5-1979

An Investigation of the Influence of Cooperating Teachers on the Educational Goal Ranking Behavior of Student Teachers

Susan Myrna Jones
Utah State University

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF COOPERATING TEACHERS ON THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL RANKING BEHAVIOR OF STUDENT TEACHERS

by

Susan Myrna Jones

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1979

Acknowledgments

The ship is now safely in the harbor and I acknowledge the guidance provided me in this task. To Dr. Michael Bertoch, my committee chairman, I extend my gratitude for your support and help in the commandeering of my ship. To Dr. William Dobson, your encouragement helped calm the waters. To Dr. Keith Checketts, many thanks for bailing when sinking seemed imminent.

I also express heartfelt thanks to my many friends and colleagues whose generous support enabled red skies at night to prevail.

Finally, I extend my thanks and express my love to my parents for all they have so warmly provided me.

Susan Jones

Susan Jones

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

Abstract

An Investigation of the Influence of Cooperating Teachers on the Educational Goal Ranking Behavior of Student Teachers

by

Susan Myrna Jones, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1979

Major Professor: Dr. Michael Bertoch
Department: Psychology

The purpose of the study was to identify the effects of the influence of cooperating teachers on how student teachers prioritize particular goals of education. This was accomplished by administering a predetermined list of eighteen educational goals to a group of student teachers prior and subsequent to their quarter-long student teaching experience, and to their respective cooperating teachers during their student teaching quarter. The list enabled the teacher groups to rank the goals in order of priority. In this way the cooperating teachers' goal rankings were compared to both the student teachers' pre and post student teaching goal rankings.

Twenty-three student teachers and their respective cooperating teachers in secondary and special education served as subjects. The Phi Delta Kappa Goal Setting Instrument was used as the goals list in

the study. The questions explored were: 1) are there differences between the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers prior to the student teaching experience and the relative importance assigned to the same goals by the cooperating teachers; 2) are there differences in the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers before their student teaching experience as compared to their assigned rankings after their student teaching experience; and 3) is there a relationship between any changes in the relative importance assigned by the student teachers prior and subsequent to the student teaching experience and the relative importance assigned by the cooperating teachers. To test the hypotheses under investigation, eighteen one-way analyses of variance with repeated measures were computed. Significant F ratios were found for two of the eighteen goals; the remaining F ratios were not statistically significant.

The results suggest some tentative support for student teachers' goal prioritizations of two goals changing after the student teaching experience. Some tentative support was also suggested on these two goals for the student teachers' goal prioritizations changing after the student teaching experience to become more similar to the cooperating teacher's goal prioritizations. However, the lack of significant change in sixteen of the eighteen goals more strongly suggested that the influence of a) the experience of the student teaching activity and b) the cooperating teachers' own goals prioritization biases upon the student

teachers did not markedly affect student teacher goal prioritization behavior. The possibilities that the teacher groups had initial general agreement on goal priorities, that the goals may represent stable educational values, and that instrumentation concerns may have affected the results were then discussed.

(83 pages)

Chapter I

Introduction

The field-based student teaching experience is generally viewed by teacher educators as the apex of the preservice teacher preparation program. Westwood (1967) suggests that teacher training ought to be viewed as the time in which a student constructs a personal concept of professional teacher behavior. Because of this many believe that the student teaching experience comprises the most important aspect of teacher preparation. Support for this view can be found in statements by students, (Wroblewski, 1963) professional educators, (Andrews,1965) and critics of teacher education programs (Silberman, 1970).

Due to the nearly universal agreement as to the importance of this experience, much research has been devoted to studying the impact of the student teaching activity upon student teachers. The inference made is that it is both important and valuable to obtain a wide range of research data pertaining to such an important aspect of teacher education. Clearly the goal is to understand better and therefore ultimately to better control this area of the teacher education process.

Particular research interest has been directed to those programs in which the student teacher is placed with an elementary or secondary level cooperating teacher for an intensive quarter or semester-long

experience. It would appear probable that such an intense training period would constitute a time of potentially major change and professional development to the student teacher, while providing to the interested researcher an excellent arena in which to explore potential behavioral and psychological ramifications of the student teacher's initial teaching experience.

A second area of burgeoning research interest has been in the development and identification of educational goals (Franklin, 1974). This research interest developed from a concern quite different from that of teacher education evaluation. The educational goal identification procedure instead stemmed from a process developed to be used by public school districts as the first step of a procedure structured to obtain both lay and professional group consensus of district program planning. This decision making process required as a first step some type of delineation of philosophical stands related to individual views of the goals of education. Often this delineation took the form of an exercise requiring an individual to prioritize already established lists of educational goals (Lengyel, 1973).

While it appears that educational goal identification is germane to the development of group consensus in school district programming, it would also appear plausable that goal identification may be a valuable and appropriate activity on an individual level as well. In fact, the group consensus techniques used for school districts to prioritize educational goals has as its first step a process of goal identification

and prioritization on an individual level. An exercise such as goal prioritization encourages individuals to delineate their own educational priorities, which would begin for the individuals the process of defining for themselves both the goals of public education generally and secondly, their own individual roles in facilitating the attainment of those goals.

With this in mind, it appears that if the individual process of prioritization of educational goals is of value, then it is only reasonable that newly trained teachers would be a group for which individual delineation of educational goal priorities would also be most appropriate. The effect of the student teaching experience on prospective teachers relative to their goal delineation in public education is the topic this thesis addresses.

Justification

The justification of this research was threefold:

1. To contribute further work in the area of the study of influence patterns within the cooperating teacher/student teacher dyad.
2. To explore the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by both experienced and student teachers in order that areas of disagreement can be recognized and understood by individuals involved in teacher training programs.

3. To extend the area of research involving goals in education from a concentration primarily upon the school district and community level to a broader expansion that includes teacher education as well.

Statement of the Problem

A large body of research literature exists reporting findings pertaining to a number of aspects of the student teaching experience. Studies reporting changes in student teacher behavior (Zevin, 1974), attitudes (Yee, 1969, Peters, 1971, Mahan and Lacefield, 1976), educational orientation (Harty, 1976), and in such personality constructs as dogmatism (Johnson, 1969) and authoritarianism (Young, 1971) are represented in the recent research literature.

All of the previously mentioned studies note that the observed change in the student teachers are, without exception, a movement toward increased similarity with their respective cooperating teachers. However, despite the breadth of research exploring these aspects of the student teaching experience, there presently exist no studies probing possible changes in how student teachers might value and subsequently prioritize educational goals as a result of their "out-in-the-real-world" student teaching experience. Similarily, no studies have been accomplished that attempt to link such changes in student teacher goal prioritization with those of their cooperating teachers. While the literature reflects interest in goal setting as an important variable in public

education, few studies have explored this variable specifically within the student teacher/cooperating teacher dyad.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to identify the effects of the influence of cooperating teachers on how student teachers prioritize particular goals of education. To accomplish this, a particular list of educational goals was presented to the student teachers both before and after student teaching. The list was used as the basis of an exercise that allowed each student teacher to rank goals of education in order of perceived importance to him or her. Similar goal rankings from the cooperating teachers with whom the student teachers were working were also collected. In this way the cooperating teachers' goal rankings were compared to both the student teachers' pre and post student teaching goal rankings.

This study sought to answer the following specific questions:

1. Is there a difference in the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by cooperating teachers and their student teachers prior to the student teaching experience?
2. Does the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers change during the student teaching experience?

Definitions (Adapted from Heitzmann, 1976)

1. Cooperating teacher. The teacher with whom the student teacher works directly. This person is chosen at the preference of the college. All cooperating teachers in this study shared the common variable of at least two years of inservice teaching experience. Some researchers refer to this teacher as the "supervising," or "inservice" teacher.
2. PDK Instrument. The Phi Delat Kappa Goal Setting Instrument is an eighteen item instrument that was used in the study to measure the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by the cooperating and student teachers.
3. Student teacher. The student involved in the student teaching experience. Sometimes referred to as the "preservice teacher."
4. Student teaching. A planned program of educational experiences during which the student evolves from the role of observer to full participant; conducting classes, home room and other duties. Historically the experience was shorter in duration; present trends have seen the expansion of the time devoted to the student teaching where the student is in the field for an entire quarter. Student teaching in this study consisted of one ten week (one quarter) experience.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

The literature reviewed for this study was divided into two areas of concern: 1) Influences of Cooperating Teacher on Student Teacher Attitudes and Behavior, and 2) Educational Goals Identification and Priortization.

