

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CRITERIA OF TEACHER EVALUATION
AS PERCEIVED BY THE SCHOOL TEACHERS OF NEWFOUNDLAND

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

JAMES HICKMAN

1992

c.1

1n0803

R

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CRITERIA OF TEACHER EVALUATION
AS PERCEIVED BY THE SCHOOL TEACHERS OF NEWFOUNDLAND

by

James Hickman

A Thesis

Submitted to the Committee on Graduate Studies

© in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Education

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

St. John's, Newfoundland

Spring 1975

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the criteria that Newfoundland school teachers felt should be used in evaluating teachers for (a) teacher competence, and (b) promotion to administrative positions.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts: a personal and school background variable questionnaire, and two evaluation questionnaires. The latter section of the questionnaire contained identical thirty-item batteries arranged in different sequences. These items were evenly distributed into Mitzel's three categories of presage, process and product for each evaluative situation. The questionnaire also asked the teachers to indicate whom they felt was in the best position to evaluate their teaching. The questionnaire provided ample space for teachers to include additional criteria which they perceived to be important for each evaluative situation, and space for teachers to add comments on the study itself. The questionnaire was mailed to 300 randomly selected Newfoundland school teachers of which 84.3 per cent responded.

To analyse the data gathered, frequency counts were compiled to place criteria in rank order to

determine whether or not a common body of criteria was perceived by the teachers as being important in the evaluation of teachers for both evaluative situations. The ranked criteria were compared for both evaluative situations to see if the teachers perceived a change of emphasis in the use of each criterion from one evaluative situation to the other. Pearson correlation coefficients were utilized to determine whether the emphasis placed upon the criterion changed with each evaluative situation. Chi square tests were used to ascertain if significant differences existed in the responses of teachers according to personal and school variables.

For the question, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?", frequency counts were compiled to determine whom the teachers felt was in the best position to evaluate their work. Chi square tests were also used to ascertain whether or not significant differences existed in the responses of the teachers according to personal and school background variables.

This study revealed that teachers do generally agree on a common body of criteria which they feel should be used for both evaluative situations. Teachers were more likely to feel that "process" criteria should be emphasized when evaluating teachers for competence, while "presage" criteria should be used when considering teachers for administrative positions. Only a few

significant relationships were observed between certain criteria of evaluation and the teachers' personal and school background variables. The teachers felt that the school principal was in the best position to evaluate their work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude for the assistance, advice and encouragement of Dr. D. Kirby, the supervisor of this study.

Appreciation is also expressed for the comments and suggestions given by Dr. K.W. Wallace and Dr. G. Wooldridge who gave willingly of their time.

Appreciation is also expressed to the Newfoundland school teachers who took time out of their busy schedule to complete the questionnaire. Without their cooperation this study would not have become a reality.

Finally, the writer wishes to express appreciation to his wife and family for their patience, understanding, encouragement and assistance while the thesis was being compiled.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Hypotheses	9
Importance of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	12
Evaluation	12
Criterion	12
Classes of Criteria	12
Teacher	13
Tenure	13
Permanent Certification	13
Interim Certification	14
Schools	14
II. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Introduction and Historical Background	15
Recent Studies on Teacher Evaluation	20
What is Evaluation?	20
Why Evaluate?	23
The School Board	24
The Public	25

CHAPTER	PAGE °
Teachers	26
Who Should Evaluate?	27
Authority Figures	28
Self-Evaluation	31
Student	32
Other Teacher	34
When Should Evaluation Occur?	35
Where Should the Emphasis be Placed in Teacher Evaluation?	35
Presage	36
Process	40
Product	44
Recent Research Related to the Present Study	47
Conclusion	49
III. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	52
The Instrument	52
Sample and Data Collection	54
Treatment of the Data	56
Limitations	58
Delimitations	59
IV. EVALUATIVE CRITERIA PERCEIVED AS SIGNIFICANT BY NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOL TEACHERS	60
Evaluation of Teacher Competence	60

CHAPTER	PAGE
Evaluation for Promotion to an Administrative Position	67
V. A COMPARISON OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA BY NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOL TEACHERS	74
Emphasis Placed on Individual Criteria in Both Evaluative Situations	74
An Analysis of the Data According To Mitzel's Categories of Presage, Process, and Product	83
Teacher Evaluation	83
Promotion to an Administrative Position	88
VI. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RATINGS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS	97
Personal and Professional Characteristics of Teachers	97
Age and Sex	97
Age	99
Sex	102
Experience and Professional Preparation	105

CHAPTER	PAGE
Teaching Experience	108
Professional Training	110
School Variables	113
Type of School Board	113
The Number of Classrooms	114
Grade Area	115
Summary	118
VII. WHO IS IN THE BEST POSITION TO EVALUATE?	120
Summary	125
VIII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	127
Conclusions and Implications	129
Recommendations for Further Research and Study	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137
APPENDIX A	144
Correspondence to Teachers	145
First Follow-up Letter	146
Second Follow-up Letter	147
APPENDIX B	148
The Instrument	149
Personal and School Variables	150
Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire One	152
Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire Two	154

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIX C	156
Criteria Used in the Instrument Set Out	
in Categories	157
APPENDIX D	159
Comments and Additional Criteria	160

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Categories of Effective University	
Teaching: Graduate Comments of all	
Faculties and Schools of the University	
of Toronto	41
II. Mean Ratings and Rank Order of the 16	
Criteria	50
III. Response Rate to Survey Questionnaire	57
IV. Frequency of Mention of Criteria Perceived	
by Teachers to be Significant in Teacher	
Evaluation N = 253	61
V. Frequency of Mention of Criteria Perceived	
by Teachers to be for Promotion to an	
Administrative Position N = 253	68
VI. Rank Order of Evaluative Criteria and the	
Degree of Relationship Between the	
Evaluative Situation and Certain	
Criteria of Evaluation	75
VII. Distribution of "Product" Variables for	
Evaluation of Teacher Competence by	
Variance and Mean	84
VIII. Distribution of "Process" Variables for	
Evaluation of Teacher Competence by	
Variance and Mean	85

TABLE	PAGE
IX. Distribution of "Presage" Variables for Evaluation of Teacher Competence by Variance and Mean	86
X. Distribution of Criteria for Evaluation of Teacher Competence	87
XI. Distribution of "Product" Variables for Promotion to an Administrative Position by Variance and Mean	89
XII. Distribution of "Process" Variables for Promotion to an Administrative Position by Variance and Mean	90
XIII. Distribution of "Presage" Variables for Promotion to an Administrative Position by Variance and Mean	91
XIV. Distribution of Criteria for Promotion to an Administrative Position	93
XV. Rank Order of Criteria of Evaluation Perceived for Teacher Competence According to Mitzel's Categories	94
XVI. Rank Order of Criteria of Evaluation Perceived for Promotion to an Administrative Position Grouped According to Mitzel's Categories	95
XVII. Comparison of the Sample with the Newfoundland Teacher Population by Years of Training	98

TABLE	PAGE
XVIII. Distribution of Teachers by Age and Sex	99
XIX. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria by Teachers Less than or Equal to 35 Years of Age and those over 35	101
XX. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria by Teachers According to Sex (.01 Level of Significance)	104
XXI. Distribution of Teachers by Years of University Training and Teacher Experience	106
XXII. Distribution of Teachers by Years of Teaching Experience	107
XXIII. Distribution of Teachers by Sex and Years of University Training	107
XXIV. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria by Respondents According to their Length of Teaching Experience	109
XXV. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria of Respondents According to their Professional Training	111

TABLE	PAGE
XXVI. Distribution of Teachers in Sample by School Board	113
XXVII. Distribution of Teachers in Sample by Number of Classrooms	114
XXVIII. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria According to the Number of Classrooms in Schools Where Respondents Taught	116
XXIX. Significant Differences in Responses to Evaluative Criteria According to the Grade Area Taught	117
XXX. Choice of Evaluator by Sex of Respondent	122

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Introduction

The evaluation of teachers is one of the many responsibilities of the school boards of Newfoundland. Prior to 1968 teacher evaluation was primarily done by the denominational supervisors, or 'snoopervisors' as they were frequently called by many educators.¹ These supervisors travelled to every bay and inlet to perform their duties. They usually arrived when least expected, observed a teacher for an hour or so, wrote up a report and left. Their style was usually autocratic, and their function was basically inspectorial. The written report was sent to the Department of Education in St. John's to be kept on file. The information in these reports was kept in confidence and used at some future time as a basis for rehiring or releasing a teacher.

With the exception of the past four years, there has been a phenomenal increase in school enrollment in

¹James Bayer, "Supervisory Techniques," Journal of Education, 18:2, May-June 1969, p. 13.

2.
this province. Total school enrollment increased from 75,086 in 1949 to 156,310 in 1969.² That is, the school enrollment more than doubled in these two decades.

At the same time there has also been a severe shortage of qualified school teachers, particularly in rural areas. Men and women were often recruited from the local community, classified as 'temporary supply' and hired to teach until more qualified teachers could be recruited. Quite often these teachers were poorly trained and possessed no more formal education than the students they taught. It was not uncommon in rural Newfoundland to have a teacher with a grade nine day school diploma, or less, teaching the primary or elementary grades. In the school year 1971-72, school boards still had a total of seventy-four emergency supply teachers in their employ.³

Today, the teacher supply situation has changed dramatically. The percentage of teachers with four or more years of university training has increased from 2.4 per cent in 1949-50 to 60.3 per cent in 1973-74.⁴

²The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Historical Statistics of Newfoundland and Labrador (St. John's: Creative Printers, 1970), p. 96.

³Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report of the Department of Education and Youth for the School Year ending June 30, 1972, p. 31.

⁴Harry Cuff and John Acreman, "A Teacher Shortage Imminent," The N.T.A. Bulletin, 17, February 1974, p. 15.

This change has probably been accomplished in part through the policies of the provincial and federal governments. The Newfoundland provincial government made monies available to students of Memorial University of Newfoundland in the form of salaries and student aid, and the federal government provided low interest loans to students. These actions probably contributed to the attraction of students to the University, and more specifically to the Faculty of Education. The teacher supply has increased to such an extent that in some subject areas there is a "buyer's market" for the school boards of this province. Although there is still a shortage of qualified teachers in such specialized areas as music, special education, guidance, art, reading, industrial arts, science education and home economics, school boards are generally in a position to select the best qualified teachers.⁵ The fact that the cost of teachers' salaries is borne entirely by the provincial government makes the choice of the best qualified teachers even more likely.

School boards are now in a position where a teacher evaluation system for the purpose of improving instruction in the schools can be useful and meaningful. Since many school boards, especially those in the larger urban centers, now receive more applications for teaching positions than they have positions available, there is an

⁵ Ibid., p. 15.

opportunity to select the most academically and professionally prepared teachers. Furthermore, recently enacted and revised provincial laws governing education implicitly call for the evaluation of teachers.

The "Collective Agreement," a contract between the Federation of School Boards and the Government of Newfoundland on the one part and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association on the other, contains provisions for tenure. Section 6.01 states:

... beginning teachers who enter into contract to teach with a School Board on or after April 1, 1973, shall be on probation until they have completed two consecutive years with that same School Board and if a teacher's services are not satisfactory to the Board at the completion of the two-year period, the Board may extend the probationary period by one additional year.⁶

Logically, the concept of tenure implies that teachers will be evaluated before tenure is granted.

In addition, the Teacher (Certification) Regulations 1972, distinguishes between permanent and interim certification.

13 - (1) Subject to paragraph (2), all initial certificates awarded under these regulations shall remain valid for two years from the date of issue, and may after a period be exchanged for a permanent certificate upon the recommendation of

- (a) the District Superintendent
- (b) the Supervisor of the School Board
- (c) where there is no District Superintendent

⁶ The Collective Agreement between the Government, Federation of School Boards and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, Article 6, p. 4.

or Supervisor, the Regional Superintendent . . . that he (the teacher) has completed two years of satisfactory teaching experience.⁷

Permanent certification under these regulations implies evaluation of job performance.

The escalation in student enrollment in the schools of Newfoundland and the increase in the level of teacher certificates in recent years has brought about an upsurge in educational expenditure. In 1973-74 it was estimated that teachers' salaries alone amounted to \$64,000,000 or 42.7 per cent of the provincial education budget. The education budget itself comprised approximately 28 per cent of the provincial budget.⁸ With this increase in educational costs, the provincial government and the people at large have become concerned. There are increasing demands that schools be held more accountable for such huge expenditures from the public chest. A.B. Perlin, writing in The Daily News, stated that "... the pace at which educational costs have risen has been a dizzy one . . . but it is surely time that there was some rationalization of what is rapidly becoming an impossible situation."⁹

⁷ Newfoundland Teachers' Association Handbook, 1973-74, pp. 43-44.

⁸ Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Estimates 1973-74, Supplement 1 to the 1973 Budget, pp. 1-18.

⁹ A.B. Perlin, The Daily News, February 19, 1974, p. 4.

An editorial in The Evening Telegram commented along similar lines:

What is needed in education is some established system of priorities White elephants abound in education. All over North America they stand as memorials to fuzzy thinking, unrestrained self-interest and lack of common sense. We are not old enough in post secondary education to have many memorials but if we continue to follow the line of providing education to suit the vanity of educators and politicians rather than the needs of the students we, too, will be in the white elephant business.¹⁰

In addition to calls for accountability from the taxpayer, teacher evaluation is being debated and discussed by educators themselves. The supervisor, who traditionally evaluated teachers, is being urged by many educators to be more specialized and to adopt as his major function, one of 'helper' rather than evaluator. Boardman et al, for example, regard supervision as:

. . . the efforts to stimulate, coordinate and guide the continued growth of the teacher in a school, both individually and collectively, in better understanding and more effective performance of all the functions of instruction so that they will be better able to stimulate and direct each student's continued growth toward a rich and intelligent participation in society.¹¹

Enns, on the other hand, feels that the principal should not formally evaluate teachers, because as a result of being the instructional leader of the school system at the community level, he too is a helper.

¹⁰ Editorial Staff, The Evening Telegram, January 23, 1974, p. 6.

¹¹ Charles Boardman et al., Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools (2nd ed., Cambridge: Houghton-Mifflin, 1953), p. 6.

When evaluation becomes specifically the inspection and assessment of teacher efficiency and effectiveness, I think the principal must withdraw if he is to continue to perform the other functions effectively.¹²

The superintendent is usually occupied with developing school board policy, educational planning, and the day-to-day operation of the schools. Therefore, it would be almost impossible for him to evaluate every teacher in his district. As a result, evaluation is often left to the supervising principals or building principals in the district. Nevertheless, evaluation is not always done in a formalized manner.

With the introduction of tenure and permanent certification, it is likely that a formalized teacher evaluation scheme will be demanded. This study was designed, within the limitations of the instrument, to ascertain the criteria which Newfoundland teachers consider significant in teacher evaluation.

Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of this study was to determine what criteria Newfoundland school teachers considered significant in the evaluation of teacher competence.

More specifically, this study was concerned with the eight questions which follow:

¹² F. Enns, "Should Principals Formally Rate Teachers," C.S.A. Bulletin, 4, (February, 1965), p. 31.

1. Do teachers agree on a common body of criteria that should be used to evaluate teacher competence?

2. Do teachers agree on a common body of criteria that should be used to select personnel for an administrative position?

3. Does the emphasis placed on particular criteria change from one evaluative situation to the other? (That is, if there is agreement in (1) and (2) above, are the criteria selected by teachers the same for both situations?)

4. Should there be any particular emphasis, from the teachers' point of view, placed on the categories of personal characteristics, on-the-job performance and attainment of objectives when evaluating teacher competence?

5. Are there any relationships between the criteria of evaluation deemed important by teachers, and their personal and school variables?

6. Do teachers feel that criteria other than those contained in the instrument should be used in teacher evaluation?

7. Who do teachers feel is in the best position to evaluate teacher competence: (i) Superintendent, (ii) Supervisor, (iii) Principal, (iv) Other teacher, (v) Students, (vi) Oneself (self-evaluation)?

8. Are the teacher evaluation criteria considered to be important by Newfoundland teachers the same as the

criteria considered to be important by inspectors, principals, and superintendents in Australia, Alberta and Newfoundland?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No significant relationships exist between the body of criteria considered by teachers to be important for (i) the assessment of teacher competence, and (ii) the selection of personnel for administrative positions.

2. The criteria considered to be important by teachers are not related to their personal and professional backgrounds.

3. No significant differences exist between the evaluation criteria which Newfoundland teachers think should be used, and the criteria actually used by principals and superintendents.

4. Teachers do not think that any one of the following factors should be emphasized more than the others: personal characteristics, on-the-job performance, or attainment of objectives.

Importance of the Study

This study is significant for the following reasons:

1. The identification of a common body of criteria considered by teachers to be significant for teacher evaluation could be valuable to teachers, principals, superintendents, supervisors, school boards, and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association in the development of a teacher evaluation program. The information gleaned from this study could be used as teacher input into an evaluation program that may be devised. Teachers should have some input into the evaluative process if a professional approach is to be taken. Hazel Davis, like many other educators, feels that:

Members of a profession traditionally regard themselves as responsible for their own actions. Teachers, no less than other professionals, have a part to play in developing policies that govern evaluation.¹³

2. This study is very timely. Currently in Newfoundland there is considerable dialogue on teacher evaluation. On Saturday, January 19, 1974, at Corner Brook, the Department of Educational Administration of Memorial University participated in a Leadership Seminar which dealt with two topics: (i) Teacher Evaluation and the Collective Agreement, and (ii) Teacher Evaluation for Competence. Another Leadership Seminar was held at St. John's on April 6, 1974. This seminar focused on the

¹³ Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence," in Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness edited by Bruce Biddle and Wilson J. Eilena (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 66.

principal's role in teacher evaluation. These seminars were attended by a cross-section of the educational community. In the related discussion it was evident that there existed a genuine concern that teacher evaluation be fair and consistent.

