board approved the study (see Appendix A). The study was completed in established or commonly accepted educational settings and was a project at less than minimal risk. Cover letters mailed with the surveys stated that a returned, completed survey indicated consent to participate in the study.

Sampling Design

The population for this study consisted of UNL student teachers who completed the student teaching experience during the Spring semester of 1996 and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 school year. All UNL 1996 Spring semester student teachers and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers who were under contract with schools in Nebraska and teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education were surveyed. The design incorporated nonprobability sampling, as the study involved all subjects from an identified group who were available to the researcher.

All Spring semester UNL student teachers with assignments in English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education

(N = 138) were included. Access to the names to be used were obtained from Dr. Tom Wandzilak, Director of Student Teaching, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

All first-year teachers with assignments in English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education (N = 121) were included. The names of the first-year teachers, addresses, and school location were obtained from Dr. James O'Hanlon, Dean of Teachers College, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Instrumentation

Following a discussion with Dean. O'Hanlon and a review of existing research instruments available through the Buros Institute for Mental Measurement, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, it was determined that an existing instrument that would meet the criteria for this study was not available. For the purpose of this study, a Likert-scale survey was developed. When constructing the instrument, the Likert-scale was used with five choices: 1 = Very ineffective, 2 = Moderately ineffective, 3 = Effective, 4 = Moderately effective, and 5 = Very effective. The items in sections one through four were developed using the four criteria defined by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: teaching process (items 1-23), the curriculum (items 24-30), the learners (items 31-44), and the profession (items 45-61). Constructs in the development of the survey instrument were incorporated from the UNL Student Teaching Progress Reports for Elementary and Secondary Student Teachers. Items were combined into a single instrument to allow

elementary and secondary student teachers to respond to the same survey. The 61 items in sections one through four in the instrument related directly to items a through d of research question one.

Section five of the survey was designed to determine satisfaction with aspects of the student teaching and first-year teaching experience. A Likert-scale was constructed with five choices: 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied. "Yes" or "no" response questions were included to determine if the student teacher received assistance from the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and building principal, prior to a request to rate satisfaction. Student teacher respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with assistance provided from the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the building principal. First-year teacher respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with assistance provided from the building principal, mentor teacher, and first-year teacher orientation.

In addition to instructions, major content sections in the instrument included the items to be rated as follows: Section I, The Teaching Process; Section II, The Curriculum; Section III, The Learners; Section IV, The Profession; and Section V, Student Teaching or First-Year Teaching Satisfaction. Demographic information was given in Section VI.

Following development of the survey, it was given to student teachers (n = 13) who were student teaching in School District 145 during the Spring semester 1995. The 13 student teachers were students from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Doane College, and Nebraska Wesleyan University. Due to the time frame and population to be used in the study, these student teachers did not participate in the actual study. The analysis

of content included clarity of wording in the items and directions, in addition to construct validity. Modifications, refinements, and revisions of the items were accomplished using the student teachers' input.

After revisions, the survey was given to student teachers (n = 16) who were student teaching in School District 145 during the fall semester, 1995. The 16 student teachers were students from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Doane College, Peru State College, and Wayne State College. Due to the time frame and population to be used in the study, these student teachers did not participate in the actual study. The analysis of content included clarity of wording in the items and directions, in addition to construct validity. Modifications, refinements, and revisions of the items were accomplished using the student teachers' input.

The survey for first-year teachers was given to first-year teachers (n = 4) who were first employed as teachers in School District 145 during the 1994-95 school year. The four first-year teachers were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Nebraska-Kearney, Doane College, and Peru State College. Due to the time frame and population to be used in the study, the student teachers did not participate in the actual study. The analysis of content included clarity of wording in the items and directions, in addition to construct validity. Modifications, refinements, and revisions of the items were accomplished using the first-year teachers' input.

The survey for first-year teachers was given to first-year teachers (n = 7) who were employed as teachers in School District 145 during the 1995-96 school year. The seven first-year teachers were graduates of the

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Nebraska-Kearney, University of Illinois, and University of Nevada, Reno. Due to the respective teaching assignments of the population to be used in the study, the seven first-year teachers only participated in the pilot study. The analysis of content included clarity of wording in the items and directions, in addition to construct validity. Modifications, refinements, and revisions of the items were accomplished using the first-year teachers' input.

A peer review of items was completed by four graduate students (n = 4) in the 1995 summer section of the survey methods class in educational research (900D) for the purpose of assessing content and construct validity. Modifications, refinements, and revisions of the items were accomplished with the input of the graduate students.

An expert panel, consisting of current, practicing administrators in School District 145 (n = 5) and directors of student teaching at the University of Nebraska-Kearney, Doane College, and Hastings College (n = 3) was used to determine construct validity. The five district administrators worked with student teachers in their respective assignments and evaluated the effectiveness of first-year teachers as determined by district standards. Their evaluation was designed to determine if the instrument adequately measured the cluster of constructs. The three college officials were identified by their respective institutions as being involved with placement and evaluation of student teachers. Their assignment was to determine if the instrument adequately measured the cluster of constructs as intended. Following feedback and discussion, modifications, refinements, and revisions were accomplished.

As additional support of content and construct validity, the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model was developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Teachers College. Through investigation of the literature and review of specific models, key personnel within Teachers College developed and introduced the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model. The Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model is derived in part from the revision of the scientist-practitioner model used within the field of school psychology. The UNL Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model is the framework and the foundation upon which Teachers College programs are based. Teachers College emphasis of the four areas of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model lend support to validate the importance of the four constructs to be included in this study.

A reliability index was obtained using the Cronbach Alpha test (Borg & Gall, 1983).

Data Collection

This study was conducted in full accordance with the University of Nebraska's Institutional Review Board Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects. The project was "exempt," as the research was done in established or commonly accepted educational settings and was a project at less than minimal risk.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers, who were student teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education during the spring semester, 1996 were surveyed. The survey contained 61 items regarding teaching effectiveness.

Items to be rated, by section, were: Section I, The Teaching Process (items 1-23), Section II, The Curriculum (items 24-30), Section III, The Learners (items 31-44), and Section IV, The Profession (items 45-61). Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the student teaching experience in Section V. The respondents were asked to give demographic information in Section VI.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln graduates who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 school year, teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education, were surveyed. The survey contained 61 items regarding teaching effectiveness. Items to be rated, by section, were: Section I, The Teaching Process (items 1-23), Section II, The Curriculum (items 24-30), Section III, The Learners (items 31-44), and Section IV, The Profession (items 45-61). Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the specified aspects of the first-year teaching experience in Section V. The respondents were asked to give demographic information in Section VI.

Mailing

Surveys were mailed to the home address of each student teacher in the sample population on April 18, 1996. The mailing included a cover letter (see Appendix B and a survey questionnaire (see Appendix C). The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey, the steps to be taken to ensure confidentiality of responses, and the procedures for reporting the results. A postage-paid envelope addressed to the researcher was included with the mailing of the survey. Nonrespondents received a second mailing on May 3, 1996. A follow-up third reminder was mailed to

nonrespondents on May 10, 1996 (see Appendix D). Each survey was numbered before it was mailed. As each survey was returned, the survey was dated, and the return of the questionnaire was recorded. The surveys were numbered and dated as they were returned to monitor response rate. Subjects' responses were treated confidentially.

Surveys were mailed to each first-year teacher in the sample population at the school address, on April 26, 1996. The mailing included a cover letter (see Appendix E) and a survey questionnaire (see Appendix F). The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey, the steps to be taken to ensure confidentiality of responses, and the procedures for reporting the results. A postage-paid envelope addressed to the researcher was included in the mailing of the survey. Nonrespondents received a second mailing on May 10, 1996. A follow-up third reminder was mailed to nonrespondents on May 17, 1996 (see Appendix G). Each survey was numbered before it was mailed. As each survey was returned, the survey was dated, and the return of the questionnaire was recorded. The surveys were numbered and dated as they were returned to monitor response rate. Subjects responses were treated confidentially.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis involved four steps: (1) descriptive information, (2) response bias, (3) internal consistency reliability, (4) research questions.

Descriptive Information

A descriptive analysis of all independent and dependent variables was completed. Information was reported about the number of returns and nonreturns of the survey. Information reported from the surveys included the percentage of respondents and nonrespondents and a description of the respondents. Descriptive statistics were reported in table form and were based on information collected on all components of the survey and included the number of subjects, means, median, and standard deviation.

Response Bias

Surveys were numbered and dated as they were returned. An analysis of surveys received after the initial mailing and after the second mailing was conducted. An independent sample t-test was used to compare differences between the first wave respondents' and the second wave respondents' scores for the four criteria of the study: teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession. Tables and descriptions were used to present the response bias check for student teachers and first-year teachers.

Borg and Gall (1983) suggested an analysis of the characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents to determine if the two groups represented differences toward specific characteristics. If their responses were not different from other respondents, a strong case for absence of response bias can be made.

A telephone follow-up was made to 15 student teacher non-respondents and 15 first-year teacher nonrespondents to determine why

they did not respond and whether their responses differed substantially from respondents. These subjects were asked three questions:

1. Did you receive the survey questionnaire?
2. Was there a reason for not responding?
3. Are you willing to complete the survey at this time?

Results were reported in narrative form.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was applied for each item and section to determine internal consistency reliability. Data were described and reported in table form. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was appropriate for determining internal reliability with responses that were weighted (Borg & Gall, 1983). Minimum alpha levels of .80 were established for acceptance of the category. If Cronbach's coefficient alphas for each category were less than .80, internal consistency would be considered lacking in the category.

Research Questions

Answers and appropriate tables were presented for the following research questions:

Research question 1. Is there a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers?

The procedure used for analysis of research question one was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups of subjects were different, and differences in the teaching effectiveness of student teachers at the completion of the student teaching

experience and first-year teachers at the end of the first-year teaching experience were investigated in this study. There was a systematic relationship between the groups of student teachers and first-year teachers, which supported the use of the independent sample t-test.

Research question 1a. Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the teaching process?

The procedure used for analysis of research question 1a was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups were different, and differences in teaching effectiveness based on the teaching process were investigated in this study.

Research question 1b. Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on curriculum?

The procedure used for analysis of research question 1b was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups of subjects were different, and differences in teaching effectiveness based on curriculum were investigated in this study.

Research question 1c. Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the learners?

The procedure used for analysis of research question 1c was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups of subjects were different, and differences in teaching effectiveness based on the learners were investigated in this study.

Research question 1d. Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the profession?

The procedure used for analysis of research question 1d was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups of subjects were different, and differences of teaching effectiveness based on the profession were investigated in this study.

Research question 1e. Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience?

The procedure used for analysis of research question 1e was an independent t-test. The independent sample t-test was selected since the two groups of subjects were different, and differences in satisfaction based on the participants' respective experiences were investigated in this study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of the study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession. The study provides new information about student teachers and first-year teachers needs related to the improvement of teaching effectiveness.

In order for student teachers to be integrated into the profession and demonstrate successful teaching effectiveness, it is important that the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, student teacher, first-year teacher, and school administrators become partners and stakeholders, committed to the improvement of teachers entering the profession. Working together, professional educators can improve the teaching profession, with the end result that successful student teachers and first-year teachers become career educators who are capable of providing effective educational experiences and opportunities for students.

Participants of the study were asked to respond to 61 items that corresponded with the four criteria of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the learners, (3) the curriculum and (4) the profession. A Likert-scale instrument was constructed, and the items on the survey were answered by choices ranging from very ineffective to very effective. Section five of the survey was designed to determine satisfaction with aspects of the student teaching and first-year teaching experience. Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction on a Likert-scale that ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The respondents were asked to provide demographic information in section six of the instrument.

The population for this study consisted of UNL student teachers who completed the student teaching experience during the Spring semester of 1996 and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 school year. All UNL 1996 Spring semester student teachers and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education were surveyed. A total of 138 student teacher questionnaires and 121 first-year teacher questionnaires were sent to potential subjects.

After the first mailing and return of the questionnaires, nine potential student teacher participants and seven first-year teacher participants were dropped from the study. The nine student teachers were dropped from the study because part or all of their student teaching assignment was in a discipline that was not included in this study. The seven first-year teachers were dropped from the study for three reasons.

Three of the seven first-year teachers were dropped because less than one-third of their teaching assignment was in a discipline included in this study. Two first-year teachers were dropped because their teaching assignment was in a discipline that was not included in this study. Two first-year teachers were dropped because they were not first-year teachers; they had taught previously in other states and were returning to Nebraska. The overall response rate for the 129 student teachers who were surveyed was 60.0 percent (n = 77). A total of 52 of the 129 student teachers did not respond to the survey. The overall response rate for first-year teachers who were surveyed was 67.0 percent (n = 76). A total of 38 of 114 first-year teachers were nonrespondents.

