1935

A critical study or analysis of rating sheets now in use for rating student teachers

Elmer L. Smith
Indiana State University

Recommended Citation

Smith, Elmer L., "A critical study or analysis of rating sheets now in use for rating student teachers" (1935). *All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2398.
https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds/2398

A CRITICAL STUDY OR ANALYSIS OF RATING SHEETS

NOW IN USE FOR RATING STUDENT TEACHERS

by

Elmer L. Smith

Contributions of the Graduate School
Indiana State Teachers College
Number 209

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree
in Education

1935

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of the Problem

A critical study or analysis of rating sheets now in use for rating student teachers was the problem of the writer.

B. Purpose of Study

The ultimate aim at all times in the supervision of student-teaching work is the improvement of the prospective teachers.[1] The use of rating sheets as one of the tools with which to help students to understand what is needed in their development or improvement is one of the current techniques. Through their use it may be possible for student teachers to make a running inventory of their strong and weak points and thus provide a means of portraying their progress from time to time.

If it were possible to secure a rating sheet which set up uniform standards of judgment and criticism, it might then prove a unit of measurement which would make comparable all ratings given by supervising teachers.

In order to formulate a rating sheet, the writer feels that the first step is to evaluate critically the rating sheets already in use. Such a study may then serve as a basis for those who would be concerned with the preparation

[1] A. R. Mead, Supervised Student Teaching (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1930), p. 504.

1

of adequate rating sheets.

C. Needs for the Study

The need for a rating sheet and the problem involved in the preparation of a scientific one have been set forth by the leaders in the field of teacher training as follows:

1. Armentrout[2] points out that some form of measurement or collective judgment on the work of the student teachers should be available. He also declares that the rating sheets now in use are, in the main, unscientific, and are chiefly the subjective opinions of the makers of rating sheets.

2. Allport[3] found in his study that most of the rating sheets now in use do not make adequate provisions for self-analysis, self-evaluation, and self-improvement on the part of the student teachers.

3. Selbery[4] points out that most of the rating sheets now in use do not make adequate provisions for further growth on the part of the student teacher.

4. Mead[5] points out in his study the fact that there

---

[2]W. D. Armentrout, The Conduct of Student Teaching in State Teachers College (Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State Teachers College, 1928), p. 189.

[3]Floyd H. Allport, "Self-Evaluation: A Problem in Personal Development," Mental Hygiene, XI (1927), pp. 570-583.

[4]Edith M. Selbery, "Supervision in General Science," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (1932), pp. 281-285.

[5]A. R. Mead, op. cit., p. 508.

has been no concerted action or scientific agreement upon what items should be considered in the best kind of rating sheets, for student teachers.

Inasmuch as there is evidence of need of an evaluation of the rating sheets in current use as a means in determining the next step necessary to more effective rating, the writer proposes to make a critical analysis of the rating sheets used by the colleges and universities of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

In order that use may be made of the findings of those who have already studied the problem, the studies are summarized in the following chapter.

II. SUMMARY OF STUDIES DEALING WITH TEACHING AND STUDENT TEACHING BY MEANS OF RATING SHEETS

A. History of Teachers-in-Service Rating

The rating of student teachers is a comparatively new development in their education. It is probably the result of a desire on the part of educators and particularly those concerned with supervision to arrive at a more scientific measure of achievement.

The rating of teachers is <u>not</u> a new thing in education, though specific check-lists of the most desirable teaching traits, and means of measuring them, are comparatively recent in their development. Meriam,[1] in 1905, was perhaps the first to make a teacher-rating scale or check-list. The effort was crude, as all beginning efforts are apt to be. He attempted to measure efficiency in terms of college scholarship, rank in practice teaching, and teaching experience.

The work of Meriam was followed in 1910 by that of Elliott,[2] who made a study of the desirable teacher traits, designing a score card in which arbitrary values were assigned to the desired traits.

---

[1] Junius L. Meriam, <u>Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching</u> (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1905), chapter IV, pp. 51-99.

[2] E. C. Elliott, "Provisional Plan for the Measurement of Merit of Teachers," <u>Bulletin of the Wisconsin State Department of Education</u>, 1912.

4

A more scientific study was begun in the same year by Ruediger and Strayer,[3] who attempted to determine the relative importance of all teacher traits.

In 1915 Boyce[4] made a more detailed rating study. He listed the qualities to be measured under five general heads: (1) personal equipment, (2) social and professional equipment, (3) school management, (4) technique of teaching, and (5) results. Each quality was subdivided, forming a list of forty-five distinct points to be rated, each with ten degrees of excellence to be recognized. Boyce's study did much to cause others to work on the same problem and to undertake similar rating plans.

In 1917 Landsittel[5] proposed a score card for the rating of high-school teachers. He listed five general qualities: personality, scholarship, method, pupil reaction, and room conditions, subdivided into six, five, seven, and three sub-qualities, respectively. To each general quality was assigned a weight: to personality, 210, to scholarship, 220, to method, 210, to pupil reaction, 250, and to room conditions, 110.

_____

[3]W. C. Ruediger and G. D. Strayer, "Qualities of Merit in Teachers," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, I (1910), pp. 272-278.

[4]A. C. Boyce, "Methods of Measuring Teaching Efficiency," _Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education_, Part II, 1915, pp. 9-80.

[5]F. C. Landsittel, "Evaluation of Merit in High School Teachers," _School and Society_, VI (1917), p. 774.

Twiss[6] proposed an extension to this score card. He added the general quality of cooperation and appended a plan whereby the rating was done jointly by a teachers' rating board, by the supervisory officers, taking into account the results of teaching as revealed by achievement tests, examinations, and similar procedures.

Rugg[7] followed this in 1918 with the first teacher-rating form that contemplated any self-rating. It consisted of two parts: the first part designed primarily for self rating, and the other for rating by supervisors, superintendent, or principal.

In 1921 W. A. Cook[8] made two cards, one for small systems and one for large systems. Teachers were to be rated in one of five classes, ranging from excellent to failure on each point. It was suggested that the rating be done by having in mind one very good, one average, and one very poor teacher, comparing with them the person to be rated. It was further suggested that the distribution of scores for the teachers in the system approximate normality.

In 1923 T. H. Schutte[9] made a revision of an earlier

---

[6]G. R. Twiss, "A Plan for Rating the Teachers in a School System," School and Society, IX (1919), p. 748.

[7]H. O. Rugg, "Self-improvement of Teachers Through Self-Rating: A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," Elementary School Journal, XX (1920), pp. 680-681.

[8]C. W. Odell, Educational Measurement in High School, (New York: The Century Company, 1920), p. 436.

[9]Ibid., p. 435.

scale known as the "Moorehead Hundred Point Scale for Rating

Teachers". In addition to blanks for training, experience,

and certain general information, this scale consists of five

divisions that deal with personal and social qualities, co-

operative qualities, leadership, scientific and professional

attitude, and teaching ability. These contain a total of

eighty-six questions, some of which are subdivided. The

total is one hundred points.

Shannon[10] secured valid data and lists of personal

qualities of high-school teachers. He concluded that the

six primary traits having most to do with success in teach-

ing in the secondary schools are sympathy, judgment, self-

control, enthusiasm, stimulative power, and neatness. Very

closely connected with these in influence are affability,

industriousness, voice, adapatability, forcefulness, co-

operativeness, attentiveness to one's own use of English,

accuracy, alertness, integrity, and reliableness. "The six

primary traits (mentioned above) will take care of eighty

per cent of all attention that needs to be given to traits

of high-school teachers."[10] These six points, then, should

be included on a rating sheet for teachers.

