

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8328451

Babcock, Treva Mae

**THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF REALITY THERAPY ON THE
STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE: A CASE STUDY APPROACH**

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

PH.D. 1983

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF REALITY THERAPY
ON THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
A CASE STUDY APPROACH

by

Treva Mae Babcock

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1983

Approved by

Barbara Clawson
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor

Barbara. [unclear]

Committee Members

[unclear]

Marshall [unclear]

[unclear]

April 27, 1983

Date of Acceptance by Committee

April 27, 1983

Date of Final Oral Examination

BABCOCK, TREVA MAE. The Application of the Principles of Reality Therapy on the Student Teaching Experience: A Case Study Approach. (1983)
Directed by: Dr. Barbara Clawson. Pp. 243

The major objective in this research was to examine, through naturalistic inquiry, the implications of the teaching of the principles of reality therapy to student teachers. Aspects of the student teaching experience that were examined more closely included each student teacher's lesson preparation (including presentation) and classroom control.

The subjects were four female seniors who completed their student teaching under the direction of the Department of Consumer Economics at Idaho State University during the Fall 1982. Observation and instrumentation were incorporated into the normal structure of the student teaching experience. The subjects were required to attend a weekly two-hour seminar during their student teaching. The principles of reality therapy were taught and modeled by the university supervisor.

The principles were modeled by commending the student teachers, by not accepting excuses from the student teachers, by allowing the student teachers to make their own value judgments, by not interfering in the teaching process, and by putting the emphasis on present behaviors rather than on feelings. Data were collected from the student teachers, students, cooperating teachers, an outside observer, and the university supervisor. Instruments utilized included the Rotter Internal-External Scale, The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orien-

tation Behavior scale, Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction, Classroom Competencies Checklist, Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern-Form B, and Class Environment.

All the subjects indicated that their experiences were positive. All stated that they would employ the principles of reality therapy in future teaching. The evaluations from the various sources were generally congruent. The student teachers who were more successful in applying the principles of reality therapy had fewer discipline problems and felt more in control of situations. Two of the subjects showed a several-point movement toward a more internal locus of control perception, as measured in the pre- and posttesting

The application of the principles of reality therapy is a complex process which is not easily learned in a few weeks. Positive supervisory practices do impact on the student teaching experience. Reality therapy offers a potential model for student teaching supervision.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her deepest appreciation to her dissertation advisor and chairman of her committee, Dr. Barbara Clawson, for her guidance and encouragement throughout this project. Appreciation is also extended to committee members, Dr. Roland Nelson, Professor of Educational Administration; Dr. Richard Weller, Associate Professor of Curriculum; and Dr. Mary Morgan, Assistant Professor of Home Economics Education, for their cooperation and helpful suggestions.

A special word of thanks is given to Emma M. Gebo, Chairman of the Department of Consumer Economics at Idaho State University, for allowing the student teachers to participate in the study. In addition, the author extends sincere appreciation to her husband, Jerome, for his continuing support and encouragement throughout graduate studies. The author's two sons, Douglas and Michael, also deserve a word of gratitude for their patience and assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Purpose	8
Definitions of Terms	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Educational Supervision	10
Supervision of Student Teachers	12
Classroom Environment	19
Reality Therapy	23
Summary	33
III. METHODOLOGY	35
Subjects	35
Design	35
Application	36
Procedure	36
Instrumentation	41
Reliability and Validity of Instruments	42
Analysis of Data	49
Summary	50
IV. FOUR CASE STUDIES	51
Introduction	51
Case I	54
Case II	77
Case III	100
Case IV	125
Chapter Summary and Discussion	145
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	156
Summary	156
Methodology	157

	Page
CHAPTER	
Results	159
Recommendations	161
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	162
APPENDIX A. LETTER TO COOPERATING TEACHERS	166
APPENDIX B. INSTRUMENTS USED IN STUDY.	168
APPENDIX C. CASE ONE RESPONSES	189
APPENDIX D. CASE TWO RESPONSES	200
APPENDIX E. CASE THREE RESPONSES	212
APPENDIX F. CASE FOUR RESPONSES.	226
APPENDIX G. COMBINED RESPONSES	239

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Ninth Week Ratings by Subjects, Cooperating Teachers, and University Supervisor	147
Table 2	Subjects' Responses to Open-Ended Questions Concerning Reality Therapy	154
Table A	Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	190
Table B	Subgroups of Classroom Environment	192
Table C	Classroom Environment	193
Table D	Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	201
Table E	Subgroups of Classroom Environment	203
Table F	Classroom Environment	204
Table G.	Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	213
Table H	Subgroups of Classroom Environment	215
Table I	Classroom Environment	216
Table J	Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	227
Table K	Subgroups of Classroom Environment	229
Table L	Classroom Environment	230
Table M	Mean Scores of Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	240
Table N	Mean Scores of Classroom Environment	241
Table O	Percentages of Items in Which 90 Percent or More of the Students Answered in the Affirmative . .	243
Table P	Attitudinal Instruments Completed by Students .	243

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The preparation of teachers is a complex process culminating in the student teaching experience in which the neophyte teacher has an opportunity to practice the art. For a great number, the experience is negative. Previous studies have indicated that "student teachers become more authoritarian, rigid, impersonal, restrictive, arbitrary, bureaucratic, and custodial by the end of their student teaching experience" (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980, p. 31). Some student teachers become disillusioned with the teaching profession and do not continue in the field. Like many experienced teachers, student teachers often feel overwhelmed. They often perceive their problems as insurmountable and their supervisors as insensitive.

Bowman (1979) indicated that many university supervisors of student teachers are ineffective. He stated that, "since according to some evidence, the supervisor doesn't have a significant role in the development of student teachers, the most sensible plan would be to stop supervising" (p. 30). Others would not recommend such drastic measures, but would instead suggest a reevaluation and reform of supervisory practices (Zimpher, DeVoss, & Notts, 1980).

Given the evidence, reevaluation and reform in the supervision of student teachers seem to be needed. "The long

and somewhat dreary history of student teaching research has too often been content to identify 'the problem' (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980, p. 38). It is not enough just to identify problems; innovative methods for supervising student teachers need to be tested with the goal of helping the total experience to be positive, thus effecting better in-class instruction.

Student teachers face the same problems as teachers, except that the problems for many student teachers are intensified because of time constraints and a lack of prior experience in the classroom. Two of the most common areas of concern for teachers are discipline (classroom control) and curriculum (lesson preparation) (Alschuler, 1980; Curwin & Mandler, 1980). To ameliorate these concerns, there is a need to focus on processes that will provide solutions.

In the early 1960s, Glasser (1960, 1965) developed the counseling approach "reality therapy" (RT). Although his book Schools Without Failure (1969) was written with the elementary school in mind, the principles of RT that it presents are universal, and thus adaptable to any level. Reality therapy was viewed by the present researcher as an innovative approach to student teaching supervision. Personal responsibility is one of the key concepts in Glasser's writings. Self-worth, according to Glasser, is attained by the acceptance of responsibility. Through accepting responsibility for one's actions, one becomes "in control" of sit-

uations rather than feeling overwhelmed by circumstances.

A measure of the amount of control that one perceives can be obtained by administering a locus of control instrument such as the Adult Form of the Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Scale (Rotter, 1966). The locus of control construct is closely related to Glasser's idea of responsibility. Lefcourt (1976) indicated that the perception that people possess concerning the amount of control they have over their fates is of great importance to the manner in which they cope with the stresses and challenges of living.

Reality therapy offers a positive approach to living through the acceptance of personal responsibility. Other concepts in RT include an emphasis on present behaviors rather than feelings and an emphasis on planning. Glasser (1969) also presented a 10-step approach to classroom discipline. The teaching of the principles of RT to student teachers would appear to offer help in the areas of lesson preparation and classroom management because RT is positive and specific in application.

The multiplicity of interactions in both the student teaching experience and its supervision complicate research efforts. The preferred method of educational research and evaluation has been the "experimental design" with its perceived strength of predicting causal relationships. However, there has been a strong interest among leading evaluation theorists in moving from the traditional paradigms to those

that are less contrived and manipulative (Guba, 1978; Mears, Ley, & Ray, 1981; Stake, 1978). "One alternative to conventional evaluation methodology is that of naturalistic inquiry, an approach which has considerable promise for social and behavioral inquiry generally and for evaluation particularly. Although naturalistic inquiry is not a new method, having its roots in ethnography and phenomenology, it has typically been eschewed as a legitimate method because of its 'softness'" (Guba, 1978, p. 1).

Wolf and Tymitz (1977) do not agree with the view that naturalistic inquiry (NI) is "soft":

Natural inquiry is no less rigorous than traditional experimental research, it is simply different. The paradigms of natural inquiry is comprehensive in scope, demanding in design, and requires a set of honorable skills that even some rigid experimentalists lack (although they may be embarrassed to admit it). (p. 7)

Natural inquiry differs from the conventional approach "by its relative position along two dimensions: (a) the degree of manipulation of conditions antecedent to the inquiry, and (b) the degree of constraints imposed on outputs by subjects involved in the inquiry" (Guba, 1978, p. 3). Differences also exist concerning basic assumptions. Naturalistic inquiry is conducted in the natural setting with as few constraints as possible. The aim is to catch a glimpse of actual, rather than contrived, phenomena. Wolf and Tymitz (1976-77) referred to this reality focus as "slice of life" episodes. Brandt (1972) indicated that naturalistic field studies have an advantage over other research types because

NI is relevant, heuristic, and very realistic.

To contrast, and thus further explain NI, Guba (1978) presented the following 14 ways in which conventional and natural inquiry differ:

<u>Points of Comparison</u>	<u>Conventional Inquiry</u>	<u>NI</u>
Philosophical base	Logical positivism	Phenomenology
Inquiry paradigm	Experimental physics	Ethnography; investigative journalism
Purpose	Verification	Discovery
Stance	Reductionist	Expansionist
Framework/design	Preordinate/fixed	Emergent/variable
Style	Intervention	Selection
Reality manifold	Singular	Multiple
Value structure	Singular	Pluralistic
Setting	Laboratory	Nature
Context	Unrelated	Relevant
Conditions	Controlled	Invited inter- ference
Treatment	Stable	Variable
Scope	Molecular	Molar
Methods	Objective--in sense of inter-subjective agreement	Objective--in sense of fac- tual/confirmable (p. 18).

Although the basic stance of NI is expansionist, the methodology does include a reductionist mode. The conceptualization of NI is that of a "wave" expanding (discovery mode) and contracting (verification mode) as the inquiry pro-

gresses, or as findings suggest further areas of study.

The case study method (one naturalistic mode for presenting data) is viewed by Stake (1978) as the preferred method for conducting behavioral research because case studies "may be epistemologically in harmony with the reader's own experience and thus to that person a natural basis for generalization" (p. 5). He maintained that case studies are an important source of better understanding of present social problems for the lay person as well as the disciplined specialist because everyone arrives at understandings through personal and vicarious experiences. Thus, the case study provides an excellent vehicle to help expand peoples' understandings. Antipositivists think that human understandings are best attained when one speaks "not of underlying attributes, objective observables, and universal forces, but of perceptions and understandings that come from immersion in and holistic regard for the phenomena" (Stake, 1978, p. 6).

The case study approach is well suited to research that has as its purpose a better understanding and extension of human experience. The style of presenting a case study is informal, even narrative, making it more "down-to-earth" (Stake, 1978). "At the present time, however, behavioral science is sadly lacking in knowledge about the ordinary behavior of people in real-life settings" (Brandt, 1972, p. 3). The student teaching experience provides a real-life educational phenomenon that, because of the complexity of the

human interactions, lends itself well to NI.

In summary, the culmination of teacher education is for many students a disappointing and frustrating period. Many university supervisors seem to lack the ability to positively impact the student teaching experience. The student teaching practicum seems to pose a paradox in that it provides needed "on-site" preservice experience, yet it seems dysfunctional in the overall preparation of teachers. Glasser's (1960, 1965) RT, with its emphasis on personal responsibility, offers an innovative approach to student teaching supervision.

Past educational research, with its propensity toward the use of the experimental paradigm, has generated little data concerning the realities of teacher education in general and the student teaching experience in particular. Brandt (1972) indicated that the behavioral sciences are lacking in a body of knowledge about "the ordinary behavior of people in real-life settings" (p. 3).

In the past few years there has been a strong movement toward NI, because it offers a "slice of life" view of complex phenomena. The main characteristics of NI are a lack of prior constraints and a lack of constraints placed on the research outputs. The student teaching experience provides a real-life setting which, because of its complexity, is ideally suited to NI.

Statement of Purpose

The major purpose in the present research was to examine, through NI, the implications of the teaching of the principles of RT to four female student teachers. The focus of the study was to gather and synthesize data from the student teachers, students, cooperating teachers, an outside observer, and the university supervisor. Aspects of the student teaching experience that were examined more closely included the student teacher's lesson preparation (including presentation) and classroom control.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be utilized in the present study:

Student teaching, senior practicum, associate teaching. The culminating experience of teacher experience. The student is given major responsibilities to assume, and develops his/her own thinking style. This teaching experience is pursued in the context of a real school situation and is directed by qualified personnel (Idaho State University, Student Teachers' Handbook, 1977).

Student teacher, associate teacher. The educator trainee who is in his/her final year of preparation and is involved in the senior practicum.

Cooperating teacher, supervising teacher. The classroom teacher who is chosen to supervise the student teacher.

University supervisor. The person employed by the uni-

versity to supervise the student teacher.

Reality therapy (RT). A method of counseling developed by Glasser (1960) which emphasizes personal responsibility. The basic premises are that humans need to give and receive love and that humans need to feel worthwhile.

Classroom environment. Unless specified in the text, the term means the psychological climate, rather than the physical surroundings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The general guiding objective in the present research was to examine through NI the implications of the teaching of the principles of RT to a selected group of student teachers. Literature reviewed in this chapter will focus on educational supervision, supervision of student teachers, and reality therapy.

Educational Supervision

To understand better the role of a supervisor of student teachers, it is necessary to first examine the general role of supervisors in education. At the present time the supervisory role in education is ambiguous and idiosyncratic. Historically, the functions of supervisors have been linked with administration (Gwynn, 1961). Supervision, in embryonic form, began as early as 1800 in American schools when school-board members visited schools to examine the educational process. Their main concern was to ensure that the "three Rs" were being taught effectively. This early approach toward supervision was predominantly authoritarian and punitive in nature (Neagley & Evans, 1980).

The concept of supervision evolved from the early inspection model to an emphasis on teacher improvement to effect better classroom instruction (Gwynn, 1961; Neagley & Evans, 1980; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979). By the 1920s

the three main supervisory functions (in priority) were viewed as the improvement of instruction, the rating of teachers, and the planning of curricula. A fourth major function, guidance, was added to the supervisory functions in 1930 (Gwynn, 1961).

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) stated that current supervisory methods are based on one, or a combination of three, general theories of supervision: traditional scientific management, human relations, and neoscientific management.

Traditional scientific management represents the classical autocratic philosophy of supervision in which teachers are viewed as appendages of management and as such are hired to carry out prespecified duties in accordance with the wishes of management. Control, accountability, and efficiency are emphasized in an atmosphere of clear-cut boss-subordinate relationships. (p. 3)

The human relations model of supervision developed in the 1930s from the democratic leadership movement (Gwynn, 1963; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979). "Participation," "personal feelings," and "comfortable relationships" were the buzz words of human relations (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979).

The neoscientific management model was largely a reactionary movement which directed its emphases away from those of the human relations model. The passwords of this movement include "teacher competencies," "performance objectives," and "cost-benefit analysis." "Neoscientific management relies heavily on externally imposed authority . . ." (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979, p. 5).

Other approaches to supervision currently being advocated include clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Kajewski, 1980), human resources (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979), and ego counseling (Mosher & Purpel, 1971). The praxis of the direct educational supervision models seem to fall into three categories: training modes which emphasize the development of techniques and skills, educating modes which emphasize the development of perspective and understanding (i.e. "mission"), and counseling modes which emphasize the development of the teacher's awareness, authenticity, and adjustment. The unifying factor in educational supervision, no matter how diverse the theoretical base and practice, is the idea that supervision should effect better classroom instruction (Gwynn, 1961; Goldhammer et al., 1980; Cogan, 1973; and Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979).

Supervision of Student Teachers

Zimpher et al. (1980) challenged Bowman's (1979) contention that supervision of student teachers by college personnel be abolished. They viewed the supervisory role as necessary as well as complex. An abundance of descriptive data about the essence of student teaching was available, but little documentation concerning the actual happenings and interactions among the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor, was found.

To help fill this void, the researchers (Zimpher et al., 1980) developed a longitudinal study to determine the

effectiveness of teacher education programs. The study consisted of the description of selected experiences of three student teachers, three cooperating teachers, and one university supervisor. Two observers who were not directly involved in the student teaching experience also gathered field data. Data were collected utilizing the following methods:

- a) taped interviews by the observers of each student teacher . . . ;
- b) taped interviews with the university supervisors on a regular basis;
- c) recordings of each conference held among any of the three parties;
- d) records of classroom observations of each student teacher by the university supervisor and observers; and
- e) additional written documentation of the student teaching experience (p. 13).

The findings concerning the formal supervisory role indicated that one of the primary functions of the supervisor was to delineate the university goals and expectations that needed to be accomplished by both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Another supervisory function was that of moving the student teacher into the classroom in phases, taking care not to transfer too much responsibility too quickly. A third supervisory function identified in the study was that of evaluation and the offering of constructive criticism. An extra-formal supervisory activity identified was that of being a personal confidante to both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.

Zimpher et al. (1980) concluded that "university supervisors appear to do more in their role than the topics of research reports would indicate. They must survive in many worlds and be many things to many different persons" (p. 14). The role of supervision, therefore, "constitutes the totality of the supervisor's presence in the student teaching experience" (p. 15).

Recent research has endeavored to find a theoretical framework from which to establish better practices in the supervision of student teachers. A consensus among developmental theorists seems to indicate that teachers who are operating at higher and thus more complex developmental levels are more effective than their peers who are at lower stages in managing classrooms. Based on that assumption, Glassberg and Sprinthall (1980) conducted a study utilizing an experimental curriculum based on a developmental approach toward supervision.

The sample consisted of undergraduate students at a large public institution who were involved in student teaching. The following three groups were available: Fall, N = 8; Fall, N = 7; and Winter, N = 15. The subjects were randomly assigned to two experimental and one control group. The independent variable (the experimental curriculum) was developmental in nature. All three groups attended weekly supervision seminars; however, the control group subjects attended the regular seminar, while the experimental groups

attended the developmental seminar.

The developmental seminar was innovative in that it was based on structured role-taking experiences. Student teachers were given time to hear other students' perspectives, as well as time to reflect and process their own experiences. "The findings clearly support the contention that a developmentally based supervision seminar for student teachers has a positive psychological impact" (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980, p. 37). The experimental group was given considerable instruction to help them analyze their own teaching as well as their peers' teaching.

The key element was the use of highly structured discrete supervision skills for video analysis. Each participant used a single dimension, such as counting positively reinforcing statements, eye contact, open-ended questions, and accuracy in responding to feelings. This provided focused feedback in which the objectives were clear and the teaching behaviors specific. (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980, p. 36).

Some of the results indicated that those in the experimental group became less dependent on outside forces. This change was "accompanied by a concomitant increase in self-direction, independence, and autonomy" (p. 37). The researchers concluded that the findings supported the idea that a developmentally-based supervision seminar would have a positive psychological impact on student teachers.

To enhance the supervision of student teachers, Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) advocated the restructuring of student teaching programs by placing the program under the direction

of an education sociologist and/or anthropologist who had had specific training in the participant/observer methodology as well as experience in the public schools. The student teachers would be required to take a preparatory course in the theory and methodology of the participant/observer approach. The student teacher would also be required to attend a seminar at which they would be given assistance in data collection and interpretation. Another dimension of this proposed program would require the student teacher to develop an empirical study of the community. The anticipated outcomes of the implementation of the described program would include a greater awareness of personal and external assumptions and expectations, and a greater appreciation for the complexities of teaching.

According to Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) "the largest unvalidated segment of professional education programs is the student teaching area" (p. 28). The main function of the student teaching experience at the present time seems to be that of socialization into the school's bureaucratic structure. They suggested that research and evaluation should be centered on what is taking place in teacher education, as well as the testing of innovative programs that are necessary to restructure the total teacher education programs. Their response to the problem was the presentation of their sociological model as described above.

The socialization into the school's bureaucracy was also noted by Hoy and Rees (1977). They conducted a study to explore the influences of the student teaching experience on the student teacher in the areas of dogmatism, pupil control orientation, and the bureaucratic orientation. Their findings indicated that although basic belief structures were not altered, secondary student teachers became more bureaucracy-oriented and rigid after the student teaching experience. They became more conforming, impersonal, and traditional. The researchers concluded that teacher education programs may be counterproductive if they emphasize idealistic orientations concerning public school programs without providing prospective teachers with the necessary tools to implement that idealism.

Gitlin (1981) offered yet another approach to student teaching supervision called horizontal evaluation -- an approach that focuses on student teacher growth as the product of evaluation. "Growth" is defined as the student teacher's development, "(1) in reflecting on what he or she thinks should be important to teach, (2) in analyzing the relationship between his or her goals or intents and what happens in practice, and (3) in rethinking and modifying goals as he or she gains educational experience and understandings" (p. 47). The construct is viewed as horizontal, reflecting individual progression, rather than vertical ranking from best to worst.

During the past 10 years, approaches taken by student teacher supervisors have been classified as directive or nondirective. The supervisor using the directive approach tries to influence the teacher through the direct offering of opinions and suggestions. The objective of this method is to provide immediate help in problem-solving. The non-directive supervisor, in contrast, asks questions to help the teacher arrive at solutions, reflects feelings, and gives suggestions only when asked (Copeland, 1982).

The literature seemed to present the assumption that all student teachers would prefer that their supervisor take a nondirective approach. However, a study by Copeland (1982) indicated that there is great variation in the supervision style that student teachers prefer. The study sample consisted of 60 elementary student teachers. The subject pool was randomly halved. Two levels of independent variables were established: time of measurement (one month into the student teaching experience and again seven months later), and the type of supervisory approach (directive or non-directive).

The results indicated that there was great variation in the preferred style. There did seem to be a relationship among the amount of time spent in the program, the amount of experience, and the preferred supervisory style. There was "a progression from a mean preference for the directive approach in the fall to one for the non-directive approach

in the spring" (p. 35).

Classroom Environment

The term "classroom environment" elicits a number of differing definitions, ranging from discussions of the physical surroundings (furnishings, arrangements, heat, light, ventilation) to the more intangible psychological environment. For purposes of the present review, the term "classroom environment" refers to the latter concept. The psychological

The psychological environment is sometimes referred to as "the climate," which includes the feelings, attitudes, and enthusiasm of both teachers and students. A key concept in producing a climate that is conducive to learning is discipline, which is perceived by Fleck (1974) as self-control rather than externally imposed punishment.

Martin and Quilling (1981) listed four definitions of discipline:

- Discipline equals control.
- Discipline equals self-reliance and responsibility.
- Discipline equals effective learning.
- Discipline equals punishment. (p. 1)

According to Martin and Quilling, there are four disciplinary models in current use.

1. Environmental Management Model that emphasizes strategies which facilitate the development of a directed learning environment.
2. Behavioral Analysis Model that diagnoses a problem and then uses specific strategies to bring about changed behaviors.
3. Humanistic Potential Model that stresses the feelings and values of others in order to promote growth

and encourage self-development.

4. Social Interaction Model that strives to assist individuals to develop competencies which enable them to function in the larger society. (pp. 2-14)

Effective discipline does not just happen. It is necessary that one be cognizant that "effective discipline is an art as well as a science." As a science, it requires analysis and the realization that no one model will solve all the disciplinary problems in the classroom environment. As an art, effective discipline requires that one behave in a humane manner. The self-worth and integrity of each individual must be maintained (Martin & Quilling, 1981).

Fleck (1980) stated that essential characteristics in the psychological environment are supportiveness, caring, a positive attitude, and the encouraging of growth. To have a healthy climate the educator should endeavor to be open, caring, and democratic in his/her approach.

Seven home economics programs that were evaluated as outstanding by the vocational state offices were studied by Mears, Ley, and Ray (1981). The teachers in each of the programs were determined to be the key to each program's success. Several instruments were used in the assessment of the programs. However, the two areas of evaluation in the study that impact on the present research were the Class Environment and the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern.

Two hundred four students in the seven programs were sampled using the Class Environment instrument. The instru-

ment was developed to measure the psychological environment in five areas: goal direction, interested, informal, cohesiveness, and democracy. Out of a possible range of 20-80, the mean for the sample was 60, indicating a positive environment in the home economics classrooms. Only one of the subscales (Informality) did not have a high score. This subscale was concerned with "guidelines and rules." The instrument coded the use of strict rules and regulations as being negative, while students agreed that their classes exhibited set guidelines and rules for conduct. This seemed to give the students security in knowing what was expected; thus, from the students' perspective, it was desirable (Mears et al., 1981).

The Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern instrument was administered to 218 students in the seven programs. Out of a possible range of 30-60, the mean for the sample was 54.463, indicating a high degree of teacher concern as perceived by the students.

Another key component in the overall climate of a classroom is the communication pattern. Gordon (1974) listed the following "twelve roadblocks" to communication with students who are having problems:

1. Ordering, commanding, directing. Example: 'You stop complaining and get your work down.'
2. Warning, threatening. Example: 'You'd better get on the ball if you expect to get a good grade in this class.'

3. Moralizing, preaching, giving 'shoulds' and 'oughts.' Example: 'You know it's your job to study when you come to school. You should leave your personal problems at home where they belong.'
4. Advising, offering solutions or suggestions. Example: 'The thing for you to do is to work out a better time schedule. Then you'll be able to get all your work done.'
5. Teaching, lecturing, giving logical arguments. Example: 'Let's look at the facts. You better remember there are only thirty-four more days of school to complete that assignment.'
6. Judging, criticizing, disagreeing, blaming. Example: 'You're just plain lazy or you're a big procrastinator.'
7. Name-calling, stereotyping, labeling. Example: 'You're acting like a fourth-grader, not like someone almost ready for high school.'
8. Interpreting, analyzing, diagnosing. Example: 'You're just trying to get out of doing that assignment.'
9. Praising, agreeing, giving positive evaluations. Example: 'You're really a very competent young man. I'm sure you'll figure how to get it done somehow.'
10. Reassuring, sympathizing, consoling, supporting. Example: 'You're not the only one who ever felt like this. I've felt that way about tough assignments, too. Besides, it won't seem hard when you get into it.'
11. Questioning, probing, interrogating, cross-examing. Example: 'Do you think the assignment was too hard? . . .'
12. Withdrawing, distracting, being sarcastic, humoring, diverting. Example: 'Come on, let's talk about something more pleasant. . . .' (pp. 48-49)

Gordon (1974) indicated that the approaches function as "roadblocks" because "they so often communicate to the troubled person that he must change, had better change, or should

change. They can also communicate that merely having the problem is unacceptable and that something must be wrong with the problem-owner. Some of the roadblocks even make the troubled person feel that you couldn't care less about his problem" (pp. 55, 56).

