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Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' ratings relate to those of student evaluators in assessing the classroom performance of high school teacher.

Methods and Procedures

The sample utilized for this study consisted of 30 classroom teachers, 30 trained instructional evaluators, and 120 students from a population that was selected from a metropolitan high school in which the staff and student body represented a diverse make-up.

Results

The results of this study were statistically insignificant because there were demographic differences, perceptual differences and affective differences among the classroom teachers, trained
instructional evaluators and student evaluators. Therefore, data indicated that there was no significant relationship between the ratings by trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators on the classroom performance of high school teachers.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

1. Ratings of students could be utilized by teachers as feedback for classroom instruction.

2. Trained instructional evaluators may need to observe classroom teachers for a full class period rather than a 15-minute period of observation.

3. Design an Instructional Improvement Council to include teachers and students to explore areas of students' concerns at the affective level.

4. Provide informative sessions for classroom teachers to discuss the teaching tasks on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Sydney Rabsatt, the Chairperson of the Dissertation Committee, for his interest, guidance and encouragement throughout the doctoral program. The researcher is further grateful for the special guidance and counsel provided by Dr. Phillip Bradley and Dr. William Denton, committee members, who assisted in making the completion of the doctoral program a reality. A very personal thanks is extended to the classroom teachers, students, and state and local administrators who assisted in the study. Sincere gratitude is extended to Dr. Anna P. Atkinson, Mrs. Cora Alsobrook, Ms. Carolyn Clark and Mr. Torrance Stephens for their assistance in completing this study. Most importantly, the researcher wishes to express sincere gratitude to her husband, Charles, and her children, Garnetta, Sandra, Trevor, Todd and Michael for their love, inspiration, patience, understanding and assistance throughout the course of this study.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................... i  
LIST OF TABLES ............................................... v  

CHAPTER  

I. INTRODUCTION .............................................. 1  
Rationale .................................................. 3  
Statement of the Problem ................................. 6  
Assumptions of the Study ................................. 6  
Limitations of the Study ................................ 7  
Research Questions ....................................... 7  
Definition of Terms ....................................... 8  
Summary .................................................. 8  

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ............................ 9  
Teacher Evaluation ....................................... 9  
Student Evaluation of Teaching ......................... 13  
Uses of Student Evaluation ............................... 17  
Instruction/Student Progress ............................ 18  
Learning Environment .................................. 23  
Summary .................................................. 29  

III. RESEARCH DESIGN ....................................... 31  
Hypotheses ............................................... 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Steps</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Methodology</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Presentation and Analysis</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Procedures</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings and Conclusions</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student Perceptions Instrument</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Comparison of Trained Evaluators and Student Evaluators</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Letter - Dr. Bill Capie</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Letter - Dr. Joy Anderson</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Letter - Selected High School Students</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Letter - Mr. Lester Solomon</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Letter - Dr. Null Tucker</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Letter - Building Administrator</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Description of Sample Groups by Age
2 Description of Sample Group by Teaching Experience
3 Description of Sample Groups by Sex
4 Description of Sample Group by Educational Attainment
5 Description of Sample Groups by Race
6 Relationships of Providing Instruction by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators
7 Relationships of Assessing and Encouraging Student Progress by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators
8 Relationships of Managing the Learning Environment by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators
9 Overall Relationships of Ratings by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators to the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and Student Perceptions Instrument
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As a result of an increasing interest in excellence in education, several states have initiated many reform measures. In Georgia, the Quality Basic Education Act (1985) became effective July 1, 1986, and was established for the purpose of providing a quality basic education to prepare students to think clearly, to be lifelong learners, to be good citizens, and to acquire skills and attitudes necessary to be responsible, self-reliant and productive members of our society.

Teacher evaluation, as cited in the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988), is an integral component in the process of improving teaching and learning. An effective evaluation program results when teachers and evaluators are successful in using evaluations to reinforce effective practices and to improve teaching.

The field-test edition of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988) was developed in response to the Quality Basic Education (QBE) Act. The QBE Act states:

All personnel employed by local units of administration, including elected and appointed school superintendents, shall have their performance evaluated annually by appropriately trained evaluators . . . Certified
professional personnel who have deficiencies and other needs shall have professional development plans designed to mitigate such deficiencies and other needs as may have been identified during the evaluation process (QBE, 20-2-210).

In August, 1988, approximately 350 administrators and supervisors received training on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) which is a component of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988). Participants in the training session were told that this workshop was necessary to meet the state's mandate. This evaluation instrument was field tested this year in 113 schools in one metropolitan public school system. The purpose of the field-test year, as stated in the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988), is to provide every evaluator and teacher an opportunity to practice and familiarize themselves with this evaluation program prior to implementation. The purposes of the annual performance evaluation are:

1. to identify and reinforce teaching practices
2. to identify areas where development can improve instructional effectiveness
3. to identify teachers who do not meet the minimum standards so that appropriate action can be taken.

The standard procedures for the evaluation of classroom teaching, as further stated in the GTEP, require unannounced classroom observations of a minimum duration of 15 minutes. Observations for evaluation using the Georgia Teacher
Observation Instrument must take place during teaching situations which provide appropriate opportunities for interaction of either a student-focused or teacher-focused nature.

Specifically, this research study will determine the degree of correlation in the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators of the classroom behavior of high school teachers. These behaviors were measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and was correlated with the Student Perceptions Instrument (SPI) (Capie, 1988), on the same behaviors.

Metropolitan schools must strive for excellence in order to properly educate students which will allow them to compete in today's society.

Rationale

Student performance is the main focal point in the assessment process. Nevertheless, what students have to say about teacher performance is of primary importance. This variable, which is usually neglected, is needed and may be the best indicator of the effectiveness of teacher performance in the classroom.

The origin of student ratings, according to Aleamoni (1976), can be traced to the time of Socrates when they were gathered informally and unsystematically. Since that time, faculty members have solicited, chastised, and ignored them; whereas
students and administrators have requested, used, misinterpreted, and misused them. Administrators, students, and faculty have all claimed, at one time or another, that the ratings are both reliable/valid/useful and unreliable/invalid/useless.

Aleamoni indicated that student ratings, in spite of their agitated history, are increasingly being used by faculty, students, and administrators for formative and summative decisions about instructional effectiveness. Student ratings, in fact, tend to be the only tangible source of instructional evaluation information in the majority of colleges and universities, both here and abroad.

According to Aleamoni, the rationale for gathering student ratings can be found in the following four arguments:

1. Students are the main source of information about the accomplishment of important educational goals, degrees of communications, and the existence of problems between instructors and students.

2. If one assumes that course elements such as the instructor, textbook, homework, course content, method of instruction, student interest, student attention, and general student attitude toward the course content, all serve to change student behavior in a specified direction, and if these course elements constitute effective instruction, then students are the most logical evaluators. Students are the only ones who are
directly and extensively exposed to the quality and effectiveness of the course elements. Such evaluations do not intrude into the class, like visits from outside evaluators, and are made by those with a genuine interest in the instructor's success.

3. Student ratings provide a means of communicating between students and the instructor which may not exist in other forms. This type of communication may lead to the type of involvement by student and instructor in the teaching-learning process that raises the whole level of instruction.

4. Student demands for information about particular instructors and courses for use by other students in selecting courses and instructors and/or to encourage instructional improvement can be provided through systematic student evaluation. Such evaluation may increase the chances that excellence in instruction will be recognized and rewarded.

Systems theory, by Getzels and Guba (Hoy, 1987), is useful in analyzing the variables which influence the behavior of individuals in organizations. Getzels and Guba, for example, describe the organization as a social system which features a hierarchical role-structure. For each role in the structure--trained instructional evaluator, teacher, or student--there are certain behavioral expectations. Everyone in the social system is an observer of others and, therefore, has certain perceptions and expectations of how those in the other roles will behave.
Expectations from the school as a social system differ among student and trained instructional evaluators in that students look to the social system as a means of having their needs met. On the other hand, trained instructional evaluators seek to determine their apparent effect on the improvement of the assessed quality of teacher performance. In addition, trained instructional evaluators' expectations are that the institution and social system will develop responsible citizens.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that was investigated by this study was to determine the comparison of student perceptions of high school teachers' classroom performance. Student perceptions were measured by their responses on the Student Perceptions Instrument and compared with the classroom performance of teachers as measured by trained instructional evaluators using the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument.

