

2005

An exploration of preservice teachers and the functions of star teachers

Robert Eugene Best
University of Dayton

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses

Recommended Citation

Best, Robert Eugene, "An exploration of preservice teachers and the functions of star teachers" (2005).
Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 1532.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses/1532

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlange1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

**AN EXPLORATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS
AND THE FUNCTIONS OF STAR TEACHERS**

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO

**The School of Education and Allied Professions
THE UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership

Robert Eugene Best, B.A., M.Ed., Ed.S

THE UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

2005

© Copyright by

Robert Eugene Best

All rights reserved

2005

An Exploration of Preservice Teachers and the Functions of Star Teachers

APPROVED BY:

[Redacted Signature]

A. William Place, Ph.D
Committee Chair

Date

[Redacted Signature]

Peter B. Nelson, Ph.D

Date

[Redacted Signature]

C. Daniel Raisch, Ph.D.

Date

[Redacted Signature]

James B. Rowley, Ph.D

Date

[Redacted Signature]

Thomas J. Lasley, Ph.D.
Dean

Date

AN EXPLORATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS AND THE FUNCTIONS OF STAR TEACHERS

By

Robert E. Best, Ph. D.

The University of Dayton, 2005

A. William Place, Ph. D.

This study explores the development of preservice teachers through their first professional education class using Haberman's 10 functions of effective teachers.

Providing students with effective teachers is a critical task for all schools. Identifying and selecting the most effective teachers requires a sound knowledge of what dispositions effective teachers possess. Are these dispositions naturally developed traits or are these traits developed by college students as they prepare to become teachers ?

The review of literature identified a variety of dispositions, characteristics, or functions of effective teachers of which Haberman has identified 10 functions he believes are the 10 functions of "STAR" teachers. The review of literature also indicates a positive relationship between effective teachers and student achievement. The interview and preservice teacher education were also reviewed in this study. Freshman level college students were studied for possible change during their beginning level professional education course using the Haberman Pre-screener and the Haberman Classroom Management Protocol Game. Two groups of students, one honors class and

one regular class, were selected for this study. The instruction of the professional education course introduced Haberman's function of effective teachers and provided opportunity for development of the student's teacher disposition.

Nine hypotheses were formulated to explore change between the two groups, change between pretest and posttest scores for the same group, and on the correlation of the two instruments using the pretest scores from both groups. Independent samples *t* tests, related samples *t* tests, and a Pearson Correlation Coefficient were performed on the data. Results from two of the hypotheses had significant difference. Pretest scores from the honors class had significant difference from scores for the regular class on the pre-screener and significant difference was found on the results from the honors class between their pretest and posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener.

Results of the study were that students in the honors class scored significantly better than their counterparts in the regular class on the Haberman Pre-screener and that the honors class students had significant gain from their pretest scores to their posttest scores on the pre-screener. Significant differences were not found on any of the tests run on the Classroom Management Protocol Game.

To my wife, Susan, my daughter, Jenny, and my sons, Dorin, Brian, and Tyler, for their support and patience throughout this journey and to my colleagues who were there to encourage me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give a special thank you to my entire committee for always being there to help and support me when I needed it. To Dr. Will Place, who I am especially indebted to, for his guidance, patience, expertise, and constant encouragement to complete what I had started. To Dr. Jim Rowley, whose ideas turned into reality, I am especially thankful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Significance of the Study	8
Limitations	10
Assumptions	10
Definitions	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Teacher Selection	14
Teacher Characteristics	16
Preservice Teachers	23
Student Achievement	31
Summary	33
III. PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY	35
Population	35
Classroom Instruction	36
Instruments	38
Reliability	39
Data Collection	39
Data Analysis	39
Null Hypotheses	40
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	42
Independent Samples <i>t</i> test	44
Paired Samples <i>t</i> test	44
Analysis of Hypotheses	45
V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
Summary	52
Findings	54
Implications	58
Recommendations for Further Research	62

REFERENCES	62
APPENDIX	69
Consent to Permit Research	70

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Identifying and employing effective classroom teachers have been major concerns for school administrators since the beginning of public education. The efforts to identify and effectively measure the quality of the characteristics of teaching candidates presents continuing challenges to these administrators. A variety of methods have been used to quantify the characteristics of a prospective teacher. The most popular of these is the interview, even though the reliability of this process has been questioned (Dipboye, 1992; Mayfield, 1964; Mayfield & Carlson, 1966; Smith & Knab, 1996).

This study focuses on the preservice teacher using Haberman's interview, Pre-screener (2004a), and classroom management protocol game (2004b) to identify and possibly develop the functions that effective teachers possess at all levels. Haberman (1995) had identified seven functions of effective, "STAR" teachers. These functions, persistence, protection of learners and learning, the application of generalizations, approach to at-risk students, professional versus personal orientation to students, burnout, and fallibility are considered by Haberman (1995) to be crucial to the success of teachers at all levels. Haberman and Stafford (2004) expanded upon these seven functions increasing the number to 10 while modifying several of the functions. The 10 functions are now "persistence, organization and planning, value of student learning, theory to

practice, teaching at-risk students, approach to students, survive in the bureaucracy, explaining teacher success, explaining student success, and fallibility.” While Haberman continues to study and expand his functions of “Star Teachers,” identifying these effective teaching functions continues to be key to the selection of successful teachers.

Dreikurs’ theory of logical consequences is also addressed in this study. Student misbehavior is based on the need for attention, power, revenge, or the avoidance of failure (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968). Haberman (2004b) believes that the best teachers make appropriate choices for classroom management based on an understanding of these four needs. Haberman (2004b) encourages veteran and novice teachers to critique themselves using Dreikurs’ theory.

Since the inception of organized education schools have been concerned with the quality of the classroom teacher. The ability, attitudes, and characteristics of teachers have been researched numerous times (Cardinal, 1987; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Kaplan & Owings, 2002) with the continuing debate over what successful teachers are, how they conduct their classroom, and how they promote student learning. To this end, effective strategies, effective styles of teaching, and supportive personality traits have been identified as well as those characteristics that are not conducive to student learning. With the knowledge of what type of teachers schools would prefer comes the challenge of selecting those teachers that will ultimately be successful in the classroom. Thus, a critical component of any school system resides in the selection of its staff. Recognizing the talents of an individual and then determining if the talents translate into effective teaching becomes a critical skill for the person selecting staff.

The selection of teachers is a major decision for any educational institution. Place (1995) refers to the selection of teachers as the million dollar selection when the monetary investment schools make in their teachers over their 30-year career is considered. The selection of effective teachers benefits not only the students but also the school where they teach (Allison, 1981; Place, 1995). Gordon (1999) believes that "Finding the right teachers for urban schools is thus the first step in helping those schools improve" (p. 304). Haberman adds to the emphasis on having effective teachers by stating, "no school can be better than its teachers. And the surest and best way to improve schooling of the approximately 12 million children and youth in poverty is to get better teachers for them" (1995, p. 777). The importance of effective teachers and the direct connection to successful schools is continually supported throughout the educational literature and research (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Gordon, 1999; Graces, 1932; Haberman, 1995; Young & Delli, 2002).

Haberman, in the process of identifying characteristics of "Star" teachers, uses the goal-directed behavior identified by Dreikurs. Dreikurs established four mistaken goals of children's misbehavior. These four mistaken goals are attention, power, revenge, and inadequacy (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982).

Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1982) state:

Every educator's approach to the educational process is based on a certain concept of human nature. The concept helps provide the educator with reasons for the behavior of children and the means by which she responds to them. The model of humanity that we propose was developed by Alfred Adler and provides new concepts with which to approach the understanding of children. (p. 8)

One concept they state is that behavior is purposive or goal-directed. With this in mind Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1982) identify the "four possible goals of disturbing behavior in children" (p. 11) as a way to: gain attention, seek power, seek revenge, and display inadequacy (real or imagined).

Attention getting occurs in most young children. The child may seek attention through socially acceptable means or seek attention through unacceptable efforts. Punishment does not detour the child as long as he or she achieves attention. If the child's self-reliance does not improve he or she will continue to seek more attention (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982).

Children seeking power want control over their actions even if these actions are disruptive. Conflict (a power contest) can occur when the adult exerts demands on the child. Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1982) state, "Efforts to control the child lead to a power struggle and increase the underlying sense of inferiority and futility" (p. 22). The child may lie, argue, cry, throw temper tantrums, and use other types of stubborn or disobedient behavior. The child usually wins this type of conflict (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982).

Children who feel they are being treated unfairly can decide to seek revenge. When seeking revenge children will choose anyone, not just those they believe hurt them, to intentionally hurt or bother. They may even choose self-depreciating actions. These children believe no one likes them and thus believe they have the right to hurt others. This is a very difficult behavior to change and can take a considerable amount of time to change (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982).

Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1982) state that "Children who after unsuccessful attempts to find significance through using goals of attention, power, or revenge, become so discouraged that they give up and move toward the goal of inadequacy" (p. 24). Children seeking this goal desire to be left alone and if asked to participate they will act as if they are unable to honor the request. Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper (1982) believe that the children feel they are avoiding more humiliating and embarrassing situations (p. 25) when they avoid participating. This avoidance can appear in all activities or in only a few specific areas (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982).

Another issue that occurs in the selection of teachers is what is the most effective method to identify the teaching characteristics a specific individual has and to what extent that individual has them. If we can identify which teacher characteristics are most desirable, then we can find a reliable and valid method of identifying those characteristics. Haberman (1995, 2004a) would suggest that his interview and pre-screener are two valid methods of identifying these characteristics.

One piece of this study focuses on the organized selection interview and the standardized pre-screener as they are the methods of assessment that Haberman (1995, 2004a) has constructed and uses in his selection process. While the interview or the pre-screener do not stand alone in the selection process, each is an important piece in this study.

Dipboye (1992), "defines the selection interview as a dialogue initiated by one or more persons to gather information and evaluate the qualifications of an applicant for employment" (p. 3). He does not intend to define the interview as a monolithic procedure apart from other selection procedures. He contends that the main source of

ambiguity resides in the content of the interview. Dipboye (1992) has identified five ways in which interviews may vary. These five ways are (a) position in the selection process, (b) bandwidth and depth, (c) structure, (d) role of the interviewer, and (e) job-content focus versus worker-trait focus. When Haberman's interview and pre-screener are viewed in comparison with these five ways, the following determination could result. Haberman's interview and pre-screener can be part of a multistage process, but they are designed to clearly identify who may be employed and who will not. The bandwidth is reasonably small, as only seven functions in the interview and 10 in the pre-screener are evaluated. While the structure of the pre-screener is standardized, the answers in the interview are judged in a specific framework. The single role of the interviewer is to select candidates for employment. The questions are job-content focused but identify the persistence, attitude, and relationship to children and staff, which are worker-traits.