Descriptive Information

Descriptive data concerning the gender of the participants in the study are provided in Table 1, and descriptive data concerning the age of the participants are shown in Table 2.

The number and percentage of participants in their respective grade level teaching assignments are provided in Table 3. Total assignments were greater than the total number of participants, as some student teachers and first-year teachers had teaching assignments in multiple grade levels.

Data concerning the type of school where participants completed their student teaching experience assignment or were employed as first-year teachers are shown in Table 4.

Table 1

Gender of the Participants

	Female	Male	Total
Student teachers	62	15	77
First-year teachers	49	27	76
Total	111	42	153

Table 2

Age of the Participants

	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	Over 44	Total
Student teachers	66	8	2	1	0	0	77
First-year teachers	48	24	1	1	1	1	76
Total	114	32	3	2	1	1	153

Table 3

Grade Level Teaching Assignments of the Participants

	Student Teachers		First-Year Teachers	
	N	%	N	%
Preschool	3	3.9	2	2.6
Kindergarten	8	10.4	6	7.9
First grade	11	14.3	16	21.1
Second grade	13	16.9	12	15.8
Third grade	12	15.6	11	14.5
Fourth grade	11	14.3	10	13.2
Fifth grade	4	5.2	13	17.1
Sixth grade	11	14.3	14	18.4
Seventh grade	8	10.4	13	17.1
Eighth grade	17	22.1	17	22.4
Ninth grade	21	27.3	23	30.3
Tenth grade	22	28.6	21	27.6
Eleventh grade	16	20.8	20	26.3
Twelfth grade	6	7.8	17	22.4

Table 4

Type of School in Which Student Teachers and First-Year Teachers Taught

	Student Teachers		First-Year Teachers	
	N	%	N	%
Public schools	71	92.2	68	89.5
Parochial schools	6	7.8	8	10.5
Total	77	100.0	76	100.0

Descriptive data are provided in Table 5, 6, 7, and 8 for each of the 61 items in sections one through four of the survey instrument. Participants were asked to select one of the five degrees of teaching effectiveness that ranged from "1," indicating very ineffective to "5," indicating very effective. The number of responses and percentages are recorded for the degree of effectiveness as reported by student teachers and first-year teachers. The mean scores and the standard deviation are also provided for each item.

The mean score was higher for student teachers compared to first-year teachers on 55 of the 61 items. On the criterion of teaching process from the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model, mean scores for first-year teachers were higher on item 9, "am quick to sense classroom

Table 5

Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Participants, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Category, Teaching Process

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
1. Plan activities to achieve learner objectives												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	6.5	26	33.8	45	58.4	4.49	.681
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	15.8	44	57.9	20	26.3	4.11	.645
2. Write unit/daily plans that demonstrate an understanding of program goals and objectives												
Student teacher	0	0.0	5	6.5	6	7.8	24	31.2	42	54.5	4.34	.883
First-year teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	12	15.8	35	46.1	26	34.1	4.11	.810
3. Demonstrate an ability to select, plan, and organize activities appropriate for students' needs, interests, and abilities												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.8	21	27.3	48	62.3	4.49	.754
First-year teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	7	9.2	33	43.4	33	43.4	4.26	.789
4. Organize content and use material in a manner consistent with needs and abilities of students												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	5	6.5	27	35.1	43	55.8	4.44	.734
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	11	14.5	38	50.0	26	34.2	4.17	.719

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
5. Organize the classroom environment to facilitate learning												
Student teacher	1	1.3	3	3.9	11	14.3	18	23.4	43	55.8	4.30	.952
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	12	15.8	31	40.8	32	42.1	4.24	.764
6. Communicate and maintain standards for behavior and achievement in the classroom and school												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	9	11.7	30	39.0	36	46.8	4.30	.779
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	12	15.8	35	46.1	28	36.8	4.18	.743
7. Maintain order through effective teaching												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	9	11.7	33	42.9	34	44.2	4.30	.727
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	9	11.8	43	56.6	23	30.3	4.15	.674
8. Demonstrate the ability to create and manage varied classroom organizational patterns that are consistent with and supportive of varied learning situations												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	12	15.6	20	26.0	44	57.1	4.39	.797
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	16	21.1	45	59.2	14	18.4	3.95	.671
9. Am quick to sense classroom management problems and competent in handling them and dealing with unexpected situations												
Student teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	18	23.4	33	42.9	23	29.9	3.99	.835
First-year teacher	0	0.0	4	4.3	9	11.8	40	52.6	23	30.3	4.08	.798

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
10. Present tasks at students' instructional levels												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	7	9.1	27	35.1	41	53.2	4.39	.764
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	25	32.9	36	47.4	14	18.4	3.83	.737
11. Demonstrate the ability to use research-based teaching techniques												
Student teacher	1	1.3	6	7.8	14	18.2	31	40.3	24	31.2	3.93	.971
First-year teacher	1	1.3	4	5.3	23	30.3	35	46.1	13	17.1	3.72	.858
12. Focus students' attention on the lesson through the use of various techniques												
Student teacher	1	1.3	2	2.6	10	13.0	21	27.3	43	55.8	4.34	.898
First-year teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	16	21.1	35	46.1	22	28.9	4.00	.816
13. Demonstrate instructional clarity												
Student teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	6	7.8	35	45.5	33	42.9	4.27	.772
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	27	35.5	36	47.4	11	14.5	3.74	.737
14. Encourage a high degree of student participation												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.8	10	24.7	50	64.9	4.52	.754
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	9.2	21	27.6	47	61.8	4.53	.664
15. Check for understanding and provide appropriate feedback												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	9	11.7	22	28.6	44	57.1	4.40	.799
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	10	13.2	36	47.4	29	38.2	4.22	.723

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
16. Use personalized and specific praise												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	6.5	12	15.6	59	76.6	4.68	.658
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	11.8	26	34.2	41	53.9	4.42	.698
17. Maximize academic learning time for students												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.8	41	53.2	28	36.4	4.23	.705
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	33	43.4	27	35.5	15	19.7	3.74	.789
18. Provide meaningful closure												
Student teacher	1	1.3	6	7.8	19	24.7	34	44.2	17	22.1	3.78	.927
First-year teacher	0	0.0	12	15.8	36	47.4	19	25.0	9	11.8	3.33	.885
19. Demonstrate appropriate poise and confidence												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	4	5.2	17	22.1	55	71.4	4.62	.708
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.5	29	38.2	42	55.3	4.49	.622
20. Demonstrate appropriate non-verbal behavior												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	4	5.2	21	27.3	51	66.2	4.58	.656
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.3	40	52.6	32	42.1	4.37	.585
21. Make appropriate decisions for teaching												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	8	10.4	20	26.0	48	62.3	4.49	.737
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	7.9	42	55.3	28	36.8	4.29	.607

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 5 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
22. Consider students' needs, abilities, and interests when making instructional decisions												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	4	5.2	26	33.8	45	58.5	4.48	.718
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	4	5.3	40	52.6	31	40.8	4.33	.641
23. Make appropriate decisions about the selection of content taught and the proportion of time devoted to instruction												
Student teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	9	11.7	32	41.6	33	42.9	4.23	.809
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	18	23.7	43	56.6	14	18.4	3.92	.688
Totals												
Student teacher	6	0.3	53	3.0	192	10.9	590	33.3	929	52.5	4.35	.783
First-year teacher	1	0.1	41	2.3	323	18.5	809	46.3	573	32.8	4.10	.724

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 6

Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Participants, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Category, Curriculum

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
24. Exhibit knowledge of content area(s)												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	9	11.7	23	29.9	44	57.1	4.43	.751
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	9	11.8	39	51.3	26	34.2	4.17	.737
25. Exhibit breadth and depth of subject-area knowledge												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	13	16.9	36	46.8	27	35.1	4.16	.745
First-year teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	16	21.1	34	44.7	23	30.3	4.01	.825
26. Display interest and enthusiasm for student(s) taught												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	4	5.2	15	19.5	57	74.0	4.66	.641
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	11	14.5	23	30.3	40	52.6	4.33	.827
27. Understand and use knowledge and skills unique to the subject area												
Student teacher	1	1.3	2	2.6	10	13.0	16	20.8	48	62.3	4.40	.907
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	14	18.4	39	51.3	22	28.9	4.08	.726
28. Follow the school curriculum												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	7	9.1	23	29.9	46	59.7	4.48	.718
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	11	14.5	28	36.8	34	44.7	4.25	.807

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 6 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
29. Demonstrate understanding of the curriculum in the subject areas												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	10	13.0	20	26.0	46	59.7	4.44	.769
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	10	13.3	37	48.7	27	35.5	4.17	.755
30. Know and implement existing district and building curriculum policies												
Student teacher	1	1.3	3	3.9	4	5.2	30	39.0	39	50.6	4.34	.852
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	12	15.8	37	48.7	25	32.9	4.12	.765
Totals												
Student teacher	2	0.4	10	1.9	57	10.6	163	30.2	307	56.9	4.42	.769
First-year teacher	0	0.0	14	2.6	83	15.6	237	44.6	197	37.1	4.16	.777

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 7

Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Participants, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Category, Learners

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
31. Consider students' developmental level in teaching												
Student teacher	0	0.0	3	3.9	10	13.0	25	32.5	39	50.6	4.30	.844
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	14.5	34	44.7	31	40.8	4.26	.700
32. Exhibit an understanding of the developmental levels and characteristics of individual students												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	9	11.7	31	40.3	36	36.8	4.33	.733
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	14	18.4	35	46.1	26	34.2	4.13	.754
33. Display an understanding of the needs, abilities, and interests of the individuals												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.8	23	29.9	46	59.7	4.47	.754
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	19.7	30	39.5	31	40.8	4.21	.754
34. Provide individualized instruction to meet students' special needs												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	9	11.7	23	29.9	43	55.8	4.39	.797
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	15	19.7	25	32.9	34	44.7	4.20	.849

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
35. Promote a positive self-concept for all students												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.8	17	22.1	52	67.5	4.55	.753
First-year teachers	0	0.0	1	1.3	7	9.2	28	36.8	40	52.6	4.41	.715
36. Avoid bias and/or favoritism toward individual students												
Student teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	6.5	24	31.2	47	61.0	4.52	.681
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	17	22.4	29	38.2	29	38.2	4.13	.806
37. Treat all students equally with respect and concern												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	3	3.9	12	15.6	60	77.9	4.69	.674
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	9.2	34	44.7	35	46.1	4.37	.650
38. Understand and plan in order to meet the needs of all students regardless of economic class, handicapping conditions, national origin, race, religion, gender, or sexual relations												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	3.9	12	15.6	61	79.2	4.71	.666
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	3.9	19	256.0	53	69.7	4.63	.629
39. Identify and diagnose learners' needs												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	11	14.3	33	42.9	31	40.3	4.21	.784
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	32.9	40	52.6	11	14.5	3.82	.749

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 7 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
40. Establish appropriate procedures for assessing students												
Student teacher	1	1.3	2	2.6	10	13.0	39	50.6	25	32.5	4.10	.821
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	25	32.9	35	46.1	15	19.7	3.84	.749
41. Establish procedures for assessing students												
Student teacher	1	1.3	1	1.3	15	19.5	36	46.8	24	31.2	4.05	.826
First-year teacher	0	0.0	5	6.6	22	28.9	35	46.1	14	18.4	3.76	.831
42. Use data to evaluate decisions about teaching												
Student teacher	3	3.9	3	3.9	13	16.9	42	54.5	16	20.8	3.84	.933
First-year teacher	1	1.3	15	19.7	23	30.3	28	36.8	9	11.8	3.38	.979
43. Provide for evaluation based on objectives/intentions												
Student teacher	1	1.3	3	3.9	12	15.6	30	39.0	31	40.3	4.13	.908
First-year teacher	0	0.0	6	7.9	17	22.4	44	57.9	9	11.8	3.74	.772
44. Supply opportunities for each student to meet success regularly												
Student teacher	1	1.3	1	1.3	6	7.8	19	24.7	50	64.9	4.51	.805
First-year teacher	0	0.0	1	1.3	7	9.2	33	43.4	35	46.1	4.34	.703
Totals												
Student teacher	8	0.7	25	2.3	118	11.0	366	34.0	561	52.0	4.34	.784
First-year teacher	1	0.1	34	3.2	208	19.5	449	42.2	372	35.0	4.09	.760