Influence of Cooperating Teacher on Student Teacher Attitudes and Behavior

Research interest in the cooperating teacher/student teacher dyad has existed for the last twenty-five years. In one of the earliest articles in the educational literature that discussed the cooperating teacher's influence on student teachers Steeves (1952) noted:

> The teachers into whose classrooms these novices are placed have been the object of little serious study. However, it is generally agreed that they can influence critically the ideas, habits and teaching methods of beginning teachers at a particularly strategic point in their careers. These off-campus cooperating teachers generally assume responsibility for guiding, directing and evaluating the specific classroom work of student teachers even where college supervisors are employed. (p. 129)

A similar allusion to the cooperating teacher as providing a critical influence on the preservice preparation of teachers was also made by Milner (1959).

The two previously mentioned theoretical articles were soon followed by publications reflecting an interest in the quantification of the potential sphere of influence postulated by Steeves and Milner. By utilizing the case study method, McAulay (1960) investigated the impact of cooperating teachers upon student teachers. In an anecdotal manner McAulay observed the impact of the three cooperating teachers upon their six respective student teachers. He contended that the latter appeared to be swayed by the former, commenting:

> Student teachers seem to be greatly influenced by the cooperating teachers...and used methods and materials learned in student teaching in their own classroom work and neglected those presented in methods courses. (p. 82)

In one of the first studies that attempted to study the change in student teachers' attitudes during the student teaching semester as related to the attitudes of their cooperating teachers, Price (1961) found that would-be teachers' attitude scores shift in the direction of their individual cooperating/supervising teacher. Using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) scores to classify cooperating teachers and student teachers into "high" "middle" and "low" groups, Price concluded that..."eight of nine subgroups of high, middle, and low attitude student teachers changed in the direction of mean scores of their respective supervising teachers."

Price indicated the MTAI to be an appropriate measuring device due to the evidence that teachers who receive high scores on the test tend to be better teachers than those who receive low scores.

In utilizing the Saunder's Observation Schedule in his study, Price further concluded that:

> the correlation between supervising teachers' and student teachers' classroom teaching performances indicated that student teachers seem to acquire many of the teaching practices of their supervising teachers during the internship semester. (p. 475)

Clearly the importance of the student teaching process in teacher education has been recognized, as has the importance of the cooperating teacher/student teacher dyad to that process. Furthermore, the influence of the cooperating teacher upon the attitudes, values, and behavior of the student teacher has been explored to some depth in more recent literature.

In an excellent review of these previously presented studies, Yee (1969) recognized and discussed the weaknesses of the previous research. Noting the unanimity in agreement of numerous sources as to the significance of student teaching to teacher preparation, Yee rightly pointed out that the hypothesis that causal influence flows from cooperating teacher to student teacher lacked adequate emperical verification. He indicated that the McAulay (1960) study observed only a limited sample, and duly noted that McAulay had rightly called for further study in the area. Yee criticized the Price (1961) study design by suggesting that a plausible rival hypothesis of Price's results was that they were due to the regression of extreme scores phenomenon. In perhaps the most scientifically rigorous and well-controlled study in this body of literature, Yee (1969) then attempted to explore the hypothesis

that cooperating teachers exert a significant source of influence in student teaching. His experimental design involved the administration of a modified version of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory to 124 elementary and secondary student teachers and their 124 cooperating teachers at the beginning of the student teacher semester (pretest) and about 16 weeks later at the semester's end (posttest). To test the hypothesis of attitude influence, the frequency-of-change-in product-moment technique developed by Yee and Gage (1968) was used. Test-retest "r"s showed that cooperating teacher scores were much more stable than student teachers', as should be expected if the cooperating teacher is the source of influence. Yee further indicated that cooperating teachers wield great congruent influence upon student teacher attitudes, and that the cooperating teachers more often exerted the predominant influence. Yee concluded that "the practical significance of these results is that the attitudes of student teachers toward young people generally reflect the predominant influence of their cooperating teachers."

Harty (1976) examined the expressed orientations toward education of preservice teachers who sought entry into student teaching programs in minority and "conventional" settings, and inservice (cooperating) teachers who serve minority or mainstream settings. Harty administered the Educational Preference Scale to 44 student teachers in a American Indian Student Teaching Program, to 36 student teachers in a Latino Program, to 40 student teachers participating in a Multicultural Educational Development Program, which basically served Afro-American

student populations, and to a random sample of 39 student teachers involved in a Regular Student Teaching Program prior to the beginning of a given student teaching experience (pretest) and 16 weeks later at the end of the student teaching semester (posttest). No mention was made if the sample included secondary or elementary student teachers. Midway during the field-based experiences, the cooperating teachers in whose classrooms the students teachers were placed also completed the EPS. Harty's findings indicated that:

> in all four programs the preservice teachers' mean scores regressed toward the more traditional mean scores of the inservice teachers associated with the given program; the mean scores of the preservice teacher's posttest in all four programs were also somewhat lower than those of the pretest, representing a somewhat less expressed liberal orientation toward educational practice. (p. 18)

All preservice teachers in all four programs became significantly more conventional. Harty concluded that "student teachers tend to become more like their supervising teachers with respect to their expressed orientations as a result of a 16-week student teaching experience."

Peters (1971) sought to investigate the influence of cooperating teachers in shaping the attitudes of student teachers toward the teaching of English. He administered a 24-item questionnaire Attitudes Toward Teaching of English to 34 secondary student teachers both before their student teaching experience (pretest) and after the student teaching experience (posttest). The questionnaire was also administered to the cooperating teachers before the arrival of the student teachers. Five of 6 items on the pretest administration of the questionnaire reflected

significant differences in attitude between the cooperating and student teachers, but no significant difference on these items between the two groups was noted on the posttest. Peters concluded that the influence of cooperating teachers in shaping the attitudes of student teachers was very real.

In a study utilizing a cognitive dissonance framework to explore changes in preservice teachers value orientations toward education during student teacher placements, Mahan and Lacefield (1976) administered the Education Preference Scale three times to 54 student teachers clustered in 3 elementary schools for 36 weeks. The scale was also administered once during the student teaching experience to the cooperating teachers with whom the student teachers were working. Mahan and Lacefield noted a highly significant group attitude change in the direction of more traditional value orientations. The student teachers had begun their experience as significantly more liberal than the cooperating teachers as a group, and after the student teaching experience, the groups scores did not differ significantly. Mahan and Lacefield concluded:

> there is little doubt that the supervising teacher's values and attitudes exercise a powerful influence upon the orientation of their student teachers; if a perceived disparity exists between student and teacher, the student will tend to adjust his view orientation to minimize disparity. (p. 1)

Such personality constructs as dogmatism and authoritarianism have also been explored within the structure of the student teacher/cooperating teacher dyad. Johnson (1969) administered the short-form Rokeach Dogmatism scale twice in a pre and post-test paradigm to 80

elementary and secondary student teachers, and once to their cooperating teachers during the course of the student teaching quarter. He noted that the scale scores of 53 of the 80 student teachers moved in the direction of their cooperating teacher's scores, while 27 moved away. The shift in the mean dogmatism scores for student teachers who scored lower (i.e. less dogmatic) than their cooperating teachers was significant at the .01 level, while the shift for subjects who scored higher (and therefore more dogmatic) than their cooperating teacher was significant at the .05 level. Johnson concluded that his results tend to support the findings of other investigators who have examined the relationship of change in student teacher personality to the personalities of their cooperating teachers. He further suggested that the more openminded student teachers showed greater susceptibility to the influence of their supervisor than the relatively close minded.

In a study of authoritarianism in elementary school student teachers and their cooperating teachers, Young (1971) administered the California F Scale, Form 30, to 112 elementary student teachers and their cooperating teachers prior to their eight-week student teaching experience, and again to the student teachers at the end of their 8-week experience. Although Young found that the relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher's F-scale scores did not strengthen significantly during student teaching, he did note that the student teachers' scores changed significantly in a less authoritarian

direction, concluding "these factors...indicate that fairly firm predispositions can be affected during student teaching."