Using the selection interview as a means of hiring teachers has been criticized many times. "Considering the ample storehouse of procedures now available, it is ironic that organizations still rely on one of the least sophisticated methods – the interview" (Dipboye, 1992, p. 1).

Haberman's interview focuses on quantifying seven functions and making the decision to employ or not employ an applicant based on the results of this interview. Gaining the information necessary to make an informed, accurate decision about teacher candidates is the ultimate goal in this interview.

Criticism also comes from Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, and Long (1979) as the selection interview is the most used and the most abused predictor utilized for hiring teachers. Despite the faith placed on selection interviews by school administrators, the

research addressing selection interviews has failed to provide a great deal of support for this selection device. Decisions made on the basis of interview data have been found to be formed too quickly (Mayfield, 1964), and to be influenced too much by factors unrelated to job performance (Hakel, Hollman, & Dunnette, 1970). Because of these findings most researchers have advocated the use of structured selection interviews (Mayfield, Brown, & Honstra, 1980).

“Productive organizations have employees who possess the knowledge, skills, abilities, and temperaments required to do their jobs” (Dipboye, 1992, p. 1). Keller states (as cited in Delli, 2001, p. 30) “the current widespread need for the selection of quality classroom teachers is being trumpeted by several stakeholder groups such as parents, school administrators, boards of education, and state and federal policymakers.”

Haberman has responded to this challenge by researching, constructing, and refining an organized interview process and an on-line pre-screener. “Given the growing pressure to select quality teachers from an increasingly shrinking pool of teacher applicants, school administrators must continue to use proven predictors of job performance when hiring teachers” (Delli, 2001, p. 33). With this as the guiding thought, Haberman’s interview and Pre-screener are used as tools to determine quality candidates, “STARS,” from a pool of prospective teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The schools of today face a continuing responsibility to effectively educate the children in their communities. The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind, 2001) and state legislation, (e.g., state standards as set by the state department of education), have set expectations and systems of accountability

that require schools to provide an adequate education for all children. To provide an effective classroom for each child there is an increasing need to have a quality teacher in that room. Without question, selecting quality teachers for these classrooms is critical to the success of the students (Haberman, 1995; Norris & Richburg, 1997; Place & Drake, 1994). Norris and Richburg state that "the difference between the performance of an outstanding teacher and that of an average teacher over a couple of decades can be immensely significant to a school district" (1997, p. 46). Quality teachers, in all classrooms, make a difference in the achievement of their students and the quality of the school they attend.

Choosing teachers who have the functions that are most effective in teaching children becomes a critical process (Allison, 1981; Cardinal, 1987; Haberman, 1995; Place & Drake, 1994). When choosing teachers, Smith and Knab (1996) found that the best hiring systems "identify those attitudes, behaviors, and skills that characterize the kind of teachers most wanted in classrooms" (p. 101).

This study investigates the correlation of scores on two instruments by two groups of preservice teachers. The two instruments used are the Haberman (2004a) "Star Teacher" Pre-screener and Haberman's (2004b) Star Classroom Management Protocol instrument. The two groups (honors and regular classes) of preservice teachers are freshman level students in beginning professional education classes.

Significance of the Study

Today schools are required to meet the needs of children in a more demanding and accountable system. To meet these needs, schools require the best and brightest teachers to guide their students. Determining what functions an effective teacher might have and

can these functions be identified in the selection process is vital to choosing the most effective teachers.

This study attempts to look at the impact of a beginning level professional education class of freshman level students on the 10 functions identified by Haberman (2004a). Investigating the beginning level as well as the development of freshman level students on the 10 functions (Haberman, 2004a) of effective teachers using two on-line instruments is the objective of this study. Research shows that quality teachers directly affect student achievement (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Gordon, 1999; Haberman, 1995; Norris & Richburg, 1997; Ross, Stringfield, Sanders, & Wright, 2003; Schalock, Schalock, & Myton, 1998). Employing quality teachers empowers the school to address the expectations of the students (attaining passing scores on achievement, proficiency, or graduation tests) and also to meet the expectations of the community that the school achieve state mandated percentages of students who pass these tests. Improving the ability of an administrator to identify the necessary skills of an effective teacher prior to hiring that teacher becomes a goal of an efficient selection process. Not only could this increase the likelihood that students could benefit from better teachers, but the schools could be more likely to meet the academic expectations from state and federal legislation.

Darling-Hammond (1997) states:

Today's educators are facing greater challenges than ever before. Not only are schools being asked to help students meet higher academic standards, but they are also expected to meet the wide-ranging needs of the most diverse group of learners ever educated in the public schools of any nation. (p. 5)

Students must be able to achieve at specific levels if they are to advance through school and meet their graduation requirements. These minimum requirements are measures of accountability that each student faces. Students depend on the school to supply the necessary support and direction for their achievement by providing effective teachers that can meet the needs of a diverse student population.

Limitations

1. participants may have different beliefs concerning effective teachers
2. participants may view the 10 functions differently
3. researcher biases toward the Haberman interview in the selection process
4. researcher biases toward Haberman's 10 functions of effective teaching
5. students may have different results with on-line instruments
6. students have different levels of interest and effort in desire to become a teacher
7. students may score differently than practicing teachers
8. the small number in the sample may result in low statistical power
9. students were not randomly sampled for the study
10. students are first semester college students and are adjusting to a college atmosphere; thus, they may show diverse approaches to class assignments, completing class readings, and in their overall approach to academic expectations at the college level

Assumptions

1. participants respond honestly
2. participants believe specific teacher functions are related to teacher success, (i.e., student learning)

3. Haberman's 10 characteristics have some measure of validity as criteria for effective teachers
4. participants value functions of effective teaching as criteria for teacher selection
5. participants accurately complete on-line instruments
6. participants have not previously taken Haberman's interview

Definitions

Effective Teacher – A teacher whose students demonstrate academic achievement in the classroom or on state competency tests. This study uses the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game to compare pretest and posttest scores on the functions of effective teachers.

Function – Characteristics of teachers that Haberman originally defined as the seven functions of effective teachers in the "Star" Teacher Selection Interview.

However, prior to the completion of this study the pre-screener was introduced containing 10 functions. This research refers to both the seven function interview and the 10 function Haberman Pre-screener.

Haberman Interview – This interview format and questions have been developed by Haberman (1995) for the specific purpose of selecting teachers. The interview consists of seven questions with two parts to each question. The interview asks the seven questions in the same order with a consistent beginning to each question; however, the dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee can change each interview based on the answers given by the interviewee. The intent of each question remains the same even though there can be a slight variation to the interview based on the responses of the interviewee. Training by the Haberman

Educational Foundation is required prior to using this interview.

Haberman Pre-Screener – This instrument is an on-line, multiple choice questionnaire that identifies and rates the 10 functions of effective teachers. The instrument consists of 50 questions that can be used to compare your answers with others who have taken the test and with the answers of star teachers. The 10 functions evaluated on this instrument are (a) persistence, (b) organization and planning, (c) value of student learning, (d) theory to practice, (e) teaching at-risk students, (f) approach to students, (g) survive in the bureaucracy, (h) explaining teacher success, (i) explaining student success, and (j) fallibility (Haberman, 2004a).

Haberman's Star Classroom Management Protocol – This instrument is an on-line interactive instrument that scores the participants' ability to respond to classroom misbehavior based on the research of Dreikurs' theory of logical consequences. The student misbehavior is based on the student's need for attention, power, revenge, or avoidance of failure. Twenty-four students must be kept on task or they will begin to disrupt their neighbors and ultimately disrupt the classroom. The score of each game is determined by the total number of seconds the students are kept on task. The game can be used by veteran teachers, novice teachers, or by preservice teachers as a means to practice on the following seven teacher skills, (a) "with-it-ness," (b) "multi-tasking," (c) responding to individual need, (d) increasing their repertoire of responses, (e) avoiding escalating problems, (f) professionalizing teacher behavior, and (g) acting decisively.

Preservice Teacher – A student who is enrolled in an undergraduate education class.

Professional Education Class – A beginning level education class that is taken by freshman level students.

Selection Interview – An interview used to select employees from a pool of candidates that is structured or unstructured.

Selection Process – The process where the selection of a candidate(s) occurs from a pool of candidates.

Star Teacher – A teacher identified by the Haberman Interview as possessing the functions necessary to effectively instruct a diverse population of students who are academically at risk.

Structured Interview – An interview process with set questions, a standard set of scoring criteria, and a consistent format and order of questions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Investigating the beginning level as well as the development of freshman level students on the 10 functions (Haberman, 2004a) of effective teachers using two on-line instruments was the objective of this study. In addition to reviewing the literature on teacher functions, Dreikurs' research on misbehavior and issues pertaining to the development of preservice teachers was also examined.

Haberman's Pre-screener and thus his star teacher functions (Haberman, 1995, 2004a) were chosen for this study due to the research and publications that are available to the educational community. Haberman has dedicated nearly 40 years to the study of effective teacher functions and the development of his interview. The Haberman interview is currently used in many school districts throughout the United States as part of their teacher selection process.

Teacher Selection

The judicious and careful selection of teachers is commensurate with any demand placed on a school district by the public it serves (Young & Ryerson, 1986). Wise selection is the best means of improving the system, and the greatest lack of economy exists whenever teachers have been poorly chosen, or are inadequately adapted to their profession (Graces, 1932). The selection of the best teachers for vacant positions is a

difficult task that requires great expenditures of effort and of time by educational administrators. Teachers are the essential element in the educational process (Young & Ryerson, 1986).

The need for better qualified teachers is clearly stated by Darling-Hammond, LaFors, and Snyder (2001):

As the 21st century approaches, it is increasingly clear that schools must become dramatically more successful with a wide range of learners if more citizens are to acquire the sophisticated skills they need to participate in a knowledge-based society. It is also increasingly clear that teachers' expertise and effectiveness are critical to the success of American education. (p. 9)

This view takes into account the long-term effect of educating students, but clearly identifies another reason (maintaining an educated society) why selecting effective teachers is vital to the success of our schools and the students they serve.