3. This study follows research undertaken at Memorial University by Reginald Farrell.¹⁴ Farrell examined the criteria of teacher evaluation employed by district superintendents of schools in Newfoundland. In addition, N.G. Rogers¹⁵ analysed the criteria used by high school principals in Alberta; E.B. Thomas¹⁶ examined the criteria used by high school principals in Victoria; and T.J. Moore¹⁷ examined the criteria used by school inspectors in Victoria, Australia. This study builds on these previous efforts by looking at evaluation by the subordinate rather than evaluation by the superordinate.

¹⁴R.A. Farrell, "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by the District Superintendents of Schools in Newfoundland" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1973).

¹⁵N.G. Rogers, "An Empirical Study of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Alberta" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969).

¹⁶E.B. Thomas, "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Victoria, Australia" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969).

¹⁷T.J. Moore, "An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria Employed in Teacher Evaluation" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

Definition of Terms

Evaluation: The forms of judgement used to describe the performance of a subordinate by a super-ordinate.

Criterion: Any standard used by which a teacher is judged or evaluated.

Classes of Criteria: The terminology of presage, process, and product criteria is based on Mitzel's study on teacher effectiveness criteria.¹⁸

(i) Presage:

These criteria refer to personal characteristics of the teacher such as personality, sensitivity, manner of speech, voice, knowledge, training, warmth, approachability, initiative, and so on.

(ii) Process:

These criteria refer to on-the-job performance of the teacher such as teaching techniques, methodology, classroom discipline, teacher-student interaction, use of technology, and so on.

¹⁸ H.E. Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 1481-1484:

(iii) Product:

These criteria refer to what has been accomplished in terms of the objectives of the courses, what gains in student growth or change that has occurred as a result of teacher inputs into the teacher-learner situation.

Teacher:

Teacher in this study shall refer to all those employed by school boards to teach children, except those involved in administration either in schools or in central offices of the school boards.

Tenure:

A set of rights whereby a teacher cannot be dismissed from his position except under procedures laid down by statute. The teacher who has tenure has a continuing contract with his employer, which in this case is the school board.¹⁹

Permanent Certification:

It is a privilege to teach, granted to teachers who have complied with the rules and regulations of the Teachers' Certification Committee which comprises of nine representatives from the Department of Education, Memorial University, the Denominational Education Committees, and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

¹⁹The Collective Agreement, op. cit., p. 4.

Interim
Certification:

It is a privilege to teach granted to a teacher for a designated period of time until some basic requirement or stipulation is fulfilled.

Schools:

This term refers to schools operated by the school boards of the province and receiving grants from the government. It includes all grades from Kindergarten to Grade Eleven.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction and Historical Background

Teacher evaluation is not a new idea, but its meaning has changed considerably in recent years. Socrates enunciated the importance of self-evaluation in his famous words 'know thyself'. It seems reasonable to assume that teachers must know their abilities and limitations, as seen by themselves, as well as others, in order to enhance their performance and hopefully improve student productivity.

In the opinion of Jerry Mitchell the demand for teacher evaluation appears to be attuned to the business cycle.¹ In periods of prosperity very few question the expenditure of monies for education. However, when the pressure is on to keep budgets down, and at the same time provide quality education in the schools, attention is drawn to the enormous expenditures for schools, particularly teachers' salaries. Teacher merit, training, experience and a multitude of other factors are brought into play for salary consideration.

¹Jerry B. Mitchell, "Merit Rating: Past, Present, and Perhaps," Phi Delta Kappan, 42:4, January 1961, p. 142.

One writer states that "Nothing much ever happens in education until someone on the outside gives a push,"²

Hazel Davis feels that this push comes most often from the industrial sector of the economy, where great emphasis is placed on productivity, cost analysis and accountability.³ Some of the impetus to measure worker productivity came in the early 1900's from Frederick Taylor's work with the Bethlehem Steel Company. His emphasis on "standardization, systemization, and stimulation," laid the foundation for the 'efficient age', and his ideas and findings were gradually interpreted, adapted and instituted into the school systems of America.⁴ Taylor's Scientific Management Theory embodied the feeling that financial resources were being wasted everywhere, but particularly in the field of education. Education became a focal point of controversy because public monies were used to pay for schools, and school administrators were expected to give account of their huge expenditures.⁵

² Editorial, "Do You Know the Score on Merit Rating?" Phi Delta Kappan, 42:4; January 1961, p. 137.

³ Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, ed. Bruce Biddle (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 44.

⁴ Ibid., p. 44.

⁵ Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 47.

The first educators to deal significantly with teacher evaluation were men like Frank Spaulding and J.L. Merriam. Spaulding introduced a merit program in the schools of Newton, Massachusetts, where he served as superintendent from 1904 to 1914.⁶ Merriam made the initial effort to measure teacher competence by "scientifically" studying the concept of teacher efficiency and attempting to take it out of the realm of opinion.⁷ John F. Bobbitt even advocated that " . . . the business and industrial world should enter the schools and set up standards--it was their civic duty."⁸ It was not uncommon for school systems to have efficiency experts who demanded stopwatch accuracy and elaborate record keeping. Rating scales were devised to rate teachers, superintendents, and even janitors.⁹ Rating became so popular that by 1915 about 60 per cent of the cities of the United States were reporting some type of formal evaluation of their teachers.¹⁰ This concern with efficiency, continued up to the mid 1920's.

⁶ Jerry Mitchell, op. cit., p. 139.

⁷ Raymond Callahan, op. cit., pp. 99-110.

⁸ Ibid., p. 101.

⁹ Ibid., p. 106.

¹⁰ Hazel Davis, op. cit., p. 49.

After 1925 concern with teacher evaluation generally declined. However, in the late 1930's educators started to look at the ability of students to evaluate their teachers. After World War II broke out, teacher evaluation essentially returned to its pre-1900 state. This is not to say that teacher evaluation disappeared completely, but the strong emphasis placed upon it in the early 1900's had waned.¹¹

Although hundreds of studies in teacher evaluation have been undertaken since 1900, Davis states that "Many evaluation forms in use since 1962 are similar to the 'efficiency record' published by Boyce in 1915."¹² Ingils found that most forms used did not include much of the area that " . . . could have been objectively stated and evaluated and which would seem to be important to teaching."¹³ Ingils postulated that the reason why these important areas were not taken into account was that school systems have no clear cut goals or objectives by which to evaluate teacher effectiveness. In spite of the lack of goals or established criteria, educators have gone ahead and evaluated teachers and ignored the fact that in " . . . no instance was any attempt made to

¹¹ Dwight Beecher, op. cit., p. 17.

¹² Hazel Davis, op. cit., p. 50.

¹³ Chester R. Ingils, "Let's Do Away with Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House, 44:8, April 1970, p. 453.

relate evaluation items to whether they contributed to learning."¹⁴

Byrne, writing with reference to the popularity of teacher evaluation as a topic of educational research, states that:

No other issue in evaluation has received so much attention from research workers. An unkind critic might be inclined to observe that never has there been so much effort expended for so few results

¹⁵

Yet few if any "facts" seem to have been established concerning teacher effectiveness; no approved method of measuring competence has been accepted, and no methods of prompting teacher adequacy have been widely adopted.¹⁶

The lack of success in the field of teacher evaluation has not meant that efforts have been abandoned. There has usually been some form of evaluation in the past, and this trend will probably continue in the foreseeable future. T.B. Greenfield writes that " . . . teacher effectiveness is evaluated despite the lack of scientific knowledge about effectiveness and despite the failure of research to devise reliable methods of

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 454.

¹⁵ T.C. Byrne, "Good Teaching and Good Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, 1:19, February 1962, pp. 20-21.

¹⁶ Bruce Biddle, Contemporary Research in Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 2.

evaluating teachers."¹⁷

Recent Studies on Teacher Evaluation

The literature on teacher evaluation can be organized in terms of five basic questions: What is evaluation?; Why evaluate?; Who should evaluate?; When should evaluation occur?; and Where should the emphasis be placed in teacher evaluation? The literature and research dealing with each of these questions will be considered in turn.

What is Evaluation?

In the past, criteria used in teacher evaluation were often very simple and frequently revolved around two basic factors: the noise level of the classroom, and the number of referrals to the principal's office. In many instances the principal could be heard to remark, "I can tell which teachers are good or bad by just walking down the corridor."

Today this form of global evaluation is considered insufficient. Burton and Brueckner, for example, echo the opinions of many writers:

. . . all in all, teaching is a very complex activity and the haphazard, unscientific and superficial study

¹⁷ T.B. Greenfield, "Teacher Leader Behavior and its Relation to Effectiveness as Measured by Pupil Growth" (unpublished Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, 1961), p. 2.

of teaching that characterizes much of our supervision today should not be tolerated. Just as we have developed improved methods of studying pupils and their habits of work, so we must develop improved methods of studying and assisting teachers.¹⁸

T.B. Greenfield agrees with Burton and Brueckner where he states that, in finding some means of evaluation:

. . . the first problem is to identify the factors which are causative or predictive of teaching success. Secondly, criteria must be established by which the success of the teacher can be judged. Finally, there is a need for a general framework within which research may proceed.¹⁹

One dictionary of education describes teacher evaluation as:

. . . an estimate or measure of the quality of a person's teaching based on one or more criteria such as pupil achievement, pupil behavior, pupil adjustment, and the judgement of school officials, parents, pupils, or the teacher himself.²⁰

Karns and Wenger see evaluation as:

. . . a process of delineating, obtaining and providing useful information for judging, making decisions, and choosing alternatives.²¹

¹⁸W.H. Burton and L.J. Brueckner, Supervision - A Social Process (New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts Inc., 1955), p. 359.

¹⁹T.B. Greenfield, op. cit., p. 21.

²⁰Carter Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 221.

²¹Edward Karns and Marilyn Wenger, "Developing Corrective Evaluation," Educational Leadership, 30:6 March 1973, p. 534.

To evaluate effectively, it seems that there must be some way in which to find facts through observation and study:

. . . and that involves the careful description of aspects to be evaluated, a statement of purpose, frame of reference, and criteria for the evaluation and the degrees of terms that are to be employed in recording judgements.²²

Putman and Chrismore²³ say that there are at least three types of evaluation when considered from a legal point of view: (1) satisfying minimum or basic legal requirements, sometimes referred to as "approval"; (2) determining the extent to which set standards of quality surpassing minimum legal requirements are met, sometimes referred to as "accreditation"; and (3) determining the extent to which specific local needs and objectives are being or have been met.

Howsam describes two major and very different types of teacher evaluation. These two types he labels formative and summative:

Formative evaluation refers to the use of data to make a process or operation effective as it goes along. By being able to redirect the process as it progresses, the goal seeker has a greater chance of reaching his goal. . . . summative evaluation occurs at the conclusion of an act or process, it is terminal. Summative evaluations have a characteristic of finality. . . . Teachers retain or lose their positions on the basis of summative evaluations.²⁴

²² Carter Good, op. cit., p. 221.

²³ John Putman et al., op. cit., p. 17.

²⁴ Robert B. Howsam, "Current Issues in Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52:5, February 1973, p. 13.

The term 'teacher evaluation' appears to vary according to the motives of the evaluator, but, in all forms of teacher evaluation, some frame of reference must be used. Invariably, this frame of reference gravitates towards the evaluator's concept of the 'ideal' teacher.

Researchers have tried diligently to use a description of the ideal teacher as a bench mark for future teacher evaluation. Antony Jones feels that to set as an objective the establishment of an evaluative instrument to identify the effective teacher would be self-defeating.²⁵ He says that the most realistic and viable objective would be to think of evaluating teacher characteristics that are desirable for a particular system, at a particular point in time. David Ryans, in his study on teacher characteristics said that:

... a person's concept of a "good" teacher depends, first, on his acculturation, his past experience, and the value attitudes he has come to accept, and, second, on the aspect of teaching which may be foremost in his consideration at any given time. ... (many educators) may consider quite different attributes in conceptualizing the competent teacher.²⁶

Why Evaluate?

Whenever reference is made to teacher evaluation there is consensus on one point and that is the need for

²⁵ Antony S. Jones, "A Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation," Clearing House, 46:8, April 1972, p. 475.

²⁶ David Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Menasha: George Banta Company Inc., 1960), p. 3.

evaluation. However, the definitions of need vary with the positions and philosophies of the people who express it.

The School Board. School boards are accountable to the public at large, and as such are responsible for the proper operation and administration of schools. "In general, then, the primary purpose of evaluation as stated in the current policies of most school boards, is to increase teacher effectiveness."²⁷ School boards have a responsibility to work towards the improvement of instruction and this can only be done by diagnosing weaknesses and through in-service education correcting or minimizing these weaknesses.

School boards often see evaluation as an instrument to help in removing the incompetent teacher. Katz maintains that " . . . a proven incompetent simply does not belong in our profession, and no tenure law should protect him from dismissal. Every profession has its share, but . . . (the teaching profession) has somewhat more than . . . (its) rightful portion."²⁸ Vittetoe agrees that ways need to be devised to get rid of

²⁷ Steve Lawson et al., op. cit., p. 1.

²⁸ Irving Katz, "Why I Oppose Selective Merit Pay," Phi Delta Kappan, 42:4, January 1961, p. 162.

incompetent teachers. "If it's the best that the profession can do is to say that only nine out of nineteen hundred teachers are inefficient, then a new type of criteria by which to judge the product should be found."²⁹

The Public. The school is a publicly financed institution and as such is held accountable for its expenditures. In 1972, the Rochester Education Association took part in a project on evaluation because parents, students, elected officials and state agencies across the nation were demanding teacher accountability. This association " . . . believed that if the profession doesn't deal with the problem, then someone else will." This association felt that all educational associations must place a high priority on becoming fully involved in establishing policies for, and carrying out evaluation programs and of teaching processes.³⁰

The political embarrassment created by international events sometimes trigger off concern for education. The launching of Sputnik in 1957 touched off an inquiry into what the schools were teaching and the calibre of instruction in the schools.

²⁹ Jack O. Vittetoe, "Evaluating Teachers," School and Community, 57:6, February 1971, p. 8.

³⁰ Larry Wicks, op. cit., p. 125.

In a world of computers and technology, the schools' curricula consisted of reading textbooks, writing on the blackboard, and reciting out loud. Suddenly, Americans realized that they had underestimated the relevance of the schools to our society and to the world.³¹

The public is expressing its discontent with education by withdrawal of financial support. This phenomenon is most prevalent where education is financed heavily from local sources. In 1965, 25 per cent of the bond issues were rejected by the public in the United States, but in 1969 this rose to 43 per cent.³² This may illustrate, in part, the concern of the public about educational expenditure. Society may feel that it is not reaping adequate returns on its expenditure in education. Teacher evaluation is perhaps one way in which the public's fears may be allayed.

Teachers. Although there is no proof that teachers want to be evaluated, there are many people who feel they should be evaluated. H. Walters in an editorial for the N.T.A. Bulletin gives two reasons why teachers should be evaluated.

Beginning teachers must be evaluated in order to receive a permanent certificate to teach - they

³¹ Marie Hackett, Success in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1971), p. 4.

³² U.S. News and World Report, "Growing Protest Against School Costs," October 20, 1969.

must be evaluated in order to receive tenure. Experienced teachers, moving from one school district to another, may be required to serve a one-year probationary period, hence evaluation.³³

In areas where merit pay systems have been introduced, good teachers may want to be evaluated for pay increments. However, merit pay has been used frequently in the past as a political ploy to " . . . make teachers' salaries seem to be higher than they are in actuality."³⁴ While some teachers stand to gain, some of their colleagues tend to suffer.

The prime goal of teacher evaluation should be the improvement of instruction, and on this point most writers agree. Most writers also agree that the improvement of instruction leads to more desirable educational outcomes. If teacher evaluation does this, it will " . . . not build a wall between the evaluator and the teacher,"³⁵ but will result in the removal of obstacles to teacher effectiveness. Teacher evaluation should also serve, in a positive way, to help prevent new obstacles from arising.

Who Should Evaluate?

According to the varying views of educational writers, teacher evaluation appears to be everyone's

³³ H.E. Walters, "Teacher Evaluation," N.T.A. Bulletin, 17:4, p. 2.

³⁴ Irving Katz, op. cit., p. 162.

³⁵ Guy Wagner, "What Schools Are Doing," Education, 89:3, February 1969, p. 280.

business. Potentially students, parents, principals, supervisors, superintendents and even peers can engage in formal evaluation of the teacher. All of these groups do in fact evaluate teachers informally now.

Authority Figures. The legal responsibility for evaluating teachers in Newfoundland rests with the district school superintendents. The Schools Act of Newfoundland defines the role of the superintendent in evaluation. The superintendent is required to " . . . recommend the promotion, transfer and, subject to this Act, the termination of employment of professional employees of the school board."³⁶ If the superintendent is fulfilling his obligation, he must evaluate to recommend, or he has to delegate that responsibility to other personnel under his jurisdiction who must perform this function on his behalf.