In summary, the psychological environment, because of its intangible human qualities, is profoundly more complex than the more concrete physical environment. Key essentials in creating a positive climate include the approach that is taken to discipline, the establishment of positive communication patterns, as well as support, caring, and the encouragement to grow.

Reality Therapy

In the early 1960s, Glasser (1960, 1965), a psychiatrist, developed the counseling approach reality therapy. He observed that the traditional method of psychoanalysis was not productive in effecting positive behavioral changes in the patients that he worked with in Veterans Administration Center in Los Angeles. He began trying other approaches, taking note of what was or was not effective. The result was the development of a series of interactionist techniques that focus on present behavior and that place the responsibility for actions on the individual.

Since its introduction, numerous studies have been conducted utilizing the principles of RT. No study was located which parallels the present study, although several related

studies were found. Research reviewed in this section will be the theoretical framework of RT, the procedural steps of RT, RT in the classroom, and RT as it relates to college students.

The Theoretical Framework of Reality Therapy

The theoretical framework of RT is simple. It is based on the assumption that all people have two basic, nonphysiological needs: the need to give and receive love (concern), and the need to feel worthwhile. A key concept in RT is personal responsibility. Accepting the responsibility for one's actions enhances the feeling of self-worth.

Reality therapy rests on a self-determining philosophy of human nature. In this view, each person is ultimately responsible for his/her actions. This stance is diametrically opposed to the deterministic ideology that is prevalent in traditional approaches to counseling.

Attempts have been made to classify Glasser's principles. Caraher (1974) examined the relationship of determinism and moral responsibility in the writings of Calvin, Freud, and Glasser. The study was undertaken because it was felt that important implications for the counseling practices of Protestant clergymen were inherent in Glasser's challenge of Freudian assumptions. Bruzzes (1979) endeavored to place RT in the area of humanistic psychology. He found many parallels, and, although Bruzzes concluded that the concepts of RT fit roughly within the boundaries of humanistic psy-

chology, he decided that Glasser did not share the great optimism concerning human nature that the humanistic psychologist possessed.

The Procedural Steps in Reality Therapy

In practice, RT is composed of three interrelated procedures:

First, there is the involvement; the therapist must become so involved with the patient that the patient can begin to face reality and see how his behavior is unrealistic. Second, the therapist must reject the behavior which is unrealistic but still accept the patient and maintain his involvement with him. Last, and necessary in varying degrees depending upon the patient, the therapist must teach the patient better ways to fulfill his needs within the confines of reality. (Glasser, 1965)

These procedures are further broken down into specific steps which form the framework for the practice of RT.

The first step is to make friends and get involved with the individual. The focus of discussions should be the present situation and should emphasize actions rather than feelings. The second step in RT is to ask the question, "What are you doing?" This simple question forces the person to analyze his/her present behavior.

Step three involves getting the person to evaluate his/her behavior and to make a value judgment concerning it. Questions like, "Are your actions helping you?" or "Are you acting responsibly?" help the person to analyze the behavior. The fourth step is to ask the individual to formulate a plan. The plan should be kept simple, and have success built into

it. At the beginning, it is sometimes necessary for the therapist to help the client formulate a realistic plan.

The fifth step involves getting a commitment to follow the plan from the person. To be effective, the plan needs to have a mechanism for checking back and for follow up. The client needs positive reinforcement, but must accept the responsibility for implementing the plan. Step six involves not accepting excuses. Making excuses is an attempt to shift the responsibility from oneself to something or someone else. By not accepting any excuses, the individual is forced to face the consequences of his own failure.

The seventh step requires that no punishment be exacted if the plan is not followed. The natural consequences of not following the plan, however, are not viewed as punishment. If the plan is not completed, the individual is simply asked to formulate a new plan. The counselor should encourage the individual to formulate plans that are small in scope so that success is a reasonable prospect.

The final step in RT is to never give up. The practitioner must be willing to continue going back through the steps if progress is not rapid.

Reality Therapy in the Classroom

With the 1969 publication of Schools Without Failure, Glasser applied the principles of RT to the classroom setting. He stated that school should be relevant to the students' lives. Thus, thinking and problem-solving skills

should be encouraged rather than the memorization of facts. To increase feelings of self-worth, students must be given tasks each day that can be accomplished.

According to Glasser (1969), the traditional letter grade system should be abolished. Failing students should be approached very cautiously because, once a student has failed, it is very difficult for that student to gain acceptance and self-worth in the school setting. Many times this is the point in time when a student will become disruptive in the classroom.

When a disruption occurs, Glasser (1969) advocated using the steps in RT. The teacher needs to first examine the manner in which he/she has been dealing with the student. The student should be dealt with in a calm manner. If the disruption persists, then a RT conference needs to be held.

The student is asked the question: What were (or are) you doing? A value judgment is obtained through the use of more questioning: Is that activity against the rules? or, Is what you're doing helping you? After the student makes a value judgment, a plan to do better must be established and a commitment made to carry out the plan. If the plan is not followed, no excuses are accepted and no punishment is allowed. The student who does not respond to the conference and keeps disrupting has to be removed from the immediate area until he/she is ready to admit his/her action and formulate a plan to do better.

One technique that Glasser (1969) recommended to help promote a productive environment in the classroom is the Class Meeting. In a Class Meeting, the students sit in a circle and discuss all aspects of their class. Muro (1978) listed eleven possible benefits that could result from Class Meetings:

1. Improved self-images
2. Improved locus of control
3. Positive personal identities
4. Improved teacher and pupil attitudes toward school
5. Cohesive, dynamic classroom groups
6. Better school achievement
7. Unified school staffs and closer pupil-teacher involvement
8. Reduction of school failure
9. More relevant curricula
10. Humane approaches to discipline
11. Critical thinking skills development

A number of studies using different designs have been conducted concerning various aspects of the effects of reality therapy training in the classroom. Browning (1978) studied the effects of the use of RT classroom management techniques on the attitudes of teachers and students. The students' achievement and classroom behavior was also studied. Neither the control nor the experimental group had had prior experience with RT principles. The teachers in the ex-

perimental group were exposed to 20 hours of RT training prior to the testing period. The results indicated that the experimental group teachers had significantly positive attitude changes with regard to their classroom management and themselves personally.

Brannon (1977) conducted a study which investigated inservice training of teachers. Teachers' perceptions of teacher-student relationships and student behaviors were studied. Student self-concept and locus of control were also explored. The treatment consisted of a modified RT discipline program. All the satellite teams received the same training. Two assessments to determine the degree of implementation were used: (1) the Stage of Concern (SoC) stimulated by the discipline program; and (2) the Level of Use (LoU) of the discipline program. On the basis of these measures, two groups were formed: the "high impact concerned" group and the "low impact concerned" group. Some of the results indicated that the "high impact concerned" group viewed RT as a positive, relaxed, and planned approach to handling problems. Discipline was viewed by the "low impact concerned" group as being less strong and more yielding than the view held by the other group. The researcher concluded that a well-designed inservice program is an effective means to improve the classroom environment.

Gang (1974) utilized a naturalistic observational approach to examine the behaviors of six elementary students.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not the teaching of the principles of RT would effect changes in student behaviors in the classroom. Two teachers from one school were chosen and given training in the principles of RT. The teachers then chose three students, each from different classes. After baseline data were collected on the students, the teachers began to implement RT at different intervals. The treatment consisted of three phases: the involvement phase, the intervention phase, and the follow-up phase.

During the involvement phase, the teachers gave each target student special attention during each class period. The teachers continued to give each target student special attention during the intervention phase, while they employed RT. The teachers did not personally receive the feedback from the researcher during the follow-up phase that had been present in the other two phases. The study design utilized trained observers. Data collection included direct observation, interviews, and written logs. The findings indicated that undesirable behaviors decreased, while student-teacher involvement increased.

A group counseling experimental approach was taken by Hollerran (1981). The purposes of the study were to explore the perception of locus of control (LOC) and to assess junior high school students in the academic area. The guiding questions in the research focused on whether or not the ap-

plication of RT principles would effect a movement toward a more internal LOC, and if this occurred, whether a more internal LOC would lead to an academic improvement.

The subjects (N = 32) were selected from a predominantly white, middle-class suburban neighborhood. The criteria for selection were an underachiever without learning disability with an IQ score of 100+, with a discrepancy of 25+ percentile point on IQ scores and class ranking, and with an external LOC as measured by the revised Academic Achievement Accountability Scale (AAA). The two groups, experimental and control, were each composed of 16 individuals. The counseling sessions were 45 minutes in length and were held two times per week for approximately 15 weeks. A traditional two group pre-test, posttest design was used. Analyses of variance were employed in the data analyses. The results supported the use of RT in effecting positive changes in under-achieving, externally oriented, female adolescents. However, no significant changes occurred in the male subjects.

Reality Therapy as Related to College Students

Several investigators have studied the effects of RT training on college students. Martig (1978) conducted a study of college students which measured social interpersonal involvement, anxiety levels, self-control, and locus of control. The researcher found that the experimental group, which consisted of 11 males and 11 females, all increased their internal LOC, while their anxiety levels de-

creased. The treatment consisted of the teaching of RT concepts, role-playing, small and large group therapy sessions, and practical outside assignments. The Rotter Internal-External Scale (I-ES) and the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (TJTA) instruments were administered before and after treatment.

Rosario (1977) utilized RT principles to test the construct validity of locus of control theory through group counseling. The Adult Form of the Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Scale was used in both pre- and posttesting of students in a community college developmental studies program. The first posttest did not show any movement in the cells. However, a posttest given five months after the treatment showed external males shifted significantly in an internal direction. An earlier study of community college developmental programs by Watts (1976) utilizing the same instrumentation as Rosario (1977) showed no significant changes in the loci of control of full-time college students in the developmental programs at four Texas community colleges.

The RT approach was compared to a number of other models by Treadway (1971). He developed a list of criteria for use in comparing the counseling models in use for college students. The criteria included ego functioning support development, reality exploration, modeling of desired behaviors, value systems development, introduction of new behaviors,

and help in the major developmental tasks faced by college students. Based on the above criteria, Treadway (1971) concluded that RT afforded the best approach to college counseling.

In summary, RT is a nondirective, humanistic approach to counseling. It is behavior modification in the sense that changed behavior is the goal. The control for the change, however, is internally rather than externally imposed. The theoretical framework of RT is simple: people need to give and receive love, and people need a positive self-concept. RT focuses on the present while offering hope for the future.

Summary

Research reviewed in this chapter has covered a brief history of educational supervision, the "state of the art" in the supervision of student teachers, and reality therapy. Historically, the functions of educational supervisors have been the improvement of instruction, the rating of teachers, the planning of curricula, and counseling. At the present time there is no consensus concerning the role of the university supervisor in the student teaching experience. Discussions range from declaring that the university supervisor performs no useful functions in the student teaching experience to the idea that the university supervisor is of much more value than research studies indicate. A number of researchers contended that the university supervisor plays a

vital role in communicating the university's requirements, acting as a public relations person for the institution, and in providing the student teacher with support and a contact with the university.

Several studies have been conducted concerning the teaching of the principles of reality therapy to different groups within the public schools. The results of a number of these studies indicated that the teaching of the principles of RT provided positive behavioral changes in students as well as teachers. No research was located which parallels the present study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The major purpose of this study was to explore through NI the implications of the teaching of the principles of RT to a selected group of student teachers. Specifically, each student teacher's lesson preparation and classroom control were studied.

Subjects

The subjects for the present research were four female seniors who completed their student teaching under the direction of the Department of Consumer Economics in the College of Education at Idaho State University. The research was conducted during the 1982 fall semester. The student teachers were informed that they were involved in a research project. However, the nature and the scope of the research were not revealed to them.

Design

The present study was conducted utilizing a NI approach. Observations, and the administration of various instruments, were incorporated into the normal structure of the student teaching experience. The approach taken was as unobtrusive as possible. In keeping with the NI design, a tape recorder was not used during any part of the research. The data collected were presented in a case study mode. A case study was developed for each of the four subjects.

Application

The application consisted of the teaching, reinforcing, and modeling of the principles of RT by the university supervisor. The student teachers were required to attend a weekly two-hour seminar, which was to be held concurrently with the student teaching practicum during the first nine weeks of the semester, as well as continuing for the remaining seven weeks of the semester. The principles of RT were taught and modeled in a natural manner utilizing a filmstrip, lectures, and discussions. Reinforcement of the principles of RT occurred during each seminar session and personal interviews. When problems were discussed, the subjects were asked to apply the principles of RT to the specific problem at hand. During personal interviews, the subjects were asked to explain their use of RT in the classroom. The university supervisor modeled the principles of RT by commending the student teachers, by not accepting excuses from the student teachers, by allowing the student teachers to make their own value judgments, by not interfering in the teaching process, and by putting the emphasis on present behaviors.

Procedure

Data were collected from various sources including the cooperating teachers, the university supervisor, an outside observer, and the students. To determine any movement in individual student teacher's locus of control, the Rotter Internal-External Scale (I-ES) was administered both in pre-

and posttreatment. To provide a profile of the subject's mode of human interactions, the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Observation-Behavior (FIRO-B) was administered pre treatment. The subjects completed a self-evaluation inventory at the completion of the student teaching experience. Weekly lesson plans were turned in both to the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. The student teachers also kept a daily journal describing their student teaching experiences. The journal was written in diary form and provided insights into the subjects' daily perceptions of the student teaching experience.

The cooperating teachers did not receive any specialized training in either observational techniques or the principles of RT because of time constraints and the desire of the researcher not to interfere with the normal procedures followed by the College of Education at Idaho State University. A letter of explanation (see Appendix A) was sent to the cooperating teacher to explain the administration of the student evaluation forms. The outside observer was a professional educator not involved in the home economics program. No training was provided.

The following chart explicates and summarizes the procedures that were followed. As previously indicated, the reinforcement and modeling of the principles of RT took place every week. Therefore, the process was not shown each week on the chart.

	Application	Kind of Data Collected	Instrument
Week One	<p>Filmstrip/tape presentation of "Glasser's Ten Steps to Discipline" (1978)</p> <p>Brief lecture concerning RT</p> <p>Distribution of RT "handouts"</p>	<p>Individual locus of control perception</p> <p>Individual human interaction mode</p>	Rotter I-ES
Week Two	Reinforcement of the principles of RT through discussion of their application to individual discipline problems	None	None
Week Three	<p>Second presentation of "Glasser's Ten Steps to Discipline"</p> <p>Reinforcement of the principles of RT</p>	<p>Observation (on-site) by university supervisor</p> <p>Informal discussion</p> <p>Observation by cooperating teacher</p>	<p>Observation report</p> <p>Personal interview utilizing open-ended questions like: "What are you doing in the classroom?" "How would you apply RT to that problem?"</p>
Week Four	Reinforcement and modeling of the principles of RT by the university supervisor	None	None

Application	Kind of Data Collected	Instrument	
Week Five	Indirect supervision by the university supervisor	Observation by university supervisor	Personal interview with student teacher
Week Six		Observation by cooperating teacher	Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form
Week Seven		Observation by an outside observer	Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form
Week Eight		Rating by the students (students in the first two classes taught by the student teacher)	Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern Form- B Class Environment
Week Nine	Continued reinforcement of the principles of RT through discussions during the seminar	Observation by cooperating teacher	Classroom Competencies Checklist
		Observation by university supervisor	Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form
		Rating by student teacher (self-evaluation)	Open-ended Questions

Application	Kind of Data Collected	Instrument
Week Ten	Student journals Self-evaluation by student teachers	Classroom Competencies Checklist Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction
Week Eleven	Self-evaluation by student teachers	Open-ended Questions
Weeks Twelve-Fifteen	Seminar sessions focused on job interviews and professionalism. The principles of RT were applied to each area through questioning and discussion	None
Week Sixteen	Perception of individual locus of control	Rotter I-ES

Instrumentation

The following instruments (see Appendix B) were utilized in the present study:

1. The Rotter Internal-External Scale (I-ES) which was completed by the student teachers in both pre- and posttreatment.
2. The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior scale (FIRO-B) which was completed by the student teachers.
3. Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form which was completed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and an outside observer.
4. Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction which was completed by the student teachers.
5. Classroom Competencies Checklist which was completed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the student teachers.
6. Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern Form B which was completed by the students.
7. Class Environment which was completed by the students.

The above-mentioned instruments, in conjunction with the student journals and interviews, formed the bases for case development.

Reliability and Validity of Instruments

Each of the seven instruments used in the present research is examined here briefly as to its reliability and validity.

Rotter Internal-External Scale

Rotter's I-ES (1966) was developed from Rotter's social learning theory. He postulated that a person's values, expectations, and circumstances will predict a person's actions.

The potentiality of occurrence of a set of behaviors that lead to the satisfaction of some need (need potential) is a function of both the expectancies that these behaviors will lead to these reinforcements (freedom movement) and the strength of value of these reinforcements (need value). It is with the term freedom of movement that we approach the location of the locus of control construct in social learning theory. (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 27).

Rotter's term "freedom of movement" is defined in the following way:

[It is] the mean expectancy of obtaining positive satisfactions as a result of a set of related behaviors directed toward the accomplishment of a group of functionally related reinforcements. A person's freedom of movement is low if he has a high expectancy of failure or punishment as a result of the behaviors with which he tries to obtain the reinforcement that constitutes a particular need" (Rotter, 1972, p. 194).

A lifetime of related behaviors provides an individual with a "generalized expectancy of success." Another term utilized by Rotter is "perceived control" which is "a generalized expectancy for internal as opposed to external con-

trol of reinforcements" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 27). A person who feels that his/her actions affect his/her fate and that he/she has a measure of control over events has an internal locus of control orientation. In contrast, a person who feels that he/she is a helpless pawn under the control of outside forces is said to have an external locus of control orientation.

The Rotter I-ES was developed to measure the locus of control orientation in individuals. The scale is a 23-item forced-choice instrument that contains six filler statements. It was adapted from an earlier 60-item instrument. The total number of external choices composes the score. A high score is indicative of an external locus of control orientation, while a low score is indicative of an internal locus of control orientation (Lefcourt, 1976).

The Rotter I-ES was used in the present research because it is relatively short in length. It takes approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Because of its length, the possibility of test fatigue is lessened. Also, the Rotter I-ES seemed to be the instrument of choice in the majority of studies involving RT and the locus of control construct.

In a number of samples, test data on the I-ES have been collected which show that it has internal consistency estimates which have been relatively stable. These estimates

have ranged from .65 (split-half techniques) to .79 (Spearman-Brown formula) (Rotter, 1972, p. 277). The samples on which these studies have been conducted have been broad, including college and high school students and a national stratified sample of adults. Test-retest reliability ranged from .60 to .83 for one month. On the whole, the I-ES has been demonstrated to have adequate internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity.

The highest possible score on the Rotter's I-ES is 23 points. Normative scores for undergraduate females range from 7.14 to 14.03 (Lefcourt, 1976). According to the literature, a lower score is indicative of a more self-actualized individual. To measure any movement in the locus of control perception of the subjects, the instrument was administered both pre- and posttreatment.

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior (FIRO-B) instrument was developed by Will Shutz (1966). It was an outgrowth of a theory formulated by Shutz which stated that people possessed a rather consistent orientation in interpersonal encounters (Borich & Madden, 1977).

The FIRO-B is a 54-item scale measuring the areas of "inclusion," "control," and "affection." Two dimensions (expressed behavior and wanted behavior) of the constructs are measured. The "inclusion" area refers to the degree of the individual's association with other people. A common

set of constructs, introversion/extroversion, is similar to the idea of "inclusion" (Borich & Madden, 1977; Ryan, 1971).

The degree to which a person is able to make decisions and assume responsibility is measured by the "control" construct. This construct is closely related to the internal/-external locus of control construct. The "affection" score is a reflection of the individual's emotional involvement with other people (Borich & Madden, 1977; Ryan, 1971).

The emphasis in the FIRO-B is on behaviors rather than feelings. The scale assesses both the individual's actual behavior toward others and the desired behavior from others. The instrument, which takes approximately 15 minutes to administer, has been used in a variety of ways, including forms of group counseling. "As a basic tool for research into interpersonal relationships, the FIRO-B can be used to establish groups, to analyze group dynamics, or to measure the outcome of group methods" (Ryan, 1971, p. 1).

A reproducibility index was computed to ascertain the internal consistency of the FIRO-B. The instrument was completed by 1543 college students and a small number of Air Force personnel. The mean reproducibility for all the scales was .94. Later, test-retest reliability of the FIRO-B was determined using samples composed of college students. During this testing, the correlation coefficients ranged from .71 to .82, with a mean of .76 (Schutz, 1958).

The FIRO-B's relationship to external criteria has been the primary emphasis in attempts to validate the instrument. Correlations have been established between the scale scores and rated creativity, freshman grades, schizophrenia diagnosis, rated supervisory effectiveness, and the development of good ideas in problem-solving groups (Borich & Madden, 1977). The FIRO-B was administered September 4, 1982. On the following day the profiles were written and filed. They were not referred to again until after the semester was completed.

Evaluation of a Single Teaching Experience Checklist

The Evaluation of a Single Teaching Experience is a 15-item checklist that was adapted from a longer scale from the Wake County Student Teacher Handbook. The shortened instrument measures several functions of the teacher in the areas of lesson organization, the materials utilized, and the student-teacher relationships. No information is available concerning the instrument's reliability or validity. The instrument is presently being used to evaluate student teachers in the Department of Consumer Economics at Idaho State University.

Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction

The Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction instrument was administered during the 10th week of the semester. The instrument measures self-perceptions concerning the use of teaching behaviors which promote self-direction in student

learning. Mears et al. (1981) reported that teachers who are more self-actualized perceive themselves as fostering self-direction in students.

The instrument contains 30 items that allow the respondent to choose from four possible behaviors that are either very similar or dissimilar to their own. The instrument is based on the idea that the higher the perception of self-actualization, the more teachers will encourage self-direction in students. Over 200 home economics teachers have responded to the inventory. The reliability index of the Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction is .91 (Mears, et al., 1981).

The possible range in scores on the measure is 30-120. Scores reported in the literature range from 45-100 for home economics teachers identified as having outstanding programs (Mears, et al., 1981). A higher score is indicative of a teacher who facilitates self-direction in students. Conversely, a lower score denotes a teacher who discourages self-direction in students.

Classroom Competencies Checklist

The Classroom Competencies Checklist is a 10-item instrument that was adapted by the researcher from a larger instrument included in Student Teachers' Handbook (Idaho State University, Consumer Economics Education, 1977). The instrument measures several teacher competencies that are related to preparation and classroom control. The respondent

is asked to check the most appropriate box from four possible choices: outstanding, good, satisfactory, or, needs improvement. No information concerning the instrument's validity or reliability is available.

Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern Form B

The Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern is a 30-item instrument which asks the respondent to circle either "yes" or "no." It was developed by Ray and is published in Mears et al. (1981) in Dimensions of Home Economics Programs: Seven Case Studies. Thousands of secondary students in a variety of content areas have completed the instrument. The purpose of the questionnaire is to ascertain the extent that the teacher is able to establish rapport with students. The instrument has a reliability of .92 (Mears et al., 1981).

This instrument was administered by the cooperating teacher during the last week that the student teacher was in the classroom. A letter (see Appendix A) was sent to each cooperating teacher suggesting that the evaluations be conducted in the first two classes that the student teacher taught, since those students would have had the longest exposure to the student teacher.

Class Environment

The Class Environment instrument's purpose is to measure the five following elements in the students' classroom: goal direction, interest, informality, cohesiveness, and democracy. The instrument is composed of 20 items which re-

quire the respondent to react to a Likert-type scale. Several hundred home economics students have completed the scale which has a reliability of .86. The scale was adapted by Mears and Ley (1981) from an instrument developed by Anderson and Walberg (Mears et al., 1981).

Analysis of Data

The data collected in the present study were presented in four case studies. The presentation was to be descriptive in nature. The pre- and posttest scores on the Rotter I-ES were compared for each individual with any movement toward externality or internality being noted in numerical form. Group scores, including the mean score for the four subjects, were computed. The summary data were compared to the normative data presented by Lefcourt (1976).

The FIRO-B was analyzed to determine how the student teacher interacts with people in general. The "control" construct is of particular interest in the present study because of its close relationship to the idea of locus of control. The data from the FIRO-B provided general information that helped to form the basis of each case study.

Observational data gathered from the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the outside observer were noted separately. The observational instruments include the Classroom Competencies Checklist and A Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form. The self-evaluation, using the Classroom Competencies Checklist, was presented separately.

The instruments completed by students were analyzed by combining the data collected from each student in individual classes. Data from both of the classes (for each student teacher) were also combined, thus giving a more complete view of student perception of the student teacher's amount of concern and the classroom environment.

Summary

A naturalistic inquiry, which is eclectic and unobtrusive in its methodology, was the research approach taken in the present study. The present investigation provided a broad view of the supervision of student teachers. The classroom is profoundly complex in its human interactions, and these interactions cannot easily be narrowed to specific, quantifiable variables. Therefore, a naturalistic inquiry mode was a vehicle to qualitatively examine the student teaching process.

The result of the compilation and presentation of all the data was a composite of the student teaching experience for each of the subjects. An objective of the study was to present a "slice of life" from the complex process of teacher preparation. The present study should lead to a better understanding of the total student teaching experience.

CHAPTER IV
FOUR CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The main purpose of this study was to examine, through NI, the student teaching experience of four female student teachers. Specifically, the principles of RT were taught and modeled by the university supervisor, and the total student teaching experience was observed with special emphasis on the student teacher's lesson preparation (including presentation) and classroom control.

Perceptions concerning each student teacher were collected from the student teachers, the cooperating teacher, an outside observer, the students, and the university supervisor. Seven instruments were used, including the FIRO-B, which provided a profile of each student teacher's approach to interpersonal relationships, and Rotter's I-E Scale, which was administered both pre- (September 3, 1982) and post-treatment (December 17, 1982). Personal responsibility is a key concept in RT. This concept is closely related to an internal locus of control perception. Therefore, a pre- and post-testing of each student teacher's locus of control perception was thought to be important in the present investigation to ascertain any movement in each subject's locus of control perception.