Assumptions of the Study

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. High school students are able to evaluate the classroom performance of teachers as identified by the objectives on the GTOI.

2. There is a need for high school students' input in the evaluation process.
Limitations of the Study

A limitation of this study is the fact that unlike trained instructional evaluators, the responses of the students are restricted to their perceptions only. This study was limited to the performance of high school teachers employed by a metropolitan public school system and assigned to a metropolitan high school. The teacher evaluation was further limited to those assessed by trained instructional evaluators.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in providing instruction?

2. What is the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers to assess and encourage students' progress?

3. What is the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers to manage the learning environment?

4. What is the overall relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators'
ratings of the competencies of high school teachers as measured by the GTOI and the SPI?

Definition of Terms

1. Student Perceptions. Those perceptions of teacher performance as measured by the Student Perceptions Instrument (Capie, 1988).

2. Teacher Performance. The demonstration of selected teaching skills that professional members have declared essential to effective classroom performance as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTEP, 1988).

Summary

This study was designed to compare the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators of high school teachers' instructional performance as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument. The primary focus of the evaluation instrument is to identify and reinforce effective teaching practices and identify areas where inservice and staff development can improve instructional effectiveness.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Evaluation of instruction or teaching is one aspect of the total teacher evaluation process. This chapter will review selected literature pertinent to the variables of this study. It will be reviewed under three headings: (1) Teacher Evaluations, (2) Student Progress, and (3) Learning Environment.

Teacher Evaluation

The major research in the area of teacher evaluation by students has been at the college and university levels. However, during the eighties, research using upper elementary and high school students as teacher evaluators began to be used.

Teacher evaluation is an integral part of instructional supervision. The evaluation of teachers encompasses issues of teacher tasks and accountability. Questions about who should be involved and how to place values on teacher performance are significant. Such questions are closely related to the overall purposes and goals of the school system as stated in the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988).

Michael Scriven (1981) discusses the two types of teacher evaluation: summative and formative evaluations. The first
deals with teacher evaluation for personnel decisions, while the second is evaluation for faculty development.

Scriven further stated that summative evaluation is primary because in teaching, human careers are at stake, not "mere" improvement. If it is not possible to tell when teaching is bad (or good) overall, it is not possible to tell when it has improved. If it is possible to tell when it is bad or good, personnel decisions can be made even though it is not known how to make improvements. In short, diagnosis is sometimes easier than healing, and an essential preliminary to it.

If faculty roles could be well defined and if the accountability problem could be resolved, then how can the evaluation of faculty be performed? Thorne (1980) called for the establishment of standards and criteria. The faculty would then perform and be measured by such standards. Thorne, however, cautioned against the use of rating scales, stating that they "tend to exert undue influence in the evaluation process."

In describing an evaluation system which is in close agreement with the concepts of Management by Objectives, Richardson (1973) stated: "The institution must first agree upon its goals and the means through which it expects to achieve these goals" (p. 20). Once this is done, the "faculty member must define his objective in such a way that there is a
relationship between what he is willing to do and the purpose of the institution" (p. 20). Zion and Richter (1973) described a similar strategy in which the faculty members undergo a strength assessment and then set professional goals. They suggested that such an approach would tend to minimize subjectivity in the faculty evaluation process.

Participative approaches (involving directly those who are to be evaluated) were considered by McCarter (1974) and Kilmann (1974). In such systems, evaluation would be viewed as an on-going process, with joint goal-setting between administrators and faculty members. McCarter also emphasized the importance of an annual review when a participative approach is used. He further suggested the keeping of records for long range comparison purposes.

The most important part of teacher evaluation is the teaching component. Teaching is difficult to evaluate. Goldschmid (1976) comments on the reluctance of faculty members to have their teaching evaluated by peers, department heads, outside evaluators, and students and suggests that the lack of a subject matter expertise concept seems to underlie much of this reluctance.

Mannan and Traicoff (1976) expressed concern over the use of universal criteria for teaching evaluation. They suggested that "institutional climate" (p. 100) must also be considered, since
teaching in one school system may not necessarily be evaluated in the same way as at another.

Centra (1977) compared student ratings of instructors to achievement, finding "apparently students' views of how arduous a course was, or how excellent the text or reading assignments were, had little to do with how much they learned" (p. 22). Centra used the common final examination method to measure achievement, as did Endo and Della-Piana (1976) in their study of seven teaching factors as compared to student achievement. Although they found some intercorrelation, they found no significant relationships between factors and achievement.

Doyle and Crichton (1978) analyzed student ratings, peer ratings, and self ratings to student achievements. They found no significant correlations. They warned, however, that there may be problems involved in the determination of how such things do interrelate. Centra (1973) found, for example, that student ratings and self ratings of instructors indicated the same strengths and weaknesses.

Braunstein and Benston (1973) made a comparison between department chairman and student evaluations of teaching, and found that the following were almost always associated with superior teaching: stimulation of interest, clarity and understandableness, knowledge of subject matter, preparation for
and organization of the course, and an enthusiasm for the subject and for teaching. There were indications that students can measure these fairly well. And, of all the possible ways to evaluate teachers, the student rating system is apparently more widely used than any other method.

**Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Lawrence M. Aleamoni (1976) indicated that the origin of student ratings can be traced to the time of Socrates, when they were gathered informally and unsystematically. Since then, faculty have solicited, chastised, and ignored them, whereas students and administrators have requested, used, misinterpreted, and misused them. Faculty, students, and administrators have all claimed, at one time or another, that the ratings are both reliable/valid/useful and unreliable/invalid/useless.

In spite of their agitated history, Aleamoni commented that student ratings are increasingly being used by faculty, students, and administrators for formative and summative decisions about instructional effectiveness. In fact, student ratings tend to be the only tangible source of instructional evaluation information in the majority of colleges and universities, both here and abroad.

Butler and Tipton (1976) reported: "There are many
arguments, most of which are not supported by evidence, that the student does not recognize effective and good instruction" (p. 111). On the other hand, Keeley and Browne (1978) considered student raters to be naive in that they misrepresent faculty behavior. Students, in order to be effective raters, would have to be trained.

In research which adapted Fleishman's Supervisory Description Questionnaire to the student evaluation of instructors, Lahat-Mendelbaum and Kipnis (1973) reported that students almost always rate highly those instructors who also rank high on the Consideration scale, regardless of ranking on the Initiation scale.

Weldon (1976) argued that the normal single evaluation, at the end of the course, is too little and too late. He also asserts that students know that this is the situation. Penfield (1978) argued that students believe the information gathered in ratings is not well used: "Student responses suggest a great deal of uncertainty as to the use made of information" (p. 21). These would serve to indicate that students are incapable of making any worthwhile contribution to the evaluation of teaching. Schuh and Crivelli (1973) were prompted to call this "animadversion" since ill will may be involved--they used the term to describe the relationship between midterm examination scores and a subsequent instructor evaluation as being weak and biased.
A validation study by Marsh (1977) indicated that the "best/worst" ratings of instructors given by seniors was quite similar to the same instructors' ratings by others. Research by Frey (1976) refuted the hypothesis that students use ratings to reward teachers who grant high grades and punish those who grade lower. Wimberly and Aft (1973), using the Management Grid as an evaluation instrument, found a low, positive correlation between expected course grades and instructor ratings, and stated that even with a fairly large sample, a strong relationship was unlikely.

Kohlan (1973) found that students having "considerable previous knowledge about the course and instructor were no more consistent in their evaluation than those with limited knowledge" (p. 593). He also noted: "It is sometimes argued student ratings are just a product of an entertainment or halo effect, but results of this study suggest this is untrue" (p. 593).