The literature reflects the research focus on student teacher values, attitudes, and personality changes during the course of the student teaching experience. However, changes in student teacher behavior has also been explored in the literature. In another early-late pre-posttest sampling design, Zevin (1974) studied the convergence of secondary social studies student teacher's behavior patterns with those of their cooperating teachers. Sixteen student teachers and their cooperating teachers were observed three times at the beginning and three times at the end of the student teaching semester. Half of the student teachers had been placed with cooperating teachers classified as having a lecture-recitation style of teaching; half had been placed with cooperating teachers utilizing the inquiry style of teaching in which all of the student teachers had been trained and encouraged to use. The teachers were observed, with behaviors classified on a modified form of the Flanders Interaction Analysis. Both student groups began the semester of student teaching following a pattern of interaction somewhat between the inquiry and the lecture recitation styles. By the end of the student teaching semester, the student teachers in the inquiry group showed significant shifts in the use of higher level questions they asked their students and the amount of time they used student ideas in class. Student teachers in the lecture-recitation group showed an increased frequency in categories of asking lower level questions, and decreased

frequency for higher level questions, and use of student ideas. Zevin suggested that student teachers tend to imitate their cooperating teachers in the field, regardless of the approval or disapproval of the college supervisor or education (methods) instructor.

In summary, the literature reviewing recent research in the area of changes in student teacher behavior, attitudes, values, and personality during the course of the student teaching experience suggest that:

1. The student teacher appears to change his/her position on a number of variables to become more like his/her cooperating teacher's position during the course of the student teaching experience.

2. The changes can be noted in a variety of instruments which purport to measure different values, attitudes, personality constructs and behaviors.

3. It appears that even long-standing predispositions (such as authoritarianism) can be affected in the student teaching experience.

Educational Goals Identification and Prioritization

The public's concern for, and disenchantment with, the educational process during the last few decades has culminated in a demand for accountability in education. Educators have made an attempt to react to this demand and to provide more public involvement in educational planning.

Efforts to provide accountability has quickly led educators to see the need for clearly defined educational goals. The desirability of involving the public in the process of determining these goals also became apparent.

It is from this particular orientation that the research interest in educational goals identification and prioritization has developed. The initial efforts at goal setting were usually carried out by a few people within a school district on a rather sporadic basis. Those efforts demonstrated the need for a more systematic process that would provide a framework to help districts involve a cross-section of the community in determining goals and assessing needs (Rose 1976).

Various goal setting and needs assessment models were subsequently developed. These models, although similar in their overall concept of planning, differ in such aspects as who is involved, the starting point, and procedures and techniques. Each model also has its own strengths and weaknesses, especially as it relates to individual district circumstances (Rose, 1975).

Deiter (1974), Snell (1974) and Rogers (1976) have all utilized what is termed "The Delphi Technique" to facilitate a goals development procedure utilizing input from a number of potentially dissenting groups of individuals (e.g. parents, teachers, school administrators and students). The Delphi Technique is usually comprised of three "rounds" (i.e. mailings) to a selected group of participants. Generally the participants generate goals on the first round, rate the amassed

generated goals according to priority rankings on the second round, and then re-evaluate their rankings on the third round in light of knowing the group modal responses reported from the second round. These rounds are accomplished through the mail, with each participant responding each round in complete privacy.

The strength of the technique is that all individuals involved are able to avoid undue pressure by other, perhaps more articulate individuals or groups, because the participants do not gather to discuss the goals. In this way no one person or group can control the goal development process or perservere in getting the participants to adopt a specific set of goals.

Deiter (1974) utilized the established three rounds of the Delphi technique to determine the applicability of the Delphi process in promoting consensus of goals and objectives for a secondary school English program among groups of randomly selected university professors, university English professors, high school English teachers, owners of small and large businesses, and parents. She concluded that the Delphi Technique caused the participants to generate and rank goals and objectives, and that this technique does promote consensus.

In a study using the Delphi Technique as the tool, a district-wide committee composed of as many diverse group representatives as possible worked in the development of a converging set of goals of education. Snell (1974) studied the development of an accountability system for a local school district. He utilized four mailings of the

Delphi technique, and concluded that the use of the Delphi Technique with nonprofessionals was feasible, with the goals developed being almost identical to those selected by the professionals.

In a study to determine a set of goals and goal classifications for middle schools, Rogers (1976) utilized a four-round Delphi technique with 160 respondents. After the goals had been generated (Round I), the respondents were asked to agree or disagree, on a five point scale, with each stated goal. The following round was then prepared with feedback to respondents consisting of the mean and mode responses for each item. Roger's study then differed from the previous two studies that utilized the Delphi technique, for at this point the resulting 66 goals for middle schools were Q-sort rank ordered by a select panel of 25 middle school authorities. Roger's concluded that: 1) There is a common set of goals for middle schools that are acceptable to the middle school administrators and authoritative writers in the field who participated in the study 2) A high level of agreement can be obtained on goals for middle schools using the Delphi technique as the developmental instrument, and 3) The Q-sort was a useful method for prioritizing the goals developed through the Delphi technique.

From a review of these three articles, it appears that the Delphi technique is best utilized to develop and promote group consensus in goals. However, Rogers (1976) did indicate that the Q-sort technique was useful for prioritizing the goals developed through the Delphi technique.

In another study utilizing a Q-sort rating technique, Orten (1976) investigated the relative importance of the eleven educational goals and their descriptors of the Wisconsin Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, as ranked by selected educators, students, and adult residents within a large Public School District in Wisconsin. The survey instrument used in the study was a modification of one designed by Diamond and House in their study of educational goals. The instrument employed a Q-sort rating technique which required respondents to place 11 educational goals and 42 student outcome goals into an order of priority. He concluded that there was a strong positive correlation among educators, students, and adult residents on the relative importance of educational goals for Wisconsin Public Schools, and that the mailed Q-sort instrument with computer analysis techniques was a viable tool for educational goal prioritization.

By utilizing a five point Likert scale for evaluations of both perceived appropriateness and perceived implementation of the eighteen "Goals for Public School Education in Texas," Rogers (1977) compared the differences between appropriateness and implementation as perceived by senior students, teachers, and administrators in smaller Texas school districts. Rogers found a significant difference between perceived appropriateness and perceived implementation of all eighteen goals by each of the three groups, with perceived appropriateness being higher in each instance. The comparison between students,

teachers and administrators revealed a significant difference between the groups on each of the eighteen goals regarding appropriateness.

It appears from a review of this study that Likert scales are also effective in detecting differences in beliefs about goals among groups of individuals.

An instrument developed by Bain was utilized as a model by Thongdee (1976) in his study developing an instrument to assess Thai students' educational needs as perceived by professorial staff, parents and students, and determining whether the respondents perceptions differed significantly. These three groups in a particular Thai school ranked educational goals in priority order. The response answer sheets were tabulated and mean values were computed. Thongdee concluded that the instrument provided a viable way to identify student's needs in the congnitive and affective domain of human behavior, and also enabled the discrepancies between respondents' perceptions to be delineated.

A review of these articles suggest that the Delphi Technique is most useful when goal consensus is desired and not when differential of individual's goal ranking differences is required. However, these studies also suggest that both the Q-sort technique and the Likert scales have been effective in prioritizing previously developed goals. A review of the Phi Delta Kappa Goal Setting instrument will next be presented.

The Phi Delta Kappa sponsored "Educational Goals and Objectives" program constitutes a model for community and school

involvement in establishing meaningful educational goals and objectives to assist school boards in fulfilling their responsibilities in the instructional programs of the district. This program for establishing educational goals has as its first step a systematic task for each individual involved in prioritizing a list of eighteen predetermined educational goals. It is this first step that the following research explores.

A review of recent studies utilizing the Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) Goal Setting Instrument (or modifications of that instrument) to measure the relative values of certain educational goals among different groups will next be presented. It should be noted that the goal setting instrument is a part of the total Phi Delta Kappa model for Community and Professional Involvement (Program Development Center of Northern California, 1974).

Bowdeshell (1974) utilized the Phi Delta Kappa Model for Community and Professional Involvement to determine if a relationship existed between rankings of goals for the schools by the teachers and community members. A high and positive correlation was found between the rankings of educational goals by teachers and community members.

