

1473339

THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT NURSE TEACHERS
DURING SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

LESLEY ANN MUNRO

A thesis submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements
of the Council for National Academic Awards
for the degree of Master of Philosophy

THAMES POLYTECHNIC

Theses
THAMES POLYTECHNIC
610.
7307
1
MUN

August 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to my supervisors, Dr. Ian McCallum and Dr. Jim Brophy, for their advice, interest and constant support throughout the writing of this thesis.

I also wish to acknowledge the invaluable help of the students and staff of Thames Polytechnic who participated in the study, as well as the students and staff in the three Schools of Nursing where permission was given for the video studies to take place.

I should also like to thank the many secretaries who have so patiently and thoroughly corrected the drafts which were necessary, prior to the production of the final manuscript.

Finally, my sincere gratitude to Neil, whose patience, and sense of humour, encouraged me during the completion of this study.

ABSTRACT

The Assessment of Supervised Teaching Experience

Lesley Ann Munro

Although the literature on the assessment of student teachers in the school sector is extensive, the literature on the assessment for student teachers in Further Education is much more limited and especially so in relation to student nurse teachers.

This study has explored one specific area in relation to the assessment of student nurse teachers during the one-year Certificate of Education Course at one Institution. This area for investigation was concerned with the ability of students to assess their own teaching performance.

The author examined the similarities and differences between the assessments of lessons made by Polytechnic tutors and the self-assessment of the same lessons made by student nurse teachers.

In order to examine these similarities and differences, the current assessment criteria sheet in use was amended. As the sample was small, care has been taken with extrapolating the findings to the population in general.

The findings did, however, show that although there was broad agreement between the Polytechnic tutors and the student nurse teachers when they were both using the amended assessment criteria sheets, this level of agreement fell short of that which is desirable.

The recommendations from the study, therefore, are that the current method of assessing teaching experience should be developed further. This development should include the use of more than one approach to the assessment of teaching and could also incorporate a more formal recognition of student self-assessment as a means of contributing to the development of effecting teaching and, as a consequence, enabling effective learning. The principles and practice of self-assessment should be given greater emphasis in the course curriculum.

The researcher also addressed the issue of staff preparation in relation to the assessment of teaching. It is considered that this should include practical training in order to minimise differences between the assessments provided by staff. This preparation should be provided for lecturers working in the host colleges as well as the Polytechnic tutors.

THE ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE	
Literature Review	
Section (a) Introduction	1
(b) The Nature of Teacher Training in the United Kingdom	3
(c) The Purpose of Supervised Teaching Experience within Teacher Training	12
(d) Supervision	29
(e) Assessment	46
(f) Self Assessment	59
CHAPTER TWO	
Background Information	
Section (a) The Organisation of Supervised Teaching Experience in the Polytechnic used for the Study	70
(b) The People Involved in Assessment	78
(c) The Methods Involved in Assessment	78
CHAPTER THREE	
Design of the Study	
Section (a) The Statement of the Problem	85
(b) The Hypotheses Generated	90
(c) The Research Methodology	91
(d) The Field Studies	92
(e) The Video Studies	94

CHAPTER FOUR

The Findings

Section	(a)	The Video Studies	96
	(b)	The Field Studies	112

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendations	132
---------------------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	145
--------------	-----

APPENDICES	158
------------	-----

1.	Supervised teaching experience handbook		
2.1	Current assessment criteria sheet		
2.2	Current assessment report form		
3.	Student profile		
4.	Host college report form		
5.	Amended assessment criteria sheets – assessor		
6.	Amended assessment criteria sheets – student		
7.	Data from the Video Studies		
	Table	A	1 Raw Data Student A
		A	2 Tutors involved in the assessments
		A	3 Correlation matrix
	Table	B	1 Raw Data Student B
		B	2 Tutors involved in the assessments
		B	3 Correlation matrix
	Table	C	1 Raw Data Student C
		C	2 Tutors involved in the assessments
		C	3 Correlation matrix
8.	Data from the Field Studies		
	Table	A	Lesson titles, The Professional Background of the Assesors, No.36
	Table	B	Complete Data Variables 1–37, Lessons 1–36
	Table	C	Data demonstrating complete agreement between Assessor and Student, Variables 1–36
	Table	D	Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement between Assessor and Student occurred, Variables 1–36
	Table	E	Data demonstrating complete agreement in grading between Assessor and Student, Lessons 1–36

APPENDICES (Contd.)

	Table	F	Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement in grading with Assessor and Student occurred
	Table	G	Data demonstrating the relationship between agreed lesson gradings and their variables
		G1	Lesson 3 Hearing
		G2	Lesson 11 Counselling
		G3	Lesson 17 Blood cells
		G4	Lesson 20 Children in hospital
		G5	Lesson 21 Assertiveness
		G6	Lesson 22 Diabetes
		G7	Lesson 29 Parkinson's disease
		G8	Lesson 33 Mental health
	Table	H	Data demonstrating Assessor's written comments
	Table	I	Data demonstrating Student Nurse Teacher's written comments
	Table	J	Definition of grades awarded
9.1	Guidelines for the Clinical Assessment Criteria Document		
9.2	Clinical Assessment Document		
10.	A Suggested Teaching Assessment Document		

CHAPTER ONE

Literature Review

(a) Introduction

"Compared with the developing field of research into teaching and teacher effectiveness in this country, investigations dealing with the assessment and evaluation of teaching are still rare. Despite the heavy investment into education programmes and the need to provide a high quality of teaching to nurture and develop young people's skills and knowledge, there is considerable disagreement about the meaning and evaluation of effective teaching" (Saunders and Saunders, 1980).

Many studies both here and in America have been conducted into the traits, attitudes and behaviour of teachers using a variety of observational methods but the results have been largely inconclusive and sometimes contradictory. This inability to reach some agreement about what teachers ought to do in practice presents major obstacles to those who select and train and assess each new generation of student teachers.

Some educationalists have abandoned the task because of the problems of obtaining some form of objective measurement. It is maintained that even if there was some agreement over the outcomes of teaching, the subtle and complex interplay of teachers and students in different schools and colleges makes the task of predictable outcomes problematic. Ultimately, however, the question of teacher effectiveness and its assessment is bound up with the question of value, so that the discussion is also affected by a range of

conflicting ideologies about the nature and purpose of professional education and training.

Teaching practice tutors are continually faced with the practical necessity of making judgements about student teachers. Many schools and colleges, impatient for a satisfactory mode of assessment, currently use a variety of means including rating schedules to arrive at a teaching practice grade. Writers such as Stones (1984) and Duffy (1987) are unhappy about their derivation. Despite the depressing and inconsistent results of research and the deficiencies of the present means of assessment adopted throughout teacher training institutions, practical decisions have to be made about the student teacher's ability to teach and these demand judgements, however imperfectly formed.

A major aim of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences between the judgements of teachers about student nurse teachers and the student's assessment of their own performance.

The development of the study grew out of a concern for more consistency across the procedures for assessment and also a recognition that the student teacher's subjective feelings about their performance should not be dismissed as idiosyncratic.

The college in which the study was done was also looking at the notion of a Liaison Scheme. This was designed to involve the college staff who supervised the student teachers, having much closer contact with the host establishment, and to create a more conducive atmosphere for learning to take place.

(b) The Nature of Teacher Training in the United Kingdom

To provide an informed overview of the current scene in England and Wales, it is essential to start with a brief resumé of those developments made in recent decades which have led to the present situation. To begin in the 1960s, there was rapid expansion of initial teacher education which was particularly marked in the non-university sector.

The universities were largely responsible for the one year Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) which trained graduates predominantly for secondary school teaching. The non-universities provided training which was largely concentrated on the Certificate in Education course and prepared students for primary and post-compulsory teaching.

In the process of expansion the non-university sector began to provide an increasing number of PGCE places and in most institutions the Certificate was phased out by the Bachelor of Education degree (B.Ed.).

At the same time, a new validating body was created following the recommendations of the Robbins Report. This was the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), to which the non-university sector gradually and increasingly turned as a validator for its courses, in preference to the various universities which had previously provided this service. There are still some institutions in the public sector which have all or some of their courses validated by a local university but the CNAA now validates about half of all teacher education courses nationally. Although the CNAA has a national headquarters in London, the validation process is mainly conducted in teams of tutors drawn from the various academic institutions in the CNAA network. In other words, it is a system of peer validation in which all institutions share. This idea has been developed following the Lindop Report, which led

some institutions to expect that they might validate their own courses without reference to anyone else. For the most part, however, the CNAA remains the only means outside the universities by which teacher education courses can be validated.

To return to the chronological approach, the 1970s were just as much about contraction in teacher education as the 1960s were about expansion. In the process of contraction, many colleges were closed or merged with others. The four colleges of post-compulsory teacher education at Wolverhampton, Huddersfield, Bolton and Garnett have all become merged with their local polytechnics. This was made possible because central government had the power to recommend a reduced, or even a nil, intake of teacher education places to an institution. This power over teacher education was indicated in the 1944 Education Act which remains the central legal basis for education in England and Wales, despite many subsequent amending Acts in the intervening years.

The exercise of this power has kept alive the fears relating to an imbalance between central and local government control over education.

As early as 1970, the then Secretary of State wrote to all the universities asking them to conduct a review of teacher education courses and stated the following:

"It may also be helpful to list some of the areas of teacher education which recent public discussion has shown to be subjects of concern. These include:

- (a) The structure of the course, including:

- (1) the distribution of the time between various elements
 - (2) the possibility of the introduction of new patterns of training
 - (3) whether a common pattern of course is an equally appropriate education for all students regardless of the ages of the children and young people they will be teaching
 - (4) doubts about the relevance of the traditional main academic subjects to the education of teachers of young children
- (b) The organisation, supervision and assessment of teaching practice and the role of the practising teacher in the field.
- (c) The adequacy of the course in relation to practical teaching problems such as classroom organisation, the teaching of reading, backward children, immigrant children and team education.
- (d) The content and relevance of courses in the theory of education and the possibilities of developing educational concepts in a more practical manner and deferring some theoretical aspects to in-service education."

These concerns have formed a background to a number of reports and recommendations produced in the 1970s and 1980s. In particular, "Teaching in Schools: the content of initial teacher training" (1983), written by HMI was suggesting that:

"Secondary education in England and Wales has a large amount of teaching undertaken by teachers who were not well qualified in the content of what they were teaching. In primary schools, teachers were not adequately prepared for the range of topics they were required to teach."

In 1983 HMI were also intensively involved in what began as a "survey of teacher training institutions". This later became a series of inspections. Significantly these were eventually extended to the universities and although this went through the ritual of being by invitation only, other linked events made the invitation obligatory.

From these surveys emerged the government's criteria for the content of initial teacher training. The question of the relationship of the government to the validating bodies was avoided by a distinction made between validation and accreditation. The second paragraph of DES Circular No. 21/84 states that:

"As the White Paper explained, the approval by the Secretary of State of initial teacher education courses is distinct from the validation of courses for academic purposes. It is for the validating body to judge the merit of a course and to determine whether a student successfully completing it should be awarded a first degree or other qualifications: it is for the Secretary of State for Education and Science to say whether the course is suitable for the professional preparation of teachers and hence the conferment of qualified teacher status."

To judge whether or not courses were suitable the government established a Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE). Members were

all personal nominees of the Secretary of State but only a minority were drawn from teacher education institutions. The majority represented the wider community of schools, colleges, industry and commerce. This reflects the widespread view that there has in the past, been a failure in England and Wales to produce teachers who were sufficiently aware of the world of work. There has, in other words, been a neglect of technical and vocational education. This neglect is seen as one of the roots of decline in economic growth in this country and, as such, has stimulated much debate about the role of post-compulsory education, for example, the Further Education Unit's "The New F.E." (1983).

There is now considerable pressure, linked to the work of CATE, for teachers to spend periods of time throughout their careers both in school and colleges, and industrial and commercial placements. Further, the circular states:

"Her Majesty's Inspectors will visit each teacher education institution in the public sector and, by invitation, the University Departments of Education. The findings will be reported to the Secretary of State, who will make them available to the Council. Reports of visits made in the public sector institutions will be published in accordance with current practice."

In other words, accreditation will be linked with HMI's advice to CATE. Under these circumstances, the request being made by an HMI to visit a University Department of Education could not be refused.

Any public sector institution, however, now providing teacher education in England and Wales has an ever-increasing number of bureaucracies to which it must address itself in order to survive and develop (Hellawell, 1987).

An interesting critique of the teaching quality issue is provided by Clarke (1987). He argues that there is a problem caused by the government's intention to place the classrooms and the teachers in them, centre-stage. He goes on to quote from the required relationship which:

"involves the staff of the training institutions and those staff of the schools being responsible for the day-to-day work of training and teaching in each other's institutions, not only as replacing each other but alongside each other so as to benefit from each other's knowledge and experience."

HMI Teaching in Schools (1983)

This proposal Clarke finds untenable given the current organisational pattern of teaching practice. The colleges are being compelled to consult the schools but Clarke can find no suggestion that the proposed partnership will extend to the college tutor so that he or she may have some say in the way in which the teacher's class is to operate while the student is there.

These major alterations in teacher education have coincided with new policies for the central funding of educational research. The DES has recently changed its rules for funding research in education. It now only awards grants to research projects which have the sole potential of making contributions to specialised fields of study. This means that a project must be likely to help a policy decision to be made; or help with the implementation of a policy decision; or help to evaluate the outcome of a policy. Research is supported by bodies other than the DES but a great deal of local research is not published, possibly because of the potential ramifications of the findings. Data now available showed that a considerable proportion of postgraduate students did not follow courses on certain topics, such as discipline and control in the classroom and special needs of children

with a handicap. There is little doubt that similar data could be obtained from B.Ed. PGCE and C.Ed. courses up and down the country.

Such courses may suffer from deficiencies arising from the imposed constraints by validating bodies. In Wales, for example, following the James Report, the Diploma of Higher Education structure, in the first two years of the B.Ed. courses, proved a major obstacle in implementing change. The academic needs of students were then considered paramount at the expense of practical proficiency in the classroom.

It can be argued therefore that there has been a lack of research into teacher education. This is especially disappointing when it is considered that there are approximately 1,200 staff in university departments who, to a greater or lesser extent, contribute to the training of teachers at a variety of levels. The reasons for this may stem from the fact that teacher education per se, is not widely regarded as a discipline in its own right. Postgraduate students do not normally follow research programmes in teacher education and this keeps the output of work low. Hence most college and university staff continue to specialise and generate research in their own academic areas.

Recent reviews, Hoyle and Megerry (1980), McNamara (1984), Alexander, Craft and Lynch (1984), however, suggest that traditionally there have been three particular areas that have provoked some debate and research in the field of teacher education; the form and functioning of teaching practice; the place of theory in teacher education; the nature of pedagogical skills training. To these can now be added the details of course structure.