Worth had sixty-three superintendents and sixty-five principals rate a lesson of a Grade one teacher. Twenty-six per cent appraised the teacher's lesson as being doubtful, weak, or barely satisfactory; sixty-nine per cent evaluated her lesson as generally satisfactory, proficient, or exceptional. Worth felt that the extreme discrepancies in these ratings cast some doubt on the ability of administrators to evaluate teachers and good

³⁶The Schools Act of Newfoundland, Chapter 346, Article 19(f), p. 4734.

teaching.³⁷ It appears that the administrators were not guided by any common definition of good teaching and lacked a clear cut definition of learning. It was evident that what one administrator perceived as unfavourable, another saw as commendable.

Gage is of the opinion that:

. . . most classroom visitors go to the classroom with definite preconceptions of what they are looking for. They go to the classroom not to find out what effective teacher behavior is, but to see whether the teacher is behaving effectively, that is, in the way they believe he should behave No fallacy is more widely believed than the one which says that it is possible to judge a teacher's skill by watching him teach.³⁸

There has been considerable dialogue on whether the principal should or should not, evaluate. Barga is of the opinion that " . . . authority need not destroy good relationship (The question of) should a principal evaluate teachers starts off on the wrong foot by assuming that authority and cooperative pursuit of common goals are incompatible."³⁹ Barga continues by saying that the crux of the problem " . . . is not of eliminating authority; it is a problem of weaving authority and participation

³⁷ W.H. Worth, "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?," The Canadian Administrator, October 1961, pp. 1-5.

³⁸ N.L. Gage, Handbook of Research in Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1963), p. 257.

³⁹ P.F. Barga, "Should a Principal Evaluate Teachers," C.S.A. Bulletin, 4:3, pp. 5-6.

effectively together . . . a leader must evaluate or he cannot lead."⁴⁰

Enns contends that principals should not formally rate teachers. He feels that if principals evaluate teachers, then other important facets will be stifled.⁴¹ The principal should facilitate learning, provide leadership, and evaluate, but, evaluate in the sense of supervision. Enns is of the opinion that when it comes to " . . . inspection and assessment of teacher efficiency and effectiveness . . . the principal must withdraw if he is to continue to perform the other functions effectively."⁴²

Andrews and Brown, as a result of their research of 608 teachers and principals, found that it could not be concluded that " . . . all school principals are able to exclude their own personalities from their ratings of teachers as successfully as . . . large high school principals."⁴³ This could suggest that objective

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 11-13.

⁴¹ F. Enns, "Should Principals Formally Rate Teachers," C.S.A. Bulletin, 4:3, February 1965, pp. 20-23.

⁴² Ibid., p. 31.

⁴³ John Andrews and Alan Brown, "Can Principals Exclude Their Own Personality Characteristics When They Rate Their Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 45, July 1959, pp. 234-241.

evaluation depends upon size of school and the degree of intimacy between the principal and his staff.

Self-Evaluation. Many educators have extolled the virtues of self-evaluation. Gowan sees two procedures for the measurement of teacher effectiveness: (1) ratings by third parties such as principals, superintendents, supervisors, parents, students; and (2) self report.⁴⁴ The ratings by third parties have the disadvantage of being second hand, while ratings by oneself are first hand. However, Gowan continues by recognizing the probable weaknesses of the self-rating approach. One of the greatest weaknesses is the probability that the self concept may be at variance with the reality of behavior. Rating scales would have to be considered in the light of " . . . validity, reliability and resistance to fakability."⁴⁵

Wicks sees teacher evaluation as a personal affair. He feels that every teacher has a desire to want to know his or her strengths or weaknesses. He contends that if the results of such evaluation were seen only by the individual educator, then great improvement would result.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ John Curtis Gowan, "Self Report Tests in the Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," The School Review, 68:4, Winter 1960, p. 409.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 410.

⁴⁶ Larry Wicks, op. cit., p. 42.

Evaluation by this method could include rating scales, audiotape, videotape, or some other form or system that the teacher would deem necessary. This whole argument seems to falter since it is based on the assumption that a teacher knows how to correct weaknesses that exist, or that the teacher knows where to get help. Neither may be true.

Houts feels that self-evaluation is the only sound form of evaluation available. He says that:

. . . if a sound and thoughtful evaluation program is essential for improving instruction in our schools, equally important, we believe, is the process of self evaluation - the critical need for all of us involved in education to think about what we are doing and why we are doing it. Unless we have the capacity for self renewal, which is, after all, at the heart of any effective evaluation program, we shall be unable to improve education in this country to any significant degree.⁴⁷

Student. If observing and judging teacher performance are important and vital factors in teacher evaluation, in many ways the best people to evaluate the teacher are the students, since they have ample time to become thoroughly acquainted with the teacher's classroom performance. Beecher concludes in one of his studies on teacher evaluation that " . . . it appears that both junior and senior high school pupils can point out specific strong and weak spots in teaching to a degree that makes pupil ratings

⁴⁷Paul Houts, "Editorial," The National Elementary Principal, 52:5, February 1973, p. 10.

worthwhile."⁴⁸ Taft, however, found that the age of children is directly related to their ability to judge others.⁴⁹ Rayder cautions against being over enthusiastic regarding student ratings, since there is the probability that if studies are not properly conducted then " . . . popularity might rate higher than intellectual vigor."⁵⁰ Taft quells some of these fears by showing that researchers have found that student ratings are not influenced by grades previously earned from the instructor being rated; and to ignore student ratings would be perilous since these raters have so much to offer.⁵¹

Jones sees student evaluation as being very vital. In fact, he contends that students are more capable of evaluating teachers than supervisors, other teachers, or principals. As a result, he recommends that students, at least in the Grades seven to twelve group, should participate in any teacher evaluation program that would be devised.⁵²

Hendrickson, goes beyond the limitations set by Jones and states that even students in Grades 3, 4, 5 and

⁴⁸ Dwight Beecher, op. cit., p. 18.

⁴⁹ E.G. Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology (New York: Prentice Hall Inc., 1940), p. 20.

⁵⁰ Nicholas Rayder, "College Student Ratings of Instructors," The Journal of Experimental Education, 37:2, Winter 1968, p. 77.

⁵¹ E.G. Payne, op. cit., pp. 76-78.

⁵² Antony Jones, op. cit., pp. 474-475.

6 are capable of valid evaluation of their teachers:

Feedback from our students at all levels of instruction is invaluable to us in evaluating our teaching procedures, finding learning difficulties and, in general, improving our educational process, as well as gauging the effectiveness of our in-service programs and special training procedures.⁵³

Other Teacher. Very little research on teacher evaluation by peers has been conducted. McBeath used other teachers to evaluate the teachers in his study and found that:

... the principals and other teachers showed the greatest amount of agreement on both behavior dimensions. They were probably in the most similar position when it came to describing the teacher's everyday behavior in the classroom.⁵⁴

Wicks saw much value in evaluation by a colleague. He saw the possibility of incorporating mutual self-appraisal with peers. He suggests that:

... the classroom teacher can evaluate himself, using an instrument of his own choice. A second party can complete an identical form evaluating the teacher. Then the two can confer and compare. This can be followed by a reversal of roles.⁵⁵

⁵³ Dean Hendrickson, "What Can Children Tell us About the Teaching of Science and Mathematics," School Science and Mathematics, 69:9, December 1969.

⁵⁴ Arthur McBeath, "Teacher Leader Behavior and Its Relation to Teacher Effectiveness" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1959), p. 112.

⁵⁵ Larry Wicks, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

When Should Evaluation Occur?

Some educators maintain that evaluation should take place only at specific points in a teacher's preparation or career. However, other educators contend that evaluation should be a continuing and never ending process.

Beecher sees evaluation in these latter terms. He sees evaluation as a guidance procedure to improve job performance by cooperative counseling and careful planning. In consideration of the qualities of a good evaluation program he states that "appraisal should be continuous (and) findings of evaluation should be used."⁵⁶

Simple logic supports the need for continuous evaluation, since at no point in a teacher's career is he or she considered competent in all situations at all times. The world is in a state of flux, and like everyone else, teachers need to re-evaluate themselves and their teaching performance.

Where Should the Emphasis be Placed in Teacher Evaluation?

Teacher evaluation has been approached from three distinct directions:

- (1) The study of teacher traits that are considered characteristic of a good or bad teacher.

⁵⁶ Dwight Beecher, op. cit., pp. 79-86.

2. The study of teacher performance and behavior.
3. The study of teacher effectiveness as measured by student performance and characteristics.

These approaches parallel Mitzel's categories of presage, process, and product criteria, defined on page 83 of this thesis.⁵⁷ To illustrate Mitzel's categories, Flanders and Simon write:

... a teacher's trait warmth towards pupils is to consider a characteristic which existed before the teaching starts; this is a presage variable. The corresponding process variable would be some behaviorally specified measure of warmth acts while teaching. The product variable in this case, would be an educational outcome, such as more learning or a measure of some pupil attitude logically related to teacher warmth.⁵⁸

Each of these three sets of characteristics and the research pertaining to each, will be discussed in turn.

Presage. Teacher evaluation in the past tended to be global in nature. Teachers were classified as good or bad, and the assessment was done from varying value systems. The classification of teachers under this system was heavily weighted with what society considered as

⁵⁷ H.E. Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 1481-1484.

⁵⁸ Ned Flanders and Anita Simon, "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (4th ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), pp. 1425-1426.

desirable character traits.⁵⁹ Considerable difficulty has been encountered in measuring the degree of "goodness" or "badness" of teachers. "Such subjective qualitative judgements must be supplemented by more exact quantitative measurements, and variables must be more carefully controlled."⁶⁰

Wyse, in one of her studies concluded that " . . . to the present writer, from the survey done, . . . too often teaching is confused with instruction."⁶¹ Wyse feels that teaching is much more than instruction and advocates that more emphasis should be placed on personality, education, experience, and other personal factors relative to teacher effectiveness.

Washburne and Heil, in a study of nine public schools in Brooklyn, found that teachers have a definite and determinable influence on the intellectual, social, and emotional growth of children. This influence is related to both the type of teacher and the kind of children whom he or she teaches.

⁵⁹ Edwin H. Reeder, Supervision in the Elementary School (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953), pp. 3-5.

⁶⁰ John Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1970), p. 7.

⁶¹ Sister Mary Corona Wyse, "A Survey of the Literature from 1950 to 1960 on the Characteristics of the Effective Teacher" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Catholic University of America, Washington, 1961), p. 5.

One striking positive result of the experiment has been clear evidence that the teacher's personality has a clear and measurable effect upon the progress of the pupils, academically and socially . . . the results verified the major hypothesis of the study . . . that different kinds of teachers get varying amounts of achievement from different kinds of children.⁶²

In Washburne and Heil's study teachers were classified into three categories related to presage characteristics. The teachers were classified as turbulent, self-controlling, and fearful. Each type of teacher had certain strengths and weaknesses when considered in relation to their students. For example, the turbulent teacher was one who placed little emphasis on structure and order. This type of teacher had best results in science and mathematics. However, the fearful teacher produced fewest over-all results, but succeeded most in social studies.⁶³

Corey and Beery, in a study on teacher popularity and student attitude towards school subjects, found that a strong correlation existed between the two. This study supported Dewey's claim that a teacher's personality is intricately interwoven with the subject he teaches, and the student is incapable of distinguishing the one from

⁶²Carleton Washburne and Louis M. Heil, "What Characteristics of Teachers Affect Children's Growth," The School Review, 68:4, Winter 1960, p. 425.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 421-428.

the other.⁶⁴

Teacher attitude towards children and the subject matter taught can have an effect upon children and their attitude toward learning. Findley and Bryan found that:

. . . teachers who bear attitudes of almost exclusive emphasis on academic achievement to the neglect of personal development, exercise an especially pernicious influence on low achieving children . . . Teachers' attitude toward achievement is shown to have a marked effect.⁶⁵

Goldberg and Passow found that the teacher's expectation had a marked effect on children's attitude toward learning:

. . . pupils of relatively low ability can achieve quite successfully in classes where expectations are high (which) suggests that teachers generally underestimate the capabilities of pupils in lower track classes, expect less of them and consequently the pupils learn less.⁶⁶

Lamke, writing on teacher characteristics, says:

. . . it appears that good teachers are likely, more than poor teachers, to be gregarious, adventurous, frivolous, to have abundant emotional responses, strong artistic or sentimental interests, to be interested in the opposite sex, to be polished, fastidious and cool. Poor teachers are more likely than good teachers to be shy, cautious, conscientious, to lack emotional response and artistic or sentimental interests, to have a comparatively slight interest

⁶⁴ Dwight Beecher, op. cit., pp. 49-51.

⁶⁵ Warren Finley and Miriam Bryan, Ability Grouping (Athens: Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, 1970), p. 40.

⁶⁶ Miriam Goldberg and Harry Passow, "The Effects of Ability Grouping," Grouping in the Elementary School, ed. A. Margenstern (New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1966), p. 36.

in the opposite sex, to be clumsy, easily pleased, and more attentive to people.⁶⁷

Probably the most recent study of teacher characteristics is one just completed by Sheffield at Toronto University, involving all twenty-four faculties and schools on campus. Sheffield found that the most significant characteristics (presage variables) of good teachers were dynamism, vivaciousness, warmth, kindness, sympathy, approachability, friendliness, availability, humourous, and a concern for students. As shown in Table I, the total presage characteristics accounted for more than 38 per cent of all responses made.⁶⁸

In conclusion, the presage criteria, although they seem to be a significant factor, may not in themselves be sufficient to delineate the good teacher. Some researchers have utilized presage criteria in their research and found it significant. It would be unwise to ignore presage criteria when evaluating teachers.

Process. Davis observed that a long standing issue among scholars concerned with teacher evaluation, is whether the teacher or the teaching should be evaluated. In practice, the teacher is evaluated, but he claims

⁶⁷Thomas Lanke, "Personality and Teacher Success," Journal of Experimental Education, 20:1, December, 1951, p. 253.

⁶⁸Based on personal correspondence between Edward Sheffield, Professor of Higher Education, University of Toronto, and the writer.

TABLE I

CATEGORIES OF EFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY TEACHING:
GRADUATE COMMENTS OF ALL FACULTIES AND SCHOOLS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Sub-categories	Per Cent of Total Responses
Dynamic, vivacious	2.8
Warm, kind, sympathetic	3.0
Had a sense of humour, amusing	3.5
Master of his subject, competent	7.8
Enthusiastic about his subject	4.2
Respect for students as persons	1.6
Concern for students' progress	3.6
Sensitive to students' feelings	2.3
Approachable, friendly, available	4.1
Students' opinions, questions encouraged	5.3

emphasis should be on the teaching act and how it can be improved to give better results.⁶⁹

Medley emphasizes that the most important area for assessment in teacher evaluation is the process rather than the product. The basic philosophy of such an approach should encompass (1) assessment for change, growth, and improvement of teaching; (2) goals such that assessment is individualized; and (3) the criteria that are agreed upon in advance by the evaluator and the evaluatee. Medley concludes his argument by saying:

... the best way to improve instruction is to improve teaching, and the only way to improve teaching is to change teacher behavior.⁷⁰

The product tells how effective or ineffective a teacher is, but it does not tell him how to improve. Karns and Wenger agree with Medley. They feel that:

... for evaluation to be an essential corrective tool, educators must look beyond the product of learning to the process of learning, beyond the product of teaching to the process of teaching.⁷¹

McKenna claims that what children know at the end of a program is not necessarily the most important factor to be considered. He feels that the public would not

⁶⁹ Hazel Davis, op. cit., p. 62.

⁷⁰ Donald Medley, "A Process Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52:5, February 1973, pp. 34-35.

⁷¹ Ibid.

tolerate inhuman, undemocratic processes, or dangers to physical and mental health to attain educational goals and objectives. He questions the rationale for the recent emphasis placed on product in teacher evaluation.

Is it not important that the process of education in the schools become a microcosm of the best of democracy as it is practiced in the greater society? . . . The importance of good processes as ends in themselves become even more important, when one considers the fact that students spend about 12,000 hours in school from Kindergarten through to Twelfth Grade.⁷²

Flanders has conducted extensive studies of the teaching process by using a system referred to as 'interaction analysis'. He claims that "Interaction analysis provides a tool to find out if changes in attitudes result in differences in teacher behavior."⁷³ He concluded that in the classrooms, where much teacher-pupil interaction takes place, students learn " . . . more constructive and independent attitudes (and that students) . . . made more dramatic changes in their patterns of influence in various time-use activity categories."⁷⁴

Corey also sees the process as being very important.⁷⁵ He emphasizes that education in the past has

⁷² Bernard H. McKenna, "A Context for Teacher Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52:5, February 1973, p. 121.

⁷³ Ned Flanders, op. cit., p. 200.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 215.

⁷⁵ Gerald Corey, op. cit., pp. 18-21.

been product oriented rather than process oriented. As students, most of the present generation were taught to think in terms of good grades rather than learning per se. As a result, grades became the goals of education, but at the center of education should be the process of learning. He says that education is ideal where students can find excitement in the process of learning itself. If children can find excitement and learn, then the ultimate aim of education is being realized.

Product. The use of product criteria in teacher evaluation is not new. External examination results attained by students have been used in the past to act as a quality control mechanism to monitor the quality of the student graduating from school. These external examinations fulfilled a second purpose by monitoring teacher effectiveness. The student growth, as portrayed by examination results, was considered as a direct result of the teacher's performance and also acted as one of the many yardsticks to measure teacher competence.