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 8

Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Participants, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Category, Profession

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
45. Exhibit a receptive attitude toward critiques of professional performance and suggestions made for self-improvement												
Student teacher	1	1.3	1	1.3	4	5.2	15	19.5	56	72.7	4.61	.764
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.3	31	40.8	41	53.9	4.51	.578
46. Set and pursue specific goals for continued improvement												
Student teacher	2	2.6	0	0.0	4	5.2	14	18.2	57	74.0	4.61	.814
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.3	35	46.1	37	48.7	4.43	.596
47. Demonstrate a commitment to teaching												
Student teacher	2	2.6	0	0.0	1	1.3	9	11.7	65	84.4	4.75	.728
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	21.1	60	78.9	4.79	.410
48. Apply technology appropriately												
Student teacher	2	2.6	4	5.2	7	9.1	31	40.3	33	42.9	4.16	.974
First-year teacher	0	0.0	5	6.6	29	38.2	22	28.0	20	26.3	3.75	.926

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
49. Demonstrate technological expertise commensurate with subject-area expectations												
Student teacher	2	2.6	6	7.8	11	14.3	23	29.9	35	45.5	4.08	1.073
First-year teacher	0	0.0	5	6.6	30	39.5	26	34.2	15	19.7	3.67	.870
50. Understand and use a variety of audio-visual resources												
Student teacher	2	2.6	2	2.6	11	14.3	15	19.5	47	61.0	4.34	.995
First-year teacher	0	0.0	7	9.2	22	28.9	25	32.9	22	28.9	3.82	.962
51. Understand and plan for multi-cultural needs												
Student teacher	1	1.3	2	2.6	8	10.4	25	32.5	41	53.2	4.34	.868
First-year teacher	0	0.0	6	7.9	8	10.5	34	44.7	28	36.8	4.11	.888
52. Assure a non-sexist climate												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	3.9	13	16.9	60	77.9	4.70	.670
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	2	2.6	24	31.6	48	63.2	4.55	.681
53. Model professional behavior that promotes quality												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	2.6	12	15.6	62	80.5	4.74	.637
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.6	20	26.3	54	71.1	4.68	.522
54. Communicate competently with parents												
Student teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	7	9.1	31	40.3	37	48.1	4.34	.754
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	10	13.2	19	25.0	45	50.2	4.41	.819

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
55. Communicate competently with other professionals												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	6	7.8	17	22.1	53	68.8	4.57	.751
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	6	7.9	20	26.3	48	63.2	4.50	.767
56. Work collaboratively with staff, individually and in groups												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	6	7.8	18	23.4	52	67.5	4.56	.752
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.6	24	31.6	46	60.5	4.55	.622
57. Work collaboratively with parents and community members												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	13	16.9	24	31.2	39	50.6	4.30	.844
First-year teacher	0	0.0	2	2.6	11	14.5	35	46.1	28	36.8	4.17	.773
58. Participate in non-instructional teaching responsibilities												
Student teacher	1	1.3	2	2.6	5	6.5	14	18.2	55	71.4	4.56	.835
First-year teacher	2	2.6	1	1.3	4	5.3	19	25.0	50	65.8	4.50	.872
59. Maintain confidentiality when appropriate												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	3.9	10	13.0	63	81.8	4.74	.657
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.9	17	22.4	56	73.7	4.70	.542
60. Make ethical decisions regarding professional issues												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	4	5.2	15	19.5	57	74.0	4.65	.703
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	16	21.1	59	77.6	4.76	.458

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

Table 8 (continued)

Item	Rating 1* N	1* %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	Mean	SD
61. Make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child												
Student teacher	1	1.3	0	0.0	4	5.2	16	20.8	56	72.7	4.64	.705
First-year teacher	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	16	21.1	59	77.6	4.76	.458
Totals												
Student teacher	21	1.6	19	1.4	99	7.6	302	23.1	868	66.3	4.51	.796
First-year teacher	2	0.1	32	2.5	142	11.0	399	30.9	716	55.5	4.39	.690

*1 = very ineffective; 2 = moderately ineffective; 3 = effective; 4 = moderately effective; 5 = very effective

management problems and am competent in handling them and dealing with unexpected situations," and item 14, "encourage a high degree of student participation" (see Table 5). The additional four items were all from the criterion of profession from the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: item 47, "demonstrate a commitment to teaching"; item 54, "communicate competently with parents"; item 60, "make ethical decisions regarding professional issues"; and item 61, "make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child" (see Table 8).

Responses to item 47, "demonstrates a commitment to teaching," generated the highest mean for student teachers (4.75) and first-year teachers (4.79). The lowest mean score for student teachers (3.84) was in response to item 42, "use data to evaluate decisions about teaching." The lowest mean score for first-year teachers (3.33) was reported from item 18, "provide meaningful closure."

Section five of the student teacher survey was designed to examine aspects of satisfaction with the student teachers' teaching experiences. A Likert-scale was constructed with five choices: (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied. The student teachers were asked if they received assistance from the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and building principal prior to the request to rate satisfaction. Student teacher respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with assistance provided from the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the building principal.

The number and percentage of respondents who reported they received assistance from the cooperating teacher are shown in Table 9.

Seventy-six of the 77 participants reported that they received assistance from the cooperating teacher.

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Student Teachers Who Received Assistance from the Cooperating Teacher (n = 77)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the cooperating teacher	76	98.7	1	1.3

The ratings of the student teachers' satisfaction with the assistance they received from the cooperating teacher are shown in Table 10. Sixty-eight percent of the student teachers reported they were very satisfied with the assistance received from the cooperating teacher.

The number and percentage of respondents who reported they received assistance from the university supervisor are shown in Table 11. Sixty-seven of the 77 participants reported they received assistance from the university supervisor.

Table 10

Ratings of the Student Teachers' Satisfaction with Assistance from the Cooperating Teacher (n = 77)

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with assistance	1	1.3	1	1.3	8	10.4	12	15.6	53	68.8	2	2.4	4.53	.844

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

Table 11

Number and Percentage of Student Teachers Who Received Assistance from the University Supervisor (n = 77)

	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the university supervisor	67	87.0	9	11.7	1	1.3

The ratings of the student teachers' satisfaction with the assistance they received from the university supervisor are shown in Table 12. Thirty-six percent of the student teachers reported that they were very satisfied with the assistance they received from the university supervisor.

The number and percentage of respondents who reported they received an evaluation from the building principal are shown in Table 13. Forty-three of the 77 participants reported that they received an evaluation from the building principal.

Table 12

Ratings of the Student Teachers' Satisfaction with Assistance from the University Supervisor (n = 77)

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with assistance	2	2.6	3	3.9	16	20.8	21	27.3	28	36.4	7	9.1	4.00	1.036

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

Table 13

Number and Percentage of Student Teachers Who Received an Evaluation from the Building Principal (n = 77)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Received an evaluation from the building principal	43	55.8	34	44.2

The ratings of the student teachers' satisfaction with the evaluation they received from the building principal are shown in Table 14. Twenty percent of the teachers reported that they were very satisfied with the evaluation by the building principal.

The mean score of the student teachers' satisfaction with assistance from the cooperating teacher was 4.53, and the mean score of the student teachers' satisfaction with assistance from the university supervisor was 4.0. Student teachers were very to moderately satisfied with the assistance received from the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Section five of the first-year teacher survey was designed to determine satisfaction with aspects of the first-year teaching experience. A Likert-scale was constructed with five choices: (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied. The first-year teachers were asked if they received assistance from the building principal, a mentor teacher, a first-year teacher orientation program, and if the first-year teacher orientation

Table 14

Ratings of Student Teachers' Satisfaction with the Evaluation by the Building Principal (n = 77)

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with evaluation	0	0.0	1	1.3	5	6.5	21	27.3	16	20.8	34	44.2	4.21	.742

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

program was designed by the school district. The first-year teachers were asked to rate their satisfaction with assistance provided from the building principal, mentor teacher, and first-year teacher orientation program.

The number and percentage of respondents who reported that they received assistance from the building principal are shown in Table 15. Sixty-six of seventy-six participants reported that they received assistance from the building principal.

Table 15

Number and Percentage of First-Year Teachers Who Received Assistance from the Building Principal (n = 76)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the building principal	66	86.8	10	13.2

The ratings of the first-year teachers' satisfaction with the assistance that they received from the building principal are shown in Table 16. Forty-four percent of the first-year teachers reported that they were very satisfied with the assistance they received from the building principal.

Table 16

Ratings of First-Year Teachers' Satisfaction with the Assistance from the Building Principal (n = 76)

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with assistance	2	2.6	6	7.9	8	10.5	19	25.0	34	44.7	7	9.2	4.12	1.105

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

The number and percentage of respondents who reported that they received assistance from a mentor teacher are shown in Table 17. Fifty-seven of the 76 participants reported that they received assistance from a mentor teacher.

Table 17

Number and Percentage of First-Year Teachers Who Received Assistance from the Mentor Teacher (n = 76)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the mentor teacher	57	75.0	19	25.0

Ratings of first-year teachers' satisfaction with the assistance that they received from the mentor teacher are shown in Table 18. Forty-four percent of the first-year teachers reported that they were very satisfied with the assistance received from the mentor teacher.

The number and percentage of respondents who reported that they received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program are shown in Table 19. Forty-nine of the 76 participants that reported they received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program.

Table 18

Ratings of First-Year Teachers' Satisfaction with Assistance from the Mentor Teacher (n = 76)

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with assistance	1	1.3	3	3.9	8	10.5	12	15.8	34	44.7	8	10.5	4.29	1.009

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

Table 19

Number and Percentage of First-Year Teachers Who Received Assistance from the First-Year Teacher Orientation Program (n = 76)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the orientation program	49	64.5	27	35.5

The number and percentage and number of respondents who reported that they received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program that was designed by the district are shown in Table 20. Forty-five of the 76 participants reported that they received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program designed by the district.

Table 20

Number and Percentage of First-Year Teachers Who Received Assistance from a First-Year Teacher Orientation Program Designed by the District (n = 76)

	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received assistance from the first-year teacher orientation program designed by the district	45	92.0	4	8.0	27	35.5

Ratings of first-year teachers' satisfaction with the assistance received from the first-year teacher orientation program are shown in Table 21. Approximately seven percent of the first-year teachers reported that they were very satisfied with the assistance received from the first-year teacher orientation program.

The mean score of the first-year teachers' satisfaction with assistance from the building principal was 4.12 on a five-point scale, and the mean score of the first-year teachers' satisfaction with assistance from the mentor teacher was 4.29. First-year teachers were moderately satisfied with the assistance received from the building principal and mentor teacher.

Response Bias

In order to assess response bias of student teachers, an independent sample t-test was used to analyze the differences between the first and second waves of responses. No significant difference was found for student teachers between the scores of the first wave of responses and the second wave of responses for the four criteria of the study: teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession (see Table 22).

Table 21

Ratings of First-Year Teachers' Satisfaction with Assistance from a First-Year Teacher Orientation Program

	1*		2		3		4		5		No Response			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with assistance	0	0.0	3	3.9	25	32.9	14	18.4	6	7.9	28	36.8	3.48	.799

*1 = very dissatisfied; 2 = moderately dissatisfied; 3 = satisfied; 4 = moderately satisfied; 5 = very satisfied

Table 22

Independent Sample t-test Results of the Wave Analysis of the Response Bias for Student Teachers

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Pooled Variance Estimate t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	Two-tail Probability
Teaching process						
Wave 1	39	99.7436	11.359	- .10	75	.918
Wave 2	38	100.0526	14.761			
Curriculum						
Wave 1	39	30.5897	3.885	- .67	75	.506
Wave 2	38	31.2368	4.588			
Learners						
Wave 1	39	60.9231	6.714	.14	75	.886
Wave 2	38	60.6579	9.272			
Profession						
Wave 1	39	77.3590	6.873	.61	75	.554
Wave 2	38	75.9737	12.365			

In order to assess the response bias of first-year teachers, an independent sample t-test was used to analyze the differences between the first and second waves of responses. No significant difference was found for first-year teachers between the scores of the first wave of responses and the second wave of responses for the four criteria of the study: teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession (see Table 23).

A telephone follow-up was made to 15 student teacher non-respondents and 15 first-year teacher nonrespondents to determine why they did not respond and whether their responses differed substantially from respondents. These subjects were asked if they had received the survey and, if so, their reason for not responding. They were asked if were they willing to complete the survey at this time.