Despite this new work, none of these aspects has been fully explored and many critical areas of teacher education remain unexamined. Studies into teacher effectiveness for example and the potential of self and peer

assessment, developing schemes of continuous assessment for teaching practice, are all worthy of consideration.

The present lack of research activity in teacher education needs rectifying if research is to be used to illuminate practice and policy and if decisions are to be made on the basis of fact rather than informed speculation.

The debate about the nature of teacher training has continued with the publication of a study entitled, "Teachers Mistaught" (Lawlor, 1990). Her contention is that teaching stands alone among the professions in switching attention from the mastery of a subject to the practice of communicating it. Because subject mastery is not accorded primacy, the courses "demean the subject to being little more than a peg on which to hang modish educational theory"

This criticism is interesting when applied to the current Certificate Course for Post Compulsory Education. The criteria for entry to these courses require that students should already possess the relevant academic and/or professional qualifications which will be needed in their subsequent employment as teachers. In the case of qualified nurses applying for these courses, their own statutory body, the English National Board, stipulates the additional knowledge they must have in order to be awarded a funded place on such a course. This rigorous system is, in turn, the statutory responsibility of the United Kingdom Central Council for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting. The Council records the teaching qualifications awarded to nurses by such courses.

This section of the Literature Review has provided a brief resumé of the nature and complexity of teacher training. It has also highlighted the relative lack of research which has been undertaken in this field. The following section will explore the purpose of supervised teaching practice within teacher training.

(c) The Purpose of Supervised Teaching Practice Within Teacher Training

The major purpose underlying the Certificate in Education course is to help the student to become a thoughtful, resourceful and effective teacher. Other important areas for consideration are, the acquisition of knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their future roles in institutions. Obviously this exacting task would be helped considerably if there was a comprehensive analysis of the task which teachers undertake.

The value of practice in teaching lies not in the end result of a one-off superlative and virtuoso performance but in the gradual improvement of one's everyday performance. Practice in teaching, unlike practice in some mechanical skill, does not consist of the practice of tasks. Unfortunately, there is in education an implicit assumption that, during the initial teacher training, certain skills are mastered "once and for all", and that no further practice is necessary.

In addition, courses are seldom corporately planned by tutors and teachers and comprehensive arrangements for the guidance and assessment of student teachers is the exception rather than the rule. Consequently student teachers in college-based preparation are confronted by different models of teaching which contain contrasting assumptions, values and interpretations.

Despite the advocacy of closer school/college co-operation which is indicated in government documents, for example, Kerry (1982), it is clear that present arrangements for teaching practice are ambiguous, idiosyncratic and even confused. The business of assessment is therefore precarious since there are no public criteria or standards against which to judge the competency of the teacher, even where teaching behaviour is assessed on a pass/fail basis.

Furthermore, college tutors formulate this training programme and it is assumed that they are in the best position to assess the performance of student teachers in colleges, even though their judgements of teaching behaviour may be largely impressionistic, imperfectly formulated and seldom subject to critical scrutiny (Lasley 1986).

Unfortunately advocates for change may meet with a lukewarm reception by teacher training institutions. Stones and Morris (1972) suggested that college staff have played a relatively small part in educational innovation, in developing new curricula and teaching methods either independently or in conjunction with other agencies.

In colleges themselves, co-operation between different groups of teachers and lecturers is exceptional and it is not always the case that these groups come together to plan a phase of teaching practice or to discuss individual student grading at the end of such a period.

It would also be erroneous to imagine that tutors in colleges of education share common assumptions about teaching. Student teachers are therefore often faced with different models, interpretations and expectations of teaching behaviour. These discrepancies are particularly evident between educational studies and main subject tutors where the goals of these two groups may differ markedly. For example, in a study of goals in a college of education, Shaw and Downes (1971) noted that members of staff pursued "a variety of goals simultaneously with overlapping frames of reference, especially in the professional area of the college work" (p.153).

Percy (1972) pinpointed some of these differences in a large-scale investigation of educational objectives and student performance in higher education. As a preliminary to the main study, Percy interviewed forty

lecturers from a variety of institutions to find out their perceptions of the objectives of their college. Effectively, the lecturers divided into two.

"Main subject lecturers made it clear that their teaching objectives were conceived and organised within a subject framework." (p.77)

Education lecturers were orientated more:

"to a common overall objective of emphasising certain styles of teaching and attitudes to education. Students were to be trained away from formal and highly structured classroom methods and shown the importance of individualised teaching of children". (p.79)

These contrasting attitudes may result in a manifestation of differing teaching experience, recruitment patterns and models of teaching.

It seems critical therefore that these two groups of lecturers need to meet regularly to analyse the basis of their different models of teaching so that individuals with strongly opposed views could learn to appreciate the sometimes slanted views of the other and, if necessary, modify these views in the interests of student learning. The problem is not alleviated by keeping groups of tutors apart in their respective departments.

Despite the limitations apparent in present practices and notwithstanding the innovative experiments being carried out in certain colleges, the majority of students are still assessed by traditional methods, where college tutors observe a limited number of lessons and arrive at a final teaching grade using impressionistic modes of assessment. Except where a student teacher is borderline or failing and an external examiner is asked to arbitrate, assessment has, in the main, remained in the hands of tutors in colleges. On

closer examination, this method has created a number of difficulties which have affected its validity, reliability and practical value.

The findings of Yates (1982), in a study of teaching practice supervision in England and Wales, would appear to support these previous assumptions. Ninety-one institutions were approached in the study and sixty-seven responded. The study was developed in four stages. Stage One was concerned with identifying the existing patterns of teaching practice and teaching practice supervision. Stage Two was concerned with the effectiveness of supervision as perceived by student teachers, co-operating teachers and college supervisors. Stage Three maintained the focus on the perceived effectiveness but used individual interviews rather than questionnaires. Stage Four was designed as a project to investigate how the supervision of student teachers could be explored and improved. The data from the returns suggest that although certain similarities exist in the overall organisation of teaching practice, there are a number of significant differences. The following relate to Stage One:

- "1. Sixty four per cent of institutions adopt a policy of using two college supervisors to visit each student. Thirty-six per cent use only one supervisor.

2. Institutions vary in the sense of providing specialist supervisors. Fifty per cent of those institutions using one supervisor model tended to appoint generalist supervisors, i.e. someone appointed at random from a general pool of available staff. In contrast, only sixteen per cent of institutions using the two supervisor model used general supervisors. The emphasis here was to use specialist supervisors.

3. Of the institutions using the one supervisor model, the average number of students allocated was 4.5. In those institutions using the two supervisor model it is common for one supervisor to work with a larger number of students than the other. The average workload of the first supervisor was 4.5 and for the second supervisor, 8.9 students.

4. Considerable variation exists in the number of visits that institutions expect student teachers to receive. However, the average number of visits expected under the one supervisory model during the total student teaching experience is 12.2 for each student. (The average length of teaching practice over a three-year teacher training course was 17.2 working weeks or 86 working days.)

The 12.2 visits averages out as one visit every seven working days. Under the two supervisor model, the average number of visits expected by the two supervisors between them is 16.3 for each student. This averages out at one visit every five working days.

5. Considerable variation exists in the amount of time institutions made available to supervisors for visits to students. The average time was one hour and thirty-eight minutes and covered travel, observation and consultation."

There were also significant differences shown in Stage Two of Yates's study, the effectiveness of supervision as perceived by student teachers, co-operating teachers and college supervisors. From the data received, there is evidence to suggest that the school-based personnel in the supervision process is of greater value than that of the college-based personnel:

- "1. The co-operating teacher is of greater help to the student teachers than the college supervisor. Seventy-two per cent of students felt this to be the case.

2. Student teachers felt that the co-operating teacher was able to give more time for observation and discussion than the college supervisor. Seventy-one per cent of student teachers agreed that the amount of time their co-operating teacher spent in observing them was sufficient for judging their work, whereas only thirty-one per cent of student teachers felt this to be so with their college supervisor(s). Fifty-three per cent of student teachers agreed that their co-operating teacher gave them sufficient time to discuss their teaching compared with twenty-four per cent who feel this way about discussions with their college supervisor(s).

3. The student teachers saw the evaluation of the co-operating teacher as being more valid than that of the college supervisor. Seventy-eight per cent of student teachers feel this way about their co-operating teacher's evaluation compared with forty-seven per cent who saw the college supervisor's evaluation as being valid.

4. That both co-operating teachers saw the role of the college supervisor as being concerned with evaluation than support. Sixty-one per cent of the co-operating teachers felt that their student teachers saw them in a supporting role, whereas nineteen per cent of co-operating teachers felt that their student teachers saw the college supervisor in this light.

5. That the evaluation of the college was more important to the teacher training institution than that of the co-operating teacher. Sixteen per cent of the college supervisors saw the school evaluation as more important than their own. Twenty-four per cent of the co-operating teachers felt that the college supervisors valued their opinions and judgements.
6. That the level of communication between the institution and the school was perceived as being more limited by the co-operating teacher than by the college supervisor. Fifty-six per cent of the co-operating teachers agreed that greater communication between college and school was necessary. Twenty-four per cent of college supervisors felt this to be so.
7. That co-operating teachers felt less clear about their role than the college supervisors realised. Sixty-four per cent of college supervisors agreed that co-operating teachers had a clear understanding of college expectations. Eighteen per cent of co-operating teachers felt this to be so.
8. That both college supervisors and co-operating teachers supported the idea of training for co-operating teachers. Eight per cent of college teachers and sixty-two per cent of co-operating teachers agreed that special training and discussion on the supervision of student teachers would be helpful."

Stage Three used individual interviews to explore supervision more closely and the limitations of the existing situation were elaborated upon. From the information received it would appear:

- "1. That although co-operating teachers recognise the importance of teaching practice, they also feel it can disrupt the work of the class.
2. That the demands of new patterns of courses within teacher training reduced for many the time available for supervision.
3. That for many students and co-operating teachers the infrequent and limited length of visits made effective communication with the college difficult."

The final stage was concerned with means of improving future practice, and recommended that:

- "1. Communication and information between the teacher training institution and the schools be improved.
2. College supervisors should, wherever possible, be linked to schools on a regular basis.
3. Before the start of teaching practice there should be a three-way meeting involving the college supervisor, the co-operating teacher and the student, in order to establish contact and clarify expectations.
4. A set of guidelines agreed by all parties in the triad should be developed to help clarify the role of the college supervisor, the co-operating teacher and the student.

5. In-service courses on supervision skills should be developed for co-operating teachers."

The detail from this study has crucial importance for the background of this literature search as many concerns expressed through the study are still relevant in 1990.

Returning to the literature concerned with the purpose of supervised teaching experience, a more recent HMI study, "Quality in Schools: The Initial Training of Teachers" (1987), reports the findings from a study undertaken in thirty colleges and polytechnics between 1983 and 1985. Although it deals largely with primary and secondary schools, it reveals some interesting insights into the problems and purposes of student teacher supervision.

The supervision by tutors, and the role of the co-operating teacher caused concern. Many students were visited less than once a week.

"There appeared to be no consensus even with a single institution about the regularity of supervisor's visits."

It was suggested that the relationships between colleges and schools would be improved by more involvement of class teachers in the courses and by tutors themselves, teaching in the practice schools.

Inspectors were particularly impressed where tutors, students and co-operating teachers worked together in the classroom. At the same time some students were allocated class teachers who were poor role models and the report suggested that local education authorities should be more involved in the selection of schools which were used for teacher training. The report also pointed out that teachers in schools, who were responsible for teaching

practice, appeared to have no specific preparation for assessing student teachers' behaviour.

"Class teachers were particularly uncertain of their role in this respect and this warrants closer attention and improvement."

This point is echoed in a study by Jenkins (1984). He conducted the investigation on the basis of individual and small group interviews to ascertain the opinions of tutors, teachers and student teachers about practical problems to do with initial teaching practice.

"In their survey of B.Ed. courses in the public sector institutions, H.M. Inspectors claim to have found it unfortunately quite common that students reported to schools armed with little more than an observation checklist and where class teachers were uncertain about the exact nature of the experienced intended." (3.11., p.7)

The reasons for some of these findings had been explored by Zeichner (1986), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985). Their work has focused on the important issue of the socialisation of student teachers within teaching institutions. It is argued that lack of attention to the content and context of student teaching have been two serious flaws in this area resulting in confusion and inequality of provision which the studies of Yates and Jenkins demonstrated.

"While all colleges make some sort of statement in their prospectuses about broad aims of the theoretical element in their courses, few venture to do the same in relation to practical teaching." (Stones and Morris, 1972, p.127)

One way to approach the content of student teaching programmes is to focus on their curricular orientations and on the conceptions of the teacher's role to which these orientations are linked. Zeichner has outlined four paradigms of teacher education which are represented in contemporary debates and which give some guidance to the conduct of teacher education. Evidence for all four of these orientations, behaviouristic, personalistic, tradition-craft and enquiry-orientated, can be found in various approaches to organising the content of student teaching programmes. When linked with the alternative conceptions of the teacher's role such as those provided by Lanier (1984), they provide one way of distinguishing among the many plans of intent for student teachers.

It is clear from any examination of the literature on student teaching that there is no agreed definition of the experience and that there is a great deal of variety in the conceptualisation, organisation and conduct of the placement. Beyond general agreement that student teaching should be:

"a period of guided teaching when the student is given increasing responsibility for the work of a given group of learners over a period of several weeks".

(Flowers et al, 1948)

there are clearly many alternatives existing in practice for this experience.

The concerns previously quoted from Zeichner, in relation to "content" are also raised by Gaskell (1975), Ryan (1982) and Calderhead (1988).

A different criticism of the content of student teaching programmes is made by Hersh et al (1982). They are concerned with the common tendency to examine isolated aspects of a student teaching programme in relation to developmental outcomes. This is to ignore the complex ecology or placement experience.

"Different aspects of teacher training programmes and relationships among participants in specific settings act as simultaneous influences on the student teachers. This phenomenon creates a complex ecology that is often masked by research attempts to explain the effects of single factors in the setting."

(Hersh 1982, p.1817)

Another criticism of the treatment of content is related to the lack of attention paid to its inclusion in the course curriculum. Zeichner has argued that the characteristics of practice-based programmes are not to be found in the public statements of intention but through an examination of the experiences themselves. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1982) elaborate on this theme when they argue that one cannot assume that all practical placement experiences pose the same constraints and opportunities for all student teachers.

