To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Theodore Wayne Belcher entitled "Student Evaluation of Teachers." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Gerald C. Ubben, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Theodore Wayne Belcher

August 1975

1345626

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to test the concept that various groups of significant others do perceive teachers in unique ways. The study involved the evaluation of all 24 teachers in the Madisonville Elementary School. The procedure of the study was conducted by a simple questionnaire for students in grades K-4. The same questions, stated in more detailed terms, were asked the panel of jury experts and the principal and supervisor who made an evaluation of their own.

Responses to the questionnaires were classified by groups, and ratings were given the teachers based on the replies to the questionnaires. Based on the survey, major findings concluded:

1. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the combined jury ($P = -.15$).

2. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the internal jury ($P = -.15$).

3. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the external jury ($P = -.22$).

4. The correlation between the evaluation of the internal and external evaluators was found to be significant at the .05 level ($P = .475$).

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. Students evidently perceive and, therefore, evaluate their teachers differently than do professional educators, both internal and external to the evaluation.

2. Professional educators, while not in perfect agreement, do display a significant degree of consistency in their evaluation of

teachers. Since the correlation, while significant, still shows many variations indicating that the various groups surrounding the teacher do perceive and evaluate teachers in unique ways, there is a need for multiple evaluations.

3. Because the recipient of the teacher's service (pupils) perceive teachers different from colleagues and supervisors, it would appear that students need to be an integral part of the evaluation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Purpose	3
	Importance of the Study	4
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Definition of Terms	5
	Procedures	5
	Organization of the Study	6
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
	A Review of Teacher Evaluation Literature	8
	Student Evaluation of Teachers	12
	Student Ratings of Teachers	15
	Summary	19
III.	ANALYSIS OF DATA	21
	Source of Data	21
	Method of Collecting Data	22
	The Instrument	24
IV.	FINDINGS	26
	Results of Questionnaires	26
	Summary	28
V.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
	Summary	33
	Findings	34

CHAPTER PAGE

Conclusions 34

Recommendations 35

BIBLIOGRAPHY 36

APPENDIX 39

VITA 45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Students and Jury Rank-Order Correlation Spearman (RHO)	27
II.	Principal and Supervisor Rank-Order Correlation Spearman (RHO)	29
III.	External Panel and Students Rank-Order Correlation Spearman (RHO)	30
IV.	Internal and External Panel Rank-Order Correlation Spearman (RHO)	31
V.	Students Questionnaire, Grades K-2	40
VI.	Students Questionnaire, Grades 3-4	42
VII.	Jury Panel Questionnaire	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of teachers has been a critical issue in education for some time. The writing in this field has been profuse, but many of the attempts at implementation have resulted in something far less than total satisfaction.

The evaluation of teachers by many different groups is inevitable whether such evaluation is defended or condemned, it is and always has been an informal part of the real world of education. The formal use of teacher ratings by groups other than the principals or supervisors are on the increase but are still lacking in general acceptance. Published results of studies of teacher ratings by students however indicate an uncanny ability on the part of students to describe good and poor teachers in much the same way as they are selected by knowledgeable adults.[1]

From California to New Jersey, formal evaluation programs have replaced the casual approach taken in the past. Not long ago a self-confident teacher would only ask his students to write an essay evaluating the course at the end of the year or the principal would stack printed evaluation forms on his desk and invite teachers to submit them

---

[1]Elizabeth L. Dalton, "Pupil Selection of Teachers," Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Vol. 28, No. 5, February, 1971, p. 476.

to the students. This seemed to be used by a teacher to pat himself on the back.[2]

Research to date has been inconclusive with regard to the implementing of effective evaluation systems. The solutions suggested relative to evaluation problems have been many, often focusing on the difficulty of obtaining both validity and reliability for evaluation designs.[3]

The discussions usually indicate that validity, the quality of measuring what one wants to evaluate, rests with the quality of the instrumentation as well as the ability and position (perspective) of the evaluators in making proper judgments. Reliability, on the other hand, in teacher evaluation deals more with the consistency of the results. This consistency, it can be argued, can be improved statistically by lengthening or increasing the time or number of observations of teaching performance by one or more evaluators. The combined results of these evaluations contribute to the reliability as well as the validity of the results.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The literature relating to the evaluation of teachers has suggested that teacher evaluation be broadly based and input should be

---

[2]Jane S. Shaw, "Students Evaluate Teachers and It Works," Nation's Schools , Vol. 91, No. 4, April, 1973, p. 49.

[3]Gerald C. Ubben, "Staff Evaluation," The Principal's Audio Journal, Vol. 1, Numbers 3 and 4, March and April, 1974.

multiple and be obtained from the various people surrounding the teacher. Appropriate to such a list would be students, principals, supervisors and other adults that might have reason to be working or observing in the school.

Collecting evaluative data from these various sources would seem appropriate only if each had a unique contribution to make regarding their perceptions of a teacher. One might argue that if principals and students or principals and supervisors always agreed on the performance of a teacher there would be no reason to gather information beyond that of an essential or key figure such as the principal. Too, it would seem that the recipients of teacher services (pupils) might have important and different perceptions about the effectiveness of instruction.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to test the concept that various groups of significant others do perceive teacher behavior in unique ways. This was done by seeking answers to the following questions:

1. Is there a significant correlation between the evaluation given by elementary students and that of the combined jury of adult educators?

2. Is there a significant correlation between the evaluation given by elementary students and administrative superordinates (principal and supervisors)?

3. Is there a significant correlation between the evaluation given by elementary students and outside evaluators (advanced graduate students in education)?