All student teachers reported that they had received the survey. The most prevalent response for not responding was that they were very busy completing the student teaching experience and preparing for graduation. All student teachers were willing to complete the survey by telephone or made the commitment to complete the survey and return it immediately.

All first-year teachers reported that they had received the survey. Although all first-year teachers reported that they had received the survey, eight indicated that they did not know what they had done with the survey. Reasons reported for not responding included the fact that the school year was rapidly coming to a close and they had many other tasks to complete that were of a higher priority. All first-year teachers indicated that they

Table 23

Independent Sample t-test Results of the Wave Analysis of the Response Bias for First-Year Teachers

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Pooled Variance Estimate t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	Two-tail Probability
Teaching process						
Wave 1	38	93.8421	10.218	- .27	74	.791
Wave 2	38	94.3947	7.706			
Curriculum						
Wave 1	38	28.6579	3.290	-1.00	74	.319
Wave 2	38	29.5000	3.992			
Learners						
Wave 1	38	57.2368	6.891	.02	74	.986
Wave 2	38	57.2105	6.585			
Profession						
Wave 1	38	74.3158	6.811	- .30	74	.762
Wave 1	38	74.7632	5.979			

would be willing to complete the study by telephone or would complete the study and return by mail within a few days.

As shown in Tables 22 and 23, no significant difference was found for student teachers or first-year teachers between the scores of the first wave of responses and the second wave of responses for the four criteria of the study: teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession. Nonrespondents who were contacted by telephone and completed the survey were reported as part of the second wave in the independent sample t-test wave analysis. These subjects were included in the total number of participants in the study, as no significant differences in responses were identified in the wave analysis.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency reliability for each of the four criteria of the study--teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession--was computed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The four criteria including item numbers in the survey and alpha levels are reported for student teachers in Table 24 and first-year teachers in Table 25.

Minimum alpha levels of .80 were established for acceptance of internal consistency for each category. All coefficient alpha levels for both student teachers and first-year teachers exceeded the .80 alpha level, indicating a very good level of internal consistency.

Table 24

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Values for Student Teachers, Sections I-IV (n = 77)

Section	Coefficient Alpha Value
Teaching process	
Items 1-23	.9584
Curriculum	
Items 24-30	.8932
Learners	
Items 31-44	.9278
Profession	
Items 45-61	.9464

Table 25

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Values for First-Year Teachers, Sections I-IV (n = 76)

Section	Coefficient Alpha Value
Teaching process	
Items 1-23	.8812
Curriculum	
Items 24-30	.8088
Learners	
Items 31-44	.8804
Profession	
Items 45-61	.8331

Research Questions

The responses of the respondents to the study were used to analyze the research question, "Is there a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers?" The research questions concerning the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model were also analyzed. An independent samples t-test was used to determine if statistically significant differences existed among the responses reported by student teachers and first-year teachers (see Table 26). Significant differences were found between the student teachers and first-year teachers for three of the criteria: teaching process, curriculum, and learners. No significant differences were found between the student teachers and first-year teachers for the criterion, profession, or for satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience.

Question 1a

Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the teaching process?

A significant difference existed between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the teaching process ($t(151) = 3.18$, $p < .002$).

Question 1b

Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the curriculum?

Table 26

Results of an Independent Samples t-test Used to Analyze Significant Differences Among Respondents on the Four Criteria of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Pooled Variance Estimate t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	Two-tail Probability
Teaching process						
Student teachers	77	99.8961	13.062	3.18	151	.002*
First-year teachers	76	94.1184	8.993			
Curriculum						
Student teachers	77	30.9091	4.231	2.86	151	.005*
First-year teachers	76	29.0789	3.658			
Learners						
Student teachers	77	60.7922	8.025	2.98	151	.003*
First-year teachers	76	57.2237	6.694			
Profession						
Student teachers	77	76.6753	9.927	1.58	151	.116
First-year teachers	76	74.5395	6.376			
Satisfaction						
Student teachers	77	9.2468	2.091	- .47	149	.642
First-year teachers	76	9.4595	3.385			

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

A significant difference existed between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the curriculum ($t(151) = 2.86$, $p < .005$).

Question 1c

Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers based on the learners?

A significant difference existed between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the learners ($t(151) = 2.98$, $p < .003$).

Question 1d

Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the profession?

No significant difference was found between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the profession ($t(151) = 1.58$, $p > .05$).

Question 1e

Is there a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience?

No significant difference was found between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience ($t(149) = -.47$, $p > .05$).

Summary

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of this study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession.

Descriptive data were provided in this chapter concerning the respondents' gender, age, grade level teaching assignments, and the type of school in which student teachers and first-year teachers taught. Descriptive data were also provided in this chapter for each of the 61 items in sections one through four of the survey instrument and for section five of the survey, which was designed to determine satisfaction with the student teaching and first-year teaching experiences.

In order to assess response bias of the student teachers and first-year teachers, an independent sample t-test was used to analyze the differences between the first and second waves of responses. No significant differences were found for student teachers and first-year teachers between the scores of the first wave responses and the second wave responses.

Internal consistency reliability for each of the four criteria of the study--teaching process, the learners, the curriculum, and the profession--

was computed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. All coefficient alpha levels for the student teachers and first-year teachers exceeded the .80 alpha level.

Significant differences were found between the student teachers and first-year teachers on three of the four criteria of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: the teaching process, the curriculum, and the learners. No significant difference was found for the criterion, the profession. There was no significant difference between the satisfaction of student teachers and first-year teachers based on the teaching experience.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subject of this study was teaching effectiveness as perceived by University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. For this study, teaching effectiveness was defined by four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the curriculum, (3) the learners, and (4) the profession. Student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions were also examined to determine if there was a significant difference in teacher satisfaction between the student teaching and first-year teaching experiences.

Leaders in schools and universities are most capable of understanding the educational needs of student teachers and first-year teachers and are best prepared to organize programs and educational experiences that will strengthen the teaching profession. Wood and Eicher (1989) noted that success in student teaching should be a predictor of future teaching success. Education is one of the few professions in which a beginner is expected to step in as a first-year teacher and manage the same responsibilities as a veteran (Sindelar, 1992). All educational organizations

must work together to maximize teaching effectiveness in a manner that consistently promotes success through growth and development of education's most critical human resource, the teacher.

Subjects

All UNL 1996 Spring semester student teachers and UNL graduates who were first-year teachers who were under contract with schools in Nebraska and teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education were surveyed for this study. Subjects included in this study provided a convenient sample, as all subjects were available to participate as members of a group and had the opportunity to choose to participate or not participate in the study.

Several influences concerning the identification of subjects for the study were further examined to determine if said influences could have had an effect on the results of the study. Student teachers and first-year teachers teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education were surveyed. Results of the study may have differed if student teachers and first-year teachers who were teaching in all disciplines were included as subjects in the study. The premise was postulated that the results of the study may have differed if subjects who were assigned to specialized disciplines, such as special education, industrial technology, music, agricultural education, and business education, were included as participants in the study.

Attempts were made to encourage all subjects to participate in the study. Results of the study may have differed had all eligible subjects participated in the study. Student teachers who were contacted and had not

completed the survey indicated that they were busy completing the student teaching experience and finalizing all graduation requirements in order to participate in spring commencement exercises. Student teachers who elected to not participate in the study may have had a less satisfying student teaching experience compared to those student teachers who voluntarily participated. However, no significant difference was found when conducting an analysis for response bias.

First-year teachers who were contacted and had not completed the survey reported various reasons for not responding. The most typical response was the high demand on the teachers' time at the end of the year. End-of-year tasks frequently mentioned included student assessments, requisition and budgeting for the following year, and completing inventories. First-year teachers who elected to not participate in the study may have had an unsatisfactory first-year experience and were reluctant to participate in the study. However, no significant difference was found when conducting an analysis for response bias. In addition, several first-year teachers who were personally contacted after they elected not to participate in the study were willing to complete the survey.

A higher rate of subject participation may have been accomplished if the survey had been administered at an earlier date. A combined total of 63 percent or 153 of 243 subjects completed the survey. Completion of the student teaching experience, graduation, and the required tasks at the end of the teaching year had an effect on the overall response rate to the survey. It is recommended that student teachers and first-year teachers be surveyed at a more timely date in future studies examining this population.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument was developed by the author with the collaboration of selected educators. When developing the survey instrument, constructs were incorporated from the UNL Student Teaching Progress Reports for Elementary and Secondary Student Teachers. Items were combined into a single instrument to allow elementary and secondary student teachers to respond to the identical survey. The survey instrument was field tested by two groups of student teachers and two groups of first-year teachers. Four graduate students were used for a peer review, and an expert panel was utilized to provide additional information with regard to the appropriateness of the survey items. Feedback was used to make modifications, refinements, and revisions to the instrument.

The Likert-scale survey was designed to include items in sections one through four in which the four criteria defined by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model were used: (1) teaching process (items 1-23), (2) the curriculum (items 24-30), (3) the learner (items 31-44), and (4) the profession (items 45-61). Section five of the survey was designed by the author to examine satisfaction with aspects of the student teaching and first-year teaching experiences. Section six was designed to gather demographic information about the participants.

The instrument was completed by participants and provided a means of collecting a large amount of valuable information in a short period of time. Participants' thoroughness in completing the survey was

due to ease of use, clarity and understanding of the items on the survey, and a willingness to provide meaningful responses.

The instrument could be used to further promote teaching effectiveness throughout the student teaching experience. Student teachers could be assessed early in the student teaching assignment. Cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and building principals could work together to analyze the results from the early assessments. The student teacher, in cooperation with supervisors and mentors, could develop appropriate prescriptions, strategies, and teaching experiences that would enhance the teaching effectiveness of the student teacher. The early identification of self-rated perceived deficiencies toward teaching effectiveness and collaborative efforts for improvement could lead to a more effective student teacher. Continued progress throughout the student teaching experience could be evaluated by using the instrument on multiple occasions. The use of the instrument could stimulate professional dialogue among all educational personnel associated with the student teacher.

The instrument should also be used to promote the improvement of teaching effectiveness for the first-year teacher. Since the full year teaching experience provides a much greater length of time compared to the student teaching experience, the instrument should be used periodically to assess the progress of the first-year teacher. The instrument could be used by principals and mentoring teachers to promote improvement toward teaching effectiveness, which would enhance the professional dialogue and support afforded the first-year teacher. Individual goals and strategies for

attainment could be developed and later assessed for progress toward refined teaching effectiveness.

When reviewing the results of this study, it is important to note the potential limitations of section two of the survey, the curriculum (items 24-30). The author questioned the degree that teaching effectiveness could be ascertained since the survey contained only seven questions concerning the curriculum. Additional specificity with respect to the design of curriculum items would increase the ability to use individual results to improve teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the ability to determine a significant difference between the self-rated perceptions of the student teachers and first-year teachers may have been limited due to the small number of items in this section.

The survey instrument was designed as a method to review the teaching effectiveness of student teachers and first-year teachers. The instrument was appropriate to answer the research questions of this study. Results from testing for internal consistency reliability, as reported in Chapter IV, suggested a good level of internal consistency for the instrument.

Data Collection

Surveys were mailed to the student teachers and first-year teachers; in addition, second and third mailings were sent to nonrespondents. The number of student teachers and first-year teachers who responded exceeded the recommended number of responses to produce a valid study. The largest available sample size, all UNL student teachers and first-year teachers who were identified as teaching in specified disciplines and under

contract with Nebraska schools, were used. More representative results of a population are achieved with larger samples. The entire groups were also selected because the researcher expected to find small differences between the responses of student teachers and first-year teachers.

Student teacher survey completion rates could be improved by stipulating that the survey be completed as part of a culminating activity for the student teaching experience and that the responsibility for supervising this task lie with the university supervisor. This would provide a mechanism to obtain valuable information from each student teacher, and the results could be examined by teacher education personnel.

First-year teacher response rates could be improved by involving the building principal in the administration of the survey. This would give the principal and first-year teacher the opportunity to incorporate the results into future goals, develop a professional dialogue for the improvement of teaching effectiveness, and provide an overall tool that could be used to promote continued growth for the teacher. Principals could forward results to university personnel in order to provide an ongoing review of teaching effectiveness as perceived by student teachers and first-year teachers.

Discussion of the Research

Implications from the Systems Theory Perspective

The theory that was used in this study was systems theory. In its simplest form, systems theory is derived by understanding what constitutes a system. A system is an entity made up of parts that perform a

function. Each part of a system contributes to the functioning of the entire system. Each individual part has a life expectancy, is dynamic, has inherent dimensions of predictability, is self-preserving, is logical, and relates to an external environment (Sybouts, 1992). Systems theory can be used to analyze success or failure within educational organizations. In this study, systems theory illustrated that major components of the entire system must contribute to the successful functioning of the student teacher and first-year teacher.