Similarly, Parlett and Hamilton (p.145, 1976) have noted that:

"An instructional system, when adopted, undergoes modifications that are rarely trivial. The instructional system may remain as a shared idea, abstract model, slogan or shorthand, but it assumes a different form in every situation. Its constituent elements are emphasised or de-emphasised, expanded or truncated, as teachers, administrators technicians and students interpret and re-interpret them for their particular setting. In practice, objectives are commonly re-ordered, re-defined, abandoned or forgotten. The original 'ideal' formulation ceases to be accurate or indeed of much relevance."

There is some evidence from other studies on student teaching which supports these arguments and which underline the inappropriateness of deriving an understanding of student teaching programmes solely from statements of goals and from instructional plans.

For example, Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981), Goodman (1984) and Evans (1987) have shown that even when the designers of practice-based programmes have articulated a specific emphasis, the actual implementation of the programme reflects a diversity of orientation as different people bring to bear their differing perspectives.

Similar evidence can be found in Griffin et al's (1983) comprehensive study of student teaching programmes at two universities.

There are also areas of conflict which surround the context of supervised teaching experience (Zeichner, 1986). This has to do with the nature of classrooms, schools, and colleges in which student teachers work. Becher and Ade (1982) point out what should be obvious, "by their very nature, no two placements are alike". Evans (1987) also suggests:

"Student teachers are often exhorted to 'fit in' and not to disturb or change what they encounter. But the prevailing norms of the school, what is acceptable, expected or encouraged may not be educative or reflective of what college personnel wish student teachers to learn".

In Zeichner's examination of sixteen representative studies of the role of the student teacher, there is a variety of ways in which placement sites have been described. At the level of the classroom, eleven of the sixteen studies do not provide any information at all about the character of the classroom in

which the students have to work beyond an occasional reference to the range of grade levels within the sample. Fairly comprehensive approaches to the analysis of placement site characteristics were provided in three of the sixteen studies.

Doyle (1977) mapped out the ecological characteristics of classrooms in which students taught and provided descriptions of the strategies which students used both successfully and unsuccessfully in attempts to reduce the complexities of classroom demands. He argues that these factors are major determinates in influencing the actions of student teachers. Becher and Ade (1982) also utilised the "Placement Site Assessment Instrument", to analyse the relationships between three specific placement characteristics as judged by university supervisors. The three were, modelling of commonly accepted good teaching behaviours, quality of supervisory feedback and opportunities for student teacher innovation.

This work, together with others such as Stevens and Smith (1978) and McIntosh (1968), which describe a set of dimensions for distinguishing among placement sites, all provide good methods from which to assess the context and therefore the quality of classrooms in which students work.

Another study of particular importance which addresses the content and context of supervised teaching practice is that of McCullough (1979). Her study involved forty-four colleges of education providing B.Ed. and B.Ed. Hons. degrees and focused specifically on the school experience element. The content of each course was explored by analysing the colleges' formal statement of intent. For example, during the course, opportunities will be provided for the observation of pupils in schools and on film or videotape and for the setting up of micro-teaching situations.

"This tells us the location of work and the choice of teaching methods; it does not tell us what, why and how the student teachers will be learning and how precisely this relates to their other programme of work."

The formal statements of intent were also balanced by considering the informal statements of intent. These were taken from college staff and included such comments as:

"Quite often, going into school will help them make the links. That is why the practical experience is so vital. Theory being taught in a vacuum suddenly starts to slot into place. For example, elements of perception can be shown to be a real issue when it comes up in the classroom."

Student statements, however, tended to contradict those of the college staff:

"You found elements of theory were really thrown out of the window as soon as you were teaching in the classroom."

"It's a good base, but once you get into school you tend to forget everything you've done in lectures and get on with teaching the kids."

The school staff developed the notion of integration further:

"A lot of theory has no meaning until they arrive in the classroom. I sometimes wonder if their academic studies have relevance to their teaching."

These comments demonstrate that there is a dichotomy of intention both in the content and the context of teaching practice. The study also explores other important issues which are closely linked with content and context.

These issues include, the cost of teaching practice which is large and carries enormous resource and finance implications. Time is another crucial factor and the allocation of hours in order to give appropriate diagnostic, formative and summative assessments was seen to vary to a very large degree. Time was also a factor which could encourage or prevent the close co-operation between the college supervisor and the co-operating teacher.

The fact that weekly timetables in terms of hours are not negotiable means that in order to fit in all commitments and deal with unforeseen problems, or spend extra time with a student teacher in difficulties, the supervisor may be forced to allocate less time to a student with above average competence. It could also be argued that student teachers who are geographically close to the college may receive more visits than those further away.

In some instances, college tutors may continue to undertake teaching commitments of their own. This means that their time for visiting will be restricted to certain days of the week. This inflexibility may also have repercussions in the host institutions where their timetables, in which the student teachers are involved, may prevent the supervisors from seeing crucial classes being taught.

The issue of generalist and/or specialist teachers is also a contentious one, and McCullough explores this at some length.

These practical problems to do with the content and context of supervised teaching practice are difficult to solve, but there are indications that a clear articulation of priorities would help.

Some colleges are at present pressing for a higher profile for teaching practice. Recent government publications on the state of teaching competence, for example, "Teaching in Our Schools" (1988), would suggest that the government will be supportive of such activity. Other colleges are abandoning B.Ed. degrees in favour of B.A. degrees in Teaching Studies with an additional main subject. The latter point is illustrated by the following quote from a prospectus:

"The new course of undergraduate teacher training will allow students to spend an increased amount of time on their academic subject."

This statement may herald a shift towards the new teacher being an educated person rather than an effective and competent practitioner. The role of the teacher surely demands both of these elements, which is why the notion of supervision is crucial. It is a "knowledgeable doer" which the process of supervision should seek to produce.

In summary, there are various views on the purpose of supervised teaching experience within teaching training. These views suggest that there is little consensus amongst experts apart from the fact that teaching experience is valuable. This value is apparent even though the period of supervised practice lacks a sense of purpose and direction.

(d) Supervision

"Supervision in teaching practice is conceived as essentially an interactive process involving as its central figures those people designated to hold the position of supervisor - the teacher from the education programme, the co-operating teacher from the school, and the student teacher." (Turney 1982)

However, Stones suggests that:

"the supervision of student teachers is a much under-studied subject in Britain. This lack of awareness stems from the fact that assessors are recruited from staff who have not made a study of any of the foundation disciplines of education apart from a limited exposure during their own teacher training and even those that have studied further in the field are extremely unlikely to have given thought to the theory and practice of assessment"

(Stones, 1984, p.11)

Prior to 1960, supervisory research focused on the characteristics of student teachers (personality, attitudes and achievements), whilst ignoring the actual process of supervision. Recently supervisory research has developed two themes. Firstly, the effectiveness of supervision and secondly, the behaviours of supervisors, co-operating teachers and student teachers.

This shift in research emphasis is attempting to deepen our understanding and address the criticism raised earlier by Stones. Stones has contributed to the debate and suggests that:

"current conceptions of supervision of student teaching practice reflect the atheoretical apprenticeship system mode of training. In an apprenticeship system, supervisors have a very ambiguous role as specialists in the academic subjects which the students are teaching, and as experienced teachers on whom the students are supposed to model their teaching. Frequently they lack credibility in both fields since colleagues working in the mainstream course of study occupy the high ground in academic subjects and teachers at the chalk face occupy a similar position with regard to practical teaching". (Stones, 1987)

Stones argues that a reconceptualisation of supervision is called for. The argument is also supported by Stones's statement that:

"we should reject the view of teaching as the transmission of verbalisations that all too often convey the very minimum of conceptual understanding, and nurture a view that sees teaching as the maximisation of the ability of the learner to better understand and to cope with their worlds and enhance their enjoyment of learning".

This statement of aims has implications for supervision. It necessitates the need for student teachers to be able to deploy (a word Stones uses particularly in this context) an understanding of key principles of human learning and for supervisors to be able to guide and discuss the deployment of the principles in the reality of the classroom.

Stones also argues that:

"unfortunately the knowledge that has been accumulated by psychologists studying human learning has had little effect on the view of learning implicit in the common view of teaching as verbal transactions aimed at transmitting information. Despite this evidence from work on human learning indicating that effective teaching is a highly complex phenomenon, teacher educators, in the main, have neglected the implications of this body of knowledge for the practical element in teacher education".

This assumption can be demonstrated by the way in which most supervisory visits are conducted. They mostly conform to the dictionary definition of supervision, "to oversee", "to watch over so as to keep order"

This authoritarian view of supervision ignores the supportive, participatory element in which sharing, discussing and planning a lesson could take place. Very often, supervision is seen as an administrative task, carried out at the back of the classroom with no words spoken until the lesson has been completed. This is a paternalistic relationship between supervisor and student teacher which may render the whole period of supervision to simplistic and superficial comment.

Stones is arguing for a different approach to supervision. He is concerned that as well as commenting on surface teaching abilities which relate to speech, eye contact, etc. supervisors should be discussing pedagogical principles to do with problem-solving and concept formation. These he refers to as "deeper structures of teaching" In order to examine these deeper structures it is necessary to carry out a systematic pedagogical analysis of teaching problems. The suggestion is that very few teachers undertake a conceptual analysis of the theoretical principles of their subject and that in

order for this to be discussed during supervision, a different approach is required.

"Supervision of this kind demands a very different realm of discussion from that normally found in supervisory interviews. Instead of focusing on cosmetic aspects of teaching such as diction, chalkboard writing, or even dress, the discussion will be about such things as programming of exemplars and non-exemplars or concepts, or the grading or salience in criterial or non-criterial attributes of concepts, or the nature of reinforcement.

Clearly discourse of this nature depends on supervisor/student relationships that extend beyond the occasional observation of lessons and reach into theoretical aspects of pedagogy that should be an integral part of the overall teacher training course. Supervision is facilitated by the common realm of discourse related to the theory and practice of teaching and provides a deeper understanding of pedagogy that enhances student, supervisor and co-operating teacher collaboration."

It is Stones' contention that by using this approach, the activity of supervision becomes less of an "expert, non-expert" encounter and more a period of joint exploration in which analysis, reflection and continued development can occur.

This view would seem to be supported by the research which has looked at how teachers learn.

There is evidence that teachers do not learn, by and large, from scholarly journals (Little 1982), research reports (Stenhouse 1987), or even by pre-service courses (Hogpen 1980). Rather, they seem to be influenced by

example, i.e. role models provided by their own teachers. Research on adult learning (Knowles 1978) suggests that adults learn in situations where they are provided with continuous guided reflection based on "lived experience".

Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1980) believe that even though research into adult development is in its infancy, the conceptual framework may develop out of practice. They argue that "since theory and practice are really different sides of the same coin, valid theory can be derived from careful and systematic analysis of practice".

Analysis of their own research has led them to suggest that the following elements are important for adult learning:

- "1. Role-taking experience: this involves the performer in a direct and active way in situations where there are new and complex tasks.
2. Qualitative aspects of role-taking: recognition is given to the capacities of individuals and the complexity of new tasks and roles.
3. Guided reflection: this acknowledges the importance of not only providing adults with new and real experiences but also the need to assist them in making sense of them.
4. Continuity: brief, episodic learning encounters as experienced in one-off days are ineffective in facilitating change.
5. Personal support and challenge: giving up old habits is a painful process. During the transition period, careful and continuous support is required."

It would seem from current practice that theories of adult learning are not being utilised in teacher training as much as they might. This is evident in the continuing argument about block versus day release for teaching practice (Jenkins 1984).

Another study which explores the effectiveness of supervisory technique is by Hogan (1983). Although the main area of concern in his paper is the validity of the assessment of student teachers, he includes the issue of "prejudice" and suggests that there is a place for positive prejudice within the process of supervision.

Because of the inconsistency among teaching practice supervisors (Musella 1970, Zeichner and Tabachnick 1979, and Stones 1975) it was hardly surprising that these writers recommended a reduction in the degree of authority given to the supervisor, a greater role for the student in self-assessment and a joint assessment of his or her performance with the supervisor. Hogan's notion of "positive prejudice" happening within the activity of supervision, he argues, is because of the fundamental issue of what constitutes good teaching.

"It is quite a chastening thought to reflect that intensive and sustained research has not produced anything approaching agreement on what constitutes good teaching. This research shed light on many aspects of the relations between pupils and teachers about which we previously knew little in any but the most intuitive sense, but its inability to provide a satisfactory answer to the central question of what constitutes good teaching (the validity question) has had unfortunate consequences."

The consequences which Hogan suggests are to do with the subjective bias which he terms "personal prejudices". He goes on to argue that if we could

articulate these prejudices in a non-partisan way, this would provide a breakthrough in educational research. It would then enable teachers to use the concept of learning and teaching which successfully resists taking its theoretical inspiration and practice ethos from a particular ideology. Hogan acknowledges that this would be problematical but goes on to explore the idea that an educational activity could have an ethos and logic of its own, "which are independent of ideological concerns and personal outlooks on life".

Without taking account of this concept, there is very little agreement between teachers about the nature of the activity in which they are engaged, the supervision of teaching and learning. Hogan is critical of the contribution made to the debate by contemporary educational philosophers such as Hirst and Peters. He suggests that their own analytical work stems from partisan view and illustrates this criticism with reference to "The Logic of Education" (1970), written as a joint venture. Hirst and Peters emphasise that this work has a second order character concerned not with advocating a particular viewpoint but rather with identifying and clarifying what is logically involved in an enterprise of this kind.

The work could be expected to prevent the reader from aligning himself with this or that viewpoint but would rather deepen his understanding of how he is placed as an educator and make explicit the dimensions in which decisions have to be made. Hogan points out that these intentions are not fulfilled. He suggests that the theme of "The Logic of Education" is a first-order advocacy, describing a particular concept of education which arises from the author's own views rather than from any logical intent in the educational enterprise itself. He continues that the influence of partisanship is clearly evident in the summary of the book's purpose.

"All it attempts to do is to sketch the ways in which this conception of education must impose its stamp on the curriculum, teachers' relationships with pupils, authority structure of the school, or college community." (p.15)

A philosopher whom Hogan considers to approach the problem of universal validity more rigorously is John Wilson, whose review article (1980) is used to take Hogan's notion of "personal prejudice" within supervision further. Wilson concludes that having considered the work of philosophical analysis in the sphere of education over the last twenty years, nearly all the studies share that view that what is to count as education must rest on one's own beliefs and attitudes as to what constitutes the good life. Philosophy may therefore be incapable of providing any other basis on which to approach the question of the validity of student teacher supervision. Wilson is reluctant to have this assumption forced on him and proposes that:

"Education marks a certain kind of human enterprise, perhaps inevitable for all societies, with its own logical limits, its own necessarily connected concepts and its own virtues and vices".

In other words the form of what is going on, the way in which it is carried out, is something universal. As something universal, the form of the educational enterprise would have a logical primacy over the particular content which this enterprise might contain. What is universal is that it is properly concerned with something which is objective and not merely personal, namely with the logic of teaching and learning as a "unique type of human intercourse".