Today, as illustrated by current literature, product criteria have again become increasingly popular as measures of teacher competence. Terms such as accountability, job targets, performance targets, performance contracting, and voucher systems tend to dominate published educational material. Howsam feels that the

outcome of teacher performance should receive the prime focus in teacher evaluation:

For many years researchers have sought to identify the characteristics of the effective teachers; more recently attention has turned to analysis of teacher behaviors. None of these efforts should obscure the fact that pupil learning and behavior are the purpose of the school and, therefore, must be the ultimate objects of evaluation.⁷⁶

Worth, in his study involving sixty-three superintendents and principals found that process criteria were difficult to measure with any degree of accuracy. He says that the most obvious place to look for measures of good teaching " . . . is in the learning achieved by students."⁷⁷ Beecher concurs with Worth by concluding his work by stating that desired learning achieved by students " . . . is the only valid criterion to teacher efficiency."⁷⁸

Smith and Gremillion state that three problems must be overcome if student achievement is to be used as a measure of teacher effectiveness:

One, we must know explicitly what changes we want to produce in the lives of our pupils. Two, we must be able to measure these changes. Three, we must be able through experimental design to attribute the measured changes to the actions of the teacher.⁷⁹

⁷⁶Robert Howsam, op. cit., p. 14.

⁷⁷Walter Worth, op. cit., p. 6.

⁷⁸Dwight Beecher, op. cit., p. 85.

⁷⁹F.M. Smith and J.B. Gremillion, Teacher Effectiveness (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1971), p. 21.

Greenfield says that a teacher " . . . will be regarded as effective in the degree to which he accomplishes goals that are held to be worthy of accomplishment."⁸⁰ He further states that " . . . the facilitation of pupil growth is presumably why society organizes schools and the use of pupil growth as an intermediate criterion seems amply justified."⁸¹ To Greenfield, teacher effectiveness is defined as the degree of change or growth which a teacher can induce into the lives of his or her students.

Ertis feels that space age society has placed emphasis on different products than those of the past.⁸² He says that students must be taught to think critically, to solve problems, and to handle inter-personal relationships. Because of this change, there is likely to be a substantial shift in the concept of the competent teacher.

Finally, Ryans, after expressing his reservations on pupil growth as a measure of teacher effectiveness stated

. . . if the rationale of the product criterion is accepted, and if the complex control problem presented by a multiplicity of producers and the

⁸⁰ T.B. Greenfield, op. cit., p. 27.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² B.P.A. Ertis, "The Measure of Professional Competence," Teacher's Magazine, November 1971, p. 48.

multi-dimensionality of the criterion can be satisfactorily coped with, student change becomes an intriguing approach to teacher effectiveness.⁸³

Recent Research Related to the Present Study

Four studies have been done using the same basic instrument as used in this study. Three of these studies were completed at the University of Alberta, while the remaining study was completed at Memorial University of Newfoundland. Moore, who developed the instrument, conducted his study to determine the criteria used by school inspectors of Victoria, Australia.⁸⁴ He found that the inspectors emphasized process criteria when evaluating for teacher competence, while presage criteria were used when evaluating teachers for promotion to an administrative position.

Thomas conducted a similar study in Victoria, Australia.⁸⁵ He tried to determine the criteria used by the high school principals in evaluating for teacher competence and promotion to an administrative position.

⁸³D.G. Ryans, "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," The Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.), 1960, pp. 1487-1488.

⁸⁴T.J. Moore, "An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria Employed in Teacher Evaluation" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

⁸⁵E.B. Thomas, "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Victoria, Australia" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969).

He found that the school inspectors and the high school principals used similar criteria in both situations of evaluation.

Rogers replicated the Thomas study and his findings were essentially the same.⁸⁶ Rogers studied the criteria employed by high school principals in Alberta.

Farrell did his study to determine the criteria employed by the district superintendents in the province of Newfoundland in evaluating for teacher competence and promotion to an administrative position.⁸⁷ His findings essentially paralleled those of Moore, Thomas, and Rogers.

Probably the most recent study was one conducted by Jenkins and Bausell in the State of Delaware.⁸⁸ These researchers attempted to isolate significant criteria that should be used in teacher evaluation. They selected sixteen criteria which they arranged in Mitzel's categories of presage, process and product. Teachers and administrators were asked to rate the sixteen criteria

⁸⁶ N.G. Rogers, "An Empirical Study of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Alberta" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969).

⁸⁷ R.A. Farrell, "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by the District Superintendents of Schools in Newfoundland" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1973).

⁸⁸ Joseph Jenkins and R. Barker Bausell, "How Teachers View the Effective Teacher: Student Learning is not the Top Criterion," Phi Delta Kappan, 55:8, April 1974, pp. 572-573.

according to their importance in determining teacher effectiveness. Table II summarizes their findings. The respondents considered 'Relationship With Class' as the most significant, whereas the 'Amount Students Learn', considered by many to be the prime reason society has schools, ranked eleventh. Jenkins and Bausell felt that the next step would be to explore the assumptions that underlie such choice of particular criteria.

Conclusion

The survey of literature has outlined some of the major approaches which have been used for teacher evaluation in the past. The first studies were concerned with an attempt to identify the characteristics that would define the 'ideal' teacher. Later studies emphasized the teaching rather than the teacher. Finally the emphasis seems to have shifted to the growth or change brought about by the teacher in the lives of the students. The survey of literature suggests that those people involved in teacher evaluation have taken into consideration presage, process, product and situational factors. Diagram I on page 51 summarizes some of the many criteria which researchers feel might affect teacher effectiveness.

TABLE II
MEAN RATINGS AND RANK ORDER OF THE 16 CRITERIA

Criteria (ordered by rating)	Type (Mitzel Scheme)	Mean Rating
1. Relationship with class (good rapport)	Process	8.31
2. Willingness to be flexible, to be direct or indirect as situation demands	Presage	8.17
3. Effectiveness in controlling his class	Process	7.88
4. Capacity to perceive the world from the student's point of view	Process	7.79
5. Personal adjustment and character	Presage	7.71
6. Influence on student's behavior . .	Product	7.65
7. Knowledge of subject matter and related areas	Presage	7.64
8. Ability to personalize his teaching	Process	7.63
9. Extent to which his verbal behavior in classroom is student-centered	Process	7.27
10. Extent to which he uses inductive (discovery) methods	Process	6.95
11. Amount his students learn	Product	6.86
12. General knowledge and under- standing of educational facts	Presage	6.43
13. Civic responsibility (patriotism)	Presage	6.25
14. Performance in student teaching . .	Presage	5.66
15. Participation in community and professional activities	Presage	4.88
16. Years of teaching experience	Presage	3.89
<u>Type</u>		<u>Combined Mean</u>
Process		7.64
Product		7.26
Presage		6.43

DIAGRAM I

THE SCHOOL AND ENVIRONMENT

SCHOOL (TYPE I VARIABLE)

School Organization
Location of School (Physical)
Facilities
Supplies
Finances

Curriculum
Instructional Staff
Movable Equipment
Flexibility of Space
etc.

GOVERNMENT (TYPE VII VARIABLE)

Level of Priority of Education
(municipal, provincial,
and federal)
Philosophy of School Board
and Personnel
Attitude of Local Education
Committee
etc.

PRESAGE	PROCESS	PRODUCT
Teacher Personal Variable	The Classroom	Student Achievement
Age	Pupil-Teacher Interaction	Subject Matter Mastered
Sex	Innovation	Goals Accomplished
Training	Teacher Techniques and Methodology	Student Growth
Personality	Lesson Preparation	Attitude Towards Authority
Voice	Class Control	Self-Expression
Speech	etc.	etc.
etc.		
TYPE IV VARIABLE	TYPE V VARIABLE	TYPE VI VARIABLE

PUPILS (TYPE II VARIABLE)

Interests
Abilities
Personality
Socio-Economic background
Age
Sex
etc.

COMMUNITY (TYPE III VARIABLE)

Community Resources
Location of School (Cultural)
Attitude Towards Education
Attitude Towards Teachers
Socio-Economic Level of
Populace
etc.

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this study to examine the criteria which the school teachers of Newfoundland felt should be taken into consideration when teachers are evaluated for competence and promotion to administrative positions. This chapter will present the characteristics of the instrument, information on the sample, and the method of data collection.

The Instrument

The questionnaire that was used in this research solicited the following information:

- (1) The School and Teacher Background Variables
 - (a) The age of the teacher.
 - (b) The sex of the teacher.
 - (c) The marital status of the teacher.
 - (d) The type of system in which the teacher taught.
 - (e) The length of experience of the teacher.
 - (f) The total years of teacher training of the teacher.
 - (g) The number of semester courses successfully completed by the teacher.

(h) The size of the school in which the teacher taught.

(i) The number of teachers on the staff of the school in which the teacher taught.

(j) The grade area in which the teacher taught.

(2) Teacher Evaluation Criteria:

(a) A section concerning the evaluation of teacher competence.

(b) A section concerning the evaluation for promotion to an administrative position.

Both sections of the questionnaire contained the same thirty items arranged in a different sequence. The rationale for this change of sequence was to lessen the probability of answers given to the first part influencing answers to the second part.

The teachers were asked to choose one of the following responses for each item:

A - a factor that should ALWAYS be used in teacher evaluation.

F - a factor that should FREQUENTLY be used in teacher evaluation.

S - a factor that should SELDOM be used in teacher evaluation.

N - a factor that should NEVER be used in teacher evaluation.

Space was provided on the questionnaire for the identification of additional criteria thought by teachers to be significant but which were not included in the instrument itself.

The criteria items used in this research are the same as those developed by Thomas Moore in Victoria, Australia.¹ Moore first requested school inspectors to react to conditions set out in a questionnaire. These reactions were then compared with criteria most frequently mentioned in current literature. A pilot study was used to isolate ten criteria for each of Mitzel's categories of presage, process and product. Moore stated that the criteria selected closely paralleled those included in Beecher's Teacher Evaluation Record.² Beecher claimed that his instrument included " . . . all the criterions of effective teaching commonly indicated in the lists of cardinal objectives and pupil needs."³

Sample and Data Collection

The questionnaire, along with a covering letter from the researcher and a stamped, addressed return envelope, were mailed to 300 randomly selected Newfoundland school teachers. The teachers were randomly selected from a list of teachers obtained at the Department of Education, St. John's. The researcher used a table of random numbers

¹ Thomas Moore, op. cit., p. 30.

² Ibid., p. 30.

³ Dwight E. Beecher, The Teaching Evaluation Record (New York: Educator's Publishing Company, 1953) as quoted in Thomas Moore, op. cit., p. 30.

55

to make the selection. The covering letter outlined the purpose of the research and assured the teachers that all information would be used only in the aggregate, and that all information supplied by the teachers would be held in the strictest confidence.

Follow-up letters were mailed to all teachers who had not responded after a period of two weeks. At that time, 48 per cent of the teachers had returned the completed questionnaires to the researcher. This letter reassured the teachers of the confidentiality of the study and instructed teachers to erase or blot out the code numbers on the return envelopes if this inhibited them from responding. Fifteen questionnaires were returned not completed. Thirteen of the teachers were no longer at the address on file at the Department of Education and two teachers refused to complete the questionnaire.

Because the school year was drawing to a close and responses were slow in arriving, replacement questionnaires were sent to all teachers who had not responded, in the event that the originals had been misplaced. The researcher contacted key people across the province, and asked them to contact the non-respondents on his behalf. Replacement questionnaires were sent and contacts made also to the teachers who erased or blotted out their teacher number on the return envelopes earlier. This

technique proved to be very effective. Responses from the follow-up and personal contacts raised the final response rate to 84.3 per cent. (See Table III).

Copies of all correspondence are included in Appendix A.

Treatment of the Data

Each teacher was asked to respond to each item of Part II of the questionnaire, and indicate the degree that he or she felt that such criteria should be used in each of the two evaluative situations. Frequency counts were made for each criterion. The letters A, F, S, and N, representing always, frequently, seldom, and never, were assumed to represent an interval scale and given an arbitrary weight of 1, 2, 3, and 4. Variances and means were then calculated for each criterion. An effort was made to determine, by ranking the mean scores, if those criteria considered significant changed from one evaluative situation to another. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to determine the degree of relationship between the scores given to criteria in the first evaluative situation and scores given those same criteria in the second evaluative situation.

An attempt was made to determine what relative emphasis teachers would place on presage, process and

TABLE III
RESPONSE RATE TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

	Number	% of Total
Returned by respondents		
(a) Usable	253	84.3
(b) Not delivered - teachers had moved	13	4.3
(c) Not completed	2	0.6
(d) Unaccounted for	32	10.6
Total number mailed	300	99.8 ^a

^aTotal not equal to 100% due to rounding.

product criteria. This was done by grouping the presage, process and product variables. Chi square coefficients were used to determine whether significant differences existed in the responses of the teachers according to specific categories of the personal and school variables. An alpha level of .01 significance was used to determine whether to accept or reject each null hypothesis.

Criteria listed by teachers, but not on the instrument, were treated as 'other criteria'. An analysis was made to determine what other criteria teachers perceived as being important for evaluation of teachers for competence, or selecting teachers for administrative positions.

Finally, an attempt was made to compare the criteria selected by the Newfoundland teachers with criteria selected by inspectors, principals, and superintendents in similar studies that have been conducted.

Limitations

This study was limited to the personal and school variables as outlined in Part I of the instrument.

It was further limited to the basic format of the instrument used, except where additional criteria were suggested by the teachers taking part in the study.

Delimitations

The field from which the data were derived was delimited to the school teachers of Newfoundland.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA PERCEIVED AS SIGNIFICANT BY NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOL TEACHERS

Evaluation of Teacher Competence

In the treatment of the data relative to teacher competence, means and variances of the responses were calculated for each of the thirty criteria. These means were then ranked from largest to smallest. To interpret the findings presented in Table IV, use must be made of both statistics: the mean and the variance. The variance indicates the degree of consensus of the respondents, while the mean serves as an indicator of the prevailing response on a continuum ranging from 1 to 4. Twenty of the thirty criteria contained in the instrument had a mean value of 2.00 or less. This means that, in the opinion of most teachers in this sample, two thirds of the criteria listed should always or frequently be used for evaluating teacher competence. Furthermore, the last column of the table indicates that twenty-three of the thirty criteria were each selected by at least 70 per cent of the teachers as being significant for teacher evaluation.

The nine top-ranking criteria combined had only three completely negative responses, and the variance

TABLE IV
FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS
TO BE SIGNIFICANT IN TEACHER EVALUATION
N = 253

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
1	Concern with the all round development of pupils	188	58	4	-	250	.227	1.26	98.4
2	Provision made for individual differences and group needs	173	74	6	-	253	.273	1.34	97.6
3	Class control	165	80	8	-	253	.300	1.38	96.8
4	Concern with character development of the pupils	161	80	12	-	253	.338	1.41	95.5
5	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	150	89	10	1	250	.353	1.45	95.6
6	Teacher-pupil relationships	147	91	11	1	250	.362	1.46	95.2
7	Lesson preparation and presentation	147	92	14	-	253	.361	1.48	94.5

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
8	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	129	110	11	-	250	.339	1.53	95.6
9	The energy, force and enthusiasm of the teacher	125	114	10	1	250	.353	1.55	95.6
10	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	110	113	28	2	253	.484	1.69	88.1
11	The degree of co-operation of the teacher with other staff members	109	110	28	3	250	.508	1.70	87.6
12	The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	90	134	26	3	253	.400	1.74	89.6
13	The methods of lesson presentation used	100	120	30	3	253	.499	1.75	87.0
14	Pupil participation in lessons	85	132	33	3	253	.483	1.82	85.8

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
15	The teacher's standing with the pupils	88	121	37	3	249	.520	1.82	83.9
16	Supervision and checking of written work	87	117	45	4	253	.569	1.87	80.6
17	The personality of the teacher	74	125	48	3	250	.532	1.92	79.6
18	The training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility	68	132	46	3	249	.504	1.94	80.3
19	The learning of the pupils in self expression	58	142	48	2	250	.457	1.98	80.0
20	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	52	148	44	4	248	.453	2.00	80.7
21	The use of teaching aids	50	147	48	5	250	.473	2.03	78.8
22	Pupils attitude of courtesy, industry and self reliance.	62	124	60	7	253	.593	2.05	73.5

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
23	The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	66	115	56	16	253	.731	2.09	71.5
24	Dress and appearance of the teacher	68	96	66	23	253	.866	2.17	64.8
25	The pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards	54	101	76	20	251	.779	2.25	61.8
26	The level of intelligence of the teacher	53	99	75	22	249	.800	2.27	61.0
27	The professional activities of the teacher	36	125	73	18	252	.637	2.29	63.9
28	The pupils work well without supervision	18	131	92	12	253	.476	2.39	58.9
29	Examination results	18	97	102	33	250	.651	2.60	46.0
30	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	13	70	110	59	252	.699	2.85	32.9

of these nine criteria illustrate a very high degree of consensus. In fact, the differences between these variances was so small that perhaps it is not justifiable to consider any one of them as having more consensus than the other.

The following criteria were selected as 'always' or 'frequently' by over 95 per cent of the teachers in the sample: Concern with the all-round development of the pupils; provision made for individual differences; class control; concern with character development of the pupils; the loyalty and dependability of the teacher; teacher-pupil relationships; lesson preparation and presentation; academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum; and, the energy, force and enthusiasm of the teacher.