4. Is there a significant correlation between the evaluation given by teacher superordinates and outside evaluators?

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Teacher evaluation has been recognized throughout the country as a major problem facing educators. Criticism has been great regarding the time and ability that administrators have to properly evaluate teachers. It is highly important that teachers be actively and positively evaluated so that all persons, teachers as well as community, will be properly served. Since other groups are possibly available to aid in the evaluation of teachers, research needs to be conducted to determine if they have a contribution to make based on perceptions that differ significantly from that of our traditional evaluator, the principal.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to the Madisonville, Tennessee Elementary School. The results of this survey cannot be generalized to more than one school because of its nature and scope. Hence, no comparisons or contrasts were drawn with any other schools in Madisonville, Monroe County, or any other geographical region.

This study was further limited to Grades K-4, for those students enrolled in those particular grades in the Madisonville Elementary School. The evaluating groups were limited to three panels of experts: college students, supervisors and principal, and students of Madisonville Elementary School, Grades K-4.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Certain words, terms and phrases which are appropriate to the field of evaluation need to be clarified at this point. They are as follows:

Evaluation: The assigning of a rate or value to any specific work or design.

Teacher Evaluation: The rate or score placed on the teacher by any group or groups appraising the teacher's work.

Student Evaluation: The rate or score placed on the students by persons who are familiar with the work they are doing.

Analysis: Determining the benefits and detriments of any particular style of evaluation being used.

Jury: The group of adults who have done extensive work in the educational field who were used in the evaluative process of the teachers at Madisonville Elementary School.

VI. PROCEDURES

All teachers of Grades K-4 (N=24) were evaluated by the supervisor of Monroe County School System, the principal of Madisonville Elementary School, a group of graduate students in education courses at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and by the students in the classrooms of grades K-4 at Madisonville Elementary School. In this way the evaluation was carried on by a wide range of individuals insofar as age, intelligence, development and life attitudes were concerned.

An evaluation of the teachers was conducted by means of a simple questionnaire completed by the students. The same questions,

stated in more detail were asked of the University of Tennessee graduate students after they had observed the teachers for two hours. The school principal and one supervisor served as a team for evaluating the teachers using the same instrument.

Responses to the questionnaires were classified by groups and ratings were given the teachers based on the replies to the questionnaires. The study was undertaken during the school term 1974-75. The principal and teachers helped the beginning students by explaining features of the questionnaire which they did not understand.

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Following the initial chapter the remainder of the study followed the following design:

Chapter II contains a review of the literature that is related to this study.

Chapter III contains sources of data, method used to collect the data and the instrument.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study.

Chapter V includes a summary, findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Systematic teacher evaluation helps to improve learning conditions for children and to facilitate administrative decisions. Evaluation procedures have been found to be most effective when they are planned cooperatively by teachers and administrators with assistance from specialists, consultants, parents and students. There is a difference between assessing or evaluating the program of a school or a school system and evaluating the individuals who make a contribution to that system. The former looks at the output of the total system, the procedures used to accomplish those outcomes and the way the procedures are, and might be implemented.

The purposes of teacher evaluation include improvement of instruction, reward of superior performance, supplying information for modifying assignments, protection of both the individual and the school system, validation of the process of selection, providing a basis for the teacher's career planning, and facilitating self-evaluation.

Student evaluation of classroom teaching has mushroomed in the past two or three years and some excellent and sensitive programs have been realized. On the other hand, others leave much to be desired in both motivation and operation. If the motive is to find evidence to support the conclusion that the campus abounds with poor teaching, then the objectivity, acceptance, and effectiveness of the instrument are also certain to suffer.

In application of the student evaluation procedure the instrument probably should be used twice per school term. The early term evaluation allows the teacher some valuable appraisal of the classroom performance of both teacher and student at a point when there is ample time for modification.

Teachers generally have little faith in the evaluation instruments used or in the procedures followed in administering them. Rating schemes that call for critical appraisal of individual teacher achievement tend to create a gap between principal and supervisors on one hand and classroom teachers on the other. Rating devices often do not measure what they claim to measure. The time devoted by supervisors and administrators to evaluation of individual teacher performance might be more profitably spent on other educational activities.[1]

In this chapter evaluation of the teachers will be considered from the following viewpoints. A general review of teacher evaluation literature, a review of student evaluation of teacher literature, and student rating forms that deal with the evaluation of teachers.

I. A REVIEW OF TEACHER EVALUATION LITERATURE

Hazel Davis observed that the chief element in evaluation in many school systems is still the assigning of a general rating or classifying judgment. The general rating sorts the teachers into several ranks or levels such as excellent, very good, good or fair.

---

[1]Lester S. Vander Werf, How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc. 1958), p. 50.

Often the grades are given as A, B, C, D, and E. In some school systems evaluation is a cooperative process of analysis and discussion. The teacher is a responsible participant and if a general rating is made he knows about it.[2]

Dale L. Bolton wrote that many people speak as though evaluation has a single purpose. It is quite apparent that there are multiple purposes which sometimes conflict with one another. The purposes may be as different as the school's need to satisfy the public's demand for accountability and the individual's desire to improve the way he teaches an aspect of one subject. The first consideration in establishing a program of evaluation is to know the purpose. Some of the questions which might be asked are: is the program intended to improve teaching, to reward superior performance, to supply information for modifying assignments, to protect the individual, to validate the selection process, to provide the basis of planning for individual growth and development or to facilitate self-evaluation?[3] The last criterion is by far the most meaningful for this study, that is, dealing with student evaluation of certain teachers of Madisonville Elementary School.

---

[2]Hazel Davis, "What Teachers Say About Evaluation of Teachers," Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 54, No. 2, February, 1965, p. 37.

[3]Dale L. Bolton, Selection and Evaluation of Teachers (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 98-99.