The content of the enterprise might indeed be concerned with ideological issues but if its form were adequately conceived, then the content of

education might have a salutary rather than an acquiescent affect on teachers and learners alike. Hogan uses a philosophical analogy here by contrasting the effect in relation to Socrates and Plato.

"Had Plato, in his writings, given due emphasis to the pedagogical character of Socrates' dialogues, had he brought to life consistently in his writings the real teaching Socrates, his influence on the western tradition of educational thought and practice might have been dramatically different."

When the Socrates concept of dialogue is explored the notion of positive prejudice can be identified. The logic of question and answer which is inherent in this concept identifies learning primarily with a questioning conversation. The conversation is not one where the roles of expert and non-expert are assumed but rather an exchange where the views of each are carefully put forward in an attempt to expose them to rational scrutiny. For this to occur, the necessary educational ethos must be created. The community must be prepared to address the issue openly. The point is made succinctly by Hogan, "the fundamental task of good teaching is not didactic but is that of succeeding in getting a critical conversation with the text underway"

When the issues are linked with the supervision of teaching practice, Hogan makes the following five points:

- "1. The ethos of the teacher education institution should be an exemplary community of learners and teachers. The position of positive prejudice should be acknowledged so that open discussion of them in the course of work with colleagues does not result in defensiveness or divisiveness but enables rational scrutiny to become an important professional attitude.

2. Prejudice in its positive sense is not seen as something to be avoided but as an essential feature of the supervisor's work.
3. The ethos of the community and the explicit acknowledgement of positive prejudice are made public so that both are aware of what constitutes a satisfactory standard in teaching practice and in the theoretical parts of the course.
4. Positive prejudice must enable the supervisor to put at risk the judgements contained in his observations of student teachers. He or she must be prepared for each period of observation to say something new about the student. There must be explanations for the student about the reasons for the assessment results and the student's comments must be included in the supervisor's assessments.
5. The supervisor and student teacher emerge as having shared the objective of developing and enriching each other's work by adopting a critical approach, in a genuinely Socratic manner."

This is a very interesting paper which much of the research mentioned earlier would support. What is more difficult to accept in Hogan's paper is his assertion that an educational institution is necessarily rational and that the form of human intercourse which he describes would necessarily fit the ecology of each and every educational establishment, wherever it existed. The factors which might inhibit change in schools and colleges are pervasive and embedded in the nature of the institutions as workplaces.

The kinds of reality described by Lieberman (1982), and Lortie (1975), are "grounded" (Glaser and Strauss 1967) in teachers' own conceptions, experiences and theories about teaching. There may well be considerable tension between the way teachers experience schooling and the way policy-makers, college supervisors and student teachers experience the same environment.

"Outsiders fail to appreciate the highly personalised, artistic nature of teaching, the endemic uncertainty of the linkage between teaching and learning in the absence of an established knowledge base and the absence of goal specificity. There is also an insensitivity to the fact that control of classroom norms is a matter of survival, in a context characterised by isolation and in the absence of a strong professional culture based on shared experience."

Liebermann (1982)

The assumption that schools or colleges are necessarily rational institutions is not supported by Wise (1977). He has described as the "hyper-rationalisation hypothesis", the tendency by some policy-makers to formulate and implement change on the assumption that schools are rationally ordered institutions. He adds that "what appears logical may or may not have a connection to reality, where the connection is absent, a policy intervention will fail" (p.44).

Similar views have been raised by Smythe (1984).

Looking at research into effective supervision aids the consideration of what supervisors do. Research into the behaviours, beliefs and values helps the consideration of what supervisors are.

The findings of a study by Kremer-Hayon (1986), sheds some light on the inner world of student teacher supervisors and uncovers some underlying professional perspectives. The term "perspectives" was used in the sense of the dynamic inner world of the person. This concept included the supervisor's theories, beliefs and values assisting Kremer-Hayon to explore the thinking processes which supervisors use.

"The growing interest in teacher thinking may be understood within two contexts: (a) theoretically, more knowledge on this topic may enrich the understanding of component parts related to this field; (b) practically, assuming that teacher thinking affects teacher behaviour, additional knowledge and better understanding of this process are a necessary condition for improving teaching."

The general aim of uncovering the professional perspectives of supervisors was broken down into several questions:

1. What are the supervisor's perspectives that are reflected in discussions on educational issues?
2. To what extent are these perspectives professional, i.e. to what extent do these perspectives reflect the characteristics attributed to a profession?
3. Can any commonalities and personal characteristics be traced in the perspectives of supervisors?

This qualitative study was conducted using twelve supervisors in a college in Israel. These twelve people met fifteen times a year to plan and evaluate the activities surrounding supervision. The discussions were held in an

atmosphere where the participants felt able to express themselves freely and it was these discussions which formed the basis for the research.

After content analysis, the conversations were classified under the following perspectives: Professional 59%; Values 15.8%; Structure and Organisation 15%; Integration 9.6%. There was a total of 2,300 analysed units.

The professional perspective score was broken down further into those comments which were cognitive, e.g. relating to knowledge, research, and those comments which were affective, e.g. relating to ethics, involvement.

The values perspective score was also divided into two categories, formative and personal. The formative value comments were classified as being more closely linked to the traditional values of education. These included knowledge of the subject, education for good citizenship, loyalty. The personal value comments related more to progressive ideas within education and included self-expression and self-actualisation.

The topics classified under structure and organisation related to two categories: the content of the educational programme and the method by which it would be taught.

The integration perspective reflected the need to close the gap between theory and practice by finding inherent relationships among them.

This overview of the study's findings provides some of the answers to the first two research questions. It was possible to identify the professional perspectives of supervisors and the perspectives which were demonstrated did reflect the characteristics attributable to a profession.

As well as classifying the discussions as a whole, to ascertain the beliefs and values of the supervisors, individual profiles were built up. These individual studies demonstrated that several distinct profiles could be drawn which highlighted a continuum of belief from emotional to rational. Four supervisors showed a tendency to express themselves in emotional terms such as "I fear that", "I am doubtful of", "I feel conflict when dealing with". Five of the supervisors were found to use phrases demonstrating a more rational approach. "We have to use rational models", "we can use the principles of problem-solving".

A question requiring more work which emerged at the end of the study was as follows: What might be the reaction of a rationally-orientated student teacher when being assessed by an emotionally-orientated supervisor and vice versa?

Another study by Gitlin et al (1985) indicated that supervisors hold a wide range of beliefs about the aims of education with an emphasis on meeting societal needs and developing cognitive skills. This, however, contrasted sharply with their supervisory practice which was focused largely on organisational issues.

"If student teachers are to develop beyond being good technicians, merely facilitating the status quo, supervisors must become aware of their own narrow focus in practice and confront the belief that an institution's role is to begin the process of enabling the student teacher to create and maintain a comprehensive understanding of educational issues."

This concept of students developing beyond being good technicians has been incorporated into the notion of partnership supervision in teaching practice

(Mercer and Abbott 1989). The authors used a modified Meighan-Harbour approach to supervision in order to make it a student centred rather than the more traditional teacher centred process. Their definition of democratic learning was one in which:

"the course members organise a learning co-operative that devises and directs its own programme of studies using the tutors as resources and as facilitators"

This activity puts the responsibility for learning on to the student. The key features of such an approach are as follows:

- (a) The student identifies an aspect of his/her own teaching which he would like to examine in more detail (the focus).
- (b) The proposed focus is discussed and suggestions are made as to how feedback might be obtained which would illuminate the focus.
- (c) The student teaches the lesson and is observed by the tutor who gathers data by making field notes.
- (d) A post lesson conference is held during which the evidence regarding the chosen focus is examined by the tutor and the student.
- (e) A new focus is identified and the process begins again.

As an example from this paper, one student asked that the tutor should consider the "emotional climate". She felt that on her first block of practice she was too hard on the pupils. Had she changed now that she was dealing with further education students and was perhaps more relaxed about teaching?

The supervisor was then able to observe her lesson and to focus in on this aspect of her teaching when writing the field notes. During the post teaching conference both tutor and student were able to explore what had occurred in the lesson in relation to the emotional climate created.

A number of issues were explored by Mercer and Abbott in relation to this approach to supervision. Firstly, it is the student who chooses the focus for the supervisory visit. It was anticipated that the student would then feel more in control of their own professional development and would therefore be more highly motivated to develop their strengths and to improve on any weakness.

The second issue raised was that partnership supervision places the students in a position of trust in that the tutors are allowing them to determine the focus for consideration. This could be thought of as a major revolution in the nature of the tutor/student relationship since it could now become possible for students to steer the tutors away from aspects of their teaching behaviour which they consider demonstrate weaknesses.

In order to overcome this problem of trust, Mercer and Abbott incorporated a provision into the verbal contract (which was drawn up between the tutor and student prior to the partnership supervision commencing) which allowed either partner to "opt out" of the process. A more traditional approach to supervision could then be used. This provision was, however, never used during their study.

A third issue related to the student teacher's ability to indicate to the tutor a specific focus for attention. Not all students were able to achieve this aim. This factor might have reflected inadequate preparation by the tutors to

enable student teachers to analyse their own performance. More work is needed on this aspect of preparation within teacher education.

The overall findings of the study were encouraging, however, in attempting to create a learning environment in which students are accepted as worthy collaborators in their own professional development.

This section of the literature review has considered some of the work undertaken on the concept of supervision. The notion of assessment will now be addressed.

(e) Assessment

Some of the most contentious issues in the notion of supervising teaching practice are to do with its assessment. It is necessary to describe the way in which the author is interpreting this word and to distinguish it from evaluation. Assessment used in this section refers to the assessment of an individual's teaching performance. Evaluation is used when courses of study are being examined for their strengths and weaknesses.

It is also necessary to differentiate between assessing and supervising. The author sees a distinct difference between the two although they may be activities carried out by the same person. It is vital that the student teacher knows which activity is being carried out at any given time.

To supervise is to offer support and guidance which a student teacher needs in order to progress. This can be given in a diagnostic and a formative sense. Both should involve the student teacher's self-assessment comments and questions. To assess is to make some final judgement about a student teacher's performance in which it is less likely that the student's comments will be included. These two activities are therefore different although in current practice one is often subsumed in the other. As has been mentioned previously, this can cause confusion for all parties concerned (Tibble 1971; Cope 1971).

This concern underlines the importance of each person being quite clear about what the terms mean (Stones 1984; Wubbels, Creton and Hoomayers 1987).

"It may surprise students to learn that tutors often experience conflict arising out of their dual role as counsellor and assessor during teaching practice." (McCullough, 1979)

There have been many criticisms of the lack of care and rigour in these assessments and of the subjective and impressionistic way assessments are often made (Stones and Morris, 1972), and of the use of "hidden criteria", which concern themselves more with personality (Stanton 1974) and gender bias (Hore, 1971). Hore's study showed that assigned grades for teaching practice showed significant differences between male and female students, the attractive females getting higher grades.

Another criticism is that assessment procedures are often not clearly related to the stated objectives of the practice experience (Duffy, 1987; and Ayer, 1986). Traditionally the assessment has depended on global judgements made by supervisors (Turney 1982). Such assessment depends on the assumption that experts, such as school and college staff, can recognise "good teaching". It may be cynical to suggest that what is commonly regarded as good teaching is simply the behaviour which is condoned at any given time, but there is some evidence to show that what is advocated as good by supervisors may not be viewed in the same way by co-operating teachers.

Vonk (1983) has also suggested that,

"During their training most teachers develop an idealistic conception of their role as a teacher with the following characteristics:

emphasis on teacher-student interaction;

emphasis on the individuality of the children;

emphasis on the self-determination of the children.

Most of the schools practise a different conception with emphasis on the responsibility of the teacher for the organisation and control of the teaching and learning activities: a hierarchical

teacher-student relationship; the ideology that children cannot bear responsibility and need to be disciplined."

Similarly, student teachers may experience conflict over what is understood to be good teaching (Corporaal 1987). It is for this reason that a lot of the time students acquire a "temporary teaching style" that they feel will get them through the teaching practice. Such 'aping' covers up the real teaching style of the student" (Duffy 1987). "Do as you're told", "Toady up to the supervisor", "Use inductive approaches" (Stones, 1974).

Despite these conflicts, several broad categories of behaviour and personality are regarded as important by all groups concerned.

Criteria related to planning and preparation, teaching skills, classroom management, pupil interest, plus desirable personality traits such as enthusiasm, consistency and openness, formed the main dimensions reported in large scale surveys in the United Kingdom (Stones and Morris 1972; McCullough 1979).

Professional concern about the bias inherent in the subjective judgement using these criteria has led to efforts to make the assessment procedures more objective. These procedures must then be rigorously tested for validity and reliability.

Returning to the conflicts involved in understanding good teaching, teachers and tutors seldom meet to attempt to agree on the characteristics of a competent teacher and, secondly, they only observe a small number of lessons taught by each student. Instead of the final assessment or profile reflecting the whole range of a student teacher's ability, it portrays a limited number of teaching skills which are identified during a restricted period of observation.

Thirdly, when assessment is carried out by observation of a limited number of lessons, there is pressure on the student to tailor his/her lessons to match the expectations of the assessor. Fourthly, some students become increasingly apprehensive and anxious when an assessor is present and this may affect their performance (Hart 1987). Fifthly, there is evidence to show that a random allocation of student teachers to schools has a differential effect on the tutor's assessment (Collier 1959). In an analysis of a training college's assessment marks, by type of school, found that the top mark awarded in the more difficult, less favoured school was B+ and in the more favoured school was A. The average mark in the less favoured school was between C and C- and the more favoured school B- and C+.

More recently, Gibson (1977), in a longitudinal study of three-year certificate students, found that the greater the difficulties the student teachers perceived in a school, the more likely they were to receive a lower grade. Finally, the subject matter may affect the teaching ability. The work of Karmos and Jacks (1977) suggests that students with a strong subject preparation will have less difficulty than those student teachers who are not so well prepared. This, in turn, may lead to the "halo" effect, suggested by Cook and Richards (1972), in which they stipulate that, "the good guys do well in everything".

The way one characteristic is rated may affect all the others. Stones (1974) also identified the problem of high and low inference variables: "The teacher scratches his nose, is a low inference variable. A high inference variable for example, is teacher warmth"

These are some of the practical issues which complicate a true representation of validity. It is important to acknowledge that however hard teachers try to create a valid scheme, there must always be respect for what Cope calls, "the humanity of participants and the validity of their versions of reality" (Cope 1974).

This may necessitate more than one type of assessment. It is possible to combine unstructured data representing participants' versions of the reality they have experienced, with complementary evidence gathered in a less subjective manner. A rating scale completed by both supervisor and student teacher can be followed by a structured interview or a diary event.