Much more often than not, reports in the literature indicate that students can be effective judges of at least some aspects of the characteristics of good college teaching. The most common device appears to be the rating form, or questionnaire, with respondents asked to agree or disagree with statements or questions, or to rate teaching on some kind of scales. Some variations appear. Granzin and Painter (1976) used a framework
of cognitive dissonance. Oliver (1973) presented a methodology based on semantic differentials. In a form developed for accounting majors, Krull and Crooch (1973) preferred the semantic differential, arguing that a short instrument which yields some good information is more suitable than a long instrument which yields little, if any, additional information.

Investigators of such instruments tend to wonder about such things as class size, major field of raters, gender, and other demographic characteristics. Most studies indicate little, if any, relationship between demographics and the student ratings of their instructors. Haslett (1976) found two instances. As class size decreased, instructor rating improved, and as overall class achievement levels increased, so did the instructor's ratings. But Barnowski and Socklof (1976) found negative relationships to class size.

Marsh and Overall (1981) studied the effects of course level, course type, and instructor on student evaluations. The effects were stable, and the variance attributable to the instructor was much larger than course level or type. This indicates that student ratings are largely a function of who (what person) is teaching the course, regardless of other factors.

When an individual is exposed to a view of his behavior which is different from his self-concept, he has a choice of
modifying the self-concept or changing his behavior (thus, ultimately modifying the behavior of others) (p. 258).

Centra (1980) suggests that the kind and type of items on a rating form and how any results are interpreted are critical. He asserts that while global (general) items are useful because they are tied to no particular teaching style, the ratings on specific items "would be more useful in instructional improvement because they can more readily suggest changes for teachers" (p. 207).

**Uses of Student Evaluation**

While acknowledging that students may not be able to determine a teacher's mastery of his/her field, Butler and Tipton (1976) contended that "the student should be able to judge how well the instructor gets his subject across to the student" (p. 111). If students can make this judgment, then faculty members ought to be able to make use of it. Braunstein, Klein, and Pacha (1973) gave indications of how this might be done.

The student questionnaire should be a key component in the evaluation process from about grade 6. The piece of paper itself is only part of the story. Preparing students as evaluators is another part, and the methods for administering the questionnaire are a third. These methods must be proof against complaints about the possibility of selective return and
prompting. A good straightforward approach is to have assistants from the central administration staff (a cheaper fallback system is using secretaries) take the questionnaires out to each class, have the instructor leave the room for a few minutes, provide a brief explanation of the process and how the results are to be used (possibly in writing), encourage questions, and pass out questionnaires to be filled out by every member of the class. One should get a 99% return rate from those present, and one should worry if it is less than 75% of those who complete the course.

Instruction/Student Progress

In one of the landmark research studies of teacher behavior, Ryans (1962) attempted to determine the relationships, if any, that existed between the characteristics of teachers and the behavior they exhibited in the classroom. Ryans' massive Teacher Characteristics Study involved 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools of 450 school systems.

One data-gathering technique of the Ryans study called for direct observation of in-classroom behavior of teachers. From the data collected, three behavioral patterns called dimensions, were noted:

1. TCS pattern X: warm, understanding, and friendly versus aloof, egocentric, and restricted teacher classroom behavior.
2. TCS pattern Y: responsible, businesslike, and systematic versus evading, unplanned, and slipshod teacher classroom behavior.

3. TCS pattern Z: stimulating and imaginative versus dull, routine teacher classroom behavior.

The description of a teacher's observed in-classroom behavior can be characterized in part in terms of the teacher's position in these patterns—either high or low. When these behavioral ratings were correlated with a complete range of personal characteristics, it was found that the "high" related teachers—the warm, understanding, responsive, and imaginative teachers—were also rated by their principals as superior. The "low"-rated teachers—who tended to evidence restricted, dull, and unplanned classroom behavior—were looked upon as poorer teachers by their principals.

Thus, one significant part of Ryans' study seems to support the idea that organizational behavior style of a teacher is important and is relevant to the achievement of the school's goals. It is not sufficient that teachers have an adequate educational background, expertise, and knowledge of the subject matter; the dynamics of interpersonal behavior in the organization have much effect on the teacher's impact in the classroom.
A component of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (1988) is the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument which requires trained evaluators to visit the classroom. The evaluator is required to observe the teacher and record "S" (satisfactory), "NI" (needs improvement) and "NA" (not applicable) on the record sheet. She/He then must be able to analyze what has taken place in the teaching. If the data are seriously distorted, the analysis will be worthless because its chief purpose is to provide a sound basis for planning future teaching curricula and staff development.

Goldhammer (1969) concluded that another assumption favoring observation is the belief that adding eyes will increase the data and demonstrate commitment to the teacher by paying close attention to his/her behavior. By being in close proximity to the teacher and the pupils at the moments when salient problems of professional practice are being enacted, the evaluator will be in a position to render needed assistance to the teacher.

In the most general sense, observation should create opportunities for evaluators to help teachers to test the reality of their own perceptions and judgments about their teaching. Given his own perceptions of what has taken place, the teacher can test "reality" by ascertaining whether the supervisor's observations (and later his value judgments) tend to confirm or to oppose his own (Persaud, 1986).
The word "teaching," as defined in Millman's handbook on evaluation (1981), refers to a very broad class of activities. The particular activities that constitute teaching in any particular situation depend upon how the school is organized, the nature of the program, the structure of the curriculum, the teaching materials to be used, the expectations of parents, and the social context of education. A method suitable for evaluating teacher effectiveness in one situation may be quite unsuitable in another. If a school encourages innovation, the teachers in each room may be functioning very innovatively and should probably be evaluated in terms of different criteria. If a school can justify evaluating all teachers through identical procedures, then the school is probably devoid of creativity and innovations. Research shows quite clearly that pupils adapt well to many different approaches to teaching, calling for very different ways of functioning on the part of the teacher. Pupils in open classrooms learn at very much the same rate as pupils in classrooms run in highly structured styles, and yet the way in which teachers function in these two settings may be very different and should be evaluated in different ways. There is no single simple method of evaluating teacher effectiveness, because there is no single concept of what the teacher should be undertaking in the classroom.

Delorne (1985) designed a study to assess the attitude of
selected teachers in North Dakota Schools serving native American students toward current and ideal instructional supervision and staff evaluation. The teacher attitudes were compared on the basis of age and school type. One hundred classroom teachers were surveyed to assess teacher attitudes and perceptions toward current and ideal instructional supervision and staff evaluation processes. There were statistically significant differences when instructional supervision and evaluation processes were compared as follows: (1) current supervision to current evaluation, (2) ideal supervision to ideal evaluation, (3) current supervision to ideal supervision, and (4) current evaluation to ideal evaluation. Statistically significant differences were found when teacher attitudes toward ideal supervision and evaluation processes were compared on the basis of age. Statistically significant differences were found when teacher attitudes toward current supervision and evaluation processes were compared on the basis of school type. Three conclusions resulted from the analysis of the data. First, teachers disagreed that current supervision and evaluation processes were conducted for the purpose of improving instruction. Teachers agreed that, ideally, supervision and evaluation should be conducted to improve instruction. Second, as age increased, teachers' attitudes toward ideal supervision and evaluation became less positive. Third, teachers who worked in
the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools had less positive attitudes toward current supervision and evaluation processes and student achievement than teachers working in public schools.

**Learning Environment**

According to the literature, in the late seventies and the eighties focus was on the learning environment of the schools.

The ecological model, which McKenna (1973) described, was an effort then at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research in San Francisco to develop a comprehensive approach to the study of teaching. The term "model" may be too precise for both the present state of the activity and the intended fluidity of the process by which the ecological-theory project is proceeding.

From the term "ecological" itself, McKenna suspected that this was a highly ambitious undertaking: to identify and define all the elements that constitute the classroom as an ecological system and then to recognize the interactions among the elements and take into account their relation to and effects on each other. In setting forth postulates for the theory, the investigators acknowledge that questions about what constitutes all the elements (including those contextual ones beyond the classroom), their appropriate aggregations, and defining information about each will be answered "somewhat later in the theory-development process . . . not only inductively but also
deductively as our definitions are tested in exploring interrelationships among elements."