The selection of the nine criteria listed above by the overwhelming majority of the teachers indicates the consensus of most teachers that these criteria are very important for evaluation of teacher competence. It must be recognized, however, that this sample of teachers was presented with an instrument that contained characteristics gleaned from literature on the topic of teacher evaluation, and criteria used by school inspectors of Australia. Thus, most of the criteria had already been judged significant or desirable in some context, and as a result, a high degree of consensus could be anticipated. It must

also be recognized that teachers could vary significantly in the meaning and definition they attach to each of the concepts and situations underlying each criterion contained in the instrument. For example, "class control" was selected 'always' or 'frequently' by 96.8 per cent of the teachers. However, even though there was almost unanimous agreement that "class control" could be a criterion used when evaluating teacher competence, the instrument did not define what constituted good or adequate class control. Similarly, even though 98.4 per cent of the sample contended that "concern with the all-round development of pupils" should be the most important factor in teacher evaluation, one wonders if one could obtain a similar degree of consensus on what specific actions, behaviors, and attitudes constitute such concern.

In general, the data indicate widespread agreement by teachers in Newfoundland that the thirty criteria listed in the questionnaire should be taken into consideration when they are evaluated for competence. Those criteria where least consensus was exhibited were: the dress and appearance of the teacher; the level of intelligence of the teacher; the pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards; and the attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority. However, even for these four criteria that, in terms of the variance, exhibited the

most disagreement, more than 60 per cent of the sample indicated they should be used.

It was only the last three criteria which received substantially less support as meaningful indicators of teacher competence. The respondents felt that the teachers' participation and standing in the community, examination results, and the ability of the pupils to work well without supervision, were weaker than the others as criteria for evaluation of teachers for competence. Even so, almost a third of the sample considered even the criterion receiving the least support, "The teacher's participation and standing in the community," to be one which should 'always' or 'frequently' be used.

Evaluation for Promotion to an Administrative Position

Table V (page 68) is a list of the thirty criteria ranked in order of the mean frequency response given by the sample of teachers when they were judging the items' significance for use when promotion to an administrative position was being considered. The first eleven ranked criteria have a mean response of 1.5 or less, suggesting that teachers believe these should be the most significant and important when selecting potential administrators. The last column of the table reveals that about 95 per cent

TABLE V

FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS TO BE
FOR PROMOTION TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION
N = 253

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
1	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	215	35	2	-	252	.147	1.16	99.2
2	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	214	35	1	1	251	.167	1.16	99.2
3	The degree of co-operation of the teacher with other staff members	210	40	2	-	252	.161	1.18	99.2
4	Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	205	41	5	1	252	.233	1.21	97.6
5	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	189	58	4	-	251	.227	1.26	98.4
6	The personality of the teacher	161	80	9	2	252	.363	1.42	95.6
7	Teacher-pupil relationships	160	78	12	1	251	.364	1.42	94.3
8	The energy, force and enthusiasm of the teacher	151	91	7	-	249	.301	1.42	97.2

TABLE V. (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
9	Class control	159	78	12	2	251	.390	1.43	94.4
10	Concern with character development of the pupils	146	92	12	-	250	.346	1.46	95.2
11	Provision made for individual differences and group needs	146	90	14	2	252	.410	1.49	93.7
12	The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	117	106	28	-	251	.454	1.65	88.8
13	The level of intelligence of the teacher	108	113	22	5	248	.513	1.69	89.1
14	The professional activities of the teacher	110	111	26	5	252	.535	1.71	87.7
15	The teacher's standing with the pupils	109	105	32	5	251	.572	1.73	85.3
16	Lesson preparation and planning	104	113	27	7	251	.573	1.75	86.5

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
17	The attitudes of the pupils to the school and to authority	99	99	43	10	251	.707	1.86	78.9
18	The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	72	134	40	6	252	.536	1.92	81.7
19	The development of the processes of individual enquiry in the pupils	66	135	47	2	250	.482	1.94	80.4
20	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	74	112	52	12	250	.699	2.01	74.4
21	Supervision and checking of written work	62	127	50	13	252	.650	2.06	75.0
22	The training of pupils in self-expression	53	134	58	6	251	.535	2.07	74.5
23	Dress and appearance of the teacher	73	104	58	17	252	.787	2.08	70.2
24	Pupil's attitude of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	52	133	56	8	249	.558	2.08	74.3

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Rank	Criterion	Frequency Response				Total	Variance	Mean	Per cent of Respondents Replying to Always or Frequently
		1 Always	2 Freq.	3 Seldom	4 Never				
25	The methods of lesson presentation used	59	121	59	11	250	.643	2.09	72.0
26	Pupil participation in lessons	50	131	62	9	252	.575	2.12	71.8
27	The pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards	55	116	68	9	248	.628	2.13	69.0
28	The use of teaching aids	48	115	70	19	252	.716	2.24	64.7
29	The pupils work well without supervision	33	125	77	17	252	.613	2.31	62.7
30	Examination results	18	80	114	39	251	.670	2.69	39.0

of the teachers felt that these criteria should 'always' or 'frequently' be used in the evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative positions. A potential administrator, in the respondents' opinion, seems to be one who displays qualities of leadership, is loyal and dependable, cooperates with other staff members and is genuinely concerned with the all-round development of children. He or she is also a person with a pleasing personality who is capable of working effectively with children, while at the same time a good disciplinarian.

On the other hand, taking a larger variance as an indicator of disagreement, the criteria which reflected the most disagreement among teachers included: dress and appearance of the teacher; the use of teaching aids; attitude of the pupil to school and to authority; and, the teacher's participation and standing in the community. However, more than 60 per cent of the sample felt that even these criteria should 'always' or 'frequently' be used as evaluation items when considering teachers for promotion to an administrative position.

In summary, over 70 per cent of the teachers felt that twenty-six of the criteria listed in the instrument should 'always' or 'frequently' be used to evaluate teachers for promotion to an administrative position.

"Examination results" of pupils were considered to be the

least helpful, since only 39 per cent felt this criterion should 'always' or 'frequently' be used in evaluation for promotion to an administrative position.

CHAPTER V

A COMPARISON OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA BY NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOL TEACHERS

The analysis discussed in this chapter has a three-fold purpose: (1) to determine if the sample of teachers felt that the same criteria should be used to evaluate teacher competence and administrative potential, and (2) if so, with the same or different degrees of emphasis; and (3) to determine if the criteria considered significant by the respondents in each evaluative situation tended to cluster into Mitzel's categories of presage, process or product.

Emphasis Placed on Individual Criteria in Both Evaluative Situations

In order to analyse the relative emphasis placed on the same criterion in each evaluative situation, the ranks of the mean scores for each criterion in both evaluative situations were compared. Table VI (page 75) lists the thirty criteria and the rank of their mean scores for each of the two evaluative situations: (1) evaluation for teacher competence, and (2) evaluation for promotion to

TABLE VI

RANK ORDER OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND THE DEGREE OF
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EVALUATIVE SITUATION AND
CERTAIN CRITERIA OF EVALUATION

Criteria	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Teacher Eval. Situation	Mean Score	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Admin. Promotion Sit.	Mean Score	Pearson's Cor- relation Between Item Response to Eval. Sit. 1 & 2	Difference in Rank
The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	12	1.74	12	1.65	.4181	-
The teacher's standing with the pupils	15	1.82	15	1.73	.5885	-
The training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility	18	1.94	18	1.92	.5163	-
Dress and appearance of the teacher	24	2.17	23	2.08	.5811	1
The pupils work well without supervision	28	2.39	29	2.31	.5424	1
Examination results	29	2.60	30	2.69	.6020	1
Teacher pupil relationships	6	1.46	7	1.42	.3975	1

TABLE VI (CONTINUED).

Criteria	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Teacher Eval. Situation	Mean Score	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Admin. Promotion Sit.	Mean Score	Pearson's Cor- relation Between Item Response to Eval. Sit. 1 & 2	Difference in Rank
The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	20	2.00	19	1.94	.4009	1
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	9	1.55	8	1.42	.4943	1
Pupils' attitude of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	22	2.05	24	2.08	.4593	2
The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	25	2.25	27	2.13	.6131	2
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	8	1.53	5	1.26	.3946	3
The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	5	1.45	2	1.16	.4806	3
The training of the pupils in self-expression	19	1.98	22	2.07	.3543	3
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	1	1.26	4	1.21	.4008	3

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Criteria	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Teacher Eval. Situation	Mean Score	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Admin. Promotion Sit.	Mean Score	Pearson's Correlation Between Item Response to Eval. Sit. 1 & 2	Difference in Rank
Supervision and checking of written work	16	1.87	21	2.06	.5362	5
The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	23	2.09	17	1.86	.3297	6
Class control	3	1.38	9	1.43	.4399	6
Concern with character development of the pupils	4	1.41	10	1.46	.4593	6
The use of teaching aids	21	2.03	28	2.24	.6275	7
The degree of cooperation of the teacher with other staff members	11	1.70	3	1.18	.3104	8
Provision made for individual differences	2	1.34	11	1.49	.3120	9
Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	10	1.69	1	1.16	.1799	9

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Criteria	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Teacher Eval. Situation	Mean Score	Criterion's Rank of Mean Score in Admin. Promotion Sit.	Mean Score	Pearson's Cor- relation Between Item Response to Eval. Sit. 1 & 2	Difference in Rank
Lesson preparation and planning	7	1.47	16	1.75	.3764	9
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	30	2.85	20	2.01	.3951	10
The personality of the teacher	17	1.92	6	1.41	.3924	11
The methods of lesson presentation used	13	1.75	25	2.09	.3854	12
Pupil participation in lessons	14	1.82	26	2.12	.5016	12
The professional activities of the teacher	27	2.29	14	1.71	.4188	13
The level of intelligence of the teacher	26	2.27	13	1.69	.4847	13

an administrative position.

A Spearman Rank correlation coefficient was computed using the ranks listed in columns one and three of Table VI, and the computation revealed a fairly strong relationship of + .69. This indicates that in general, the teachers in this sample placed the criteria in the same relative order for each evaluative situation. Those criteria which were deemed important for evaluating teachers' competence were also thought to be useful if one were going to evaluate a teacher for possible promotion to an administrative position.

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for each item to ascertain whether the same or a different group of respondents was rating an item "high" (should always or frequently be used) in both evaluative situations. A strong positive correlation would indicate that the same teachers were rating the item high in both situations, while a zero or negative correlation would indicate that teachers were rating the item high in one situation and low in the other evaluative situation. Only three criteria had coefficients of + .60 or greater, while the lowest correlation was + .18. The majority of the items showed correlations between + .35 and + .55, once again indicating general agreement among teachers that if an item was thought to be useful in one evaluative situation, it was also useful in the second situation.

However, there were some important distinctions and differences which manifested themselves. First, where the difference in rank order was small (between 0 and 2), the items concerned were considered relatively unimportant by the teachers. Only two of these eleven comparisons involved items ranked in the first ten. Therefore, the teachers seemed to agree most on what they considered relatively unimportant criteria. Second, for each evaluative situation, one half of the first ten ranked criteria had rank order differences greater than or equal to six. For example, "Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher" was ranked first in the promotion to an administrative position situation, but only tenth in the teacher evaluation situation. "The degree of cooperation with other staff members" was ranked third in the promotion situation but eleventh in the teacher evaluation situation. "The personality of the teacher" was ranked sixth among the criteria for the promotion to an administrative position situation, but a mere seventeenth in the teacher evaluation situation.

Therefore, relatively speaking, leadership qualities, cooperation with other staff members, and the personality of the teacher are not deemed by teachers to be as important as characteristics of good and successful teachers, as they are as characteristics of potential

administrators. On the other hand, teachers seem to feel that the potential administrator need not display as much concern for class control, provision for individual differences, concern for pupil character development, or lesson planning. If we look only at the relative differences within the top ten ranked items in each evaluative situation, these differences suggest that teachers in Newfoundland feel that successful administration and teaching comprise in part two separate task areas and skills.

Nevertheless, when we look at absolute mean scores instead of relative ranks of the mean scores, we see that even for those criteria where the difference in relative rank is large, the raw mean scores are quite similar. For example, although the difference in relative ranks for "Concern with pupil character development" was six, the two raw mean scores for this criterion were 1.41 and 1.46--almost the same. Because there was general agreement by the sample that all criteria listed in the instrument were generally applicable in both evaluative situations, the differences in emphasis seem to be more relative than absolute. The general mean for the raw scores in the "Promotion to an administrative position" situation are slightly lower than the "Teacher evaluation" situation (1.76 and 1.87 respectively), but both cluster between the 'always' and 'frequently' categories.

The single most important criterion (i.e. of those which were ranked high) which seems to display the greatest difference in emphasis is "Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher." The difference in ranks was nine; the difference in raw mean scores was .53, one of the largest in the study; and for this item the correlation between teachers' responses for the two evaluative situations was only + .18--the lowest of any item. These facts suggest that teachers believe that "leadership qualities" are necessary for an administrator, but are not as necessary for a teacher. Furthermore, although this criterion displayed raw mean scores of 1.69 and 1.16, both of which are high and can be interpreted as an indication of general support for the use of this criterion, the low correlation coefficient means that for each evaluative situation it is a different group of teachers who ranked the criterion as significant. That is, there seems to be a group of teachers who consider "leadership qualities" as an important indicator of successful teaching, and a different group of teachers who consider it just as important in the identification of potential administrators. Whether or not they are both defining "leadership qualities" in the same way is a matter of conjecture.

An Analysis of the Data According
To Mitzel's Categories of Presage,
Process, and Product

To establish a picture of the teacher's emphasis on each of Mitzel's three categories of presage, process, and product, the means and variances for all items in each category were grouped and arranged in order of magnitude of the mean, for each evaluative situation. The statistics are presented in Tables VII to IX. The means and variances by categories are summarized in Table X.

Teacher Evaluation

Six of the presage criteria, nine of the process criteria and four of the product criteria had a mean score of less than 2.00. However, as Tables VII to IX show there is a wide degree of latitude between the extreme items within each category, suggesting that perhaps Mitzel's system of categorization is questionable. For example, while in general, the 'product' criteria were ranked less important, the most important criterion of all thirty (i.e. that one ranked first) was also a product criterion: "Concern with the all-round development of pupils." Similarly, that item ranked first among the 'presage' criteria (the loyalty and dependability of the teacher) had a mean score of 1.45 which resulted in it

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF "PRODUCT" VARIABLES FOR EVALUATION
OF TEACHER COMPETENCE BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	Concern with the all-round development of pupils	.227	1.26
2	Concern with character development of the pupils	.338	1.41
3	The training of the pupils in civic competence	.504	1.94
4	The learning of the pupils in self-expression	.457	1.98
5	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	.453	2.00
6	Pupils' attitude of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	.593	2.05
7	The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	.731	2.09
8	The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	.779	2.25
9	The pupils work well without supervision	.476	2.39
10	Examination results	.651	2.60
Group mean and variance		.521	2.00

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF "PROCESS" VARIABLES FOR EVALUATION
OF TEACHER COMPETENCE BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	Provision made for individual differences and group needs	.273	1.34
2	Class control	.300	1.38
3	Teacher-pupil relationships	.362	1.46
4	Lesson preparation and planning	.361	1.47
5	The energy, force, and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	.353	1.55
6	The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	.400	1.74
7	The methods of lesson presentation used	.499	1.75
8	Pupil participation in lessons	.483	1.82
9	Supervision and checking of written work	.569	1.87
10	The use of teaching aids	.473	2.03
Group mean and variance		.407	1.64

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF "PRESAGE" VARIABLES FOR EVALUATION
OF TEACHER COMPETENCE BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	.353	1.45
2	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	.339	1.53
3	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	.484	1.69
4	The degree of cooperation of the teacher with other staff members	.508	1.70
5	The teacher's standing with pupils	.520	1.82
6	The personality of the teacher	.532	1.92
7	Dress and appearance of the teacher	.866	2.17
8	The level of intelligence of the teacher	.800	2.27
9	The professional activities of the teacher	.637	2.29
10	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	.699	2.85
Group mean and variance		.573	1.97

TABLE X

DISTRIBUTION OF CRITERIA FOR
EVALUATION OF TEACHER COMPETENCE

Class of Criteria	Response				Variance	Mean
	1	2	3	4		
Presage	830	1058	486	134	.5738	1.97
Process	1169	1101	231	20	.4073	1.64
Product	745	1128	540	97	.5209	2.00

being ranked higher than twenty-five of the other criteria-- even though as a group the 'presage' criteria were among the lowest ranked.

Therefore, although Table X indicates that Newfoundland teachers generally feel that more emphasis should probably be placed on the criteria Mitzel calls 'process' variables when they are being evaluated for teaching competence, there are non-process criteria which, when taken alone, may be more important. The fact that the group of 'process' criteria had the lowest average mean and the smallest variance masks some important differences.