Reliability refers to consistency, that is, achieving a desirable level of agreement and consistency across the judgements that assessors are required to make. Stones (1972), in a survey of methods being used to assess student teachers, found from the one hundred and twenty-two replies to a questionnaire that sixty-nine used impressionistic methods of assessment, seventeen used a combination of impressionistic and analytical, and seventeen reported using analytical methods only. This survey indicated that, where colleges based the teaching mark on the subjective impression of an individual tutor or a group of tutors, the results would tend to be unreliable. This finding is supported by Robertson (1957) who asked eighteen supervisors in one institution to rank fifty criteria of effective teaching. He found that the correlations between the eighteen sets of rankings ranged from 0.73 to 0.16. Therefore the teaching marks given by the supervisors would not consistently mean the same thing.

These issues of validity and reliability have been addressed by the study undertaken by McCullough (1979). As part of the work which investigated school experience in B.Ed. and B.Ed. (Hons) degrees as validated by the CNA, McCullough collected information from forty-four institutions about the

arrangements for supervised teaching experience. Thirty-seven colleges said they had an assessment schedule but only twenty-four stated that it was used in practice. Of these twenty-four colleges, only fourteen graded each criteria on the schedule although a total of eighteen colleges used a grading system. Of the fourteen which used and graded criteria, twelve colleges translated the grade into a pass/fail category and two emerged with a final score which then counts as a final mark to contribute to the degree classification.

It is useful to consider McCullough's suggestions in relation to the very wide differences revealed by these responses.

"The prior definition of the elements to be assessed, i.e. the practice of teaching, is crucial. This must be done before any formal means of assessment may be constructed. The number and disparity of activities included within this element imply the necessity for separate modes of assessment designed for particular aims and processes. Since the achievement of validity in the assessment of the practice of teaching is extremely difficult, the necessity for the reliability in implementation of the agreed instrument of assessment is crucial. This must reflect the need for systematic training of all concerned. If criteria for failure are agreed they must be specified. It is unjust and unjustifiable to have hidden assessment criteria. The position of the external examiner must be clarified."

Concern for a more valid and reliable approach lead to the development of criterion-referenced assessments of designated competencies (competency based teacher education), CBTE.

Assessment was developed on the prior definition of instructional purposes and the universal application of the same criteria (Swezey, 1981). Since

CBTE analyses teaching performance into discrete skills on the assumption that achieving proficiency in a series of skills can be equated with teacher effectiveness or competence, it had the positive effect of focusing attention on many behavioural aspects of teaching. CBTE also stipulates publicly the standard or criterion level to be attained for competence to be judged as satisfactory (Centre for Vocational Education, 1978).

In relating assessment closely to specified objectives, the goals of instruction are identified and defined in terms of teacher and student behaviours. This form of assessment has come under attack as the usefulness or even the appropriateness of devising objectives for the teaching of Arts and Humanities has been questioned by Eisner (1976), and Sriven (1967). Dewey (1904) pointed to the weakness of this proficiency model which encourages the adoption of "outward forms of method", without equal attention being paid to the more central issues of understanding how students learn. "For immediate skill may be got, at the cost to go on growing" (Dewey, 1904, p.318).

Creative student teaching may be inhibited by the use of predetermining objectives as this approach does not take account of unintended events and outcomes.

Despite these criticisms the objectives approach of CBTE developed through the use of checklists and rating scales has been the most influential trend in the assessment of student teachers in the last decade. These checklists and rating scales are said to reduce the assessor's level of bias (Anderson and Ball, 1978), and by directing attention to particular items of teaching behaviour, ensure that all assessors are using the same kind of data when making judgements. Some research has shown that a significant degree of agreement can be obtained by using these methods (Boothroyd, 1977).

Povey (1975) compared three groups of supervised student teachers graded by three different methods. Firstly, an analytical observation criteria with a graphic rating scale; secondly, a profile observation with a less tightly structured rating scale; thirdly, a global observation criteria with no uniformly agreed rating scale. The results indicated that the analytical method was the most meaningful and the most consistent.

While checklists and rating scales are seen as objective measures, the instruments are frequently still subjective and impressionistic if there has been no preparation for their use. This issue of preparation for use was part of a study undertaken by Bondy (1984). The research was concerned with reliable, objective methods of identifying safe and competent nursing practitioners.

"The contributions of the rating scale format to objectivity, in the form of accuracy and reliability depends not only on the specificity of the behaviours assessed, but also on the clarity with which each gradation in a series of scales is defined."

The purpose of her study was to determine the accuracy and reliability of clinical assessment scores when using a five-point criterion referenced rating scale. The hypotheses were:

1. Assessors who use scale labels defined by criteria will be more accurate than those assessors who do not.
2. There will be no difference in assessment scores between experienced and non-experienced staff.

3. There will be no difference in scores as a result of student activity being portrayed on a videotape.
4. On re-test, staff who use the criteria will have a higher reliability than those who do not.
5. Staff scores computed from the rating scales will be more accurate than estimated scores.

Two instruments were developed for the study, the first being a set of videotapes of staged nursing activity to provide uniform observation material. Each videotape portrayed a senior nursing student working with a clinical instructor. The vignette on each tape was repeated five times to illustrate five levels of competency. Each of the five levels of performance was based on a description of three factors:

1. Accuracy of the behaviours, according to professional standards.
2. Qualitative aspects of behaviour including the use of time, equipment and energy.
3. The type and amount of assistance required.

The five levels of performance were labelled as follows:

Level five	:	independent
Level four	:	supervised
Level three	:	assisted (minimum level required to achieve competence)
Level two	:	marginal

- Level one : dependent
Level x : not observed

The second instrument developed for the study was the clinical assessment sheet which contained fourteen items with the five-point scale.

Two groups of staff were then assigned to a control and an experimental group. The control group were asked to gauge the fourteen criteria using a five-point numerical scale, i.e. 5 4 3 2 1, five being the highest grade. This group was given:

- (a) an explanation of the study and
- (b) a review of the behavioural items on the rating scale.

This procedure lasted approximately twenty-five minutes.

The experimental group was asked to assess the fourteen criteria using the descriptive scale previously discussed. This group was given:

- (a) an explanation of the study
- (b) a review of the behavioural items on the rating scale
- (c) an explanation of the criteria for assessment
- (d) a practice session with the video.

This procedure lasted approximately one hour.

A re-test was undertaken six to eight weeks later using the same format for both groups. After statistical work using four-way analysis of variance and product moment correlation the following findings emerged:

There was a significant difference between the experimental group who used criteria to differentiate between levels of performance and the control group who did not.

The use of stated criteria to define the labels on a rating form for clinical assessment of student performance made a significant contribution to the accuracy and reliability of the staff scores. An examination of the means showed that as the student's level of performance improved, the beneficial effect of the criteria became more pronounced. While the staff frequently expressed qualms about assessing performance in the pass/fail area, this study suggests that it is the more competent students who loose out from unstated criteria.

There was evidence that behaviour could be discriminated on a five point scale, thus increasing the amount of information that could be communicated, by a number, in relation to a student's level of performance. Contrary to common perception, the study showed that the reliability of a rating scale increases as the scale steps increased from two to seven.

It would be interesting to repeat the study using a group of supervisors and some videotapes of student teachers demonstrating different levels of competence. The issue relating to "assistance or cues required" would help some supervisors to focus on the often unmet need more fully.

A survey by McCurdy (1962) explored the relationship between the amount of help that was needed by student teachers and the amount of help provided by college supervisors. Her findings included expressions of satisfaction in some areas of the student's work, e.g. handling disciplinary problems, but dissatisfaction was evident over assistance required with evaluating pupil learning, self-expression and understanding school policies.

As early as 1951, Evans included pupil ratings of student teachers as a viable means of assessing teaching ability on the grounds that:

"Pupils, who are taught by any teacher regularly, over a period of time, will know more about what goes on during lessons than anyone else can do". (p.92)

More recent studies have shown that pupils in high school are dependable judges of the characteristics of student teachers. Their assessments show strong correlations with the assessments of experienced supervisors (Perl, 1978).

Vonk (1983) included a pupil questionnaire in his study of new teachers. The object was to collect information about the teacher's behaviour in relation to:

- (a) the subject matter given by the teacher
- (b) the communication skills of the teacher
- (c) the instructional skills of the teacher
- (d) the management skills of the teacher
- (e) the teacher's activities involving teacher-pupil relation and classroom climate.

This information together with structured diaries kept by the new teachers enabled a research design to emerge which would

- (a) allow data to be collected from the experience of beginning teachers so as to establish insight into their problems of everyday school life;
- (b) help beginning teachers to analyse their problems in their own institution and get to grips with them.

Stones also argued that the learning which pupils achieve in a class ought to be a measure of student effectiveness and therefore part of the formal assessment strategy. In the study undertaken with Sidney Morris (1972) they found that out of nearly one thousand items of teaching criteria, only fourteen related to a pupil's learning.

A similar study by Start (1974) demonstrated that out of one thousand teachers only four per cent accepted pupil learning as a criteria for assessment.

Seville (1975), by producing a system analysis of the course in an English college of education, was able to find out the requirements of the customers of the college, teachers, head teachers, college supervisors. He was able to identify one hundred and thirty items that referred to the qualities and skills which the customers thought the student teachers should have after training. He attempted to assess the degree to which the college took untrained students and transformed them into teachers of the quality for which the institutions were looking. For this he used a competency based approach using the identified items.

This section of the literature review has considered some of the research undertaken on the concept of assessment. The last section of the review will focus on self-assessment.

(f) Self-Assessment

If a major purpose of assessment is to promote professional growth and autonomy, the issue of self-assessment must be considered.

Sumner (1986) has also suggested:

"From the learning standpoint, examination boards have the appearance of authenticated judgements, whereas the learner's own judgements appear to be unsupported, idiosyncratic and highly subjective. Yet, if learning is concerned with individual awareness and self-understanding, self-assessment must be at the kernel of development. It has to be accepted that naive learners will most probably judge their attainments or their difficulties inadequately; but the education process should help them towards greater maturity with regard to both learning a curriculum and reflection on their own attainments."

The development of an ability to self-assess is highly regarded by college supervisors (Turney, 1977), co-operating teachers and student teachers themselves (Goodall, 1985).

In one interesting system of self-assessment, York University (1977) students, with help, construct learning contracts in the form of goal statements for practical teaching and then assemble materials to provide evidence of meeting those goals. In regular consultation with staff, student teachers then discuss their strengths and weaknesses and decide what remedial action, if any, is necessary. This system takes account of assessment being both diagnostic and formative. The student has the chance to have any weaknesses highlighted or suggests for himself that they exist and the means to improve on them is

clearly explained. There is then further opportunity for student and staff to repeat an exercise and measure improvement. Contract learning has been recently reviewed in a paper by Mazhindu (1990).

A paper by Ricord (1986), investigated the development of a "teaching-self" in nine student teachers during their field experience. The research questions concentrated on the following issues: How did the student teachers perceive themselves as teachers? What professional concerns and dilemmas did they have in relation to their self-perception? How did they go about finding solutions to their dilemmas?

In summary, and before any field experience, the student teachers were positive about assessing their role as teachers, demonstrating emotional maturity, extroversion and social adjustment. The concerns and dilemmas which they had, Ricord suggests, related to the emergence of their own teaching personality along the dimension of assertiveness/dogmatism (Lehman 1981).

As the student teachers progressed through their field experience, it was evident that they became more assertive in order to be able to cope with the unpredictable nature of most classroom environments. It was also the case that those who were more student-centred and humanistic before their field experience commenced, became more dogmatic.

The student teachers used key experience to explore possible solutions to their dilemmas but needed the regular help of skilled supervisors to benefit from this process. Although this study used a small number of subjects, it does demonstrate that student teachers can be taught to assess their own performance but at the same time the role of the supervisor is essential to the success of the venture.

The current literature in the United Kingdom would suggest that self-assessment is not universally acknowledged or included in the formal grading of supervised teaching practice. There is, however, a growing number of papers on reflective teaching, Calderhead (1987), Handel and Lauvas (1987), Ashcroft and Griffiths (1989), Keiny and Dreyfus (1989), which include the issue of self-assessment.

This concept has been described in several ways, drawing on Dewey (1933), modes of reasoning; Schon (1983) on professional thinking; Stenhouse (1975) on teachers as researchers; recent theories of cognition, Borko (1988); and critical theory, Elliot (1987).

"Some of the common principles of reflective teaching are that professional growth, both in pre-service and in-service education is viewed as being achieved through the adoption of responsibility for one's own actions, and through the analysis and critical evaluation of practice, sometimes including the relationship of one's own action to the organisation and societal context in which one works".

(Calderhead, 1987)

Reflective teaching strategies need different kinds of interpretive frameworks and it was these frameworks which Calderhead was trying to identify.

It is suggested that they are linked to three phases which the student teachers pass through, "fitting in", "passing the test", and "exploring" "In all stages, a number of factors were identified that heavily constrained the quality of student teacher reflection." The role of the co-operating teacher and the supervisor in promoting reflection is also considered.

When the students reflected on their own performance in the early stages of teaching, "fitting in", a very high level of anxiety was expressed. This was caused by constantly being on view, taking responsibility for up to thirty children and the fact that the reality of the classroom did not match their own conceptions of reality.

At the same time, the student teachers reported learning a lot in the early stages of practice, especially in relation to classroom management. This learning did, however, reach a plateau and then began to decline. Their daily work had become routine and once a series of teaching "tests" had been passed that were free to teach as they pleased, just like the driving test. Their college supervisor was regarded as the examiner who had to be impressed. This resulted in some very stereotyped teaching, the stereotyping developed out of a concern about the nature of the assessment rather than any concerns for effective teaching. The students knew that certain behaviours were expected of them but could not always describe their educational justification. For example, circulating round the children was felt to be intrusive. The students could not justify it on the grounds that it might help them to monitor the children or to guide those who were slower to get started. Other issues like this arose and when they were discussed with the college supervisors, the student teachers were remarkably resistant to much of the specific feedback which was offered.

Some of the reasons stemmed from the differing conceptions between teaching in the college and teaching in the school. The student teachers had learnt "that's all right in college but we don't do it like that here".

The students were also resistant to feedback comments because they did not match their own self-assessment. They could not always agree with the supervisor and felt that their criticisms were unjustified.

Perhaps of even more concern was that some teachers did not understand the feedback comments which were given. One example was to do with, "structuring the lesson". The student admitted that at the end of the first phase of teaching practice he was still unclear what this process involved. Hence, the supervisor's intention to cue in, or assist the student in self-assessment was unsuccessful, and frequently students failed to identify the problems in their practice to which the supervisors were attempting to alert them. This was linked with their own limited ability to self-assessment. Student teachers often reported being stuck for something to write in their teaching files. One student spoke of teaching being a "ritual", and that afterwards "there was rarely anything to say about it"

These early self-assessments, when they were attempted, concentrated on such issues as clarity of voice, boardwork, etc. There was very little attention paid to whether the children were actually learning anything. The pressure was always centred round producing materials for the next lesson rather than reflecting on and analysing the completed one.