In a study by George (1974), the differences in goal rankings among citizens, educators and students were examined. The differences in goal ranking among areas for each respondent group was tested using one-way analysis of variance. George found that citizens exhibited significant differences among the five attendance areas for

three of the goals. Educators exhibited significant differences among the attendance areas for four of the goals. Analysis of student responses revealed significant differences among attendance areas for four of the goals.

Lenghel (1974) utilized the Phi Delta Kappa goals instrument to measure the degree of concordance in the rank orders of educational priorities of a particular Christian school among the twelve school board members, and a random selection of 12 parents and 12 teachers. After data analysis, no significant differences were found among the groups.

A study determining whether there exists communality of position within and between groups of community people, teachers and students within two cities on a priority ranking of the PDK educational goals was conducted by Franklin (1974). Utilizing data from 93 community members, 116 teachers, and 106 students, Franklin concluded that members within community groups, teacher groups and student groups of the two participating cities did not agree on the relative importance of the 18 preconceived goals. He also noted little difference in the amount of agreement or disagreement when comparing how community, teacher and student groups within a city ranked the 18 preconceived educational goals.

Rose (1976) identified and discussed similarities and differences between the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by university elementary education students and by representative

community groups. Utilizing the PDK Model Program for Community and Professional Involvement, she collected data from representative groups of residents in four communities numbering 152 individuals in all, and from 56 junior and senior education majors. She found a significant relationship between the students and each of the four community groups and between each of the community in the way they ranked the 18 educational goals; however she also found significant differences in the mean values assigned by the students and the four community groups on two goals, between the students and three of the community groups on four goals, and between the students and two of the community groups on three goals. She concluded that despite general agreement, there are important areas of disagreement that need to be understood and considered by prospective teachers, by the institutions that prepare them, and by the school districts that employ them.

The Rose (1976) study marks the beginning of research interest in how teachers in training assign relative importance to selected educational goals. It is at this point that educational goals are no longer used simply for school district programming. In her study Rose utilizes the goal statements to also infer attitudes about the role of public education.

In summary, the literature reviewing recent research in the area of Educational Goals Identification and Prioritization suggests that:

1) A public interest in and demand for accountability in education has led to an increased interest in and need for clearly defined educational goals.

2) A number of models have been developed for use in this goal identification process. Among those developed have been the Delphi Technique, (which appears to be most appropriately used when goal concensus is the desired outcome) the Q-sort technique, the use of Likert scales, and the PDK instrument. Of these last three models, the PDK instrument appears to be the most widely used, with a number of studies reporting its effective utilization.

3) Research utilizing the PDK instrument has primarily identified similarities between goal rankings of community members, educators and students. Some interesting and significant differences in goal rankings between groups have also been noted in the literature.

4) Only one study (Rose, 1976) has utilized the PDK instrument with students in education to determine their attitudes about the priorities of public education.

Chapter III

Methodology

This study sought to identify the effects of the influence of cooperating teachers on how student teachers prioritize particular goals of education. The procedures utilized to accomplish this study will be outlined in this chapter.

Sample

Participants for the study were (1) preservice teacher education majors obtaining their secondary or special education student teaching experience at Moorehead State University in Moorehead, Minnesota, fall quarter, 1978 and (2) the cooperating teachers with whom they worked.

The study did not include any elementary education student teachers due to practical considerations. The elementary education program at Moorehead State University is structured differently from the secondary and the special education programs. Therefore, an intensive student teaching experience for elementary education students similar to the secondary education and the special education programs is not in existence.

Thirty-three students attended the pretesting session in which the PDK instrument was administered. In the course of the student

teaching quarter, four students did not complete the student teaching requirement and were dropped from the program, and three students did not choose to continue participation in the study. Twenty-six student teachers successfully completed student teaching and participated in both the pre and post student teaching testing sessions. Since data analysis required each student's cooperating teachers' goal rankings, the scores of the three students whose cooperating teachers did not participate in the study were then dropped.

Demographic data were collected at the pretesting session and can be used to describe the student teacher group. This information is presented in Table 1. Eighteen women and five men comprised the sample; the mean age was twenty-two years. The sample group had averaged ten quarters at MSU, and averaged thirty-five credits in education classes. The majority of the student teachers had had some previous practicum experience for at least one quarter, most commonly as a teacher's aide. Only five subjects reported no previous classroom experience. The most common majors reported by the subjects were Business Education and Special Education.

The cooperating teacher group was comprised of those individual teachers with whom the student teachers worked. These teachers were contacted by the university teacher education program staff to serve in this capacity. Twenty-six cooperating teachers were involved with the student teachers. Twenty-three participated in the study.

Table I
Characteristics of the Student Teacher Group

Age	N
18.5 - 20.5	1
20.5 - 22.5	16
22.5 - 24.5	2
24.5 - 26.5	2
26.5 - 28.5	1
> 28.5	1

Credits in Education

	N
5 - 20	1
21 - 25	2
26 - 30	6
31 - 35	7
36 - 40	1
41 - 45	1
46 - 50	2
> - 50	2
no response	1

Major	N
Special Education	7
Business Education	6
Industrial Education	3
Physical Education	1
English	3
German	1
Spanish	1
Speech Pathology	1

Sex	N
Male	5
Female	18

Number of quarters at MSU

	N
> 6	1
7 - 8	2
9 - 10	9
11 - 12	6
13 - 14	2
15 - 16	1
17 - 19	1

Previous Experience (in quarters)

		N
a) teacher aide	1	8
	2-3	4
	6	3
b) reading clinic	1	2
c) practice speech clinician	1	1
d) no previous experience		5

Demographic data describing the cooperating teachers are presented in Table 2.

Twelve women and eleven men comprised the sample, the mean age being forty-three years. Fourteen of the sample group had earned a B.A. or B.S. degree; the remainder were at the master's level. The cooperating teacher group averaged fifteen years of teaching, and had supervised an average of ten student teachers. A number of teaching majors were represented in the group.

Treatment/Procedure

The present study included data collected from both the student teacher and cooperating teacher groups. The student teachers participated in full-time student teaching in the classrooms of the cooperating teachers during the interim between the two student teacher test administrations.

The Student Teacher Pre Student Teaching Testing. The group administration of the PDK instrument to the student teachers prior to their student teaching experience was accomplished at an organizational meeting for all student teachers held at the beginning of the quarter.

As the students entered the room they were handed a packet containing 1) the Informed Consent Agreement Sheet 2) the Background Information Sheet 3) the PDK Individual Goal Rating Sheet, 4) the PDK Directions for Individual Members of the Representative Community Committee sheet 5) a PDK display board, and 6) an envelope

Table 2
Characteristics of Cooperating Teacher Group

Age	N
< 25.5	2
25.5 - 35.5	6
35.5 - 45.5	3
45.5 - 55.5	11
> 55.5	1

Sex	N
Male	11
Female	12

Highest Degree Obtained:

	N
B.A./B.S.	14
M.A./M.S.	9

Years Experience

	N
1 - 5	3
6 - 10	6
11 - 15	6
16 - 20	1
20 - 25	4
> 25	3

Number of Student Teachers Supervised

	N
1 - 5	7
6 - 10	6
11 - 15	7
> 15	2
no response	1

Major	N		N
Business Education	5	Industrial Education	3
Business Education/Spanish	1	Special Education	2
Business/Physical Education	1	English	2
Physical Education	3	German	1
Physical Education/Biology	1	Spanish/Home Ec	1
Physical Education/Soc Stu	1	History	2

containing 45 red disks (used in the test to determine the number of "points" awarded to each goal), and the eighteen PDK educational goals on cards. The packet items appear in Appendixes E through H.

The Dean of Education and Regional Services, in his speech to welcome the student teachers into the program, also introduced the testing by stating that the research investigation was related to the impending National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluation and accreditation visit. Due to that process, the Dean indicated to the student teachers that some self-study and research into the teacher education program was being implemented. He encouraged the student teacher group to participate in that process. The Dean then introduced the researcher as the individual in charge of the investigation.

The researcher then introduced herself and the PDK instrument. These comments and directions may be found in Appendix D.

The student teachers completed the exercise and transferred their results to their PDK Individual Goal Rating Sheet, and then turned in their completed packets. The researcher was available to answer any questions.