Promotion to an Administrative Position

The means and variances of the thirty criteria which resulted from the respondents' assessment of what should be their importance when evaluating a teacher for promotion to an administrative position are grouped in Tables XI to XIII according to Mitzel's categories of presage, process and product. Once again, the range of the mean scores within the categories is greater than the differences between the categories. Although, in general, 'presage' criteria were considered by teachers to be more useful or valid when evaluating a teacher for promotion to an administrative position, this was not universally true. For example, the 'product' criterion "Concern with

TABLE XI

DISTRIBUTION OF "PRODUCT" VARIABLES FOR PROMOTION TO
AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	Concern with the all-round development of the child	.233	1.21
2	Concern with character development of the pupils	.346	1.46
3	The attitude of the pupils to the school and authority	.707	1.86
4	The training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility	.536	1.92
5	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the students	.482	1.94
6	The training of the pupils in self-expression	.535	2.07
7	Pupils' attitude of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	.558	2.08
8	The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	.628	2.13
9	The pupils work well without supervision	.613	2.31
10	Examination results	.670	2.69
Group mean and variance		.531	1.97

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF "PROCESS" VARIABLES FOR PROMOTION TO
AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	Teacher-pupil relationships	.364	1.42
2	The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	.301	1.42
3	Class control	.390	1.43
4	Provision made for individual differences	.410	1.49
5	The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	.454	1.65
6	Lesson preparation and planning	.573	1.75
7	Supervision and checking of written work	.650	2.06
8	The methods of <u>lesson presentation</u> used	.643	2.09
9	Pupil participation in lessons	.575	2.12
10	The use of teaching aids	.716	2.24
Group mean and variance		.508	1.77

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF "PRESAGE" VARIABLES FOR PROMOTION TO
AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION BY VARIANCE AND MEAN

Rank	Criteria	Variance	Mean
1	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	.147	1.16
2	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	.167	1.16
3	The degree of cooperation of the teacher with other staff members	.161	1.18
4	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	.227	1.26
5	The personality of the teacher	.363	1.41
6	The level of intelligence of the teacher	.513	1.69
7	The professional activities of the teacher	.535	1.71
8	The teacher's standing with the pupils	.572	1.73
9	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	.699	2.01
10	Dress and appearance of the teacher	.787	2.08
Group mean and variance		.417	1.54

'the all-round development of the child' has a mean score of 1.21 in this context--making it 'more significant' than seven of the 'presage' criteria.

Table XIV summarizes the average means and variances for Mitzel's categories for this evaluative situation, but as pointed out in the previous paragraph, the stress which appears to be placed on 'presage' criteria is not as strong as this table indicates.

In order to present the emphasis that Newfoundland school teachers gave to Mitzel's three categories of presage, process and product in a more graphic manner, Tables XV and XVI were constructed. The broken line separates the fifteen highest ranking criteria from the rest. Together with the data presented in Tables X and XIV it can be seen that on the whole, teachers think there should be more emphasis placed on process variables when evaluating for teacher competence, and more should be placed on presage variables when evaluating for promotion to an administrative position.

However, the fact must be emphasized that while the data appear to indicate that teachers feel most emphasis should be placed on process criteria for evaluation of teacher competence, the criteria ranked one and four are product criteria, while those ranked five and eight are presage criteria. Therefore, with such high ranking

TABLE XIV
DISTRIBUTION OF CRITERIA FOR
PROMOTION TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Class of Criteria	Response				Variance	Mean
	1	2	3	4		
Presage	1463	793	211	51	.4171	1.54
Process	1056	1050	341	64	.5075	1.77
Product	799	1089	520	98	.5308	1.97

TABLE XV

RANK ORDER OF CRITERIA OF EVALUATION PERCEIVED FOR TEACHER
COMPETENCE ACCORDING TO MITZEL'S CATEGORIES

Category	Rank as per Table V									
PRESAGE	5,	8,	10,	11,	15,	17,	24,	26,	27,	30
PROCESS	2,	3,	6,	7,	9,	12,	13,	14,	16,	21
PRODUCT	1,	4,	18,	19,	20,	22,	23,	25,	28,	29

TABLE XVI

RANK ORDER OF CRITERIA OF EVALUATION PERCEIVED FOR PROMOTION TO AN
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION GROUPED ACCORDING TO MITZEL'S
CATEGORIES.

Category	Rank as per Table V									
PRESAGE	1,	2,	3,	5,	6,	13,	14,	15,	20,	23
PROCESS	7,	8,	9,	11,	12,	16,	21,	25,	26,	28
PRODUCT	4,	10,	17,	18,	19,	22,	24,	27,	29,	30

product and presage criteria, perhaps the strongest statement that can be made is that taking the first half (top ranked) of the criteria, eight of these were identified as "process" variables.

In the evaluation of teachers for administrative positions, the emphasis is a bit stronger (Table XVI). Eight of the fifteen criteria including the three highest ranks are "presage" variables. However, even here "process" and "product" criteria constitute almost half of the fifteen highest ranked criteria.

In summation, evidence seems to indicate that in general, Newfoundland school teachers think process criteria should be most important in the evaluation of teachers for competence, and presage criteria should be most important in the selection of personnel for administrative positions. From Tables XV to XVI it can be seen that teachers feel that less emphasis should be placed on product criteria for both evaluative situations.

CHAPTER VI

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RATINGS OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

This chapter is concerned with hypothesis two, which stated that there were no significant differences between the evaluative criteria thought by teachers to be important, and selected personal and school related characteristics. First, however, it was necessary to determine if the sample was representative of the population from which it was drawn. Table XVII indicates that at least on the basis of years of training, it is representative. The chi square goodness of fit test indicates that the coefficient of 5.43 is not significant at the .01 level.

Personal and Professional Characteristics of Teachers

Age and Sex

The distribution of teachers by age and sex (Table XVIII) shows that of the 253 teachers involved in the study, 41.8 per cent were male, and 58.1 per cent were female. Both male and female teachers were fairly evenly distributed over the four age categories, although

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF THE SAMPLE WITH THE NEWFOUNDLAND TEACHER POPULATION
BY YEARS OF TRAINING

Years of Training	Total Population of Newfoundland Teachers (a)			Sample Population	
	No.	%	Expected	No.	%
1	647	9.1	23	18	7.1
2	1151	16.2	41	38	15.0
3	939	13.2	33	34	13.4
4	1650	23.2	59	66	26.1
5	1475	20.6	52	55	21.7
6	882	12.4	31	31	12.3
7	291	4.1	11	11	4.4
Licensed	78	1.1	3	-	-
Totals	7113		253	253	$\chi^2 = 5.43$

(a) Source: H. Cuff and J. Acreman, "A Teacher Shortage Imminent,"
N.T.A. Bulletin, 17(6), February 1974, p. 16.

the female segment of the sample had more older and younger teachers.

TABLE XVIII
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY AGE AND SEX

Age	Male %	Female %	Total %
20 - 24	8.3	14.6	22.9
25 - 28	12.3	14.2	26.5
29 - 34	14.2	12.3	26.5
35 and over	7.1	17.0	24.1
Total	41.8 (N=106)	58.1 (N=147)	100.0 (N=253)

Age. The teachers were divided into two age categories for the purpose of determining if significant differences existed in the selection of criteria for evaluation of teacher competence, or evaluation for promotion to an administrative position: those less than or equal to 35 years of age, and those over 35. Significant differences were found to exist in response to five criteria at the .01 level of significance using chi square tests, three in the evaluation of teachers for competence and two in the evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative positions. These criteria

are presented in Table XIX. Thus the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed was rejected in only five of the sixty cases.

The criteria which had significant differences in the responses for teacher evaluation according to different age groups were: the personality of the teacher; the attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority; the pupils' attitude of courtesy, industry and self-reliance; and, dress and appearance of the teacher. The two criteria that showed significant differences relative to age and promotion to an administrative position were: the dress and appearance of the teacher; and, supervision and checking of written work.

For the criterion "the personality of the teacher," teachers over 35 years of age felt that much more emphasis should be placed on this criterion than did the teachers 35 years of age and under. Only 23.8 per cent of the younger teachers felt that this criterion should 'always' be used in the evaluation of teachers for competence, while 49.1 per cent of the older teachers felt that it should 'always' be used. Similarly, older teachers were also more likely to think that "the attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority" and "pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry, and self-reliance" should always be used. For the latter criterion, while 41.4 per cent of the older teachers felt that this criterion

TABLE XIX

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE
CRITERIA BY TEACHERS LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO
35 YEARS OF AGE AND THOSE OVER 35

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S*	Chi Square	df	S*
The personality of the teacher	15.25	3	.0016	NS**	-	-
The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	14.33	3	.0025	NS	-	-
Pupils' attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	12.70	3	.0053	NS	-	-
Dress and appearance of the teacher	13.44	3	.0038	13.22	3	.0042
Supervision and checking of written work	NS	-	-	12.46	3	.0060

** NS - no significant difference

*S - significance

should 'always' be used, only 19.5 per cent of the younger teachers saw this as being the case.

For the criterion "the dress and appearance of the teacher" significant differences existed between the responses of the age groups for both evaluative situations. For the evaluation of teacher competence 43.1 per cent of the older teachers felt this should 'always' be used, whereas only 22.1 per cent of the younger teachers felt this should be the case.

In the evaluation of teachers for promotion to an administrative position 47.4 per cent of the older teachers perceived this criterion as being important as compared with 23.6 per cent of the younger teachers.

The older and younger teachers also differed significantly on the criterion "supervision and checking of written work," although this was true only in the promotion of teachers to administrative positions context. Once again, it was the older teacher who felt that more emphasis should be placed on this criterion. Older teachers were more likely to think that this criterion should 'always' be used, while the teachers of 35 years of age and less, felt the criterion should 'frequently' be used.

Sex. Significant differences relative to sex were observed in the responses of six criteria connected with

evaluating teachers for competence, and two criteria when considering teachers for promotion to an administrative position. (Table XX). The six criteria with significant differences relative to sex for the teacher evaluation situation were: lesson preparation and planning; the methods of lesson presentation used; pupil participation in lessons; the use of teaching aids; concern with the all-round development of the child; and, the training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility. The two criteria perceived significantly different in evaluating teachers for promotion were: the training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility and the training of the pupils in self-expression.

Teachers differed most on the criterion "lesson preparation and planning." It was observed that 99.3 per cent of the female teachers, and only 87.7 per cent of the male teachers, felt that this criterion should 'always' or 'frequently' be used. Considering the 'always' category by itself, 68.7 per cent of the female teachers thought that this criterion should 'always' be used, compared with 43.4 per cent of the male teachers.

Female teachers placed greater emphasis than did the male teachers on the criteria "the methods of lesson presentation used," and "pupil participation in lessons." Female teachers also saw a greater need for emphasis being

TABLE XX

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE
CRITERIA BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX
(.01 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE)

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S*	Chi Square	df	S*
Lesson preparation and planning	24.92	3	.0000	NS**	-	-
The methods of lesson preparation used	14.96	3	.0019	NS	-	-
Pupils participation in lessons	14.82	3	.0020	NS	-	-
The use of teaching aids	13.37	3	.0039	NS	-	-
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	10.20	2	.0061	NS	-	-
The training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility	14.05	3	.0028	15.30	3	.0016
The training of the pupils in self-expression	NS	-	-	14.76	3	.0020

** NS - no significant difference

*S - significance

placed on the "use of teaching aids," and "concern with the all-round development of pupils" as criteria of evaluation for competence than did the male teachers.

The criterion "the training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility" showed significant differences in responses in both evaluative situations. Once again, in both situations female teachers indicated a much stronger desire to have this criterion used 'always' or 'frequently'.

"The training of pupils in self-expression" was also considered more significant in evaluation of teachers for promotion to an administrative position. It was observed that 65.7 per cent of the female teachers, as compared with 34.3 per cent of the male teachers, felt this criterion should 'always' or 'frequently' be utilized.

In summary, where age and sex differences were manifested, it was female teachers and those over 35 years of age who felt stronger emphasis should be placed on the criteria mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. However, only twelve out of a possible 120 comparisons showed significant differences, and there was no pattern other than the one just mentioned which was discernible.

Experience and Professional Preparation

The distribution of teachers in the sample according to professional preparation is presented in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY YEARS OF UNIVERSITY
TRAINING AND TEACHER EXPERIENCE

Years of Teaching Experience	Years of University Training								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1 - 4	1	7	8	22	26	3	1	-	68
5 - 9	6	13	11	17	16	12	6	-	81
10 - 14	5	12	8	10	5	8	3	-	51
15 - 19	2	-	3	6	3	2	-	1	17
20 and over	3	6	4	11	5	6	-	-	35
Total	17	38	34	66	55	31	10	1	252 ^a

^aTotal number of teachers not equal to 253 because one female teacher failed to give teaching experience.

The highest concentration of teachers by years of university training was located in the four and five year groups. These two groups comprised 48 per cent of the sample. Table XXII shows that approximately 79 per cent of the teachers had fourteen years or less teaching experience, and Table XXIII indicates that the male teachers in the sample tended to be more qualified professionally (i.e., have completed more years of university) than female teachers. Only 36 per cent of the male teachers had four years or less professional preparation.

TABLE XXII
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY YEARS OF TEACHING
EXPERIENCE

Years of Teaching Experience	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1 - 4	11.9	15.1	27.0
5 - 9	15.5	16.7	32.1
10 - 14	8.7	11.5	20.2
15 - 19	2.4	4.4	6.7
20 and over	3.6	10.3	13.9
Total	42.1 (n=106)	57.9 (n=146)	100.0

TABLE XXIII
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY SEX AND YEARS OF
UNIVERSITY TRAINING

Professional Preparation	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
1	0.4	6.7	7.1
2	2.0	13.0	15.0
3	3.6	9.9	13.4
4	9.1	17.0	26.1
5	12.6	9.1	21.7
6	10.3	2.0	12.3
7	4.0	-	4.0
8	-	0.4	0.4
Total	42.0 ^a	58.1 ^a	100.0

^a not equal to 100 per cent due to rounding.

whereas, over 80 per cent of the females fell into that category.

Teaching Experience

Because age and experience are both functions of time, it could be hypothesized that the significant differences that existed between the two age groups would also be found when responses were classified by experience. However, only two of the criteria showed significant differences in both evaluative situations, and a third significant difference was detected only in the case of experience.

The three criteria that teachers with less than ten years teaching experience felt differently about than those with more than ten years of experience in the evaluation of teachers for competence were: the personality of the teacher; the development of the processes of individual enquiry in the pupils; and, the dress and appearance of the teacher. The last criterion was also perceived differently by the experienced and less experienced groups in the evaluation of teacher for promotion to an administrative position. In all cases the more experienced teachers placed more emphasis on these criteria than the less experienced teachers. (Table XXIV).

The one criteria which appeared as significant here but did not in the case of age was "the development of

TABLE XXIV
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE CRITERIA
BY RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR LENGTH OF TEACHING
EXPERIENCE

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S [*]	Chi Square	df	S [*]
The personality of the teacher	12.95	3	.0048	NS ^{**}	-	-
The development of the processes of individual enquiry in the pupils	12.19	3	.0068	NS	-	-
Dress and appearance of the teacher	12.08	3	.0071	11.78	3	.0082

^{**} NS - no significant difference

^{*}S - significance

the processes of individual enquiry in the pupils." While 53.6 per cent of the less experienced teachers felt that this criterion should 'frequently' be used, 72.5 per cent of the more experienced teachers thought it should 'frequently' be used. Both groups stated strongly that this criterion should 'always' be used. Except for the four cases already cited, the null hypothesis was upheld for the remaining fifty-six cases.

Professional Training

For the purpose of determining if significant differences existed between the well trained and the other teachers of the study, the teachers were divided into the two groups of four years or less and over four years of professional training. (Table XXV). Only two significant chi square values were obtained for the variable of professional training, and the null hypothesis was accepted for all other criteria. These criteria were "lesson preparation and planning," and "the use of teaching aids." Both criteria were perceived significantly different for the evaluation of teachers for competence. No significant differences were detected in the responses of teachers on these variables when considering teachers for promotion to administrative positions.

For the criterion "lesson preparation and planning," a significant difference was observed. The chi

TABLE XXV

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE CRITERIA
OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S*	Chi Square	df	S*
Lesson preparation and planning	14.08	2	.0009	NS**	-	-
The use of teaching aids	12.78	3	.0051	NS	-	-

** NS - no significant differences

* S - significance

square test revealed that 98.7 per cent of the teachers with four years or less university training felt that this criterion should 'always' or 'frequently' be used, whereas 87.6 per cent of the teachers with more than four years university training thought this should be the case.

The criterion "the use of teaching aids" also found more support from the less qualified teachers. Whereas, the less professionally trained teachers indicated that they felt that this criterion should 'frequently' be used, the more qualified teachers felt that this criterion should 'seldom' be used when evaluating teachers for competence.

The researcher tried to ascertain whether significant differences existed in the responses of teachers when considered by marital status or the number of semester education courses successfully completed at some teacher training institution. For the latter case, the responses were separated into two groups: up to twelve courses, and over twelve courses. However, no significant differences at the .01 level were detected for the two variables, and the null hypotheses in these cases were upheld. Similarly, marital status showed no significant differences.

School Variables

This study utilized a number of school variables for consideration in the analysis of the data to determine if significant differences existed in the responses of respondents relative to their school situation. The school variables used were: the type of school board, the number of classrooms, the number of teachers on staff, and the grade area in which the respondents were teaching.

Type of School Board

Table XXVI shows the distribution of the teachers in the sample by type of school board. The null hypothesis that no significant differences existed in the responses of teachers of the various systems was upheld in all cases.