In the early stages of the project, McKenna tentatively identified 10 elements for further definition, description, and confirmation (revision or rejection) in naturalistic classroom settings: students, teachers, other human elements, role, time, physical locus and arrangement, educational materials, task standards and sanctions, and communication. It is clear from the descriptors themselves that several elements are clearly contextual factors—time, physical locus and arrangement, and educational materials. If, however, context is to be considered in the broadest possible sense, then other human elements, task standards and sanctions, and communication also need to be considered as contextual.

McKenna was concerned that ecological theory has not pursued all the contextual factors in depth, but it appears to be in the process of identifying and clarifying a broad range of them, with the intent of taking into account their complex interrelationships as teaching is studied. Attention to interrelationships in a naturalistic setting, along with their consequences, may also have important implications for teacher evaluation.

Ausejo (1984) examined the leader-behavior characteristics of urban elementary school principals in the State of California
as perceived by their teachers in order to identify those characteristics related to the positive organizational climates in their respective schools.

The data gathering instruments in Ausejo's study were the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The statistical analysis of the research data was accomplished by means of several steps—dependent tests, discriminant analysis, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and canonical correlational analysis.

Ausejo's first research question determined if there was a significant relationship between the principals' and teachers' perceptions of school climate and leader behavior. Relative to climate, teachers' ratings were more positive than principals' on Disengagement and Esprit; principals' ratings were more positive on Production Emphasis and Consideration. Relative to leader behavior, principals were consistently higher in their ratings of their own leader behavior than were the teachers.

The second research question by Ausejo assessed which teachers perceived characteristics of leader behavior as being associated with better organizational climates. There was a consistent trend of higher scores being associated with more closed climates. Sixty-five percent of the schools were rated as closed in climate and only four schools had open climates.
The schools with Open/Autonomous climates demonstrated high teacher morale; Controlled/Familiar climates showed satisfactory teacher morale; Parental/Closed climates showed low teacher morale. Teacher scores were able to predict the three climate types.

The third research question in Ausejo's study examined the degree of congruency of principal and teacher perceptions of principals' leader behavior as it related to organizational climate. There were negligible correlations between the two sets of congruency scores. Congruency between teachers and principals within a school did not relate to whether the school's climate was open or closed.

Although this study did not establish a relationship between the two congruency measures, it demonstrated that the LBDQ can be used to predict perceptions of school organizational climates using the OCDQ.

Graham (1984) studied the relationship of perceived secondary principals' leader behavior as identified by secondary teachers and measured by the Organizational Climate Survey (OCS), and perceptions of secondary school climate held by secondary teachers and measured by the Organizational Climate Index (OCI).

More specifically, Graham's study focused on the following hypothesis independent variable of teacher-perceived principal
leader behavior as measured by the OCS and factors of the
dependent variable of teacher perceived school climate as
measured by the OCI.

The sample for Graham's study was 250 teachers and their
respective building principals representing fifty secondary
schools in the states of Iowa and Missouri. Data for the
independent variable of teacher-perceived leader behavior were
provided by measures of the OCS. Data for the dependent
variable of teacher-perceived school climate were provided by
measurement of the OCI.

The examination of the data by Graham presented by the
multiple regression analysis prompted rejection of the
hypothesis. The data revealed a relationship between selected
independent variable factors and the dependent variable factors
of Personal Dignity, Organizational Effectiveness, Orderliness,
Impulse Control, Developmental Press and Control Press.

Therefore, as concluded by Graham, secondary school
principals can improve their effectiveness by addressing through
their behavior, those selected independent variable factors
which are most highly related to the dependent variables they
wish to impact.

Fleming (1981) conducted a study to determine whether school
climate was "real" in the sense of being measurable. A
secondary purpose was to examine the relationship between
student perception of school climate and (1) student attitudes toward school, (2) student behavior, and (3) student achievement at four high schools in a relatively large suburban school district in the State of Utah.

To accomplish these purposes, Fleming employed two strategies: (1) Perceptual—to collect the data that would reflect individual student perception of school climate and to test the relationship which may exist between individual perception of school climate and student performance outcomes (attitudes toward school, behavior, and achievement) and (2) Global—to compare the schools studied with the mean scores on the measures of school climate, attitudes toward school, behavior, and achievement for possible trends that may be occurring.

The data in Fleming's study were collected from students and faculty members in four high schools in a relatively large suburban school district in the State of Utah. A total of 580 students and 178 faculty members participated in this study during the 1978-79 school year.

A school climate questionnaire, an attitude survey and a socio-economic measure were administered by Fleming to each student. Grade-point average, number of days absent from school, and achievement test scores were obtained from the student's permanent record card. Behavior incidents were
gathered as they were reported by the administrators in each school. A school climate questionnaire was also administered to each faculty member in each school.

Fleming's data showed perception of school climate is not random. Data also indicated that both student and faculty perceptions of school climate differed from school to school. Students and faculty did not appear to perceive the climate the same. Student perception of school climate is related to student attitudes toward school and this relationship is strong and consistent across schools.

Summary

The literature summarized in this study indicated that the evaluation of teachers must be considered in the context of community characteristics, resources, and effort for schooling; in the context of the total school system climate and organizational arrangements; in the context of the way in which the school unit and its leadership function; in the context of the time, human and material resources, and autonomy provided the classroom teacher; and in the context of the characteristics of the students themselves. Unless all of these factors are considered as mediators in observing the performance of teachers, whatever judgments are made may be attributed to teachers when the compelling forces underlying teacher
performance reside in places quite apart from the transactions that take place between teacher and student.

The review of the literature is required to analyze what research has been done in the areas of evaluation, instruction/student progress, and learning environment.
CHAPTER III  
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY  

This study proposed to address the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators based on the variables of the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument. The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument is designed to measure the performance of teachers in three areas: Providing Instruction, Assessing and Encouraging Student Progress, and Managing the Learning Environment (See Appendix A).

Specifically, the study was to determine the degree of relationship between both groups of evaluators. The behaviors, as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument, were correlated with the Student Perceptions Instrument on the same behaviors. The descriptive survey method was used in this study because this method seeks to describe particular phenomena as they are (Slavin, 1984). By comparing the responses, it was possible to test the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses

\( H_1 \): There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and
student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in providing instruction.

**H2:** There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in assessing and encouraging student progress.

**H3:** There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in managing the learning environment.

**H4:** There is no significant relationship between the overall perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers as measured by the GTOI and the SPI.

**Population**

A metropolitan high school was selected from high schools in an urban setting where the staff and student body represented a diverse make-up. The students came from all economic, social, racial and ethnic backgrounds. An equally wide range of academic abilities is represented by the students, from college-
bound students to students classified as mentally handicapped. The mobility rate of the community is high; however, many of the students have remained in the neighborhood all of their lives.

Because of the socio-economic status and racial composition of the students, the school has an excellent social atmosphere. It benefits well from its metropolitan location, a community with a tradition of non-conformity, tolerance for racial and social diversity, and artistic and theatrical activities.

The selected teaching staff is almost as diverse as the student body, coming from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. The experienced and well-trained staff hold the following degrees: 4 Ph.D.'s, 6 Specialists, 39 Masters, and 11 Bachelors.

The research population was randomly selected from a pool of 60 certified teachers at a metropolitan high school. The names of the teachers were placed on a computer list and every third name was selected until a sample of 30 had been reached. The 30 instructors teach grades 9 through 12, and were assessed on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument during the second semester of 1989. Trained instructional evaluators for the GTOI administered the assessment to the teachers.

The 120 students were randomly selected from a pool of 600 students in grades 9 through 12 who were assigned to the 30
selected teachers for at least one class period per day during the first or second semester of the 1988-89 school year. The 600 names were listed on a computer sheet and every third name was selected until a sample of 120 was reached. These students evaluated the classroom behavior of teachers using the Student Perceptions Instrument. Salvin (1984) indicated that random assignment makes more defensible the assumptions of equality of each group, in that every subject will have an equal opportunity to be placed in each group.

Sample

The study consisted of 30 classroom teachers, 120 students and 30 trained instructional personnel from a selected high school in metropolitan Atlanta. The 30 classroom teachers and 120 students from the high school were randomly selected.

The role of the classroom teacher was to implement the instructional program at the high school level in grades 9-12. Teachers were responsible in all disciplines for providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress, and managing the learning environment.