Eric Berger commented that one of the primary reasons incompetent teachers are to be found in schools is because more educational administrators have not made teacher evaluation a top priority. Often evaluation has been given very low priority. This has worked a disadvantage on many schools and school systems.[4]

Nancy L. Roser pointed out that recent federal impetus for educational evaluation has resulted in increased attention to the construction of models and theories of evaluation. Possessing more likenesses than differences, rational theories stress systematic collection of data related to the effectiveness of particular programs in achieving the intended objectives. Educational decisions should come as a result of constructive evaluation of those involved in the process.[5]

Mel J. Zelenak and Bill C. Snider had the opinion that different administrators and teachers have different philosophies concerning the purpose and process needed for constructive teaching evaluation. The evidence suggests that evaluation philosophies are usually separated into two distinct beliefs. One emphasizes that the objective of evaluation is for administrative purposes and the other suggests that it is for instructional purposes.[6]

---

[4]Eric Berger, "The Evaluation of Teachers," NASSP Bulletin Options '74, No. 382, May, 1974, p. 147.

[5]Nancy L. Roser, "Evaluation and the Administrator: How Decisions Are Made," Journal of Education, Vol. 156, No. 1, February, 1974, p. 44.

[6]Mel J. Zelenak and Bill C. Snider, "Teachers Don't Resent Evaluation--If It's for the Improvement of Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 8, April, 1974, pp. 570-571.

In answer to the question, why evaluate anyway, James D. Finn gave five reasons. These were: (1) to add to the substantive knowledge of educational processes; (2) to provide information in order to adjust, discard, or otherwise change the application of an on-going educational process; (3) to provide justification for a political-social-economic action relating to education; (4) to create a production (usually paper) which can move through educational bureaucratic systems and thus keep these systems operative; and (5) to provide instruments which may be used to carry information on the success of the process to the educational community.[7]

Goldstein demonstrated a deep interest in the field of testing. He made it clear that there has been a widespread growth and acceptance of testing in most areas of education. Testing, and particularly objective testing, has become widely accepted in the United States. Along with the wide-scale use of testing have come reactions purporting that testing is tyrannical. These reactions represent a logical fear that testing has disadvantages as well as advantages. From these reactions it may be concluded that testing has an effect upon the institutions and the society within which it operates.[8]

Johnson wrote that along with the increased emphasis on social problems, and in part contribution to the problems, has been a wave of technological advance which far surpasses anything ever seen before.

---

[7]James D. Finn, "Institutionalization of Evaluation," Educational Technology, Vol. IX, No. 12, December, 1969, p. 15.

[8]Harold Goldstein, Evaluation of Students (Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Graduate School Printers, 1967), p. 20.

This new technological capability has seemed to generate pressure for change as if the new and different were automatically better than the old. Being new and different has positive values which are inherent in nature and from which the principle benefits of innovation may frequently originate.[9]

The Guide for School Improvement prepared by the National Study of School Evaluation enumerated some of the school's tasks in evaluation. There were found to be three phases. Phase one was a self-evaluation carried out by the faculty of the individual school. This step usually requires a minimum of one year. Phase two was an evaluation of the school's progress by a visiting committee. This is very similar to the procedure planned for evaluating the teachers of grades K-4 of Madisonville Elementary School. Phase three consisted of the school's consideration and follow-up of the findings of the evaluation. It was considered practically useless to conduct a survey such as was being set up at Madisonville Elementary School without the findings being put to practical use.[10]

II. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

This section is limited to only one phase of evaluation. That phase concerns student evaluation of teachers.

---

[9]George H. Johnson, "The Purpose of Evaluation and the Role of the Evaluator," Evaluative Research (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: American Institute for Research, 1970), p. 1.

[10]National Studyof School Evaluation, Elementary School Evaluative Criteria, (Arlington, Virginia: National Study of School Evaluation, 1973), p. 3.

Joan Jacobson took the position, along with the students, that students should evaluate teachers provided that in each case certain conditions exist:

1. A mutual feeling of trust has been developed between students and the teacher.

2. Such information is used solely for the improvement of instruction and not for determining salary, tenure or promotion.

3. The evaluation instrument is cooperatively developed or agreed upon by teacher and students.

4. Findings are discussed with students and with others at the teacher's discretion.[11]

Rolf Mirus made a study of student evaluation of teachers. He found that the need to explore the extent to which student evaluation of teachers is subject to instructor's manipulation is considerable. Comment is made that there is possible impact made by ratings of section sizes, scheduling of classes during odd hours, the type of material taught and whether or not the course is required. For these varying reasons the evaluation is not uniform.[12]

Harry Lasker and Karl Vogt prepared a survey dealing with student evaluation regarding some myths and realities. These researchers found that:

---

[11]John Jacobson, "Should Students Evaluate Teachers?" The Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 62, No. 5, May, 1973, p. 49.

[12]Rolf Mirus, "Some Implications of Student Evaluation of Teachers," Journal of Economic Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1973, pp. 35-37.

1. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and age of instructor.

2. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and faculty rank.

3. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and faculty degree attained.

4. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and class size.

5. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and the nature of the subject matter.

6. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and involvement in non-teaching activities.

7. There is no relationship between student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and faculty grading policy.[13]

Lorraine Poliakoff wrote that there are advantages to student evaluation. First, students have had the opportunity to observe continually what they are rating. Second, a large number of individual biases can be averaged, which is not possible where administrator evaluates a teacher. Third, students seem to take good teaching seriously. A questionnaire answered by 1,063 high school students in 1970 gave the highest rating to teachers who were demanding and cared about students as fellow human beings.[14]

---

[13]Harry Lasker and Karl Vogt, "Student Evaluation: Myths and Realities," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXII, No. 4, Autumn, 1974, pp. 267-268.

[14]Lorraine Poliakoff, "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principal, Vol. LII, No. 5, February, 1973, p. 39.

C.L. Overturf and Edwin C. Price wrote that students at St. Johns River Junior College of Palatka, Florida evaluated their instructors' personal traits, scholarship, skill of presentation and accuracy in evaluation. The questionnaire form used a numerical system which allowed ranking of professors according to total adjusted scores. Instructors awarding higher grades did not rate higher than instructors awarding lower grades. Instructors rated most highly were those who taught toward clearly defined and communicated objectives, who used only relevant material and who were always in charge of their classes.[15]

III. STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHERS

The success of a survey depends on several factors. One important factor is the attitude the students take toward the instrument.

Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement was the title of a research conducted by Ned A. Flanders and published as a book in 1960. In this book the author points out that one way to describe the process of instruction is to say that the teacher strives to change the response pattern of a student from merely complying to an authority figure to more independent actions that are determined by the student's own analysis of the subject matter problems confronting him.[16]

---

[15] C.L. Overturf and Edwin C. Price, Student Rating of Faculty at St. Johns River Junior College, Palatka, Florida: St. Johns River Junior College, 1966.

[16] Ned A. Flanders, Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), p. 13.

According to John E. Bolen there are four features which are essential in an evaluation instrument. These are:

1. Relevance--teacher behavior required to be evaluated should be reflected in the instrument.

2. Reliability--the instrument should yield consistent information about the teacher.

3. Freedom from bias--the instrument should be flexible to the extent that it attempts to accommodate situational factors that might influence its objectivity.

4. Practicality -- the instrument should be releatively easy to use and provide sufficient data within reasonable time limits.

Due to the many interrelated abilities involved in teaching, it is very difficult to secure an objective basis for validating an evaluation instrument.[17]

Edwin M. Larsen wrote an article entitled "Students Criteria for Responses to Teaching Evaluation Questionnaires." The author summarized a survey that was made of students criteria for favorable and unfavorable responses to teaching evaluation questionnaires. The results were taken from responses of 40 undergraduate and 15 graduate students. The findings indicated that there was considerable difference between the student's expectations upon entering a course and his

---

[17]John E. Bolen, "The Dilemma in Evaluating Instruction," Educational Digest, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 9, May, 1973, p. 22.

acquired experience upon its completion.[18]

Donald J. Veldman and Robert F. Peck presented a monograph summarizing the development of the pupil observation survey report. This was an instrument designed to be completed by pupils in junior and senior high school classes for the purpose of describing their teachers. The instrument consisted of 38 statements followed by sound choice agreement scales. This evaluative instrument was given to 100 students. The survey proved successful and its use has spread. This instrument is currently in use in a number of experimental studies being carried out in teacher education.[19]

Gordon A. Sabine produced an article entitled, "How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers." This document included questionnaire results of a national study sample drawn from the million high school juniors and seniors who had taken the ACT Battery during 1969-70. The students responded to more than 100 multiple choice items and to one open ended question on student protests, parents, schools and teachers. In this way the students' attitudes toward the questionnaire was determined. The teachers' characteristics were measured by 1,603 students. Student ratings were generally considered just and generous.[20]

---

[18]Edwin M. Larsen, "Students' Criteria for Response to Teaching Evaluation Questionnaires," Journal of Chemical Education, Vol. 51, No. 3, March, 1974, pp. 163-165.

[19]Donald J. Veldman and Robert F. Peck, The Pupil Observation Survey: Teacher Characteristics from the Students' Viewpoint (Bethesda, Maryland, National Institute of Mental Health), October, 1967, p. 25.

[20]Gordon A. Sabine, "How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers," Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals Journal, November, 1971, p. 81.

According to Robert Pace, Professor of Higher Learning, University of California, Los Angeles, the first ten items in the Purdue scale have been used since 1927. These items deal with such qualities of the teacher as "interest in subject," "fairness in grading," "Self-reliance and confidence," and "stimulating intellectual curiosity." The next 16 items were incorporated in the 1950 printing. They deal with somewhat more specific aspects such as "suitability of the reference material used," "the weights given to test in determining the final grade," and "the degree to which the objectives of the course were clarified and discussed."

These scales are useful in their present form, making it obvious that little or nothing has been done in recent years to improve the content, increase their discriminating power, or provide up-to-date norms. Moreover, the varied and changing patterns of college instruction--lectures, discussions, laboratories, T.V. programmed learning, independent study, and other practicies--may rapidly make the Purdue scale, which Pace used, obsolete for many instructors and courses.[21]

According to Benjamin Rosner, the Purdue scale seems to be a carefully constructed instrument designed to estimate individual, school or system wide teacher morale. In its present form the opinionnaire used at Purdue offers both an overall estimate of

---

[21]Robert Pace, "Tests and Reviews: Miscellaneous Education," The Sixth Mental Measurement Year, Highland, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, Cop. III, 1965, p. 709.

"interest in and enthusiasm for" a particular job situation, as well as ten subscores reflecting teacher reaction to discrete components to teacher morale.[22]

IV. SUMMARY

It was pointed out in this chapter that a way to describe the process of instruction was to say that the teacher strived to change the response pattern of a student. There are four features of an evaluation instrument, namely, relevance, reliability, freedom from bias, and practicality.

A monograph summarized the development of pupil observation survey report. Further,the idea was illustrated by the questionnaire results of national study samples of a select group of high school students, resulting in the conclusion that students were usually just and generous.

The Purdue scale was used to evaluate the items of fairness, self-reliance and intellectual curiosity. The Purdue scale was used by many curious and impatient people. The findings seem to confirm the use of tests and questionnaires in evaluation.

Research disclosed that teachers usually have little faith in evaluation instruments. It was observed that the main element in evaluation was that the purpose of the survey must be clear and plain. It was significant that educational administrators were brought to

---

[22]Benjamin Rosner, "Tests and Reviews: Miscellaneous-Education," The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, Cop. II, 1967, p. 591.

real life except to work in the most menial surroundings. Teachers should be thought of in a polite, respectful way. The importance of testing was cited and its effects on the educational process were examined.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter treats the sources of information about teacher evaluation coming from all available sources. The method, time and number of evaluations were reached by consultation with persons experienced in evaluation. The nucleus of this study was based on an evaluative instrument in the form of a questionnaire.

I. SOURCE OF DATA

Sources of data came from various schools across the nation which have been engaged in teacher evaluation. Material in journals, magazines and books aided in the construction of a questionnaire instrument which it was hoped would effectively and reliably evaluate the teachers under survey.