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teachers, an outside observer, and the university supervisor. To determine each subject's use of behaviors that encourage self-direction in student learning, the Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction instrument was completed by the subjects. The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the student teachers. The students evaluated the student teachers by completing the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern Form B and the Class Environment instrument. In addition to the formal instrumentation the subjects responded to two sets of open-ended questions concerning their planning, classroom control, and their personal perceptions of RT.

The student teaching experience is profoundly complex, so no specific conclusions related to the value of the teaching of the principles of RT can be made. The student teachers were informed at the beginning of the study that they would be participating in an investigation. However, the nature and purpose of the study were not disclosed. The naivete of the subjects was evidenced by the fact that when the Rotter I-ES was administered posttreatment the subjects, although vaguely aware that they had taken the instrument before, did not remember having taken it four months earlier in the same class.

An effort was made by the researcher to keep the application of the principles of RT and the observations as unobtrusive as possible. The presentations of the principles of RT were made in a simple straightforward manner. The university supervisor (researcher) suggested that the student teachers try to utilize the principles of RT in the classroom. However, no direct assignment was made, neither was a grade directly involved with the utilization of the principles of RT. Feedback concerning the value of RT was elicited only after the grade for the student teaching experience had been determined.

The cooperating teachers were neither apprised of the concepts of RT, nor were they aware of the research design. Two of the subjects expressed that they felt inhibited in trying out RT when their cooperating teachers were present in the room because they felt that they should be conforming to the cooperating teacher's mode of discipline.

The method chosen to present the collected data was the case study. The subjects' names were changed in each case to protect their anonymity. Each of the four cases is presented according to the following outline:

- I. The Student Teaching Site
- II. The Student Teacher
- III. The Students' Perceptions of Student Teacher
- IV. The Cooperating Teacher's Perceptions of Student
Teacher

- V. The Outside Observer's Perceptions of Student
Teacher
- VI. The University Supervisor's Perception of Student
Teacher
- VII. Summary and Discussion

The length of the journals prohibited their being incorporated into the text in totality. Therefore, excerpts from each journal were presented. The passages were selected if they contributed insights into the subject's approach to teaching, mentioned RT, concerned lesson preparation, or concerned classroom control.

Case I

The Student Teaching Site

The student teaching site in Case I was a rural community with a population of approximately 2500, in one of the upper valleys of southeastern Idaho. The economy of the community was dependent on agriculture (potatoes and dairy products) and lumber. The predominant religion was Mormonism.

The school in the community that was chosen as the student teaching site was the local high school. The physical facilities were old and continually in a state of remodeling or renovation. For sporting competitions, the school was classified as A-2.

The student population was about 500, most of whom were brought in by busses from neighboring areas. The students

formed a rather homogeneous group, since all were from rural areas, and most had the same religious background.

Cooperating teacher A was well known in the community, having taught at the local high school for 20 years. She had a very good reputation with both the administration and the students. The student teacher that was assigned to cooperating teacher A said of her, "She is an excellent teacher and was so open to my new ideas."

The Student Teacher

Tammy was born and raised in a community near the student teaching site. She was eager to begin her student teaching and had little difficulty adjusting to the school and the students. Coming from a family of ten children, she had several brothers who were known by her students.

A graduate in fashion design and illustration from Brigham Young University, Tammy worked as a window displayer before deciding to obtain teaching certification. She became 25 years old in September 1982.

Her interests included snow and water skiing, racquetball, and jogging. Because she was raised on a farm, her activities also included driving trucks, tractors, and moving pipe line.

When asked to state her professional goals, she wrote:

I would like to be able to look at my life and feel that I have taught something valuable to young people; that I have touched their lives and maybe have helped them to develop high self-esteem and love for themselves and the people that they associate with. These are a

few of my goals, both professionally and personally. I would like to teach students how to survive in this world and be happy. I would like to get married and have children. But all-in-all, to make my life as worthwhile as it can be by using my talents and giving of myself--in doing this I will have found happiness.

In response to the question asking her to list in rank order the three areas that she anticipated as possible problem areas, Tammy wrote:

1. Preparing enough material to last 50 minutes;
2. Being too friendly with the students; and
3. Ensuring that the students are learning.

During the student teaching experience, Tammy kept a daily journal. Excerpts from her edited journal are presented in the following passages:

August 23. Teachers meetings from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Very interesting. I found out that teachers can be close friends and kind of fun.

August 26. I met my supervisor today. I was nervous but I feel confident that she will be good. I'm pleased that I am with Mrs. K. and Mrs. Babcock. The adult living class was on values, goals, and working together. We played the squares game, then they wrote their values, and goals down. It was a good game. Mrs. K. handles discipline well. It is a lot different with boys than with girls. I started working on a food preservation unit to teach. Scary!

August 27. I'm continuing to work on my unit and am observing in between going crazy. I previewed the film that I am going to show. Mrs. K. went over my behavioral objectives and helped me to break them down. I called roll in each class again. I sat in on life management, which is an all girl senior class. The guys kept calling me Miss Bullins and teasing me a little. I was interviewed for the school newspaper.

August 30. I taught both foods classes. I felt a lot better about the second class. The film was too broad. I should have shown some slides the home economist told

me about later. My questions are not specific enough. It's hard to bring things down to a high school level.

August 31. The foods classes went better, even though I was more nervous. I reviewed the filmstrip and helped them to understand it better, then I showed the equipment used for canning. Today my second period class went better than my fifth period class. There are some real "smart-aleck" kids who asked me questions like this, "Have you ever canned before?" It made me feel humiliated.

September 7. It was hard to come back after the break. I started teaching the adult living classes today. I am now teaching four classes. I realized that boys are a lot different to discipline than girls. I taught them about laundry, but I feel that my questions were not specific enough. I taught my foods classes how to freeze corn and strawberries.

September 9. I had a hard time with the adult living today in keeping them quiet. I am trying to make my questions more specific so that they will understand me. We learned how to press and iron shirts. My foods classes went well. I dried chives and fruit leather as a demonstration for them, then we had a discussion on drying foods. I handed out something on pickling for those who would be gone tomorrow.

September 14. I gave my first test today. I thought that it would be too easy, but a lot of kids said that it was hard. I hope that it was acceptable. My adult living class was interesting. I demonstrated the sewing machine and then let them try sewing on paper. Mrs. Babcock came and observed during my fourth hour adult living class. I was nervous, but she seems so nice about it. She told me that I was positive, that I was good humored, and that I did try to use Glasser's approach. It was nice to get positive comments instead of negative ones. She seems like she knows how to relate to us who don't know how to teach yet.

September 15. I gave my foods classes their tests back. I commented that I thought that they didn't take notes well enough. When I gave a reading assignment, they sure did take the time to write down everything. In my adult living, we threaded the machines and sewed some seams.

September 23. My foods classes were real interested in my diets. Since I have had so much experience in this

area, it makes it more interesting. In my fifth hour we were behind, so I didn't get to hand out everything. Also, there are five guys in the class who are not into diets as much as the girls are. When things really got bad between G. and B. (they were playing with suspenders), I asked another student to call out the quiz questions and I told G. and B. that I wanted to see them. The bell rang and I only got G. I tried to apply Glasser. I asked him what he thought should be done and if he thought that his activity was fair to the rest of the class. I'll talk to them some more tomorrow.

September 28. In my foods class I had a breakfast marathon. They had 10 minutes to prepare, eat, and clean-up. I was really excited about it. My first class turned out better than my second. They were better prepared and said that they had fun. My supervisor came today during the second foods class. Someone guessed that she was my supervisor, and passed a note around saying that they ought to be good for me because I was being graded. I thought that was cute. I thanked them the next day for looking out for me. I felt badly because the second hour was more chaotic than the first class. I just hope that Mrs. Babcock realizes that I'm trying my best.

October 21. The boys made chocolate chip cookies today in third period. The third period class stole the fourth period's chocolate chips. Fourth hour class was really mad. My two foods classes had labs on different fruit dishes. Some turned out quite interesting, but, I will not plan four labs in one day again. I'm trying to get my life management class to use their imaginations to think of furniture that they can make or use in an apartment with a small budget. Even with my letting them look through home magazines, they could hardly think of 20 ideas.

October 22. It was Homecoming day for the school so I only had half my classes. They were hectic, but we kept going. The students had a cute assembly and parade. I wouldn't let third hour cook today because of the stolen chocolate chips.

October 25. Today was hectic in my second foods class. It was the worst class that I've ever had. They just would not be quiet. I kept trying to control by using Glasser. Mrs. K. said that she stayed out because she knew I was having trouble. She said that she would have really yelled at them and was surprised that I

could keep my "cool." I was really frustrated by them.

October 26. Today went better. We prepared our forms for the computer. The foods classes do a lot better if they have something to do other than listening to me. Life management class went to look at an apartment. I think that they learned a lot by actually seeing it.

October 28. The adult living classes cooked German pancakes or omelets. They did a whole breakfast and did really well. I was proud of them for being so organized. They had a lot more to do than when they made their cookies. Mrs. Babcock came today during second period.

November 5. My last day of teaching, although I will come again on Monday, I won't be teaching. My second hour foods class had a cake and a rose for me. I was really flattered. Then my other foods class was another story--terrible. We were talking about labeling and they were looking on cans and boxes to find out the information. But, they just wouldn't be quiet and listen. After the sixth person asked me the same thing, I just said "shut-up." Two girls brought me a note saying how they were sorry and that they could tell that I was upset. Four boys from the adult living class that had been hunting and had missed my class came to see me during seventh period to say "goodbye." I was flattered that they would leave their hunting to do that when they had missed school all day. My life management girls had a party for me too.

Tammy's journal entires reveal that she was quite concerned about what the students thought about her. Although she was eager to be accepted, she did not allow them to control her. She seemed to have a balance in her comments about things she needed to work on and things with which she was pleased. It is interesting to note that there was not a word of criticism concerning her cooperating teacher. Her comments indicate that she took the student teaching experience seriously.

During the 9th week of the semester, the subjects were asked to evaluate themselves in the following areas: classroom management (environment and discipline), lesson preparation (including presentation), and responsibility.

Tammy's edited evaluation follows:

Classroom management. I feel that my environment in the classroom is good. I try to have a good atmosphere and to stay on "good terms" with the students. As far as discipline goes--sometimes it is better than at other times. I can control the class as long as I am standing in front of the room, but when we work in a laboratory setting, it is harder for me to control the students. Complete silence is not what I am after. It's hard for me to know how mean or strict I should be. I think sometimes that I'm too nice.

Lesson preparation. I feel like I have been prepared for my lessons well. There have been a few times when I just can't decide how I want to present something. Then, at the last minute my teacher and I come up with a new plan. When this happens, I feel badly, but I think that sometimes you have to change ideas or plans at the last minute to fit the mood of the day. I try to present my lessons with enthusiasm in order to motivate the students. I feel that I do a pretty good job at this because boredom is a major cause of discipline problems. If I can motivate them and keep their interest high, the kids will remember that particular lesson a lot longer. So, I try to think of various ways to teach. At first I was lecturing more, but now I try to have the students more involved in discussions.

Summary. I think that I have been responsible in my student teaching. I have gotten my lesson plans in on time (even though they were sometimes quite broad), I have been to school on time and have been to each of my classes, even when I was sick. I felt that it was my responsibility to be there. I feel a sense of responsibility for each of my students. I have a deep concern for their welfare. I hope that they have learned even a fraction of what I have learned and have gained from this experience. I feel like I should give myself an A- because I worked my "tail" off and I learned a great deal about teaching. I tried my best.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist (see Appendix C) Tammy perceived herself as "good" in the areas of motivation of students, preparation of lesson plans, presentation of material, management of time and energy, student evaluation, and provision for individual needs. She felt that she was "outstanding" in the use of varied techniques and in her attitude. The only area that she felt "satisfactory" in was her ability in classroom control.

During the 11th week the subjects were asked to answer a set of open-ended questions. Tammy's responses to the questions follow:

Have the principles of RT been helpful to you in your student teaching experience? Give specific examples. I think they have been very helpful because they kept me in better control. I would think about getting mad at a problem student but think of Glasser and remain a lot calmer. Like one student sitting on the cupboards after doing a ton of other wrong things. I said--"What is the cupboard for?" instead of simply saying "Get off the cupboard."

Did you go through the procedures outlined by Glasser to help deal with discipline problems? Give examples. I would try to say What are you doing? and even before that I would be nice to the student and ask them something about themselves to show I was concerned and cared. Like one I would say--I like your permanent or Did you cut your hair--it looks good--then I would ask if what they were doing was right.

Would you use Glasser's approach again? Explain. Yes, I thought it was and is an excellent guide. Even if you don't use every step just the way it is written it can be a great tool.

Did you benefit personally from the principles of RT? Explain. Yes--like I said before; it kept me in better control. I think that I can be a much calmer, less high strung worrier; in the classroom at least; if I use Glasser. Gives you something to fall back on.

In your opinion what is the most outstanding concept in RT? That it puts responsibility on to the student--takes it off your shoulder and lets him say--"Hey, what am I doing wrong and is it really fair to the rest of the class or teacher?" Helps them become more mature and responsible.

On a scale from 1-10 with 1 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall student teaching experience? I would rate it a 2!

The objective in administering the FIRO-B to the subjects was to obtain a profile of the subject's mode of establishing interpersonal relationships. The instrument measures both the actual and desired behaviors in three areas: "inclusion," "control," and "affection."

In the area of "inclusion," Tammy's (student teacher number one) expressed and wanted scores were equal (5, 5). The scores are borderline, mid-point scores. They are one point in the direction of the high side, which may indicate both a comfortableness in being around people and a desire to be around people, but in moderation. There is no conflict between the actual and desired interactions with people. Tammy seems to be well adjusted in human interaction as measured by this instrument.

The scores in the expressed and wanted "control" area are "matched," being four and five respectively. As a "matcher" (a term coined by Ryan, 1970) Tammy is capable of making decisions and of taking responsibility, but she wants reassurance and support from others while she is doing so. She prefers to share an area of responsibility, rather than

do it alone. Her attitude could be reflected in the statement, "I want you to work shoulder-to-shoulder with me." She is democratic, not putting excessive demands on others for support. However, she expects others to match the responsibility that she assumes.

As a "matcher" Tammy is not dependent, but she does have some doubts about her ability. She finds reassurance and safety in sharing responsibility with others. If she is unable to put this defense into operation, her behavior then resembles the "checker" (a term coined by Ryan, 1970). She will "check" with people around to seek reassurance of the correctness of her decisions. She is capable of making a decision and even of going against the opinion of others, but only after checking to see where she stands. Her "checking behavior" serves two purposes: by comparing her thinking with others, she is able to ascertain support; and if support is not forthcoming, she is in a better position to defend herself against future criticism if she goes against the majority opinion.

Tammy's expressed "affection" score is a borderline score of five, which indicates that she may become easily involved emotionally. Her high wanted "affection" score (eight) denotes that she is desirous that others initiate close, intimate relationships with her. This profile relies heavily on Ryan (1970) for the interpretation of the subject's scores.

The Rotter's I-ES was administered before and after the student teaching experience. Tammy's September score was 13. Her score in December was 11. Thus, the pre- and post-testing demonstrated a two-point movement toward a more internal locus of control.

Students' Perceptions of Student Teacher

The students' perceptions of the student teacher were measured utilizing two instruments: Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern Form B and the Class Environment. The purpose of the former instrument is to ascertain the extent to which a teacher is able to develop rapport with the students, while the latter measures five elements in the classroom climate.

The possible range of scores on the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern was 30-60, with a high score being indicative of a greater concern by the teacher for the students. Twenty students evaluated Tammy. The mean score for the sample was 56.041. The mean for the foods class ($n = 12$) was 57.333, while the mean for the adult living class ($n = 8$) was 54.750.

The percentages of "yes" responses for each item are shown in Table 2 (see Appendix C). Of the 30 items, eight had a 100 percent "yes" response from both classes. Tammy's students perceived her as being very fair to all the students in the class. They felt that they received a desirable amount of personal attention.

Tammy was perceived as being concerned with how students feel, being easy to talk to, helping students when they have problems, and making students feel important. These are all characteristics of good interpersonal relationships.

The lowest rating (56 percent) that Tammy received was in response to whether or not the teacher knew what the students were capable of doing. This is not surprising considering the fact that this was her first teaching experience.

The students' perceptions of five elements in their classroom climate were measured by the Class Environment instrument. The subscales on the measure were: goal direction, interested, informal, cohesiveness, and democracy. The possible range of scores on the instrument was 20-80, with a higher score being indicative of a positive classroom environment.

The instrument was administered to the same classes as the previous instrument, with the number being 13 in the foods class and eight in the adult living class. The mean score for the foods class was 64.077, while the mean in the adult living class was 58.625. The possible range of scores in each of the subgroups were: goal direction, 1-16; interested, 5-20; informal, 3-12; cohesiveness, 4-16; and democracy, 4-16. A high score indicated that a classroom environment possessed the quality in a high degree, while a low score indicated a lesser amount of the attribute. The

mean scores for the subgroups were as follows: goal direction, 13.793; interested, 16.158; informal, 6.418; cohesiveness, 12.211; democracy, 12.769 (see Appendix C).

All the students felt that their class had specific objectives that they were working toward. They also perceived that each lesson had specific goals. The majority of students felt that everyone in the class was free to give opinions and that decisions were made democratically. They did not perceive the class to be informal, but did not view the structure as detrimental.

Cooperating Teacher's Perceptions of Student Teacher

Cooperating teacher A was very pleased with Tammy's attitude and performance. Portions of a letter written by the cooperating teacher provide insight concerning Tammy's student teaching experience.

Miss Bullins established a good rapport with the students immediately. They liked her and cooperated with her. Miss Bullins is a little older than some college students. This worked to her advantage.

She was very nervous about working with the students at the beginning but she grew in poise and self-confidence as she progressed. Her training in Fashion Design, work experiences, and personal interests gave her a background that she was able to share appropriately with the students.

Miss Bullins was excellent about complimenting the students when they had done a good job and in general was very positive with the students. She was never sarcastic or put the students down in any way.

Miss Bullins especially worked on discipline. She read several books by leading authors. Effective discipline did not come easily for Miss Bullins but she worked diligently at it and made good progress. She was able to

recognize and alleviate some of the causes of earlier disruptive behavior.

Miss Bullins' subject matter knowledge was acceptable. Because it had been a few years since she had had classes in some of the subject matter areas, she did a lot of studying to update herself.

Miss Bullins worked well with the faculty and administration. Her friendly, poised manner and professional conduct won her immediate acceptance and approval.

Miss Bullins planned two successful field trips and made arrangements for three townspeople to speak to the classes. She did an excellent job of planning and following through.

Miss Bullins is an easy person to work with. She was willing to try different teaching methods. She was adaptable and able to change plans when it became necessary. She sought suggestions and help in improving her teaching. She was willing to spend the time necessary to prepare good lessons. She did a good job of preparing lesson plans and thinking through her objectives.

Two instruments were completed by the cooperating teacher. The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teacher during the sixth week that the student teacher was under her (see Appendix C).

Cooperating teacher A felt that Tammy was very well informed on the subject that she was teaching. Her preparation was acceptable in all areas pertaining to the organization of the lesson, with the exception of summarizing and clarifying. Cooperating teacher A indicated that Tammy needed to give these areas more emphasis. Tammy's concern for individual students was thought to be strong. Other areas related to her relationship with the students were acceptable.

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the cooperating teacher at the end of the third, sixth and

ninth week of student teaching (see Appendix c). Tammy was evaluated as having an "outstanding" attitude throughout the student teaching experience. At the end of the nine week period, Tammy's preparation of lesson plans was considered "outstanding" also. Cooperating teacher A evaluated Tammy's performance as "good" in the areas of provision of individual needs, motivation of students, presentation of lessons, use of varied techniques, classroom control, management of time and energy, and student evaluation.

Outside Observer's Perceptions of Student Teacher

In the original case development plan, data were to have been collected from an outside observer. However, a suitable observer could not be located. The area vocational coordinator was asked to make an observation, but scheduling would not permit it.

University Supervisor's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The university supervisor made four unannounced visits to the teaching site. The first visit, which was a "get acquainted visit" was made on August 26. At this time the university supervisor met both Tammy and her cooperating teacher. Since it was during the first week of school, Tammy had not yet begun any actual teaching.

The second visit was made on September 14. At six feet and a size nine, Tammy was very striking in her role as a teacher. Her background in fashion design prompted her students to ask if she had been a fashion model. Her height,

grooming, and the fact that she was in her middle twenties were positive factors in her overall performance.

During the time spent at the teaching site, the supervisor observed Tammy's teaching of an adult living class composed entirely of junior and senior boys. It was a particularly cold morning and instead of going to their seats, the boys were huddled around the radiator; some were sitting on it. Tammy requested that they take their seats. They pleaded with her, "Aw come on, let us get warm." Their tone of voice or attitude did not appear to be belligerent or offensive. They seemed to be teasing. The cooperating teacher, hearing what was happening, came into the room from an adjacent room and glared at the offenders. The student teacher again asked the students to take their seats, which they did. Tammy remained calm during this whole episode.

Tammy was well prepared for the lesson, which was a demonstration on the use and threading of the sewing machine. She did have some difficulty in keeping the demonstration moving. Later in the class period, the students had an opportunity to practice what had been demonstrated. Throughout the class period, Tammy made comments like, "That's great," or "That's good." She also asked one student, "What did you just do?" Throughout the whole class period, Tammy displayed a good sense of humor and a relaxed manner.

The next visit by the university supervisor occurred on September 28, during a foods class. The students seemed to be unusually noisy. Several times while she was giving in-

structions, Tammy stopped and said, "I need it quiet." The students were instructed that they had to prepare and eat a breakfast in 10 minutes. They were given a few minutes to plan a breakfast that was original and contained foods from the basic four food groups. After completion of this assignment, Tammy demonstrated an orange blender drink. During the class period, she remarked to the supervisor that things had gone more smoothly in an earlier class that had had the same assignment.

The university supervisor indicated that Tammy was well informed on the subject. Her performance was considered acceptable in all areas pertaining to the organization of the lesson (see Appendix C). Tammy's concern for individual students was perceived to be strong. She was also rated as having flexible reactions to various situations that arose.

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the university supervisor at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth week (see Appendix C). At the end of the nine weeks, Tammy was rated as "outstanding" in motivating students, preparing lessons, and using varied techniques. Her attitude was considered "outstanding" throughout the nine-week period. Tammy was evaluated as "good" in the presentation of lessons, the management of time and energy, and in classroom control (see Appendix C for the complete evaluation).

Summary and Discussion

Tammy responded well to an indirect supervisory mode. An indication of this can be found in her journal entry for

September 14, concerning a supervisory visit: "It was nice to get positive comments instead of negative ones. She seems like she knows how to relate to us who don't know how to teach yet." She was apprehensive at the beginning of the experience and seemed to benefit from the close supervision of her cooperating teacher.

Tammy's positive attitude and her willingness to try new approaches, including RT, contributed greatly to her performance as a teacher. Other factors that were beneficial were her familiarity with the student teaching site, the congruence of religion between her and the students, her age, and her appearance.

As the student teaching experience progressed and as she developed a good rapport with the students, her confidence was enhanced. She had an easy, relaxed manner which enabled her to work well with people.

In her statement of anticipated problem areas, written on September 3, 1983, Tammy expressed a concern about lesson preparation. Specifically, she indicated that she felt that her number-one problem would be "preparing enough material to last 50 minutes." Nothing in her student teaching journal indicated that her fear had become a reality.

A self-evaluation during the ninth week revealed that Tammy felt that she was well prepared for her classes and that she tried very hard to make the classes interesting. She also indicated that she felt that she had handled all

aspects of the student teaching experience in a responsible manner. She included as responsible acts the following: not missing any class (even when not feeling well), getting lesson plans in on time, and feeling a sense of responsibility for each student.

Tammy was conscientious and dependable, never missing day of student teaching or a seminar. Her lesson plans were submitted each week as required, although by her own admission, they were sometimes rather broad.

When asked to complete the Classroom Competencies Checklist, Tammy was very positive in evaluating her performance. In lesson preparation and presentation she rated herself as "good." She also rated herself as "good" in the provision of individual differences and needs and motivation of pupils. In the use of varied techniques, Tammy rated herself as "outstanding."

Cooperating teacher A's ninth week ratings tended to agree with Tammy's tenth-week self-evaluation, with the exception that the area of preparation of lesson plans was rated as "outstanding" by the cooperating teacher. At the end of nine weeks, the university supervisor rated Tammy as "outstanding" in both the motivation of pupils and lesson planning. In the other areas related to lesson preparation and presentation, the university supervisor rated Tammy as "good."

On the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor agreed

that an area of strength was Tammy's knowledge of the subject matter. The only area of disagreement concerning lesson planning and presentation was in the area of summarizing. The cooperating teacher indicated a need for more emphasis in this area, while the university supervisor indicated that the summarizing was "acceptable." It should be pointed out, however, that the cooperating teacher made her observation during the sixth week, in a foods class, while the university supervisor made her observation during the ninth week in an adult living class.

An indication of whether or not the students perceived the student teacher as being prepared can be inferred from the students' perceptions that the class had specific objectives to follow. One subscale on the classroom environment instrument was goal direction. One hundred percent of the students in both classes that were tested were in agreement that the class, as well as each lesson, had specific goals.

Classroom control (discipline) did not appear on Tammy's list of anticipated problem areas. After the student teaching experience commenced, however, concerns about discipline were mentioned in her journal.

Tammy made reference to Glasser three times in her student teaching journal. Classroom observations by the university supervisor substantiated the fact that Tammy was trying to implement the procedures outlined by Glasser (1969) to handle discipline problems in the classroom.

In her open-ended evaluation concerning classroom control, Tammy was quite positive. She was not, however, overly confident in this area of control, stating that her efforts were more successful at some times than at others. For instance, she stated that laboratory experiences presented greater discipline challenges than regular classroom work.

Tammy stated in the Classroom Competencies Checklist that she thought that her ability to motivate students was "good." She seemed to feel that she was able to provide interesting activities to hold the students' interest. In the area of classroom control, she thought that her performance was "satisfactory."

Cooperating teacher A's evaluation of Tammy's ability in classroom control moved from "satisfactory" in the first two evaluations to "good" on the last evaluation. In the area of motivation of students, the cooperating teacher rated Tammy's ability as "good" on each evaluation. On the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, a "strong" area was Tammy's concern for individual students.

In her general comments concerning Tammy, the cooperating teacher indicated that although discipline was not easy for her, Tammy worked very hard on it and read several authors on the subject. The cooperating teacher stated that Tammy "had made good progress" in the area of discipline. Concerning the stolen chocolate chips (see journal entry for

October 21), the cooperating teacher commented that Tammy had handled the matter effectively, although differently, than she would have handled it. She stated that she would have yelled and lectured, while Tammy handled the matter very calmly. The class that was responsible for the loss was not allowed to cook on the following day.