Many external or mediating variables influence teaching effectiveness. A significant difference was found in this study in three of the four criteria used to assess teaching effectiveness. Student teachers and first-year teachers reported various responses relevant to the assistance received from personnel involved with the student teaching and first-year teaching experience. Student teachers and first-year teachers additionally reported varying degrees of satisfaction with the assistance received from personnel involved with the student teaching and first-year teaching experience.

Many variables play important roles in the development of teaching effectiveness for student teachers and first-year teachers. Cooperating teachers, mentor teachers, university supervisors, principals, teacher preparation programs, teacher orientation programs, the attitudes, and desire for improvement all contribute as a system and affect the development of student teachers and first-year teachers. The interrelated constructs created and defined by the relationships among the variables can be used to explain and even predict teaching effectiveness. All parts of the

educational system must provide appropriate and meaningful experiences to allow student teachers and first-year teachers to function as effective teachers. Student teachers and first-year teachers may experience early success in their educational experiences; however, the implications of systems theory, in which all parts of the educational system are working together, will determine the overall success and effectiveness of the teacher throughout the professional teaching career.

Research Questions

The key research question of this study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers. Teaching effectiveness was defined by the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Model: (1) teaching process, (2) the learners, (3) the curriculum, and (4) the profession.

Research question 1a. The first sub-question of the study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the teaching process. A significant difference was found between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers on this criterion. Participants were asked to select one of five degrees of teaching effectiveness that ranged from (1) very ineffective, (2) moderately ineffective, (3) effective, (4) moderately effective and (5) very effective. The overall mean score for student teachers was 4.36 compared to a mean score of 4.10 for first-year teachers, which indicated that student teachers and first-year teachers were moderately effective with regard to the

teaching process. However, a review of responses concerning the teaching process provides a more in-depth view.

Results of the survey indicated differences in perception on several items regarding the teaching process. The perceptions of student teachers would suggest that they were moderately effective in their ability to present tasks at the pupils' instructional levels, while first-year teachers reported they were effective. This item represented the greatest difference in perceptions among all survey items concerning the teaching process. This difference suggests that more work is needed to develop teachers with the ability to present tasks at the pupils' instructional level. Student teachers' reported that they were moderately effective and first-year teachers reported they were effective in their ability to demonstrate instructional clarity, which was also true of the student teachers' and first-year teachers' ability to maximize academic learning time for students. Although student teachers and first-year teachers perceived that they were effective in providing meaningful closure, a notable difference in scores was reported. Student teachers reported that they were moderately effective, and first-year teachers were effective in demonstrating the ability to create and manage varied classroom organizational patterns.

First-year teachers reported higher mean scores on two items related to the teaching process. First-year teachers were moderately effective in their ability to sense and handle classroom management problems and deal with unexpected situations, while student teachers perceived their ability to be effective. First-year teachers reported a higher degree of effectiveness

compared to student teachers on the item concerning a high degree of student participation. First-year teachers were more at ease in the classroom and felt comfortable with active student participation without feeling as if they would lose control of the learning environment. This survey item received the highest mean score for first-year teachers. The highest mean score for student teachers was for the item concerning the ability to use personalized and specific praise.

The lowest mean score for student teachers and first-year teachers on the 61 items on the survey resulted from their responses to the item concerning the provision of meaningful closure. Although, both student teachers' and first-year teachers' scores fell in the effective range, more time and effort should be spent developing educators who provide meaningful closure to classroom experiences.

The mean difference between student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions of the teaching process was identical to the difference between student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions of the curriculum. This can be attributed to the complexity of the teaching process in addition to the length of the student teaching experience compared with a full year of teaching. The teacher who is understanding of the teaching process can engage in more activities to develop successful learning experiences relating to the curriculum.

The teaching process includes a multitude of skills and proficiencies that provide an opportunity for the teacher to be effective. Areas of emphasis in the teaching process include planning, classroom management,

teaching methods, and decision making. Teachers learn how to manage students and the learning environment effectively in order to create an optimum learning climate. Students learn to analyze information about content, learners, methodology, the school, and the profession in order to make rational and effective educational decisions. The student teachers' higher perceptions about their effectiveness in the teaching process can be attributed to the amount of support and influence they received from their respective cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

The length of time of the student teaching experiences places limitations on the opportunity to explore and develop, in-depth, the intricacies of the teaching process. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors work to guide, influence, and develop student teachers so as to allow them to achieve success in the classroom. The ability to attain the skills and proficiencies demonstrated and directed by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor may lead to perceived effectiveness. However, too much support and direct supervision may actually prevent the student teacher from developing individual talents and proficiencies. The student teacher's ability to understand and implement effective solutions relevant to the teaching process is enhanced when the student teacher is presented with a variety of classroom challenges throughout the student teaching experience.

Research question 1b. The second sub-question of the study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the curriculum. Participants were asked to select one of five degrees of

teaching effectiveness that ranged from (1) very ineffective, (2) moderately ineffective, (3) effective, (4) moderately effective, and (5) very effective. A significant difference was found between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers relating to items on the survey concerning the curriculum criterion. According to the overall mean scores of 4.42 for student teachers and 4.16 for first-year teachers, they were moderately effective with regard to the curriculum. Of the three criteria of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model in which a significant difference was determined, the mean score of 4.42 was the highest for the student teachers.

Results for student teachers and first year teachers indicated that they displayed interest and enthusiasm for the subject taught and rated themselves as moderately effective. This item on the survey (item 26) received the highest mean score for student teachers and first-year teachers. Although student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions indicated that they performed moderately effective with regard to the ability to understand and use knowledge and skills unique to the subject area (item 27), a noticeable difference in mean scores existed (student teachers = 4.40; first-year teachers = 4.08). The difference in the perceptions of the respondents could be due to the first-year teachers' increased awareness of the complexity of subject matter and the time required to demonstrate competence to effectively teach, develop, and assess the curriculum. The lowest mean score for student teachers and first-year teachers was for item 25, exhibit breadth and depth of subject-area knowledge.

The curriculum focuses on understanding the scope and sequence of curriculum in school and the appropriate application of the curriculum in a manner that impacts instruction and learner outcomes. A significant difference related to curriculum was found in this study. It is important that educators promote continued efforts in the understanding and application of curriculum in order to impact teaching and student learning.

Research question 1c. The third sub-question of this study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the learners. Participants were asked to select one of five degrees of teaching effectiveness that ranged from (1) very ineffective, (2) moderately ineffective, (3) effective, (4) moderately effective, and (5) very effective. A significant difference was found between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers on survey items relating to the learners. The overall mean scores of 4.34 for student teachers and 4.09 for first-year teachers indicated that student teachers and first-year teachers were moderately effective with respect to the learners.

Upon review of survey items, several concepts relevant to the learners warrant further discussion. Notable differences between student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions were found for item 36, avoid bias and/or favoritism toward individual students; item 43, provide for evaluation based on objectives and intentions; and item 42, use data to evaluate decisions about teaching. Although the student teachers' mean score of 3.84 and first-year teachers' mean score of 3.38 indicated both groups were effective, the difference in the mean scores was large when

compared to other items. This survey item had the lowest mean score for both student teachers and first-year teachers.

The perceptions of the student teachers and first-year teachers indicated that they were moderately effective with regard to item 38, understand and plan in order to meet the needs of all students, regardless of economic class, handicapping condition, national origin, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation. The highest mean score for student teachers and first-year teachers in the learner section of the survey was reported for item 38. These responses support the efforts and emphasis on the part of the university to improve students' ability to work successfully with equity issues in a multicultural society.

Learners refer to students and emphasizes developmental level and cognition, special needs and equity, assessment and evaluation. The growing diversity of the student population requires that student teachers and first-year teachers recognize and respond effectively to the special needs of individuals. The student teacher and first-year teacher must respond appropriately to the uniqueness of all students and the diversity of any school population. Student teachers and first-year teachers must develop effective instructional plans to meet the needs of the learner. The evaluation of learner progress and the ability to respond appropriately to learner progress must continue to be emphasized by student teachers and first-year teachers in order to teach effectively and meet learner needs.

Research question 1d. The fourth sub-question of the study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between UNL student teachers and first-year teachers' effectiveness based on the Scholar-

Practitioner Curriculum Model criterion, the profession. Participants were asked to select one of five degrees of teaching effectiveness that ranged from (1) very ineffective, (2) moderately ineffective, (3) effective, (4) moderately effective, and (5) very effective. No significant difference was found between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers with regard to items concerning the profession. The overall mean score for student teachers was 4.51 compared to 4.39 for first-year teachers, which indicated that student teachers and first-year teachers were moderately effective with respect to the profession.

Although no significant difference was found between the student teachers' and first-year teachers' mean scores, a review of several concepts is appropriate. The mean scores of first-year teachers were higher on four items related to the profession: item 47, demonstrate a commitment to teaching; item 55, communicate competently with parents; item 60, make ethical decisions regarding professional issues; and item 61, make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child. The more positive perceptions of effectiveness among first-year teachers could be attributed to the experience gained throughout the first year compared to the limited opportunity provided by the student teaching experience.

According to the student teachers' and first-year teachers' mean scores, student teachers and first-year teachers were moderately effective in applying technology (item 48). Recent changes in the requirements of UNL graduates with respect to technology have produced student teachers and first-year teachers who are confident and proficient with the ability to use technology.

Both the student teacher and first-year teacher groups received the highest mean score on item 47, demonstrate a commitment to teaching (4.75 and 4.79, respectively). Apparently, student teachers and first-year teachers had selected teaching as a profession and were willing to make the commitment to develop into outstanding educators.

The profession is a component of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model and places an emphasis on equity, technology, society, and ethics. Education students must be exposed to multicultural schools and classrooms and as professionals confront the uniqueness of schools and students in a successful manner. No significant difference was determined with respect to the profession, which demonstrates that both student teachers and first-year teachers were working diligently to become effective teachers, committed to the profession.

Research question 1e. The fifth sub-question of the study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference between UNL student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience. Participants were asked to select one of five degrees of satisfaction that ranged from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied. No significant difference was found between student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experiences.

Student teachers were the most satisfied with the assistance provided by the cooperating teacher, followed by the university supervisor and the building principal. The cooperating teacher was the main resource for the student teacher, which affirms the valuable assistance that can be provided

to allow the student teacher to maximize learning throughout the student teaching experience.

First-year teachers reported a high degree of satisfaction with building principal assistance and assistance provided by a mentor teacher. Although an overwhelming majority of the teacher orientation programs were designed by the district, first-year teachers were not enthusiastic about the assistance provided by a teacher orientation program.

Limitations

Generalizations beyond the population studied may be limited. The population of this study was confined to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln 1996 Spring semester student teachers and graduates who were first-year teachers during the 1995-96 contract year. Subjects were teaching in the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education. Results of this study may have varied if all disciplines of teaching were included.

The results associated with survey questions in section two of the survey, the curriculum, should be reviewed with caution, as there were only eight items in the section. It is suggested that additional items relating to the curriculum be added in future surveys to better reflect the intent of each survey item.

Implications For Education

The focus in this section is on the student teacher and first-year teacher in addition to components of the educational system in which meaningful induction experiences are planned and coordinated to enhance teaching effectiveness. Recommendations are offered that were derived from the results of this study and research.

University Supervisor

McIntyre (1984) reported on the criticism and problems associated with the performance of the university supervisor. A major concern was that the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor rarely spend much time together. University supervisors should meet with the cooperating teacher and student teacher on a regular basis throughout the student teaching experience. The university supervisor must provide time, energy, and professional expertise to help prepare the student teacher. In this study, the overall perceptions of student teachers were higher compared to the overall perceptions of first-year teachers. This suggests that the student teaching experience may provide an inaccurate picture about teaching. The university supervisor must work as a partner in the supervision of student teachers and provide leadership and direction to ensure the student teaching experience simulates the real world of teaching.

Cooperating Teacher

The fact that the major influence on the student teacher is the cooperating teacher was supported by this study. The cooperating teacher

must understand and appreciate the importance of the student teacher learning from experience. Experience is gained through active participation. Cooperating teachers should encourage student teachers to observe other classes. This promotes a better understanding of a variety of teaching strategies that are used by other teachers in the school and allows student teachers the opportunity to incorporate additional strategies into their teaching. Observations of other teachers should be accomplished in a timely manner in order to allow the student teacher to implement teaching strategies learned via observation.