These studies were followed by many others, some very

much in detail, some designed more for self-improvement,

some for teacher-rating, both types for teacher-improvement,

all tending more and more toward objective measurement of

[10]J. R. Shannon, Personal and Social Traits Requisite
for High-Grade Teaching in Secondary Schools, (Terre Haute,
Indiana: Indiana State Teachers College Press, 1928), p. 88.

desired traits.

This trend is desirable since, to summarize Almy and Soreson,[11] more injustice has been committed in teacher-rating than in any other phase of educational administration and supervision. The reason for this is that administrators have attempted to evaluate by devices which elude reliable rating. A teacher's success is measured by things other than her classroom activities. She is a factor in all the educational activities, also a citizen of the community.

B. Summary of Teacher Rating

Rating of teachers, although imperfect, has improved as follows: The makers of rating sheets have agreed in the main to include such rubrics as personal qualities, professional qualities, teaching technique, management, and results to be used as major captions. They have not reached an agreement as to the number of rubrics which should be included as sub-items under each major caption or to the wording of different rubrics. Often the same rubric appeared on a rating sheet under one major caption, and on the next rating sheet it was listed under a different major caption. A number of these rating sheets have provided a possibility for personal improvement through self-rating.

Shannon[12] has given a scientific list of desirable

[11]H. C. Almy and Herbert Sorenson, "A Teacher-Rating Scale of Reliability and Validity," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (1930), pp. 179-186.

[12]J. R. Shannon, op. cit., p. 88.

personal qualities which should be included on a rating sheet for high-school teachers.

C. History of Student-Teachers Rating

The rating of student teachers is a later development. One of the early attempts to measure objectively success in student teaching was made by Sprague.[13] He prepared a rating sheet for student teachers in which an analysis is presented of the qualities necessary for successful teaching and of relation of these qualities one to another. It will serve the following purposes:

1. In the hands of the student teachers this analysis will tend to promote self-criticism and self-improvement.

2. In the hands of the critic teachers this analysis will tend to promote their comprehensiveness of judgment in rating students' teaching efficiency.

3. The records on the score card could be used as a basis for recommending graduates for appointments.

The qualities of merit enumerated on Sprague's score card are organized about four main topics: (1) Preparation, (2) Teaching Skill, (3) Classroom Management, and (4) Personality.

Among the most comprehensive studies of teacher traits is the one made by Charters and Waples.[14] In their

---

[13]H. A. Sprague, "A Score Card for Rating Student Teachers in Training and Practice," Pedagogical Seminary, XXIV (1917), pp. 72-80.

[14]W. W. Charters and Douglas Waples, The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), p. 18.

co-operative study of teacher preparation, they attempted to determine what traits were requisite for successful teaching from the kindergarten to the twelfth year of the public schools. The purpose of this study was to give those concerned in teacher training basic data with which to work.

In 1928 C. W. Waddell,[15] at the University of California, made a rating scale for practice teaching. It contained four main divisions dealing with personal qualities, academic and professional background, classroom management, and teaching skill. Under each main division were several subdivisions, giving a total number of some seventy points to be rated. Its principal contribution lies in the fact that it takes into consideration a modern educational point of view.

All the rating sheets made for student teaching have, in the main, contained about the same number and same major captions as those found in rating sheets for teachers. There is no uniformity in the rubrics used as subdivisions of the major captions, either as to number or position. The meaning of those used was very indefinite.

Brueckner[16] points out the fact that the rating of teachers has three primary functions:

1. To provide necessary information for administrative

---

[15]C. W. Waddell, "A New Rating Scale for Practice Teaching," Journal of Educational Method, VIII (1929), pp. 214-219.

[16]L. J. Brueckner, "Scales for the Rating of Teaching Skill," Bulletin of University of Minnesota, Educational Research Bulletin, February, 1927, pp. 3-4.

officials concerning the general efficiency of individual
teachers.

2. To furnish information for the supervisory group,
and to point out the teacher's strength and weakness.

3. To provide a basis for self-evaluation by the
teacher himself.

That there is dissatisfaction with the rating sheets
now in use with student teachers is evidenced by Brueckner,
who says: "The rating sheets now in use do not provide for
differentiation of techniques for evaluating the work in
the different subjects of the curriculum; in other words,
they disregard the fact that techniques are specific, not
general. The standard that can serve as the basis for
evaluating a lesson in spelling may be quite different
from those that should be used to evaluate a lesson in the
social studies." He further points out that ordinarily
teacher-rating schemes disregard the grades in which a
person is teaching, the mental level of the pupils, their
previous training, the physical conditions, the attitude of
the home, the equipment available, and numerous other ele-
ments in determining the learning situation in any class-
room.

Waddell,[17] in discussing the problem of defects,
points out other defects, chief among these in the rating
sheets now in use is a lack of sufficient emphasis on the
newer points of view in education and the newer procedures

_____

[17]C. W. Waddell, op. cit., pp. 214-219.

in teaching. He says that, since we are training our teachers to teach by an activity or project procedure, we can not judge them on a scale for a formal-drill or recitation type of teaching. If we desire our students to use the new laws of learning in their teaching, we must let them know that we shall judge them upon these points.

Douglas[18] points out the fact that on most of the rating sheets the terms are of such a generic nature that it is difficult to define terms; therefore they are less objective than they seem at first glance.

It has been shown by Hartson[19] through statistical analysis that rating scales are subject to error from a number of sources. The rating is inefficient because of inadequate information and "errors of the rater". He adds that another group of factors that make for inexact judgments could be called the "errors of the rating scale". Some of the outstanding ones are judging abstract qualities and using composite terms. He concludes that it is impossible to determine the reliability of most of the factors listed on these scales because of lack of objective measure.

Armentrout[20] says, "The rating of student teachers in a large number of qualities of merit is not practical, as

[18]Harl R. Douglas, "Methods of Student-Teacher Rating," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVII (1931), pp. 343-345.

[19]L. D. Hartson, "An Experiment with Rating Scales Based upon a Tentative Functional Analysis of the Subject," Educational Monographs. The Society of College Teachers of Education. Number XIV, 1925. Studies in Education, (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.)

[20]W. D. Armentrout, The Conduct of Student Teaching in State Teachers College, (Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State Teachers College, 1928), p. 191.

the details of rating become too complicated and there is
of necessity a large amount of overlapping of various
traits."

D.   Summary of Student-Teachers Rating

Seemingly, the consensus of opinion of those concerned
with the problems of rating student teachers is that measure-
ment in this field still falls far below measurement in
several of the subject-matter fields in respect to general
use, accepted criteria, and objectivity of rating.

There is some evidence of agreement as to the use of
rating sheets and as to items to be rated.   In general,
account has not been taken of the fact that subjects vary,
that techniques are specific, that methods have changed, and
of the fact that a teacher must be a member of the community.

Recognizing the possibility of never arriving at per-
fection in evaluating student teaching, and, at the same
time being convinced that this principle should not act as
a deterrent, the writer will attempt to utilize the expe-
riences of the past and to make suggestions for the future.
The history of all progress in science, social studies,
business, industrial life, and even the natural world about
us has been made by building a super-structure upon the
failures of the past.   Rudyard Kipling in his poem "The
Palace" states it appropriately in these words:

"When I was a king and a Mason--A Master proven and
    skilled--
I cleared me ground for a palace such as a king should
    build.
I decreed and dug down to my levels, presently, under
    the silt,

I came on the wreck of a Palace such as a king
    had built.
There was no worth in the fashion--there was no
    wit in the plan--
Hither and thither, aimless, the ruined footings
    ran--
Masonry brute, mishandled, but carven on every
    stone:
'After me cometh a Builder, Tell Him, I too have
    known.'"