TABLE XXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS IN SAMPLE BY SCHOOL BOARD

School Board	Number of Teachers
Roman Catholic	86
Integrated	153
Pentecostal	13
Other	1
Total	253

The Number of Classrooms

Table XXVII gives the number of classrooms in the schools in which the respondents of the sample were teaching. The greatest concentration of teachers was in schools of nine to sixteen classrooms. In order to investigate whether significant differences existed in the responses of respondents of large and small schools, the school size variable was divided into two categories: one to ten classrooms and eleven and over.

TABLE XXVII

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS IN SAMPLE BY NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS

Number of Classrooms	Number of Respondents In Schools of Given Size
1 - 8	58
9 - 16	103
17 - 25	63
26 and over	29
Total	253

Only one significant chi square value was observed for the variable school size. The teachers in larger schools placed more emphasis on the criterion "level of intelligence of the teacher" for evaluation of teacher

competence than did the teachers of smaller schools. In all other cases, the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed between the size of school and how the respondents responded to each criterion was upheld.

Grade Area

In the analyses of the data for the purpose of determining if significant differences existed in the responses of respondents by grade area, the teachers were divided into two groups: those teaching from kindergarten to grade six, and those teaching grades seven to eleven. Significant differences in responses were observed for the following criteria with respect to the evaluation of teachers for competence: class control; supervision and checking of written work; the use of teaching aids, the training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility; and, the degree of cooperation of the teacher with other staff members.

For the criterion "class control" the teachers teaching in the lower grades felt much greater emphasis should be placed on this criterion than did the teachers teaching in the higher grades. It was observed that 71.2 per cent of the teachers teaching in the K--6 area thought this criterion should 'always' be used, while 59.3 per cent of the teachers of grades seven to eleven agreed with this assessment.

TABLE XXVIII

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE
CRITERIA ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS
IN SCHOOLS WHERE RESPONDENTS TAUGHT

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S*	Chi Square	df	S*
Level of intelligence of the teacher	12.17	3	.0068	NS**	-	-

** NS - no significant difference

* S - significance

TABLE XXIX

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE CRITERIA
ACCORDING TO THE GRADE AREA TAUGHT

Criteria	Teacher Competence			Administrative Promotion		
	Chi Square	df	S*	Chi Square	df	S*
Class control	28.89	6	.0001	NS**	-	-
Supervision and checking of written work	29.23	9	.0006	NS	-	-
The use of teaching aids	25.75	9	.0022	NS	-	-
The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	24.47	9	.0036	NS	-	-
The degree of cooperation of the teacher with other staff members	23.59	9	.0050	NS	-	-

** NS - no significant difference

* S - significance

The criterion "supervision and checking of written work" was also considered more important by teachers in the lower grades. While 90.6 per cent of the teachers of the lower grades felt that this criterion should 'always' or 'frequently' be used in teacher evaluation for competence, only 68.5 per cent of the teachers in the higher grades felt this to be the case.

The remaining significant criteria "the use of teaching aids"; "the training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility"; and, "the degree of cooperation with other staff members," showed a similar pattern. All three criteria differed in the responses of respondents in the 'always' and 'seldom' categories, and in all three cases it was the teachers in the lower grade levels who felt that they should be emphasized when evaluating teachings for competence.

Summary

The analyses of the data revealed only twenty-eight out of a possible 540 comparisons where significant differences were found. Twenty-three of these were in the evaluation of teachers for competence, and five were in the evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative positions. According to Mitzel's categories significant differences occurred for eight presage

criteria, ten process criteria, and ten product criteria.

In most cases the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed in the responses of respondents and personal and school variables, was upheld.

CHAPTER VII

WHO IS IN THE BEST POSITION TO EVALUATE?

In 1972, The Teacher Certification Regulations were formulated.¹ These regulations made the distinction between interim and permanent certification, and in order to qualify for a permanent teaching certificate, the prospective teacher had to undergo a process of assessment. These regulations stated several possible evaluators, but did not delegate the sole responsibility to any one evaluator. Although in the final analysis the superintendent is usually the one to recommend permanent certification, the actual evaluation could have been performed by other school board personnel. As a result, evaluation could vary significantly from one area of the province to another.

The Collective Agreement, which was also signed in 1972, gave provision for tenure.² These regulations specified the period of probation, but stated only that the school boards had the responsibility of evaluating

¹Newfoundland Teachers' Association Handbook, 1973-74, pp. 43-44.

²The Collective Agreement between the Government, Federation of School Boards and The Newfoundland Teachers' Association, Article 6, p. 4.

teachers before tenure was granted. As a result, the school board could assign the responsibility to any one of its personnel.

A perusal of the current and past literature on teacher evaluation unveils a distinct problem--who should evaluate teachers for competence? Some people feel that the superintendent should not evaluate because he is far removed from the actual classroom situation. Other interested educators feel that the supervisor's role is one of helper rather than evaluator, and still others feel that the principal should try to improve instruction and not inspect or assess. Finally, there are those who feel that students should not evaluate, since such evaluation may be very unreliable. The result is that the question remains unresolved. Can we assume that all teachers are competent, and thus, there is no need for assessment? Or if not all teachers are competent, who should evaluate?

The instrument for this study contained the following question: Whom do you feel is in the best position to evaluate your work as a teacher? The following potential evaluators were given, and each respondent was asked to select one: the superintendent, the supervisor, the principal, other teacher, the students, or self.

When the researcher analysed this section of the instrument, it was found that thirty-five teachers felt

that a combination of evaluators was necessary. Because this was an incorrect response to the question asked, these thirty-five responses were excluded from the following analysis.

Table XXX gives a breakdown of the choice of evaluator by sex of respondent. It appears that teachers feel the principal is the person most capable of evaluating them as teachers. Almost half of the sample chose that person as the one in the best position to evaluate a teacher's work.

TABLE XXX
CHOICE OF EVALUATOR BY SEX OF RESPONDENT

Evaluator Chosen	Sex of Respondent		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
Superintendent	-	-	-
Supervisor	-	4	2
Principal	52	48	49
Other Teacher	16	13	14
Students	16	5	10
Self	17	30	24
Total	101 ^(b)	100	99
	N=89	N=120	N=209 ^(a)

^aForty-four respondents failed to correctly answer the question. Of these a total of thirty-five respondents felt a combination of evaluators should be used.

^bTotals differ from 100 per cent due to rounding.

Although the number of respondents is small, there are two interesting differences in Table XXX. Male teachers were more likely to put more confidence in students as evaluators than were female teachers, while the reverse was true when selecting oneself as the evaluator. In the latter case females were more likely to select themselves.

Looking at the relationship between the responses to the question, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?" with the variable age, it was found that the younger teachers considered students to be in a better position to evaluate than did the older teachers. Only 2 per cent of the older teachers responded that students were in the best position to evaluate, while 11.9 per cent of the younger teachers felt this way. On the other hand, older teachers were more likely to respond that they themselves were in the best position to evaluate. It was observed that 34.7 per cent of the older teachers saw this as being the case, while only 21.3 per cent of the younger teachers felt this way.

The relationship between years of teaching experience and responses to the question, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?" showed that the more experienced teachers were more likely to feel themselves as being in the best position to evaluate their work. While 19 per cent of the less experienced teachers perceived themselves

as being in the best position to evaluate, 33.8 per cent of the more experienced teachers perceived this as being the case.

The relationship between the variable number of teachers on staff with responses to the question, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?" also revealed significant differences. Teachers on small staffs (less than ten staff members) were more likely to name the principal as being in the best position to evaluate, while the teachers of larger staffs were much more diverse in their responses. Of the teachers on smaller staffs, 65 per cent chose the principal as the best evaluator, while only 43 per cent of the teachers of larger staffs chose the principal. The teachers on larger staffs were the only respondents who felt that the supervisor was in the best position to evaluate. They were also more likely to see themselves capable of self-evaluation than were teachers on smaller staffs. While only 15 per cent of the teachers on smaller staffs felt that they were in the best position to evaluate their own work, 28.2 per cent of the larger-staff teachers felt this to be the case.

A similar relationship was observed when the variable, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?" was compared with the number of classrooms in the schools in which the respondent was teaching. While 58.8 per cent

of the teachers in schools of ten classrooms or less selected the principal as the best evaluator, only 43.4 per cent of the teachers in schools of more than ten classrooms selected the principal as the best evaluator. It also seems that teachers in larger schools have more confidence in themselves as evaluators. Whereas only 15 per cent of the teachers in smaller schools felt they themselves were the person in the best position to evaluate, 30.2 per cent of the teachers in the larger schools thought themselves as being in the best position to evaluate.

Finally, an examination of the relationship between the variable, "Who is in the best position to evaluate?" and grade level taught reveals that all the teachers who selected the supervisor as being in the best position to evaluate were teaching in the lower grades, that is, from kindergarten to grade six.

Summary

In general, the respondents considered the principal as being the person in the best position to evaluate. However, there were variations. The male teachers in the sample expressed more confidence than the females in the student as the best evaluator. On the other hand, female teachers expressed more confidence in

their ability to evaluate their own work than did male teachers. The same was true for older and more experienced teachers. Teachers in larger schools, with larger staffs, also felt themselves as more capable of evaluating their own work than did teachers in small schools, with small staffs. The teachers teaching in grades kindergarten to six were the only group who responded that the supervisor was in the best position to evaluate.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The basic purpose of this study was to determine what criteria Newfoundland school teachers felt should be significant in the evaluation of teachers for competence, and the evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative positions.

There are numerous articles on many aspects of teacher evaluation and teacher effectiveness in the literature. However, the results have been disappointing and perplexing. No universally accepted criteria, or method for teacher evaluation have been devised. Nevertheless, educators have gone ahead and evaluated teachers for competence and promotion to administrative positions without investigating which criteria should be used. Because the classroom teacher is in many ways closest to the situation being evaluated, it was felt that their opinions on this subject were both theoretically and administratively necessary.

A random sample of 300 Newfoundland teachers was chosen from the entire teaching population of Newfoundland, excluding all administrators at the school and board office levels. A questionnaire, of which 84.3 per cent

were returned, was sent to each of these 300 teachers.

The questionnaire used in this research asked for information about ten personal and school related items, and consisted of two thirty-item batteries. These contained the same thirty criteria re-arranged in different order for two evaluative situations: evaluation for teacher competence and, evaluation for promotion to an administrative position. The thirty criteria could also be grouped according to Mitzel's three categories of presage, process and product.

Statistical procedures used in the analysis included frequency counts to determine priority of teachers' ranking of criteria for both evaluative situations; a comparison of ranked criteria was done to determine if any change of emphasis was evident from one evaluative situation to the other; Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to ascertain the degree of relationship between each criterion in each evaluative situation; a grouping of criteria to determine the degree of emphasis placed on Mitzel's categories of presage, process and product; and, chi square tests at the .01 level of significance to isolate significant differences between categories of the ten personal and school variables and choice of evaluative criteria.

The different analyses of the data showed that in general teachers did agree on a common body of criteria

which they felt should be used both for teacher evaluation for competence and promotion to administrative positions. Some changes of emphasis on criteria were observed from one particular evaluative situation to the other. Teachers generally felt that process criteria should be used in the evaluation of teachers for competence, and presage criteria should be given primary emphasis when evaluating teachers for administrative positions. Although some significant differences were observed between the personal and school variables and perceived use of certain criteria, the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed was upheld for most of the criteria in each evaluative situation.

Conclusions and Implications

As a result of this study the following conclusions and implications may be formulated:

1. Since teachers do generally agree on a common body of criteria for the evaluation of teachers, it is felt by the writer that any evaluative instrument devised should be constructed partially from the criteria listed in the instrument used in this study. The inclusion of these criteria would at least result in a more consistent method of evaluating teacher competencies. However, the criteria should first be checked for validity and

reliability. It could be argued that the feelings and ideas of teachers might not be reliable for construction of an evaluative instrument. However, this criticism could be raised for any set of criteria proposed by any group of individuals, whether they belong to the teaching profession or not.

2. The qualities outlined by teachers as important for potential administrators suggest that they should be diplomatic, dependable, and concerned with the welfare of the child. The teachers also considered academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum as being important for the evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative positions. This implies that teachers feel that administrators should be well trained academically and informed in curriculum matters. This suggests that the Department of Educational Administration and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland should work together in devising a program where potential administrators can obtain training in at least the basic concepts of curriculum and instruction.

3. The teachers felt that the criteria important for evaluation were somewhat different for the two evaluative situations. The criterion "concern with the all-round development of the child" ranked first in evaluation for teacher competence, and fourth in the

evaluation for promotion. The criterion "qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher" ranked first in the evaluation for promotion and tenth in the evaluation of teachers for competence. Some criteria changed as many as thirteen ranks from one evaluative situation to another. This suggests that good teaching and administrator competence, in the opinion of the teachers of the sample, are similar but not the same. If this is the case, then the preparation of teachers and administrators should continue to be somewhat different, as it is in most educational institutions at present.

4. By grouping the criteria in Mitzel's categories of presage, process, and product it was observed that teachers felt greater emphasis should be placed on process criteria in evaluating teachers for competence, and on presage criteria when evaluating teachers for promotion to administrative positions. The findings of the Thomas, Moore, Rogers and Farrell studies are practically identical. This study found that teachers, and Farrell found that Newfoundland superintendents, generally agree on the criteria that should be used in both evaluative situations, at least in terms of the criteria presented in the instrument used in all of these studies. Since the instrument was designed by asking the inspectors of Australia which criteria they used in both evaluative

situations and consulting current literature to ascertain the opinion of educational experts, it is reasonable to believe that the criteria presented in the instrument were fairly valid. Therefore, these criteria should be considered in the setting up of an evaluative program. Not only would this lead to greater consistency in evaluation for the entire province, it would also provide a foundation for the evaluator and evaluatee to build upon; that is, both would know what was expected of each other.

5. It appears that teachers, principals, and superintendents all agree that student gain is not the most important criterion in either evaluative situation. This is supported by the findings of Moore, Thomas, Rogers, Farrell, and now this study. Given the emphasis that is currently placed on examination results by students, teachers and administrators, it might be wise to re-evaluate the place of such practices in Newfoundland's school system.

6. The study revealed that a few responses and emphases varied significantly with the personal and school related variables of the respondents. Although these instances were few in number this change of emphasis according to age, sex, experience, training and grade area taught indicates varying views on the use of certain criteria as a means of evaluating teachers for

competence or promotion. These varying views should be taken into consideration if an evaluative instrument is to be devised.

7. The teacher certification regulations of 1972 placed the final responsibility for evaluating teachers in the hands of the superintendent. In order for a teacher to be awarded a permanent certificate, he or she must be recommended by his or her superintendent. On the other hand, the findings of this study indicate that teachers do not consider the superintendent to be in the best position to evaluate their work. It was the principal who was considered to be in the best position. Perhaps another look should be taken at who should recommend that a teacher be granted permanent certification.

8. The strong emphasis placed on class control in the studies of Thomas, Moore, Rogers, Farrell, and also in this study indicates that this criterion still has high priority as a measure of teacher competence. A good teacher is perceived as one who has control over the classroom situation. Although the teacher's concept of class control may vary significantly from one teacher to another, class control is considered important. The traditional feeling that a teacher cannot teach if he or she has no discipline, seems to be still accepted today. In a society that places a good deal of emphasis on

freedom and permissiveness, the schools seem to be either a moderating force, or out of touch with present reality.

Recommendations for Further Research
and Study

Future work in this area should concentrate on development of a teacher evaluation program which is acceptable to the Department of Education, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and all other educational agencies. Such a program would have to be clearly understood by the evaluator and the evaluatee in order to be of significant value. The evaluative program would also have to be checked for validity and reliability.

The insistence of the teachers to exclude product criteria as important from both evaluative situations calls for further research. It seems evident that a major step would be to explore why the teachers, and others in similar studies, tended to ignore product criteria. There is an apparent need to explore the basic assumptions which underlie the choice of particular criteria as displayed in this and other studies.

Research has been conducted into what inspectors, principals, and superintendents use and feel should be used in the evaluation of teachers for competence, and evaluation of teachers for promotion to administrative

positions. This study asked for the opinions of teachers in this regard. It seems apparent that much could be learned if parent and student feelings could also be researched. Students, most particularly, should be in a good position to distinguish desirable characteristics of good teachers.

Teachers were quite willing to express their views on teacher evaluation. Research should be carried out to determine the degree to which teachers are involved in the evaluative process and the degree to which they would like to be involved. Recent research by William Inkpen seems to be a step in the right direction.¹ Research needs to be undertaken to identify the characteristics, if any, which distinguish the good administrator from the good teacher.

Finally, a large area for future research revolves around the effects of contextual factors of communities, and how they affect teacher evaluation. In-depth studies should reveal if teacher or administrator success is genuine or the result of other peoples' perceptions. If teacher evaluation fails to become more exacting, success could be only a matter of peoples' perception of a

¹William Inkpen, "A Comparison of the Present and Desired Levels of Participation by Elementary Teachers in Educational Decision-Making" (unpublished Master of Education Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1974).

teacher or administrator and not that which is being accomplished. It appears also that more sophisticated means of measuring educational productivity is paramount.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, J. and Brown, A. "Can Principals exclude their own Personality Characteristics when they Rate their Teachers?," Educational Administration and Supervision, July 1959:234-242.
- Bargen, P.F. "Should a Principal Evaluate Teachers?," C.S.A. Bulletin, 4(3), February 1965:3-18.
- Bayer, J.D. "Supervisory Techniques," Journal of Education, 18(2), May-June 1969:13-16.
- Beecher, D. The Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949.
- Best, J. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Biddle, B. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Boardman, C. et al. Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.
- Bolen, J. "The Dilemma of Evaluating Instruction," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:72-75.
- Byrne, T.C. "Good Teaching and Good Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, 1(19), February 1962:19-24.
- Burton, W.H. and Brueckner, L.J. Supervision - A Social Process (3rd. ed.), New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- Callahan, R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Castle, E.B. The Teacher. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Corey, G.F. Teachers Can Make a Difference. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973.