The role of the trained instructional evaluator was to assess the instructional performance of teachers in the classroom based on their providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress, and managing the learning environment.
The role of the student evaluator was to evaluate their teachers' performance based on how they perceived the teachers in providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress and managing the learning environment.

**Instruments**

The instruments used in the study were the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (Appendix A) and the Student Perceptions Instrument (Appendix B). The GTOI is a component of the GTEP (1988) and the SPI was developed by the Teacher Assessment Project, College of Education, University of Georgia (Capie, 1988).

The purpose of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program is three-fold: 1) to identify and reinforce effective teaching practices, 2) to identify areas where development can improve instructional effectiveness, and 3) to identify teachers who do not meet the minimum standards so that appropriate action can be taken. The GTOI is the instrument used to assess the classroom behavior of all certified teaching personnel. Continuous evaluation of teachers is part of the evaluation process (GTEP, 1988).

The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument is composed of three multidimensional tasks generally associated with effective teaching: (1) providing instruction, (2) assessing and
encouraging student progress and effort, and (3) managing the learning environment. In addition, the instrument contains numerous sample practices which may be used by an evaluator in determining the degree to which the observed teacher has demonstrated the performance of his/her assigned responsibilities. The evaluation will address the area of performance in which deficits exist and will be the basis for ongoing professional development of the individual employee.

The dimensions on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument are scored on the basis of either 3- satisfactory (S) or 1- needs improvement (NI) with two exceptions. Building for Transfer (Task 1: Dimension C) may be scored 2- not applicable (NA) during student-focused content development. Content Development (Task 1: Dimension B) may be scored by observing either teacher-focused interactions or student-focused interactions or both (Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program, 1988).

The purpose of the Student Perceptions Instrument is to determine how students perceive the performance of their teacher in selected areas. Although not intended for use as certification criteria, the data generated through administration of the instrument may prove useful for staff development purposes (Capie, 1988).

The Student Perceptions Instrument measures students' perceptions of the performance of their teacher in the
classroom. It consists of items parallel to those found in the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument, altered to fit the vocabulary and maturity of the students.

The SPI is scored on a scale from 1 to 3. The scoring is: 1 - Never, 2 - Sometimes, 3 - Often. The SPI scoring is designed to enable upper elementary, middle and high school students to evaluate the classroom behaviors of their teachers. The instrument is to be administered in the absence of the assessed teacher before or after the regular school day. Each item is to be read aloud to students who need it. The students will respond on each item by marking each appropriate space (never, sometimes, often) on the response form.

This study focused on the similarity of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' perceptions of the performance of high school teachers.

The state developed the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTEP, 1988) in an attempt to implement a uniform evaluation instrument that could be used statewide. The evaluation is designed to indicate the area of performance where deficits exist. In a telephone conversation with Dr. Null Tucker (1989), he indicated that at the present time, the University of Georgia is currently collecting data to declare the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) a valid and reliable instrument by utilizing information received from
statewide field testing during the 1988-89 school year. Until the data are obtained, however, it is presumed that the GTOI is a reliable and workable instrument.

The Student Perceptions Instrument (Capie, 1988), was developed to determine how students perceive the performance of their teacher in selected areas. Although it was not intended for use as certification criteria, the data generated through administration of the instrument may prove useful for staff development purposes. Since the SPI was not designed to be used as certification criteria (Tucker, 1989), validation was not initiated. However, it is presumed to be reliable and workable.

Items on the Student Perception Instrument were matched with items on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument to establish face validity, so that this researcher could conduct a correlation study of trained evaluators and student evaluators of high school teachers' classroom performance.

**Procedural Steps**

It was deemed necessary to complete the following steps before implementing this study.

1. Obtain evaluation instrument and information from officials in the State of Georgia's Assessment Department necessary to conduct the study.
2. Secure permission from the building administrator to conduct the student evaluation instrument in the school.

3. Randomly select 30 classroom teachers from a selected high school with codes for trained evaluators.

4. Randomly select 120 students from a selected high school.

5. Administer the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument to 30 high school teachers.

6. Allow 120 students to evaluate the 30 selected teachers.

7. Obtain general demographic data of staff and students from the building administrator.

8. Keep a record of all activities.

9. Analyze data collected from all participants to be included in the final dissertation.

Data Collection and Methodology

The method of data collecting for this study was obtained by supplying the names of selected teachers that were included in this study to the building administrator who comprised the study sample. The building administrator was requested to supply the researcher with the evaluation and biographical data of the teachers and trained instructional evaluators selected for this study, which were subsequently identified by numbers so as to maintain confidentiality. The building administrator was also requested to supply the researcher with the biographical data of
the students selected for this study. Follow-up telephone calls were conducted to obtain all the requested data.

Students selected to participate in the study were requested to meet with the researcher in the library of the school, before or after school hours, at designated times and dates, to conduct the evaluations. Follow-up telephone calls were conducted after the initial contact, until all student participants had completed evaluations of the selected teaching personnel.

Data Presentation and Analysis

A descriptive research design was the method that was utilized to conduct this research. The design sought to determine the degree of similarity of the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators on the classroom performance of certified high school teachers. The data was arranged in tabular form, comparisons were noted and statistically analyzed. The responses to these two assessment instruments formed the basis for the analysis.

Analytical Procedures

The four hypotheses were addressed individually. The hypotheses were analyzed using the Pearson R Correlation to determine if there was a significant relationship that existed between the variables. Simple statistics were also presented in
summary tables to present a general and specific overview of the
data collected. This was done separately for trained and
student evaluators. The variables were tested for relationships
at the 0.05 level of significance.

Summary

This research was conducted through the use of the
descriptive research design. This design sought to determine
the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional
evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings on the classroom
performance of high school teachers. The evaluations were based
on the variables of the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument,
which is a component of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program
(1988), and the Student Perceptions Instrument (Capie, 1988).
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this research study was to investigate the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators of the classroom performance of high school teachers employed in a metropolitan school district. The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTEP, 1988) was administered to 30 teachers who were randomly selected in grades 9 through 12 by trained instructional evaluators.

Students randomly selected in grades 9 through 12 evaluated the teaching performance of the 30 selected teachers by utilizing the Student Perceptions Instrument (Capie, 1988). A total of 120 students from a metropolitan high school were involved in this study. The GTOI and the SPI were used to collect data from the selected participants for statistical analysis and for interpretation.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to test each hypothesis to determine if a significant relationship exists between the trained evaluators and student evaluators of high school teachers' classroom performance. A .05 level of significance was used as the criterion of acceptance or rejection for each hypothesis.
The researcher presents here demographic information on the population of high school teachers, trained instructional evaluators, and high school students used in this study. Table 1 shows a listing of the subjects that were used in this study according to age.

Table 1
Description of Sample Groups by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>13-18</th>
<th>19-22</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen percent of the classroom teachers were 30-35 years of age, 23 percent were 36-40 years of age, 50 percent were 41-45 years of age, and 10 percent were in the 46-50 years of age category. Seven percent of the trained instructional evaluators were 30-35 years old, 23 percent were 36-40 years old, 67 percent were 41-45 years old, and 3 percent were 46-50 years old. Ninety-six percent of the students were 13-18 years old and 4 percent were 19-22.
Age difference between the trained instructional evaluators and the student evaluators who are young, may have some significance on how the two groups rate teachers on their instructional performance.

A description by teaching experience of the sample population in this study is shown in Table 2.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1-5 Years %</th>
<th>6-10 Years %</th>
<th>11-15 Years %</th>
<th>16-20 Years %</th>
<th>Over 20 Years %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the 30 subjects had been teaching for one to five years, which represents seven percent of the classroom teachers. Thirteen percent of the classroom teachers had 6-10 years, 23 percent had 11-15 years, 40 percent had 16-20 years and 17 percent had over 20 years of teaching experience. One of the trained instructional evaluators had been teaching one to five years, which represents three percent of the trained evaluators; 10 percent had 6-10 years; 33 percent had 11-15 years; 47 percent had 16-20; and 7 percent had over 20 years of teaching experience.
The teaching experience of the trained instructional evaluators and classroom teachers are similar, which may indicate that they hold similar perceptions regarding the instructional process.