Giving due credit to those pioneers in the field of evaluation of student teaching, and trusting that an analysis of the sheets in current use may prove a foundation for others who will follow, the writer has summarized what seems to be the consensus of opinion of those who are dealing with rating sheets.

(1) The chief purpose of any system of rating is the improvement of teaching; for this reason a rating plan should provide for self-evaluation and self-improvement.

(2) The methods used in arriving at a rating of a student teacher's efficiency should be as objective and scientific as educational progress permits and should be understood by all those rating and rated.

(3) The results of rating when completed should, as far as possible, insure justice to the one being rated.

(4) In order for a rating sheet to be efficient it must provide for progressive growth.

(5) In order to be more reliable and to arrive at a more valid conclusion a rating sheet should not have too many rubrics. However, if the sheet is used for an improvement sheet instead of a rating sheet, it must be specific and diagnostic in order for the student teacher

to discover his strong and weak points.

With these standards as criteria, the writer proposes to make a critical analysis of the rating sheets used by the colleges and universities of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges as a means for taking a first step in preparing a more effective rating sheet.

III. SOURCE AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A. Source of Data

As he has indicated in previous chapters, the writer proposes to determine the present status of the rating sheets in current use for student teachers. As a first step, requests for student-teacher rating sheets were made of 163 colleges and universities. Each of these colleges and universities is a member of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. This study was limited to the members of this association as this response would give a random sampling of rating sheets in current use for student teachers in teacher-training institutions recognized by this standardizing agency. The rating sheet now in use in Indiana State Teachers College was not used as the writer did not wish to criticize it.

One hundred and twenty-eight replies were received. One hundred and three institutions, or about eighty per cent of those from whom replies were received, reported that they were using some type of rating sheet and sent copies. Twenty-three institutions or about eighteen per cent of those replying reported that they were not using any form of rating sheet. Two of the institutions, or approximately two per cent, reported that they were revising their present rating sheet. Fifty-two institutions, or about forty per cent of those replying, reported that they were not satisfied with their present rating sheet. The fact that nearly forty per cent of those schools that are using rating sheets are not

satisfied with them is an indication that those directors who are training the future teachers recognize the need of revising the present rating sheets.

Table I summarizes the foregoing information.

TABLE I

TABULATION OF RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR RATING SHEETS

	Requests	Replies	Using	Not Using	Being Revised	Total	Using but not Satisfied
Number	163	128	103	23	2	128	52
Per Cent			80	18	2	100	40

The second step was to set up questions which would need to be answered through the analysis in order to see to what extent the rating sheets of these colleges and universities meet the standards set up at the close of the previous chapter. The analysis will then include evaluation in terms of the following questions.

1. To what extent do the rating sheets in current use make provisions for objective measurement?

2. To what extent is there evidence that the rating of student teachers is understood by administrators, supervising teachers, and students?

3. To what extent do the employers of rating sheets attempt to insure justice to the one being rated?

4. To what extent do the rating sheets provide for

self-evaluation and improvement?

5. To what extent do the makers of rating sheets limit to a reasonable degree the number of rubrics to be checked?

6. Is there evidence that the rating sheets take into account modern trends in teaching?

7. Is there any evidence that those who rate student teachers recognize the need for considering specific subjects, grade levels, or mental levels?

8. Is there any evidence to show that the rating sheets recognize the fact that the teacher is considered a factor in all educational activities and plays his part as a citizen of the community?

The technique used throughout this study involves tabulation and critical evaluation of the data.

B. Analysis of Data

To determine to what extent the colleges and universities in the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, who contributed rating sheets to this study provided for objective measurements, the first criteria set up, the writer examined the rating sheets received.

1. Provisions for Objective Measurement. Provision for objective measurement was considered to be indicated if there was evidence that rating was done on the basis of behavior in concrete situations.

The following table shows the extent to which objectivity of measurement is apparent.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF RATING SHEETS SHOWING EVIDENCE OF OBJECTIVITY

Indications	Frequency	Per Cent
Requests for Concrete Evidence on Certain Items	1	.9
Description of Situations Which Furnish Basis for Judgment	22	21.3
Requests for Statistical Data Based on Tests	1	.9
Personal Opinion:		
Major Items	38	36.9
Specific Points	35	33.9
No Attempt at Objective Measurement	6	5.8
Total	103	100

It may be seen that approximately twenty-three per cent of those colleges and universities involved in this study make an attempt to base judgment on objective evidence. The descriptions furnished varied from very simple to very specific information. It was interesting to note that members of one school based their judgment upon tests used. One school used a commercial rating sheet. In six schools there was no attempt to measure objectively. Personal opinion ranked highest in judging the quality of work, which leaves a doubt in the writer's mind as to the objectivity of those judgments. Seemingly, many colleges have not found desirable methods of rating objectively.

2. <u>Terminology</u> <u>of</u> <u>Major</u> <u>Rubrics</u>. In order to arrive at the data which indicated that there might be misunderstanding due to difference in the interpretations of administrators, supervising teachers, employers, and student teachers, the writer tabulated the rubrics employed on the rating sheets, using the exact terms there employed as major rubrics. This lengthy tabulation follows in Table III.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY OF MAJOR RUBRICS ON RATING SHEETS EXAMINED

Rubrics	Frequency
Personal Qualities	29
Teaching Skill	19
Personality	18
Teaching Technique	17
Professional Qualities	16
Preparation of Lessons	12
Classroom Management	11
Professional Attitude	10
Scholarship	10
Results	9
School Management	6
Management	6
Preparation for Profession	5
Class Procedure	4
Pupil Response	4

TABLE III. (Continued)

Skill in Conducting Recitation	4
Ability to Manage Children	4
Personal Fitness for Teaching	4
Vitality and Health	4
Aptitude for Teaching	4
Co-operation Professional Attitude	4
Social and Personal Qualities	4
Personal Appearance	3
Pupil Achievement	3
Social and Professional Equipment	3
Social Traits	2
Care of Room	2
Professional Growth	2
Knowledge of Subject-matter	2
Common Sense	2
Teaching Methods	2
Discipline	2
Methods and Principles	2
Social Attitudes	2
Co-operation and Loyalty	1
Social Morals	1
Organization and Management	1
Student-Teacher Relations	1
Consciousness of Definite Objectives	1
Ability to Lead and Control	1
Character	1

TABLE III. (Continued)

Factors that Condition Teaching	1
Teaching Elements	1
Physical Characteristics	1
Preparation and Fitness for Teaching	1
Attributes	1
Teaching Characteristics	1
Achievements	1
Moral Efficiency	1
Attitude Towards Work	1
Attitude Towards Pupils	1
Personal Characteristics	1
Professional Characteristics	1
Voice and Speech	1
Professional Outlook	1
Teaching Activity	1

3. Analysis of Tabulation Results. Table III indicates the rubrics used as major rubrics for evaluation. The total number of group headings, or major rubrics used, is fifty-six. The rubrics are arranged according to their frequency.

It seemed to the writer, after making a careful analysis, that much of the apparent lack of agreement in major rubrics could be greatly reduced by reaching some agreement in terminology. As shown in Table III above, "Personal Qualities"

has the highest frequency. The major item "Personality",
probably identical as to meaning, also has a high frequency.
Other items equally similar would include: "Personal Fitness for Teaching", "Personal Appearance", "Personal Qualities", and "Personal Characteristics". Rubrics which
evidently meant the same to those using the rating sheets
since sub-items were duplicated, include the following:
"Vitality and Health", "Social Personal Qualities", "Character",
"Physical Characteristics", "Social Attitudes", "Moral Efficiency", "Voice and Speech", and "Attributes".