Student Teacher Post Student Teaching Testing. The second and final student teacher testing session was held at the end of the fall student teaching quarter. The student teachers were similarly given packets containing all items distributed in the pretesting session with

the exception of the Informed Consent Agreement Sheet and the Background Information Sheet. The directions for the goals instrument were again read to the students.

Cooperating Teacher Testing Session. All cooperating teachers were invited to an introductory meeting held prior to the student teaching quarter on the MSU campus. A copy of the memorandum inviting the cooperating teachers to the meeting appears in Appendix B. It was planned that the goals instrument would be administered at that time to the cooperating teacher group. However, only four cooperating teachers attended the meeting. These individuals were introduced to the PDK instrument and the consent and background information forms in a way entirely similar to the introduction outlined in the Student Teacher Administration section of this chapter. A copy of the cooperating teacher background information form appears in Appendix A.

The majority of the cooperating teacher group was contacted on a one-to-one basis by the student teacher supervisors during their first visit in the cooperating teachers' classrooms. At this time they were invited to complete the PDK instrument. A memorandum from the Dean of Education and Regional Services, introducing the research and encouraging cooperating teacher participation was also presented to the cooperating teachers by the student teacher supervisors at this time. A copy of this memorandum appears in Appendix C.

The eighteen item Phi Delat Kappa Goal Setting Instrument (a copy of which appears in Appendix G) was selected to measure the

relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by the student and cooperating teachers.

The list of educational goals originated with the Program Development Center at the California State University, Chico, through a grant from the United States Office of Education, as part of the Phi Delta Kappa Model for community and professional involvement. In April 1972, the Commission on Educational Planning of Phi Delta Kappa began distribution of the model program. Since that time the program has been used extensively by many school districts for establishing educational goals and writing performance objectives. The program consists of a series of strategies to monitor community responses to a set of pre-determined educational goals, followed by a programmed method for writing of performance objectives by the teachers in a school district. The end result is an instructional-management program design.

The PDK instrument requires that an individual "award" each of the 18 goals with 0 to 5 points. The more points a particular goal is awarded the more important that particular goal is to the individual. Only 45 points can be used in rating the goals.

Although the PDK Goals Setting Instrument is in actuality Phase I of the total procedure outlined above, numerous studies have been reported specifically using Phase I (Phi Delta Kappa, 1974).

The entire model has been field-tested in the California School Districts from 1969 through 1972 with more than three thousand

educators representing schools and colleges across the nation attending workshops set up to design and refine the model. The closed questionnaire form was chosen as the one which would give the desired results. It was felt that this simple and inexpensive system, which is a non-threatening procedure, would develop outcomes which would have practical application for a school district or community.

Dr. Wilmer Bugher, the Associate Executive Secretary and Director of the Phi Delta Kappa Center for Dissemination of Innovative Programs in Bloomington, Indiana, summarized his recollections about the development of the PDK instrument (Bugher, Note 1):

> A survey was made in which goal statements were collected from many school districts throughout the nation. Recognizing that school districts would need a lot of help, Dr. Rose [the developer of the instrument] examined the results of this study and found that there appeared to be a lot of commonality in the goal statements that were submitted from different districts throughout the nation. It was recognized, however, that if citizens were to be involved in the identification/prioritization of goals, that statements would need to be written so that they would communicate most effectively to lay citizens in a community. After pulling together those statements which appeared most frequently, it was decided that goal clarifying statements should be added to help communicate more effectively to individuals who would be asked to prioritize the goals.
>
> The gaming device was a creation of Dr. Rose. The forced choice technique which ultimately leads to the most important goal was [also] conceived by Dr. Rose. After piloting the original statements with a number of different groups of citizens in different school districts, repeated revisions were made until the authors were satisfied that the statements were in the best condition possible.

Research Design

The one group pretest posttest design was used for this study. A number of variables supported the use of this paradigm:

1. The dependent variable (relative importance assigned to selected educational goals) was argued to be a relatively stable one. Certainly the dependent variable was not likely to change due to maturation.
2. The interval between the pretest and the posttest was short.
3. The only possible control group available for the study was other teacher education majors who were not yet far enough in their studies to be student teaching. However, this group differed from the student teacher population on a number of descriptive variables such as age and number of education courses completed. Most importantly, the teacher education majors could strongly differ for student teacher group in their motivation and commitment in completing the teacher education program. Clearly the concern related to the appropriateness of such a group to serve as a control in studies of student teachers was reflected in the literature, where student teachers are studied almost without exception in a one group pretest posttest design (Yee, 1969).

Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed utilizing one-way analyses of variance with repeated measures.

For each of the eighteen goals, the mean of the cooperating teacher group ranking, the pre-student teacher group rankings and the post-student teacher group rankings were compared.

Chapter IV

Results

This study sought to answer the two following specific questions:

1. Is there a difference in the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by cooperating teachers and their student teachers prior to the student teaching experience?
2. Does the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers change during the student teaching experience?

Both of these questions were statistically tested in the study by utilizing analyses of variance. A presentation of the results of these analyses is made in this chapter.

One of the hypotheses considered in the study stated that there is no difference between the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers completed prior to the student teaching experience and the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by cooperating teachers. To test this hypothesis, eighteen one way analyses of variance with repeated measures were computed, each one testing one of the eighteen goals of education comprising the PDK instrument. For each of the eighteen analyses, a set

of twenty-three triads was determined. These triads were composed of:

1) the student teacher's pre-student teaching assigned rankings for the particular goal.
2) the student teacher's post-student teaching assigned rankings for the particular goal and
3) the cooperating teacher's assigned rankings for the particular goal.

From the mean square for the student teacher versus cooperating teacher variance and the mean square for the residual variance, the amount of variation between the three scores comprising the triads was determined for each of the eighteen goals.

The obtained F values are presented in Table 3. Sixteen of these values were not significant at the .05 level, indicating no difference between groups.

Analysis of the two remaining goals "Learn how to be a good citizen" and "Gain information needed to make job selections" produced F values significant at the .05 level. An examination of the group means of these two goals (presented in Table 3) posits that significant differences between the pre-student teaching goal ranking means and the cooperating teacher goal ranking means existed in these two goals.

A second hypothesis investigated in this study stated that there is no difference in the relative importance assigned to selected

Table 3
Analyses of Variance for the Eighteen Goals of Education

Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
Goal No. 1. "Learn how to be a good citizen"				
Between triads	52.81	22	2.4	
Within triads	64.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	17.94	2	8.97	8.54*
Residual	46.06	44	1.05	
Group means for goal no. 1				
Pre student teaching	1.78			
Post student teaching	2.00			
Cooperating teachers	2.96			
Goal No. 2. "Learn how to respect and get along with people who think, dress, and act differently."				
Between triads	23.91	22	1.09	
Within triads	90.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	4.17	2	2.09	1.07
Residual	85.83	44	1.95	
Goal No. 3. "Learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world."				
Between triads	22.16	22	.96	
Within triads	52.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	3.25	2	1.62	1.46
Residual	48.75	44	1.11	

* $p < .05$

Table 3 (Continued)

Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
Goal No. 4. "Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening."				
Between triads	76.67	22	3.48	
Within triads	64.66	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	.46	2	.23	.16
Residual	64.20	44	1.46	
Goal No. 5. "Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals."				
Between triads	25.07	22	1.14	
Within triads	37.61	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	3.60	2	1.80	2.61
Residual	30.41	44	.69	
Goal No. 6. "Learn how to examine and use information."				
Between triads	46.99	22	2.14	
Within triads	50.67	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	6.35	2	3.17	3.14
Residual	44.32	44	1.01	
Goal No. 7. "Understand and practice the skills of family living."				
Between triads	49.74	22	2.26	
Within triads	52.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	1.83	2	.91	.80
Residual	50.17	44	1.14	

Table 3 (Continued)

Source of Information	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
Goal No. 8. "Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live."				
Between triads	44.64	22	2.02	
Within triads	48.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	.55	2	.28	.26
Residual	47.45	44	1.08	
Goal No. 9. "Develop skills to enter a specific field of work."				
Between triads	51.91	22	2.36	
Within triads	45.34	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	3.86	2	1.93	2.05
Residual	41.48	44	.94	
Goal No. 10. "Learn how to be a good manager of money, property, and resources."				
Between triads	21.91	22	1.00	
Within triads	63.34	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	1.25	2	.62	.44
Residual	62.09	44	1.41	
Goal No. 11. "Develop a desire for learning now and in the future."				
Between triads	61.07	22	2.78	
Within triads	80.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	3.25	2	1.62	.93
Residual	76.75	44	1.74	