The cooperating teacher must engage in reflective activities with regard to the student teacher's teaching, planning, and organizing. Quality feedback that is accurate and meaningful must be discussed in such a manner that a continued desire for the student teacher to improve is fostered. Specific, prescriptive plans should be written and reviewed in order to allow the student teacher the opportunity to improve teaching effectiveness. The student teacher should have input and ownership in the plan for improvement, understand the expectations, and be able to determine how performance will be measured. The cooperating teacher must provide honest and straightforward feedback with respect to the student teacher's teaching effectiveness.

Partington (1982) documented the importance of the quality of the cooperating teacher's supervision. Garland and Shippy (1991) and Abel, Ausel, Hawiller, and Sparapani (1988) developed programs to better prepare and enhance the skills and abilities of cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers should have organized training prior to serving as a

cooperating teacher. This training should be provided by the university and designed to maximize the ability of the cooperating teacher to work successfully with the student teacher and university supervisor. Cooperating teachers should not be assigned to supervise student teachers unless they have been properly trained. The lack of communication between cooperating teachers and student teachers has often been mentioned as the most frequent problem in student teaching. The cooperating teacher must assume leadership and promote communication to ensure the cooperation and coordination of those associated with the student teaching experience.

Student Teachers

Goals for the student teaching experience should be developed with the input of the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. The student teacher must ensure the goals are focused on the student teaching experience and not on the whims and wishes of the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor.

MacKinnon (1989) concluded that conformity is not an unknown aspect of student teaching. Student teachers sometimes feel pressured to conform to the ways of the cooperating teacher to gain a positive evaluation from the cooperating teacher. The purpose of the student teaching experience is the accomplishment of an experience that reinforces the transfer of learned theory into successful application. Although conformity may play a part in the student teaching experience, the student teaching experience should not merely produce a clone of the cooperating teacher.

In their study, Beynon, Geddis, and Onslow (1992) found that there is no one correct teaching strategy suitable for every teacher or pupil. Student teachers should learn to incorporate varied teaching strategies that are designed with respect to the needs of students. Schwartz (1995) advocated that interdisciplinary teams of student teachers be combined with interdisciplinary teams of experienced teachers and work as colleagues to meet the educational needs of students. The teaming approach, which has been strongly supported, encourages student teachers to develop and implement new and creative approaches to teaching and learning while under the direct supervision and support of experienced professionals. The cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and student teacher should include a goal for the student teaching experience that promotes the opportunity for teaming. Teaming will allow student teachers to gain a better understanding of the concept of collaboration and collegiality that is necessary to effectively educate students in schools.

The student teaching experience, in addition to teaching, creates new demands for time management skills: planning the next week's lesson, grading papers, conferencing with students and supervising personnel, reviewing and studying course content, and becoming familiar with school curriculum and policies. Student teachers learn that the actual teaching of students represents only a fraction of a teacher's assignment. Student teachers are often frustrated by other "things" that take up time during the school day: lunch count, fire drills, announcements over the intercom, copying, bus duty, playground supervision, hall monitoring, study hall supervision, communicating with colleagues, and phone calls to and from

parents. Student teachers must learn to balance the goals they have set for students with the demands of the setting. Student teachers must set realistic goals that are attainable within the time frame of the student teaching experience.

Principals

The building principal has traditionally played a limited role throughout the student teaching experience. Only fifty-six percent of the student teachers who participated in this study were evaluated by the building principal. The building principal must become a more integral part of the student teaching experience. Principals should treat student teachers like other certificated staff members in the school. Principals should work with the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and student teacher in an effort to maximize the student teaching experience and the learning opportunities for students. The principal should observe and evaluate the student teacher, thus providing the student teacher with the same feedback and opportunity for improvement as the regular teacher.

Thirteen percent of the first-year teachers in this study indicated that they did not receive assistance from the building principal. Principals must be held directly responsible for the successful induction and orientation of first-year teachers. The principal must establish and implement an organized, purposeful induction program to assist first-year teachers. Although approximately seventy percent of the first-year teachers reported that they were moderately to very satisfied with the assistance received from the building principal, there should not be a single case in which the building principal does not provide assistance to a first-year teacher. A

major focus and commitment of the principal must be to provide instructional supervision and leadership for all teachers. The principal must be held accountable.

First-Year Teachers

The mean score of the first-year teachers was lower compared to student teachers on 55 of the 61 effective teaching evaluation survey items. First-year teachers were more alert to classroom management problems and were competent in handling them and dealing with unexpected situations. First-year teachers also encouraged more student participation. The first-year teachers' higher mean scores on these items could be explained by the increased experience of first-year teachers and the increased confidence in their ability as a teacher.

Results of the study indicated that the perceptions of first-year teachers were higher compared to student teachers on four other items on the survey : demonstrate a commitment to teaching, communicate competently with parents, make ethical decisions regarding professional issues, and make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child. The experience base acquired through on-the-job training might explain why first-year teachers were more comfortable in these areas.

Sindelar (1992) suggested that education is one of the few professions in which a beginner is expected to step in and manage the same responsibilities as a veteran. Many times the first-year teacher secures a teaching contract by agreeing to accept extra-duty or coaching assignments that are available. The extra-duty assignments can detract from the first-year teacher's opportunity to concentrate on teaching and learning for

students. Extra-duty responsibilities should be assigned in a manner that provides the first-year teacher the opportunity to concentrate on becoming a more effective teacher. School administrators must restrain from over assigning the first-year teacher to extra-duties.

Survey results of first-year teachers indicated that 75 percent received assistance from a mentor teacher. Building administrators should assign a mentor teacher to work with all first-year teachers. Sixty-one percent of first-year teachers reported a moderate to high degree of satisfaction with the assistance they received. Kozisek (1988) reported that a conflict existed between what beginning teachers expected to happen and the reality of teaching. The mentor teacher should create individual and varied learning opportunities for the first-year teacher. The assistance should include guidance to complete the tasks required of all teachers and focus on quality instruction, classroom management, and continued support throughout the school year. It is further recommended that mentor teachers receive training and be evaluated for effectiveness, and mentor programs be designed with time allotted for mentors and first-year teachers to work and plan together. Jarmin and Mackiel (1993) suggested that mentors should initiate contact with first-year teachers at the start of the year and organize schedules to ensure time for mentor contact with the first-year teacher.

Sixty-five percent of the first-year teachers reported that they received assistance from teacher orientation programs. Only 26 of the first-year teachers percent reported a moderate to high degree of satisfaction with the assistance provided by the teacher orientation program

Teacher orientation programs should be required of all school districts. Schlechty and Whitford (1989) suggested that school officials recognize the need to develop human resources while assuring that the quality of education for children is not compromised. Sindelar (1992), Carter and Richardson (1989), Kozisek (1988), and Kueker and Haensly (1990) emphasized a well-developed and formalized plan for teacher orientation and induction should be implemented. The orientation program should be designed in order to support the unique characteristics of the first-year teacher and the school in addition to promoting a universal view of effective teaching in the district.

Teacher Preparation Programs

A significant difference was found between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers. Differences in teaching effectiveness were found for three criteria of the Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: the teaching process, the learners, and the curriculum. In all criteria in which a statistical difference was found, student teachers' self-rated perceptions were higher than first-year teachers'. This suggests that student teachers perhaps had an inaccurate picture of the teaching experience. A main responsibility of a teacher education program is to prepare student teachers to enter the world of work, prepared to meet the demands of the education profession. Teacher education programs should help student teachers understand that the student teaching experience is limited with respect to simulating the actual first-year teaching experience.

Student teachers reported greater satisfaction with the assistance provided by the cooperating teacher than with the university supervisor. Teacher education programs should make the university supervisor a more integral part of the student teaching experience. More observations, conferences, and meetings that allow the student teacher to have direct contact and interaction with the university supervisor could produce a student teacher who is better equipped to meet the demands of teaching. Teacher education programs should set up networking opportunities for student teachers to meet with teacher education personnel and discuss the student teaching experience. The sessions would not only provide a means of content specific training, but could also focus on the transition of theory into practice.

Teacher education programs should be retooled to include support for the first-year teacher. According to the results of this study, the university and teacher education officials were providing a quality experience for the student teacher. However, since the first-year teachers' self-rated perceptions of teaching effectiveness were lower than student teachers, they should be given additional support by teacher education programs and personnel. Teacher education programs should work cooperatively with school districts to provide a successful induction, orientation, and transition for first-year teachers into the teaching profession.

Nodie Oja (1990) advocated for appropriate and meaningful growth activities for all teachers, utilizing an appropriate understanding of developmental theory. If teacher education officials were to take the

leadership and initiative, first-year teachers, schools, and students would benefit. An increased understanding of the first-year teacher experience could additionally benefit teacher education programs, as teacher education preparation programs are modified to better prepare student teachers for the real world of teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness

The total mean scores of the student teachers' and first-year teachers' self-rated perceptions of teaching effectiveness were 4.41 and 4.19 respectively, on a five point scale. According to the self-rated perceptions of the student teachers and first-year teachers, their teaching effectiveness was moderately effective. Glickman (1990) noted that teacher development should include a variety of activities to support a teacher's personal and professional goals and that teaching effectiveness will evolve with appropriate developmental activities. The UNL Scholar Practitioner Curriculum Model, which is used in the preparation of teachers, is effective and provides a focus on the multitude of activities necessary for continued development of teachers. Teachers College officials at the University of Nebraska should work with first-year teachers and local schools to assist in the evaluation of first-year teachers. This cooperative venture could benefit the teacher and school and could promote continued development by providing appropriate and meaningful developmental activities for teachers.

According to the findings of this study, job entry reality shock could have existed, as a significant difference was found for three of the four criteria of the Scholar Practitioner Curriculum Model. First-year teachers'

perceptions toward teaching effectiveness were lower than student teachers'. Pigge and Marso (1992) found that an increase in field experiences along with teacher induction programs may decrease job entry reality shock. Local schools and teacher education programs should cooperate to produce field experiences for prospective teachers. Increased opportunities for learning and participating in developmental activities in the school setting will provide a more realistic picture of the demands of teaching and better prepare future educators to be effective teachers.

Implications for Further Research

Researchers should examine teaching effectiveness from many viewpoints. It would be of interest to determine whether there would be different results if the participants of the study would have included student teachers and first-year teachers from all disciplines in addition to the disciplines of English, social science, science, math, and elementary regular education. Researchers and school principals should consider use of the survey instrument developed for this study to evaluate teachers, plan appropriate staff development activities, and determine perceptions and improvement toward teaching effectiveness. The survey instrument should be considered for use with second, third, and fourth year teachers on a continued basis to determine changes in perceptions toward teaching effectiveness. Staff development activities could be developed specifically for individual teachers and would specifically address targeted criteria. The accuracy of perceptions of student teachers and first-year teachers could be examined by comparing the participants' ratings with the

perceptions of school principals, cooperating and mentor teachers, and university personnel. Are student teachers' and first-year teachers' perceptions accurate, too low, or inflated? Additional information could be obtained by conducting similar research, using specific variables such as teaching discipline, gender, elementary versus secondary placement, and private or public school assignments. The examination of teaching effectiveness should be continued in order to assist in the development of effective teachers.

Summary

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were significant differences between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln student teachers and first-year teachers who were graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. A significant difference in teaching effectiveness was found for three of the four criteria of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model: (1) teaching process(2) the learners, and (3) the curriculum. No significant difference was found for the fourth criteria, the profession. No significant difference was found between student teachers' and first-year teachers' satisfaction based on the student teaching and first-year teaching experience.

Leaders in schools and universities are most capable of understanding the educational needs of student teachers and first-year teachers and are best prepared to organize programs and educational experiences that will strengthen the teaching profession. All educational

organizations must coordinate, cooperate, and plan meaningful induction experiences that will enhance teaching effectiveness and develop successful teachers. Recommendations and strategies for improvement have been provided. Teaching effectiveness should remain a focal point for all educators, as the effectiveness of the teacher is directly related to learning for students.

Results of this study supported the use of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Scholar-Practitioner Curriculum Model. However, as first-year teachers' self-rated perceptions of teaching effectiveness were lower than the student teachers', additional support should be provided by the education programs at the UNL Teachers College. Upon completion of a program in Teachers College, graduates should reflect the critical attributes of a scholar-practitioner. The strength of the relationship between scholarship and practice enhances and supports the continuous development and growth of the professional educator as an effective teacher. Teacher education programs, working cooperatively with schools, could improve teaching effectiveness and decrease job entry reality shock.