Carrying the analysis further the writer found that the
rubrics which have to do with professional qualifications,
found on Table III above, are: "Professional Qualities",
"Professional Equipment", "Professional Characteristics",
"Professional Growth", "Professional Attitude", "Aptitude
for Teaching", "Co-operation Professional Attitude", "Attitude Towards Work", "Professional Outlook". Other items
which evidently meant the same to those using the rating
sheets, since sub-items were duplicated, include these:
"Social Morals", "Social Traits", and "Co-operation and
Loyalty".

The items which have to do with classroom management
(Table III) are: "Classroom Management", "School Management", "Management", "Ability to Manage Children", "Care
of Room", "Organization and Management", "Ability to Lead
and Control", "Discipline", and "Student-Teacher Relation".

The rubrics which have to do with technique of teaching
(Table III) and which are similar in meaning are: "Teaching

Technique", "Teaching Skill", "Skill in Conducting Recita-
tion", "Teaching Methods", "Factors That Condition Teaching",
"Teaching Elements", "Teaching Activity", and "Teaching
Characteristics". Other items which apparently meant the
same to those using the rating sheets, as evidenced by the
duplication of sub-items, include the following: "Prepara-
tion of Lesson", "Consciousness of Definite Objectives",
and "Methods and Principles".

The rubrics dealing with scholarship (Table III) and
meaning practically the same to those using the rating
sheets are: "Scholarship", "Preparation for Profession",
"Knowledge of Subject Matter", "Preparation and Fitness
for Teaching", and "Common Sense".

Rubrics which have to do with results (Table III) and
meaning the same to those using the rating sheets are:
"Results", "Pupil Achievement", "Pupil Response", and
"Achievement".

A similar frequency tabulation has been made by
William Maddock[1] of Stanford University.

It is clear that an attempt should be made to reduce
the confusion as to major rubrics, as revealed in the tab-
ulation. It will be noticed that in each group many terms
to express approximately the same idea have been formed by
dropping a word, adding a word, or using a phrase. It may

---

[1] William Maddock, "Thesis Submitted to the Department
of Education," Stanford University, California. Published
in the Yearbook, 1922-1923. National League of Teachers
Association, pp. 36-60.

be possible that eventually some agreement may be reached
and that some standard form may be evolved, as in the case
of cumulative records by the American Council of Education.
Arriving at well-defined major headings would be a first step
in such an evolution.

In order to arrive at further data which indicated that
there might be misunderstanding relative to interpretation
by administrators, supervising teachers, employers, and stu-
dent teachers, the writer tabulated the rubrics employed
under the specific major rubrics indicated on the sheet, the
sub-items employed on that sheet.

The attempt made to tabulate the frequency of occur-
rence of all rubrics on rating sheets submitted (Table IV)
was very difficult because of the indefiniteness of many
of the rubrics employed, and the use of a variety of almost
synonymous terms, presumably intended to indicate the same
rubric.

4. <u>Distribution</u> <u>of</u> <u>Rubrics</u>. In Table IV the distribu-
tion of the 187 rubrics under different major captions is
shown.

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN RUBRICS UNDER DIFFERENT MAJOR CAPTIONS

Rubrics	Frequency						
	Personal Qualities	Teaching Skill	Classroom Management	Professional Qualities	Scholarship	Results	Total
Breadth of General Knowledge				4	9		13
Knowledge in Special Fields				2	2		4
Grasp of Educational Problems					1		1
Understanding of Child Psychology					1		1
Interest in Problems of Present Civilization					1		1
Proper Use of Fundamental Habits and Skills					1		1
Understanding of Subject Matter					1		1
Understanding of Methods of Instruction		1			1		2
Understanding Pupils					1		1
Use of English	6	7		12	8	1	34
Master of Subject Matter		10			2		12
Versatility					1		1
Open-Mindedness					1		1
Professional Progressiveness					1		1
Handwriting				1	1		2
Common Sense and Adaptability					1		1

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Interest and Growth				1		4	5
Ability to Meet People				2			2
Insight into Child Nature				6			6
Influence of Children's Standard				1			1
Democratic Control				1			1
Academic Preparation				2			2
Professional Preparation		5		5			10
Knowledge of Educational Principles				2			2
Co-operation and Loyalty	7		1	12		3	23
Professional Interest				3			3
Professional Growth	5			4			9
Professional Activity				1			1
Scholarship	7			4			11
Preparation and Organization of Material				1			1
Interest in Work				3			3
Use of Materials		16	2	1			19
Ability to Motivate				1			1
Ability and Disposition to Accept and Act on Suggestions		1		8			9
Ability to Clinch Subject Matter Effectively		3		1			4
Interest in Pupils				4			4
Accuracy and Neatness	2		1	2		1	6
Devotion to School Duties				1			1
Enjoyment of Work				1			1
Attention to Details				1			1

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Sense of Responsibility				1		1
Promptness in Carrying Out Suggestions				1		1
Desire for Self-Improvement				1		1
Securing Co-operation of Pupils				1		1
Sympathy for Pupils' Opinions	7			3		10
Attitude Towards Teaching				1		1
Use of Sound Educational Principles		4		1		5
Plan-Writing				2		2
Spelling				1	1	2
Assigning Work		19		1		20
Skill in Questioning		17		1		18
Response to Suggestions	1			1		2
Daily Progress				1		1
Professional Zeal				1		1
Punctuality	4		5	1		10
Professional Attitude	1			4		5
Sociability		1		1	2	4
Leadership	4	1	3	1		9
Organization of Subject Matter		11		1		12
Choice of Techniques				1		1
Disciplinary Powers		12	13	2		27
Attention to Routine		7		1		8
Voice	22	1		1		24
Teaching Interest				1		1
School Management				1		1

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Ability to Criticize Self				1			1
Resourcefulness	7	3	1	1			12
Attendance at Conferences				1			1
Industry	7						7
Judgment				1			1
Systematizing and Economizing Routine			11				11
Attention to Lighting, Heating, etc.			11				11
Housekeeping			10				10
Seating			5				5
Pupil-Teacher Relationship			5				5
Care of Equipment		1	4				5
Organizing Power			3				3
Attention to Pupils			3				3
Record and Reports			3				3
Economy of Time			3				3
Ability to Manage Pupils			2				2
Use of Time-Saving Devices			2				2
Maintaining Authority			2				2
Interest in Playground Activities			2				2
Interest in Physical Welfare of Children			2				2
Handling of Children			2				2
Morale of Pupils			2			1	3
Tact	4		2				6
Decision			1				1

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Consisténcy			1				1
Poise	14		1				15
Directed Activity			1				1
Atmosphere			1				1
Ability to Adjust New Methods to Different Type of Pupil-Activity	4		1				5
Arrangement of Equipment			1				1
Attention to Posture and Movement of Pupils			1				1
Classroom Control			1				1
Project, Excursions, Field Trips			1				1
Report of Pupil Progress			1				1
Display of Work			1				1
General Attitude			1				1
Development of Citizenship			1				1
Evidence of Growth			1				1
Attention and Response of Class						5	5
Pupil Attitudes Built Up						5	5
Growth of Pupils in Subject Matter						5	5
General Growth of Pupils						5	5
Habits and Skills						4	4
Power of Expression						4	4
Habits of Study						3	3
Development of Thought						3	3
Development of Taste						3	3