These statements set the expectation that the selection of an effective teaching staff is paramount to the achievement of their students. Haberman (1995) believes that selection is more important than training. His calculated hunch is that selection accounts for 80% of the effective teachers employed by schools. He also reports that it is highly likely that, for urban teachers, selection is far more important than training. Although it can be argued that teacher education could be more important in the training and education of teachers rather than just relying on natural ability (Darling-Hammond, 2000), the selection of the best teachers still remains critical to the education of our students. Finn and Kanstoroom (1999) released this statement:

We know that better quality teachers make a big difference. We know this from decades of research and from the experience of millions of families. Recent studies in Tennessee, Boston, and Dallas find dramatic differences between the performance of youngsters who are assigned the best teachers and those assigned the worst teachers. (p. 2)

This should not be a surprise to anyone involved in education. Children will be more successful with someone who is better at his or her craft than with someone who does not have the capabilities of effective teachers. Darling-Hammond, LaFors, and Snyder report (2001), "only teachers who are both knowledgeable in their content areas and extremely skillful in a wide range of teaching methods can respond appropriately to diverse students' needs and enable them to succeed at these challenging learning goals" (p.10).

Teacher Characteristics

The search to find successful teachers revolves around the identification of those characteristics that effective teachers display. There are a number of teacher characteristics that have been studied as to their relevance to effective teaching. The authors cited in this study have reviewed several teacher characteristics and their association with effective teaching. These characteristics are presented in this chapter as well as the argument that commonality exists between the separate lists of characteristics identified by each author.

As mentioned previously, Haberman (2004a) has identified 10 functions of "STAR" teachers used in the pre-screener. Haberman (1995) also developed an additional six functions, (a) emotional and physical stamina, (b) organizational ability, (c) teaching

style, (d) explanations of success, (e) basis of rapport, and (f) readiness, for successful teachers that are not included in his interview process.

Lasley (1986, pp. 74-78) derived eight common characteristics of teachers from 20 nationally focused studies. The teacher as a well educated person, as an intellectually curious person, as a knowledgeable person, as part of the society and profession, one who knows the student, as a pedagogical manager, as a continuous learner, and as a career person are characteristics Lasley identified.

“The Gallup Organization’s research suggests that outstanding urban teachers do exist, can be identified, and do make a difference” (Gallup Organization, as cited in Gordon, 1999, p. 304). That study revealed 11 themes where significant differences between teachers judged best and representative occurred. These 11 themes consist of (a) Commitment, (b) dedication, (c) individualized perception, (d) caring, (e) involver, (f) empathy, (g) positivity, (h) initiator, (i) stimulator, (j) input, and (k) concept (Gallup Organization, as cited in Gordon, 1999).

Cardinal (1987), developer of the Cardinal Teacher Interview, has found 13 distinct competencies of successful teachers. These competencies include (a) commitment, (b) positive associations, (c) role impact, (d) performance expectation, (e) organization or preparation, (f) communicator, (g) sensitivity, (h) imaginator, (i) stability or objectivity, (j) climate focus, (k) learning activator, (l) opportunist, and (m) student focus. These 13 competencies are both similar to the previously identified characteristics but also add to the list of qualities effective teachers possess.

One thing begins to emerge as these numerous characteristics are studied.

Educators, practitioners and researchers alike, are looking for the skills and functions that

effective teachers have and are also looking for how these qualities can be evaluated in the selection process, specifically, the interview. Having the ability to determine which characteristics actually relate to good teaching and how these characteristics can be accurately and reliably identified in candidates continues to be a challenge. As we continue to look for quality candidates, not only is there the need to have strong academic candidates, but also to determine what "qualities" (Lasley, 1986, p. 79) should be sought.

Paramount to selecting effective teachers is identifying the key characteristics that these teachers possess. Alcock and Ryan (2002) "assert the importance of selecting teachers based on professional attitudes and personal attributes" (p. 58). They review the selection of teachers using predetermined criteria from four instruments. The four instruments studied were the Teacher Perceiver Instrument (Selective Research International, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002), the STAR Teacher Interview (Haberman, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002), PRAXIS III Teacher Performance Assessment (Educational Testing Service, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Propositions (NBPTS, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002).

"Building a case on the commonalities found in four teacher assessment instruments, the authors assert the importance of selecting teachers based on professional attitudes and personal attributes" (Alcock & Ryan, 2002, p. 58). The four instruments reviewed assess teachers regarding their knowledge, skills, and values (Alcock & Ryan). The emphasis is placed on determining if the candidate possesses specific functions toward teaching and, in some cases, quantifying the candidate's skills. "It seems determining who enters the profession and who stays in the profession can be based on

identifiable teacher characteristics” (Alcock & Ryan, 2002, p. 59). Walls, Nardi, von Minden, and Hoffman (2002) found several teacher skills and dispositions of effective teachers that are identified by Alcock and Ryan (2002) in their study. Participants in the Walls et al. (2002) study responded by identifying their most effective teachers as having skills and dispositions that relate to those in the four frameworks compared by Alcock and Ryan (2002). Walls et al. (2002) found effective teachers described as warm, friendly, enthusiastic, and caring about their students. These descriptions fit with Haberman’s (1995) criteria of persistence, promoting learning, and approach to at-risk students; PRAXIS III domain B, creating an environment for student learning; PRAXIS III domain C, teaching for student learning; and PRAXIS III domain D, teacher professionalism in PRAXIS III (Alcock & Ryan, 2002); NBPTS (Alcock & Ryan, 2002) standard one, committed to student learning, and standard three, responsible for monitoring student learning; and empathy, rapport drive, and innovation from the interpersonal theme of the Teacher Perceiver (Alcock & Ryan, 2002). Walls et al. (2002) also found effective teachers described as organized, prepared, had clear expectations, and used student involved teaching. These descriptions align with Haberman’s (1995) theory to practice and burnout; PRAXIS III (Alcock & Ryan, 2002) domain A, organizing content knowledge for student learning and PRAXIS III domain C, teaching for student learning; NBPTS (Alcock & Ryan, 2002) standard three, responsible for student learning, and standard four, think systematically about their practice; and from the Teacher Perceiver (Alcock & Ryan, 2002) intrapersonal theme, focus, as well as the extrapersonal theme, activation.

Each of the four instruments compared by Alcock and Ryan has a number of teacher characteristics that are assessed using the instruments. These instruments have several common threads which emphasize the importance of those characteristics and skills of effective teachers. The following chart (Alcock & Ryan, 2002) gives a brief listing of the characteristics identified by each instrument. The STAR interview had seven characteristics:

- “1. Persistence
2. Promoting Learning
3. Theory into Practice
4. Approaching At-Risk Students
5. Professional Personal Orientations
6. Burnout
7. Fallibility” (Haberman, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002, p. 60)

The Praxis III domains and criteria were:

- A Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning
 - A1 Becoming familiar with students’ knowledge and experiences
 - A2 Articulating clear and appropriate learning goals
 - A3 Connecting content
 - A4 Selecting appropriate methods, learning activities, and materials
 - A5 Selecting appropriate and aligned evaluation strategies
- B Creating an Environment for Student Learning
 - B1 Creating a climate that promotes fairness
 - B2 Rapport

B3 Communicating challenging learning expectations

B4 Establishing consistent standards of classroom behavior

B5 Safe and conducive-to-learning physical environment

C Teaching for Student Learning

C1 Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students

C2 Making content comprehensible to students

C3 Encouraging students to extend their thinking

C4 Monitoring students' understanding of content

C5 Using instructional time effectively

D Teaching Professionalism

D1 Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met

D2 Efficacy

D3 Building professional relationships

D4 Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning.

(Educational Testing Service, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002, p. 63)

NBPTS propositions were:

“P1 Committed to students and learning

P2 Know subjects and how to teach subjects

P3 Responsible for managing and monitoring student learning

P4 Think systematically about practice and learn from experience

P5 Members of learning communities” (NBPTS, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002, p. 62)

Teacher perceiver characteristics were:

“Intrapersonal Theme:

1. Mission
2. Investment
3. Focus

Interpersonal Theme:

1. Empathy
2. Rapport drive
3. Listening
4. Objectivity

Extrapersonal Theme:

1. Individualized perception
2. Input drive
3. Activation
4. Innovation
5. Gestalt” (Selective Research International, as cited in Alcock & Ryan, 2002, pp. 59, 60)

There are a number of common characteristics that appear consistently in these four instruments. These common characteristics are considered to be essential skills for effective teachers. These are the skills that enable teachers to meet the needs of all children on a daily basis in ever increasingly demanding curriculum. Alcock and Ryan (2002) state that:

Excellent teachers, those able to contribute for the long haul, must know: the student and his/her individual nuances, the subject matter and how to teach the

subject matter and a variety of instructional strategies. Excellent teachers must be able to employ multiple instructional strategies, communicate clearly, motivate students to learn, and be effective lifetime learners. Excellent teachers must have a strong sense of efficacy and be deliberately committed to ALL students and their learning. (p. 65)

It appears that there are teacher characteristics, dispositions, or functions that have been identified through research, that have a relationship to effective teaching and thus to student learning.

Preservice Teachers

This study researches preservice (undergraduate) teachers as a key point in the development and nurturing of potential teachers. While the identification and selection of effective teachers is the mission of the Haberman Interview, how and where does the undergraduate student learn the strategies necessary to be an effective teacher and also hone their natural talents? Traditionally this responsibility has been held by the colleges and universities. Thus, there is the question of what do students learn in college and what skills can they be taught? While Haberman's Interview focuses on selecting teachers, this study will look at preservice teachers and their development during a semester in an introduction to professional education course. How are their teaching skills developed or new skills learned and are these skills related to the skills research identifies as those of effective teachers?

Darling-Hammond (1997, 1999, 2000) cites the need to have appropriate teacher education programs. She clearly reports through her own research and the work of others (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Darling-Hammond, LaFors, & Snyder,

2001; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002) that teacher education plays a critical role in the development of effective teachers. There are skills that effective teachers possess that directly relate to student achievement.

Darling-Hammond (1999) states that:

Other research confirms the effectiveness of teachers who comprehend their subject matter, understand student learning and development, know a wide range of teaching methods, and have developed their skills under expert guidance in clinical settings. Over two hundred studies illustrating the positive effects of teacher education contradict the long-standing myth that "teachers are born and not made." This research also makes it clear that teachers need to know much more than the subject matter they teach.