Each part of the educational system must perform with a purpose that contributes to the successful functioning of the student teacher and first-year teacher. Personnel in the educational system must continue to find new ways to work together to create appropriate and meaningful experiences that allow student teachers and first-year teachers to function as effective teachers.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Abel, F. J., Ausel, D., Hawiller, J. G., & Sparapani, E. F. (1988). Enhancing the effectiveness of cooperating teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 10(4), 42-46.

Babbie, E. (1990). Survey research methods (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Berry, R. L. (1995). Dealing with an aggressive student. Teaching for Excellence, 13, 1-2.

Beynon, C., Geddis, A., & Onslow, B. (1992). Developing a teaching style: A dilemma for student teachers. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 38(4), 301-315.

Blank, M., & Heathington, B. S. (1987). The supervisory process: A consistent approach to help student teachers improve. Teacher Educator, 22(4), 2-14.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M.D. (1983). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brock, B. (1988). First-year teachers in Catholic Schools: A study and analysis of perceptions of undergraduate preparation, entry-level assistance, and problems, and development of a model of assistance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Carter, K., & Richardson, V. (1989). A curriculum for an initial-year-of-teaching program. The Elementary School Journal, 9(4), 415-417.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16(3), 297-334.

Deno, S., & Schelske, M. (1994). The effects of content-specific seminars on student teachers' effectiveness. Action in Teacher Education, 26 (1), 20-28.

Fields, G. (1988). A field-based approach to improving teacher supervisory skills. Action in Teacher Education, 10(1), 43-53.

Garland, C., & Shippy, V. (1991). Improving the student teaching context: A research-based program for cooperating teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 13(1), 37-41.

Gehrke, N. J. (1991). Seeing our way to better helping of beginning teachers. The Educational Forum, 55(3), 233-242.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jarmin, H .R., & Mackiel, D. S. (1993). Mentor perceptions of contact with beginning teachers. The Clearing House, 67(1), 45-48.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of educational research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kozisek, J. A. (1988). The effects of a planned induction program on first-year teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Kremer-Hayon, L. (1992). Interpersonal relationships of cooperating teachers' and student teachers' satisfaction with supervision. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27(1), 31-38.

Kueker, J., & Haensly, P. (1990). Developing induction year mentorships in a generic special education teacher training program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 738)

MacKinnon, J. (1989). Living with conformity in student teaching. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35(1), 2-19.

Marrou, J. (1989). The university supervisor: A new role in a changing workplace. Teacher Educator, 24(3), 13-19.

McIntyre, D. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 25(3), 42-45.

Nodie Oja, S. (1990). Developmental theories and the professional development of teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 351)

Pannell, S., & Morris, J. (1987). Parental opinions about student teachers. Teacher Educator, 23(2), 21-27.

Partington, J. (1982). Teachers in school as teaching practice supervisors. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(3), 262-274.

Pigge, F. L., & Marso, R. N. (1992). The nature of the differences between 1985 and 1990 first-year teachers' reports of job entry reality shock. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 743)

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (2), 28-34.

Schlecty, P. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1989). Systematic perspectives on beginning teacher programs. The Elementary School Journal, 89 (4), 441-449.

Schwartz, F. (1995). An education miracle? Teaming up makes a difference in teachers college's January experience. Education Week, 37.

Shapiro, P. P., & Sheehan, A. T. (1986). The supervision of student teachers: A new diagnostic tool. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (6), 35-39.

Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J. (1988). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sindelar, N. W. (1992). Development of a teacher mentorship program: High professionalism and low cost. ERS Spectrum, 10(2), 13-17.

Stolworthy, R. L. (1987). Teaching competencies demonstrated by student teachers and first year teachers: Tabular illustrations and a ranking of the mean values. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 846)

Sudzina, M. R., & Knowles, J. G. (1992). Personal characteristics and contextual conditions of student teachers who "fail": Setting a course for understanding failure in teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 354)

Sybouts, W. (1992). Planning in school administration: A handbook. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Walker, L., & Richardson, G. (1993). Changing perceptions of efficacy: From student teachers to first-year teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Wood, R., & Eicher, C. (1989). Self-perceived adequacy of student teachers ratings: Another look. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310 073)

Yates, J. (1982). Student teaching: Results of a recent survey. Educational Research, 24(3), 212-215.

Yates, J. (1983). Student teaching in England: Results of a recent survey. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(5), 44-46.

APPENDIX A

IRB Approval

University of Nebraska Lincoln

Research Compliance Services
Institutional Review Board
103 Whittier Bldg.
2255 'W' Street
P.O. Box 830849
Lincoln, NE 68583-0849
(402) 472-6965
FAX (402) 472-9323

April 9, 1996

Mr. Dan Ernst
13820 Newgate
Waverly NE 68462

Dear Mr. Ernst:

IRB # 96-03-286 EX

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Teaching Effectiveness: Perceptions from University of Nebraska-Lincoln Student Teachers and First-year Teachers

This project has been approved by the Unit Review Committee from your College and sent to the IRB for a number. According to the information provided, this project is exempt under 45 CFR 46:101B.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project.

Sincerely,

R. Gene White, Director
for the IRB committee

xc: Dr. Donald Helmuth
Unit Review Committee
Faculty Advisor

APPENDIX B

Student Teacher Cover Letters

April 18, 1996

First Name Last Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear First Name,

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL. **As a current UNL student teacher your participation is critical to the success of this study.** Your thoughts and efforts in this project will help to improve the likelihood for teaching success and a satisfying and rewarding career as a professional educator.

Anonymity will be ensured. The identification numbers assigned to all participants are known only to the researcher and will be used only for the purposes of follow-up reminders and providing a summary of results to respondents. Information will be pooled in reporting results, and responses will be destroyed at the conclusion of this study. The **10-15 minutes** you take in completing the survey is sincerely appreciated.

Your returned, completed survey will indicate consent to participating in the study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have any questions about your rights as a respondent to this survey, please contact the University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965 or to contact me at 402-786-2321 (day), 402-786-2133 (evenings), or by E-mail at dernst@esu6.esu6.K12.ne.us. First Name, it is our sincere hope that your student teaching experience met your expectations and best wishes to you in securing employment for the 1996-97 school year.

Please return the survey promptly by **May 3, 1996** in the postage paid return envelope provided.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst
Graduate Student
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Marilyn L. Grady, Ph.D.
Secondary Investigator
(402) 472-3726

May 3, 1996

First Name Last Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear First Name,

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL. **As a current UNL student teacher your participation is critical to the success of this study.** Your thoughts and efforts in this project will help to improve the likelihood for teaching success and a satisfying and rewarding career as a professional educator.

Anonymity will be ensured. The identification numbers assigned to all participants are known only to the researcher and will be used only for the purposes of follow-up reminders and providing a summary of results to respondents. Information will be pooled in reporting results, and responses will be destroyed at the conclusion of this study. The 10-15 minutes you take in completing the survey is sincerely appreciated.

Your returned, completed survey will indicate consent to participating in the study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have any questions about your rights as a respondent to this survey, please contact the University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965 or to contact me at 402-786-2321 (day), 402-786-2133 (evenings), or by E-mail at dernst@esu6.esu6.K12.ne.us. First Name, it is our sincere hope that your student teaching experience met your expectations and best wishes to you in securing employment for the 1996-97 school year.

Please return the survey promptly by **May 10, 1996** in the postage paid return envelope provided.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst
Graduate Student
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Marilyn L. Grady, Ph.D.
Secondary Investigator
(402) 472-3726

APPENDIX C

Student Teacher Survey

EFFECTIVE TEACHING EVALUATION

The purpose for conducting this study is to determine if there is a difference between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL.

Directions: This instrument is designed to provide you with the opportunity to evaluate your performance as a student teacher. Please rate your effectiveness on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating very ineffective and 5 indicating very effective.

Rating Scale:

1. Very ineffective
2. Moderately ineffective
3. Effective
4. Moderately effective
5. Very effective

I. The Teaching Process

As a student teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective<>very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
1. Plan activities to achieve learner objectives.	1 2 3 4 5
2. Write unit/daily plans that demonstrate an understanding of program goals and objectives.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Demonstrate an ability to select, plan, and organize activities appropriate for students' needs, interests, and abilities.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Organize content and use material in a manner consistent with needs and abilities of students.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Organize the classroom environment to facilitate learning.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Communicate and maintain standards for behavior and achievement in the classroom and school.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Maintain order through effective teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
8. Demonstrate the ability to create and manage varied classroom organizational patterns that are consistent with and supportive of varied learning situations.	1 2 3 4 5
9. Am quick to sense classroom management problems and competent in handling them; and dealing with unexpected situations.	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. Very ineffective
2. Moderately ineffective
3. Effective
4. Moderately effective
5. Very effective

As a student teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective <> very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
10. Present tasks at the pupils' instructional levels.	1 2 3 4 5
11. Demonstrate the ability to use research-based teaching techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
12. Focus students attention on the lesson through the use of various techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
13. Demonstrate instructional clarity.	1 2 3 4 5
14. Encourage a high degree of student participation.	1 2 3 4 5
15. Check for understanding and provide appropriate feedback.	1 2 3 4 5
16. Use personalized and specific praise.	1 2 3 4 5
17. Maximize academic learning time for students.	1 2 3 4 5
18. Provide meaningful closure.	1 2 3 4 5
19. Demonstrate appropriate poise and confidence.	1 2 3 4 5
20. Demonstrate appropriate non-verbal behavior.	1 2 3 4 5
21. Make appropriate decisions for teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
22. Consider students' needs, abilities, and interests when making instructional decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
23. Make appropriate decisions about the selection of content taught and the proportion of time devoted to the instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
II. The Curriculum	
24. Exhibit knowledge of content area(s).	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. Very ineffective
2. Moderately ineffective
3. Effective
4. Moderately effective
5. Very effective

As a student teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective <> very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
25. Exhibit breadth and depth of subject-area knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5
26. Display interest and enthusiasm for subject(s) taught.	1 2 3 4 5
27. Understand and use knowledge and skills unique to the subject area.	1 2 3 4 5
28. Follow the school curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
29. Demonstrate understanding of the curriculum in the subject areas.	1 2 3 4 5
30. Know and implement existing district and building curriculum policies.	1 2 3 4 5
III. The Learners	
31. Consider students' developmental level in teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
32. Exhibit an understanding of the developmental levels and characteristics of individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
33. Display an understanding of the needs, abilities, and interest of individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
34. Provide individualized instruction to meet students' special needs.	1 2 3 4 5
35. Promote a positive self-concept for all students	1 2 3 4 5
36. Avoid bias and/or favoritism toward individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
37. Treat all students equally with respect and concern.	1 2 3 4 5
38. Understand and plan in order to meet the needs of all students regardless of economic class, handicapping conditions, national origin, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. Very ineffective
2. Moderately ineffective
3. Effective
4. Moderately effective
5. Very effective

As a student teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective <> very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
39. Identify and diagnose learners' needs.	1 2 3 4 5
40. Establish appropriate procedures for assessing students.	1 2 3 4 5
41. Establish appropriate procedures for assessing the effectiveness of lessons.	1 2 3 4 5
42. Use data to evaluate decisions about teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
43. Provide for evaluation based on objectives/intentions.	1 2 3 4 5
44. Supply opportunities for each student to meet success regularly.	1 2 3 4 5
IV. The Profession	
45. Exhibit a receptive attitude toward critiques of professional performance and suggestions made for self-improvement.	1 2 3 4 5
46. Set and pursue specific goals for continued improvement.	1 2 3 4 5
47. Demonstrate a commitment to teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
48. Apply technology appropriately.	1 2 3 4 5
49. Demonstrate technological expertise commensurate with subject-area expectations.	1 2 3 4 5
50. Understand and use a variety of audio-visual resources.	1 2 3 4 5
51. Understand and plan for multi-cultural needs.	1 2 3 4 5
52. Assure a non-sexist climate.	1 2 3 4 5
53. Model professional behavior that promotes equity.	1 2 3 4 5

54. Communicate competently with parents. 1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. Very ineffective
2. Moderately ineffective
3. Effective
4. Moderately effective
5. Very effective

As a student teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective<>very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
55. Communicate competently with other professionals.	1 2 3 4 5
56. Work collaboratively with staff, individually and in groups.	1 2 3 4 5
57. Work collaboratively with parents and community members.	1 2 3 4 5
58. Participate in non-instructional teaching responsibilities.	1 2 3 4 5
59. Maintain confidentiality when appropriate.	1 2 3 4 5
60. Make ethical decisions regarding professional issues.	1 2 3 4 5
61. Make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child.	1 2 3 4 5

V. Student Teaching Satisfaction

Please answer the following questions and rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your student teaching experience:

	(Circle One)
1. Did you receive assistance from the cooperating teacher?	Yes No
If you received assistance, rate your satisfaction with the assistance provided by the cooperating teacher.	(Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied> 1 2 3 4 5
2. Did you receive assistance from the university supervisor?	(Circle One) Yes No
If you received assistance, rate your satisfaction with the assistance provided by the university supervisor.	(Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied> 1 2 3 4 5

3. Did you receive an evaluation from the building principal? (Circle One) Yes No

If you received an evaluation, rate your satisfaction with the assistance provided by the building principal. (Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied>

1 2 3 4 5

VI. Demographics

Statements 1 - 4 concern demographic information about you and your student teaching assignment. Please circle appropriate response(s).