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Good Citizenship and Health	17	1				3	21
Acquisition of Knowledge						2	2
Happiness and Contentment of Pupils						1	1
Independence						1	1
Character	4					1	5
Expansion of Worthy Outside Interest						1	1
Pupils Lead to Assume Responsibility						1	1
Study of Guidance of Pupils						1	1
Pupils' Experiences Enriched						1	1
Effort						1	1
Written Work						1	1
Influence on School						1	1
Personal Appearance	25						25
Enthusiasm	16	1					17
Self-Control	11						11
Sense of Justice	9						9
Dependability	8						8
Personality	7						7
Courtesy	6						6
Mental Attitude	5						5
Forcefulness	4						4
Cheerfulness	2						2
Integrity	2						2
First Impression of Apprentice's Ability	2						2

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Cultural Influence	1						1
Reliability	1						1
Attendance	1						1
Power	1						1
Enunciation	1						1
Ideals	1						1
Manner	1						1
Ability to Stimulate Interest		17					17
Skill in Testing Results		9					9
Ability to Carry on Work of the Classroom with Promptness and Efficiency		7					7
Supervision of Study		6					6
Drill		5					5
Unit Plan		5					5
Skill in Leading Pupils to Draw Correct Conclusions		4					4
Use of Children's Experience		4					4
Amount and Distribution of Pupil Participation in Recitation		4					4
Skill in Presentation		3					3
Pupil Participation		3					3
Reviews		3					3
Adaptation of Materials to Needs and Interest of Class		2					2
Diagnostic and Remedial Work		1					1
Correlations		1					1
Results of Teaching		1					1

TABLE IV. (Continued)

Ability of Purpose	1					1
Ability to See Through the Core of the Lesson	1					1
Manner in Conducting Class Exercises	1					1
Development of New Phases of Work	1					1
Knowledge of Pupils	1					1
Attending to Slow and Bright Pupils	1					1
Skill in Diagnosis	1					1
Stimulating of Initiative	1					1
Alertness	1					1

A study of this table will reveal that some confusion exists. It is evident that agreement should be reached in placing of the different rubrics under the major rubrics. The following disagreements are outstanding. The rubric "Use of English" was used under "Results" once, under "Personal Qualities" six times, under "Teaching Skill" seven times, under "Scholarship" eight times, and under "Professional Qualities" twelve times, making a total of thirty-four times this rubric was used under five headings.

The rubric "Cooperation and Loyalty" was used under "Classroom Management" once, under "Results" three times, under "Personal Qualities" seven times, and under "Professional Qualities" twelve times, making a total of twenty-three times that this rubric was used under four headings.

The rubric "Disciplinary Powers" was used under "Professional Qualities" twice, under "Teaching Skill" twelve times, and under "Classroom Management" thirteen times, making a total of twenty-seven times that this rubric was used under three headings.

Other rubrics with smaller frequencies were used under more than one of the major headings. It is evident that the makers of rating sheets feel that these rubrics should be on rating sheets but do not seem to know under just what major heading they should be used.

A few of the rubrics listed under only one major heading will be given as evidence of an outstanding agreement in their use. The rubrics are: "Personal Appearance", which was used twenty-five times under "Personal Qualities", "Ability to Stimulate Interest", which was used seventeen times under "Classroom Management", and "Sense of Justice", which was used nine times under "Personal Qualities".

It is evident that the makers of rating sheets do agree as to certain sub-headings to be checked under major rubrics.

Without definite directions relative to their use and a definite meaning for each rubric, it seems that there could be no uniformity of the rating of all student teachers by all critic teachers. Since the number of rubrics is so large and the indefiniteness as to their use is apparent, justice cannot be assured to all those being rated.

5. Agreement of Symbols Used in Ranking. In order to determine to what extent employers of rating sheets attempt to insure justice to the ones being rated, the writer further

studied the data to see if there was an agreement as to what letter, word, or symbol was used to indicate the different rankings in each of the several teacher-training institutions. The writer tabulated the letters, words, or symbols employed on the rating sheets in current use.   See Table V.

TABLE V
CLASSIFICATION OF GRADING SCALES ON RATING SHEETS EXAMINED

Scale	Frequency
Three-Point Scale:	
Superior, Satisfactory, Weak	1
Superior, Average, Inferior	3
High, Medium, Low	2
X, Y, Z	1
Four-Point Scale:	
Above Average, Average, Below Average	2
Excellent, Good, Medium, Poor	1
Superior, Average, Inferior, Undecided	1
Very High, High, Average, Low	1
Superior, Good, Average, Weak	2
Superior, Good, Medium, Passable	1
Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor	3
Excellent, Good, Fair, Weak	1
A, B, C, F	1
A, B, C, D	2

TABLE V. (Continued)

Five-Point Scale:

Superior, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Poor	6
Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor	3
Very Superior, Superior, Average, Low Average, Poor	2
1, 2, 3, 4, 5	5
Superior, Good, Average, Fair, Poor	1
Excellent, High Average, Average, Low Average, Poor	1
Excellent, Superior, Medium, Poor, Failure	1
Excellent, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Unsatisfactory	4
Highest, High, Middle, Low, Lowest	1
Superior, St., Good, Fair, Weak	1
Superior, Very Good, Medium, Inferior, Poor	3
Excellent, Good, Average, Fair, Poor	4
Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very Poor	5
Very Good, Good, Average, Poor, Very Poor	1
Very Superior, Superior, Average, Poor, Very Poor	1
Excellent, Very Good, Average, Poor, Very Poor	1
High Fifth, Fourth Fifth, Third Fifth, Second Fifth, Low Fifth	2
Superior, Good, Satisfactory, Poor, Unsatisfactory	1
Excellent, Good, Medium, Poor, Def.	1
Excellent, Superior, Good, Fair, Poor	1
Superior, Very Good, Above Average, Below Average, Unsatisfactory	1
A, B, C, D, F	16
A, B, C, D, E	12

TABLE V. (Continued)

E, S, M, I, U	3
Seven-Point Scale:	
Very Superior, Superior, High Average, Average, Low Average, Poor, Very Poor	2
7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1	1

6. _Summary of Data Relating to Symbols_. A summary of the data relative to different scale-points used on the rating sheets is as follows:

1. On seven of the rating sheets the three-point scale was used.

2. On fifteen of the rating sheets the four-point scale was employed.

3. On seventy-nine of the rating sheets the five-point scale was used.

4. On two of the rating sheets the seven-point scale was used.

It was interesting to note that on the three-point scale letters were used once to denote the ranking of the student teacher, while descriptive words were used three times. In the four-point scale letters were used twice and descriptive words were used eight times to denote rankings. In the five-point scale figures were used once, letters were used three times, and descriptive words were used twenty times to denote rankings. In the seven-point scale figures were used once and

descriptive words were used twice to denote rankings.

The majority of the one hundred and three rating sheets examined used the five-point scale in rating the student teachers. This is one point on which there is relative agreement by those concerned with rating in teacher-training institutions. However, there is a lack of agreement upon the letter, word, or symbol that denotes the student teacher of the highest ranking. Since letters are used by a large number of colleges and other schools in recording grades in the many courses offered, it would seem to be a better practice if student teachers were rated with a letter than with a word. If some terminology for a grading scale could be agreed upon by all colleges that offer teacher-training work, it seems to the writer that this would give to prospective employers a definite ranking of student teachers.

In order to show the need of agreement in terminology the writer made an analysis of the words, letters, or symbols designating the levels of attainment of the student teachers in seventy-nine different teacher-training institutions using the five-point scale. See Table VI.