Teachers who have had more opportunity to study the processes of learning and teaching are more highly rated and successful with students in fields from early childhood and elementary education to mathematics, science, and vocational education. (p. 29)

Darling-Hammond (1999) continues examining the importance of effective teachers by stating, "Providing the kind of preparation that teachers need to meet current demands for stepped-up student learning requires a fundamental redefinition of the act of teaching" (p. 29).

The focus on preservice teachers and their preparation is discussed by Haberman and Post (1998) in terms of teaching in multicultural schools. To teach successfully in multicultural schools they believe selecting teachers who are predisposed with particular dispositions is necessary. While training is not discounted and is considered a vital

component of developing teacher skills, emphasis is placed on selecting the right kind of person. The essential elements of knowledge Haberman and Post (1998) identify are self-knowledge, self-acceptance, relationship skills, community knowledge, empathy, cultural human development, cultural conflicts, relevant curriculum, generating sustained effort, coping with violence, self-analysis, and functioning in chaos. This knowledge is gained in life and as a teacher. Haberman and Post (1998) attribute considerable teacher development to studying the lives of children. What ideology the teachers bring with them is their most important source for teacher development. Haberman and Post (1998) state in their article, "teaching is a process in which selective perception enhances what the teacher believes at the start" (p. 101).

While Haberman and Post (1998) expound upon the predispositions necessary to be multicultural teachers and the critical skills developed while teaching, they also emphasize training for those with the appropriate predispositions. If the person has the proper belief system, then effective teaching skills can be taught. Training preservice teachers has an important place in the development of teachers although Haberman and Post (1998) clearly believe selecting individuals with the proper predispositions is vital.

Haberman and Post (1998) recommend that preservice teachers have extensive study in scenarios on situations using children to develop teaching skills. The preservice teachers that participated in this study were involved in course work that also used specific scenarios that focused on classroom situations that involved student and teacher problems.

Dembo's (2001) paper on teaching human learning to preservice teachers in an educational psychology course states, "The first goal is to teach future teachers to become

more effective learners. The second goal is to teach them to be more effective teachers” (p. 25). While Dembo is looking to change a specific component in preservice teacher programs, he indicates that preservice teachers need to become better learners. He supports that the same learning strategies the preservice teachers learn should be taught to others. Dembo (2001) suggests that the preservice teachers demonstrate the self-regulatory skills they have developed and create strategies to teach these skills to others. Although Dembo focuses on the educational psychology component of teacher education, there is still a clear effort to improve teaching by affecting the content and knowledge preservice teachers receive in the college education courses.

As the need to improve the quality of teachers becomes more prominent in our society and our country, the question remains of how can our schools reform and provide the type of learning the students of today need to compete locally and globally. Darling-Hammond (1999) takes issue with the efforts of the college and university departments in the use of their resources. She believes that through the use of the vast resources at the disposal of the universities, that elementary, secondary, and college level teachers could be better prepared to enhance the learning of their students and raise the level of academic achievement.

Darling-Hammond (1999) questions the efforts of educational reformers to focus on teaching at all levels. She states, “For most of this century, teaching in elementary and secondary schools has been treated as a form of semiskilled labor requiring little more than the ability to get through the book with the aid of a few simple routines and tricks of the trade” (p. 28). Darling-Hammond (2000) analyzed teacher education programs and found that, “research suggests that the extent and quality of teacher

education matter for teachers' effectiveness" (p. 166). The type of education, 4-year programs, 5-year programs, alternative certification programs, or professional development schools can be debated as to the success each program has, but this does not change the need to educate or train preservice teachers.

Darling-Hammond (1999) challenges universities and colleges of education to redefine their preparation of teachers to meet today's teaching responsibilities. Teachers need to instruct students in complex learning activities such as problem solving and invention rather than simply recalling facts from teacher lectures. Darling-Hammond (1999) believes that teachers need to be diagnosticians and planners. These teachers should present critical ideas and systematically organize learning as well as create reciprocal relationships with their students' learning (Darling-Hammond, 1999).

Weinstein (1989) discovered that 113 students enrolled in sophomore level education courses and 74 cooperating teachers responded to a questionnaire with 30 categories for describing a good teacher. Weinstein (1989) reported, "Students tended to emphasize social and affective variables such as caring and concern for children, ability to relate to students, patience, and enthusiasm, while minimizing the academic aspects of teaching" (p. 58). The cooperating teachers, while stressing affective skills like caring, motivating students, and enthusiasm were found to differ from the students in that they cited organization and creativity rather than patience or the ability to relate to children. The cooperating teachers and preservice teachers in Weinstein's (1998) study both defined good teachers as warm and caring rather than referring to the academic achievement of their students. While college and university teacher education programs need to be aware of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching, these same teacher

education institutions must provide training in the pedagogical skills and content knowledge required of effective teachers. Teachers should not only have warm and caring attitudes as well as show enthusiasm for teaching, but need to be well grounded in teaching strategies and be knowledgeable in the subject matter they teach (Weinstein, 1989).

Walls, Nardi, von Minden, and Hoffman (2002) found similar responses to Weinstein (1989) when researching characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. Three categories of teachers: prospective, novice, and experienced, described effective and ineffective teachers in emotional environment, teacher skill, teacher motivation, student participation, and rules and grades. They found effective teachers described as warm, friendly, caring, enthusiastic, organized, and prepared by all three categories of teachers. Walls et al. (2002) found several additional attributes of effective teachers were also described. These attributes included involving the students in learning, interactive questioning and discussion, caring about student success, and advocating for student achievement. Walls et al. (2002) again state perceived functions of effective teachers as identified by teachers at different stages of their careers.

Darling-Hammond, Chung, and Frelow (2002) found in their survey of nearly 3,000 beginning teachers in New York City that teachers who rated themselves as "better prepared were significantly more likely, at a probability of less than .001, to believe they could reach all of their students, handle problems in the classroom, teach all students to high levels, and make a difference in the lives of their students" (p. 294). They also found that when the teacher felt under prepared there was a feeling of uncertainty in how

some students should be taught as well as the belief that the home life and fellow students had a greater effect on the learning than they did as teachers.

Ralph, Kesten, Lang, and Smith (1998), while studying what qualities school districts look for when hiring new teachers, also referred to the need to identify what characteristics are found in effective teachers. In their study (Ralph et al., 1998) they found that administrators rated the following eight teaching skills a median of 5 on a Likert scale where 5 was the highest rating:

1. establishing positive classroom climate
2. building/maintaining rapport with students
3. classroom management/discipline
4. personal qualities (e.g., creativity)
5. using communication/interpersonal skills
6. planning/preparing for instruction
7. maintaining rapport with parents/community
8. using instructional methods/strategies (p. 52)

Ralph et al. (1998) found that administrators in the survey gave a median score of 4 to these additional seven skills:

9. building/maintaining rapport with staff
10. using instructional skills (e.g., explaining)
11. knowledge of subject matter
12. using evaluation/assessment procedures
13. extracurricular work
14. professional development

15. knowledge of core curriculum (p. 52)

Ralph, Kesten, Lang, and Smith (1998) found their respondents indicated that 83% of the listed teaching skills to be important. They found “five of the first seven of the fifteen highly important aspects deal more with the personal/social/affective nature of teaching than with the technical, structural aspect” (p. 53). The study by Ralph et al. (1998) also supports similar effective teaching characteristics mentioned by Darling-Hammond (1999). These characteristics, teachers knowing their subject matter, understanding how students learn, and using a variety of teaching strategies, are presented in both publications as effective teacher qualities.

Place and Kowalski (1993) surveyed 81 principals on factors in a study on teacher selection. Their research found several teacher characteristics rated 4.0 or higher on a 5-point (highest) Likert scale. Several of these characteristics are similar to those identified by Haberman (1995, 2004). The following is a comparison showing several teaching skills surveyed by Place and Kowalski (1993) with Haberman’s (1995, 2004a) teacher functions:

Place and Kowalski (1993)	Haberman (1995, 2004a)
willingness to be a team player – 4.58	surviving in the bureaucracy
ability to work with peers – 4.80	surviving in the bureaucracy
ability to assess pupil progress – 4.68	explaining student success
respect for students – 4.94	approach to students
knowledge of child growth and development – 4.47	approach to students
knowledge of multicultural education – 4.05	approach to students
time management – 4.21	organization and planning

knowledge of several models of teaching – 4.37

theory to practice

ability to use questioning techniques – 4.44

theory to practice

While the study by Place and Kowalski (1993) is not linked empirically to Haberman's (1995, 2004a) teacher functions, again there is support for the need to identify those characteristics that are found in effective teachers and to note that similar functions are found in separate research efforts.

Student Achievement

The studies of Sanders and Rivers, Jordan, Medro, and Weerasinhe, and Haycock (as cited in Sanders, 2000) identify that teacher effectiveness is the largest single factor affecting student achievement. Sanders (2000) cautions us to be careful when using student data to evaluate teacher effectiveness, but he states that "the cumulative and residual effects of teacher effectiveness on student academic achievement are measurable and huge" (p. 334). Sanders (2000) finds that effective teachers are successful with a diverse population of students, while ineffective teachers provide very little gain for their students. Schools that are serious about improving student achievement must have effective teachers. Using his Value-Added Assessment model, effective teachers can improve their instruction for all students by using academic data for sustained yearly achievement. Using academic data to facilitate instruction for all students is something all teachers, as well as preservice teachers, should be comfortable using.

Ross, Stringfield, Sanders, and Wright (2003), in their study concerning teacher effects and teacher mobility, found that in restructuring schools student achievement gains over a 4-year period showed a statistically significant improvement for the 1995 cohort. Highly experienced teachers, 6 or more years at the same restructuring school,

and moderately experienced teachers, 1 to 5 years at the same restructuring school, in the 1995 cohort had statistically significant gains in student achievement for this 4-year period. While Ross et al. (2003) were focusing on school restructuring, they found teacher experience to be the largest effect on student achievement. Ross et al. (2003) in their study also support the importance of teachers' effect on student achievement.

Sanders and Horn (1998) using data from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) database, found "that teacher effectiveness is the major factor influencing student academic gain" (p. 255). Results also showed that teacher effects are both additive and cumulative on student achievement and that the effects of ineffective teachers are difficult to overcome even by effective teachers. Wright, Horn, and Sanders (as cited in Sanders & Horn, 1998) stated that "differences in teacher effectiveness were found to be the dominant factor affecting student academic gain" (p. 253).