Table 3 (Continued)

Source of Information	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F.
Goal No. 12. "Learn how to use leisure time."				
Between triads	66.49	22	3.02	
Within triads	54.66	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	.46	2	.23	.19
Residual	54.20	44	1.23	
Goal No. 13. "Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety."				
Between triads	65.77	22	2.99	
Within triads	42.00	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	.46	2	.23	.24
Residual	41.54	44	.94	
Goal No. 14. "Appreciate culture and beauty in the world."				
Between triads	52.67	22	2.39	
Within triads	47.33	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	1.04	2	.52	.50
Residual	46.29	44	1.05	
Goal No. 15. "Gain information needed to make job selections."				
Between triads	17.48	22	.79	
Within triads	33.33	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	5.59	2	2.80	4.44*
Residual	27.74	44	.63	
Group Means for Goal No. 15				
Pre student teaching	1.22			
Post student teaching	1.61			
Cooperating teachers	1.91			

* $p < .05$

Table 3 (Continued)

Source of Information	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F.
Goal No. 16. "Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth."				
Between triads	15.22	22	.69	
Within triads	47.33	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	5.68	2	2.84	2.99
Residual	41.65	44	.95	
Goal No. 17. "Develop good character and self-respect."				
Between triads	34.14	22	1.55	
Within triads	55.34	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	2.70	2	1.35	1.13
Residual	52.64	44	1.20	
Goal No. 18. "Gain a general education."				
Between triads	49.91	22	2.27	
Within triads	87.33	46		
Students vs. cooperating teachers	7.16	2	3.58	1.97
Residual	80.17	44	1.82	

educational goals by student teachers before their student teaching experience as compared to their assigned rankings after the student teaching experience. This hypothesis was tested with the same statistical analyses as outlined to test the first hypothesis, resulting in the F ratios previously noted. Examination of the trends in the data suggest that the two significant F ratios do not reflect a significant difference in the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals by student teachers before their student teaching experience as compared to their assigned rankings after their experience. As indicated in the discussion of the first hypothesis, the sixteen nonsignificant F ratios indicate no difference between groups.

The third and final hypothesis considered in this study stated that there is no relationship between any changes in the relative importance of the goals assigned by the student teachers prior and subsequent to the student teaching experience and the relative importance assigned by the cooperating teachers. Again, this hypothesis was tested with the same statistic as the previous two hypotheses, and reference to Table 3 is again indicated. Of the two significant F ratios, consideration of the group means (See Table 3) suggest that the student teachers' post student teaching importance assigned to these two goals are more similar to the cooperating teachers goal assignments than the pre-student teaching student teacher importance assigned. However, it should be emphasized that this trend is not statistically significant, and is therefore presented tentatively and should be interpreted with caution.

Due to the large number of analyses and the probability for a Type I error for the study set at the .05 level, (i.e. acceptance of the null hypothesis when the null hypothesis is, in fact, false), about one chance in twenty existed of making such an error in this study. It would therefore be unsurprising to obtain one significant F ratio by chance alone in the computation of eighteen analyses. As reported, only two F ratios in this study were found to be significant, appearing to indicate weak support at best for the hypotheses under study. Due to the equivocal data results, further post hoc analyses were not computed.

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusions

The primary goal of this study was to identify the effects of the influence of cooperating teachers on how student teachers prioritize particular goals of education. To accomplish this a list of educational goals was presented to a group of student teachers before and after their student teaching experience. The student teachers then ranked the predetermined goals of education in order of perceived importance. Similar goal rankings from the cooperating teachers with whom the student teachers worked were collected in order to compare their goal rankings to the student teachers' pre and post-student teaching goal rankings. The objectives of this study, as outlined previously, were successfully accomplished.

This chapter will discuss and draw conclusions and implications from the data presented in Chapter IV.

Discussion of Results

No differences were found in the relative importance assigned to sixteen of the eighteen selected educational goals by the student teachers prior to student teaching, the relative importance assigned by the student teachers after their student teaching experience, and the relative importance assigned by their cooperating teachers. A significant

difference was noted in the relative importance assigned by the groups to the two remaining goals, "Learn how to be a good citizen," and "Gain information needed to make job selections."

The results of the two goals whose statistical analyses obtained significant F ratios will first be discussed, after which the bulk of this chapter will address the more general implications of the study's major findings of the reported lack of significant differences among the teacher groups on the prioritization of the remaining sixteen goal statements.

Two major observations can be noted from the significant results obtained from the two previously mentioned goals. First, for both of these goals, the significant F ratio obtained appeared to indicate a difference between the student teachers pre-student teaching goal rankings and the cooperating teacher's goal rankings (see Table 3). Second, for both of these goals, the trends noted in the means of the relative importance of the goals assigned by the groups suggested that for these two goals the post student teaching student teachers' means were more similar to the cooperating teachers' means than the pre student teaching student teachers' means. However, this second observation is only a trend in the data, and is duly noted to be such.

As outlined in the previous chapter, at the 95% confidence level, chance alone would lead to an expectation of significant results in one of twenty analyses. Since eighteen analyses were computed, probability factors dictated that at least one of the analyses to be significant by

chance. The fact that two analyses were significant is, in the writer's opinion, an indication of the weakness of the phenomenon measured. Due to this reservation, the author's interpretation of this data is approached with caution.

It is clear from the results presented in Table 3 that in the case of these two goal statements, the student teachers began their student teaching experience valuing these particular goals of education much less highly than their cooperating teachers. It is also clear that the trends in the data indicated a post student teaching move toward an attitude more similar to the cooperating teacher's. However, this movement toward the cooperating teacher's evaluation is, emphatically, only a trend. In any case, a slight tendancy toward alignment with the relative importance assigned by the cooperating teacher is noted. However, the two cases in which this trend is noted must be evaluated within the total context of the study's findings, since sixteen of the eighteen goals under investigation indicated no significant differences. These lack of significant findings are, in the author's opinion, more important to the study's major conclusions. The implications for these findings will be discussed below.

The result that the analyses of sixteen of the eighteen goals presented no significant differences appears to indicate that the relative importance student teachers assigned to these sixteen educational goals was not affected or influenced by either a) the student teaching experience *per se* (perhaps related to being in a real classroom for the first

time) or b) the cooperating teacher's own prioritization of educational goals and the subsequent influence of these priorities upon the student teacher. Despite numerous cases in the research literature suggesting that even long standing predispositions can change as a result of the student teaching experience (Yee, 1969, Young, 1971), few observed changes in the relative importance assigned to selected educational goals in the student teachers were noted in this study.

A possible speculative hypothesis to explain the lack of significant differences in the sixteen goals rests in the contention that the goals in education outlined in the PDK instrument in some way delineated an individual's values in education. Values are by definition strongly held judgements that are based on abstract concepts or broad classifications which are fairly stable to the individual and temporally long lasting (Harrison, 1972). If this were the case, it would appear consistent that these values would not change to any great degree during the course of the student teaching quarter. No studies specifically exploring change in student teacher values have been reported in the literature.

A second possible hypothesis for this major finding of the study is that there existed more similarities than differences in the relative importance assigned to a majority of the goals by the pre-student teaching students and their cooperating teachers. If these two groups generally concurred on the relative importance of these goals, then there could be little movement on the student teacher's part toward a post student teaching response more similar to that of the cooperating teacher. This

would then result in non-significant findings. The results of the study may reflect the possibility that there exists nearly universal agreement by individuals who are teaching or about to be teaching as to appropriate goals in public education. Therefore, student teacher change in goal prioritization could not be noted, nor could any differences between groups. The study's results could therefore simply reflect the totally non-controversial nature of the goal prioritization task.