- Cuff, H. and Acreman, J. "A Teacher Shortage Imminent," N.T.A. Bulletin, 17(6), February 1974:15-16.
- Drummond, W. "Involving the Teacher in Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:30-32.
- Enns, F. "Should Principals Formally Rate Teachers?," C.S.A. Bulletin, 4(3), February 1965:19-40.
- Ertis, B.P.A. "The Measure of Professional Competence," Teacher's Magazine, November 1971:47-52.
- Farrell, R.A. "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by District Superintendents of Schools in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1973.
- Finley, W.G. and Bryan, M.M. Ability Grouping. Athens: Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, 1970.
- Flanders, N.A. and Simon A. "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (4th ed.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969:1423-1435.
- Gage, N.L. Handbook of Research in Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1963.
- Goldberg, M. and Passow, A.H. "The Effects of Ability Grouping," Grouping in the Elementary School. Edited by Anne Margenstern, New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1966.
- Good, C. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Gowan, J.C. "Self-Report Tests in the Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," The School Review, 68(4), Winter 1960:409-412.
- Greenfield, T.B. "Teacher Leader Behavior and Its Relation to Effectiveness as Measured by Pupil Growth." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.
- Hackett, M. Success in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

- Hendrickson, D. "What can Children Tell us about the Teaching of Science and Mathematics," School Science and Administration Quarterly, December 1969:773-778.
- Houts, P. "Editorial," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:10-11.
- Howsam, R.B. "Current Issues in Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:12-17.
- Ingils, C.R. "Let's Do Away with Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House, 44(8), April 1970:451-456.
- Jenkins, J.R. and Bausell, R.B. "How Teachers View the Effective Teacher: Student Learning is not the Top Criterion," Phi Delta Kappan, 55(8), April 1974:572-573.
- Jones, A.S. "A Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The Clearing House, April 1972:42-43.
- Karns, E. and Wenger, M. Developing Corrective Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.
- Katz, I. "Why I Oppose Selective Merit Pay," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1961:161-163.
- Lamke, T.A. "Personality and Teacher Success," Journal of Experimental Education, XX, December 1951:250-261.
- Lawson, S. et al. "Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices and Future Directions," Orbit 16, 4(1), February 1973.
- McBeath, A.G. "Teacher Leader Behavior and its Relation to Teacher Effectiveness." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1959.
- Mackay, D.A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and their Relationship to other Characteristics of School Organization." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- McKenna, B.H. "A Context for Teacher Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:18-23.
- _____. "Teacher Evaluation - Some Implications," Today's Education, February 1973:55-56.

Medley, D.M. "A Process Approach to Teacher Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February, 1973:33-35.

Megel, C.T. "Merit Rating is Unsound," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1961:154-156.

Mitchell, J.B. "Merit Rating: Past, Present and Perhaps," Phi Delta Kappan, 42(4), January 1961:139-143.

Mitzel, H.E. "Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.), New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960:1481-1484.

Moore, T.J. "An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria Employed in Teacher Evaluation." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

Payne, E.G. Readings in Educational Sociology, (Vol. II). New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1940.

Perlin, A.B. "The Wayfarer," The Daily News. St. John's: February 19, 1974.

Putman, J. and Chrismore, W.D. Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Service, 1970.

Rayder, N. "College Students' Ratings of Instructors," The Journal of Experimental Education, 37(2), Winter 1968:76-81.

Redferne, G. "Legally Mandated Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 52(5), February 1973:45-50.

Rogers, N.G. "An Empirical Study of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Alberta." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969.

Rose, G. "Towards the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, 15:231-238, January 1958:48-52.

Ryans, D.G. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.), 1960:1488-1491.

Characteristics of Teachers. Menasha: George Banta Company Inc., 1960.

Smith, F.M. and Gremillion, J.B. Teacher Effectiveness. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1971.

Thomas, E.B. "An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Victoria, Australia." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1969.

Vittletoe, J. "Evaluating Teachers," School and Community. February 1971:7-8.

Wagner, G. "What are Schools Doing?," Education. February 1969:280-283.

Walters, H.E. "Teacher Evaluation," N.T.A. Bulletin, 42(4), 1973.

Washburne, C. and Heil, L.M. "What Characteristics of Teachers Affect Children's Growth?," The School Review, 68(4), Winter 1960:421-428.

Wicks, L. "Teacher Evaluation," Today's Education. March 1973:42-43.

Worth, W. "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?," The Canadian Administrator, 1(1), October 1961:1-6.

Wyse, M.C. "A Survey of the Literature from 1950 to 1960 on the Characteristics of the Effective Teacher." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The Catholic University of America, Washington, 1961.

OTHER MATERIAL

The Collective Agreement between Newfoundland Federation of School Boards and Newfoundland Teachers' Association, 1972.

Editorial Staff, Evening Telegram, January 23, 1974.

Editorial, "Do You Know the Score on Merit Rating? It's Changing," Phi Delta Kappan, 52(4), January 1961.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Historical Statistics of Newfoundland and Labrador. St. John's: Creative Printers, 1970.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Estimates
1973-74. Supplement 1 to the 1973 Budget.

Newfoundland Teachers Handbook, 1973.

Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Supplement to the
Annual Report of Department of Education and Youth
for School Year ending June 30, 1972.

The Schools Act or Chapter 346, 1970.

U.S. News and World Report. "Growing Protest Against
School Costs," October 20, 1969.

APPENDIX A

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

Department of Educational Administration

May 15, 1974.

Dear teacher,

I am a graduate student in Educational Administration at Memorial University. As part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, I am conducting a study on teacher evaluation. This research is a study of two situations for appraisal - (1) teacher evaluation for competence and, (2) teacher evaluation for promotion to an administrative position.

You have been chosen in a random sample of the school teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador to respond to this questionnaire. All information received will be used in the aggregate and thus will not be identified with you in any way. All information that you give will be held in the strictest confidence.

I would be very grateful if you could spare approximately fifteen minutes from your schedule to fill in the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

It is extremely important that every questionnaire be completed and returned as soon as possible.

Your co-operation in completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

James Hickman

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

Department of Educational Administration

June 2, 1974

Dear teacher,

On May 20th I mailed to you a questionnaire relating to a research project which is part of my graduate studies program at Memorial University. To date I have not received a reply from you. I am anxious to include your opinions in the consolidated responses, the analysis of which must begin soon.

I am well aware of the pressures under which teachers work, particularly at this time of year and thus I must apologize for the extra demand I am making upon you at this time.

This study is of significance to you since you have the opportunity to express your ideas on teacher evaluation for competence and the selection of personnel for administrative positions. You will not be identified with the information given in any way. The number which is placed at the bottom of the return envelope is your teacher number which is placed there only for follow up purposes such as this one. You may erase or blot out this number if you wish.

Please forward your completed questionnaire as soon as possible - I will be truly grateful for your cooperation, and all the information given by you will be held in the strictest confidence.

Yours truly,

James Hickman

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

Department of Educational Administration

June 11, 1974.


Dear teacher,

On May 20, I sent you a questionnaire from which I had hoped to gather data for a study concerning the evaluation of teachers for competence and the selection of personnel for administrative positions.

You are one of 300 randomly selected teachers across Newfoundland teaching from Kindergarten to Grade Eleven, who have been asked to complete this questionnaire. However, response to this questionnaire has been a little disappointing. To date, I have received only 55% of the questionnaires that I sent out - I need at least 70% to continue my research. I would like to receive your completed questionnaire so that I may continue. If you have not already returned the questionnaire, would you please take a few minutes to complete and return it as soon as possible? I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire in the event you have misplaced the original.

If you have completed and returned the questionnaire I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your assistance.

Yours truly,

 James Hickman

APPENDIX B

TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES
FOR SCHOOL TEACHERS

There are two sections to this instrument:

Section One: Personal and School Data Questionnaire.

Section Two: Evaluation of Teachers
(Two Questionnaires)

1. It will take approximately fifteen minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire.
2. You are asked to return the completed instrument in the stamped addressed envelope provided, at your earliest convenience. Your cooperation would be greatly appreciated.
3. After you have completed the questionnaire, please feel free to make comments you wish on the evaluation of personnel, the questionnaires, or the study.

COMMENTS

1. Age _____.
2. Sex _____.
3. Marital Status: Single _____ Married _____
4. Type of System in which you Teach:
Roman Catholic _____ Integrated _____
Pentecostal _____ Other _____
5. Number of years teaching experience _____.
6. Number of years university training _____.
7. Number of semester education courses successfully completed at some teacher training institution _____.
8. Number of classrooms used for instruction in the school in which you teach _____.
9. Number of teachers on the staff of the school in which you teach _____.
10. Grade area in which you teach: K-6 _____, 7-11 _____.

SECTION TWO

Instructions.

1. Each of the following questionnaires list 30 factors which may be considered when evaluating teachers. Please score EACH item on BOTH questionnaires according to the importance YOU think should be placed on it in the evaluation of teachers. Please use the following scale.

Circle your selected response according to the scale given below.

(A) Indicates a factor that should always be used in teacher evaluation.

(F) Indicates a factor that should frequently be used in teacher evaluation.

(S) Indicates a factor that should seldom be used in teacher evaluation.

(N) Indicates a factor that should never be used in teacher evaluation.

2. Score each item of Questionnaire One according to the importance YOU think should be placed on it in the evaluation of teachers for competence. Score each item of Questionnaire Two according to the importance YOU think should be placed on it in the evaluation for promotion to an administrative position.

Question

As a teacher, whom do you feel is in the best position to adequately evaluate your work as a teacher? (Please tick response.)

- (a) Superintendent? _____
- (b) Supervisor? _____
- (c) Principal? _____
- (d) Other Teachers? _____
- (e) Students? _____
- (f) Yourself? _____

TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

PURPOSE: EVALUATION OF TEACHER COMPETENCE

Score each item according to the importance you think should be placed on it in the evaluation of teachers for competence.

- | | A | F | S | N |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Provision made for individual differences and group needs | A | F | S | N |
| 2. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher | A | F | S | N |
| 3. The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed | A | F | S | N |
| 4. The teacher's participation and standing in the community..... | A | F | S | N |
| 5. Supervision and checking of written work. | A | F | S | N |
| 6. Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum..... | A | F | S | N |
| 7. The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority..... | A | F | S | N |
| 8. Pupils attitude of courtesy, industry and self reliance..... | A | F | S | N |
| 9. Class control..... | A | F | S | N |
| 10. Concern with character development of the pupils..... | A | F | S | N |
| 11. Dress and appearance of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N |
| 12. The methods of lesson presentation used.. | A | F | S | N |
| 13. The professional activities of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N |
| 14. The pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards..... | A | F | S | N |
| 15. The pupils work well without supervision. | A | F | S | N |
| 16. Pupil participation in lessons..... | A | F | S | N |
| 17. The level of intelligence of the teacher. | A | F | S | N |
| 18. Lesson preparation and planning..... | A | F | S | N |

always
frequently
seldom
never

always
frequently
seldom
never

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 19. Examination results..... | A | F | S | N |
| 20. The personality of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N |
| 21. Teacher-pupil relationships..... | A | F | S | N |
| 22. The teacher's standing with pupils..... | A | F | S | N |
| 23. The development of the process of
individual enquiry in the pupils..... | A | F | S | N |
| 24. The loyalty and dependability of the
teacher..... | A | F | S | N |
| 25. The learning of the pupils in self
expression..... | A | F | S | N |
| 26. The energy, force, and enthusiasm
displayed in the teaching..... | A | F | S | N |
| 27. The degree of co-operation of the
teacher with other staff members..... | A | F | S | N |
| 28. Concern with the all-round development
of pupils..... | A | F | S | N |
| 29. The use of teaching aids..... | A | F | S | N |
| 30. The training of pupils in civic
competence and responsibility..... | A | F | S | N |

Please list below any factors that you feel always or frequently should be used when evaluating teacher competence, and not included in the above list.

- | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 2. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 3. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 4. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 5. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 6. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 7. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 8. _____ | A | F | S | N |

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

PURPOSE: EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Score each item according to the importance you think should be placed on it in the evaluation of teachers for promotion to an administrative position.

- | | | always | frequently | seldom | never |
|--|---|--------|------------|--------|-------|
| 1. Dress and appearance of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 2. Supervision and checking of written work... | A | F | S | N | |
| 3. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the students..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 4. The attitudes of the pupils to the school and to authority..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 5. The professional activities of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 6. The use of teaching aids..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 7. The teacher's standing with the pupils..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 8. The degree of co-operation of the teacher with other staff members..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 9. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 10. Provision made for individual differences and group needs..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 11. The personality of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 12. Pupil participation in lessons..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 13. The pupils work well without supervision... | A | F | S | N | |
| 14. The methods of lesson presentation used.... | A | F | S | N | |
| 15. The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 16. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher..... | A | F | S | N | |
| 17. Concern with the all-round development of the pupils..... | A | F | S | N | |

always
frequently
seldom
never

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 18. Examination results..... | A | F | S | N |
| 19. The pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards..... | A | F | S | N |
| 20. The energy, force, and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching..... | A | F | S | N |
| 21. Teacher-pupil relationships..... | A | F | S | N |
| 22. Class control..... | A | F | S | N |
| 23. The training of pupils in self expression..... | A | F | S | N |
| 24. The teacher's participation and standing in the community..... | A | F | S | N |
| 25. Concern with character development of the pupils..... | A | F | S | N |
| 26. Lesson preparation and planning..... | A | F | S | N |
| 27. The level of intelligence of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N |
| 28. Pupils' attitude of courtesy, industry and self reliance..... | A | F | S | N |
| 29. Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum..... | A | F | S | N |
| 30. The loyalty and dependability of the teacher..... | A | F | S | N |

Please list below any factors that you feel always of frequently should be used when evaluating a teacher for a promotion to an administrative position, and not included in the above list.

- | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 2. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 3. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 4. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 5. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 6. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 7. _____ | A | F | S | N |
| 8. _____ | A | F | S | N |

APPENDIX C

CRITERIA INCLUDED AT RANDOM IN THE INSTRUMENT
GROUPED ACCORDING TO MITZEL'S CATEGORIES

A. PRODUCT CRITERIA

1. Concern with the all-round development of the pupils.
2. Examination results.
3. The pupils work well without supervision.
4. The development of the process of individual inquiry in the pupils.
5. Concern with character development of the pupils.
6. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility.
7. Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance.
8. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards.
9. The training of the pupils in self-expression.
10. The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority.

B. PROCESS CRITERIA

1. Lesson preparation and planning.
2. Pupil participation in lessons.
3. Teacher-pupil relationships.
4. Class control.
5. The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching.
6. Supervision and checking of written work.
7. The methods of lesson presentation used.
8. The use of teaching aids.
9. The provision made for individual differences and group needs.
10. The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed.

C. - PRESAGE CRITERIA

1. The personality of the teacher.
2. The dress and appearance of the teacher.
3. Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum.
4. The level of intelligence of the teacher.
5. The professional activities of the teacher.
6. The degree of cooperation by the teacher with other staff members.
7. The loyalty and dependability of the teacher.
8. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher.
9. The teacher's participation and standing in the community.
10. The teacher's standing with the pupils.

APPENDIX D

TABLE XXXIV

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS TO BE IMPORTANT
IN EVALUATION OF TEACHERS FOR COMPETENCE

No.	Criteria	Frequency		Weighted Score (A=5 F=3)
		Always	Frequently	
1.	Teacher's punctuality in carrying out of duties	6	0	30
2.	Willingness to take part in extra curricular activities	3	3	24
3.	Keeping up to date with modern teaching methodology	3	2	21
4.	Teacher's attitude toward suggestions	3	1	18
5.	Teacher's flexibility in approach to teaching	3	1	18
6.	Good working relationships with principal, staff, pupils, parents, etc.	3		15
7.	Being able to relate to all pupils regardless of socio-economic background	3		15
8.	Teacher's love of children	3		15
9.	Teacher's correct use of English and vocabulary	3		15
10.	Physical condition of the school and environment	2	1	13
11.	Creative approach in presenting material	2	1	13
12.	Teacher's dedication to teaching	2		10

TABLE XXXV

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS TO BE IMPORTANT IN
EVALUATING FOR PROMOTION TO ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

No.	Criteria	Frequency		Weighted Score (A=5 F=3)
		Always	Frequently	
1.	Open to suggestions, listens to new ideas	10	1	53
2.	Ability to make decisions, accept responsibility for decisions made	7		35
3.	Cooperation with other teachers, pupils	7		35
4.	Teaching experience and devotion	6		30
5.	Ability to get to the core of the problem effectively and efficiently	3		15
6.	Objectivity and applied diplomacy	3		15
7.	Good manners and self control	3		15
8.	Organizational ability	3		15
9.	Lack of fear of becoming unpopular	3		15
10.	Always attentive to the school program	2		10
11.	A real concern and love for children	2		10
12.	Ability to communicate	2		10