The ultimate goal of selecting effective teachers is to provide a competent and appropriate classroom teacher for all students. Research has shown that student achievement is affected by the quality of the teacher and "the belief that teachers make a difference" (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997, p. 57).

Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) used data collected over a 2-year period for the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System. The data are from the 1994 and 1995 CAP scores for the five subjects: math, reading, language, social studies, and science in Grades three, four, and five. Their findings show "that the most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher" (Wright et al., 1997, p. 63). Effective teachers are successful with students at all levels of achievement. Wright et al. (1997) found that

the teacher effect was highly significant in all analyses and also had the largest effect size in 20 of the 30 analyses. Their findings support the need to find the best teachers possible for every classroom.

Taylor, Pearson, Clark, and Walpole (2001), while studying school and classroom factors in primary grade reading achievement, also found that effective teachers had positive affects on student achievement. These researchers found that their most accomplished teachers exhibited skills in small group instruction, coaching, and higher level questioning that positively affect student achievement. This study continues to support the relationship between effective teachers and the learning of their students.

Driving the need to identify and hire the most effective teachers is the need to have all students achieve to their maximum ability. Student achievement has been linked to teacher effectiveness in several studies (Ross, Stringfield, Sanders, & Wright, 2003; Ross et al., 2001; Sanders, 2000; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2001; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997).

Summary

The review of literature in this study identifies a number of functions attributed to effective teachers. There appears to be some agreement on what skills effective teachers should have. Warm, caring individuals (Gordon, 1999; Walls et al., 2002; Weinstein, 1989), rapport with students and respect for students (Alcock & Ryan, 2002; Haberman, 1995, 2004a; Place & Kowalski, 1993; Ralph et al., 1998), organization and planning (Haberman, 1995, 2004a; Place & Kowalski, 1993), as well as collegial interaction with peers (Haberman, 1995, 2004a; Place & Kowalski, 1993) are some of the functions of effective teachers that appear in multiple studies. While this research may not present a

complete list of all the functions of effective teachers, it certainly identifies a number of functions recognized by teachers as skills displayed by effective teachers. The final result of providing effective teachers for each student is that student achievement will be improved (Ross, Stringfield, Sanders, & Wright, 2003; Ross et al., 2001; Sanders, 2000; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2001; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to investigate change in university students (preservice) participating in a beginning level professional education course in relation to the 10 functions (Haberman, 2004a) of "Star Teachers." This chapter describes the participants as well as the course instruction (intervention) the students received. The two instruments used for pre-testing and post-testing are described with the data collection procedures. The two instruments were developed by Haberman.

Population

Participants in this study consisted of 48 university students assigned to two sections of an introductory level professional education class. All students were first year freshman level college students. These students were in their first semester of college and thus making their initial adjustments to the academic and social life at college. The students were assigned to the two sections in the study as part of the registration process. The students participated in one of two sections, honors or regular, for 15 weeks. Students who were selected for the honors section had achieved set criteria for academic achievement, a minimum high school grade point average of 3.7, or were in the top 10% of their graduating class and had scored a minimum of 1300 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or 30 on the American College Test (ACT), prior to the start of the professional education class. Students assigned to the regular section were

assigned by the university registration process. The population consisted of 36 women and 12 men. The honors section had 21 women and 2 men, while the regular section had 15 women and 10 men. Three student scores were not included in the pre-screener analysis and three student scores were not included in the classroom management protocol as they did not complete both instruments. Only students who completed both the pretest and posttest of an instrument were included in the analysis of the scores on that instrument. Forty-five student scores were used in the data analysis. The pre-screener scores included 22 student scores from the honor's section and 23 student scores from the regular section. The classroom management protocol scores included 21 student scores from the honor's section and 24 student scores from the regular section. One student in the regular section did not have a score used in the pre-screener or the classroom management protocol analysis. Two students had scores included in only the pre-screener analysis while two different students had their scores only included in the classroom management protocol analysis.

The students were asked to complete a consent form to participate in this study. The instructors of each section informed the students that their grades would not be affected in any way due to their participation in this study.

Classroom Instruction

The participants were instructed using the seven functions of "Star Teachers" (Haberman, 1995) and the four goals of disturbing behavior in children (Dreikurs, Greenwald & Pepper, 1982, p. 11) as the foundation of the course (intervention instruction).

The students were instructed to read "Star Teachers of Children in Poverty" (Haberman, 1995), read and use the facilitator's guide, "Becoming a Star Urban Teacher" (Rowley & Hart, 1995), view the seven video cases series, "Mentoring the New Teacher" (Rowley & Hart, 1994), and research Dreikurs' four goals of children's misbehavior. The students also participated in class discussions relating to the information presented in class.

The participants began the professional education class with no prior knowledge of Haberman's dispositions of effective teaching. The professional education class interventions were designed to introduce these concepts to the students. The students read "Star Teachers of Children in Poverty" (Haberman, 1995), through the professors' instruction they became aware of the seven functions (persistence, protecting learners and learning, generalizations: putting ideas into practice, approach to at-risk children, professional-personal orientation to students, bureaucracy, fallibility) of effective "Star," teachers, participated in classroom activities, used on-line discussion, and were involved in internet research. During class students viewed video cases and discussed each situation. Participants viewed each video case one scene at a time, stopping to reflect and then discuss each scene before moving to the next scene. Each case consisted of nine to 11 scenes that varied in length between 15 seconds and 3 minutes. Each scene began with a title page that identified the main idea of that video case (Rowley & Hart, 1995). Each scene would be discussed in small groups using the facilitator's guide "Becoming a Star Urban Teacher" (Rowley & Hart, 1995). At the conclusion of each video the students reflected on the key ideas of the case. The students would view and reflect on each video scene, read the chapter in "Star Teachers of Children in Poverty," and then could

participate in the on-line discussions using "Teacher Line" that was accessible to all students in this study. Students compared and contrasted Haberman's functions with PRAXIS III as well as conducting internet research on Dreikurs, culminating with an opportunity to share their research with the class. Dreikurs' four goal directed misbehaviors, attention, power, revenge, and avoidance of failure were studied.

Instruments

The students were pre-tested and post-tested using the on-line instruments, the Haberman "Star Teacher" Pre-Screener and the Star Classroom Management Protocol. The Pre-Screener consists of 50 multiple choice questions designed to rate each participant on the 10 aspects of effectively teaching diverse students in poverty schools (Haberman, 2004a). Each question has three possible answers that complete the statement for that question. Most questions consist of a single sentence. Several items consist of a situation that is briefly explained. To complete the last sentence, the participant chooses the appropriate solution from three options. A time limit in which to complete the instrument is not used. The Protocol is an on-line interactive game where 24 interactive students are to be kept on task. The interactive students misbehave due to their need for attention, power, revenge, or avoidance of failure. These needs are based on Dreikurs' theory of misbehavior. Misbehaviors are presented with possible solutions until the classroom reaches a set level of disruption. As each misbehaving student (flashing yellow) is selected, the misbehavior and three possible solutions are presented. If the correct solution is chosen, the student is corrected and stops disrupting the class. If the incorrect solution is chosen, the student continues to disrupt (flashing yellow) the class. The student will become permanently disruptive (flashing red) if a second incorrect

solution is chosen or the student remains disruptive for an inappropriate period of time. Multiple students will be disrupting the class at the same time and must be corrected as quickly as possible. When three students become permanently disruptive (flashing red), the classroom is considered completely disrupted and the game ends. The participants received a score based on their time and correct responses.

Reliability

The Haberman interview was originally created in 1963 assessing seven functions of “Star” teachers. Studies done since the inception of the interview show that it predicts which teachers will be successful with students at risk with an error rate of $\pm .05$ (Haberman, 1998). The online pre-screener assesses the 10 functions of “Star” teachers, an increase from seven, but this instrument is still considered to identify with a 95% accuracy which teachers will be successful (Haberman, 2004a).

Data Collection

The students took the pre-screener and the protocol on-line. The pretest and posttest scores for each student were collected and stored electronically. Students took the test at their discretion outside of class instruction. After the data were collected and saved electronically, they were transferred to a separate data file. Calculations were done using the SPSS 12.0 format.

Data Analysis

An independent samples *t* test was performed on the data for hypotheses one, two, three, and four. The *t* test for two independent samples was the appropriate parametric procedure of significance for hypotheses one, two, three, and four. A related samples *t* test was performed on the hypotheses five, six, seven, and eight. A repeated measures

design was used for hypotheses five, six, seven, and eight. The t test for independent samples and the t test for repeated measures were appropriate as the scores on these two instruments represent ratio scales. The Pearson correlation coefficient was performed on hypothesis nine to determine the possible relationship between the scores on the pre-screener and the scores on the protocol.

Null Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference on the pretest scores between the honors class and the regular class on the pre-screener.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference on the pretest scores between the honors class and the regular class on the protocol.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the honors class and the regular class on the gain scores on the pre-screener.

Null Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the honors class and the regular class on the gain scores on the protocol.

Null Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the honors class on the pre-screener.

Null Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the regular class on the pre-screener.

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the honors class on the protocol.

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the regular class on the protocol.

Null Hypothesis 9: There is no correlation between the pre-screener and the protocol in the group of preservice educators on these instruments given prior to instruction.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the change in the scores of preservice teachers on the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game during a beginning level professional education class (Haberman, 2004).

This university was selected by the researcher due to its accessibility for the researcher and the content of the professional education courses. Another factor in choosing this university was that several faculty members in the education department are familiar with Haberman and his effective teacher dispositions. The university is a private, Catholic university in the Midwest. The university has slightly more than 10,000 students attending baccalaureate, masters, post-masters, and doctoral programs. The Carnegie rating at this university is doctoral intensive. The university has more than 70 academic programs. The city in which the university is located has approximately 200,000 people. The school of education has a 4-year program that consist of four programs, early childhood (Grades preK – 3), middle childhood (Grades 4-9), adolescence to young and adult (Grades 7-12), and intervention specialist (Grades K-12). Students are selected for the teacher education program through admission to the university and application to the teacher education department. All students who are accepted into the teacher education program are required to take the beginning level education course.