After data were gathered and considered, specific questions were developed. These questions were presented to the teachers for their appraisal and opinion before they were finally adopted for use. The teachers offered many worthwhile suggestions concerning the relativity of the proposed questionnaire and the cooperation which might be expected from other members of the school system. Some of these suggestions included making the questions simple enough for each group to understand and making the questions specific enough to secure the data needed.

II. METHOD OF COLLECTING DATA

At Madisonville Elementary School there were 24 teachers to be evaluated. It was decided to evaluate each teacher five times as follows: one time by the supervisor, one time by the principal, one time by the elementary students and two times by a jury panel from a class at The University of Tennessee.

A total of 48 hours of evaluation were conducted by the expert panel of students from The University of Tennessee, 24 hours by the supervisor and 24 hours by the principal. The entire procedure of evaluation of the teachers by elementary students required a period of two weeks. This was done by collecting evaluative data from three classes per day, of approximately thirty minutes per class. The same time each day was used for the students to evaluate the teachers--from nine o'clock to eleven o'clock each morning.

In the elementary students' evaluation, the principal went into each classroom and collected that data while the teacher left the room. Thus, the teacher was not present while the students evaluated her.

The questionnaire forms were printed for members of the K-2 group so the questions could be more easily read. Forms for the 3-4 groups were typed. To be certain that no identities would be revealed, the principal explained to the students that no one was to put his or her name on the paper anywhere. He explained that the students should answer the questions openly, freely and as honestly as they knew how. In case of words of doubtful meaning, such as "pet," the principal took

particular pains to explain the entire meaning of the questions. The questions were read by the principal and marked by the students.

Next came the evaluation by a panel of University graduate students. The evaluation was so designed that no member of the jury panel evaluated the same grade level twice. Each jury panel member evaluated each teacher one hour. The jury panel members were numbered as they were chosen at random between one and twelve for identification purposes. Then a system was worked out whereby the panel members evaluated from 9 o'clock until 10; 10 o'clock until 11; 11 o'clock until 12; and 1 o'clock until 2. Since each teacher was evaluated twice by a jury panel member, comparisons and contrasts could be drawn from persons completely unacquainted with the teacher.

A short training period was held with members of the jury panel before the evaluation began. In this training period the schedule and routine which would be followed were carefully explained. It was further emphasized that much good might emanate from the evaluation and that in particular cases teachers might come to realize some of their weaknesses and might be enabled to correct them. In the conference concerning evaluation the jury panel members were instructed to try to make the teachers feel at ease during the evaluation.

The same questionnaire form was used by the supervisor and principal as was used by the jury panel. The principal spent a considerable amount of time in conference with the supervisor explaining the purpose and procedure for the survey. About three weeks were spent in the program of orientation and administrating the instrument.

When the questionnaire forms were returned, the data secured was processed by determining the number of forms which were checked "yes" and "no." These raw data were ready to be shown in table form.

III. THE INSTRUMENT

The questions given to the students were 15 in number and were numbered one through fifteen. These 15 questions were placed in 7 categories according to the nature of the information desired. Each category took into consideration the statements given in response to certain questions asked by the questionnaire. First, category one included questions 1, 6 and 12 and was classified as "pupils attitude toward teachers." Second, category two included questions 2, 7 and 13 and was categorized as "teachers' attitude toward students as perceived by students." Third, category three contained question 3 and was distributed by "teachers' interest in students out of school life." Fourth, category four included question 8 which asked about the "teachers' role in creating student participation." Fifth, category five contained questions 4 and 9 which inquired about "Teachers' interest in students' problems." Six, category six included questions 5, 10, 11 and 14 and contained "teachers' fairness in dealing with students." Seventh, category seven used question 15 which summarized "teachers' awareness to classroom environment."

This evaluation was designed to determine the role of the teacher in forming a classroom atmosphere in which the student feels important and has an active part. It was designed to check those areas that cause a student to either like or dislike his teacher. Due to

the nature of the questions on the questionnaire, the categories have mixed numbers of questions which were listed.

The questions used for Grades K-2 and for Grades 3-4 and appearing in the appendix were the same in meaning but were worded more in accordance with the students' range of vocabulary and comprehension. (See Appendix for K-2 questionnaire, jury panel questionnaire and principal and supervisor questionnaire.)

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to show the relationship that existed when comparing the elemntary students' ratings with the ratings of internal and external panels in the field of education.

I. RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

The ranking of students and the combined jury according to Spearman's[1] rank-difference are presented in Table I. To avoid the chance of identification, the teachers were chosen by letters instead of figures.

The jury ranking from the highest to the lowest level is shown in Table I. The students' ranking did not correspond with the jury panel except for teachers Q and R. The letter R_1 showed the ranking of the jury, while R_2 showed the ranking by the elementary students. The letter D indicated the difference of the scores of the two ranks, the jury panel and the elementary students. The Table shows D^2 in order to get all the figures positive. The data were analyzed by the Spearman formula $P = 1 - \frac{6 \ D^2}{N \ (N^2-1)}$. The statistic did not produce a significant correlation between the scores of the combined jury and the elementary students. The resulting rho coefficient (P= -.15) was

---

[1] J.P. Guildford and Benjamin Fruchter, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 5th edition, 1973), pp. 283-285.