A description by sex of the sample population used in this study is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Description of Sample Groups by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage of Group (Male)</th>
<th>Percentage of Group (Female)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluator</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Evaluators</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that 70 percent of the classroom teachers were females and 30 percent were males. Twenty-three percent of trained instructional evaluators were males and 77 percent were females. Sixty percent of the student evaluators in the study were females and 40 percent were males.
The data indicated that there were more female evaluators and classroom teachers, which may have influenced the perceptions of both groups.

A description by educational attainment of the sample population in this study is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Description of Sample Group by Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>B.A. (%)</th>
<th>M.A. (%)</th>
<th>ED.S (%)</th>
<th>ED.D (%)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates that 10 percent of the classroom teachers hold Bachelor degrees, 74 percent hold Masters degrees, 13 percent hold Specialist degrees, and one holds the Doctorate of Education degree. Seventeen percent of trained evaluators hold Bachelor degrees, 67 percent hold Masters degrees, 3 percent hold Specialist degrees, and 1 holds the Doctor of Education degree.

More trained instructional evaluators and classroom teachers, within the selected school setting, hold Masters degrees. This may, also, have influenced the perceptions of the sample group.
A description of the sample population used in this study according to race is shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Description of Sample Groups by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Black %</th>
<th>Caucasian %</th>
<th>Oriental %</th>
<th>Others %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 indicates that 63 percent of the teacher sample population were Black, 33 percent were Caucasian, and one percent fell into the "Other" category. Forty percent of the trained evaluators were Black, 54 percent Caucasian, 3 percent Oriental, and 3 percent fell into the "Other" category.

The sample population by race represents the diversity of the classroom teachers, trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators. This may have influenced the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators on the performance of classroom teachers.
The researcher presents each hypothesis, respective table and decision for each hypothesis on the following pages. The first hypothesis is presented here for testing.

\( H_1: \) There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in providing instruction as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument.

Table 6 presents the results of the analysis by using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) to test this hypothesis.

Table 6

Relationships of Providing Instruction by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9166</td>
<td>.06609</td>
<td>.1720</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluators</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.6310</td>
<td>.30741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The computed means indicated there is little difference in the ratings by trained instructional and student evaluators on providing instruction. The difference between these means is less than .3 of a point. The standard deviation of the ratings by trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators suggested that the scores cluster relatively in the same area against the normal curve. There is a weak correlation (r .1720) between the ratings by the trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators in reference to their scores on providing instruction.

The probability level of .182 indicates that there is no significant relationship at the .05 level of significance between the two ratings. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted, as there is no significant relationship between the ratings on the competencies of high school teachers in providing instruction as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument by the trained instructional evaluators and the student evaluators.

This means that the perceptions of the trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators, as they related to the performance of classroom teachers on providing instruction, were different. The difference of the two groups or maturity level of the students may account for these ratings.
The second hypothesis is presented here for testing:

\[ H_2: \text{There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in assessing and encouraging student progress.} \]

Table 7 presents the results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) to test this hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9666</td>
<td>.04342</td>
<td>-.0099</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluators</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.5875</td>
<td>.39489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computed means indicated little difference in the ratings by trained instructional and student evaluators on assessing and encouraging student progress. The difference between these means
is less than .4 of a point. The standard deviation of the ratings by trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators suggested that the scores cluster relatively in the same area against the normal curve. The data in Table 7, therefore, indicate that there is a weak inverse correlation (r = -.0099).

The probability level of .479 indicates that there is no significant relationship at the .05 level of significance between the two ratings. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted, as there is no significant relationship between the ratings on the competencies of high school teachers in encouraging student progress as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument by the trained instructional evaluators and the student evaluators.

The data indicated that as the trained instructional evaluators rated the classroom teachers high on assessing and encouraging student progress, the students rated them low. This type of rating caused an inverse correlation. This may be due to the fact that the classroom teachers were 63 percent Black and the students were 54 percent Caucasian. Even though statistically there was a weak inverse correlation between the two evaluators, there was no significant difference.
The third hypothesis is presented here for testing:

$H_3$: There is no significant relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers in managing the learning environment.

Table 8 presents the results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient ($r$) to test this hypothesis.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships of Managing the Learning Environment by Trained Instructional and Student Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computed means indicated little difference in the ratings by trained instructional and student evaluators on managing the learning environment. The difference between these means is less
than .4 of a point. The standard deviation of the ratings by trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators suggested that the scores cluster relatively in the same area against the normal curve. The data in Table 8, therefore, indicate that there is a weak correlation ($r = 0.0659$) between the ratings by the trained evaluators and student evaluators in reference to their ratings on managing the learning environment.

The probability level of .365 indicates that there is no significant relationship between the two ratings at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted, as there is no significant relationship between the ratings on the competencies of high school teachers in managing the learning environment as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument.

The perceptions of the trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators on managing the learning environment were different. The students' ratings on this competency indicated that they perceived classroom teachers being unable to monitor the behavior of the entire class, while providing the necessary feedback to facilitate learning. This could be accounted for by the difference in the ages and training of the two groups, or maturity level of the students.
The fourth hypothesis is presented here for testing:

H₄: There is no significant relationship between the overall perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers as measured by the GTOI and the SPI.

Table 9 presents the results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) to test this hypothesis. The table shows that there is no significant relationship in the overall perceptions of trained instructional evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers as measured by the GTOI and the SPI.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained Instructional Evaluator</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9393</td>
<td>.11547</td>
<td>.1391</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluator</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.5952</td>
<td>.83074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall computed correlation indicated there is no significant relationship between the variables of providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress, and managing the learning environment by the trained instructional and student evaluators. The difference between the mean scores of the two groups is less than .3. The standard deviation for each of the groups on the variables in the study indicate that the scores are near the same area on the normal curve. There is, however, a weak correlation (r .139) between the ratings by the trained instructional evaluators and those of the student evaluators in reference to the probability level of .232 at the .05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis is therefore accepted, as there is no significant relationship between the ratings by trained evaluators and student evaluators on the competencies of high school teachers in the overall relationships of providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress, and managing the learning environment.

This indicated that there was a difference in the overall ratings between the two groups of evaluators. This difference could have been caused by the difference in the age, sex or race.

The trained instructional evaluators were 41-45 years old (67 percent) and the students were 13-18 years old (96 percent). Although not in a majority by sex, 40 percent of the students were
male and 54 percent were Caucasian, which could have impacted on the differences in the ratings. The data, further, did not indicate that race was a factor in the ratings by the trained instructional evaluators who were 54 percent Caucasian. In fact, the trained instructional evaluators consistently rated the classroom teachers, who were 63 percent Black, high.

**Summary**

The findings are based on the analysis of data and are presented in order of the hypotheses.

1. $H_1$: There was no significant relationship between the ratings of trained instructional and student evaluators on the competencies of high school teachers in providing instruction. When the two groups' ratings were compared, a score of .1720 was obtained with a probability level of .182. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted because the correlation of .1720 is not significant.

2. $H_2$: There was no significant relationship between the ratings of trained instructional and student evaluators regarding the competencies of high school teachers in assessing and encouraging student progress. When the two groups' ratings were compared, a score of -.0099
was obtained with a probability level of .479. There was also a weak inverse correlation between trained instructional and student evaluators. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted because the correlation of -.0099 was not significant.

3. H₃: There was no significant relationship between the ratings of trained instructional and student evaluators on the competencies of managing the learning environment. When the two ratings were compared, a score of .0659 was obtained with the probability level of .365. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted because the correlation of .0659 is not significant.

4. H₄: There was no significant relationship between the ratings of trained instructional and student evaluators' ratings by the two groups in the overall perceptions of trained evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the three competencies as measured by the GTOI and the SPI. When the two ratings were compared, a score of .1391 was obtained with the probability level of .232. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted because the correlation of .1391 is not significant.
5. The demographic information suggested that the age, sex and race differences of the trained instructional and student evaluators may have influenced the ratings of the teachers. Statistically, there was no significant relationship between the perceptions of the two groups of evaluators as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument.