Even when the lesson went drastically wrong there was very little written analysis of the reasons. Some students felt that comments such as these would give ammunition to their supervisor so thought it better not to commit failure to paper.

It appears that there were no written guidelines for self-assessment and although it might have been thought of as a beneficial activity, there had been no preparation for its use prior to the teaching experience commencing.

The role of self-assessment when used with students, has been explored by several authors, Woods et al (1988), Locker and Jensen (1988). According to Woods, self-assessment is "the ability of a person to accurately evaluate or

assess his/her performance, and his/her strengths and weaknesses". Further, "mature self-assessment recognises that evaluation concerns the performance and not the person"

When an assessment is made, the judgement is not whether the student teacher is "good" or "bad", but whether the performance was "good" or "bad". Self-assessment might, therefore, be more accurately described as "self performance assessment".

Woods et al have been developing the skill of problem-solving through self performance assessment at the McMaster University in Canada. Their findings suggest that self-assessment may not be an easy idea to introduce. There may be reluctance expressed by both students and staff.

An important issue which relates to this expressed reluctance concerns whether or not self-assessment activity should be awarded a formal grade. Some people argue that if a grade is to be given then weaker students will be over-generous to themselves, negotiate a grade which they do not deserve, and distort the assessment. More able students feel their abilities will no longer be recognised and that their higher grades will be devalued. Tutors worry about issues involving honesty and trust. Can students be trusted to award themselves honest self-assessment grades?

The other argument raised in relation to formally grading self-assessments expresses the concern that, if these grades do not count towards the final marks, the students will not take self-assessment seriously.

The findings from the study also include an analysis, which considered the students' summative assessments and compared this with their performance on the final written examination. The average deviation was less than ten per cent.

Loacker and Jensen (1988) pursue a similar item of problem-solving through self-assessment in their work at Alverno College. Here, the students are encouraged to move from passively receiving assessment comments from their tutors, to actively identifying and applying criteria to assess their own performance. The students achieve this progression by demonstrating specifically identified criteria laid down by members of staff from their faculty.

The students' progression is also documented in great detail with the use of profiles. On this system, assessment becomes a major method of learning and of verifying learning. The authors identify three levels of student self-assessment. The levels are those of the beginning student, the intermediate student, and the advanced student. Beginning students confront the major challenge of finding strategies to distance themselves from their performance so that they do not confuse performance with person. They need to be able, without devastation, to say, as one student did, "I really sounded dull and uninteresting on that video tape. I could do better". Intermediate students struggle to compare and construct the nature of their developing performance with the performance which they demonstrated when their course began. Advanced students are able to express more sophisticated characteristics of self-assessment ability such that the faculty feel justified in their belief that the students can use self assessment strategies and, through these, be responsible for their own learning and development.

The authors also suggest that the process and nature of self-assessment continues to raise more questions for staff and students. They recognise that there is still a lot of careful research needed, both quantitative and qualitative, to illuminate further this educational practice.

A paper by David Boud (1989) concentrates on an investigation of the reliability of student-generated grades through the process of self-assessment. Boud suggests that if student-generated marks are to become part of the officially-recorded assessment, the marks must be acceptable to tutors with whom the students have worked. He goes on to say that,

"It is also necessary to demonstrate that if students can produce marks which are acceptably similar when they are not formally recorded, the context of formal assessment proceedings does not distort their ratings so that students produce unrealistic assessments of their performance under these conditions"

Boud's paper also reviews the literature on the comparison of teacher marks with student self-ratings. This literature, Boud suggests, has developed two themes. The first theme relates to studies concerned with the reliability of student self-grading, taking teacher marks as the independent variable. The second theme is concerned with developing ways in which students can become more critical and perceptive about the learning.

In attempting to justify the official inclusion of student-generated marks, Boud makes several interesting points. The first of these relates to the recognition that self-assessment does not exist in a vacuum. It always occurs in a context.

"Sometimes the setting is quite benign and the individual's standards are quite sufficient; on other occasions, the context constrains and may distort the individual's sense of what is an appropriate assessment. Self-marking provides practice in the interpretation of the often arbitrary requirements which most public work needs to satisfy."

A second point, Boud suggests, is to do with time. If the students can take a greater role in assessment, there is a potential for saving staff time and using this for more educationally worthwhile activities.

If, however, students are not able to assess themselves reliably with respect to teachers, then Boud suggests these points may not be seen as a strong enough justification for student assessment to be used formally. This leads some teachers to drop all notions of self-assessment, despite other educational benefits.

At the other extreme teachers believe that the benefits of self-assessment are so great that they should trust their students to act appropriately even when there is a risk that they might not award themselves the same marks as would be given by a member of staff.

As part of the conclusions which Boud makes in his paper, he cites the need for more research into:

(a) Studies on the psychodynamics of self-assessment and the influence of contextual factors, such as:

What leads to cheating?

What are the circumstances in which students will make a fair and reasonable self-assessment?

What features of a self-assessment process encourage a self-critical approach?

- (b) Further monitoring of innovations in self-assessment. In which circumstances they can be used more widely and in which circumstances they can be adopted.
- (c) The use of collaborative approaches to research to take account of student perspectives as well as those of staff. This perspective from students is needed in order to deepen our understanding of the self-assessment process.

It appears that there is more work to do to enable the concept of self-assessment to be more universally and effectively used.

This section on self-assessment will be concluded by quoting from a paper concerned with teacher self-assessment, Kremer and Ben-Peretz (1984).

"From the need for constant feedback, on the one hand, and from trends towards professionalisation and the development of an autonomous teacher on the other, it follows that fostering teachers' self-assessment is an essential need. Fortunately, this need is in line with societal demands for accountability, implying demands from teachers to be responsible for student achievement. Personal and professional growth are also necessary and satisfying this latter need may well contribute to teachers' mental hygiene by preventing routine and thus counteracting potential burnout.

There is an emerging requirement that those people engaged in the process of helping others to learn should at all times be aware of and capable of assessing their own strengths and weaknesses."

It is within the specific field of self-assessment that this study will be focused. The aims are as follows:

1. to examine the extent to which there are similarities and differences between the self-assessments made by student nurse teachers and the assessments made by the teaching staff;
2. to examine the relationship between the professional background of the teaching staff and their assessment of the student nurse teachers;
3. to examine a method of self-assessment which could be used by student teachers and teaching staff;
4. to make proposals regarding the potential use of such a method within the Certificate of Education course.

Chapter One has reviewed some of the literature related to the assessment of supervised teaching practice. In Chapter Two, a description of its organisation will be provided as background information for the main study.

THE ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

CHAPTER TWO

Background Information

Section (a) The Organisation of Supervised Teaching Experience in the Polytechnic Where the Study was Undertaken

During the one-year Certificate of Education Course for Post-Compulsory Education, supervised teaching experience occupies eleven weeks out of a thirty-four-week period.

The eleven weeks are divided into two phases. The first period of supervised teaching experience takes place in phase two of the course, during the autumn term, and lasts for three weeks. The second period of supervised teaching experience takes place in phase four of the course, during the spring term, and lasts for eight weeks.

The purpose of these two periods of supervised teaching experience is as follows:

"To provide opportunities for the student to put into practice the skills and procedures that have been practised in the Teaching Method, Special Method and the Teaching Aids sectors of phase one and phase three, linking them with Learning Theory, and to enable the student to make first-hand investigations relating to all other sectors of the course"

(Supervised Teaching Experience Handbook, 1988) (Appendix 1)

The stated aims of supervised teaching experience within phase two are as follows:

1. To provide a range of observations of teaching situations, varied in respect of the age and ability of the further education students, course settings, modes of attendance and teaching styles.
2. To give opportunities for the practice of particular teaching skills, usually as part of a lesson, in co-operation with the usual class teacher.
3. To afford some experience of assuming responsibility for entire learning situations, including self-evaluation of the teaching.
4. To promote awareness of further education students in respect of their backgrounds, expectations, motivations, behaviours, language, and learning problems.
5. To afford familiarisation with the functions, organisation, staff, resources and administrative procedures of the Department to which the student teacher is attached.

The stated aims of supervised teaching experience within phase four are as follows:

1. To develop teaching strategies and performance skills and the ability to integrate one with the other.
2. To develop judgement of the interaction of learning goals, experiences and outcomes, and willingness to modify performance in response to evaluation of student learning.

3. To develop awareness of processes of curriculum development and implementation.
4. To afford continuing contact with at least one particular group of students, and opportunity to consider the responses of that group over this STE period.
5. To encourage conduct appropriate to the varied professional responsibilities and relationships of a teacher in further education, such as the meeting of deadlines, co-operation with colleagues, and contribution to college organisation and the development of its work.
(Course Handbook (1985 - 86)).

Student teachers are also given structured learning goals for phases two and four to assist them to make the best use of the opportunities which their host institution can provide (Appendix 1).

The learning goals of supervised teaching experience for phase two are as follows:

1. Appreciate the experience of the FE student by following a group through a day in college.
2. Apply appropriate schemes of analysis to at least six observed lessons.
3. Evaluate particular aspects of at least six observed lessons (e.g. use of questions, demonstration, teaching aids, teacher's language).

4. Explain the contribution made to a lesson taught in co-operation with the usual class teacher, describe what happened, and propose modifications (if any) for next time.
 5. Draft plans of intention for all lessons taught (Optimum: 6 lessons or 12 hours contact).
 6. Apply appropriate schemes of analysis to all lessons taught.
 7. Evaluate at least one taught lesson in co-operation with a tutor who has observed it.
 8. Describe chosen aspects of a particular group of students (e.g. backgrounds, expectations, language abilities), and relate these to their learning behaviours during an observed lesson.
 9. Describe the organisation and functioning of the Department and/or course team to which the student is attached.
- * The activities required by the learning goals will often all be undertaken in the course of any one week; it may well be desirable for each day to be apportioned among 2, 3 or even 4 of them.

The learning goals of supervised teaching experience for phase four are as follows:

1. Evaluate all observed lessons, in co-operation with the class teachers engaged (optimum: 12 lessons or 21 hours teaching).

2. Analyse the responses of a particular group of students to the different styles of teaching experienced during one day in college.
3. Identify the characteristics of each course taught in terms of course specifications, recruitment, and college development of it.
4. Identify the characteristics of a course different in style from those normally encountered, in terms of specialism, student expectations, and/or learning/teaching methods.
5. Draft appropriate plans of intention for all lessons taught (optimum: 45 lessons or 80 hours contact).
6. Deploy a range of teaching strategies and evaluate the suitability of each in terms of class response, effective learning, and own performance skills.
7. Deploy a range of assessment procedures in the evaluation of student learning.
8. Analyse all lessons taught and justify changes (or no changes) in the plan of intention for subsequent teaching.
9. Evaluate several taught lessons in co-operation with the tutors who have observed them (optimum: 4 observed by Garnett tutors; 3 by college teachers).
10. Describe and analyse the responses of a particular group of students during teaching contact with them over the phase.

11. Fulfil the requirements of the placement college as regards attendance, punctuality, and the keeping of records.
12. Survey the overall activities and educational provision of the college, consider its ethos, and evaluate its development and potential.
13. Organise all the documents required during the phase into a Commentary upon the STE.

The student profile (Appendix 3) requires each personal tutor to make overall comments from the student's performance in phases two and four.

The organisation of supervised teaching experience should therefore be geared to the socialisation process for student teachers as they become more familiar with their host institutions. Important issues which arise for student teachers as a result of this socialisation process include the need for adequate and effective support, guidance, and feedback in relation to their teaching. These issues are particularly important in relation to the five summative teaching assessments which the student teachers must successfully complete during phase four. Support, guidance and feedback should also be considered important if assessors are planning diagnostic and formative teaching assessments. Diagnostic and formative assessments are undertaken by some assessors in phase two.

A diagnostic assessment carried out early in phase two enables the assessor to establish a baseline in terms of the student's teaching performance. Strengths and weaknesses can then be identified and relevant strategies planned for future lessons.

Formative assessments allow the student to practise these planned strategies under supervision but without the lesson being given a grade. At present, a formative assessment may be undertaken with a student in phase two. Summative teaching assessments are, however, given grades which are recorded by the assessor and discussed with the student. These summative assessments usually take place in phase four.

In order to ensure that other important processes of socialisation are organised effectively, such as finding adequate teaching materials, etc., a Liaison Scheme has been introduced.

The purpose of the Liaison Scheme is to ensure that groups of three Polytechnic tutors liaise with three or four host institutions. The student teachers allocated to those host institutions are then able to identify specific Polytechnic tutors who will assist them during the socialisation process with any organisational problems such as finding accommodation in the staff room, locating timetables, and finalising teaching sessions.

The members of the Liaison Team do not necessarily observe the students teaching. This observation is, in fact, in the main the responsibility of the personal tutors or the teaching method tutors who have had the closest contact with the students, and have participated in their development from phase one.

The personal tutors usually have the same professional background and qualification as their students. The teaching method tutors, however, may not necessarily have the same professional background as the student. A chemist could therefore be assessing a student nurse teacher and a nurse might be assessing a student engineering teacher.

Although the Liaison Scheme is relatively new, a recent evaluation suggests that the idea is beneficial and has been favourably received by the Polytechnic tutors and the host college mentors. There are, however, issues which need further discussion, and these include:

- the need for clearer information about the role of the host college mentor ;
- the need to improve internal college communication systems;
- the need to ensure and monitor an even flow of liaison tutors into the host college.

In post-compulsory teachers education, the relationship between host college mentors and student teachers is different from that which takes place in primary and secondary teacher education. As has been mentioned earlier, in schools, the process is more clearly defined. The students are involved in more team teaching in the early part of their practice. This approach involves their mentors sharing in the lesson planning process as well as participating in the teaching.

In this way, students experience the role of being an observer, in the classroom, being an observer/participant, before finally taking the responsibility for planning and teaching a complete lesson, as an independent practitioner.

In the early stages of post compulsory supervised teaching experience, students are provided with opportunities to observe lessons being taught by qualified, experienced tutors.

The students do not, in the main, however, have the opportunity to develop an observer/participant role. That is, they have to take immediate responsibility for planning and teaching complete lessons and tend not to share the planning and teaching with other experienced members of staff.

Section (b) The People Involved in Assessing Supervised Teaching Experience

The following people are involved in the assessment procedure:

Student teachers

Polytechnic tutors

Host college mentors

Learners being taught

External examiners

Section (c) The Methods Used for Assessing Supervised Teaching Experience

The Assessment Criteria Sheet

Polytechnic tutors assess student teachers using the assessment criteria sheet (Appendix 2.1).