The university supervisor observed that Tammy remained calm when confronted with discipline problems in the classroom. In different situations that arose, she was flexible in her reactions. A rating of "good" was given by the university supervisor on each evaluation of Tammy's ability in classroom control.

Student Teacher's Profile

Based on Tammy's FIRO-B profile, one could have predicted that she would be a success in her student teaching experience. She was comfortable with the students, as substantiated by the positive student evaluations.

The profile also indicated that she was democratic in her approach. The possible range of scores on the democracy subscale of the Classroom Environment instrument was 4-16. Tammy's combined mean score was 12.769. The mean score on the same subscale in the Mears et al. (1981) study was 12.225.

The pre- and posttesting of the locus of control perception, as measured by the Rotter's I-ES, showed a two-point movement (13 to 11) toward a more internal locus of control perception. According to the literature, this move-

ment suggests that Tammy, at the end of the student teaching experience, felt more in control of her life than at the beginning. However, the researcher in the present study questions the validity of the instrument that was utilized.

Student Teacher's Perceptions of Reality Therapy

When asked if the principles of RT had been helpful, Tammy indicated that she felt that knowing and utilizing the principles of RT kept her in better control than she might otherwise have been. She also stated that she had tried to apply the principles to specific situations. This was corroborated by the university supervisor's observations.

On a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being the most positive, Tammy rated her overall student teaching experience as a "2." She stated that Glasser's approach was "an excellent guide" and that the principles of RT were "a great tool."

The researcher had an opportunity to present the principles of RT to Tammy's cooperating teacher in a workshop format several weeks after the student teaching experience. During the course of the workshop, the researcher shared some experiences concerning the student teachers. Cooperating teacher A was quick to confirm that Tammy had tried diligently to apply the principles of RT in the classroom.

Case II

The Student Teaching Site

The student teaching site in Case II was located in a city in southeastern Idaho that had a population of approximately 50,000. The economy in the city was diversified. The predominant religion in the community was Mormonism.

The school in the community that was chosen as the student teaching site was one of the local junior high schools. The school building, which was located in a noncongested area at the edge of the city, was modern with very adequate teaching facilities. Most of the students that attended this school were from upper-middle-class families.

Cooperating teacher B, the twice-divorced mother of two daughters, returned to college in her early thirties to complete her degree. She had been at this junior high school (her first teaching position) for three years. The student teacher assigned to her thought that she was very talented because of her sewing ability and interior design ability.

The Student Teacher

Pat transferred to Idaho State University from a two-year Mormon college in a nearby community. During her last two years of college she lived at home where she was one of eight children. She became 21 years old and was engaged to be married in September 1982.

When asked to state her professional goals, she wrote the following:

After I get my degree in May 1983 I plan to teach for two or three years and then try to go back to school and get my masters degree.

If I ever have the opportunity to do so I would also like to get a teaching certificate in elementary education.

I want to be a good teacher and maybe help even one person to feel some personal worth because I remember how low my own self-confidence was when I was in high school.

I plan to get married within this next year and not too long after that start a family.

Pat seemed to be a typical young woman in the Mormon Church. Her goals for marriage and a family were stated in tandem with her teaching goals. She expressed a desire to be of help to young people, and was generally idealistic in her attitudes. Edited excerpts from Pat's daily journal are presented in the following:

August 23. I had been nervous for this day for a long time but as it turned out, there was really no need to be so nervous. I guess I'll save it for when the students come on Wednesday. I came in at about 9:00 AM and Mrs. H. introduced me to some teachers. . . . Later all the teachers met with the principal and staff. They introduced me and one other student teacher. We were told lots of things but the most important thing they stressed was to not take any "guff" from the students. We were told to let the vice principal handle rough students

August 25. Well, today was the first day we had students in class. There are about 120 in all six classes. I don't know if I'll ever get to know them all. Hopefully, I'll get all their names, even though it's going to be tough. The morning classes are fairly small, but the afternoon ones make up for it. All we did today was to let the students fill out a card with their names, why they took home economics, and what they wanted to learn this year They all seemed like nice kids, but sixth hour was kind of "rowdy." Maybe they will settle down. Well, see you tomorrow.

August 26. Today was a really hard day to stay awake. I listened to Mrs. H. explain the classroom rules, the importance of the equipment, and then she issued tote trays. One fun thing we did was to play a welcome game, which helped the kids to feel more comfortable in class.

August 30. Today was the most boring day yet. Mrs. H. gave a reading assignment of 14 pages, then she gave the students a handout to complete for tomorrow. The kids really hate to have to read this "stuff" and then do handouts. But, Mrs. H. says that's the only way she knows how to teach family relations. I don't want to teach this way when I finally become a teacher. She also tried to make them be as quiet as mice. I think that that is a little too much to ask for. Oh well, they're her students, not mine. P.S. I'm getting to know their names and faces quite well now.

August 31. Today we corrected yesterday's assignment, which most of them didn't bring back. Mrs. H. then gave the students terms and definitions about family relations. The students were given another "take home" handout that is due on Thursday. I feel that if there are handouts to do, they should be given in class, with adequate time to complete them. Because most of the students forget about them, or lose them shortly after they leave class, especially if they're not due for two days. Mrs. Babcock came today and discussed with Mrs. H. and me concerning when I would start teaching. She made sure that I would be able to teach in three areas. She also said that if I had any problems to just let her know and that she would help in any way that she could.

September 3. "TGIF" for sure! This has been a long week. I guess that it's probably because I kind of want to teach now. It can't possibly be that hard to give reading assignments and handouts. Today was a fun day, however. Mrs. H. had work stations set up to introduce the students to problems that elderly people have. In one the student wore big gloves and then tried to thread a needle. In another, the kids put saran wrap over their eyes and tried to read the newspaper. They had to turn in an outline about how it felt to be old.

September 10. Today we discussed ways to improve peer relations. I outlined on the board a guideline for personal standards and popularity. These guides included characteristics of friendship, ways for self-improvement, and just a few tips on dating. Then we passed out more handouts. This time a total of four had to be taken home. They are due on Monday. They're worth 100 points,

all together, so I hope that the kids will try to get them all back. Mrs. H. is having trouble with a boy in sixth hour (G). He causes trouble, I think, just to get some attention. I feel sorry for him because I think that she's being too mean to him.

September 14. I'm teaching all the sewing classes now. I'm writing my own lesson plans, so I think that it will be more fun for the kids. Today went really well. I wish Mrs. H. would tell me when I do something good; but she's really rare on compliments. She did say that I'm not being firm enough with third hour. Anyway, I introduced the sewing classes to fibers I felt like I had the attention of the students really well, since they asked questions. P.S. Mrs. H. is teaching the foods classes today. They had to find cooking terms in the book and had to be totally quiet.

September 20. Today I gave the sewing classes a big exam over fibers and machine parts/functions. I sure heard a lot of gripes and moans, but, they all lived. After the test they went to the machines again and worked on perfecting their paper stitching exercises. Mrs. H. gave the foods classes a lesson on baking and a quiz over chapter 16.

September 27. Today the students were issued their pillow kits and they started their layouts and pinning. I was running around like a chicken with its head cut off. The kids were getting bored by having to learn off the board and lectures. Today they proved how well they had been listening, which wasn't very well

September 28. . . . We just had the foods classes read another chapter in the book about planning nutritious meals. This chapter was too long. I think this is just an easy way out of planning lessons. Maybe I shouldn't say that, but that's how I feel. Mrs. H. got really mad at sixth hour for talking. She told them that she would send certain kids to the office if they didn't "shape up." She especially jumped on G. and D. She makes G. sit at the table in the front of the room where he is constantly on display. I don't like it but, I don't know where else he could be put where he wouldn't cause troubles. I know he's just trying to get attention, but I really can't say anything. I really feel sorry for him.

September 29. Today I gave the sewing classes a quiz over sewing machine parts and functions. After the quiz, the students worked on their projects. Some of them got their patterns all pinned on and ready to cut out. But

some didn't get hardly anything done. In the foods classes we showed a nutrition film on fats, carbohydrates, and proteins. Then afterwards we discussed them each in detail. The students really added good comments and had good questions.

September 30. Today I ran around back and forth checking the students pattern layouts and measuring. A few students did get their pillows cut out and ready to mark. Other students worked on their seam samples. In the foods classes we showed another filmstrip on minerals and vitamins. Then we discussed it in detail afterwards. The kids were good again today. They added comments and shared ideas.

October 4. Today the kids were quite lazy. I really had to get on them to get them going. They seem to think that they have forever to get their pillow projects finished. I guess that they're just anxious for the four-day weekend coming up. State in-service is this coming Thursday and Friday. Some of the kids smarted off when I told them to get to work. But, they didn't say much when I told them I would be grading them as to how wisely they used their classtime. Today I also took over all the foods classes. So, I'm now teaching them all. I demonstrated making biscuits and then let them sample some. I was kind of afraid to take over sixth hour, but it went "OK." I was really tired when I went home. I guess I'm ready for a longer weekend too, but I do have to go to some teacher inservice meetings. It will be a change though. The foods classes made their own master mix for their lab tomorrow.

October 5. Today the clothing classes worked on their seam samples and most of them got theirs handed in for grading. Then they worked on cutting and marking their projects. During preparation period I went to the store to get extra ingredients for the biscuit labs (jelly, butter). Then in the foods classes they made biscuits. For the most part, they turned out "OK." But, one kitchen used their whole can of master mix instead of the $1\frac{1}{4}$ cups. They made about four dozen biscuits. Actually, they were the best ones we tasted all day. We gave the extra ones to the faculty. There were a few problems with towel flipping, but it wasn't too bad. G. hasn't been any problem for me. As a matter of fact, he tried his best to please me in every way that he could. He carried a bag of flour for me and emptied it into the container. This made me feel really good.

October 14. . . . I had to really get after sixth hour for talking, but it didn't really help. Sometimes I feel really discouraged after sixth hour because I feel they're not listening, nor do they really care.

October 18. Today the clothing classes came in and started sewing like mad. They're starting to get worried about getting their projects done by next week. One boy got some of the body of his project into the seam. When he tried to rip out the seam, he ripped a big hole in the middle where it couldn't be hidden in the seam. I repaired it for him the best I could. In foods I gave a breakfast survey. Then we discussed the importance of breakfast everyday. I think that the kids really learned today because they asked lots of questions and really seemed to want to know more. I really felt good about today.

October 19. Some of the students finished their pillows today. I'm glad. To these students I gave a self-evaluation form to complete. Also, today was the last day to order patterns. Most of the kids brought their money for the order. In foods we had a lesson on the egg. First, I showed a filmstrip, then I outlined on the board the parts of the egg. During sixth hour a vocational "big wig" came and observed me. He was Oriental, but I can't remember his name. He seemed to be a really nice man.

October 20. Today I gave the sewing classes another quiz on machine parts and functions. There was some improvement this time, which really pleased me. They also worked on their projects. The kids that were finished read about caring for fabrics. During preparation period I went to the store to get all the supplies for the breakfast lab that we're having in foods today. I was really surprised at how well everyone cooperated today in getting things done and in getting out in time. Everyone had a really good time and were pleased with the way that everything turned out.

October 25. Today in clothing class most of the kids finished their projects. But, there are several that still are not done. I stayed after school until nearly 5:00 p.m. with kids who wanted to stay to complete their projects, but, only three kids stayed. In foods I gave a lesson on milk and dairy products. Sixth hour was really noisy and rowdy, so I really yelled at them. I guess maybe I shouldn't have yelled, but they seemed to quiet down a bit. I felt really discouraged when I left today because of it. I wish there was something that I

could do to make them listen better or something, but, I just don't know.

October 26. Today was the due date for the sewing projects. Most were turned in, but some are still not done. One girl complained all day because I didn't give them enough time to do them. Some people are never satisfied, and it makes me feel badly. I guess that I shouldn't try to please everybody, because it's impossible. She thinks it's my fault that she didn't finish. But, I've noticed throughout the term that she blames others for her own mistakes. It's really sad to see people like this

October 29. My last day. I felt kind of sad going to school today because I really have enjoyed teaching. I've really grown to love these kids. It was hard to leave. The first two clothing classes gave me a party. Both classes were really nice. Third hour didn't plan a party, so they worked on their sewing samples. In foods the fifth hour class had a really big party. It was lots of fun too. There was enough left over so I could share with sixth hour, because they didn't plan a party either. Seventh period did have a party, which made me feel really good. Maybe I did touch them in some way. The periods were all cut short because they had a dance. Mrs. H. and I went to chaperone for a little while, then we came back and cleaned up the classroom. I got all my things together and Mrs. H. told me that if I needed help with anything to just give her a call and she would do what she could. I appreciated that because she expressed some emotion in those few words that I hadn't heard her do before. As I drove away, I had a few tears in my eyes, but I was glad that my experience as a student teacher had been positive and not negative. I was especially glad that another major step had been completed towards my degree in the subject I love, home economics.

Throughout the journal, Pat tended to be rather critical of her cooperating teacher. She also expressed a feeling of tiredness on several occasions. There were no references to either Glasser or RT in the journal. At one point she expressed a wish for something that she could do to make the students listen better.

Her concern for the students, particularly one boy, was evidenced throughout the journal. The boy that had been causing problems for the cooperating teacher seemed to respond to Pat's approach. This provided Pat with a sense of accomplishment.

During the ninth week of the semester the subjects were asked to evaluate themselves in the following areas: classroom management (environment and discipline), lesson preparation (including presentation), and responsibility. Pat's unedited evaluation follows:

Classroom management- I feel that the set up of my classroom is very good. Everything is organized and I basically know where things are and should be put after use each day. In the discipline area, I feel that I may be a bit too lax in some classes (foods) or maybe just too patient but I feel discouraged some days when they won't be quiet and I can't make them even when I separate them. I feel my discipline is good in the sewing classes because none of our equipment has been taken so they are all pretty much learning to be responsible as a whole class and not just individuals.

Planning- I think that my planning has been good. I've been just a bit late getting everything written down in lesson plan form, but I do have them planned in my mind. Carrying out my plans have gone really good except sometimes I plan too many things in too short a time limit.

Responsibility- I feel I have accepted the responsibility as a student teacher very well. I don't expect my cooperating teacher to fill me in if I don't have quite all the information I need, I just tell the students that I will find out and let them know. I do the shopping for the foods labs in my own car and I figure out the grocery list before I go. I wash/dry and fold the towels after labs and don't expect her to help. In the sewing classes I take the responsibility of helping the students with their jam ups and problems and expect them to fix it the way I ask them to. I put the equipment away each day after class and don't expect her help. In the grading I figure out the scale and judge according

to my standards not hers but she does give me a few tips. I feel that I am organized the way I should be in planning and presentation except for being about 5 minutes late everyday. Somehow I've got to improve in this area. Overall I feel I have done a pretty good job as a student teacher and I feel a great feeling of accomplishment. I would estimate my grade to be about an A-.

A summary of Pat's self-evaluation on the Classroom Competencies Checklist follows (see Appendix D for the complete evaluation):

Pat felt that she was "outstanding" in several areas, including providing for individual needs, presenting material, managing time and energy, student evaluation, and attitude. Areas that she considered herself "good" in were motivating pupils and preparing lesson plans. In the areas of the use of varied techniques and classroom control she rated herself as "satisfactory."

During the eleventh week the subjects were asked to answer a set of open-ended questions. Pat's responses to the questions follow:

Have the principles of RT been helpful to you in your student teaching experience? Give specific examples. Sometimes yes and sometimes no. Step number one being personal worked with me everytime, it helped me to get closer to the student and let them know that I wasn't out to get them. Step number two works sometimes but most times it doesn't or didn't work for me. Either a smart allic kid would blame someone else or say nothing was happening. If I would have ever used number three, they most often would have said yes and that would not have helped me any at all.

Did you go through the procedures outlined by Glasser to help deal with discipline problems? Give examples. Not completely through but I think I probably used them all randomly at least once or twice. I tried to always

recognize students outside of the classroom. I tried to reinforce good behavior such as in labs. I don't think I ever gave up.

Would you use Glasser's approach again? Explain your answer. I think I would and follow it step by step through and I probably would not have all the problems that I had in student teaching.

Did you benefit personally from the principles of RT? Give examples. Probably not because I didn't use it like I should have.

In your opinion what is the most outstanding concept in RT? Number one be personal.

On a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being the most positive and 10 being the most negative, how would you rate your overall student teaching experience? Number two.

Student Teacher's Profile

A low "inclusion" score on the FIRO-B indicates that Pat prefers to move away from people. Her "inclusion" scores of 0 in both the expressed and wanted areas suggest that she not only avoids people when she can, but also that she is most comfortable when people in general stay away from her. These extremely low scores do not mean that she cannot associate with people, but rather that she is highly selective in her associations. The low wanted "inclusion" score suggests that Pat has a very small circle of friends.

The "inclusion" scores also provide insight into how an individual handles problems of rejection. Pat protects herself from rejection by rejecting others before they have the opportunity to reject her. She is vulnerable only to those few individuals whom she allows into her exclusive club. It is only when a member rejects her that she becomes aware

of her sensitivity about being rejected. She would be classified as a loner.

The low expressed "control" (0) score indicates that Pat avoids making decisions. It also indicates that she may have difficulty in taking responsibility for everyday functioning. She is most comfortable when others do not attempt to control her. She does not tell others what to do, and conversely, she does not want others to tell her what to do. Her basic attitude is, "I will stay off your back, but you stay off mine."

On the surface this attitude may give the impression of a self-sufficient and independent individual. This is the impression that she strives to communicate. The "image of adequacy" is often more important than actual adequacy. The stance that she might assume is a defense against exposing self-doubts. She is neither dependent nor inadequate, but she does have doubts about her ability to handle new areas of responsibility; she needs to be certain that she knows what she is doing so that she will not make a fool of herself. She resists being pushed into situations that might expose her shortcomings. Old, familiar areas of responsibility do not bother her; it is new, untried and untested areas that make her anxious.

She would be classified as a "rebel." Unlike the dependent person, the "rebel" has good potential for leadership, but she will move into new areas of responsibility only at her own speed. She cannot be rushed. If she is pushed, her

level of anxiety increases, and all the avoidance responses that she has learned, such as temper tantrums, noisy emotional arguments, intellectualization, rationalization, pseudo-perfectionism, negativism, procrastination, or running away will come into play.

In the area of expressed and wanted "affection" Pat's scores are borderline, four and five respectively. The expressed "affection" score may indicate that she is cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships. The wanted "affection" score of five may indicate a tendency toward wanting others to initiate close, intimate relationships with her.

The preceding profile relied heavily on Ryan (1970) for the interpretation of the subject's scores. To measure any movement in the locus of control perception of the subjects, the instrument was administered both pre- and posttreatment. Pat's September score was 11. Her score in December was 4, showing a seven-point movement toward a more internal locus of control perception.

Pat's score on the Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction, which was administered during the tenth week, was 78. This high score indicates that Pat exhibits behaviors that encourage self-direction in students.

Students' Perceptions of Student Teacher

The Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern measures the extent to which the student teacher was able to establish

rapport with the students. A high score is indicative of a greater concern by the teacher for the students, while a low score indicates a lesser amount of concern. A total of 34 students from two classes evaluated Pat. The mean score for the sample was 52.796. The mean score for third hour (n = 15) was 54.066, while the mean score for fifth hour (n = 19) was 51.526. The possible range of scores is 30-60.

The students seemed to sense Pat's genuine concern for them, and for the most part they were quite responsive to her. Pat's style of teaching was in sharp contrast to that of her cooperating teacher. Cooperating teacher B tended to be very strict, and authoritarian in her approach, while Pat tended to be more gentle and less strict. The students, not accustomed to having more freedom, tended to take advantage of Pat. Instead of following the procedures outlined in RT, Pat occasionally "yelled" at the students. According to her journal, these unaccustomed outbursts brought momentary results. However, she discovered that it was not a long-term solution.

The only question on the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern (see Appendix D) that all students answered in the affirmative (a 100 percent response) was the question: "Does this teacher think you are as important as anyone else in class?" Approximately 90 percent indicated that Pat was able to help them so that they did not mind being helped. Over 90 percent of the students thought that Pat encouraged them

to independently look for answers rather than just telling them the answers. The lowest percent of "yes" responses (63 percent) had reference to whether or not the teacher had helped them to become a better leader. Overall, the students' perceptions indicate that Pat was successful in establishing rapport with students.

The cooperating teacher administered the Class Environment instrument to the same two classes as the previous instrument. The number of students completing the evaluation in third hour was 16, while the number completing it in fifth hour was 20. The mean score for third hour was 55.999 and for fifth hour, 55.500 (see Appendix D).

The students were interested in the class and they indicated that the class was goal-oriented. The goals of the class, as well as the objectives for individual class periods, were evident to the students. The class environment was not perceived to be strongly democratic in nature. Only about 60 percent of the students thought that most decisions were made by everyone in the class. However, 80 percent of the students felt that everyone in the class was free to share his/her opinions. Ninety-five percent of the students thought that the students worked well together in various combinations.

Cooperating Teacher's Perceptions of Student Teacher

Positive comments by the cooperating teacher concerning Pat were sparse. The university supervisor was confronted with two comments, which became thematic of each visit:

"Pat is never on time in the morning" (teachers in the building were to be at work by 8:00 a.m.), and "She is taking advantage of the fact that her future father-in-law is the principal of the school" (had this fact been known earlier, Pat would not have been placed at that particular school). Cooperating teacher B also felt that Pat was not strict enough in her approach to classroom control.

Concerning Pat's actual performance in the classroom, her cooperating teacher, using the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, rated her as "strong" in her knowledge of the subject and on having clear objectives (see Appendix D). Pat was evaluated as "acceptable" in having meaningful activities, motivating students, and sequencing. She was also rated as "acceptable" in the level of materials selected and in the use of the materials. Cooperating teacher B indicated that Pat needed to improve in summarizing and clarifying concepts during the presentation.

In the area of Pat's relationship to the students, she was considered to be "acceptable" in her concern for individuals, and in understanding the students' abilities. She was evaluated as needing to improve in the areas of flexible reactions to situations that arose and in keeping the attention of most students.

The cooperating teacher was to have completed the Classroom Competencies Checklist at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth week as a composite evaluation rather than a

single teaching evaluation. However, Pat's cooperating teacher completed the form only at the end of the third week. She also used the form as a single teaching evaluation for two class periods. Because of these data collection errors, the completed form was considered unusable.

Outside Observer's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The outside observer was the area vocational coordinator. He observed Pat during the sixth hour on October 19, 1982. To evaluate Pat, he used the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form. Pat was rated as being "acceptable" in all areas related to the organization of the lesson (see Appendix D). The outside observer indicated that Pat needed to improve in the area of imagination and resourcefulness. In the area of her relationship with the students, Pat was evaluated as "strong" in her concern for the individual and her understanding of the students' abilities and needs. She was rated as needing to improve in the ability to be flexible in situations that arose in the classroom. He indicated that Pat was poised, with a well-modulated tone of voice.

The outside observer added the following comments:

With additional work experience in the field, the teacher should develop personal aptitudes. [She] should prove to be an outstanding addition to home economics education. [She] needs to establish a teacher-student relationship that will create an atmosphere for effective learning.

University Supervisor's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The university supervisor made four unannounced visits to the teaching site on August 31, September 17, October 21, and October 29, 1982. The first visit was a "get acquainted," orientation visit, since neither the cooperating teacher nor the student teacher had met the university supervisor. Because it was the first week of school, Pat had not yet begun any actual teaching. Pat's appearance was pleasant and somewhat "ruffled." She seemed to be rather detached from her surroundings at times. Her movements were slow, making her seem older than her almost 21 years.

During the second visit, the university supervisor observed Pat's teaching for two periods of clothing. The classes began promptly with Pat calling the roll. She announced that there would be a test the next Monday. Next she emphasized and clarified some points that had been studied previously.

Pat then demonstrated the use of the sewing machine and allowed the students to practice machine control. The class time was utilized well. She appeared poised and presented the material with good humor. The next two visits were approximately the same concerning her approach and handling of the class.

Each student teacher was required to turn in lesson plans each Friday, prior to teaching the following week. Pat, on several occasions, did not turn in her lesson plans on time.

However, she eventually turned in all of them. Despite the delay, she seemed to be well prepared at the time of teaching.

Pat became engaged during the semester and began planning for a January wedding. This seemed to be very distracting for her. However, her attitude remained good throughout the student teaching experience.

She tried to be positive with the students and seemed to be able to establish rapport with the students. An area of strength was her concern for individual students and their needs. At the beginning of the seminar on October 15, 1982, the university supervisor asked the usual question about what was going on in the classroom. Pat immediately responded that she seemed to be making good progress with a boy that had previously been giving the cooperating teacher "fits." When asked to what she attributed her success she quickly replied, "Glasser." The remark was entirely spontaneous, without any prompting or suggesting. As there were no references to Glasser in her journals, it is possible that Pat was responding in the way she felt would be acceptable to the university supervisor at that time.

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation form on October 21, during a clothing class (see Appendix D). Pat was rated as "strong" in being well informed on the subject, as well as summarizing and clarifying concepts during the lesson. In the areas of having clear objectives, meaningful activities, logical sequence, and

being able to motivate the students, she was evaluated as "acceptable." Pat was also rated as being "acceptable" in her selection and use of materials. Concerning her relationship to the students, Pat was considered to be "strong" in her concern for individual students. She was thought to be "acceptable" in the other areas related to her relationship with the students.

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the university supervisor at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth week of the student teaching experience (see Appendix D). At the end of nine weeks Pat was rated as "outstanding" in the presentation of material, in the use of varied techniques, and in the provision of individual needs. In the areas of management of time and energy she was evaluated as "satisfactory." Pat was rated as "good" in all the other areas in the checklist.

Summary and Discussion

Pat's number two anticipated problem area, as stated by her on September 3, 1983, was being able to plan "interest approaches." This was the only stated anticipated problem area that was related to lesson preparation or presentation. During the student teaching experience, Pat's desire to present material in an interesting manner gained impetus through what she referred to as her cooperating teacher's "dull routine."

In a self-evaluation during the ninth week Pat indicated that she felt that her planning had been good, with the exception that she was habitually late in getting her ideas written down in lesson plan form. She seemed quite pleased with her lesson presentation.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist, Pat was very positive in her evaluation. In the areas of provision for individual differences and needs, and presentation of material, she rated herself as "outstanding." The preparation of lesson plans and motivation of pupils were rated as "good." In the areas of management of time and energy, Pat rated herself as "outstanding" because she felt that she had not wasted time while at school.