1. Gender: a. Female b. Male

2. Age: a. 20-24 b. 25-29 c. 30-34 d. 35-39 e. 40-44 f. Over 44

3. Student Teaching Assignment: Circle all grades that apply

P K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. Type of School:

a. Public b. Private c. Parochial

Please return the survey by <u>Friday, May 3, 1996</u> in the self-addressed envelope to:

Dan E. Ernst
13820 Newgate
Waverly, NE 68462

Telephone:
Home: (402) 786-2133
Work: (402) 786-2321

APPENDIX D

Student Teacher Reminder Letter

May 10, 1996

Dear First Name,

This is a reminder to complete the survey mailed to you as a student teacher on teaching effectiveness. Your participation will allow the results to be more meaningful for UNL Teachers' College. First Name, I would like to reassure you that all responses will be treated confidentially. Your time and effort in completing the survey is greatly appreciated. Please return the survey by May 17, 1996. If you have misplaced your survey please call me at (402) 786-2133 (Home), or (402) 786-2321 (Work). I hope you have enjoyed a great year.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst

APPENDIX E

First-year Teacher Cover Letters

April 26, 1996

First Name Last Name
Address Line 1
Address Line 2
City, State Postal Code

Dear First Name,

The purpose for conducting this study is to determine if there is a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL. **As a graduate of UNL and a first-year teacher your participation is critical to the success of this study.** Your thoughts and efforts in completing this survey will help to improve teacher education training and the likelihood for future teaching success and rewarding careers as professional educators.

Anonymity will be ensured. The identification numbers assigned to all participants are known only to the researcher and will be used only for the purposes of follow-up reminders and providing a summary of results to respondents. Information will be pooled in reporting results, and responses will be destroyed at the conclusion of this study. The **10-15 minutes** you take in completing the survey is sincerely appreciated.

Your returned, completed survey will indicate consent to participating in the study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have any questions about your rights as a respondent to this survey, please contact the University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board at (402)472-6965 or contact me at 402-786-2321 (day), 402-786-2133 (evenings), or by E-mail at dernst@esu6.esu6.K12.ne.us. First Name, it is our sincere hope that your first-year teaching experience to date has been enjoyable and that you experience continued success in years to come.

Please return the survey promptly by **May 8, 1996** in the postage paid return envelope provided. If you would like a summary of the results, please check the line provided at the end of the survey.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst
Graduate Student
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Marilyn L. Grady, Ph.D.
Secondary Investigator

May 10, 1996

First Name Last Name
Address Line 1
Address Line 2
City, State Postal Code

Dear First Name,

The purpose for conducting this study is to determine if there is a significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL. **As a graduate of UNL and a first-year teacher your participation is critical to the success of this study.** Your thoughts and efforts in completing this survey will help to improve teacher education training and the likelihood for future teaching success and rewarding careers as professional educators.

Anonymity will be ensured. The identification numbers assigned to all participants are known only to the researcher and will be used only for the purposes of follow-up reminders and providing a summary of results to respondents. Information will be pooled in reporting results, and responses will be destroyed at the conclusion of this study. The **10-15 minutes** you take in completing the survey is sincerely appreciated.

Your returned, completed survey will indicate consent to participating in the study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have any questions about your rights as a respondent to this survey, please contact the University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board at (402)472-6965 or contact me at 402-786-2321 (day), 402-786-2133 (evenings), or by E-mail at dernst@esu6.esu6.K12.ne.us. First Name, it is our sincere hope that your first-year teaching experience to date has been enjoyable and that you experience continued success in years to come.

Please return the survey promptly by **May 17, 1996** in the postage paid return envelope provided. If you would like a summary of the results, please check the line provided at the end of the survey.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst
Graduate Student
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Marilyn L. Grady, Ph.D.
Secondary Investigator
(402) 472-3726

APPENDIX F

First-year Teacher Survey

EFFECTIVE TEACHING EVALUATION

The purpose for conducting this study is to determine if there is a difference between the teaching effectiveness of UNL student teachers and first-year teachers who are graduates of UNL.

Directions: This instrument is designed to provide you with the opportunity to evaluate your performance as a first-year teacher. Please rate your effectiveness on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating very ineffective and 5 indicating very effective.

Rating Scale:

1. **Very ineffective**
2. **Moderately ineffective**
3. **Effective**
4. **Moderately effective**
5. **Very effective**

I. The Teaching Process

As a first-year teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective <> very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
1. Plan activities to achieve learner objectives.	1 2 3 4 5
2. Write unit/daily plans that demonstrate an understanding of program goals and objectives.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Demonstrate an ability to select, plan, and organize activities appropriate for students' needs, interests, and abilities.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Organize content and use material in a manner consistent with needs and abilities of students.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Organize the classroom environment to facilitate learning.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Communicate and maintain standards for behavior and achievement in the classroom and school.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Maintain order through effective teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
8. Demonstrate the ability to create and manage varied classroom organizational patterns that are consistent with and supportive of varied learning situations.	1 2 3 4 5
9. Am quick to sense classroom management problems and competent in handling them; and dealing with unexpected situations.	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. **Very ineffective**
2. **Moderately ineffective**
3. **Effective**
4. **Moderately effective**
5. **Very effective**

As a first-year teacher, I:	(Circle One) < very ineffective <> very effective > 1 2 3 4 5
10. Present tasks at the pupils' instructional levels.	1 2 3 4 5
11. Demonstrate the ability to use research-based teaching techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
12. Focus students attention on the lesson through the use of various techniques.	1 2 3 4 5
13. Demonstrate instructional clarity.	1 2 3 4 5
14. Encourage a high degree of student participation.	1 2 3 4 5
15. Check for understanding and provide appropriate feedback.	1 2 3 4 5
16. Use personalized and specific praise.	1 2 3 4 5
17. Maximize academic learning time for students.	1 2 3 4 5
18. Provide meaningful closure.	1 2 3 4 5
19. Demonstrate appropriate poise and confidence.	1 2 3 4 5
20. Demonstrate appropriate non-verbal behavior.	1 2 3 4 5
21. Make appropriate decisions for teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
22. Consider students' needs, abilities, and interests when making instructional decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
23. Make appropriate decisions about the selection of content taught and the proportion of time devoted to the instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
II. The Curriculum	
24. Exhibit knowledge of content area(s).	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. **Very ineffective**
2. **Moderately ineffective**
3. **Effective**
4. **Moderately effective**
5. **Very effective**

	(Circle One) < very ineffective<>very effective >
As a first-year teacher, I:	**1 2 3 4 5**
25. Exhibit breadth and depth of subject-area knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5
26. Display interest and enthusiasm for subject(s) taught.	1 2 3 4 5
27. Understand and use knowledge and skills unique to the subject area.	1 2 3 4 5
28. Follow the school curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
29. Demonstrate understanding of the curriculum in the subject areas.	1 2 3 4 5
30. Know and implement existing district and building curriculum policies.	1 2 3 4 5
III. The Learners	
31. Consider students' developmental level in teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
32. Exhibit an understanding of the developmental levels and characteristics of individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
33. Display an understanding of the needs, abilities, and interest of individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
34. Provide individualized instruction to meet students' special needs.	1 2 3 4 5
35. Promote a positive self-concept for all students	1 2 3 4 5
36. Avoid bias and/or favoritism toward individual students.	1 2 3 4 5
37. Treat all students equally with respect and concern.	1 2 3 4 5
38. Understand and plan in order to meet the needs of all students regardless of economic class, handicapping conditions, national origin, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.	1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. **Very ineffective**
2. **Moderately ineffective**
3. **Effective**
4. **Moderately effective**
5. **Very effective**

	(Circle One) < very ineffective<>very effective >
As a first-year teacher, I:	1 2 3 4 5
39. Identify and diagnose learners' needs.	1 2 3 4 5
40. Establish appropriate procedures for assessing students.	1 2 3 4 5
41. Establish appropriate procedures for assessing the effectiveness of lessons.	1 2 3 4 5
42. Use data to evaluate decisions about teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
43. Provide for evaluation based on objectives/intentions.	1 2 3 4 5
44. Supply opportunities for each student to meet success regularly.	1 2 3 4 5
IV. The Profession	
45. Exhibit a receptive attitude toward critiques of professional performance and suggestions made for self-improvement.	1 2 3 4 5
46. Set and pursue specific goals for continued improvement.	1 2 3 4 5
47. Demonstrate a commitment to teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
48. Apply technology appropriately.	1 2 3 4 5
49. Demonstrate technological expertise commensurate with subject-area expectations.	1 2 3 4 5
50. Understand and use a variety of audio-visual resources.	1 2 3 4 5
51. Understand and plan for multi-cultural needs.	1 2 3 4 5
52. Assure a non-sexist climate.	1 2 3 4 5
53. Model professional behavior that promotes equity.	1 2 3 4 5

54. Communicate competently with parents. 1 2 3 4 5

Rating Scale:

1. **Very ineffective**
2. **Moderately ineffective**
3. **Effective**
4. **Moderately effective**
5. **Very effective**

	(Circle One) < very ineffective<>very effective >
As a first-year teacher, I:	1 2 3 4 5
55. Communicate competently with other professionals.	1 2 3 4 5
56. Work collaboratively with staff, individually and in groups.	1 2 3 4 5
57. Work collaboratively with parents and community members.	1 2 3 4 5
58. Participate in non-instructional teaching responsibilities.	1 2 3 4 5
59. Maintain confidentiality when appropriate.	1 2 3 4 5
60. Make ethical decisions regarding professional issues.	1 2 3 4 5
61. Make ethical decisions that foster the overall growth of the child.	1 2 3 4 5

V. First-Year Teaching Satisfaction

Please answer the following questions and rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your first-year teaching experience:

	(Circle One)
1. Did you receive assistance from the building principal?	Yes No
If you received assistance, rate your satisfaction with the assistance provided by the building principal.	(Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied> 1 2 3 4 5
2. Did you receive assistance from a mentor teacher?	(Circle One) Yes No
If you received assistance, rate your satisfaction with the assistance provided by the mentor teacher.	(Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied> 1 2 3 4 5

(Circle One)

3. Did you receive assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program? Yes No

If you received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program, was the program designed by your school district? (Circle One) Yes No

If you received assistance from a first-year teacher orientation program, rate your satisfaction with the first-year teacher orientation program. (Circle One) < very dissatisfied<>very satisfied>

1 2 3 4 5

VI. Demographics

Statements 1 - 4 concern demographic information about you and your first-year teaching assignment. Please circle appropriate response(s).

1. Gender: a. Female b. Male

2. Age: a. 20-24 b. 25-29 c. 30-34 d. 35-39 e. 40-44 f. Over 44

3. Teaching Assignment: Circle all grades that apply

P K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. Type of School:

a. Public b. Private c. Parochial

Please return the survey by Monday, May 6, 1996 in the self-addressed envelope to:

Researcher: Dan E. Ernst
13820 Newgate
Waverly, NE 68462

Telephone:
Home: (402) 786-2133
Work: (402) 786-2321

*** Please check if you would like a summary of these results. _____

APPENDIX G

First-year Teacher Reminder Letter

May 17, 1996

Dear First Name,

This is a reminder to complete the survey mailed to you as a first-year teacher on teaching effectiveness. Your participation will allow the results to be more meaningful for UNL Teachers' College. First Name, I would like to reassure you that all responses will be treated confidentially. Your time and effort in completing the survey is greatly appreciated. If you have misplaced your survey please call me at (402) 786-2133 (Home), or (402) 786-2321 (Work). I hope you have enjoyed a great year.

Sincerely,

Dan E. Ernst