The students selected to participate in this study were enrolled in a beginning level professional education class. These students were enrolled in class as part of their registration process and were not randomly selected for this study. First-year students who had achieved a grade point average (G. P. A.) of 3.7, or were in the top 10% of their high school graduating class and scored a minimum of 1300 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or 30 on the American College Test (ACT) could elect to apply to the honors section of the professional education course. This study selected the honors section and one regular education section. Forty-eight students were enrolled in these two sections, but two students were excluded from the research as they failed to complete all of the instruments and did not give their consent to participate in this study. The population consisted of 36 women and 12 men. The honors class consisted of 21 women and 2 men while 15 women and 10 men made up the regular class. All students in this study were freshman level students in their first year of college. The beginning level professional education course used 10 functions of effective teachers (Haberman, 2004) with Dreikurs' four concepts on misbehavior as the key components for course instruction.

The Haberman Pre-screener has a maximum score of 50 with a minimum score of 0. In this study the maximum score attained on the pretest was 42. The minimum score attained on the pretest was 27. The maximum score achieved on the posttest was 45 while the minimum score achieved on the posttest was 27. Students in the honors class achieved the highest score on both the pretest and posttest on this instrument. Students in the regular class achieved the minimum score on both the pretest and the posttest on the Haberman Pre-screener.

The Classroom Management Protocol Game has a score range from 0 to 4320. In this study the maximum score achieved on the pretest was 3375 with a minimum score achieved of 396. The maximum score achieved on the posttest was 3876 with a minimum score achieved of 555. The maximum score on the pretest and the posttest were achieved by one person; the minimum scores on the pretest and the posttest were also only achieved one time. A student from the honors class had the maximum score on the pretest and also had the maximum score on the posttest. Separate students in each class attained the minimum scores on the pretest and on the posttest.

Independent Samples *t* test

The independent samples *t* test was used to compare means between the honors class and the regular class on the pretest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener and pretest scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game. The independent samples *t* test was also used to compare means on the gain scores between the honors class and the regular class on the Haberman Pre-screener and on the Classroom Management Protocol Game. The independent samples *t* test is an appropriate procedure for this study as it has ratio data. The independent samples *t* test was used on Null Hypotheses one, two, three and four. The results from the independent samples *t* test can be found in Table 1 and Table 2.

Paired Samples *t* test

The paired samples *t* test was used to compare the means of each group on pretest and posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game. The students were pre-tested on each instrument at the beginning of the

course and then posttested on each instrument at the end of the course. The paired samples t test is most appropriate for these data as it is a ratio scale and there are two scores for each individual taken at different points and time. The paired samples t test was used on Null Hypotheses five, six, seven, and eight. The results of the paired samples t test can be found in Table 3.

Analysis of Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference on the pretest scores between the honors class and the regular class on the pre-screener (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the scores on the Haberman pre-screener, the t test result for pretest scores between the honors class ($M = 35.95$, $SD = 4.09$) and the regular class ($M = 31.17$, $SD = 2.78$) was statistically significant, $t(df = 44) = -4.681$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). (The probability that a Type I error was set at less than .05.) The Null Hypothesis was rejected. Table 1 displays the statistical analysis of hypothesis 1.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference on the pretest scores between the honors class and the regular class on the protocol (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game, the t test result for the pretest scores between the honors class ($M = 1561.81$, $SD = 902.11$) and the regular class ($M = 1458.00$, $SD = 842.80$) was not statistically significant,

$t(df = 43) = -.399, p = .692$ (two-tailed). The Null Hypothesis was retained. Table 1 displays the statistical analysis of hypothesis 2.

Table 1

Independent Samples t-test – Pretest Scores for the Honors Class and Regular Class on the Pre-screener and Classroom Management Protocol Game

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
Classroom Mgt. Protocol	Regular	24	1458.0000	842.79509	-.399	43
	Honors	21	1561.8095	902.10746		
Haberman Pre-screener	Regular	24	31.1667	2.77671	-4.681*	44
	Honors	22	35.9545	4.08805		

Note. * = significance at $<.05$

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the honors class and the regular class on the gain scores on the pre-screener (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For scores on the Haberman pre-screener, the t test result for the gain scores between the honors class ($M = 3.05, SD = 5.96$) and the regular class ($M = 1.74, SD = 4.26$) was not statistically significant, $t(df = 42) = -.844, p = .404$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 2 displays the analysis for hypothesis 3.

Null Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the honors class and the regular class on the gain scores of the protocol (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Findings: For the scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game, the t test result for the gain scores between the honors class ($M = 325.14$, $SD = 794.04$) and the regular class ($M = -7.71$, $SD = 794.29$) was not statistically significant, $t(df = 43) = -1.403$, $p = .168$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 2 displays the analysis for hypothesis 4.

Table 2

Independent Samples t-test – Gain Scores on the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
Haberman Pre-screener	Regular	23	1.7391	4.25566	-.844	42
	Honors	21	3.0476	5.96218		
Classroom Mgt. Protocol	Regular	24	-7.7083	794.29184	-1.403	43
	Honors	21	325.1429	794.04221		

Note. * = significance at <.05

Null Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the honors class on the pre-screener (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the honor class's scores on the Haberman Pre-screener, the t test result for the difference between the pretest scores ($M = 36.00$, $SD = 4.18$) and the posttest scores

($M = 38.95$, $SD = 3.75$) was statistically significant, $t(df = 20) = -2.250$, $p = .036$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 3 displays the statistical analysis for hypothesis 5.

Null Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores for the regular class on the pre-screener (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the regular class's scores on the Haberman Pre-screener, the t test result for the difference between the pretest scores ($M = 31.35$, $SD = 2.69$) and the posttest scores ($M = 33.09$, $SD = 3.68$) was not statistically significant, $t(df = 22) = -1.960$, $p = .063$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis retained. The statistical analysis for null hypothesis 6 can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Paired Samples t-test – Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Haberman Pre-screener for the Honors and Regular Classes

		Mean						
Class	Instrument	N	Pretest	Posttest	Diff.	SD	t	df
Honors	Pre-screener	21	36.0000	38.9524	2.95238	6.01229	-2.250*	20
Regular	Pre-screener	23	31.3478	33.0870	1.73913	4.25566	-1.960	22

Note. * = significance at $<.05$

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the honors class on the protocol (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the honor class's scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game, the t test result for the difference between the pretest scores ($M = 1561.81$, $SD = 902.11$) and the posttest scores ($M = 1886.48$, $SD = 730.89$) was not statistically significant, $t(df = 20) = -1.873$, $p = .076$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 4 displays the results of the analysis for hypothesis 7.

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the regular class on the protocol (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: For the regular class's scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game, the t test result for the difference between the pretest scores ($M = 1458.00$, $SD = 842.80$) and the posttest scores ($M = 1449.25$, $SD = 799.25$) was not statistically significant, $t(df = 23) = .054$, $p = .957$ (two-tailed). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 4 displays the results of the analysis for hypothesis 8.

Table 4

Paired Samples t-test – Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Classroom Management Protocol Game for the Honors and Regular Classes

Class	Instrument	N	Mean		Difference	t	df
			Pretest	Posttest			
Honors	Protocol	21	1561.8095	1886.4762	324.6667	-1.873	20
Regular	Protocol	23	1458.0000	1449.2500	8.7500	.054	23

Note. * = significance at $<.05$

Null Hypothesis 9: There is no correlation between the pre-screener and the protocol in the group of preservice educators on these instruments given prior to instruction (two-tailed significance at less than .05).

Finding: No significant correlation was found between the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game in this group of preservice educators on these instruments given prior to instruction. The results from a Pearson Correlation are found in Table 5. The null hypothesis was retained.

Table 5

Correlation Between the Haberman Pre-screener and the Classroom Management Protocol Game Prior to Instruction

<u>Instruments</u>	<u>Pearson Correlation</u>	<u>Significance(2-tailed)</u>
<u>Protocol Game and Pre-screener</u>	<u>-.150</u>	<u>.326</u>

Note. * = significance at <.05

In summary, there were two hypotheses that were rejected. The data show that there was a significant difference found on the pretest scores between the honors class and the regular class on the Haberman Pre-screener and a significant difference was found between the pretest and the posttest scores for the honors class on the Haberman Pre-screener.

No significant difference was found on the remaining seven hypotheses and all seven were retained. However, two of the seven retained hypotheses have interesting

results. The difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the regular class on the Haberman Pre-screener was $t(df = 22) = -1.960, p = .063$ (two-tailed). On the Classroom Management Protocol Game the honors class had $t(df = 20) = -1.873, p = .076$ (two-tailed).

While these results may create some discussion, it is important to note that due to the small N in this study a Bonferroni adjustment for the number of hypotheses was not used on the data analyses. The level of significance used was less than .05 for each of the nine hypotheses. This does not set the more stringent level of significance that would exist if the Bonferroni adjustment had been used and thus there is a higher probability for a Type I error.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study researched the development of preservice teachers during a semester beginning level professional education course. The review of literature looked at several pieces of research that describe preservice teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2000; Dembo, 2001) and identified a number of characteristics that have been found to be related to the description of effective teachers (Alcock & Ryan, 2002; Haberman, 1995, 2004a; Place & Kowalski, 1993) and the importance of addressing these characteristics in relation to the effectiveness of teaching and ultimately to student achievement (Ross et al., 2003; Sanders, 2000; Sanders & Horn, 1998). This study was not designed to focus specifically on effective teaching or student achievement but only to use these topics as a desired result of preservice teacher courses. Thus, analyzing the change in preservice teachers after completing a beginning level professional education course is one step in the process to develop effective teachers.

In this study the instruments used were developed in the past few years and there is no evidence that they have been used in a preservice teacher study prior to this research. Active teachers have been encouraged to use these instruments for their own knowledge, but in this study I was interested in applying these instruments to a freshman level preservice teacher sample. While this has been an exploratory effort to use these

instruments to assess freshman level preservice teachers, Haberman (1995) has indicated that having the dispositions to be a star teacher are not taught but must develop in an individual. Thus, using the instruments to assess preservice teachers may have the potential to identify effective teachers. Haberman's Pre-screener assesses effective teaching characteristics that have been identified by Haberman (1995, 2004a). The Classroom Management Protocol Game assesses the effectiveness of an individual to identify the cause of classroom misbehavior and the best solution based on the four concepts for misbehavior identified by Dreikurs (Dreikurs, Greenwald, & Pepper, 1982). Haberman's Pre-screener assesses 10 functions of effective teachers while the Classroom Management Protocol Game assesses the ability of an individual to control 24 students who are disrupting a classroom. These two instruments are used to assess student change from the beginning of a professional education class to the end of the semester class.