Cooperating teacher B did not complete the Classroom Competencies Checklist as had been planned. Therefore, no comparative data are available, except the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form. Pat's cooperating teacher indicated that being well informed on the subject was one of Pat's strong points. Another of Pat's strong areas, as stated by the cooperating teacher, was the formulation of clear objectives. Overall, cooperating teacher B's evaluation of areas related to Pat's preparation and presentation of materials was positive. This was surprising, since cooperating teacher B complained continually to the university supervisor regarding Pat's lack of getting lesson plans in on time and her punctuality. The university supervisor encouraged the

cooperating teacher to record these complaints and to make sure that her feelings were reflected in her evaluations. However, the cooperating teacher did not comply with the suggestion. Perhaps those thoughts would have been reflected in the Classroom Competencies Checklist, if it had been completed.

The university supervisor, at the end of the ninth week, rated Pat as "outstanding" in the provision for individual differences and needs, presentation of material, and use of varied techniques. Pat was rated as "good" in the areas of motivation of pupils and lesson preparation. In the area of management of time and energy, the university supervisor rated Pat as "satisfactory." The discrepancy between Pat's self-rating of "outstanding" and the university supervisor's rating probably lies in the interpretation of the statement. Pat seemed to apply the statement in a restricted manner which related to her activities during the school day, while the university supervisor was viewing the statement of the management of time and energy in a more holistic manner.

The outside observer evaluated Pat, on the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, as being "acceptable" in all areas related to the organization of the lesson. In the areas of resourcefulness and imagination, the outside observer rated Pat as "needing more emphasis."

One hundred percent of the students sampled ($n = 36$) felt that their class (Pat's classes) had specific objectives,

while 90 percent felt that the goal of each lesson was identified. These evaluations were consistent with Pat's statement that she thought that she was well prepared. The students' evaluations also were congruent with cooperating teacher B's statement that one of Pat's strong areas was her ability to formulate clear objectives.

The first anticipated problem area on Pat's list was "discipline." Concerns about discipline did not, however, dominate Pat's journals. Also, there was nothing in her journal about RT.

On the ninth-week self-evaluation Pat indicated that she was possibly "a bit too lax" in some of her classes, but in other classes she felt that the discipline was good. During the tenth week the subjects completed the Classroom Competencies Checklist. Pat rated herself as "satisfactory" in the area of classroom control. On the same instrument, the university supervisor rated Pat as "satisfactory" during the third and sixth week, and "good" during the ninth week in the area of classroom control.

Pat seemed to be successful in helping a boy that was causing discipline problems. When asked to what she attributed her success, she stated, "Glasser." The cooperating teacher, the outside observer, as well as the university supervisor rated Pat as having a "strong" concern for individuals. Out of a possible range of 30-60, on the Students'

Estimate of Teacher Concern, the mean score for Pat's classes was 52.796. The mean score on the same instrument in the Mears et al. (1981) study was 54.463.

Student Teacher's Profile

Pat's FIRO-B profile indicated that she tended to move away from people and cultivate only a select circle of friends. From this it may have been predicted that she would have difficulty developing rapport with the students. However, this was not the case. She seemed to have a genuine concern for her individual students. She did not develop a close relationship with her cooperating teacher though. No personality clash of great magnitude developed between them, but each was critical of the other.

In the area of "expressed" and "wanted" control the profile indicated that Pat may have problems accepting responsibility for everyday functions. This prognostication proved somewhat accurate since Pat was habitually late to school, and she had difficulty getting her lesson plans in on time.

The pre- and posttesting of the locus of control perception, as measured by the Rotter's I-ES, showed a seven point movement toward a more internal locus of control perception. Pat's September score was 11, while her December score was four. The literature implied that a lower locus of control perception was indicative of a more self-actualized person. The more internal locus of control perception sug-

gests that Pat felt more in control of her life at the end of the student teaching experience than at the beginning.

Student Teacher's Perception of Reality Therapy

During the eleventh week the subjects answered some open-ended questions concerning RT. When asked if the principles of RT had been helpful, Pat answered "yes" and "no." She stated that the first step worked well for her. However, she stated that she was not successful in utilizing the other procedures. When asked if she would use RT again, she answered in the affirmative and added that had she used the steps correctly, she probably would not have had as many discipline problems. She indicated that she probably had not personally benefited from RT because she had not used the principles properly. On a scale from 1 to 10, with one being the most positive, Pat rated her overall student teaching experience as a "2." She indicated that she felt that the first step of RT was the most valuable.

Case III

The Student Teaching Site

The student teaching site in Case III was located in a southeastern Idaho city of approximately 50,000. The area had been experiencing growth and development at a steady rate. The religious and political attitudes remained conservative. The predominant religion in the community was Mormonism.

The school in the community that was selected as the student teaching site was one of the local junior high schools. The school building was old, having been remodeled and modified. The home economics department was located in one room with all the equipment crowded into it.

The student population was approximately 550. Most of the students that attended the school were from the lower to lower-middle class. However, a very small percentage of the students came from very affluent families.

Cooperating teacher C was not from the area. She graduated from Ohio State University and had had six years of teaching experience. She and her husband (no children) came to Idaho so that he could work on a doctorate. However, it was not possible for them to live on her salary, so he went to work as a biology teacher and a coach. During the time that the student teacher was with cooperating teacher C, she was taking an accounting course in anticipation of an alternate career.

The Student Teacher

Debbie was not the best candidate for student teaching. The previous spring she had "broken down" during a "bit teaching" experience in a high school classroom. This experience seemed to intensify Debbie's already low self-esteem. When speaking to another individual, her eyes were always downcast.

She was heavy and always wore pants or jeans. Her hair was unkempt and difficult to manage and she wore no makeup. She seemed to try to maintain an air of toughness, both in actions and speech. One suspected that it was a coverup for insecurity.

A good student, Debbie was active in the university organizations related to home economics. She was 25 years old, married, with no children. Her husband, a first class petty officer in the Navy, was stationed at a nearby engineering laboratory. She was the only one of the student teachers that was not Mormon.

Debbie graduated from high school in Yuma, Arizona. She had attended several institutions of higher learning, because of her frequent moves. Her father was not living, but she had a stepmother and a 10 year-old brother who lived in Yuma.

When asked to list three anticipated problem areas in student teaching, she listed the following:

1. Motivating students
2. Discipline/Classroom management
3. Being organized enough for the "little details"

Debbie expressed her professional goals in the following:

Because my husband is in the U. S. Navy, and we're due to transfer to a new duty station in Spring 1983, I don't have my sights set on any one position as a graduate. Once I learn where we're going, I intend to learn all I can about the community, to see what it offers, and to see what I can offer the community.

Consumer Economics will be advantageous to me, whether in the public schools or in adult education. I don't

feel my degree will end up just a diploma on the wall, but because of moving every 3-5 years, what I make of my career is entirely up to me. It won't be easy. Nothing worthwhile is easy.

Edited excerpts from Debbie's daily journal are presented in the following:

August 31. I took roll. Mrs. K. assigned pp. 11-23 for reading, with questions on board to be answered in class (10 questions). Students were to copy questions on their own paper, then read to find answers, conveniently in order rather than all over.

This format is OK, considering there are only 20 books (a room set), to be used in class, and checked out only on occasion.

Valuable time is lost by requiring kids to write the questions. With a ditto form, one can give more questions, and the kids have something easier to study.

September 7. I assigned chapter four to be read, and gave out a study guide with 15 questions to be answered. I'm allowing the entire period to read and answer questions. Those who need to may check out texts at the end of the day. Five minutes will be allowed tomorrow to finish before we start a discussion based on this chapter.

I don't care for this type of lesson either, but the chapters need to be read sometime. This will give a basis for tomorrow and will provide a good study guide. Will try to make discussion tomorrow lively to compensate for this drudgery. Not every day can be fun and entertaining. And, a full page of questions is at least a sign that I mean business and expect some work.

September 8. I gave the lesson in periods 2 and 4. Fourth was best. I tried to get a discussion going about communication in family living. Not much participation. Then we played "gossip": one person whispers a short message to another until the last person hears it and repeats it aloud. It is supposed to come out different--but not X rated. Scratch the game for 2nd hour! Back to straight discussion; no dice. So I gave them the worksheet (important terms with a word bank supplied--not difficult) and it wasn't popular either. Most finished on time. Had better results in 4th.

September 14. Review day. In order to have the last worksheet for review, I need to allow a few minutes for them to finish and a little time for me to grade and record them (a "true-false" worksheet). While I grade and record, they check the crossword puzzle. I'll pass back the papers then play "review baseball."

Mrs. K's classes are having a similar day. Except her worksheet is different and her game rules are different. I want to try the game with slightly harder rules; more like real baseball: three strikes and the other team gets the ball (question). That would create better competition for points. Also, I don't want to allow use of notes unless it proves to be necessary; I want to impress upon them the need to study for this test, and consider checking out a book. But if I get nothing but "duh!", I may have to allow the use of notes.

There were 50 questions (hand written on index cards). Both classes got through at least 40 questions. It was pretty successful. Good scores! And without collaboration or use of notes. All had to answer questions--not just a smart few.

About the only problem was one girl who routinely sits in class like a big bump on a log (not just our class). She's a big mature kid (physically), not at all popular. She never got any right, of course, and some kids resented the "strikes" when her turn came. I just asked for her best guess, and pointed out to the others that they're not perfect either, and should worry only about their own answers. No big deal made out of it. I think C. wanted to participate a little today, but without putting in any effort before today, she wasn't prepared. There's a difference between embarrassment and total humiliation; a little embarrassment or waking to the fact that we expect some participation might not hurt. She's the kind of kid you encourage, but can't push. So apathetic I'd like to set a fire under her chair some days, just to get a reaction.

September 16. Today I added two more classes. I now have first, second, fourth, and fifth hours. First and second will spend two and one half to three weeks on a money and resource management unit. When the unit is over, they will begin sewing.

My original plans had too much time spent on clothing selection; I hadn't realized the tiny details could swallow up entire days. Like three days to sew just to gain control of the machine. One entire day on explain-

ing machine parts, and another to practice threading it. Mrs. Babcock's first observation-type visit, at three weeks. I guess Glasser deserves a chance.

September 17. In first and second hour I gave a quiz. Thursday's reluctance to read prompted me to warn that they could very possibly get a quiz--I don't want to just give a worthless threat.

The quiz drew such "creative responses" that I had to take the papers home to grade--to sift out the correct creativity from the b.s. One class generally did so poorly that I told them to open books, and take the thing over using the book, and I would average the two scores together.

One boy (reading problems) got frustrated on the first quiz and when asked to list resources, wrote: "dogs, pigs, cows, chickens." Judging by other answers on the paper, he just scribbled that for something to scribble. But he got credit for that answer. In general the kids who don't do well with books and writing apply themselves better to manual skills. In order not to put one class ahead of another, I assigned collages as a project; each student was to depict the kind of clothes they liked. Some of the students were less than thrilled with this cut and paste, but our "bump on the log" made two pictures.

September 27. In first and second hour I tried to get some discussion going, but it's difficult to get real seriousness for any length of time from jr. high. "What should we do about over-population and starvation?" "Line 'em all up and shoot 'em!" I used two worksheets from Mrs. W's workshop Both were based on values and opinions and, as such, could not be "score" against anything; "bonus points," in a way. That's not totally bad; some kids need the points, and the chance to see an A now and then.

It's not easy to plan! I had intended to incorporate housing more. Mrs. K. said she uses housing in money resources management study. Yet, she later cautioned against being too heavy on it, because housing and decorating will also be covered separately later on.

September 30. Well, we reviewed all that world resource material. The kids were grouching about, "What's this got to do with home ec?" I explained it--but they don't believe. Still, they dutifully wrote (or scribbled) on worksheets. I gave strong hints that

there would be a quiz, so they'd be wise to form good answers.

Next: in 4th and 5th I checked the kids' ability to thread machines, wind bobbins, etc. Assigned three seams . . . I demonstrated, repeated myself silly, had samples tacked up on a bulletin board, on easel, and still they don't understand!! I can hardly wait to start the Frostline kits; those instructions resemble army technical manuals!

When they switch chairs, and the one who "sat" gets to sew, and the machine won't run correctly, their first reaction is to cuss the machine. When I tell them the machine's threaded wrong, they yell at their partner. Challenging.

October 5. First and 2nd hour took unit exam. Fourth and 5th are still sewing along, getting started on their Frostline kits. Despite the fact that they are all sewing with the same color of thread, they change the bobbin and thread when they take turns!! Then, the second person often threads the machine incorrectly. Kits temporarily "disappear," and who gets blamed? Me! I drop everything to look for an entire tote tray that the kid misplaced! Machine needles "disappear." Kids are breaking needles because of incorrect needle positioning. They love to "sandbag" the next class by sabotaging the machines by: lowering the feed dog, messing up the tension, releasing the hand wheel, etc. The kids coming in don't check over the machines and so they lose time. "Mrs. C!! Mrs. C!!" I need trackshoes.

October 11. . . . Third and 6th hours are chaos! Too big, too few machines. Sixth hour has too many rowdies for just one class. I'm having trouble with their names. Mrs. K. encouraged me to take a break and go to the lounge before I had all six classes. The few times I sat in the back to observe, I was seeing backs of head. Seating chart is useless. The kids hate answering up to roll call. "Where's Mrs. K?" "We need two teachers!" I agree, but can't tell them that. I sometimes wish that Mrs. K. got here earlier. But, what great challenges await her these days? Nothing but sewing in the conference room and studying her accounting homework. I have no keys, however. Asking to be let in the room by someone else is like putting a red flag on the fact that she's coming in rather late, and I'm reluctant to do that. I'm also reluctant to come super

early myself just to stand outside a locked door, or inhale smoke in the lounge. I've formed the habit of getting here by 7:40 AM and running dittos if needed, then waiting. This AM it was more crowded than usual at the ditto machine. We took turns.

Well, some old so-and-so complained about my being there. The principal then asked Mrs. K. if I could try to run dittos at some other time of the day. Guess I'll try, but my stuff's as important as anyone else's. Anyone who ran dittos after I must have been later than I was. Student teachers can identify with Rodney Dangerfield; we often "don't get no respect." I should, however, try to get stuff copied one day in advance, when possible, for myself, not others.

October 12. . . . These big classes will drive me nuts with continued requests for drinks and potty breaks. They also are reluctant to sign the help list. They act glued to their chairs and expect me to fetch zipper feet, chalk, tape measures, etc. I've got to set ground rules!

October 15. . . . I don't know, I guess I'm not a super teacher. Don't think I ever will be. I hate these kids. Trying to plan what's next. I can't help thinking so much else should have been taught first. These kits do not relate well to concepts and techniques such as grain line, cutting, marking, etc. All pre-cut, everything included, it really doesn't prepare them well for what lies ahead.

Besides--the kids who are finishing aren't bringing in mending or anything to keep busy. Some do help those who are behind which is OK when they instruct them correctly. Even with the help list the kids are going nuts for not enough assistance. I am losing patience. There's only one of me. I think this should be team taught. Maybe I'm slow, though, or not skilled enough.

October 18. Mrs. K. agreed to "pop in" sometime during 5th and 6th. During 5th I could have really used some help, but she didn't "pop in" then. During 6th many kids were finished and my problems must have looked as if I'd exaggerated. She helped a few kids, then "popped out" again. I realize that the main reason she leaves me alone so much is that she wants the kids to regard me as the teacher and to come to me with questions. But I still wish that something else could have been worked out. Still, here I am a supposedly highly qualified adult. Why can't I handle it 100 percent by myself?

Worst part is, I'm beginning to make survival my main objective. Sure, I want to get the kids to learn things that will help them in their next project. But getting myself through the day in one piece is taking a lot out of me lately. Why have they failed to bring in patterns and fabric? My instructions were clear and I repeated them often. If not patterns and fabric, then bring mending. It seemed logical that today we could've taken one kid's pattern and shown how to lay out and straighten grain But no one (oops! one kid) brought anything. That one brought plaid and it was 45 inches wide rather than the 54 inches listed on the pattern back. Luckily, it was an easy poncho and we made it fit.

October 19. I passed out Frostline kits to 1st and 2nd hour. We were one kit short! I had labeled all remaining kits, so one obviously had taken a hike. S.O. hadn't paid for his anyway. All others had. One hadn't been ordered for R.--a new kid who signed up today. Both he and S. have reading difficulties and couldn't read the instructions anyway, most likely. So I'll have them make something else. I may have to design it myself in my spare time.

October 25. First and 2nd hour worked on the Frostline kits. It's amazing how much calmer things are in a smaller class, where each kid has a machine to him/herself! It also, logically, takes one half as long to complete the same project.

The other classes worked on gathering techniques and finished hemstitches. They are a little calmer in 5th and 6th, as grading time approaches I'm not sure now that I can do machine buttonholes (by myself). No two alike! But the thing that really gave me a headache was the realization that, with only two buttonhole feet, I can't make a group effort of it anyway. Unless there are more buttonhole feet riding in the closet that I don't know about. It's stuff like this that gets me down; maybe I am left on my own too much. I can't get much help from her in the morning, because she shows up about five or ten 'til eight, and there's a faculty meeting at eight.

October 27. There are buttonhole feet in the closet--hidden in plastic boxes and boxes and boxes. In second hour, R. finally brought his stuff together for the pillow. Monday neither R. nor S. had brought anything. "We forgot."

"Well, fine. Just sit quietly the entire period. No more playing with fabric scraps."

They were both bored silly! So, Tuesday S. cut out his pillow and marked darts, etc. Today R. had his things, and S. helped him cut out the pillow, etc. These two are becoming fast friends. S. has few friends, but I can think of better ones than R, who was sent here from H. due to disciplinary problems. The two of them "hang out" together all the time now, outside of class. S. is a follower, and R. likes to be "cool" and "tough."

Last evening I made a special trip to D. Industries to get several packages of shirt buttons In 3rd hour, where are the buttons? Luckily, others were available At lunch, I find that I put a brown bag containing cheese and crackers in the desk drawer and the buttons in the fridge. The kids did fairly well with buttons. They laughed that the suggestion that they had to be taught something so simple--but many requested individual help after the demonstration. A common question was, "How do you tie a knot?"

October 29. TGIF! Halloween party day. First and 2nd worked half-heartedly. Many interruptions from spooks in dire need of safety pins, etc. . . . In 3rd hour I sent R.M. to the office because of his foul mouth and noncooperation. He spouted off when I put his hat in the closet and said he'd get it back after class (the kids were tossing it around then later were running machines fast, loud, and unnecessarily. A couple of kids attempted to hand in Frostline kits today. They were due over a week ago. I told them that I couldn't grade them; and that they'd have to learn to meet deadlines. Besides--computing all those grade averages is work enough

Teachers' Halloween potluck was in the home economics room, not the media center as originally planned, because it was decided to entertain kids not going to the dance with a movie in the media center. When do I find this out? Towards the end of 4th hour. The kids helped me get the machines put away, etc. I let them go a tad early because teachers were flitting about with casseroles and desserts, and the goings-on. An older teacher said, "Hmph! I'd have made them stay and they wouldn't leave 'til everything was perfect." I bit my tongue to keep from saying, "Well, I'm not you--I have my own way of doing things." The same old biddy later complained, "We almost had pins in our dessert, folks," because there was a pin on the counter. She was one of the first "kitchen invaders" that arrived; she probably laid her cookie plate right on top of that pin.

November 1. HALLELUJAH! Shorter-than-normal class periods during 1st and 2nd to allow for two TA periods. Temporary report cards were carried around by kids, from class to class. Mrs. K. suggested that a puzzle would keep the kids occupied harmlessly. I wouldn't need to grade it, but the kids need not know that it wouldn't be graded. By 4th hour, I could see that the puzzle was insufficient to occupy them. During lunch I ran off a true-false worksheet about clothing care for the rowdy 5th and 6th hours. C. L. threw a fit because I wouldn't grade her Frostline bag today.

The kids that got lousy grades are upset by the grades, primarily because they'd been sure that home economics was an easy A! In most cases, the grade that I gave corresponded with their other class grades; the achievers got high marks all-around, some got C's and F's, and some got B's and C's. It was a bummer of a day! Awful to have some nice kids hating your guts on your last day; couldn't leave on a happy note, I had to dis-tribute the somber news, then slink out.

R.M. came in after school to chit-chat. I'd asked Mr. G. today whether or not all three boys that were sent to him Friday had reported to him and he said, "Yes." R., however, said that he hadn't had the guts to go see him. But that his mother had found the paper in his jacket pocket, and she chewed him out about it. I hope she did a good enough job of it. As of tomorrow, it's no longer my problem. Not a wonderful attitude, perhaps, but I am weary of this.

During the 9th week of the semester the subjects were asked to evaluate themselves in the following areas: classroom control, lesson preparation (including presentation), and responsibility. Debbie's evaluation follows:

I have trouble with the "problem kids," and I can't seem to always prevent them from leading the others off the straight and narrow path to learning. The kids aren't motivated; self-motivated or teacher motivated. Yet, I'm not sure junior high students care deeply about many school subjects.

The little bitty details drive me nuts: collecting FHA dues, pizza party money, and Frostline kit money every period, sorting it, issuing receipts, locating lost student property they claim was stolen, etc. Of the class

period, 45 minutes, really only 40 minutes is usable, and it's so much interrupted and fractured. Maybe I'm not resilient and resourceful enough. I realize that all kids are different. But this age group can get to me; I'm tired of whine, complaint, and lack of self-discipline. The language problem aside, how do you get junior high kids to stop saying, "School ----?"

With the classes I've had from almost the beginning, I feel I've actually managed to get some important concepts across, without much chaos. The classes that I added later, the ones taken in the third week seem to be productive learning situations. But, in the two classes that I took the sixth week, the vibes are wrong! The classes are larger, the kids are wilder, and they view me as a rude interruption. A person has to establish respect and control before much learning can happen. In the last classes that I've taken on, I don't feel that I've achieved what I wanted to. But I'm not a failure, either.

In the area of lesson plans, I have relied exclusively upon block plans to plot weekly/unit schedules. After one or two days, there are always changes! I wanted to write up impressive, complete plans, but it seems that after grading papers and all, I'm so exhausted that I put my energy into how to best convey the next logical step in a lab project. I tend not to have detailed plans far enough in advance. I'm always finding the most fabulous things that I could have used--but too late. I feel so blasted inadequate when it takes me forever to decide the logical sequence for teaching sewing--then the plans have to be totally revamped the next day. I do feel that I needed my cooperating teacher in the room a bit more. Yet if I'm grown up and ready for this, why can't I go it alone? Every night I make a little list, separate from plans, reminding myself of vital things to say or do. Still, I seem to omit things, though I try my best.

In class "presentation," I wish that I could elicit better student response in discussion of topics. Even the group decision-making exercises were groaned about. I thought that I'd bomb out when the kids got to the sewing machines, and be a total nincompoop. But, aside from too many kids to help at once, it's okay. I think that I could do better if the classes were "my own," and older. I don't like being "mommy" in any way, shape, or form to that many kids. They are "a challenge."

Student Teacher's Profile

Debbie's expressed "inclusion" score (6) on the FIRO-B indicates that she is quite comfortable around people. In social settings she will tend to move toward people. Her wanted "inclusion" score is extremely low (0) indicating that she is selective about with whom she associates. The extremely low wanted "inclusion" score indicates that Debbie has a select circle of associates. The basic attitude is, "I'll call you, don't call me." Membership rules for admission into the "exclusive club" are determined primarily by the wants in the "control" and "affection" areas.

The expressed "control" score (3) indicates that Debbie is capable of making decisions and taking responsibility necessary for everyday functioning. She neither avoids making decisions, nor does she become overbearing in her control of others. Her wanted "control" score (6) is high, which may indicate a tendency toward dependency. However, it may also only represent the degree to which she has learned to tolerate control from others, rather than a measure of how much control she wants.

The extremely low expressed and wanted "affection" scores (3,3) indicate that Debbie is very selective about with whom she forms deep relationships. She is very cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships.

Debbie's September score on the Rotter's I-ES was 12. Her December score was six, which showed a six-point movement toward a more internal locus of control perception. The shift, according to the literature, is indicative that Debbie felt more in control at the end of the semester than at the beginning. Her score on the Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction was 79, indicating that Debbie encouraged a rather high degree of self-direction in students.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist (see Appendix F), Debbie did not rate herself as "outstanding" in any area. She felt that she had done a "good" job in providing for individual needs and in using varied techniques. In the areas of presentation of lessons and student evaluation, she rated herself as "satisfactory." Debbie evaluated herself as needing to improve in five areas: motivating students, preparing the lesson, controlling the class, attitude, and managing time and energy.

During the eleventh week of the semester, the subjects were asked to answer a set of open-ended questions. Debbie's responses to those questions follow:

Have the principles of RT been helpful to you in your student teaching experience? Give specific examples. Yes. Primarily, "giving the time of day" and the "what are you doing" step. I was particularly careful to speak pleasantly and conversationally the next day with any student who had stepped "way out of line" the previous day (swearing, etc.) necessitating a trip to Mr. G's office. That way he/she knows it's the behavior I disapprove of, not the person. Also, to ask, in some form, "What are you doing?" can avoid the problem of a teacher assessing a situation incorrectly and over-

reacting. It forces both the teacher and the student to take a hard, realistic look at behavior, rather than reacting.

Did you go through the procedures outlined by Glasser to help deal with discipline problems? Give examples. Yes and no. I did try to give each kid "the time of day." I also tried to impress upon each one that the responsibility of correct behaviors rests with the student--but perhaps my "options" weren't enough to choose from: "You can clean up your language or take a visit to Mr. G's office, whichever you prefer." When we "worked things out" in addition to appropriate behavior substituted for inappropriate, it was generally, what day and time for detention.. Detention is standard policy at this school, and some kids will egg you on until they get some. And I accepted no excuses; football takes a back seat to detention.

Would you use Glasser's approach again? Explain your answer. Yes. I feel it would be far more successful in a "classroom of my own." In the beginning, I felt hampered by the fact that the rules established by Mrs. K. were already there, when the students are supposed to help decide the rules. I suppose we could've made more rules though. The big "boo-boo" was, I should've scrapped the list of rules and had the kids help draft a new set when we started using the sewing machines, because many old rules were then obsolete, while new ones were needed.

Did you benefit personally from the principles of RT? Give examples. When I was using the principles, I felt the kids were more calm and in control of themselves, and so was I. The classroom atmosphere was better. When the sewing machines moved in, and we all spread out and got noisy, student-developed and enforced rules could've helped so much--I can see that now.

In your opinion, what is the most outstanding concept in RT? It is student-centered. It places the bulk of responsibility upon the student. The teacher structures the classroom and environment and learning situations, and when disruptions occur, the teacher lets the student explain the actions. It's rational rather than reactional, for both the student and teacher.