TABLE VI

CLASSIFICATION SHOWING VARIATION OF MEANING OF TERMS USED IN SEVENTY-NINE RATING SHEETS

Terms Used in Rating	Highest	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Lowest
Superior	12	5	0	0	0
Excellent	24	0	0	0	0
Very Superior	3	0	0	0	0
Highest	1	0	0	0	0
A	28	0	0	0	0
1	5	0	0	0	0
E	3	0	0	0	24
Very Good	1	8	0	0	0
High Fifth	2	0	0	0	0
Above Average	0	10	0	0	0
B	0	28	0	0	0
Good	0	12	1	0	0
2	0	5	0	0	0
High Average	0	1	0	0	0
High	0	1	0	0	0
St.	0	1	0	0	0
S	0	3	0	0	0
Fourth Fifth	0	2	0	0	0
Average	0	0	28	0	0
C	0	0	28	0	0
3	0	0	5	0	0
Medium	0	0	5	0	0

TABLE VI. (Continued)

Middle	0	0	1	0	0
M	0	0	3	0	0
Third Fifth	0	0	2	0	0
Satisfactory	0	0	1	0	0
Below Average	0	0	0	11	0
D	0	0	0	28	0
Fair	0	0	0	9	0
Low Average	0	0	0	3	0
4	0	0	0	5	0
Poor	0	0	0	11	23
Low	0	0	0	1	0
Inferior	0	0	0	3	0
I	0	0	0	3	0
Second Fifth	0	0	0	2	0
F	0	0	0	0	16
5	0	0	0	0	5
Failure	0	0	0	0	2
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	6
Lowest	0	0	0	0	1
Weak	0	0	0	0	1
Very Poor	0	0	0	0	7
U	0	0	0	0	3
Low Fifth	0	0	0	0	1
Def.	0	0	0	0	1

7. <u>Summary</u> <u>of</u> <u>Data</u> <u>Relating</u> <u>to</u> <u>Variation</u> <u>of</u> <u>Meaning</u> <u>of</u>
<u>Terms</u>. The outstanding example of disagreement, as found in
the tabulation (Table VI), is concerned with the letter "E".
"E" is used in three institutions to denote the student teacher
ranking highest, while in twenty-four other institutions it
denotes the student teacher ranking lowest. The word "Super-
ior" was used by twelve institutions to denote the student
teacher ranking highest; however, five institutions used it
to denote the student teacher ranking above average. The
word "Good" was used by twelve teacher-training colleges to
rank a student teacher as above average, while in one insti-
tution it was used to denote the average student teacher.
The words "Very Good" were used by one institution to rank
the student teacher highest; in eight other institutions it
denotes above average.

The fact that the institutions do not agree in termin-
ology used to denote those student teachers ranking highest
indicates that justice is not insured to the student teachers
or to prospective employers, since the best student teachers
from some institutions would rank the same as the poorest or
failures in other institutions. The other variations, even
though in a less degree, carry the same injustice.

In designating the various ratings with a letter, word,
or symbol the makers of student-teacher-rating sheets have
seemingly been unable to agree. However, in using the let-
ters "A", "B", "C", and "D" to designate the highest, above
average, average, and below average student teachers, twenty-
eight institutions agreed perfectly on these rankings. Sixteen

of these institutions used the letter "F" to designate the poorest or failure student teacher, while the remaining twelve used the letter "E" to designate the same ranking.

Billett,[2] in a study of four hundred and twenty-seven high schools, found that four-fifths of these schools used the letter scale "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F". Many elementary schools, high schools, and higher institutions of learning use the letter scale "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F" to rank their students. The writer is of the opinion after the analysis of a number of rating sheets, which is a random sampling of the teacher-training institutions of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, that the use of the letters "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F" to designate student teachers of various rankings is best. Seemingly, this scale would give a ranking which would be understood by the greatest number of student teachers and employers and thus justice would be insured to all.

Almy and Sorenson[3] say, "One of the most potent reasons for unreliability of teachers' rating is the failure to standardize the steps of the rating devices used. Such categories as strong, average, weak; excellent, good, fair, and poor; and 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 do little to standardize

[2]Roy O. Billett, "Provisions for Individual Differences, Markings and Promotion," Bulletin, 1932, Number 17. National Survey of Secondary Education. Monograph 13, Part IV, pp. 424-471.

[3]H. C. Almy and Herbert Sorenson, "A Teacher-Rating Scale of Determining Reliability and Validity," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (1930), p. 182.

their meanings for the interpreters."

8. <u>Provisions</u> <u>for</u> <u>Self-Evaluation</u> <u>and</u> <u>Improvement</u>. The writer next attempted to discover whether or not there had been any provision made for self-evaluation and improvement. An examination of the rating sheets revealed that two of the one hundred and three rating sheets directed the student to rate himself as a means for inducing improvement. Since one of the primary functions of a rating sheet Brueckner[4] indicates, is to provide for self-evaluation, theory and practice do not coincide as to the use of rating sheets as a means of improvement.

Barr and Burton[5] say, "If a rating scheme is to be truly helpful, its chief elements must be self-improvement through self-rating."

9. <u>Number</u> <u>of</u> <u>Rubrics</u> <u>Employed</u>. In order to determine to what extent rating sheets meet the criteria of reasonableness in the number of items to be scored, the writer tabulated the number of rubrics employed on the various rating sheets. Table VII shows the results.

---

[4]L. J. Brueckner, "Scales for the Rating of Teaching Skill," <u>Bulletin</u> <u>of</u> <u>University</u> <u>of</u> <u>Minnesota</u>, <u>Educational</u> <u>Research</u> <u>Bulletin</u>, February, 1927, pp. 3-4.

[5]A. S. Barr and W. H. Burton, <u>The</u> <u>Supervision</u> <u>of</u> <u>Instruction</u>, (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1926), p. 465.

TABLE VII

VARIATION IN NUMBER OF RUBRICS ON ONE HUNDRED
AND THREE RATING SHEETS

Range in Rubrics	Number of Sheets	Per Cent
1--10	23	22.3
11--20	25	24.2
21--30	31	30.1
31--40	14	13.6
41--50	4	3.9
51--60	3	2.9
over--61	3	2.9
Total	103	100

Table VII indicates a lack of agreement as to the number of rubrics used. They vary from ten or less in twenty-three of the rating sheets to more than sixty-one in three of the rating sheets. On thirty-one of the rating sheets from twenty-one to thirty rubrics were used. On seventy-nine, or a majority of the rating sheets, not more than thirty rubrics were employed. Probably thirty or less would be considered a reasonable number. Since the majority of the rating sheets use no more than this number of items, there is evidence that those who rate student teachers are meeting the standard set up by the criteria "A reasonable number of rubrics".

10. __Recognition of Modern Trends__. The writer next attempted to discover whether the rating sheets in current use took into account the modern trends in teaching. An examination of the rating sheets was made to see whether any of the sheets provided for teaching by an activity or project procedure, since Waddell[6] indicated that such procedures were evidence of recent trends. The rating sheets examined did not reveal any evidence of such technique. It was indicated by the sub-items that the student teacher was rated on the formal-drill or recitation type of teaching.

11. __Provision for Specificity__. In order to ascertain whether there was any data to show that those who rated student teachers recognized the need of considering specific subjects, grade levels, or mental levels as set forth by Brueckner,[7] the writer examined the rating sheets submitted. An attempt was made to determine whether the various colleges and universities used the same rating sheet in both high schools and elementary schools. Next a careful study was made to find whether there was any evidence on the rating sheets of regard for the mental level or previous experiences of the pupil being taught. There was no evidence to show that any provision had been made for differentiation of techniques

---

[6]C. W. Waddell, "A New Rating Scale for Practice Teaching," __Journal of Educational Method__, VIII (1929), pp. 214-219.