The use of preservice teachers as the research population was the choice of the researcher as there was accessibility to this student population and the question could be addressed as to the possible development of effective teaching characteristics. These students were in their first semester of college and would have been adjusting to their first college experience. The students may have been more influenced by their high school or home experiences and may have different views of what dispositions effective teachers may have. The beginning level professional education classes at this university specifically addressed Haberman's effective teacher functions through research, discussion, and application. Haberman (1995) stresses the importance of selecting the right type of people, those with the appropriate dispositions toward students and teaching while Darling-Hammond (1997, 2002) has intensively researched the educational

programs of teachers. While I would not suggest that these are opposing views of the question of the natural disposition of a teacher and how, if at all, their disposition can be affected by teacher education programs, they are two different views and are of interest. Administrators faced with the critical task of selecting the most effective teachers for their students would be well served to have knowledge of the important characteristics of effective teachers and what possible effects teacher education programs could have on the development of effective teaching skills.

Findings

This study should be reviewed with the understanding that the sample population was small and was not randomly sampled. The data collected in this research demonstrated a significant difference on the pretest scores between an honors class and a regular class on the Haberman pre-screener and on the difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the honors class on the Haberman pre-screener. In this research significant differences were found only on the Haberman pre-screener in two analyses. One analysis compared the honors class with the regular class on the pretest scores while the other analysis compared pretest scores with the posttest scores of only the honors class.

The difference between the honors class and the regular class raises the question as to why these two groups would have significantly different scores. When looking at the individual scores on the Haberman pre-screener not only does the lowest score, 27, come from the regular class but 8 of the 10 lowest scores, which were 29 or lower, were in the regular class. When looking at the highest pretest scores on the Haberman pre-screener the regular class' highest score was 35 while the honors class had 15 scores of

35 or higher. These scores reflect the dispositions toward teaching the two classes had prior to instruction. The higher scores of the honors class are clearly demonstrated in the means of each class on the Haberman Pre-screener. The pretest mean of the honors class was 35.95 while the pretest mean of the regular class was 31.16. There was a difference in the means of 4.78 points, which resulted in a significant difference, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). Although the posttest scores were not analyzed for significance, this difference continued into the posttest scores for both groups. The posttest mean for the honors class was 38.95 while the mean for the regular class was 33.08. The difference was 5.86 points between the means which was a numerically larger difference than the pretest scores, but was not tested for significance. Both classes thus had positive gain on their mean scores, but the honors class achieved higher mean scores in both pretest and posttest results. A significant difference with a probability of less than .001 was found for the honors class compared to the regular class on the pretest scores in this study on the Haberman Pre-screener. The honors students were more successful on the Haberman Pre-screener in this research.

The honors class showed a significant difference between their pretest scores and posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener. When compared to themselves the honors class had a significance of .036 on a two-tailed test in their mean scores. The regular class did not achieve a significant difference but had a probability of .063 on a two-tailed test of significance. (significance at $<.05$) In the two analyses where each class was analyzed for significant difference between their pretest and posttest scores the honors class had the significant difference, $t(df = 20) = -2.250, p = .036$ (two-tailed), between the pretest and posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener. The honors class

consistently achieved higher scores on the Haberman Pre-screener on pretest scores, and gain scores.

While the regular class did not have a significant difference in their results on the Haberman Pre-screener it should be noted that the significant difference of .063 is reasonably close to the .05 level. This is not sufficient to describe the results as significant, but it can be noted that due to the low statistical power of the study, a type II error could have resulted. Thus, retaining null hypothesis six may be inaccurate.

The honors class had higher scores in both the pretest and posttest results. The honors class also had a higher gain score than the regular class. In this research the honors class clearly displayed higher achievement on the Haberman Pre-screener.

The Classroom Management Protocol Game scores did not demonstrate any significant differences in this study. The only analysis that approached a significant difference was hypothesis seven. The honors class had a *t* test score of -1.873 with a probability of .076 on the two-tailed test of significant difference on the difference between the pretest and the posttest scores (not significant at $<.05$). However, these scores clearly did not achieve a significant difference and demonstrated that in this study neither of the two groups achieved a significant difference on any analysis involving the Classroom Management Protocol Game.

A more appropriate discussion at this time would be on the large standard deviation on both the honors class and the regular class. There was a large range of scores achieved by the participants for both the honors class and the regular class. Scores for the participants ranged from a high score of 3876 to a low score of 396. This large range of scores for both classes resulted in large standard deviations for both classes.

Thus, the scores in the sample are relatively inconsistent and relatively distant from the mean for both classes. Why these scores varied so largely is difficult to determine.

The Classroom Management Protocol Game is an interactive game using solutions to classroom disruptions based on Driekurs' four mistaken goals of misbehavior. It is difficult to determine what prior experiences with interactive games the participants may have had that would have affected their scores or if the participants had been previously exposed to the four mistaken goals of misbehavior. However, nearly as many participants, 19, had a lower score on the posttest as those participants, 23, who had higher posttest scores. The pretest scores ($M = 1561.81$, $SD = 902.11$) and the posttest scores ($M = 1852.59$, $SD = 730.76$) for the honors class were both higher than the regular class's pretest scores ($M = 1458.00$, $SD = 842.80$) and posttest scores ($M = 1450.08$, $SD = 798.62$) and the large standard deviations indicate that the scores are not consistently located around the mean. The data on the regular class show a decrease in their mean score from the pretest ($M = 1458.00$) to the posttest ($M = 1450.08$). While both classes were exposed to the same instruction, the data do not display the same results. However, due to the large standard deviations, it appears that nothing significant could be determined from these varied results. Did the participants have difficulty with the game itself or did they have insufficient knowledge to accurately respond to the classroom disruptions? The exposure many college students may have had to interactive games may have had some effect upon the scores this group achieved on the Classroom Management Protocol Game. As there was no significant change in the game scores, it would appear that the exposure to Driekurs' theories did not significantly affect the students on this game. The large standard deviations indicated that the participants had a

wide range of results on the game and thus they appear to have had an inconsistent experience based on the data of this instrument and that the exposure to Driekurs' theories in the beginning level education class did not have a significant effect upon the participants.

Implications

The data suggest that the students' scores on the Haberman Pre-screener are more likely to show a significant difference than do the Classroom Management Protocol Game scores. In both analyses, where significant differences occurred, identical analyses were run on the Classroom Management Protocol Game with no significant difference resulting. This may be attributed to the type of instrument as the Haberman Pre-screener was composed of multiple choice questions while the Classroom Management Protocol Game was an interactive game with multiple choice answers where the complexity of playing the game and the time limit pressure may have affected the scores. The large standard deviations that occurred on the Classroom Management Protocol Game suggest the participants had a more varied experience with this type of instrument. The participants were not questioned on their reactions to the instruments; thus, no attempt was made to compare the difficulty of the instruments based on the opinions of the participants.

Hypothesis nine addressed the issue of correlation between the two instruments. A Pearson Coefficient Correlation was run on the two instruments with the results showing a correlation of $-.150$ on the pretest scores. The correlation in this analysis, $r (df = 43) = -.150, p < .05$ (two-tailed), is not a significant correlation as the r_{obt} of $-.150$ does not exceed the r_{crit} of $\pm .294$. Any expectation that the score on one instrument could be

significantly related to the score on the other instrument should not be made. The null hypothesis is retained in hypothesis nine. In this study reference to positive or negative correlation cannot be made based on this analysis.

The instruction of the professional education course may have had a significant impact on the participants' scores from the honors class on the Haberman Pre-screener. The content of the professional education course was designed to expose the participants to Haberman's dispositions of effective teachers. The manual used in class, the discussions, and the video situations were designed to acquaint the participants with classroom situations that would be discussed and guide the participants in the development of their own teaching skills. The instruction of the course was designed to develop competency in the skills identified by Haberman (1995, 2004a). Assignments for the course required the participants to specifically study each function of effective teachers using video case studies and reflective dialogue. The participants experienced situations which would give them appreciation and knowledge (Rowley & Hart, 1995) about the dispositions of effective, "Star" teachers. These participants may have been "better prepared" to take the Haberman Pre-screener, although not to the same degree for both groups. The participants were first-year college students and may have been more at ease with the Haberman Pre-screener as it is a series of multiple choice questions. This format would be typical of tests and quizzes they would have had previously in their educational experience. The Haberman Pre-screener would in its physical form look like evaluations the participants had experienced. The data support the fact that the honors class achieved significant difference on the pretest scores as compared to the regular class

and achieved significant difference from their pretest scores to their posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener.

However, the participants may not have been better prepared to take the on-line Classroom Management Protocol Game at the end of the course. The participants studied Dreikurs' four concepts of misbehavior, wrote in their journals, and researched Dreikurs' concepts presenting their discoveries to their class. While the honors class had a mean gain from pretest scores to posttest scores, $t(df = 20) = -1.873, p = .076$ (two-tailed), on the Classroom Management Protocol Game, there was no significant difference as in the Haberman Pre-screener. The regular class not only did not have a significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores on the Classroom Protocol Management Game, $t(df = 23) = .054, p = .957$ (two-tailed), but had a mean score that decreased 7.70 points from the pretest score to the posttest score. This is another example of where the large standard deviation illustrates the wide range of scores and the fact that the scores did not fall closely around the mean. The scores may show a difference from pretest to posttest, but due to the large standard deviation, a significant difference did not occur. Their study, research, and reflection on Dreikurs did not impact their scores significantly on the Classroom Management Protocol Game.

In this study the question of prior achievement of the participants, based on grade point average and S.A.T. or A.C.T. scores could be a factor. The data show that the honors class had higher scores on the Haberman Pre-screener on the pretest scores and gain scores. The review of literature did not indicate that scoring well on the S.A.T. or A.C.T. or an ability to be successful in school as evidenced by a grade point average of 3.7 or higher correlated with more effective teaching. The higher scores from the honors

class may however be an example of their ability to succeed at school related tasks that would be expected on the college entrance tests and their high school grade point average.

This study attempted to look at the change occurring in preservice teachers during a semester professional education course. One practical application of this study would be the use of these instruments to assess student growth in the specific dispositions identified by Haberman (1995, 2004a). This study could also be used to discuss the effectiveness of introducing preservice teachers to these specific teacher dispositions.