On a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being the most positive and 10 being the most negative, how would you rate your overall student teaching experience? Four.

Students' Perceptions of Student Teacher

The possible range of scores on the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern is 30-60, with a high score being indicative of a greater concern by the teacher for the students. Nineteen students from two classes evaluated Debbie. The mean score for the sample was 46.185. The mean score for 1st period (n = 12) was 46.083, while the mean score for 2nd period (n = 7) was 46.286 (see Appendix E).

Approximately 72 percent of the students thought that it mattered to the teacher if they were happy or unhappy. Less than one half (46 percent) of the students felt that the teacher wanted to know them better. Thirty-four percent of the students felt that they could talk with the teacher concerning their problems. Ninety-six percent indicated that they received as much attention as the other students. From the students' perspective, Debbie was unable to develop a close rapport with them. However, the students indicated that Debbie treated them equally.

The Class Environment instrument was administered to the same classes as the previous instrument (see Appendix E). The mean score for 1st period was 55.642. And the mean score in 2nd period was 50.777. One hundred percent of the students felt that the class worked toward certain goals. One half of the students thought that everyone in the class got along well with each other. The students (90 percent) thought that everyone in the class had opportunities to share their

opinions. However, fewer (71 percent) thought that decisions in the class were made by everyone.

Cooperating Teacher's Perceptions of Student Teacher

In written comments, cooperating teacher C indicated that one of Debbie's good qualities was her use of good English and grammar. Preparing written unit and lesson plans was another strong point, noted by the cooperating teacher. Other positive comments were: "Debbie came in early the last two weeks; it seemed to help her prepare," and "She gave a lot of thought to a handicapped girl's problem with sewing."

Cooperating teacher C stated that Debbie needed to improve in eye contact with students during lessons, in classroom control, and in opening and closing the class in a systematic and effective manner. She also stated, concerning rapport with students, "This is a bit of a problem area-- sometimes you can 'get off on the wrong foot' with students and are unable to develop rapport. . . . In general Debbie has shown improvement; she may find greater success with teaching an older group."

Using the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form (see Appendix E), cooperating teacher C evaluated Debbie as "strong" in her subject matter knowledge. She rated Debbie as "acceptable" in having clear objectives, meaningful activities, and summarizing concepts.

In her relationship with the students, Debbie was evaluated as "acceptable" in her concern for individuals. How-

ever, cooperating teacher C indicated that Debbie needed to improve in her understanding of the students' abilities and needs, questioning the students, and in keeping the students' attention.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist (see Appendix E), the cooperating teacher rated Debbie, at the end of the ninth week, as "outstanding" in the preparation and presentation of lessons. Debbie was evaluated as "good" in providing for individual needs, using varied techniques, managing her time and energy, evaluating students, and her attitude. Two areas that the cooperating teacher rated as "satisfactory" were motivation of students, and classroom control.

Outside Observer's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The outside observer in this case was the area vocational coordinator. He observed Debbie on October 14, 1982. He stated that Debbie "[n]eeds to develop self-confidence and establish rapport with all students." The outside observer went on to state that Debbie needed to use more appropriate language in some situations.

Using the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form (see Appendix E), the outside observer indicated that Debbie was "strong" in her knowledge of the subject, in having clear objectives, and meaningful activities. She was evaluated as needing to improve in the area of motivating students, in her concern for individuals, and in understanding the students' abilities and needs. The outside observer rated Debbie as

"acceptable" in all the other areas related to the observed lesson.

University Supervisor's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The university supervisor made four unannounced visits to the teaching site on August 31, September 16, October 21, and October 29, 1982. The first visit was made to meet the cooperating teacher and to outline expectations. This visit was made during the first week of school, so the student teacher was not teaching.

The university supervisor observed Debbie for two periods during the next visit. The bell rang at 8:30 a.m.; however, Debbie did not begin the class until 8:38 a.m. At the beginning of the class period, a test was passed back and an opportunity was given to the students to ask questions about the grading. Certain areas of the test were discussed.

One boy immediately threw his paper away upon receiving it. Debbie told him to get his paper, but the boy did not retrieve it. Debbie went on with the discussion without saying another word to him about the test paper. The other students, although not as demonstrative, were not paying close attention to the activity.

Debbie had some visual aids (pictures of different clothing styles), which she used quite effectively to gain the students' interest. She made good use of the board. However, no instructions were given concerning whether or not the students should have been taking notes. Debbie also

tended to stay in one spot at the front of the room, rather than move around the room. It was observed that, although she was well informed in the content area, she did not summarize and review the concepts that she was teaching with the students. Debbie was positive with the students and displayed a sense of humor. She turned in lesson plans late to the university supervisory on two occasions.

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form (see Appendix E) on October 21, 1982. Debbie was rated as "strong" in her knowledge of the subject matter. She had "acceptable" objectives, activities, and motivation of students during the lesson. Areas that Debbie needed to improve were: summarizing concepts, checking for student understanding of concepts, and reacting in a more flexible way to situations that arose. All other areas related to the lesson were evaluated as being "acceptable."

Using the Classroom Competencies Checklist (see Appendix E) the university supervisor rated Debbie's performance at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks. The area that was consistently in need of improvement was classroom control. Her attitude was evaluated as "satisfactory" along with her motivation of students and her use of varied techniques. The other areas on the checklist were rated as "good."

Summary and Discussion

Debbie's number one anticipated problem area in student teaching was "motivating students," while her number three concern was that she would not be organized enough to handle all the "little details." The "little details" seemed to plague Debbie throughout the student teaching experience. In her ninth week self-evaluation she wrote, "the little bitty details drive me nuts" On the Classroom Competencies Checklist Debbie rated herself as "good" in the areas of provision for individual differences and needs, provision for teacher-pupil learning, and use of varied techniques. In the areas of motivation of pupils, preparation of lesson plans, and management of time and energy, she evaluated herself as needing improvement. She felt that her presentations were "satisfactory."

Cooperating teacher C's ninth week evaluations on the Classroom Competencies Checklist agreed with Debbie's evaluations in some areas. The cooperating teacher rated Debbie as "good" in the areas of provision for individual differences and needs, provision for teacher-pupil learning, and use of varied techniques. These ratings were in agreement with Debbie's self-ratings. Areas of disagreement on the ratings were the following: the cooperating teacher rated Debbie as "good" in management of time and energy, and as "outstanding" in the preparation and presentation of material. Debbie and

her cooperating teacher both agreed that Debbie needed improvement in motivating students. The outside observer was in agreement with this as well.

The university supervisor rated Debbie as "good" in the areas of provision for individual differences and needs, preparation of lesson plans, presentation of material and management of time and energy. In the areas of motivation of students, provision for teacher-pupil learning, and use of varied techniques, the university supervisor rated Debbie as "satisfactory."

On the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, the cooperating teacher, the outside observer, and the university supervisor were in agreement that one of Debbie's strong points was her knowledge of the subject matter. These evaluations were made on different days and in different classes. The cooperating teacher and the outside observer both listed four areas that they felt Debbie needed to emphasize, while the university supervisor listed three areas that needed more emphasis. There was no agreement among the three observers concerning the areas that needed improvement.

In the student evaluations of Debbie's teaching, 100 percent of the students sampled felt that both the class and each lesson had identifiable goals. These evaluations were consistent with the other three observers' evaluations with regard to objectives.

According to all the observers, Debbie's greatest strength was her ability to organize and write out lesson plans. However, she had difficulty in presenting the material. By her own admission, she did not enjoy interacting with the students in a learning environment.

Debbie's journal reflects a growing frustration concerning classroom management, especially during laboratory classes. During the third week, after a visit from the university supervisor, Debbie indicated in her journal that perhaps Glasser deserved a chance. However, nothing in her journal after that comment indicated that she had endeavored to utilize the principles of RT in the classroom. Observations made by the university supervisor failed to uncover any evidence that Debbie was trying to implement the principles of RT in the classroom.

In her ninth-week open-ended evaluation, Debbie mentioned that she had trouble with the "problem kids." Rather than owning the problem herself, though, she stated that the students were not self-motivated and that she did not think that they were interested in many classes.

By October 18, she stated that she was beginning to make survival her main objective. In her self-evaluation she stated that the last classes that she had taken were more difficult to manage. She indicated that she did not feel that she had achieved what she had set out to achieve. However, she

wrote, "But I'm not a failure either."

Debbie, as well as the university supervisor, rated her performance as "needing improvement" in the areas of classroom control. The outside observer stated that Debbie's language was not always appropriate for the classroom.

At the beginning of the student teaching experience, Debbie had listed as her number two anticipated problem area discipline/classroom management. This anticipation proved to be an accurate assessment, since all the evaluators were in agreement that classroom management was an area that Debbie needed to improve.

In the area of ability to develop rapport with the students, which is a concept closely related to classroom control, Debbie's cooperating teacher indicated that Debbie's inability to develop rapport with the students was a major factor in her overall student teaching experience. The student evaluations supported the idea. On the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern, Debbie's mean score was 46.185. The possible range is 30-60. In the Mears et al. (1981) study, the mean score was 54.463 on the same instrument. Another factor related to classroom control that was noted by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor was the fact that Debbie had problems beginning the class, as well as ending the class.

Student Teacher Profile

Debbie's FIRO-B profile indicated that she was quite comfortable around people. However, her wanted "inclusion" score of zero and her low expressed and wanted "affection" scores (3,3) implied that Debbie was highly selective in her associations, and that she would proceed very cautiously in establishing close relationships. From this profile it could have been predicted that Debbie would possibly have a problem in the area of developing rapport with the students.

The pre- and posttesting of the locus of control perception, as measured by the Rotter's I-ES, showed a six-point movement toward a more internal locus of control perception. Her score in September was 12, and her December score was six. Debbie, at the end of the student teaching experience, felt more in control of her life than she did at the beginning.

Student Teacher's Perception of Reality Therapy

Debbie stated that the principles of RT had been helpful to her, primarily in realizing the need to give each of the students recognition. Her response to the question of whether or not she had followed the procedures outlined by Glasser to deal with problems showed that she did not understand the principles. For instance, she stated that her options to the students were "You can clean up your language or take a visit to Mr. G's office, which ever you prefer." This is not an example of the application of the principles of RT.

When asked if she would use Glasser's approach again, she stated that she would. Debbie indicated that she thought that having her own class would help. To the question of whether or not she had benefited personally from the principles of RT, she said that both she and the students seemed to be calmer when she was trying to apply the principles.

On a scale from 1 to 10, with one being the most positive, Debbie rated her overall student teaching experience as a "4." She stated that the most outstanding concept, in her opinion, was the fact that the approach is "student-centered."

Case IV

The Student Teaching Site

The student teaching site in Case IV was located in a southeastern Idaho city of approximately 40,000. Although there was some diversification in the economy, agriculture remained the dominant force. The religious and political attitude were conservative, with Mormonism being the largest religious influence.

The school in the community that was selected as the student teaching site was one of the local senior high schools which was located about five miles north of the city. The school building, a four-year-old modern structure, was built on seven levels. Both the facilities and equipment were new. The home economics department contained four separate areas, a clothing lab, a foods lab, an interior design/child devel-

opment lab, and a lecture room. The student population was approximately 1000. Most of the students that attended the school were from middle-class homes. About one half of the students came from rural areas.

Cooperating teacher D was not from the area. She graduated from Queens College in Charlotte, North Carolina. Her student teacher described her as having "a cute Southern accent that the students were always teasing her about." She had two children: a girl in school and a mentally retarded boy. Cooperating teacher D had many interests from entertaining to camping and travel.

The Student Teacher

Linda was an enthusiastic, friendly 20-year-old who grew up on a farm in southeastern Idaho. Some of the activities that she enjoyed were camping, showing horses, horseback riding, and hiking. She was a transfer student from a two-year Mormon college in Idaho. Linda was a very good student and stated that she enjoyed school and learning.

Student Teacher's Profile

The matched expressed and wanted "inclusion" scores, (6,6) indicate that Linda is comfortable in social settings and will tend to move toward people. At the same time, she has a great need to belong and to be accepted.

Linda has an extremely low score in the expressed "control" area (1) indicating that she avoids making decisions and taking responsibility. Although her expressed score in-

dicates that she avoids decisions, her wanted control score (2) indicates that she definitely does not want others to make decisions for her. She communicates that she is "in control" and that she does not want interference. However, at the same time she is hesitant in decision-making.

She is neither dependent nor independent, but she has doubts about her ability in new situations. As long as she is familiar with the areas of responsibility there are no problems. But she resists moving into new areas of responsibility, and will do so only at her own pace. She would be classified as a "rebel," with good leadership potential.

Linda's expressed and wanted "affection" scores are five and eight. The very high wanted "affection" score indicates that she wants others to initiate close, intimate relationships with her. Her borderline expressed "affection" score may indicate that she can quite easily become emotionally involved in the establishment of intimate human relationships.

Linda's September score on the Rotter's I-ES was 11, and her December score was also 11. Although the score was the same at both testings, her responses to individual items on the measure varied. On the Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction instrument, Linda scored 81. With a possible range of 3-120, 81 was considered a high score. This would indicate that Linda uses teaching methods which encourage the development of independent study in the students.

When asked to list three anticipated problem areas in student teaching, Linda wrote the following:

1. Variety
2. Motivating the students
3. Grading

Linda stated her professional goals in the following:

After finishing my B.S. degree in Consumer Economics, I would like to teach school for a couple of years. Then I would like to go back to school and get a master's degree. I am interested in hiking, camping, and first aid, and would like some training in these areas. After finishing my master's degree, I would like to teach high school.

Edited excerpts from Linda's daily journal follow:

August 30. Well, today was my first day of student teaching. I want to learn as much as I can about teaching and how to become a great teacher. C.H. is the nicest lady. She is so kind and helpful. I know she wants me to succeed and will help me when I need it. Today all I really did was sit around and watch. It was kind of boring and although I am scared to teach, I am looking forward to the challenge of trying a few things. I feel so dumb and inexperienced. I guess it must be typical though. I hope that I get over it. I was really tired when the day was over. I didn't realize new experiences were so exhausting.

September 1. Today I found out that I am teaching the foods class next week. I need to have my lesson plans written tomorrow so I can type them. I guess I am going to be busy tonight. I'm glad Mrs. H. asked me about it because I was wondering when and what I was going to teach. I asked her about it the other day. I guess that she thought that I knew what I was doing (what a laugh). Anyway, I am going to teach sanitation and measuring next week.

September 3. Today I finished my lesson plans. I sure feel inadequate and scared.

September 7. Today was my second week of student teaching and my first lesson that I have taught. It felt good to be doing something. Last week all I did was ob-

serve. I realize that I am going to make many mistakes while teaching, but that's the only way to learn, and I want to learn as much as I can about teaching. The lesson went pretty well today, I thought. The lesson was too short, though. I didn't know what to do with the left-over time, so Mrs. H. gave me a safety handout to go over with them. Thank heaven for Mrs. H. It was nice to have her help and support today. In the future, I will always over plan and always have something extra, just in case.

September 9. I had a great lesson planned for today, I thought. They did a lab on measurements, abbreviations, and equivalents. The lab went really well and I felt they learned from it. I had a small problem with S., the blind student. I went to her table to help her get to her kitchen. She said that she didn't want to do it because she couldn't see. I told her that I would help her, and that she needed to do it. She then agreed and we went to her kitchen and worked on her lab sheet.

Today it was brought to my attention, by Mrs. H., that I say "OK" about every sentence. I didn't realize that I was doing it. I really felt bad and kind of like a failure. I realize that if I can't communicate well, the students will feel no need to listen. Also, they will start counting my "OK's." So to take care of this problem, I am going to stop saying "OK" starting today.

September 13. Today went much better. My language was good and my timing was great. I was determined never to say "OK" again. I bet that I only said it once or twice. I did great, if I don't say so myself.

I have this problem though, well, actually I have three. One is a blind student and the other two are exchange students. One is a girl from Germany and the other is a boy from Norway. They speak pretty good English, but they both have problems with new vocabulary and measurements. When I say teaspoon, they haven't the faintest idea what I mean. I feel badly for them, but also frustrated because I don't know what to do about tests, etc. Heaven knows what I am going to do. I made a study sheet for S., the Norway boy. I hope that he does OK on the test.

I think that I have the blind girl figured out. I make up work sheets, study guides, etc. then the special ed. lab reads them to her and gives her the tests orally. I think that this system works pretty well.

September 23. Today in foods class my class totally shocked me. Usually they are mouthy and noisy, but today they were really quiet. That class will always puzzle me. The other class gets excited about cooking, but 1st hour is "grumpy." Monday when I was giving a lecture to the class about quick breads, I developed a severe case of the "scares." A couple of girls were being rude at the beginning of class so I got after them. I guess they unnerved me, because I was nervous the rest of the class. Mrs. H. asked me what happened and I told her that I seriously didn't know. So we talked about it for awhile. Now after that little experience I have gotten a hold of myself. I realized that I can't let students walk on me and I must be firm. I told Mrs. H. that I was going to become a reformed woman this week and she laughed. But, I have, and Mrs. H. has even said that I have.

In child development they were working on a worksheet. I realized that some people are a lot faster than others. It was sure hard to find something for the ones that got finished to do.

September 24. Foods went fine today. I can feel myself acquiring more confidence every day. I must do something about life management though. This is just not working with N. I ask her about getting lesson plans for the next week and she just says, "Well, I don't know what to do." I say, "Well, I'll write some lesson plans for you and we can coordinate the two classes."

September 27. It seems like I have a hard time getting into Monday mornings. It seems like everything goes wrong. Today, J. brought her baby (which isn't hers) to show the class how to bathe and dress it. It was a total disaster. The class caught on right away that it wasn't hers by the way that she was handling it. She did everything wrong and I thought that I was going to die before she finished. It was a bad experience, but I sure learned a lot.

September 28. Wow, what a day. The kids were rowdy. It is homecoming week and they are really wound up. I taught N's 1st hour class today. I love her 1st hour, they are good and fun to teach. My 2nd hour class was very noisy; so I got mad at them. They picked a great day for it because my supervising teacher was here observing. I realize that I handled the situation wrong. They were extremely noisy, so I told them if they didn't listen to me they would have to read the book (they made that choice last week). Anyway, they weren't listening,

so I had them read the book. This was a bad choice, because I've used the book as a consequence, now everytime I use the book they will think that it's because they are being noisy.

September 29. Today went so smoothly. It was wonderful. First hour baked nut breads. Second hour we talked about goals. I felt very comfortable with the subject. I really enjoy teaching this class.

October 4. I have this problem in foods, 1st hour. I get nervous because C. sits right there and I feel like she is watching my every move. So C. and I had a little talk and I told her the way that I felt. So we decided that she should sit around the corner.

October 5. Today we finally had our guest speaker in 6th period child development. She was good, but she went through it really fast. She showed the class how to bathe and dress a baby. Anyway, she showed us and then she left. In the other classes the guest speaker took more time and answered questions. So I had about 20 minutes left. I again realized the importance of over-planning and of always having something on hand. Luckily, I did have a short worksheet for them to do.

October 18. Today in foods we started on the nutrition unit. It was kind of fun. I made pop for them. I put soda water, sugar, orange food coloring, and flavoring together. The class was amazed by the amount of sugar in pop. We also did some comparing of the food values in different foods using the comparison cards that I got from the dairy council. I'm having a good time teaching this unit.

October 19. In foods today we played Banana, Banana. It is a nutrition game. They played it in teams. It's kind of like concentration. They really enjoyed it. It was a good review of the film that they saw. I think that playing games is a good way to learn. There are so many fun ways to teach a subject besides lecturing.

October 20. I got the opportunity to do something really neat. The home economics department at ISU let me use their "Eat Smart" program for the Apple II computer. The students had a worksheet that had codes for foods. They wrote down what they ate and then coded it. After that they were able to punch the codes into the computer. The computer provided a printout analyzing their nutritional intake. The students loved it. They got so excited. The principal tried it too, and he

thought that it was really neat. Now they are talking about getting an Apple II for the home economics department. I hope that they get one because it would be so neat.

October 28. My last day Hippi Skippi! Something really funny happened in foods today. The power went off. The school doesn't have any windows, so it was completely dark. The students had cupcakes in the oven and they were worried that they wouldn't get done After awhile the power came back on. Then the principal told them over the innercom to go to 2nd hour. The kids were mad because their cupcakes weren't done. They hurried really fast, but everyone was very late for their next class, including me.

In life management we had a party. We had a lot of fun. In child development we had a pumpkin carving contest. They seemed to enjoy it. I really had mixed emotions today. I have become quite attached to the students. They were a lot of fun. But, I was glad that student teaching was over. It was certainly a lot of work.

Linda's comments in her journal were, for the most part, positive. She seemed to have a balanced approach to her own performance and accomplishments. Several times she expressed satisfaction in her teaching, although she was quick to point out that things did not always go as she had planned. She tried very hard to vary her techniques and to provide stimulating lessons. Her journal revealed that she worked well with her cooperating teacher and was able to face problems. Linda's confidence in her ability to handle situations increased with each success that she experienced in the classroom.

During the ninth week of the semester, the subjects were asked to evaluate themselves in the following areas: classroom control, lesson preparation (including presenta-

tion), and responsibility. Linda's self-evaluation follows:

Man, have I learned a lot. When I started I wasn't sure how to handle a noisy class, but now I feel that I have the ability and knowledge to handle the situation. I had to learn by experience and by trying different approaches. I found that Glasser's theory will work, if you are consistent. I also feel that the first step in classroom management is to have something that the students want to learn. Also, the teacher can make any subject exciting or boring. I also learned that a good way to deal with individual problems is to have a personal talk or conference. This helps the student know that you really care. Every class was different so I now have experience in many discipline situations.

Lesson Preparation and Presentation (responsibility)

I feel that I am always ready for each class. I make it a point to be on time and prepared for the class. I feel if the teacher hasn't done her homework, why should the students. My cooperating teacher let me handle every situation that came up while I was there. Including: finances, broken equipment, special education students, the grading scale, and full responsibility for the lesson content and discipline. She let me make mistakes and work through the problems myself. If I needed some suggestions, she would willingly give them, but the problems were mine to deal with. Because I did all these things, I feel that I've gotten a real good overview of what teaching is all about. One of the best things that I did (for me) was the budget. I can't believe how careful you have to be with money. I was also involved with FHA and after school activities. I was a chaperone several times, which was a good experience. I learned to be firm, without being mean.

Evaluating myself overall, I feel that I deserve an A. I worked hard, and was very concerned about how I did. I wanted to learn and to do well.

Linda completed the Classroom Competencies Checklist during the tenth week of the semester (see Appendix F). She rated herself as "outstanding" in the use of varied techniques and in the management of time and energy. Areas that she considered herself "good" in were: motivation of students,

preparation of lessons, and attitude. She evaluated herself as "satisfactory" in providing for individual differences and in presenting material. Classroom control and student evaluation were areas that Linda felt she needed to improve.

During the eleventh week of the semester, the subjects were asked to answer a set of open-ended questions. Linda's answers to the questions follow:

Have the principles of RT been helpful to you in your student teaching experience? Give specific examples. Yes they have. I tried it a few times and it will work if you do it right. I tried it in 5th hour child development. We set rules (2) and consequences. When they were breaking a rule I would ask them what they were doing and if they were breaking the rules. It was nice because they were telling themselves that they were wrong, instead of my telling them. I also had them tell me the consequences and they would do it.

Did you go through the procedures outlined by Glasser to help deal with discipline problems? Give examples. a. We set rules: No one else talks while someone is talking; and When doing individualized book work, it should be quiet. b. Set consequences: Have to stay one minute and 30 seconds after the bell rings and have points taken off. c. Value judgment: I had the students admit that they were wrong.

Would you use Glasser's approach again? Explain your answer. Yes, I would, but I would use it earlier. I would do it the first week instead of waiting a couple of weeks.

Did you benefit personally from the principles of RT? Give examples. Yes, it was nice because once I learned how to do it I realized the students couldn't get really mad at me because it wasn't my fault.

On a scale from one to ten, with one being the most positive and ten being the most negative, how would you rate your overall student teaching experience? Three.

Students' Perceptions of Student Teacher

The students completed the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern (see Appendix F) during the last week that the student teacher was in the classroom. The possible range of scores was 30-60. A high score is indicative of a greater concern by the teacher for the students, while a low score indicates a lesser amount of perceived concern. The mean score for the sample was 50.190. The mean score for child development class (CD) was 50.647 (n = 17) was 50.647, while the mean score for the first hour (n = 15) foods class (F) was 49.733.

Over ninety percent of the students perceived Linda as being fair and friendly with all the students. The students (88 percent) felt that it mattered to the teacher if they were happy or unhappy. Ninety-four percent of the students thought that what they said was important to Linda. However, only 16 percent felt that they could discuss their problems with her. Overall, the students' perceptions of Linda were quite positive.

The students' perceptions of their class environment as measured by the Class Environment instrument (see Appendix F) showed that the students felt that both the class and each lesson had specific goals. Ninety-six percent of the students thought that everyone in the class got along well with each other, although only 66 percent stated that the class members were personal friends. Ninety-one percent of the students thought that everyone in the class had opportunities

to share his/her opinions. Concerning decision-making, 88 percent thought that decisions were made by everyone. Overall, the class was thought to have definite direction and structure, the students were interested in the class, and the class formed a cohesive group.

Cooperating Teacher's Perceptions of Student Teacher

Cooperating teacher D did not add any written comments to any of her evaluations. However, in casual conversation with the university supervisor she always had positive comments concerning Linda's performance in the classroom and her attitude. She did mention that Linda's grammar needed improvement. At the end of the nine weeks she stated that although she had had other student teachers who were outstanding in certain areas, she felt that Linda was the best overall student teacher that she had ever supervised.

Cooperating teacher D completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form (see Appendix F) on a lesson in child development. She rated Linda as being "strong" in having meaningful activities and in having a logical sequence to the lesson. Concerning the materials used, cooperating teacher D thought that Linda was "strong" in the level chosen, the skill exhibited, and imagination.

Linda's concern for individuals and her understanding of their abilities and needs were also considered to be strong points. Cooperating teacher D indicated that Linda was flexible in her reactions to situations that arose in the classroom.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist (see Appendix F) cooperating teacher D evaluated Linda as "outstanding" at the end of the nine weeks in all areas except two. The two areas that were rated "good" were the motivation of students and classroom control.

Outside Observer's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The outside observer in case number four was the vocational coordinator for two school districts in southeastern Idaho. She observed Linda during a foods class on October 27, 1982. Using the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form, she indicated that Linda was "strong" in her content knowledge, activities, motivation of students, sequencing and selection and use of materials. The outside observer thought that she was acceptable in having clear objectives, summarizing concepts, questioning, and checking for student learning. Linda's relationship to the students was perceived to be excellent.