[7]L. J. Brueckner, __op. cit.__, pp. 3-4.

for evaluating the different subjects. The same standard was used to evaluate a lesson in spelling as was used to evaluate a lesson in the social studies. Seemingly this would not insure justice to student teachers when they are rated on the major rubric pupil-result.

12. Recognition of Activities Outside the Classroom. Almy and Sorenson,[8] maintain that a teacher's success is measured by more things than just the classroom activities. She is a factor in all educational activities, also a citizen of the community. Consequently a study was made of the rating sheets to find whether the student teacher was considered a factor in all educational activities and a citizen in the community. The writer made a careful examination of the data to see if the student teacher was rated on any activities other than teaching her class, also to discover whether the rating sheets had any rubric under which to check her work as a citizen of the community. There was no evidence to indicate that these points had been included in any of the rating sheets.

13. Summarization of Data with Respect to Standards. The foregoing information could be summarized as follows:

1. There is need of provision for objective measurement.

2. There is need of agreement in terminology of major rubrics used.

3. There is need of agreement as to the selection of sub-items under the major rubrics.

4. There is need of agreement in terminology used in

---

[8]H. C. Almy and Herbert Sorenson, op. cit., pp. 179-186.

ranking student teachers.

5. There is need of provision for self-evaluation.

6. There is need of provision for modern trends in teaching.

7. There is need of provision for differentiation of techniques for evaluating the work in different subjects of the curriculum.

8. There is need of provision for considering the teacher in activities outside the classroom.

Probably these conditions explain why about forty per cent of the directors of student teaching are dissatisfied with their present rating sheets. The rating sheets that do not provide for those things enumerated in the preceding paragraphs do not meet in practice the needs which theory says should be met.

IV.   SLECTION OF RUBRICS FOR COMPOSITE RATING SHEET

It seems that it might be interesting to summarize what has been revealed in this study of rating sheets by synthesizing the data.

The first problem is the selection of the major rubrics which should be included on a rating sheet, as has been indicated by the analysis of the rating sheets examined. It is clear that the rubrics should be intelligible to those using them, but not too comprehensive. The rubric should at the same time furnish the information that is seemingly most essential, as indicated by the makers of rating sheets. It is assumed that such a selection is possible and it is hoped that by summarizing the group of major rubrics listed on pages 23 and 24 that a step in the right direction will be taken. The accompanying major rubrics are therefore submitted as reasonably representative of the group referred to above: "Personal Qualities", "Professional Qualities", "Classroom Management", "Teaching Skill", and "Pupil Results". This selection is that of going to an "ideal" from an analysis of the present practice and, therefore, is not submitted as being scientific. There is need of much further study.

"Personal Qualities" was a major rubric on forty-one per cent of the rating sheets, while the rubric "Personality" appeared on more than twenty-five per cent of the rating sheets, making a total of sixty-six per cent using the rubrics

48

which have to do with personal qualities.

"Professional Qualities" was a major rubric on about thirty-four per cent of the rating sheets, while the rubric "Professional Attitude" appeared on more than twenty-one per cent of them, making a total of fity-five per cent using these rubrics which have to do with professional qualities.

"Classroom Management" was a major rubric on more than thirty-one per cent of the rating sheets, while "School Management" and "Management" each appeared on more than seventeen per cent, making a total of over sixty-five per cent using the rubrics which have to do with classroom management.

"Teaching Skill" had a percentage of twenty-nine, "Teaching Technique", twenty-six, and "Preparation of Lessons", eighteen, making a total of seventy-three per cent using the rubrics which have to do with teaching skill.

"Pupil Result" was used as a major rubric on fifty-one per cent of the rating sheets.

Since similar rubrics appear to a reasonable degree under the different major rubrics, there is evidence to justify the use of terminology suggested for major rubrics.

Scholarship is an essential qualification for good teaching. Nevertheless, it has been purposely omitted as a major rubric. First, because it appeared as a major rubric on only ten of the rating sheets using the five-point scale, and secondly, the requirements set up by teacher-training institutions insure a fair degree of scholarship of all candidates being recommended for student teaching. Hence the task of setting up standards rests with the teacher-training

institutions.

After having selected the major rubrics, the writer faced the problem of selecting the rubrics to be used as sub-items under each major rubric. Out of the mass of data the writer ventures to select the rubrics to be used under the major rubrics, these being chosen primarily because of frequency mentioned.

In view of the justification given and exercising freedom in combining rubrics allied in sense or phrasing, the writer submits the following rubrics, as a possible basis on which to determine the teaching efficiency of those being rated. The rubrics to be placed as sub-items under the major rubric "Personal Qualities" are as follows: "Personal Appearance", "Voice", "Health", "Enthusiasm", "Poise", "Sense of Justice", "Initiative", "Dependability", "Scholarship", and "Personality".

The rubrics to be placed as sub-items under the major rubric "Teaching Skill" are as follows: "Assignment", "Ability to Stimulate Interest", "Questioning", "Use of Materials", "Attention to Individual Needs", "Organization of Materials", "Mastery of Subject Matter", "Skill in Testing Results", and "Supervision of Study".

The rubrics to be placed as sub-items under the major rubric "Professional Qualities" are as follows: "Use of English", "Co-operation and Loyalty", "Ability and Disposition to Accept and Act on Suggestions", "Knowledge of Subject Matter", "Daily Preparation", and "Insight into Child Nature".

The rubrics to be placed as sub-items under the major rubrics "Classroom Management" are: "Disciplinary Control", "Systematizing and Economizing Routine", "Attention to Lighting, Heating, and Seating", "Pupil-Teacher Relationship", "Promptness", and "Care of Equipment".

The rubrics to be placed as sub-items under the major rubric "Pupil Results" are: "Attention and Response to Class", "Pupil Attitudes Built Up", "Growth of Pupils in Subject Matter", "Habits and Skills", and "Power of Expression".

The writer has placed the sub-items under their respective major rubrics, according to their frequency as found on the rating sheets examined.

A composite rating sheet will be found in Appendix, section B.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary

As a whole, this study based on the data examined has proved both interesting and profitable in finding both qualitatively and quantitatively what is included in a student-teacher-rating sheet.

There exists some evidence that provision is being made now to measure the work of student teachers objectively. However, a large percentage of the institutions submitting rating sheets rank their student teachers by the subjective method.

There is a lack of uniformity as to what letter, word, or symbol is used to indicate the ranking of the student teacher. The letter scheme "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F" is used by more institutions than any other one scheme in ranking student teachers. There is evidence to show that agreement in this terminology is needed in order to insure justice to those being rated. The five-point scale predominated in the sheets examined.

A lack of uniformity in the number and distribution of rubrics used exists. A group of twenty-one to thirty rubrics was used more than any other one group of rubrics.

The major rubrics that predominate after combining those whose meaning seemingly was identical are: "Personal Qualities", "Professional Qualities", "Teaching Skill", "Classroom Management", "Pupil Results", and "Scholarship".

An existing need which should be met by rating sheets is the provision of a better means whereby the student

52

teacher may be able to rate himself so that he may discover his weak and strong points.

There exists a need of provision for differentiation of techniques for evaluating the work in different subjects, grade levels, and mental levels.

Another need is that of provision for considering the teacher in all of his various educational activities of the school and community.

B. Conclusions

From his study the writer decided that there are a few things which should be done in order to improve the rating sheets commonly used.

1. Prepare Descriptions. Descriptive statements made on a basis of qualitative analysis as a means of providing for objective measurements should be prepared. A good example of this may be found in Adams[1] and Howe-Kyte.[2]

2. Clarify Definitions. A clear concise definition of each point in the scale should be set forth. A good example of this procedure may be found in Adams,[3] Charters and Waples,[4] and Mead.[5]

---

[1]Edwin W. Adams, A Qualitative Analysis of Certain Teaching Traits, (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1928), pp. 16-60.