There are four broad headings:

Preparation

Presentation

Social relationships

Post-performance analysis

The broad headings are then given sub-sections.

This assessment criteria sheet is best described as a checklist designed with a closed questioning format. The most logical way to respond would be to give "yes" or "no" answers, but this is not the usual practice.

Polytechnic tutors generally make a global and impressionistic response to the checklist when they are assessing lessons taught by student teachers. The tutors then use longhand to write out their assessment comments (Appendix 2.2). This written assessment is global because it refers to all the items on the checklist, and impressionistic because the criteria are interpreted in different ways.

A random sample of fifty completed assessment sheets demonstrated to the researcher that there was considerable variation in the way in which tutors wrote about the lesson which they had observed. Some tutors completed three or four blank sheets of very detailed assessment comments. These comments were often accompanied by notes of guidance for future consideration by the student. Other tutors completed only one sheet, included less detail and did not offer notes of guidance for future consideration.

There is no weighting given to the broad headings and it is assumed, therefore, that each of them is of equal importance.

Although tutors are asked to grade each assessed lesson using a literal scale, A, B, C, or R, (Appendix 8, Table J) there is no description of these grades apart from the fact that the first three are Pass grades and that R is a Fail grade. Students, moreover, are not always told which grade they have been awarded. There is little opportunity for students to grade themselves or to

make a formal, written self-assessment of their teaching, which could then be discussed with the assessor.

Host college mentors are also encouraged to use the assessment criteria sheet. A similar situation applies here in that there are no further guidelines to assist the mentor to interpret the checklist and the same global, impressionistic approach is taken. There is one very important difference, however, between the gradings given by polytechnic tutors and host college mentors. Tutors use, A,B,C, and R grades, whereas mentors are asked to use a different literal scale, namely E (excellent), VG (very good), G (good), S (satisfactory), M (marginal) and F (fail) (appendix 4). There is no further description of these grades and the relationship between these two literal scales is not made explicit in the Supervised Teaching Handbook. The host college mentors are required to undertake at least one summative teaching assessment in phase four. The external examiner is also involved in the assessment of supervised teaching experience towards the end of phase four. Any student teacher may be visited on a random basis but all students who are borderline failures, or who are thought to be exceptionally capable, are seen.

The same assessment criteria sheet is used and the visit may or may not result in a written report. The grading is the same as that which is used by the polytechnic tutors but the student teacher is not normally informed of the grade which she or he has been given. The polytechnic tutors, host college mentors, and external examiners are not formally required to document student self-assessment comments. Some tutors do, however, encourage this activity.

Self-Assessment by Student Teachers

As stated in the learning goals for phases two and four, student teachers are required to undertake written self-assessments as part of supervised teaching experience. These self-assessments may either be undertaken privately when the student has taught a lesson unsupervised, or may be undertaken as part of the discussion with a visiting assessor, when the student's teaching has been supervised. Because of the lack of further information as to precisely how these two procedures should be undertaken, there are occasions when neither of these takes place in an effective manner. Concern has been expressed by student teachers in relation to this aspect of teaching practice. A recent survey undertaken by the Student Union suggested that there was little recognition given to the student's opinion of their own teaching (Lewis 1987).

Another concern arising from the survey related to the reliability of the assessment process during supervised teaching experience. It was felt by some students that there was a lack of consistency in the interpretation of the assessment criteria by assessors, and that this inconsistency could lead to inappropriate comments being made by personal tutors in the student profiles.

The Student Profile

The overall grade for supervised teaching experience is awarded by the student's personal tutor and recorded in their profile (Appendix 3, page 3). The overall grade reflects the grades awarded under the headings "Thinking", "Teaching", and "Involvement".

The sources which are used by the personal tutor for the summative comments required under these three headings are as follows:

Thinking

Supervised teaching experience file

Post STE tutorials

Teaching

Written observations of visiting tutors

College mentors

Observation

Involvement

College mentors.

The profile also contains a record of the theoretical grades obtained by the student throughout the course (p.4).

The Supervised Teaching Experience File

By the end of phase four, each student teacher is required to complete a supervised teaching experience file (Appendix 1, p.3). This file enables the student to document, analyse and evaluate the lessons which they have observed or taught. It also allows them to present materials reflecting the ethos and organisation of their host college. The personal tutor makes written assessment comments in the file and in the student profile, under the heading "Thinking". The file is also graded and this result becomes part of the overall grade for supervised teaching practice.

Chapter Two has described the current organisation and assessment of supervised teaching experience in the polytechnic where this study was undertaken. Several issues of concern have been highlighted which the researcher chose to investigate further.

Firstly, the issue of student self-assessment is given relatively little formal attention in the overall assessment process. Student teachers have identified this as a problem in their own professional development.

Secondly, student teachers in post compulsory teacher education generally take responsibility for complete lessons throughout their practice placement. These students are therefore not able to progress through the stages of being an observer, a participant/observer, and then an independent practitioner in the classroom.

Thirdly, the current assessment criteria sheet is intended for global use. This means that each of the criteria are judged within each assessed lesson. There is also considerable variation in the way in which assessors complete the current assessment criteria sheet.

Fourthly, there may be inconsistencies in the use of the assessment criteria sheet when the professional background of the polytechnic tutor is different from that of the student teacher.

Chapter Three will explore these issues in more detail, beginning with a statement of the problem. The hypotheses generated for the study will be described and the methodology for the data collection will be explained.

CHAPTER THREE

Design of the Study

(a) Statement of the Problem

From the previous description of the current assessment tools and procedures, the following problems for further investigation emerged. The issue of student teacher self assessment is given very little formal attention in the overall assessment process.

There is a Handbook provided for supervised teaching experience in which the activity of self assessment is mentioned (Appendix 1, p.6). This reference to self assessment invites the student to use the same assessment criteria sheet which is used by the tutors. There are no further details, however, on how, or when this process should take place, neither are there any suggestions as to how a student might begin to assess and write down their own strengths and weaknesses. The opinions of the student are not formally incorporated into the assessment process.

The current assessment criteria sheet is also intended for global use. This means that each of the thirty-six lesson variables is considered by the assessor whilst he or she is observing the lesson. Written comments are normally provided by the assessor under the four categories, planning activities, performance abilities, social relationships, and post performance analysis. There is no stated opportunity in the Handbook for students to identify and concentrate on improving one category of teaching behaviour at a time.

Reference is made in the Handbook to a discussion following a teaching practice visit (Appendix 1, p.10). The discussion, however, usually takes place after the tutor's report has already been written, effectively ignoring any issues which the student may wish to contribute.

In addition to the lack of opportunity for students to benefit from the guided use of self assessment, the tutors and mentors are required to use an assessment criteria sheet for which there is no accompanying rating scale or description of the grades to be awarded.

The tutor's responses, therefore, to the questions posed on p.6 remain diverse and subjective. Some tutors complete their written reports using one blank assessment form (Appendix 2.1). Other tutors may use four or five forms to describe what they have observed.

The categories within the assessment criteria had, however, been developed over many years and were regularly reviewed by the staff involved and thought to be satisfactory, apart from their lack of rating scale.

Amendments to the Assessment Criteria

The original criteria sheet consists of a list of questions under the following headings (Appendix 2):

Planning abilities

Performance abilities

Social relationships

Post performance analysis

The amendments made for this study consisted of changing each question into a statement adding a scale of "appropriateness" (Appendix 5 & 6).

As an example the first statement is "The plan of intent was" The person completing the sheet then had to decide whether the plan of intent was "very appropriate", "appropriate", "not applicable".

The phrases were also given a numerical value from 4 ("very appropriate") to 0 ("not applicable").

These amendments produced thirty-six statements relating to the four headings previously mentioned and are as follows:

Planning Abilities

1. The plan of intent was
2. The lesson objectives were
3. Variation in student activity
4. Sequencing
5. Variation in student ability
6. The combination of content and method was
7. The aids which were prepared were
8. The demonstration was
9. The management of the physical environment was

Performance Abilities

10. The opening of the lesson was
11. The statement of the lesson objectives was
12. Appearance

Performance Abilities (Contd.)

13. Tone of voice
14. Personality
15. Eye contact
16. Questioning
17. Aids
18. Discussion
19. Explanation
20. Analogy
21. Group work
22. Role play
23. The level of the lesson was
24. The pace of the lesson was
25. Ability to adapt to individual student need was
26. The checks used on learning were
27. The lesson summary was

Social Relationships

28. The learning environment created was
29. The student's attitude to the class was
30. The attitude of the class to the student was
31. The degree of rapport established was
32. The student's use of language was
33. The classroom management was

Post Performance Analyses

34. The testing methods which were used were
35. The administration of the tests was
36. The learning which took place was

These statements were followed by a blank page on which further comments could be added if the assessor or the student wished to do so.

The final page contained both the grades to be awarded for the lesson and a description of each grade.

The grades were described as follows:

A

Extremely suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, exceptionally sensitive management of the whole class. Understands and is responsive to the students' needs. Evaluates learning effectively.

B

Suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, sensitive oversight of the whole class, demonstrates good relationships with the students. Attempts to evaluate learning.

C

Limited attempt to choose appropriate content and method. Suitable evidence of structure but this became muddled at times. Inconsistency in class management but some attempt made to recognise students' needs. Little evidence of evaluating learning.

R

Poor understanding of content and method, material inappropriate and inaccurate with little evidence of planning, fails to manage the class as a whole or to recognise students' needs. Fails to evaluate learning.

The assessment criteria sheets used in this research, and designed to enable students to record self assessments, were almost identical to that of the assessor. They were, however, printed in a different colour to avoid confusion with those of the assessor. The terminology used was made more personal to the students so that they were asked to rate "themselves" on "their" lesson (Appendix 6).

The assessment sheets were designed to be straightforward to complete. Instructions were given at the top of each front page and the person was asked to circle the words which best described the lesson they had either just observed or had just delivered.

The assessment sheets had to be completed after the lesson and before the normal feedback took place. Completed sheets were returned to the researcher in sealed envelopes. The assessors were not required to see the students' completed sheets.

(b) The Hypotheses Generated

The two main aims of the study were, firstly, "to examine the extent to which there are similarities and differences between self assessments made by the student nurse teachers and the assessments made by the teaching staff"

The second aim was "to examine the relationship between the professional background of teaching staff and their assessment of student nurse teachers".

From a review of the literature, the current assessment procedures and various research approaches, the following null hypotheses were generated:

1. There is, in general, no relationship between the ratings given by Polytechnic tutors and the self assessment ratings given by student nurse teachers, when they are both using the amended assessment criteria sheets.
2. There is, in general, no relationship between the professional background of the Polytechnic tutors and the ratings which they give to student nurse teachers when they are both using the amended assessment criteria sheets.

A third related area for investigation was to examine the extent to which the ratings provided by individual tutors were a fair and reliable assessment of the student's ability.

(c) The Research Methodology

In order to test these two null hypotheses, a non-experimental, descriptive correlation design was used.

The purpose of ex post facto research is the same as experimental research; to determine the relationship among variables. The most important distinction between the two is the difficulty of inferring casual relationships in ex post facto studies because of the lack of manipulative control of the independent variables. Correlation research is one way of conducting ex post facto studies. It provides indices of the extent to which two variables are related.

Two procedures were used in order to obtain the information required.

The Field Studies

The sample for the field studies consisted of the thirty-six student nurse teachers due to complete the Certificate of Education course in the academic year 1986/7. These students belonged to the, then, Faculty of Science and Technology and each gave a one-hour lesson which was assessed by a tutor from the Polytechnic (also a member of the Faculty of Science and Technology).

The students' background was that they were all Registered General Nurses, some of whom had a second professional qualification, i.e. Registered Mental Nurse, Registered Sick Children's Nurse.

Many had completed an initial teaching course and were either Registered Clinical Nurse Teachers or had undertaken the City and Guilds 730 Teaching course.

Their knowledge in relation to practical teaching was already quite considerable, as was their interpersonal and communication skills.

Information was generated by the students who used the amended criteria sheets during the long phase of supervised teaching practice. By this stage the students had settled into their allocated teaching placement.

They were visited on three to five occasions by tutors from the Polytechnic, for the purposes of assessment. One of these assessments was used to provide the research data. The choice of which lessons to assess was a random one. The thirty-six students knew that during one visit from an assessor, they would be required to complete an assessment sheet similar to that completed by their assessor. The students had no knowledge of which visit would be used for this purpose. The assessors for the field studies

were, in the main, the three nurse teachers from the Faculty of Science and Technology but other members of the Faculty participated. A complete list of lessons and assessors is contained in Appendix 8A.

The decision as to which assessor assessed a lesson for research purposes was planned in relation to the organisation of supervised teaching experience. Factors such as the geographical location of the School of Nursing, the cost of travelling between the Polytechnic and the School of Nursing, the most beneficial use of time for all concerned, were taken into account.

It was important that the students should receive the appropriate number of visits, at reasonably spaced intervals throughout their twelve-week placement.

Another crucial factor in relation to which assessor visited the student was that, in the main, the assessor and the student would be known to each other.

This familiarity could arise from the following circumstances: either the assessor was the student's personal nurse tutor, or the assessor could have been a leader of one of the student's faculty groups, for example, Teaching Method.

A Teaching Method group could be led by an Engineer, Nurse, or Mathematician. These Teaching Method groups were multi-disciplinary and would have included two or three student nurse teachers.

The research data gathered from the field studies involved the student teachers preparing and delivering a one-hour lesson whilst the assessor from the Polytechnic observed the lesson and made written comments. Before the lesson began, the student was required to prepare a lesson plan and to

present the plan, with copies of any other teaching materials, to the assessor. When the lesson was finished and before any further discussion took place, the assessment sheets were completed separately by the student and the assessor. The assessor and the student did not see each other's results. The sheets were then placed in a sealed, addressed envelope and returned to the researcher. Once this process had taken place, the normal lesson feedback was undertaken.

The lessons which were used to obtain the research data indicate a wide range of topics. They are, however, typical of the type of lesson which student nurse teachers are asked to undertake.

Three lessons, Bereavement, Parkinson's Disease, and Assertiveness, were taught twice. There was no connection between these pairs of lessons. They were taught by different student teachers who all used different methods.

The Video Studies

Video recordings of three lessons, given by three students, were used as a means of determining the extent of agreement between tutors regarding the characteristics of the teaching observed.

It was thought important to examine the extent of agreement between tutors because this agreement is a fundamental aspect of achieving and demonstrating reliability.

Unless the tutors demonstrate a reasonable level of agreement when observing the same lessons, there is little value to be derived from an exploration of the extent to which students and tutors agree.