The outside observer also indicated that Linda was strong in all areas of personal attributes. She had good rapport with the students, used appropriate language, and paid attention to class routines. The outside observer wrote the following statement concerning Linda:

I feel Linda presented a well-prepared lesson which was designed to reinforce learning from the previous day or days. The students played a nutrition game which encouraged them to think of food values before they bought. The students worked in small groups as a team; a few lost interest and could have been redirected to join their team. Time passed quickly, but perhaps a little

more time should have been allowed at the end of the period for review and analyzing which team ended up with the greatest amount of nutrients and why. Linda had the game all prepared at the start of the period and was well organized. She was familiar with it and knew just what she was going to do. She has a very pleasant manner with the students and did lots of positive reinforcement.

University Supervisor's Perceptions of Student Teacher

The university supervisor made four unannounced visits to the teaching site on August 26, September 14, September 28, and October 28, 1982. The first visit was made before school had started for the students. The visit was basically a "get acquainted" time because the cooperating teacher had not met the university supervisor. Ideas and expectations were exchanged between them.

Linda was administering a test to each of the classes that she was teaching, when the second visit was made. It was observed that Linda remained at the desk in the front of the room, occupied with some papers. She did not move around the room or glance at the students, until it was obvious that some of the students were not keeping their eyes on their own papers. She seemed to be amazed that anything like that would go on in the classroom.

During the next visit Linda was observed while teaching a life management class. The lesson topic was decision-making. She seemed to be well prepared. The class period was begun promptly and the class was kept moving. Linda made several positive comments throughout the class period.

As the lesson progressed, the class became a little noisy. At one point Linda said, "B., what are you doing?" She threatened to give them a reading assignment if they did not settle down. Linda's perception seemed to be that the class was "out of control," because she stated, "I don't have control." Then she gave the students a reading assignment. It was the perception of the university supervisor that the class was not out of control, but that the student teacher had wanted things to be "perfect" for the university supervisor.

A conference was held with the student teacher after the class period ended. Alternate ways of handling the situation were discussed. Since the student teaching had referred the reading assignment as "their punishment," the university supervisor discussed Glasser's (1969) view of the difference between punishment and the natural consequences of one's actions. Linda seemed to understand the differentiation. She commented, "I see it, I see the light."

One day during the time that Linda was student teaching, the university supervisor received a call from cooperating teacher D who stated that Linda had a problem. She had taken a class under another teacher in order to meet the state vocational requirements of having three lesson preparations. The teacher continually changed her mind about what she wanted Linda to do, which was very frustrating for Linda. Cooperating teacher D asked the university supervisor what she was going to do. The university supervisor replied that it

was Linda's decision as to how to handle the situation.

At the next seminar, the problem was discussed. The other student teachers suggested various courses of action that could be taken. Linda was told by the university supervisor that she had fulfilled the state requirement and that the class could be dropped if she felt that that was the right decision.

Linda decided to continue with the class. Her plan included writing out lesson plans and submitting them to the teacher. She planned to tell the teacher that she had developed lesson plans according to what she would like to do in the class, but that she would welcome any suggestions or additional ideas from the teacher. The plan worked well and Linda had no further problems with the teacher.

The whole process seemed to strengthen Linda's self-confidence. She indicated that she was very pleased with the decision that she had made and the plan that she had worked out to solve the problem.

Linda prepared good lesson plans and was always prompt in turning them in, even when it meant putting them in the mail, or making a special trip to the supervisor's home. She did not miss a day of school during her student teaching assignment. Linda was an easy person to work with both in class and out of class. She worked hard at trying to apply the principles of RT. Several times during the seminars she would tell the other students that the procedures did work.

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form during a child development class on October 28, 1982. In the general area of organization of lesson Linda was evaluated as being "strong" in having clear objectives, motivating students, and sequencing. She was perceived as "acceptable" in her knowledge of the subject, activities and in summarizing concepts. Linda was rated as "strong" in having the attention of most of the students during the lesson. The one area that the university supervisor indicated needed improving was in checking for student understanding of the lesson.

At the end of the ninth week, the university supervisor, using the Classroom Competencies Checklist, rated Linda as either "outstanding" or "good" in all the areas (see Appendix F). Linda was perceived to be "outstanding" in motivating students, preparing lessons, using varied techniques, managing time and energy, and attitude.

Summary and Discussion

Linda's first two anticipated problem areas, as stated before student teaching, were providing enough variety and motivating the students. Both of these areas relate to lesson preparation and presentation. On the Classroom Competencies Checklist, which Linda completed during the tenth week, she rated herself as "good" in the areas of provision of teacher-pupil learning, motivation of students, and preparation of lesson plans. In the area of use of varied tech-

niques, she rated herself as "outstanding." Her self-rating was "satisfactory" in the areas of presentation of material and provision for individual needs. Linda stated that she had always been on time and that she was well prepared for each class.

Cooperating teacher D indicated on the Single Teaching Experience Form that Linda was "acceptable" in the areas of motivating students and providing meaningful activities. The outside observer rated Linda as "strong" in both the above areas. The ratings of the university supervisor were "acceptable" on meaningful activities, and "strong" in the area of motivating students. Each of the above ratings was made on different lesson presentations.

The ratings made by cooperating teacher D during the ninth week, utilizing the Classroom Competencies Checklist, were "outstanding" in every area related to lesson preparation and presentation, except in the area of motivation of students. In the area of motivating students, cooperating teacher D rated Linda as "good." The university supervisor rated Linda as "outstanding" in the areas of motivating students, preparation of lesson plans, and the use of varied techniques.

A concern about classroom management did not appear on Linda's list of anticipated problems. Entries in her journal revealed that although she did have some "bad" days concerning discipline, it was not a major problem. During the ninth

week of the semester, the subjects answered some open-ended questions. Concerning classroom management, Linda wrote that at the beginning she was unsure of herself, but that she had gained confidence in her ability to handle situations. She stated that Glasser's theory worked, if one was consistent in its application.

On the Classroom Competencies Checklist, Linda rated herself as "needing improvement" in the area of classroom control. The cooperating teacher, as well as the university supervisor, rated Linda as "good" in this area.

Each of the observers rated Linda's ability to develop rapport with the students as either "strong" or "acceptable." The mean score of the students sampled, utilizing the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern, was 50.190. The possible range on the measure was 30-60. The sample mean on the same instrument in the Mears et al. (1981) study was 54.463.

Linda's FIRO-B profile implied that she was quite comfortable around people and that she enjoyed people initiating warm relationships with her. From this assessment, it could have been predicted that Linda would be successful in her student teaching experience. She was able to develop rapport with the students as well as her cooperating teacher, with whom she developed a very close relationship.

The profile also indicated that Linda may have doubts about her ability in new situations, but that when familiarity was gained, she would not have problems in accepting

responsibility. This prognostication seemed to be accurate. At the beginning of the student teaching experience, Linda's journal entries reflected a feeling of uncertainty. However, her confidence grew until at the end she expressed the feeling that she could handle a class of her own.

The pre- and posttesting of the locus of control perception, as measured by the Rotter's I-ES, showed no movement in either direction. Linda's September and her December score were both 11. This is surprising because of the degree of personal growth that had been observed.

Linda stated that she thought that the principles of RT were of benefit to her in her teaching. She indicated that she had followed the procedures very closely and stated that they worked. When asked if she would use the approach again, she replied in the affirmative. But, she indicated that she would start sooner, rather than waiting a couple of weeks. The concept that seemed to stand out to her was the idea of student responsibility rather than teacher responsibility for discipline problems.

On a scale from 1 to 10, with one being the most positive, Linda rated her overall student teaching experience as "3." She stated that the principles of RT had been helpful to her personally, because she realized that by placing the responsibility for conduct on the students, they in turn could not become upset with her.

Chapter Summary and Discussion

Chapter IV presented four individual case studies developed from the student teaching experiences of four females who student taught under the direction of the Department of Consumer Economics in the College of Education at Idaho State University during the fall semester 1982.

Data were collected from the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, the students, an outside observer, and the university supervisor. Perceptions concerning the student teacher's lesson preparation, including presentation, and classroom management were elicited utilizing several instruments. The study was naturalistic in design, with a minimum number of constraints placed on the data collection. The administration of the instruments was incorporated into the normal procedures.

In Case I the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor were in agreement that the subject's lesson preparation was "outstanding." The subject rated herself as "good" in the area. All three were in agreement that the subject's presentation of material was "good." In the area of classroom control the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor were in agreement that the subject's ability was "good." The subject rated herself as "satisfactory" in the area of classroom control.

In Case II the university supervisor and the subject were in agreement that her preparation of lesson plans was

"good." The university supervisor rated the subject as "outstanding" in lesson presentation, while the subject rated herself as "good" in the area. In the area of classroom control, the university supervisor rated the subject as "good," while the subject rated herself as "satisfactory." The cooperating teacher did not complete a usable instrument.

In Case III, the university supervisor rated the subject as "good" in the areas of lesson preparation and presentation, while the cooperating teacher rated the subject as "outstanding" in the same areas. The subject rated herself as "satisfactory" in lesson preparation and "good" in lesson presentation. In the area of classroom control, the university supervisor and the subject rated her ability as "needs improvement," while the cooperating teacher rated the area "satisfactory."

In case IV, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher rated the subject as "outstanding" in the preparation of lesson plans, while the subject rated herself as "good" in the area. The university supervisor rated the subject as "good" in the presentation of material, while the cooperating teacher rated her as "outstanding." In the area of classroom control both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher rated the subject as "good," while the subject rated herself as "needs improvement."

Table 1 shows a congruence among the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and for the most part, the

Table 1

Ninth Week Ratings by Subjects, Cooperating Teachers, and University Supervisor

Classroom Competencies	Case I Tammy				Case II Pat				Case III Debbie				Case IV Linda			
	O	G	S	NI	O	G	S	NI	O	G	S	NI	O	G	S	NI
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs		X # *			X *					X # *			#	*	X	
2. Motivation of Pupils	*	X #				X *					# *	X	*	X #		
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	# *	X				X *			#	*		X	# *	X		
4. Presentation of Material		X # *			*	X			#	*	X		#	*	X	
5. Use of Varied Techniques	X *	#			*		X			# X	*		X # *			
6. Ability in Classroom Control		# *	X			*	X				#	X *		# *		X
7. Management of Time and Energy		X # *			X		*			# *		X	X # *			
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement		X # *			X	*				# *	X		#	*		X
9. Attitude	X # *				X	*				#	*	X	# *	X		

Key: O = Outstanding; G = Good; S = Satisfactory; NI = Needs Improving; x = Subject's self-rating; # = Cooperating teacher's rating; * = University supervisor's rating.

Note. Cooperating Teacher B did not complete a usable evaluation.

student teachers' evaluations. Pat tended to over-rate herself, when compared to the other two evaluators, while Linda tended to under-rate herself, when compared to the other two evaluators.

In their written evaluation, the subjects were able to identify their strengths and weaknesses with a great amount of accuracy. Pat had difficulty putting her lesson plans together, but presented them very well. Conversely, Debbie was able to write excellent lesson plans, but had difficulty in presenting the material. Her cooperating teacher noted that she needed to develop better eye contact with the students. Debbie was also not consistent in following through her instructions to the students. She was not able to develop rapport with the students.

Results from the Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern which measured the ability of the student teacher to develop rapport with the students, revealed that Debbie's mean score was 10 points below that of Tammy (see Appendix G). Debbie's mean score was 46.185, while Tammy's mean score was 56.041. Pat's mean score was 52.796, and Linda's score was 50.190. The possible range was 30 to 60.

A total of 105 students was sampled in the four cases. The mean score for the total was 51.301. The Mears et al. (1981) study sampled a total of 218 students. The sample mean was 54.463 (see Appendix G).

The subjects in the present study compare favorably with the teachers in the Mears et al. (1981) study in their ability to develop rapport with the students. It should be pointed out that the programs that were evaluated in the latter study were considered to be outstanding. The teachers in those programs were said to be the key in each program's success. All the teachers in the programs were experienced, with the average number of years in teaching of 6.5. Several of the teachers had master's degrees. The mean score of 54.463 was considered by the researchers as indicative of "an extremely high degree of teacher concern" (p. 21).

It is surprising that the subjects in the present study scored high in the area, because of the lack of experience, pressures from the classes not being their own, and the time constraints that were placed on them.

The first step in the application of the principles of RT is to develop rapport with the students. In the present study, all but one of the subjects were able to develop a high degree of rapport with the students. The subject that was unable to develop rapport did not try to apply the principles of RT in the classroom. As evidenced by her remarks, she did not understand the first step.

A key concept in RT is personal responsibility. Being self-directed is evidence of the acceptance of responsibility. The instrument, Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction, measured how the teachers perceived themselves in their teaching

behaviors that encouraged student self-direction in learning. The possible range on the instrument was 30 to 120, with a higher score denoting a teacher who facilitates self-direction in students. In the present study, Tammy's (case I) score was 81, Pat's (case II) score was 78, Debbie's (case III) score was 79, and Linda's (case IV) score was 81.

In the Mears et al. (1981) study the individual teacher's scores were as follows: teachers in Pennsylvania, 89, 69, and 75; teachers in Virginia, 85, 72; an average of two teachers in Michigan, 45; and a teacher in Iowa, a score of 100.

Again, the subjects' scores in the present research compared favorably with the individual scores in the Mears study. These high scores indicate that the student teachers perceived themselves as promoting self-direction in student learning.

The FIRO-B instrument was administered to give a view of the subjects' overall approach to interpersonal relationships. Debbie's score showed that she tended to want other people to take responsibility for her, rather than assuming it herself. The scores in the "affection" area and the "inclusion" area indicated that Debbie was very selective in her associations and that she had little need to become emotionally involved with people. The results of the FIRO-B, if they had been used to predict success in the student teaching experience, would have been remarkably accurate in

focusing on potential weaknesses. The profiles seemed to be congruent with the actual in-class interpersonal relationships.

All the student teachers successfully completed the student teaching experiences. All utilized the principles of RT to some degree in the classroom, and all indicated that they would use the principles of RT again. It is interesting to note that the two subjects who utilized the principles of RT the least seemed to have more discipline problems in the classroom. They were also perceived by the university supervisor as well as the cooperating teachers more negatively in the area of classroom control.

Because of the complexity of the student teacher experience and the imprecision of the instruments, it was not possible to ascertain the exact role that the principles of RT played in the resulting evaluations. Nevertheless, the subjects indicated that the principles of RT had been helpful in their student teaching experience.

The university supervisor did not mention the word "control" during the course of the student teaching time. However, three out of the four subjects mentioned either the word "calm" or "in control" concerning the personal benefits that they felt that they had derived from the principles of RT. The student teachers responded well to the mode of supervision utilized by the university supervisor. The non-directive, positive approach was especially effective with

Linda, who seemed to develop confidence in the classroom as she accepted more responsibility in the student teaching experience.

Tammy expressed in the journal a feeling of relief that the university supervisor was not negative and critical. Debbie, with her expressed insecurities, probably would not have been able to function in a negative climate. Pat would have more than likely responded to a directive approach because she seemed to be conditioned to external pressure.

The results of the pre- and posttesting of the Rotter's I-ES showed a dramatic shift toward a more internal locus of control perception in two of the subjects. Pat moved seven points, from a score of 11 to a score of four, while Debbie moved from a score of 12 to a score of six. Tammy's score moved from 13 to 11, and Linda's score remained the same at 11. Perhaps Debbie, if given a longer period of time would have been able to be more effective in the classroom.

Again, because of the complex nature of the student teaching experience and the difficulty in measurement, it is not known exactly what impact the teaching of the principles of RT had on the locus of control perceptions among the subjects. The answer to question number two is, perhaps the teaching of the principles of RT effected the movement, but perhaps it did not.

The overall student teaching experience was rated by all the subjects as being a positive time. Summary data from the other instruments are presented in Appendix G.

Table 2 presents excerpts from the subjects' responses to the open-ended questions concerning RT. At this juncture, several factors related to the teaching and modeling of the principles of RT in the present study need to be clarified.

1. The use of the principles of RT was not given assignment to the subjects.

2. The use of the principles of RT was not tied to the grade that the subjects received for student teaching.

3. The subjects knew that their grade for student teaching had been determined when they were asked to comment concerning RT.

4. The subjects were not aware that the teaching and the modeling of the principles of RT had anything to do with the research that was being conducted.

5. A relaxed and open climate had developed in the seminar, so that the subjects felt free to express their feelings.

In summary, all the subjects perceived their student teaching experience as positive, and all indicated that they would employ the principles of RT in the classroom in the future. Each was candid in her appraisal of the use of the principles of RT in their student teaching experience.

Table 2

Subjects' Responses to Open-Ended Questions Concerning Reality Therapy

Question	Responses
<p>1. Have the principles of RT been helpful to you in your student teaching experience?</p>	<p>I. "I think that they have been very helpful because they kept me in better control." II. "Sometimes yes and sometimes no. Step number one worked every-time. It helped me to get closer...." III. "Yes, primarily, 'giving the time of day'...." IV. "Yes, they have. I tried it a few times and it will work if you do it right...."</p>
<p>2. Did you go through the procedures outlined by Glasser to help deal with discipline problems?</p>	<p>I. "I would try to say, 'What are you doing?' and even before that I would be nice to the student.... " II. "Not completely through, but I think I probably used them all randomly at least once or twice." III. "Yes and no. I did try to give each kid 'the time of day.'" IV. "We set rules...set consequences...values judgments...."</p>
<p>3. Would you use Glasser's approach again?</p>	<p>I. " Yes, I thought it was and is an excellent guide. Even if you don't use every step...it can be a great tool." II. "I think I would and follow it step by step through...." III. "Yes, I feel it would be far more successful in my own class." IV. "Yes, I would, but I would use it earlier...."</p>
<p>4. Did you benefit personally from the principles of RT?</p>	<p>I. "Yes, like I said before, it kept me in better control." II. "Probably not because I didn't use it like I should have." III. "When I was using the principles, I felt the kids were more calm and in control of themselves, and so was I." IV. "Yes, it was nice because the students couldn't get mad...."</p>

Question	Responses
5. In your opinion, what is the most outstanding concept in RT?	I. "That it puts the responsibility on to the student..." II. "Number one be personal." III. "It is student-centered. It places the bulk of responsibility upon the student." IV. "Student responsibility for problems."
6. On a scale from 1-10, with 1 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall student teaching experience?	I. "2" II. "2" III. "4" IV. "3"

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The student teaching experience, which is the culmination of teacher education, is for many a negative experience. At the end of the experience, many student teachers become more dictatorial, inflexible, and uncaring. Some research has pointed to the ineffectiveness of the university supervisor to have a positive impact on the student teaching experience. Therefore, innovative supervisory methods need to be tested. Traditionally, the focus of supervision has been to improve classroom teaching.

The two main problems that teachers face have been identified as classroom management and lesson preparation. Since student teachers are faced with these problems, supervisory practices should focus on processes that will ameliorate these concerns. In 1965, Glasser presented his theory of reality therapy, which was viewed by the present researcher as an innovative approach to student teaching supervision.

The major purpose in the present research was to explore the application of the principles of RT to the student teaching experience. The principles of RT were taught to four female student teachers during the Fall 1982 semester at Idaho State University. The principles of RT were also

modeled by the university supervisor. The goal of this research was to produce a "slice of life" from the complex phenomena called student teaching. The overall student teaching experience was examined, with special focus on each student teacher's lesson preparation (including presentation) and classroom control.

Methodology

The methodological approach taken in the present study was naturalistic in design. Data were collected from various sources including the student teachers, the students, the cooperating teachers, the university supervisor, and an outside observer. Four individual case studies were presented. All phases of the study, including treatment, observations, and the administering of instruments, were incorporated into the normal student teaching experience. A total of seven instruments were utilized in the study.

Limitations

The following factors were seen as limitations on the present research:

1. In-service training for the cooperating teachers concerning the principles of RT, prior to their supervisory roles, would have been helpful because the teachers could have reinforced the principles of RT.

2. Training concerning the completion of the instruments for the cooperating teachers, the students, and the outside observers would have lessened data collection prob-

lems.

3. Securing the same outside observer would have provided more uniformity in the evaluations. The researcher endeavored to obtain the same observer, but was unable to do so.

4. More precise, coordinated observations by the observers, e.g. all observing the same class during the same week, would have made the results more reliable.

5. An observation instrument, based on the principles of RT, could have been developed for more focused data collection.

6. Three of the four subjects were Mormon. There appears to be an incongruity between the principles of RT and the view of the Church toward the respective male/female roles and human initiative.

7. When not understood and accurately applied, RT can become manipulative in nature.

8. To be more effective, the use of RT would have to have been implemented at an administrative level. Schools are highly bureaucratic in structure, and therefore, it is difficult to effect change in the classroom without administrative support.

9. The results from the pre- and postadministration of the Rotter's I-ES should be viewed with caution because the scores are individual scores rather than group mean scores. The researcher also questions the validity of the

instrument.

10. The constraints of time and the fact that the classrooms were not their own seemed to inhibit the subjects' free expression of experimentation. It was easier for the subjects to follow along with the cooperating teacher's style.

11. The student teaching experience did not seem to be the optimum time to introduce a relatively new concept such as RT. The student teachers were confronted with a multiplicity of new relationships, a change in status, pressures and time limitations. Therefore, it was difficult for the subjects to concentrate on the application of the principles of RT.

Results

All the subjects were successful in their student teaching experience. None of them had any major problems in the preparation and presentation of lessons or classroom control. The self-evaluations, as well as those of the cooperating teacher, the students, the outside observers, and the university supervisor were quite congruent.

Each of the subjects indicated that she would utilize the principles of RT in the future. However, the exact impact that the teaching and the modeling of the principles of RT had on the subjects was not discernible. The student teachers responded well to the mode of supervision utilized by the university supervisor. Tammy and Linda seemed to respond especially well in the accepting of personal respon-

sibility.

Two of the subjects moved six and seven points toward a more internal locus of control perception, as measured by the Rotter's I-ES. One subject's score moved two points, and one subject's score remained the same. Those students with a more stable locus of control perception seemed to perform better in the overall student teaching experience. Perhaps the subjects that showed a greater shift toward a more internal locus of control perception were in a state of "becoming." Given a longer period of time, perhaps these subjects would have performed with more self-assurance.

The possible misuse of RT was evidenced by Debbie's statement that she was applying the principles of RT to situations, when in actuality it was obvious that she did not fully understand the principles and was not implementing them properly. The possibility of misuse and manipulation of the principles of RT is ever-present.

The following generalizations are based on the collected data and are applicable only to the four case studies that have been presented:

1. The application of the principles of RT is a complex process which is not easily learned in a few weeks.

2. The principles of RT did not have a negative impact on the subjects, since all rated their student teaching experience as positive.

3. Positive supervisory practices do impact on the student teaching experience.

4. Reality therapy offers a viable approach to student teaching supervision.

Recommendations

It is recommended that, in future studies of a similar nature, the teaching of the principles of RT begin in the preceding year during a methods course. The students would be less distracted. Role-playing could be utilized to teach the principles. The principles of RT could then be retaught and reinforced during the student teaching experience.

It is recommended that future studies explore the use of the FIRO-B as an indicator and predictor of success in the student teaching experience. The FIRO-B could also be utilized as a means of matching cooperating teachers with student teachers.

The present research was exploratory and expansionist in nature. Future studies could focus on the development of an instrument to measure the degree of application of the principles of RT, and the development of a more sophisticated model of the application of the principles of RT to the supervisory role.

Reality therapy is not a panacea for all the problems in a classroom, but it does offer a viable, positive approach to helping students become more responsible. It also offers a potential model for student teaching supervision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alschuler, A. S. School discipline: A socially literate solution. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980.
- Borich, G. D., & Madden, S. K. Evaluating classroom instruction: A sourcebook of instruments. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.
- Bowman, N. College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 33(2), 29-30.
- Brandt, R. M. Studying behavior in natural settings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Brannon, J. M. The impact of teacher stage concern and level of use of a modified reality therapy discipline program on selected student behaviors: A discriminant analysis approach (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4037A.
- Browning, B. D. Effects of reality therapy of teacher attitudes, student attitudes, student achievement, and student behavior (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 4010A.
- Bruzzes, R. Can reality therapy be subsumed under humanistic psychology? (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 2332B.
- Caraher, J. C. The relation of determinism and moral responsibility in the writings of Freud, Calvin, Glasser (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 5514A.
- Cogan, M. Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Copeland, W. D. Student teachers' preference for supervisory approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33(2), 22-26.

- Curwin, R. L., & Mendler, A. N. The discipline book. Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Co., 1980.
- Fleck, H. Toward a better teaching of home economics. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Fleck, H. Toward a better teaching of home economics (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.
- Gang, M. J. Empirical validation of a reality therapy intervention program in an elementary classroom (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 4216B.
- Gitlin, A. Horizontal evaluation: An approach to student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(5), 47-50.
- Glassberg, S., & Sprinthall, N. A. Student teaching: A developmental approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(2), 35-38.
- Glasser, W. Mental health or mental illness? New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Glasser, W. Reality therapy: A new approach to psychiatry. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.
- Goldhammer R., Anderson, R. H., & Kajewski, R. J. Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.
- Gordon, T. Teacher effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Wyden Publisher, 1974.
- Guba, E. Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. University of California at Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1978, Monograph No. 8.
- Gwynn, J. M. Theory and practice of supervision. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1961.
- Holleran, J. P. Effect of group counseling on locus of control and academic achievement: Reality therapy with underachieving junior high school students (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 41, 4980A.

- Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(1), 23-26.
- Idaho State University, Consumer Economics Education. Student teachers' handbook. Pocatello, Idaho: Idaho State University, 1977.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Martig, R. M. The behavioral and psychological effects of group reality therapy on male and female college students (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Institute of Technology, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 1902A.
- Martin, B. B., & Quilling, J. Positive approaches to classroom discipline. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1981.
- Mears, R. A., Ley, C. J., & Ray, E. M. Dimensions of home economics programs: Seven case studies. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1981.
- Mosher, R. L., & Purpel, D. E. Supervision: The reluctant profession. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971.
- Muro, J. J. The Glasserian classroom meeting: Some problems, remedies, and promises. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 1978, 3, 86-95.
- Neagley, R. L., & Evans, N. D. Handbook for effective supervision of instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Rosario, A. C. The interaction of counseling strategy and locus of control (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 2672A.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(Whole No. 609).
- Rotter, J. B. Chance, J. E., & Phares, E. J. Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

- Ryan, L. R. Clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1970.
- Salzillo, F. E., Jr., & Van Fleet, A. A. Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(1), 27-31.
- Schutz, W. FIRO-B: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958. (Republished as The interpersonal underworld.)
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill book Company, 1979.
- Stake, R. The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7(2), 5-8.
- Treadway, D. M. Reality therapy as a model for college student counseling (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 4971A.
- Watts, G. The effects of reality therapy and individualized instruction on the locus of control expectancy of students in selected Texas community college developmental education programs (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 410A.
- Wolf, R. L., & Tymitz, B. Ethnography and reading: Matching inquiry mode to process. Reading Research Quarterly, 1976-77, 12.
- Wolf, R. L., & Tymitz, B. Toward a more natural inquiry in education. CEDR Quarterly, 1977, 10.
- Zimpher, N., deVoss, G., & Nott, D. A closer look at university student teaching supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(4), 11-15.