The following chapter will focus on the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations based on this data.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the perceptions of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators on the classroom performance of high school teachers. This investigation was based on three teaching tasks that were identified on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI). The teaching tasks were as follows: (1) Provides Instruction, (2) Assesses and Encourages Student Progress, and (3) Manages the Learning Environment.

The sample used for this study included 30 classroom teachers, 120 students and 30 trained instructional evaluators from a metropolitan high school in an urban setting. The teachers and students used in this study were randomly selected.

The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perception Instrument were used to collect the data. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was utilized to analyze data from the GTOI and the SPI to determine the degree of relationship between variables.

Findings and Conclusions
The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to
which the perceptions of trained evaluators' scores relate to those of student evaluators in assessing the classroom performance of high school teachers. The results of the study indicated that there are no significant statistical relationships between the scores of trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Instrument on hypothesis one, providing instruction; on hypothesis two, assessing and encouraging student progress; on hypothesis three, managing the learning environment; and on hypothesis four, the overall perceptions of teacher evaluators' and student evaluators' ratings of the competencies of high school teachers as measured by the GTOI and the SPI.

Trained instructional evaluators based their assessment on observations done on a minimum of 15-minute visitations. On the other hand, student evaluators based their assessment on daily observations of the teachers' classroom performance. Students' and trained instructional evaluators' scores had weak relationships on all four variables listed in Appendix C. The data also indicated that there was a weak inverse relationship by trained instructional and student evaluators on hypothesis two, assessing and encouraging student progress. This competency is easily observable for the person with training and experience in the collection of data on the classroom performance of teachers. However, student evaluators are not experienced trained observers
of classroom phenomenon; therefore, when they assess those dimensions for this task, they are answering at the affective level for how they perceive the teacher has performed on the tasks. Student evaluators are given some of the following items to assess this teaching task:

1. My teacher gets me interested in new lessons;
2. My teacher gives me a chance to do things in class;
3. My teacher explains things again if I don't understand;
4. My teacher listens to me and uses my ideas;
5. My teacher tells me when my answers are right or wrong;
6. My teacher cares about my feelings;
7. My teacher is patient and understands (See Appendix C).

The perceptions of both groups of evaluators on this competency may cause a weak inverse relationship of scores due to the interpretation that each gives to its significance in the overall function of the performance of high school teachers, and also the age difference between the two groups.

Trained instructional and student evaluators, for the most part, showed no significant relationships in their ratings of the classroom performance of high school teachers. Student evaluators are long-term observers who are constantly observing the classroom performance of teachers and are able to appraise certain behaviors when they are the only ones in the classroom as well as when others are there to observe the interaction that exists in the teaching and learning interaction.
The demographics of the teacher population showed that the teachers were female, Black, middle-aged and past mid-career toward retirement. The majority of the trained instructional evaluators were Caucasian, middle aged and mid-career. The student evaluators were young. The majority were 13-18 years old.

The data of this study were based on the perceptions of the two groups of evaluators. Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9, which deal with the variables of the study, point out the fact that there is no significant relationship of perceptions between trained instructional and student evaluators about the classroom performance of high school teachers.

Implications

The data indicated that the two groups of evaluators had quite different perceptions about the performance of the teachers in the area of instruction. Although there was no significant relationship between the two groups, students tended to score teachers high in the area of amount and organization of the lesson content that was appropriate for the students based on their abilities and the complexity of the material.

Evidence indicated the content was developed through appropriate teacher-focused or student-focused activities. In addition, lessons focused on content emphasis, linking, and summaries which build for transfer of learning.
On the other hand, the students felt teachers did not make stimulating presentations, encourage active participation, respond to student performance and support students in the learning process.

The student evaluators seemingly felt that teachers used classroom time effectively, and the physical setting allows the students to observe the focus of instruction. However, student evaluators rated teachers low in maintaining and monitoring classroom behavior.

As daily observers of their teachers' classroom performance, students may be able to provide an accurate, objective and reliable appraisal of their classroom teachers' performance.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings, conclusions, and implications:

1. Ratings by students could be utilized by teachers as feedback for classroom instruction, since students observe teachers on a daily basis as compared to trained instructional evaluators' periodic observations.

2. Trained instructional evaluators may need to be required to observe classroom teachers for a full class period rather than a 15-minute period of observation.
3. Design an Instructional Improvement Council to include teachers and students to explore areas of students' concerns, especially at the affective level.

4. Provide informative sessions for classroom teachers to discuss the teaching tasks, guidelines and procedures of the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument.

Aleamoni (1976) indicated that student ratings tend to be the only tangible source of instructional evaluation information in the majority of college and universities. On the other hand, Keeley and Browne (1978) considered student raters to be naive in that they misrepresent faculty behavior. Consequently, in order for students to be effective raters, they would have to be trained.

The major research in the area of teacher evaluation by students as gleaned from the literature has been at the college and university levels. Therefore, the additional recommendations are based on the review of the literature and opinions of this researcher. They are as follows:

1. Since the student's evaluation of teachers' behavior is a daily and continuous process, it is recommended that the State Department of Education give credence to the Student Perceptions Instruments (SPI) in the total teacher evaluation process.
2. Students should be better informed through course syllabi about course expectations and the components that are evaluated in the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument. There may be less congruency between the two groups because trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators are not looking for the same thing.

3. An experimental research study should be conducted that would train high school students on the use of the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument to ascertain whether a greater degree of congruency would result.

Summary

The results of this study are statistically insignificant because there are demographic differences, perceptual differences and affective differences among the classroom teachers, trained instructional evaluators and student evaluators. The demographic information in tables 1-5 describes the population of high school classroom teachers, trained instructional evaluators and high school students that were used in this study by age, teaching experience, sex, educational attainment, and race.

The majority of the sample group clustered as follows: age - classroom teachers 41-45 years of age (50 percent), trained instructional evaluators 41-45 years of age (67 percent), and
students 13-18 years of age (96 percent); sex - 21 of the 30 classroom teachers (70 percent), 23 of the 30 trained instructional evaluators (77 percent), and 72 of the 120 students (60 percent) were female; race - 19 of 30 classroom teachers were Black (63 percent), 16 of the 30 trained instructional evaluators (54 percent) were Caucasian, and 65 of the 120 students were Black; teaching experience - classroom teachers 16-20 years (40 percent) and trained instructional evaluators 16-20 years (47 percent); educational attainment - 22 of the 30 teachers hold Masters degrees (74 percent) and 20 of the 30 trained instructional evaluators hold Masters degrees (67 percent).

The teachers were consistently rated high on providing instruction, assessing and encouraging student progress, and managing the learning environment by the trained instructional evaluators as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument.

As stated, the majority of the classroom teachers and trained instructional evaluators are demographically similar in years of teaching experience, educational attainment and age. The majority of trained instructional and student evaluators were Caucasian, and the majority of classroom teachers were Black.

On the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument Teaching Task II, Assessing and Encouraging Student Progress, there was a weak inverse correlation between the ratings by the trained
instructional evaluators and the student evaluators. Race did not seem to statistically influence the results of the two instruments. However, it could have affected the ratings of the classroom teachers by the student evaluators based on their youth and lack of exposure to multicultural settings. The instruments, however, were not designed to measure racial bias.
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Appendix A

Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument

Teaching Task I: Provides Instruction

Dimension A: **Instructional Level.** The amount and organization of the lesson content are appropriate for the students based on their abilities and the complexity and difficulty of the material.

Dimension B: **Content Development.** Content is developed through appropriate teacher-focused or student-focused activities.

Dimension C: **Building for Transfer.** Lesson includes initial focus, content emphasis or linking, and summaries which build for transfer of learning.

Teacher Task II: Assesses and Encourages Student Progress

Dimension A: **Promoting Engagement.** Instructional engagement is promoted through stimulating presentations, active participation, or techniques which promote overt or covert involvement.

Dimension B: **Monitoring Progress.** Progress, understanding, and bases of misunderstanding are assessed by interpreting relevant student responses, contributions, performances, or products.