TABLE I

STUDENTS AND JURY RANK-ORDER CORRELATION
SPEARMAN (RHO)

Teachers	Jury Score	Students Score	R_1	R_2	D	D^2
A	100	76	1.5	11.5	-10.0	100.00
B	100	72	1.5	20.5	-19.0	361.00
C	98	76	3.5	11.5	- 8.0	64.00
D	98	66	3.5	24.0	-20.5	420.25
E	97	79	6.0	5.0	+ 1.0	1.00
F	97	78	6.0	8.0	- 2.0	4.00
G	97	75	6.0	14.0	- 8.0	64.00
H	95	74	8.0	16.5	- 8.5	72.25
I	93	84	9.5	1.0	+ 8.5	72.25
J	93	76	9.5	11.5	- 2.0	4.00
K	88	69	11.0	23.0	-12.0	144.00
L	87	78	12.5	8.0	+ 4.5	20.25
M	87	72	12.5	20.5	- 8.0	64.00
N	85	78	14.0	8.0	+ 6.0	36.00
O	83	70	16.5	22.0	- 5.5	30.25
P	83	81	16.5	2.5	+14.0	196.00
Q	83	74	16.5	16.5	0.0	0.00
R	83	74	16.5	16.5	0.0	0.00
S	80	81	19.0	2.5	+16.5	272.25
T	78	79	20.0	5.0	+15.0	225.00
U	75	76	21.0	11.5	+ 9.5	90.25
V	73	73	22.5	19.0	+ 3.5	12.25
W	73	74	22.5	16.5	+ 6.0	36.00
X	70	79	24.0	5.0	+19.0	361.00
						ΣD^2=2650.00

$$P = 1 - \frac{6 \ \Sigma D^2}{N \ (N^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{6 \ (2650)}{24 \ (24^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15900}{24 \ (576 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15900}{24 \ (575)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15900}{13800}$$

$$= 1 - 1.152$$

$$= P = .15$$

not found to be significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was no significant correlation between the combined jury evaluation of the teaching staff and the students' evaluation.

When the data were analyzed in the light of possible correlation between the students' evaluation and those of the principal and supervisor (Table II) a rho of -.15 was found. This finding did not prove to be significant.

Analysis of the relationship between the students' evaluation and that of the external jury showed a correlation of P = .22 (Table III). This finding did not prove to be significant.

However, an analysis of the data provided by a comparison of scores of external and internal evaluators resulted in the significant rho of .475 (Table IV). This finding revealed that there was indeed a significant positive relationship between the evaluation judgments of the two professional bodies used in this study that was not reflected in correlations between the students' evaluations and the combined jury, the students' evaluation and the internal jury, nor the students' evaluation and the external jury.

II. SUMMARY

Chapter IV contains the results of the answers given to the questions in the questionnaire. The results of the findings can be summarized as follows:

1. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the combined jury (P = -.15).

2. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the internal jury (P - -.15).

TABLE II

PRINCIPAL AND SUPERVISOR RANK-ORDER CORRELATION
SPEARMAN (RHO)

Teachers	Principal and Supervisor Score	Students Score	R_1	R_2	D	D^2
A	100	76	4.5	11.5	- 7.0	49.00
B	100	72	4.5	20.5	- 16.0	256.00
C	100	76	4.5	11.5	- 7.0	49.00
D	100	66	4.5	24.0	- 19.5	280.25
E	100	79	4.5	5.0	- 0.5	0.25
F	93	78	12.5	8.0	+ 4.5	20.25
G	93	75	12.5	14.0	- 1.5	2.25
H	97	74	9.5	16.5	- 7.0	49.00
I	97	84	9.5	1.0	+ 8.5	72.25
J	93	76	12.5	11.5	+ 1.0	1.00
K	100	69	4.5	23.0	- 18.5	342.25
L	93	78	12.5	8.0	+ 4.5	20.25
M	80	72	19.5	20.5	- 1.0	1.00
N	87	78	16.0	8.0	+ 8.0	64.00
O	83	70	17.5	22.0	- 4.5	20.25
P	63	81	24.0	2.5	+ 21.5	462.25
Q	77	74	21.5	16.5	+ 5.0	25.00
R	77	74	21.5	16.5	+ 5.0	25.00
S	73	81	23.0	2.5	+ 20.5	420.25
T	100	79	4.5	5.0	- 0.5	0.25
U	83	76	17.5	11.5	+ 6.0	36.00
V	80	73	19.5	19.0	+ 5.0	0.25
W	90	74	15.0	16.5	- 1.5	2.25
X	100	79	4.5	5.0	- 0.5	0.25

$\Sigma D^2 = 2645.50$

$$P = 1 - \frac{6 \Sigma D^2}{N (N^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{6 (2645.50)}{24 (24^2 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15873}{24(576-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15873}{24 (575)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{15873}{13800}$$

$$= 1 - 1.150$$

$$P = -.15$$

TABLE III

EXTERNAL PANEL AND STUDENTS RANK-ORDER CORRELATION
SPEARMAN (RHO)

Teachers	External Panel	Students	R_1	R_2	D	D^2
A	97	76	5.0	11.5	- 6.5	42.25
B	93	72	8.0	20.5	-12.5	156.25
C	100	76	2.0	11.5	- 9.5	90.25
D	97	66	5.0	24.0	-19.0	361.00
E	100	79	2.0	5.0	- 3.0	9.00
F	97	78	5.0	8.0	- 3.0	9.00
G	83	75	16.0	14.0	+ 2.0	4.00
H	70	74	21.0	16.5	+ 4.5	20.25
I	60	84	23.5	1.0	+22.5	506.25
J	73	76	19.5	11.5	+ 8.0	64.00
K	87	69	12.5	23.0	-10.5	110.25
L	100	78	2.0	8.0	- 6.0	36.00
M	87	72	12.5	20.5	- 8.0	64.00
N	87	78	12.5	8.0	+ 4.5	20.25
O	63	70	22.0	22.0	0.0	0.00
P	83	81	16.0	2.5	+13.5	182.25
Q	73	74	19.5	16.5	+ 3.0	9.00
R	83	74	16.0	16.5	- .05	0.25
S	93	81	8.0	2.5	+ 5.5	30.25
T	87	79	12.5	5.0	+ 7.5	56.25
U	90	76	10.0	11.5	- 1.5	2.25
V	60	73	23.5	19.0	+ 4.5	20.25
W	80	74	18.0	16.5	+ 1.5	2.25
X	93	79	8.0	5.0	+ 3.0	9.00
						$D^2 = 1804.50$

$$P = 1 - \frac{6\ D^2}{N\ (N^2 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{6\ (1804.50)}{24\ (24^2 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{10827.00}{24\ (576 - 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{10827.00}{24\ (575)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{10827.00}{13800}$$

$$= 1 - .7845$$

$$= + .2155$$

$$P = + .22$$

P = .343 needed for significant at .05 level.