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO COOPERATING TEACHERS



Idaho State University
College of Education
Pocatello, Idaho
83209-0009

Department of Consumer Economics

Mrs. J. Jones
Anyplace High School
Centerville, Idaho

Dear Mrs. Jones:

Enclosed are two sets of forms to be completed by the students in two different classes. If possible, it would be best to administer the forms to the first classes that Linda picked up, since they have been exposed to her teaching the longest.

Please make clear to the students that they are evaluating the student teacher rather than their regular classroom teacher. The date of administration of the evaluations will be left up to your discretion.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

Treva M. Babcock,
University Supervisor

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS USED IN STUDY

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

P. 169-173 Rotter's I-E Scale

P. 174-177 Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior

P. 178-180 Teacher Facilitation of Self-Direction

P. 181 Open-Ended Questions

P. 182-184 Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern - Form B

P. 185-186 Class Environment (Completed by Students)

P. 187 Classroom Competencies Checklist

P. 188 Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

APPENDIX C
CASE ONE RESPONSES

Table A
Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern

Question	Percentages of "yes" responses	
	Foods Class (n = 12)	Adult Living (n = 8)
1	100	100
2	100	100
3	92	100
4	100	100
5	75	88
6	100	88
7	92	38
8	92	50
9	83	100
10	92	63
11	92	100
12	100	100
13	67	57
14	100	100
15	92	88
16	100	100
17	100	88
18	92	100
19	50	63
20	75	88

Question	Foods Class (n = 12)	Adult Living (n = 8)
21	92	57
22	100	88
23	92	50
24	92	88
25	100	100
26	92	100
27	92	88
28	100	100
29	83	75
30	100	88

Table B
Subgroups of Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluations)

Group	Foods Class (FC) n = 13	Adult Living (AL) n = 8
Goal Direction (items 1-4)	14.462	13.125
Interested (items 5-9)	17.692	14.625
Informal (items 10-12)	5.462	7.375
Cohesiveness (items 13-16)	12.923	11.500
Democracy (items 17-20)	13.538	12.000

Table C
Classroom Environment

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	FC	AL	FC	AL	FC	AL
1	54	25	46	75	100	100
2	85	25	15	75	100	100
3	62	38	38	62	100	100
4	46	25	54	75	100	100
5	62	0	38	88	100	88
6	54	0	46	75	100	75
7	38	38	62	50	100	88
8	62	25	31	38	93	63
9	62	38	38	50	100	88
10	0	0	31	38	31	38
11	0	13	15	50	15	63
12	0	13	0	38	0	51
13	38	25	62	38	100	63
14	31	13	54	63	85	76
15	23	38	77	25	100	63
16	31	38	62	62	93	100
17	31	38	69	50	100	88
18	54	25	46	63	100	85
19	38	38	46	50	84	88
20	46	17	54	83	100	100

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teacher during the sixth week that the student teacher was under her. Tammy's cooperating teacher recorded the following evaluation on a presentation of diet plans:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	needs more emphasis

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	acceptable
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	needs more emphasis

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the university supervisor on October 28 during an adult living class. The class was discussing various types of clothes and their appropriate uses. The university supervisor recorded the following evaluation:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	needs more emphasis

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	acceptable
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	needs more emphasis

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was administered to the subjects during the tenth week of the semester. The subjects were instructed to justify each rating that they gave themselves. The possible choices for each item were O (outstanding), G (good), S (satisfactory), and NI (needs improvement). Tammy's self-ratings and justifications for the ratings follow:

1. Provision for individual differences and needs: Good. I put good because I tried to relate some of my lessons and labs to the individual students needs. For instance--one girl was dieting; so the lab I assigned her group was a special diet dish. She was also getting too much protein--the report I had her do was on that--also others that were fasting did reports on that. I could have done more maybe.
2. Motivation of pupils: Good. I tried to keep the students motivation high and planned to have things that were interesting although a couple of classes or students needed more motivation.
3. Preparation of lesson plans: Good. I put good because I would prepare them well but sometimes change my mind the day of or day before and think of better ways to do it. If I was really good--the ideas would be there a lot sooner.
4. Presentation of material: Good. The material was presented well but I think I could have written more notes for me--so in demonstrations for instance--time would never lapse.
5. Use of varied technique: Outstanding. I tried lots of different techniques and I varied with the class needs. Guest speakers overhead, film, movies, field trips, reading, reporting in class etc.
6. Ability in classroom control: Satisfactory. I put satisfactory because a couple of my classes were really hard for me to control--the larger 2. I wish I could have done better in that respect.

7. Management in time and energy: Good. I put good because most of the time I managed time well but a few of the times I ran over or short. Money--I tried to keep in control as far as food labs go and I would discuss a less expensive alternative with the students.

8. Evaluation of pupil learning and achievement: Good. I maybe could have evaluated more or given more review to the students, but all in all my evaluations were pretty accurate and good. I worried though that they might not be the easiest to understand (my tests) but I feel that they were good.

9. Attitude: Outstanding. My attitude till the last week was real good I kept calm and would just keep trying and smiling when something came up unexpected--I took it in stride. The last week I worried about some problems of my own and I felt like I was getting tired of being graded and watched for my teacher but the vice principal and principal as well. All in all my attitude was excellent toward the students and I never would hold a grudge or anything against one that misbehaved or gave me a hard time--I acted like nothing happened.

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the cooperating teacher at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results follow:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	S	S	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	G	G	G
3. Preparation of Lesson Plan	G	O	O
4. Presentation of Material	S	G	G
5. Use of Varied Technique	S	G	G
6. Ability in Classroom Control	S	S	G
7. Management of Time and Energy	S	G	G
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	G	G	G
9. Attitude	O	O	O

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The university supervisor completed the Classroom Competencies Checklist at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results follow:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	S	G	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	G	G	O
3. Preparation of Lesson Plan	G	G	O
4. Presentation of Material	S	G	G
5. Use of Varied Technique	G	O	O
6. Ability in Classroom Control	G	G	G
7. Management of Time and Energy	G	G	G
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	S	G	G
9. Attitude	O	O	O

APPENDIX D
CASE TWO RESPONSES

Table D
Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern

Question	Percentages of "yes" responses	
	Third Hour n = 15	Fifth Hour n = 19
1	87	100
2	87	95
3	93	83
4	100	95
5	73	79
6	87	63
7	57	58
8	50	19
9	87	76
10	73	84
11	93	81
12	80	74
13	86	68
14	100	89
15	100	78
16	100	61
17	87	79
18	87	81
19	77	53
20	67	58

Question	Third Hour n = 15	Fifth Hour n = 19
21	67	53
22	93	89
23	67	74
24	79	88
25	100	100
26	87	100
27	80	78
28	93	100
29	80	78
30	87	100

Table E
Subgroups of Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluations)

Group	Third Hour n = 16	Fifth Hour n = 20
Goal Direction (items 1-4)	12.000	12.800
Interested (items 5-9)	15.500	15.100
Informal (items 10-12)	5.750	5.875
Cohesiveness (items 13-16)	11.312	11.750
Democracy (items 17-20)	11.312	10.100

Table F
Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluation)

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	3rd	5th	3rd	5th	3rd	5th
1	6	25	94	75	100	100
2	25	35	69	65	94	100
3	0	15	100	75	100	90
4	0	20	100	75	100	95
*5	25	15	69	65	94	80
*6	19	40	81	50	100	90
*7	19	25	75	45	94	70
*8	13	15	69	70	82	85
*9	19	32	75	68	94	100
*10	0	0	25	10	25	10
*11	0	0	20	30	20	30
*12	0	5	6	15	6	20
13	0	5	88	75	88	80
14	0	16	63	68	63	84
15	6	10	75	85	81	95
16	0	20	100	70	100	90
17	6	5	56	55	62	60
18	13	22	69	56	82	78

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	3rd	5th	3rd	5th	3rd	5th
19	19	12	69	65	88	77
20	0	22	75	39	75	61

* Items were reversed in scoring.

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teacher during the sixth week that the student teacher was under her. The results follow:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	strong
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	needs more emphasis

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	acceptable
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	needs more emphasis
attention and participation of most students	needs more emphasis
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The outside observer completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form during the 6th hour on October 19, 1982. The results follow:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	acceptable
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	needs more emphasis

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	strong
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	needs more emphasis
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form on October 21 during a clothing class. The results follow:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	strong

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	acceptable
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was administered to the subjects during the tenth week in the semester. The subjects were instructed to justify each rating that they gave themselves. The possible choices for each item were O (outstanding), G (good), S (satisfactory), and NI (needs improvement). The results are as follows:

1. Provision for individual differences and needs: Outstanding. I chose outstanding because I allowed for students with little ability or handicaps to finish projects a bit later. Also, I allowed team members who were gone for ball games or what ever to make up assignments and tests. I also allowed students who were hunting to make up assignments and tests.
2. Motivation of pupils: Good. I chose good because I was always excited about what I was teaching but maybe I lectured too much. I think I should have tried a different approach to some subjects.
3. Preparation of lesson plans: Good. I chose good on lesson preparation because I didn't always get them written out by the time my cooperating teacher wanted them but I always had them finished before the new school week started and I feel like I did an excellent job of preparing them and carrying them out.
4. Presentation of material: Outstanding. I chose outstanding because I tried to be enthusiastic about every topic and I tried to involve classroom participation also I tried to use visual aids.
5. Use of varied techniques: Satisfactory. I chose satisfactory because I think I lectured too much. The students, I think, get really tired of this and their attention is hard to maintain. I should have used group discussions and other techniques. I did use filmstrips though but they got old fast also.
6. Ability in classroom control: Satisfactory. I chose satisfactory because I had some problems with a few classes. I guess I need to become more strict. I didn't know what to do though.

7. Management of time and energy: Outstanding. I chose outstanding because I don't feel I ever wasted any time. If I ever had any spare time I either did some wash, prepared handouts, lesson plans, or something to get ready for the next day.

8. Evaluation of pupil learning and achievement: Outstanding. I chose outstanding because I tested the students frequently and gave them a score for daily work. Also I figured all the grades at the end and allowed for individual differences.

9. Attitude. Outstanding. I chose outstanding because I looked upon my student teaching experience in a positive way. Some days I did get discouraged but that was good because it helped me to see where I was having problems and where I needed improvement. Lots of teachers here would tell me that when they did their student teaching it was the worst time in their whole lives but I'll never say that because I think it was a very good experience.

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the university supervisor at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results are as follows:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	S	G	O
2. Motivation of Pupils	G	G	G
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	NI	S	G
4. Presentation of Material	G	O	O
5. Use of Varied Technique	S	G	O
6. Ability in Classroom Control	S	G	G
7. Management of Time and Energy	S	G	S
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	S	G	G
9. Attitude	G	G	G

APPENDIX E
CASE THREE RESPONSES

Table G
Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern

Question	Percentages of "yes" responses	
	1st Hour n = 12	2nd Hour n = 7
1	75	71
2	58	80
3	42	50
4	75	100
5	42	43
6	80	14
7	8	57
8	8	0
9	36	43
10	42	71
11	82	71
12	91	86
13	42	86
14	58	43
15	33	71
16	92	100
17	75	83
18	83	71
19	42	29
20	42	57

Question	1st Hour n = 12	2nd Hour n = 7
21	8	29
22	75	43
23	0	57
24	50	71
25	92	71
26	58	86
27	67	57
28	75	75
29	75	86
30	92	43

Table H
Subgroups of Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluations)

Group	1st Hour n = 14	2nd Hour n = 9
Goal Direction (items 1-4)	11.714	11.111
Interested (items 5-9)	14.214	12.333
Informal (items 10-12)	6.500	7.222
Cohesiveness (items 13-16)	11.643	9.444
Democracy (items 17-20)	11.571	10.667

Table I
Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluation)

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
1	25	11	58	89	83	100
2	50	44	50	56	100	100
3	23	11	46	89	69	100
4	33	0	58	60	91	60
*5	36	0	36	67	72	67
*6	14	13	64	75	78	88
*7	7	13	43	63	50	76
*8	14	0	50	63	64	63
*9	43	33	43	56	86	89
*10	0	11	29	33	29	44
*11	7	0	27	89	34	89
*12	5	0	14	25	19	25
13	9	0	57	44	66	44
14	15	11	69	11	84	22
15	29	0	29	33	58	33
16	29	0	43	78	84	78
17	29	0	57	56	86	56
18	29	0	50	100	79	100

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
19	21	11	36	56	57	67
20	21	0	36	67	57	67

* Items were reversed in scoring.

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teacher during the sixth week that the student teacher was in the classroom. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	needs more emphasis
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	acceptable
understanding of abilities and needs	needs more emphasis
skillful questioning to provide thought	needs more emphasis
flexible reactions to situations that arise	acceptable
attention and participation of most students	needs more emphasis
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The outside observer completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form on October 14, 1982. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	strong
meaningful activities	strong
motivation of pupils	needs more emphasis
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	strong
skilled and meaningful use	strong
shows resourcefulness and imagination	strong

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	needs more emphasis
understanding of abilities and needs	needs more emphasis
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	needs more emphasis
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form on October 21, 1982 during the second period class. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	acceptable
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	needs more emphasis

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	acceptable
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	acceptable

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	acceptable
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	needs more emphasis
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	needs more emphasis

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was administered to the subjects during the tenth week in the semester. The subjects were asked to justify each rating that they gave themselves. The possible choices for each item were O (outstanding), G (good), S (satisfactory), and NI (needs improvement). The results are as follows:

1. Provision for individual differences and needs: Good. I have allowed/encouraged certain students to complete worksheets and even exams with the help of their resource room teacher, so they might have extra time to complete assignments, and also have more assistance. I made up a pillow pattern for two students who weren't good at reading, and composed instructions for the pattern, including where the machine dials should be set at each step (stitch length, width, etc.) I encourage kids to come in after school for help. For two weeks I allowed them to come in during lunch too, but more chatter than sewing was accomplished by kids who weren't really behind in their work! I decided I needed that time for myself.

2. Motivation of pupils: Needs Improvement. I do explain why it's important to have various types of skill and knowledge. My basic problem may be that I expect a student/learner to meet me halfway in effort, for I can't supply internal motivation. I don't feel that I am an "inspirational" teacher, and I don't feel that I should be expected to be the main reason a child applies him/herself.

3. Preparation of lesson plan: Needs Improvement. This area got bad the last three to four weeks. Nothing seemed to be working right. In my mind, the Frostline kit didn't fit well into the amount of time allotted for sewing, and for my time schedule to be there. Being pre-cut and ready to sew this kit not only didn't reinforce grainline and weave concepts, but also these kids thought that Butterick and Simplicity pattern books described kits too! And, in the last two weeks, the students were in a "holding pattern," just sort of "waiting" for the second project, and the "good stuff." I felt out of control, and unsure how to make experi-

ences relevant, and therefore I was at a loss for good, solid plans towards the end.

4. Presentation of material: Satisfactory. I was highly disappointed that it is so difficult to get good serious discussions going with junior high kids. I wish there were separate clothing and foods facilities, and a larger budget for materials. What few dumb things I planned that caught their attention involved personal expense things like fabric for them to stitch their names on.

5. Use of varied techniques: Good. I must say that when the boat sticks in the sand, I don't force it deeper. A reference to a Glasser filmstrip/cassette presentation on discipline, not teaching techniques. And, even if an experience works fine the same thing all the time is boring, like ice cream three times a day.

6. Ability in classroom control: Needs Improvement. I fall short in this area, at least in large groups, and especially with the kids who are long-term "challenges to authority." Again, the problem is that I expect a certain amount of self-control from kids, alone or in groups. Also, I'd like to have several of the kids out of the classroom officially. This school has kids that are sent here because they couldn't "cut" it at the other school. A teacher can feel powerless.

7. Management of time and energy: Needs Improvement. I know that I need to improve here. I was keeping late hours, grading papers and trying to make plans while exhausted. I never got much planning done during planning period; searching for bobbin cases takes time. Also, by 7th hour, I was too tired to think straight. Also, kids "wander in" then.

8. Evaluation of pupil learning and achievement: Satisfactory. In the 1st and 2nd hour, I am pleased with the whole group. Even those who got F's (few!) learned some valuable things, and their first sewing project is something they're proud of. The other classes, however, are disappointing to me. The kids who excelled would've excelled anywhere, for anybody. Many kids take home economics for "an easy A" and are dumbfounded when they see it's not all "a piece of cake," literally and figuratively.

9. Attitude: Needs Improvement. My attitude now is lousy. In the beginning it was good. Towards the

middle, it was not too wonderful. It's not the teaching, it's the mothering and babysitting atmosphere of junior high that I can't handle well. But, I don't apologize much for that.

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the cooperating teacher at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results are as follows:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	G	G	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	S	S	S
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	O	O	O
4. Presentation of Material	S	G	O
5. Use of Varied Technique	G	G	G
6. Ability in Classroom Control	NI	S	S
7. Management of Time and Energy	S	S	G
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	G	G	G
9. Attitude	G	G	G

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the university supervisor at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results are as follows:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	S	G	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	NI	S	S
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	G	G	G
4. Presentation of Materials	S	G	G
5. Use of Varied Technique	S	S	S
6. Ability in Classroom Control	NI	NI	NI
7. Management of Time and Energy	S	G	G
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	G	G	G
9. Attitude	G	G	S

APPENDIX F
CASE FOUR RESPONSES

Table J
 Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern

Question	Percentages of "yes" responses	
	Child Development n = 17	Foods n = 15
1	82	93
2	94	93
3	76	73
4	76	100
5	71	27
6	76	67
7	31	27
8	19	13
9	82	93
10	59	27
11	75	69
12	75	69
13	81	33
14	94	100
15	82	53
16	94	100
17	88	93
18	71	93
19	59	40
20	47	40

Question	Child Development n = 17	Foods n = 15
21	35	7
22	88	93
23	41	20
24	75	93
25	100	93
26	75	73
27	71	73
28	82	93
29	88	80
30	71	80

Table K
Subgroups of Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluation)

Group	Child Development (CD) n = 17	Foods (F) n = 22
Goal Direction (items 1-4)	13.000	12.227
Interested (items 5-9)	15.867	14.773
Informal (items 10-12)	5.867	6.727
Cohesiveness (items 13-16)	12.733	11.409
Democracy (items 17-20)	11.933	10.955

Table L
Classroom Environment
(Student Evaluation)

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	CD	F	CD	F	CD	F
1	20	14	80	86	100	100
2	47	27	53	68	100	95
3	27	5	60	86	87	95
4	20	10	80	82	100	92
*5	40	23	40	55	80	78
*6	60	27	33	64	93	91
*7	36	18	64	50	100	68
*8	7	14	64	59	71	74
*9	53	32	47	55	100	77
*10	0	9	33	14	33	23
*11	0	5	36	23	36	28
*12	0	5	14	5	14	10
13	27	18	73	75	100	91
14	21	5	50	45	71	50
15	40	5	60	82	100	87
16	33	14	67	73	100	87
17	14	5	79	77	93	82
18	47	32	53	50	100	82

Question	Percent Strongly Agree		Percent Agree		Total Percent Agree	
	CD	F	CD	F	CD	F
19	27	0	60	77	87	77
20	17	0	67	65	84	65

* Items were reversed in scoring.

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form was completed by the cooperating teacher during the sixth week of the student teaching experience. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	acceptable
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	strong
motivation of pupils	acceptable
logical sequence	strong
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	strong
skilled and meaningful use	strong
shows resourcefulness and imagination	strong

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	strong
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	strong
attention and participation of most students	acceptable
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The outside observer completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form during a foods class on October 27, 1982. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	strong
clear objectives	acceptable
meaningful activities	strong
motivation of pupils	strong
logical sequence	strong
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	strong
skilled and meaningful use	strong
shows resourcefulness and imagination	strong

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	strong
understanding of abilities and needs	strong
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	strong
attention and participation of most students	strong
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	acceptable

SINGLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE EVALUATION FORM

The university supervisor completed the Single Teaching Experience Evaluation Form on October 28, 1982 during a child development class. The results are as follows:

1. Organization of lesson

well informed on subject	acceptable
clear objectives	strong
meaningful activities	acceptable
motivation of pupils	strong
logical sequence	strong
concepts summarized and clarified periodically during lesson	acceptable

2. Materials

appropriate level of difficulty	strong
skilled and meaningful use	acceptable
shows resourcefulness and imagination	strong

3. Relationship with students

concern for individuals	acceptable
understanding of abilities and needs	acceptable
skillful questioning to provide thought	acceptable
flexible reactions to situations that arise	acceptable
attention and participation of most students	strong
checks for student understanding of concepts being taught (monitors learning process)	needs more emphasis

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was administered to the subjects during the tenth week in the semester. The subjects were asked to justify the ratings they gave themselves. The possible choices for each item were O (outstanding), G (good), S (satisfactory), NI (needs improvement).

The results are as follows:

1. Provision for individual differences and needs: Satisfactory. In a few of my classes there were students that needed individual help or had special problems. I copied notes for them, invited them in after school, and talked with each of them individually to see where I could help.
2. Motivation of pupils: Good. I feel that I did a good job in this area. I loved what I was teaching and this made the students want to learn it. I also tried a variety of approaches to interest them.
3. Preparation of lesson plans: Good. I was always prepared with a lesson plan and an extra activity just in case we finished early. There are a lot of ways to teach an idea. I feel that there should be a variety in methods. Like lecture, group activities, guest speakers, films, etc. As far as the actual lesson plan, I feel that I could have written better objectives and interest approaches.
4. Presentation of material: Satisfactory. In presenting the material, I feel that I did about average. Somedays I did very well, and other days were terrible. I had my cooperating teacher listening to me to see if I said too many "OK's," "uhs," "wells," etc. It is important to me that I use proper English and speak well.
5. Use of varied techniques: Outstanding. I did great in this area. I really tried to have a variety. The class even commented on how they liked doing so many different things.
6. Ability in classroom control: Needs Improvement. I need improvement in this area. Although I came along ways during student teaching, I'm not sure if I did the

best thing with my talkative class. It wasn't just one or two students, the whole class talked. I tried a few things C. told me, but I didn't like them too well.

7. Management of time and energy: Outstanding. I do well in this area. I hate to waste time, mine or anyone else's.

8. Evaluation of pupil learning and achievement: Needs Improvement. I could greatly improve in this area of evaluating students. I know that there are other ways of evaluating, but I don't know what they are.

9. Attitude: Good. I have a good attitude. I love to learn and feel that challenges are a way to grow.

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the cooperating teacher at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results are as follows:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	G	G	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	S	G	G
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	G	O	O
4. Presentation of Materials	G	G	O
5. Use of Varied Technique	G	O	O
6. Ability in Classroom Control	S	S	G
7. Management of Time and Energy	S	G	O
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	G	G	O
9. Attitude	G	O	O

CLASSROOM COMPETENCIES CHECKLIST

The Classroom Competencies Checklist was completed by the university supervisor at the end of the third, sixth, and ninth weeks of the student teaching experience. The four categories of response are abbreviated as follows: Outstanding = O; Good = G; Satisfactory = S; Needs Improvement = NI. The results are as follows:

	<u>3rd</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>9th</u>
1. Provision for Individual Differences and Needs	S	G	G
2. Motivation of Pupils	G	O	O
3. Preparation of Lesson Plans	O	O	O
4. Presentation of Materials	G	G	G
5. Use of Varied Technique	G	G	O
6. Ability in Classroom Control	G	G	G
7. Management of Time and Energy	O	O	O
8. Evaluation of Pupil Learning and Achievement	S	G	G
9. Attitude	O	O	O

APPENDIX G
COMBINED RESPONSES.

Table M

Mean Scores of Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern

Case/Subject	Number of Usable Returns from Individual Classes		Total Number of Usable Returns	Individual Class Mean Scores		Sample Mean
Case I	<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>		<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>	
Tammy	12	8	20	57.333	54.750	56.041
Case II	<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>		<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>	
Pat	15	19	34	54.066	51.526	52.796
Case III	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>		<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	
Debbie	12	7	19	46.083	46.286	46.185
Case IV	<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>		<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>	
Linda	17	15	32	50.647	49.733	50.190

Note. Possible range of scores is 30 to 60. A higher score is indicative of a more positive classroom environment.

Table N
Mean Scores of Classroom Environment

Case/Subject	Number of Usable Returns from Individual Classes		Total Number of Usable Returns	Individual Class Mean Scores		Sample Mean
Case I	<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>		<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>	
Tammy	13	8	21	64.077	58.625	61.350
Case II	<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>		<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>	
Pat	16	20	36	55.999	55.500	55.748
Case III	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>		<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	
Debbie	14	9	23	55.642	50.777	53.209
Case IV	<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>		<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>	
Linda	17	22	39	59.400	56.091	57.745

Note. Possible range of scores is 20 to 80. A higher score is indicative of a more positive classroom environment.

Table O

Total Percentages of Items in Which 90 Percent or More
of the Subjects Answered in the Affirmative

Case/Subject	Classroom Environment (in agreement)		Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern ("yes" response)	
Case I	<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>	<u>Foods</u>	<u>AL</u>
Tammy	75	30	80	43
Case II	<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>5th</u>
Pat	45	40	27	23
Case III	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>
Debbie	10	20	13	6
Case IV	<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>	<u>CD</u>	<u>Foods</u>
Linda	55	30	13	40

Table P
Attitudinal Instruments Completed by Students

Instruments	Number of Usable Returns		Possible Range	Mean	
	Present Study	Mears et al. (1981)		Present Study	Mears et al. (1981)
Class Environment	119	204	20 to 80	57.014	59.571
Subscales:					
Goal Direction	119	204	4 to 16	12.555	12.569
Interested	119	204	5 to 20	15.013	15.676
Informal	119	204	3 to 12	6.347	6.907
Cohesiveness	119	204	4 to 16	11.589	12.196
Democracy	119	204	4 to 16	11.510	12.225
Students' Estimate of Teacher Concern	105	218	30 to 60	51.301	54.463