The review of literature demonstrated that there is a need for highly qualified teachers. There are ever increasing demands being placed on teachers by the students, the schools, and the communities in which we live. Today all students are expected to achieve and be successful in school. No Child Left Behind clearly sets the expectation that schools will provide educational opportunity and adequate yearly progress for all students. The success of these students depends on the expertise of the teachers whom they will encounter in their educational experience. The review of literature in this study lists a number of characteristics that relate to effective teaching and thus student achievement. The data in this study suggest that some preservice teachers can improve pretest scores to posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener. The Haberman Pre-screener consists of questions designed to recognize effective teaching dispositions. Thus, preservice teachers who improve their score may be improving their understanding of the skills and dispositions necessary to be successful teachers. These preservice teachers may be developing latent talents that they may have not used as much before or might be developing skills that they did not possess to the same degree at the beginning

of the professional education course. In both cases the development of those skills necessary to be successful teachers is the goal of the professional education course while the use of the Haberman Pre-screener allows the students, professor, or another outside source such as an employer, to gain some knowledge about the qualities of a prospective teacher.

This study attempted to look at a small sample of preservice teachers and what change occurred in their dispositions toward teaching during a semester of training. As there are two analyses that had significant differences, what effect might the training have had on the preservice teachers should be considered. Haberman (1995), while certainly supporting the need to train teachers, stated that selection may be more important than training. If this is the case, the sample in this study indicated that preservice teachers who had high achievement prior to college had significant difference when compared to the regular class on the pretest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener and significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores on the Haberman Pre-screener. It is possible that one indicator that could be used to identify stronger candidates for teaching programs might be their achievement in high school and college entrance tests. I would not want to exclude potential teachers on prior academic success alone, but this may be one piece of the puzzle on finding better prospective teachers.

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendation 1: Due to the significant difference found in two of the hypotheses, this study could be replicated with a larger population. This study is susceptible to type II errors due to the low statistical power of the analysis. Increasing the size of the population and using random sampling would increase the statistical power

and reduce the possibility of error and give further study a more representative sample to the total population.

Recommendation 2: Further study could continue to analyze the differences between preservice teachers with different levels of high school achievement. Does higher achievement prior to college indicate that these students will be more successful on the instruments used in this research? In this study the honors class had significant differences on gain scores where the regular class did not achieve significance on gain scores.

Recommendation 3: Further study could be done to assess preservice teachers after they have secured positions as teachers to determine if their scores on instruments such as the Haberman Pre-screener indicate how they will perform in the classroom.

Recommendation 4: Further research could be done to test the effectiveness of the two instruments used in this study to assess preservice teachers. In this study significant differences were found on two hypotheses analyzing the Haberman Pre-screener while significant differences were not found in any analysis using the Classroom Management Protocol Game. Each instrument could be analyzed to determine the validity of these instruments in assessing the change of preservice teachers during a beginning level professional education course.

Recommendation 5: Further research could be done with the participants in this study by reassessing them when they become seniors in college. The predictive value of assessing freshman level students could be explored as well as the possible change that may have occurred over the students' college experience.

Recommendation 6: Further study could be done with the regular class students to determine what type of preservice educational programs would most benefit their preparation to become teachers. This recommendation is based on the lower pre-screener scores achieved by the regular class.

REFERENCES

- Alcock, M. A., & Ryan, P. M. (2002). The case for teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 24(1), 58-67.
- Allison, B. H. (1981). *A study of candidate age, candidate experience, and administrative level as criteria in the teacher selection process*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI.
- Cardinal, K. (1987). *Teacher interview*. Kent, Ohio: Ken Cardinal & Associates.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Quality teaching: The critical key to learning. *Principal*, 77(1), 5-11.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Educating teachers: The academy's greatest failure or its most important future? *Academe*, 85(1), 26-33.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166-173.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 286-301.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaFors, J., & Snyder, J. (2001). Educating teachers for California's future. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 9-55.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "high quality teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13-25.
- Delli, D. A. (2001). Criteria for adopting commercial interviews for teacher selection. *The AASA Professor*, 25(1), 30-34.
- Dembo, M. H. (2001). Learning to teach is not enough – Future teachers also need to learn how to learn. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(4), 23-35.

- Dipboye, R. L. (1992). *Selection interviews: Process perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern Publishing Company.
- Dreikurs, R., & Grey, L. (1968). *A new approach to discipline: Logical consequences*. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc.
- Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. (1982). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Finn, C. E. Jr., & Kanstoroom, M. (1999). *Better teachers, better schools*. Washington, DC: The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Gordon, G. (1999). Teacher talent in urban schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(4), 304-306.
- Graces, F. P. (1932). *The administration of American education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Haberman, M. (1995). Selecting star teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(10), 777-781.
- Haberman, M. (1998). *Introduction to the star teacher video series*. Houston, TX: The Haberman Educational Foundation.
- Haberman, M. (2004a). *The Haberman pre-screener*. Retrieved April 18, 2004, from the Haberman Education Foundation Website:
<http://www.altcert.org/teacher/dimensions.asp>
- Haberman, M. (2004b). *The star classroom management protocol*. Retrieved February 3, 2004, from the Haberman Educational Foundation Website:
[http://www.altcert.org/game/thegame.asp?page=Star Classroom Management Protocol](http://www.altcert.org/game/thegame.asp?page=Star%20Classroom%20Management%20Protocol)
- Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1998). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 96-104.
- Haberman, M., & Stafford, D. (2004). *Can I be a star teacher of diverse children in poverty?* Retrieved January 14, 2004, from the Haberman Educational Foundation Website:
<http://www.habermanfoundation.org/research/research.asp?article=news&pages=Research>
- Hakel, M. D., Hollman, T. D., & Dunnette, M. D. (1970). Accuracy of interviews, certified public accounts, and students in identifying the interest of accounts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 115-119.
- Harris, B., McIntyre, K., Littleton, V., & Long, D. (1979). *Personnel administration in education: Leadership for instructional improvement*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Kaplan, L. S., & Owings, W. A. (2002). The politics of teacher quality: Implications for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 86(633), 22-41.
- Lasley, T. J. (Ed.). (1986). *Issues in teacher education, Volume II*. (Teacher Education Monograph Series #6). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Mayfield, E. C. (1964). The selection interview: A reevaluation of published research. *Personnel Psychology*, 7, 239-260.
- Mayfield, E. C., Brown, S. H., & Honstra, B. W. (1980). Selective interviewing in the life insurance industry: An update of research and practice. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 725-739.
- Mayfield, E. C., & Carlson, R. E. (1966). Selection interview decisions: First results from a long-term research project. *Personnel Psychology*, 19(1), 41-53.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 et seq. (2001)
- Norris, G., & Richburg, R. W. (1997). Hiring the best. *The American School Board Journal*, 184(11), 46, 48, 55.
- Place, A. W. (1995). The effects of applicant age and academic achievement in screening decisions for the employment of secondary teachers: A re-examination using a comparative decision model. *Journal of Research Education*, 5(1), 33-38.
- Place, A. W., & Drake, T. L. (1994). The priorities of elementary and secondary principals for the criteria used in the teacher selection process. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4(1), 87-93.
- Place, A. W., & Kowalski, T. J. (1993). Principal ratings of criteria associated with teacher selection. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7, 291-300.
- Ralph, E. G., Kesten, C., Lang, H., & Smith, D. (1998). Hiring new teachers: What do school districts look for? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(1), 47-56.
- Ross, S. M., Stringfield, S., Sanders, W. L., & Wright, S. P. (2003). Inside systemic elementary school reform: Teacher effects and teacher mobility. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 14(1), 73-110.
- Ross, S. M., Wang, L. W., Alberg, M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (2001, April). *Fourth-year achievement results on the Tennessee value-added assessment system for restructuring schools in Memphis*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.

- Rowley, J., & Hart, P. (1994). *Mentoring the new teacher* [Video series]. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rowley, J., & Hart, P. (1995). *Becoming a star urban teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sanders, W. L. (2000). Annual CREATE Jason Millman memorial lecture: Value added assessment from student achievement data: Opportunities and hurdles. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(4), 329-339.
- Sanders, W. L., & Horn, S. P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee value-added assessment system (TVAAS) database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247-256.
- Schalock, D., Schalock, M., & Myton, D. (1998). Effectiveness – along with quality – should be the focus. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(6), 468-470.
- Smith, M. C., & Knab, K. M. (1996). Designing and implementing teacher selection systems. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(579), 101-106.
- Taylor, B. T., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2001). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade reading instruction in low-income schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(2), 121-165.
- Walls, R. T., Nardi, A. H., von Minden, A. M., & Hoffman, H. (2002). The characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(1), 39-48.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 53-60.
- Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11(1), 57-67.
- Young, I. P., & Delli, D. A. (2002). The validity of the teacher perceiver interview for predicting performance of classroom teachers. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 586-612.
- Young, I. P., & Ryerson, D. (1986). *Teacher selection: Legal, practical, and theoretical aspects* (UCEA Monograph Series). Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

APPENDIX

Consent To Permit Research

Consent to Permit Research

"An Exploration of the Functions of Star Teachers"

Robert E. Best
Doctoral Student
University of Dayton
937-884-5751

Dr. A. William Place
Dissertation Chair
University of Dayton
937-229-2640

I am a doctoral student at the University of Dayton. I am currently gathering data for my dissertation on the functions of star teachers. I will be comparing students in EdT 110, The Introduction to Professional Teaching using two instruments.

During this study, participants will be asked to complete two on-line instruments, the Haberman "Star Teacher" Pre-screener and Haberman's Star Classroom Management Protocol.

While there are no known risks associated with participation in this research, some participants could be mildly frustrated when taking the classroom management protocol. Some students could decide to change majors (career objective) due to their scores on the instruments.

All records of participation will be kept strictly confidential. Results from this research will be kept electronically on the personal computer of the researcher and the university computers of Dr. W. Place and Dr. J. Rowley. These three individuals will have the only access to the results. Results will be coded by giving each participant a number, replacing his/her name. The results from this study will be reported in a written research report. Information about this project will not be made public in any way that identifies individual participants.

Participation is completely voluntary. It may be discontinued at any time for any reason, without explanation and without penalty.

Please sign below indicating that you have read the above form, understand the information provided, understand that participants can ask questions or withdraw at any time, and consent to allow participation in the study.

Questions concerning this research may be directed to Robert E. Best at 937-884-5751 or Dr. A. William Place at 937-229-2640. Questions about the ethics of this research may be directed to Dr. Greg Elvers, Chair for the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 937-229-2171.

Signature of individual granting permission

Name and Title (please print)

Date

Researcher's signature

Date

R702031782