TABLE IV

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PANEL RANK-ORDER CORRELATION
SPEARMAN (RHO)

Teachers	Internal Panel	Students	R_1	R_2	D	D^2
A	100	97	4.5	5.0	- 0.5	0.25
B	100	93	4.5	8.0	- 3.5	12.25
C	100	100	4.5	2.0	+ 2.5	6.25
D	100	97	4.5	5.0	- 0.5	0.25
E	100	100	4.5	2.0	+ 2.5	6.25
F	93	97	12.5	5.0	+ 7.5	56.25
G	93	83	12.5	16.0	- 3.5	12.25
H	97	70	8.5	21.0	-11.5	132.25
I	97	60	8.5	23.5	-14.0	196.00
J	93	73	12.5	19.5	- 7.0	49.00
K	100	87	4.5	12.5	- 8.0	64.00
L	93	100	12.5	2.0	+10.5	110.25
M	80	87	19.5	12.5	+ 7.0	49.00
N	87	87	16.0	12.5	+ 3.5	12.25
O	83	63	17.5	22.0	- 4.5	20.25
P	63	83	24.0	16.0	+ 8.0	64.00
Q	77	73	21.5	19.5	+ 2.0	4.00
R	77	83	21.5	16.0	+ 5.5	30.25
S	73	93	23.0	8.0	+15.0	225.00
T	100	87	4.5	12.5	- 8.0	64.00
U	83	90	17.5	10.0	+ 7.5	56.25
V	80	60	19.5	23.5	- 4.0	16.00
W	90	80	15.0	18.0	- 3.0	9.00
X	100	93	4.5	8.0	- 3.5	12.25
						$D^2 = 1207.50$

$$P = 1 - \frac{6 \quad D^2}{N\ (N^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{6\ (1207.50)}{24\ (24^2\ -1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{7245.00}{24\ (576\ -\ 1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{7245.00}{24\ (575)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{7245.00}{13800}$$

$$= 1 - .525$$

$$P = .475*$$

* P= .343 needed for significant at .05 level.

3. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the external jury (P = .22).

4. The correlation between the evaluations of the internal and external juries was found to be significant at the .05 level (P = .475).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to test the concept that various groups of significant others do perceive teachers' behavior in unique ways.

I. SUMMARY

A questionnaire was prepared to test the opinions that three groups of people had of the teachers at Madisonville Elementary School, grades K-4. When the questionnaire forms were completed, reviewed and approved by the elementary teachers, they were used as follows.

A separate questionnaire was prepared and printed for the elementary students, grades K-2; while questionnaires for grades 3-4 were typed. The jury, composed of advanced students in the field of education, along with the supervisor and principal, used the same questionnaire. The questions used by both the jury and the students contained the same seven categories of questions. However, the instrument used was simplified for the benefit of students in the lower grades.

There were 24 teachers in the elementary group. Each teacher was tested five times, once by the elementary students, once by the principal and supervisor, and twice by the panel jury composed of graduate students in education at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Data collection was carried out by the principal going to each classroom and having the students listen as he read the questions and explained the meaning of each question. The members of the jury came

on specified days, arranged hours, and interviewed the teachers, according to a prepared schedule. Each teacher was evaluated by both these means. Data analysis was done manually and reported in Chapter III.

II. FINDINGS

Based on this survey, major findings were:

1. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the combined jury (P = -.15).

2. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the internal jury (P = -.15).

3. There was no significant correlation found between the students' evaluation and that of the external jury (P = .22).

4. The correlation between the evaluations of the internal and external educators was found to be significant at the .05 level (P = .475).

III. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. Students evidently perceive and, therefore, evaluate their teachers differently than do professional educators, both internal and external to the evaluation.

2. Professional educators, while not in perfect agreement, do display a significant degree of consistency in their evaluation of teachers. Since the correlation, while significant, still shows many variations indicating that the various groups surrounding the teacher do perceive and evaluate teachers in unique ways, there is a need for multiple evaluations.

3. Because the recipient of the teachers' service (pupils) perceive teachers different from colleagues and supervisors, it would appear that students need to be an integral part of the evaluation process.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the survey and its chief objectives, the following recommendations were offered to improve the evaluation features of the school:

1. That evaluation models include evaluations from various significant others in order to gain the unique insights these groups have found in the evaluation of teachers.

2. That further research be conducted on the ability of elementary students to evaluate their teachers using improved research design.

3. That further testing include improved instrument validation and reliability measures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, Eric. "The Evaluation of Teachers," NASSP Bulletin Options '74, Number 382, May, 1974.

Bolen, John E. "The Dilemma in Evaluating Instruction," Educational Digest, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 9, May, 1973.

Bolton, Dale L. Selection and Evaluation of Teachers, Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1973.

Dalton, Elizabeth L. "Pupil Selection of Teachers," Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, Vol. 28, No. 5, February, 1971.

Davis, Hazel. "What Teachers Say About Evaluation of Teachers," Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 54, No. 2, February, 1965.

Finn, James D. "Institutionalization of Evaluation," Educational Technology, Vol. IX, No. 12, December, 1969.

Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement, Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Goldstein, Harold. Evaluation of Students, Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Graduate School Printers, 1967.

Guilford, J.P. and Benajmin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 5th edition, 1973.

Jacobson, Joan. "Should Students Evaluation Teachers?" The Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 62, No. 5, May, 1973.

Johnson, George H. "The Purpose of Evaluation and the Role of the Evaluator," Evaluative Research, Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research, 1970.