[2]Mary E. Howe and George C. Kyte, Manual of Directions for Using the Howe-Kyte Diagnostic Record of Teaching, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932), pp. 3-22.

[3]Ibid., pp. 16-60.

[4]W. W. Charters and Douglas Waples, The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929), pp. 223-224.

[5]A. R. Mead, Supervised Student Teaching, (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1930), pp. 504-508.

3. <u>Provide</u> <u>for</u> <u>Self-Evaluation</u>. Provide for assignments necessitating study of the rating sheets by the students themselves. A good example of this procedure may be found in Howe-Kyte,[6] Reed,[7] Shannon,[8] and Bright.[9]

4. <u>Standardize</u> <u>Terminology</u>. An agreement should be reached on the meaning of terms and kind of rankings. The five-point letter scheme is probably the best.

5. <u>Provide</u> <u>for</u> <u>Differentiation</u> <u>of</u> <u>Techniques</u>. Provide specific ratings for varying grade levels, mental levels, and specific subjects.

6. <u>Provide</u> <u>for</u> <u>All</u> <u>Educational</u> <u>Activities</u>. Provide means for rating all of the educational activities in the school. Also consider the teacher as a citizen in the community.

---

[6] Mary E. Howe and George C. Kyte, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 3.

[7] Mary D. Reed, Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

[8] J. R. Shannon, Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

[9] Harold Bright, Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

VI. APPENDIX

A. Bibliography

Adams, Edwin W. <u>A</u> <u>Qualitative</u> <u>Analysis</u> <u>of</u> <u>Certain</u> <u>Teaching</u>
    <u>Traits</u>. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1928. Pp.
    16-60.

Allport, Floyd H. "Self-Evaluation: A Problem in Personal
    Development," <u>Mental</u> <u>Hygiene</u>, XI (1927). Pp. 570-583.

Almy, H. C., and Sorenson, Herbert. "A Teacher-Rating Scale
    of Reliability," <u>Educational</u> <u>Administration</u> <u>and</u> <u>Super-</u>
    <u>vision</u>, XVI (1930). Pp. 179-186.

Armentrout, W. D. <u>The</u> <u>Conduct</u> <u>of</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Teaching</u> <u>in</u> <u>State</u>
    <u>Teachers</u> <u>College</u>. Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State
    Teachers College, 1928. P. 191.

Barr, A. S., and Burton, W. H. <u>The</u> <u>Supervision</u> <u>of</u> <u>Instruc-</u>
    <u>tion</u>. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1926.
    P. 465.

Billett, Roy O. "Provisions for Individual Differences
    Markings and Promotion," <u>National</u> <u>Survey</u> <u>of</u> <u>Secondary</u>
    <u>Education</u>. Bulletin, 1932, Number 17. Monograph 13.
    Pp. 424-471.

Boyce, A. C. "Methods of Measuring Teaching Efficiency,"
    <u>Fourteenth</u> <u>Yearbook</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>National</u> <u>Society</u> <u>for</u> <u>the</u>
    <u>Study</u> <u>of</u> <u>Education</u>, 1915. Pp. 9-80.

Bright, Harold. Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Brueckner, L. J. "Scale for the Rating of Teaching Skill,"
    <u>Bulletin</u> <u>of</u> <u>University</u> <u>of</u> <u>Minnesota</u>, <u>Educational</u> <u>Re-</u>
    <u>search</u> <u>Bulletin</u>, February, 1927. Pp. 3-4.

Charters, W. W., and Waples, Douglas. <u>The</u> <u>Commonwealth</u>
    <u>Teacher-Training</u> <u>Study</u>. Chicago: University of
    Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. 223-224.

Douglas, Harl R. "Methods of Student-Teacher Rating,"
    <u>Educational</u> <u>Administration</u> <u>and</u> <u>Supervision</u>, XVII (1931).
    Pp. 342-345.

Elliott, E. C. "Provisional Plan for the Measurement of
    Merit of Teachers," <u>Bulletin</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>Wisconsin</u> <u>State</u>
    <u>Department</u> <u>of</u> <u>Education</u>, 1912.

Hartson, L. D. "An Experiment with Rating Scales Based
    upon a Tentative Functional Analysis of the Subjects,"
    <u>Educational</u> <u>Monographs</u>. <u>The</u> <u>Society</u> <u>of</u> <u>College</u>

Teachers of Education. Number XIV. Chicago, Illinois: Studies in Education, The University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Howe, Mary E., and Kyte, George C. Manual of Directions for Using the Howe-Kyte Diagnostic Record of Teaching. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932. Pp. 3-22.

Landsittel, F. C. "Evaluation of Merit in High-School Teachers," School and Society, VI (1917). P. 774.

Maddock, William. "Thesis Submitted to the Department of Education," Standord University, California. Published in the Yearbook, 1922-1923. National League of Teachers Association. Pp. 36-60.

Mead, A. R. Supervised Student Teaching. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1930. Pp. 504-508.

Meriam, Junius L. Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1905. Pp. 51-99.

Odell, C. W. Educational Measurements in High School. New York: The Century Company, 1930. Pp. 435-436.

Reed, Mary D. Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Ruediger, W. C., and Strayer, G. D. "Qualities of Merit in Teachers," Journal of Educational Psychology, I (1910). Pp. 272-278.

Rugg, H. O. "Self-Improvement of Teachers Through Self-Rating: A New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," Elementary School Journal, XX (1920). Pp. 680-681.

Selberry, Edith M. "Supervision in General Science," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (1932). Pp. 281-285.

Shannon, J. R. Personal and Social Traits Requisite for High-Grade Teaching in Secondary Schools. Terre Haute, Indiana: Indiana State Teachers College Press, 1928. Pp. 3-88.

Shannon, J. R. Personal Files, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Sprague, H. A. "A Score Card for Rating Student Teachers in Training and Practice," Pedagogical Seminary, XXIV (1917). Pp. 72-80.

Twiss, G. R. "A Plan for Rating the Teachers in a School System," School and Society, IX (1919). P. 748.

Waddell, C. W. "A New Rating Scale for Practice Teaching,"

Journal of Educational Method, VIII (1929). Pp. 214-219.

B. Composite Rating Sheet

Student's Name _____   Grade _____

Rated by   _____   Date _____

I. Personal Qualities: A B C D F

    1. Personal Appearance

    2. Voice

    3. Health

    4. Enthusiasm

    5. Poise or Self-Control

    6. Sense of Justice or Judgment

    7. Initiative

    8. Dependability

    9. Scholarship

    10. Personality

II. Teaching Skill:

    1. Assignment

    2. Ability to Stimulate Interest

    3. Questioning

    4. Use of Materials

    5. Attention to Individual Needs

    6. Organization of Materials

    7. Mastery of Subject Matter

    8. Skill in Testing Results

    9. Supervision of Study

III. Professional Qualities:

    1. Use of English

A B C D F

2. Co-operation and Loyalty

3. Ability and Disposition to Accept
   and to Act on Suggestions

4. Knowledge of Subject Matter

5. Daily Preparation

6. Insight into Child Nature

IV. Classroom Management:

1. Disciplinary Control

2. Systematizing and Economizing Routine

3. Attention to Lighting, Heating, etc.

4. Seating

5. Pupil-Teacher Relationship

6. Promptness

7. Care of Equipment

V. Pupil Results

1. Attention and Response to Class

2. Pupil Attitudes Built Up

3. Growth of Pupils in Subject Matter

4. Habits and Skills

5. Power of Expression