Dimension C: **Responding to Student Performance.** Students are provided reinforcement for adequate performances when appropriate and specific feedback or correctives for inadequate performances.
Dimension D: **Supporting Students.** Support for students is conveyed by using techniques such as providing encouragement, lowering concern levels, dignifying academic responses, and using language free of sarcasm, ridicule, and humiliating references.

Teaching Task III: Manages the Learning Environment

Dimension A: **Use of Time.** Use of instructional time is optimized by techniques such as providing clear directions and using efficient methods for transitions, materials distribution, and other routine matters and by techniques such as focusing on objectives and providing sufficient instructional activities.

Dimension B: **Physical Setting.** The physical setting allows the students to observe the focus of instruction, to work without disruption, to obtain materials, and to move about easily; and it allows the teacher to monitor the students and to move among them.

Dimension C: **Appropriate Behavior.** Appropriate behavior is maintained by monitoring the behavior of the entire class, providing feedback, and intervening when necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My teacher enjoys teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My teacher keeps me interested in my school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My teacher knows what to do and how we are going to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My teacher is friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My teacher cares about my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My teacher is patient and understands me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My teacher lets me know if I am behaving right or wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher is polite and courteous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My teacher does things to keep students well-behaved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teacher is fair when students misbehave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My teacher teaches in ways that help me learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My teacher uses things like charts, movies, filmstrips, records, and overhead transparencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teacher chooses things such as texts, equipment, supplies, and worksheets that help me learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My teacher gives clear directions and explanations about my class work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teacher explains things again if I don't understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My teacher listens to me and uses my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My teacher tells me when my answers are right or wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My teacher talks and writes so that I can understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My teacher teaches things in an order that makes sense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My teacher uses more than one way to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My teacher works with large groups, small groups, and individual students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My teacher gets me interested in new lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My teacher gives me a chance to do things in the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I work or pay attention during a whole lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My teacher does things to keep me working or paying attention during a lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My teacher tells me why the things we learn in school are important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My teacher knows a lot about what is taught in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My teacher does things like taking up lunch money and handing out papers quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My teacher uses the whole class period for teaching and learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My teacher makes my classroom look like a nice place to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

COMPARISON OF TRAINED EVALUATORS AND STUDENT EVALUATORS

Trained Evaluators (GTOI)

1. Dimension A:
   Instructional Level—The amount and organization of the lesson content are appropriate for the students based on their abilities and the complexity and difficulty of the material.

   1. My teacher enjoys teaching.
   2. My teacher keeps me interested in school work.
   3. My teacher knows what to do, and how we are going to do it.
   4. My teacher teaches in ways that help me to learn.
   5. My teacher uses things like charts, movies, filmstrips, etc.
   6. My teacher chooses things such as texts, equipment that help me learn.
   7. My teacher knows a lot about what is taught in school.

2. Dimension B:
   Content Development—Content is developed through appropriate teacher-focused or student-focused activities.

   8. My teacher talks and writes so that I can understand.

Student Evaluators (SPI)
3. **Dimension C:**
Building for Transfer—Lesson includes initial focus, content emphasis, or linking, and summaries which build for transfer of learning.

9. My teacher teaches things in an order that makes sense.

10. My teacher uses more than one way to teach.

11. My teacher works with large groups, small groups and individuals.

### TEACHING TASK II: ASSESSES AND ENCOURAGES STUDENT PROGRESS

4. **Dimension A:**
Promoting Engagement—Instructional engagement is promoted through stimulating presentations, active participation, or techniques which promote overt or covert involvement.

12. My teacher gets me interested in new lessons.

13. My teacher gives me a chance to do things in class.

14. I work or pay attention during a whole lesson.

15. My teacher does things to keep me working or paying attention.

16. My teacher tells me why things we learn in school are important.

17. My teacher uses the whole class for teaching and learning.

5. **Dimension B:**
Monitoring Progress—Progress, understanding, and bases of misunderstanding are assessed by interpreting relevant student responses, contributions, performances, or products.

18. My teacher explains things again if I don't understand.
6. Dimension C:
   Responding to Student Performance—Students are
   provided reinforcement for adequate performances
   when appropriate and specific feedback or
   correctives for inadequate performances.

19. My teacher listens to me and uses my ideas.

20. My teacher tells me when my answers are right or
    wrong.

7. Dimension D:
   Supporting Students—Support for students is
   conveyed by using techniques such as providing
   encouragement, lowering concern levels,
   dignifying academic responses, and using language
   free of sarcasm, ridicule, and humiliating
   references.

21. My teacher is friendly.

22. My teacher cares about my feelings.

23. My teacher is patient and understanding.

---

**TEACHING TASK III: MANAGES THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

8. Dimension A:
   Use of Time—Use of instructional time is
   optimized by techniques such as providing
   clear directions and using efficient methods for
   transitions, materials distribution, and other
   routine matters and by techniques such as
   focusing on objectives and providing sufficient
   instructional activities.

24. My teacher gives clear directions and
    explanations about classwork.

25. My teacher does things like handing out work
    fast.

9. Dimension B:
   Physical Setting—The physical setting allows the
   students to observe the focus of instruction, to
   work without disruption, to obtain materials, and
   to move about easily; and it allows the teacher to
   monitor the students and to move among them.

26. My teacher makes my classroom look like a nice
    place to be.
10. Dimension C: Appropriate Behavior—Appropriate behavior is maintained by monitoring the behavior of the entire class, providing feedback, and intervening when necessary.

27. My teacher lets me know I am behaving right or wrong.

28. My teacher is polite and courteous.

29. My teacher does things to keep students well-behaved.

30. My teacher is fair when students misbehave.
November 2, 1988

Dr. Bill Capie
Performance Assessment
Laboratory
U.G.A., Route 3
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dear Dr. Capie:

I am in need of any statistical information that you can send me on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument as it relates to face validity, construct, etc.

Don Splinter referred me to you and indicated that you had the information that is needed for my research project. I would appreciate receiving the information from you as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Carrie Roseberry
(Mrs.) Carrie Roseberry
Program Assistant
Appendix E

The University of Georgia
College of Education

April 26, 1989

Ms. Carrie Roseberry
Atlanta City Schools
210 Pryor Street SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30335

Dear Ms. Roseberry:

Enclosed please find the manual which describes the 1987-88 pilot test of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program that you requested.

If we can provide you with any further information, please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joy Anderson

enclosure
MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected High School Students

FROM: Mrs. Carrie Roseberry
Doctoral Student
Atlanta University

RE: Evaluating Teachers' Classroom Behavior

You have been selected to participate in a research study that entails evaluating your teacher's classroom performance. The principal will announce to you the time and place of the meeting.

Please be assured that all information gathered will be strictly confidential, and your names and the school's identification will be anonymous.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study.
Appendix G

Mr. Lester Solomon, Associate Director
Performance Based Certification
Division of Staff Development
Georgia State Department of Education
1870 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dear Dr. Solomon:

Thank you for your assistance in providing me with the Student Perception Instrument and in suggesting the contacts that allowed me to collect the data for my research study. All of the contacts you suggested were most cooperative, which enabled me to achieve my desired goal.

Thank you again for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Carrie Roseberry
Doctoral Student
Appendix H

3789 Dover Court, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30331
April 30, 1989

Dr. Null Tucker, Coordinator
East Metro Atlanta Area Regional
Assessment Center
Georgia State Department of Education
955 North Indian Creek Drive
Clarkston, Georgia 30021

Dear Dr. Tucker:

Thank you for your assistance in providing me with the relevant information on test validity and reliability for the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument, the Student Perception Instrument, and for allowing me to use the information in my research study.

Again, thank you for your cooperation and assistance which allowed me to gather the necessary information for completing my study.

Sincerely,

Carrie Roseberry
Doctoral Student
Dear Building Administrator:

Thank you for granting me permission to collect the Georgia Teacher Observation Evaluations of the 30 selected teachers and to administer the Student Perception Instrument to 120 selected students at your school site.

All information gathered will be treated in a confidential manner. The names of respondents and the school's identification will be anonymous. The information gained from this study should prove helpful in improving instruction in the supervision process.

Sincerely,

Carrie Roseberry
Doctoral Student