It is the writer's opinion that instrumentation may have played a role in the obtained results of the study. The PDK instrument was developed to be utilized, as previously mentioned, in a school district setting to obtain group consensus of school goals and priorities. It was not specifically developed to be utilized in a pre and post testing situation as an instrument sensitive to an individual's changes in goals prioritization. Secondly, pretest-posttest reliability data for the instrument is sparse (Bugher, Note 1), although the lack of change noted in the student teachers' pre student teaching to post student teaching scores may be in itself an indication of test-retest reliability.

It is possible, therefore, that the PDK instrument's test-retest reliability is such that the instrument is not effective in noting the subtle changes that may occur in an individual's goal prioritization from a ten-week student teaching experience. The reliability of the instrument is further affected by the ipsative nature of the test. All 45 "points" must be used when taking the test. This both limits the

range of scores obtainable and leads to the situation of interdependancy of test items. With 45 points needing to be used, a change in the number of the points awarded to one goal will automatically change the number of points awarded to another goal.

The literature indicated clearly that the PDK goals instrument was both useful and valid for identification of goal priorities; however, the need for greater test-retest reliability in the instrument may have overshadowed the instrument's many strengths. Since none of the other goals instruments have reported any reliability data in the literature either, it appears essential that before similar research to this study is again conducted, a more sensitive and reliable non-ipsative measuring device must be developed.

Some comments pertaining to methodology are also in order at this time. It is the writer's opinion that the results of the study were not related to methodological concerns; however, the study's results might have been better understood had the cooperating teacher group been pre and posttested in a similar manner to the student teachers. However, instrumentation concerns suspected in influencing the results of the study far outweigh this methodological weakness.

Conclusions

On two of the eighteen goal statements, a significant difference between the relative importance assigned to these goals by the pre student teaching student group, and the cooperating teacher group was

noted. Since approximately one of the eighteen analyses was expected to be significant due only to chance, the interpretation of this rather inconclusive finding is made cautiously. This result suggests some tentative support for student teachers' assigned relative importance to these two goal changing after the student teaching experience to becoming more similar to the cooperating teacher's assigned relative importance.

However, this tentative finding on these two goals must be viewed within the framework of the lack of significant results on the remaining sixteen goals. It is the writer's opinion that these results are the more relevant of the two sets of findings.

The insignificant differences noted between the pre-student teaching goals prioritization, post-student teaching goals prioritization and the cooperating teacher goal prioritization in sixteen of the eighteen goals suggests that the influence of a) the experience of the student teaching activity, and b) the cooperating teacher's own goals prioritization biases upon the student teacher does not markedly affect student teacher goal prioritization behavior.

The writer suggests three possible hypotheses for the study's results. The first hypothesis presents the possibility that the educational goals prioritizations reflect an individual's own personal values about education. Values are durable and stable personal judgements, and therefore would not be as susceptible to change during a ten week

time period as either teaching behaviors or attitudes. Because of this, few changes in student teacher goal prioritization would be unsurprising.

A second possibility forewards the theory that the lack of group differences in goal prioritization simply reflects the non-controversial nature of the task, and suggests that general universal agreement about the role of public education may exist for those who are teaching and who are about to be teaching.

A third hypothesis forewarded by the writer in discussing the results of the study relate to instrumentation. The instrument used in the study may have been weak in that it: 1) was developed to be used in a different setting for a different purpose 2) may have insufficient reliability to measure subtle changes in prioritization, and 3) is ipsative in nature, which presents concerns both of changes in one score in the instrument affecting changes in other scores, and in limitations to the range of possible scores obtainable.

Limitations of the Study

1. The student teaching experience was only ten weeks (one quarter) in duration.
2. The sample size was small (i.e. less than thirty cooperating teacher-student teacher dyads), thus lessening the study's generalizability.

3. The Moorehead State University secondary and special education student teacher population was not systematically checked on a number of variables to ascertain if it was representative of student teacher groups at all universities.
4. The student teachers were not randomly assigned to their cooperating teachers. Instead, subject matter and grade level played a part in student teacher placement.
5. The cooperating teachers were not randomly selected to serve in their capacity.

Recommendations

In further study of changes in educational goal prioritization in student teachers as related to cooperating teachers goal prioritization, it is recommended that:

1. The possibility of the development of alternative non-ipsative measures of an individual's prioritization of educational goals be explored.
2. Concomitant data be obtained during the student teaching activity by using measures to determine changes in areas already found to be influenced during student teaching such as student teacher attitudes and behavior.
3. The cooperating teachers also be pre and posttested to control for the student teacher influence on cooperating teachers.

Bibliography

Andrews, L. O. Theory underlying proposed state and federal support to promote high quality student teaching. Action for Improvement of Teacher Education, Eighteenth Yearbook. Washington D. C.:American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Education Association, 1965.

Bowdeshell, J. W. Relationship of expressed goals and perceived performance of schools as reported by teachers and community members in three Oklahoma school districts (Oklahoma State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 35, 6439-A.

Dieter, L. The use of the Delphi technique in setting goals and objectives for a secondary school English program. (Northwestern University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts, 1974, 35, 3389-A.

Franklin, H. Community involvement in educational goal ranking and program assessment procedures in two Indiana school corporations (Indiana University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 35, 5676-A.

George, G. R. Differential goal ranking among citizens, educators and students in unified school district 512 Shawnee Mission, Kansas (University of Kansas, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts, 1977, 38, 610-A.

Harrison, A. Psychology as a social science. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972.

Harty, H. Expressed philosophical, value, and/or attidinal orientations toward educational practice of student teachers preparing to teach minority and mainstream ethnic groups. Teacher Education Forum, 1976, 4, 12-15. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 310).

Heitzmann, W. The classroom teacher and the student teacher, what research says to the teacher, Washington D. C.: National Education Association, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 146 152).

Johnson, J. Changes in student teacher dogmatism. The Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 62, 224-226.

Lengyel, H. C. An institutional goal-prioritization study in a selected private school (University of Oregon, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 35, 4866-A.

Mahan, J. & Lacefield, W. Changes in preservice teachers value orientation toward education during year-long cluster, student teaching placements. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 124 534).

McAulay, J. D. How much influence has a cooperating teacher? Journal of Teacher Education, 1960, 11, 79-83.

Milner, E. J. The supervising teacher, thirty eight yearbook of the association for student teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1959.

Orten, G. Educational goal congruency among educators, students, and adult residents within a city school system--A critical step in educational planning (Marquette University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 37, 1923-A.

Peters, W. An investigation of the influence of cooperating teachers in shaping the attitudes of student teachers toward the teaching of English. Lexington, Kentucky:The University of Kentucky, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 074 052).

Price, R. D. The influence of supervising teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 471-475.

Program Development Center of Northern California. Workshop Packet for Educational Goals and Objectives. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974.

Rogers, F. Goal development for middle schools (University of Georgia, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 37, 2698-A.

Rogers, J. A study of the goals for public school education in Texas (North Texas Stake University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts, 1977, 38, 1165-1166A.

Rose, M. J. A comparative study of the goals of education as perceived by those about to enter teaching and residents of representative Indiana communities (Indiana University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts, 1977, 37, 4846-A.

Silberman, C. Crisis in the classroom: the remaking of American education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Snell, C. Community based goals of education by use of the Delphi technique (Drake University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts, 1974, 35, 2612-A.

Steeves, F. L. A summary of the literature in the off-campus cooperating teacher. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1952, 38, 129-137.

Thongdee, C. A study to develop an instrument to assess students' priority goals and objectives as perceived by selected professional staff, parents, and students at the local level in Thailand (University of New Orleans, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts, 1977, 37, 7465-A.

Westwood, L. J. The role of the teacher. Educational Research, 1967, 9, 122-134.

Wroblewski, C. A student teacher views the supervising teacher. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1963, 14, 107.

Yee, A. Interpersonal relationships in the student teaching triad. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 95-112.

Yee, A. Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.

Yee, A. & Gage, N. Techniques for estimating the source and direction of causal influence in panel data. Psychological Bulletin. 1968, 70, 115-126.

Young, J. Authoritarianism in elementary school teachers and their supervising teachers. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 70-71.

Zevin, J. In the cooperating teachers image: Convergence of social students student teacher's behavior patterns with cooperating teacher's behavior patterns. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013 371).