Larsen, Edwin M. "Students' Criteria for Response to Teaching Evaluation Questionnaires," Journal of Chemical Education, Vol. 51, No. 3, March, 1974.

Lasker, Harry and Karly Vogt. "Student Evaluation: Myths and Realities," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXII, No. 4, Autumn, 1974.

Mirus, Rolf. "Some Implications of Student Evaluation of Teachers," Journal of Economic Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1973.

National Study of School Evaluation, Elementary School Evaluative Criteria, Arlington, Virginia: National Study of School Evaluation, 1973.

Overturf, C.L. and Edwin C. Price. Student Rating of Faculty at St. Johns River Junior College, Palatka, Florida: St. Johns River Junior College, 1966.

Pace, Robert. "Tests and Reviews: Miscellaneous--Education," The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, Cop. III, 1965.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principal, Vol. LII, No. 5, February, 1973.

Roser, Nancy L. "Evaluation and the Administrator: How Decisions Are Made," Journal of Education, Vol. 156, No. 1, February, 1974.

Rosner, Benjamin. "Tests and Reviews: Miscellaneous--Education," The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, Cop. II, 1967.

Sabine, Gordon A. "How Students Rate Their Schools and Teachers," Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals Journal, November, 1971.

Shaw, Jane S. "Students Evaluate Teachers and It Works," Nation's Schools, Vol. 91, No. 4, April, 1973.

Ubben, Gerald C. "Staff Evaluation," The Principal's Audio Journal, Vol. 1, Nos. 3 and 4, March and April, 1974.

Vander Werf, Lester S. How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.

Veldman, Donald J. and Robert F. Peck. The Pupil Observation Survey: Teacher Characteristics from the Students' Viewpoint, Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute for Mental Health, October, 1967.

Zelenak, Mel J. and Bill C. Snider. "Teachers Don't Resent Evaluation--If It's for the Improvement of Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 8, April, 1974.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

TABLE V

STUDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE, GRADES K-2

Questions	Yes	No
1. Do you think your teacher treats you the same as she treats the other students in the room?		
2. When you don't understand something are you afraid to ask your teacher a question?		
3. Does your teacher show an interest in your home life?		
4. Does your teacher help you with your work when you need help?		
5. Does your teacher give you work that you do not understand?		
6. Would you be happy with this same teacher next year?		
7. Does your teacher have favorites or pets?		
8. Does your teacher do different things to make you happy and encourage you to take part in class?		
9. Does your teacher seem to care about you?		
10. Does your teacher give you enough time to finish your work?		
11. Do you get to help your teacher as much as other students in the classroom?		
12. Do you like your teacher?		
13. Does your teacher yell at the students a lot?		
14. Does your teacher give you work that is too easy?		

TABLE V (Continued)

Questions	Yes	No
15. Does the teacher go all out to make school interesting for all the students?		

TABLE VI

STUDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE, GRADES 3-4

	Questions	Yes	No
1.	Does your teacher treat you fairly?		
2.	When you don't understand something are you afraid to ask your teacher a question?		
3.	Is your teacher interested in the things you do at home?		
4.	Does the teacher help the students when they need help?		
5.	Does your teacher give you work that is too hard?		
6.	Do you wish you could have this teacher next year?		
7.	Does your teacher like some students better than others?		
8.	Does your teacher do different things to make you happy and encouarge you to take part in the class?		
9.	Does your teacher seem to care about you?		
10.	Does your teacher give you enough time to finish your work?		
11.	Do you get as many chances as other students to do special jobs in your classroom?		
12.	Do you like your teacher?		
13.	Does your teacher yell at the students a lot?		
14.	Does your teacher give you work that is too easy?		
15.	Does the teacher go all out to make school interesting for all the students?		

TABLE VII

JURY PANEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Categories	Questions	Yes	No
Category 1 Pupil attitude toward teachers	1. Does the teacher seem to treat the students fairly?		
	2. Would you think that the students would be happy with this teacher next year?		
	3. Do the students seem to like the teacher?		
Category 2 Teachers' attitudes toward students as perceived by students	4. When the students do not understand do they seem to be afraid to ask the teacher?		
	5. Does the teacher seem to like some students better than others?		
	6. Does the teacher yell at the students frequently?		
Category 3 Teachers' interest in pupils out of school life	7. Does the teacher demonstrate an interest in what the pupils do at home?		
Category 4 Teachers' role in creating student participation	8. Are the materials presented in such a way as to create interest for the students?		
Category 5 Teachers' interest in students' problems	9. Does the teacher help the pupils when they need help?		
	10. Does the teacher seem to care for the students		

TABLE VII (Continued)

Categories		Questions	Yes	No
Category 6 Teachers' fairness in dealing with students	11.	Does the teacher give work that is too hard?		
	12.	Does the teacher give the students enough time to finish their work?		
	13.	Does the teacher give work that is too easy?		
	14.	Does the teacher give equal chances to all students to do special jobs in the room?		
Category 7 Teachers' awareness to classroom environment	15.	Does the teacher go all out to make school interesting to all the students?		

VITA

Theodore Wayne Belcher was born in Madisonville, Tennessee on June 6, 1932. He attended elementary school in Madisonville and was graduated from Madisonville High School in 1951. The following September he entered Hiwassee College and received the degree of Associate of Arts in June, 1953. In the Fall of 1953 he enrolled at The University of Tennessee and spent two years as a student. He went into the United States Army in the Fall of 1955 and served for two years. In October of 1957 he entered the teaching profession teaching physical education. He transferred to Tennessee Wesleyan College and received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1961. He became principal of Madisonville Elementary School in 1966 and retains this position today.

He entered the Graduate School of The University of Tennessee the Winter quarter of 1974 and received the Master's degree in Educational Administration and Supervision in August 1975.

He is married to the former Nancy Helen Joines of Madisonville, Tennessee. He has an adopted son named Michael Wayne Belcher.