Reference Notes

Bugher, Note 1. Personal communication, August, 1978.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Cooperating Teacher Background Information Sheet

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA

_____
Name (please print)

Background Information: (Supervisory Teachers)

1. Age_____ 2. Sex: male_____
female_____

3. Major_____

4. No. of years teaching--experience (including this one) _____

5. Highest degree held: BA/S_____
MA/S_____
Doctorate_____

6. No. of student teachers I have supervised_____.

7. What is the name of your student teacher?_____

RJ/sr
9/14/78

Appendix B

Memorandum Concerning Cooperating Teacher Meeting

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA

TO: Supervising Teachers in Secondary and Special Education

Sept. 7, 1978

FROM: Richard Jones
Dean of Education and Regional Services

Arlo Brown
Director of Clinical Experiences

SUBJECT: Get together at MSU on Thursday, September 14, 4:00 p.m. in the Student Union, Room 215.

This is to invite you to a meeting here at the campus to:

1) meet Dr. Richard Bowman, our new director of Secondary Education.

2) discuss and comment on our program to prepare teachers.

3) participate in a project to evaluate our program, by completing a short goal setting instrument for us., and

4) have an opportunity to sip a cup of coffee and talk with other supervising teachers.

Please come by; we should be through by 5:30 at the latest! Thursday, 9/14, 4:00 p.m. at the Student Union.

(Enclosed in a parking permit for that day).

RJ/sr

Appendix C

Memorandum Concerning Cooperating Teacher Participation

DEPARTMENT Academic Affairs

Office Memorandum 64

TO : Cooperating Teachers for Fall, 1978

DATE: Sept. 25, 1978

FROM : Richard Jones
Dean of Education & Regional Services

PHONE: 2181

SUBJECT: Goal Setting Process

This year, MSU will be evaluated by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for the continued accreditation of our teacher education program. As a part of that process, we have instituted a self-study and a bit of research.

This is a request to you to help us in our endeavor.

Enclosed are a set of materials designed to determine the educational goals that individuals - or groups - think are important for our schools. We would appreciate your cooperation in completing this process. We hope that by gathering this information, we will be able to more accurately reflect the important goals in our teacher education curriculum.

The process only takes about 20 minutes. The directions are on the back of the Blue sheet, or your student teacher can assist you. (They have all gone through the process!).

When you are done, the University Supervisor will pick up the materials. The completed set includes: (in addition to the Board, goals and discs).

1. The Blue Sheet with your scores for the 18 goals, and your name at the top.

2. The Personal information sheet, completed.

3. The "Informed Consent Agreement", signed. (Note that the statement is designed for much more complicated experiments than is ours. It is from Utah State, because one of our researchers is from that University).

If you have any questions about the process, the use that will be made of the information, or anything, please call the University supervisor, or call me (236-2181).

Thank you very much for your help.

RJ/sr

Appendix D

Comments and Directions for Student Teacher Testing

COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHER TESTING

1) As part of the assessment of student teaching at MSU, we are interested in collecting information about how student teachers prioritize educational goals.

2) We will be collecting some information from all the student teachers both at the beginning and at the end of the student teaching quarter.

3) The information that will be collected today will also be used for research purposes. Because of this a signed Informed Consent Agreement from all participating subjects is necessary. Please read and sign this agreement.

4) Please fill out the Background Data Sheet. This information will be used to describe the student teaching group.

5) All collected data will be held entirely confidential. Subjects are free to withdraw consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time.

6) Upon request, you will be informed by letter as to the purpose and result of the study.

7) The goals instrument to be looked at today was developed by Phi Delta Kappa for use in communities interested in goal setting for

their school districts. That is why some of the terminology in the directions is inappropriate for a student teacher group.

8) Phi Delta Kappa is a professional educational fraternity dedicated to the promotion and improvement of publically supported and universally available education.

9) Taking a look at one's educational priorities is a valuable exercise for anyone entering a career in education. Therefore we feel that this exercise is not only useful in terms of research, but will also be useful and meaningful to you individually both personally and in your professional development.

Appendix E

Informed Consent Agreement

INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

I hereby give my consent to participate in the project involving human subjects. I understand the procedure to be followed in the study and am aware of the discomforts and risks involved by my participation. I will receive answers to my inquiries regarding the project and am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time.

_____

Signed Date

Appendix F

Student Teacher Background Information Sheet

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA

_____

Name (please print)

Background Information:

1. Age_____ 2. Sex: male_____
female_____

3. Major_____

4. No. quarters (including this one)
attended MSU_____

5. No. credits in Education_____
(including Special Education)

6. Please check those items which describe your past experiences in the schools:

_____teacher aide (No. years___ ___)

_____volunteer aide (No. years_____)

_____playground supervisor (or lunchroom, etc.)
(no. years_____)

_____other school experience Years

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

RJ/sr
9/6/78

Appendix G

Directions for Individual Members of the Representative Community Committee

DIRECTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE REPRESENTATIVE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Directions:*

1. Make sure your materials include the following items:

   (a) Display Board; (b) Eighteen (18) cards containing goal statements; (c) A set of (50) red colored discs.

2. | Note: Punch out 45 of the red discs contained on the card (leave five (5) discs on card). |

3. Read each of the green Goal Statement Cards. As you examine each Goal Statement carefully, read the similar goals associated with it. The similar goals listed under each of the Goal Statements are important for understanding the Goal Statement. As you read each card, ask yourself . . .

   HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS EDUCATIONAL GOAL FOR OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM?

4. Separate each goal statement card from the sheet and place on the Display Board in the space in the column labeled "Goal Statement." The order in which you place the cards on the board is not important. There is one space for each card.

5. Place a red colored disc in the column labeled #1 beside each of the 18 goal statements. Each disc has a value of 1 point.

6. Reread the goal statements. For those goals you believe to be more important, place another red disc beside each in the column labeled #2.

7. Read the goal statements that have two (2) red discs beside them. For those goals you believe to be much more important than others, place a red disc beside them in the column labeled #3.

8. Read the goal statements that have three (3) red discs beside them. For those goals you believe to be much more important than others, place a red disc beside them in the column labeled #4.

   Have you used all of your red discs?
   If not, continue on to direction #9.
   If yes, see direction #10.

9. Read the goal statements which have four (4) red discs beside them. For those goals you believe to be of extreme importance, place a red disc beside them in the column labeled #5.

10. Review your Display Board and keep in mind the following:
    a. All 45 red discs must be used (each disc has a value of 1 point).
    b. At least one goal statement must have five (5) red discs (5 points) beside it.
    c. A maximum of five (5) red discs (5 points) is allowed for any one goal statement.
    d. It is not necessary for a goal statement to have a red disc beside it.
    e. In the event you wish to rearrange your display board, you may add or remove red discs (points) from the goal statements (remembering that discs must always be in horizontal sequence with no spaces between discs).

11. Transfer the total number of points for each goal to the goal summary sheet. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THE GOAL STATEMENTS FOUND ON YOUR INDIVIDUAL GOAL SUMMARY SHEET ARE IN RANDOM ORDER AND WILL NOT MATCH THE ORDER IN WHICH YOU PLACED YOUR GOALS.

12. During the next few minutes you will be given a card assigning you to a small group (4 persons). After refreshments, you will be working with your group in arriving at a consensus on a single display board.

13. Leave your display board at your position. Take the direction sheets to your small group meeting.

---

*Those Committee members who have developed goals in addition to the original 18 goals must inform the program moderator at the beginning of the meeting for additional directions.

Appendix H

Individual Goal Rating Sheet

INDIVIDUAL GOAL RATING SHEET

Instructions: Place the total number of points (red discs) you gave to each of the goals on your display board in the blank space found next to each of the goals on this page.

Goals	My Individual Score for Each Goal	(Optional) Our Small Group Score
LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN		
LEARN HOW TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WHO THINK, DRESS AND ACT DIFFERENTLY		
LEARN ABOUT AND TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN THE WORLD		
DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING		
UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS AND IDEALS		
LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION		
UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING		
LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE		
DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK		
LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD MANAGER OF MONEY, PROPERTY AND RESOURCES		
DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE		
LEARN HOW TO USE LEISURE TIME		
PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY		
APPRECIATE CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD		
GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS		
DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH		
DEVELOP GOOD CHARACTER AND SELF-RESPECT		
GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION		

REMEMBER YOU WILL NEED THIS SHEET FOR YOUR SMALL GROUP MEETING!