The three nurse teachers, whose lessons were video-recorded, were typical members of the Nurse Education Section of the Faculty of Science and Technology. All were female, Registered General Nurses. Two were also, in addition, Registered Clinical Teachers.

The selection of these three students was random. They were asked to participate in the research after having been allocated to the Schools of Nursing who had given permission for the videos to be made. None refused.

The choice of these three Schools of Nursing which were considered to be "not untypical", was decided in relation to their proximity to the College and therefore the ease with which the video equipment could be transported.

The sample of assessors for the video studies consisted of twenty Polytechnic staff. They all had several years' experience of working with student nurse teachers. This experience would have come from leading various Faculty Groups of which student nurse teachers would have been members. Examples of the groups include Teaching Method and Special Method. These randomly selected staff were required to provide independent assessments of the three recorded lessons. Information regarding the professional background of the assessors was also obtained.

Each of the one-hour video'd lessons, with their lesson plans, were made available to the twenty Polytechnic staff. The three lessons were typical of the type of lesson which student nurse teachers are asked to undertake.

Student A taught: "Sexually Transmitted Diseases" using a variety of methods.

Student B taught: "Post Natal Depression" using a more didactic approach.

Student C taught: "Assertiveness" using group work and discussion.

All three lessons contained practical as well as academic material and each involved different degrees of interactive activity.

The guidelines for lesson planning had been followed and one student was able to get written, as well as verbal, feedback from her group in order to evaluate the session as effectively as possible.

The assessors had previously been sent three amended assessment criteria sheets (Appendix 5) labelled Student A, Student B, and Student C. They were asked to watch each video, and to assess the student using the sheets provided. The words which best described the lesson were to be circled, as was the overall grade which they intended that the student should receive. Additional comments could be added on the page provided for this purpose.

When they had completed the video assessment, they were required to return the sheets to the researcher in sealed, addressed envelopes.

The following Chapter describes the findings from both the video and the field studies.

THE ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

CHAPTER FOUR

The Findings

(a) The Video Studies

A description of the findings will concentrate firstly on the video studies. Complete data from these studies is contained in Appendix 7. Video recordings of three lessons given by three students were used as a means of determining the extent of agreement between individual tutors, regarding the characteristics of the teaching which they were observing.

The Observed Lessons - Student A

The lesson taught by Student A was "Sexually Transmitted Diseases" The methods used were interactive, allowing the class time for participation and to ask questions. There were twelve second-year student nurses in the group.

The teaching aids were particularly impressive. Care had been taken in the design of each overhead transparency and there was a wide selection of Health Education leaflets available for everyone to use.

The student demonstrated a high level of knowledge in relation to the content of the lesson and illustrated the material with her own clinical experiences. Because of this ability, and the enthusiasm with which she taught the lesson, she demonstrated a very positive attitude to this emotive topic.

This gave the class the confidence to ask the sort of question which they otherwise might have found embarrassing.

Towards the end of the lesson, Student A asked the class to evaluate it and gave them each a prepared sheet to fill in. The responses of the class were favourable. The student nurses enjoyed the lesson and learnt new knowledge and skills.

The lesson which Student A had undertaken was given a grade A by the visiting assessor, who was a nurse tutor. Student A's self assessment grade was A.

Student B

The lesson taught by Student B was "Post Natal Depression" The methods used were didactic as well as interactive. There were thirty-six second-year students in the group.

Effective use was made during the lesson of a video on "Post Natal Depression" This was followed by six small group discussions based on prepared questions.

Student B used considerable skill to manage the feedback from the six small groups. She was able to use her own clinical experiences gained in Kenya and to contrast these with the experiences which members of the group had with the local community.

The knowledge which Student B used was good in relation to the material covered. The lesson was given a grade B by the visiting assessor, who was a nurse tutor. Student B's self-assessment grade was B.

Student C

The lesson taught by Student C was "Assertiveness". The methods used were interactive, allowing the class to participate and to ask questions. There were twenty second-year student nurses in the group.

This was a very lively lesson with several assertion activities happening simultaneously. The activities had been carefully planned and they required considerable skill in classroom management. Following these activities, Student C was able to draw out the principles of assertive behaviour using the personal experiences of the group members. The knowledge base which Student C demonstrated was very good, her teaching style was warm and enthusiastic. The lesson was given a grade A by the visiting assessor, who was a nurse tutor. Student C's self assessment grade was A.

In each of these three video recordings it was possible to judge the performance of the student teachers. Each tape was of one hour's duration and provided ample opportunity to assess each of the characteristics included on the amended assessment criteria sheets.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the ability of students A, B, and C came within a very narrow range.

These three nurses were clearly very able student teachers. Each of them had taught prior to commencing the course and all of the students were knowledgeable within their specialist subjects. They were all highly motivated and undertaking the Certificate in Education course was a deliberate step which they wished to take in their career pathway.

Because of the small numbers involved, caution has been exercised in extrapolating the findings to the population in general.

In order to determine the extent of agreement between tutors', correlations were calculated between corresponding pairs of variables, omitting any pairs of figures if either had missing data. This meant that the sample size varied for different correlation coefficients. Appendix 7 Table A3, B3, C3.

In the correlation tables, the levels of significance are shown below:

$$p < 0.05 \quad r > 0.326 \quad (n \ 36)$$

$$p < 0.01 \quad r > 0.418 \quad (n \ 36)$$

Findings from the Observed Lessons

Correlation matrices derived from tutor assessments are presented in Appendix 7, Tables A3, B3 and C3. These show Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the assessments provided by the fifteen tutors who observed and rated Lesson A, and the nine and eight respectively who observed and rated Lessons B and C.

The square of the correlation coefficient provides an indication of the proportion of the variance which could be predicted by a knowledge of the other. This calculation has been borne in mind in presenting the findings.

In considering the extent of agreement/disagreement between these ratings, some important factors must be taken into account. The three students whose lessons were video-taped in common with all the students who took part in the study, provided the assessors with a very narrow range of ability

from which to make judgements. From a total of fifteen assessors involved in the video studies, only one awarded the refer grade (coded 1) to a student. 83% awarded overall grades of A or B (coded 4 and 3 respectively) and only 14% awarded a grade C (coded 2).

The narrow range is also apparent in data from the field studies, Appendix 8, Table B. The data demonstrates that 80% of the assessors involved in this part of the study awarded "very appropriate" and "appropriate" ratings.

Raw Data

The narrowness of the range of ability can also be seen from a preliminary examination of the raw data, Appendix 7, Tables A1, B1, and C1. Although Student A was referred by one assessor, in all other cases the students were awarded overall pass grades. The three students also assessed themselves as having passed. With the exception of one refer grade, therefore, there appears to be a high level of agreement between the assessments as indicated by the overall grade awarded by the assessors and the self-assessments made by the students.

There are exceptions, however, to this apparent high level of agreement which is evident in the ratings of the variables. This is particularly apparent in the case of the chemistry tutor who, whilst assessing Student A, gives a large number of "not very appropriate" and "inappropriate" ratings, Table A1. From the thirty-six lesson variables only five were graded as being "very appropriate", five were graded as being "appropriate", and five were graded as being "not very appropriate". Thirteen variables were graded as "inappropriate". The overall grade was 1, and the lesson was referred. These ratings are clearly in conflict with the ratings awarded to Student A by the other assessors.

The chemist was the only assessor participating in the video studies to award the refer grade to a student. The reason may have related to the methodology which was used by Student A. One particular aspect of the methodology was the high level of class participation. The chemistry tutor might have been more accustomed to a didactic approach, involving strict classroom management. This notion appears to be supported when the grades which were awarded for Variables 3, 4, 34 and 35, are examined. These variables relate to variation in activity, sequencing, testing methods and administering tests, respectively. Each variable was awarded an "inappropriate" grade. These grades differ markedly from those awarded by other assessors.

Another factor which might have influenced the tutor was the content of the lesson. Sexually transmitted disease is for most people a sensitive subject which often highlights personal prejudice, fear and misunderstandings. As such, the topic is usually difficult for student teachers to convey effectively. The professional and specialist nursing background of Student A (involving Sexually Transmitted Disease Clinics) enabled her to approach the subject openly and without embarrassment, whilst using everyday words and phrases. This might have been judged by the tutor as being excessively explicit and insensitive.

The chemist was, however, more in agreement with the other assessors when considering variables 14, 29 and 30. These variables are: personality, student's attitude to the class and the attitude of the class to the teacher. Each of these variables was awarded a rating of "very appropriate". The same level of "inappropriate" ratings is not apparent in the chemist's assessment of Student B. He did, however, award Student C, twelve "not applicable" grades. The reason for this result could have been the nature of the lesson in which many activities were happening simultaneously. The

tutor's judgement therefore might have been that the lesson could not be assessed in the usual way. Student C was awarded an overall Grade B by the chemist.

Instances where there was lack of agreement between assessors can be seen from an examination involving the following lesson variables.

Variable 8 Demonstration

It is interesting to note that Student A indicates that a demonstration is "not applicable" Seven out of fifteen assessors awarded ratings for this lesson variable.

Food Studies	"very appropriate"
Engineer (1)	"very appropriate"
Psychologist (1)	"appropriate"
Engineer (3)	"appropriate"
Biologist	"not very appropriate"
Nurse (4)	"inappropriate"
Nurse (5)	"appropriate"

Student B indicates that a demonstration is applicable. Seven out of nine assessors have awarded "not applicable" grades.

Nurse (1)
Engineer (1)
Nurse (2)
Mathematician

Psychologist

Engineer (2)

Physicist

Student C indicates that a demonstration is "not applicable" Six out of eight assessors have awarded ratings.

Food Studies "appropriate"

Engineer (1) "appropriate"

Mathematician "appropriate"

Psychologist "appropriate"

Chemist "appropriate"

Engineer (2) "appropriate"

Variable 21 Group Work

Student A indicates that group work is "appropriate" Five assessors have awarded "not applicable" grades.

Nurse (1)

Chemist

Engineer (2)

Physicist

Engineer (3)

There is more agreement with the responses to group work in the raw data for Student B and C.

Variable 22 Role Play

Student A indicates that role play is "not applicable". Two assessors awarded ratings.

Food Studies	"appropriate"
Biologist	"not very appropriate"

Student B indicates that role play is "not applicable". Two assessors awarded ratings.

Food Studies	"appropriate"
Physicist	"appropriate"

Although only three variables (demonstration, group work and role play) demonstrate this level of disagreement, there are implications to consider. It is of concern to the researcher that these three variables caused such confusion. These are strategies which require great skill to perfect and sustain, they are important teaching techniques and their effective use should be recognised in the overall assessment. It is crucial therefore that effective feedback is provided by the assessor when students introduce these methods into their lessons. In the case of Student B, seven assessors out of nine would not have included comment about demonstration technique, due to their rating of "not applicable" for this variable.

Conversely, in the case of Student A, seven assessors out of fifteen were giving ratings for a demonstration which the student did not include in the lesson.

A similar situation arises with Student C.

The level of disagreement which the researcher has highlighted in relation to these three variables also raises concern regarding the process of self-assessment.

In order that the simultaneous process of student self-assessment and tutor assessment is carried out as honestly and effectively as possible, it is essential that both parties are clear about the detail of the planned lesson. Although the format of the existing lesson plan requires that teaching and learning activities should be itemised, there is still the possibility of error as the previous paragraphs demonstrate.

Correlations between assessments

Cohen and Manion 1985 (p.163) have provided some practical examples of interpreting correlation coefficients. They have established the following criteria for relational studies.

Very slight relationship between variables	0.20 ----- 0.35
Slight relationship between variables	0.35 ----- 0.65
Moderate or good relationship between variables	0.65 ----- 0.85
Very good relationship between variables	0.85 and above

From an examination of Appendix 7, Tables A3, B3, and C3, it would appear that the level of agreement is not as high as might be expected.

Lesson A

Using the description suggested by Cohen and Manion for very good relationships, only the following correlation was identified.

r	r ²	
0.869	0.75	75% agreement between Engineer (1) and Food Studies

From a total of 120 correlation coefficients, 11 were found to demonstrate a moderate relationship between variables (0.65 ---- 0.85).

r	r ²	
0.707	0.49	49% agreement between Food Studies and Nurse (1)
0.707	0.49	49% agreement between Engineer (1) and Nurse (1)
0.699	0.48	48% agreement between Engineer (2) and Nurse (1)
0.756	0.57	57% agreement between Physicist and Nurse (1)
0.672	0.45	45% agreement between Psychologist (2) and Nurse (1)
0.657	0.43	43% agreement between Engineer (2) and Food Studies
0.733	0.53	53% agreement between Psychologist (2) and Food Studies
0.651	0.42	42% agreement between Psychologist and Engineer (1)
0.701	0.49	49% agreement between Psychologist (2) and Chemist
0.689	0.47	47% agreement between Physicist and Engineer (2)
0.717	0.51	51% agreement between Psychologist (2) and Engineer (2)

Eight negative correlations can be found in the matrix for Lesson A. Although these figures demonstrate disagreement, none of them was large enough to be considered significant. It should be noted, however, that the eight negative correlations all relate to the level of agreement between the self-assessment ratings of the student and the ratings given by the assessors.

It follows, therefore, that forty-seven correlation coefficients demonstrated slight relationships between assessors (0.35 ---- 0.65).

Lesson B

A similar examination of the correlations between the assessments of Lesson B showed that there was one correlation which demonstrated a moderate or good relationship between variables.

r	r ²	
0.748	0.55	55% agreement between Engineer (1) and Food Studies

There were five correlations which demonstrated a slight relationship between variables (0.35 ---- 0.65).

There were ten negative correlations which did not appear to conform to any particular pattern.

Lesson C

For Lesson C, there was one correlation which indicated a very good relationship between assessors.

r	r ²	
0.946	0.89	89% agreement between Mathematician and Food Studies

The following figures indicate a moderate or good relationship:

r	r ²	
0.832	0.69	69% agreement between Engineer (1) and Food Studies
0.680	0.46	46% agreement between Engineer (2) and Food Studies

0.781	0.60	60% agreement between Mathematician and Engineer (1)
0.723	0.52	52% agreement between Engineer (2) and Engineer (1)

There were no negative correlations in this matrix.

Slight relationships between tutors' assessments

Lesson A produced forty-seven examples of slight relationships between variables. Lesson B produced five examples of slight relationship and Lesson C produced sixteen examples of slight relationships between variables.

Agreement between tutors

In summary, in only two cases was there a very good level of agreement between tutors. One of these cases concerned an engineer and a food studies tutor. The second case concerned a mathematics tutor and a food studies tutor.

In the first case the engineer (1) and the food studies tutor were assessing Student A. Their correlation, using the overall assessment ratings, was 0.869.

In the second case there was a very good level of agreement which involved a mathematics tutor and the food studies tutor who had assessed Student C. Their overall assessment ratings produced a correlation of 0.946.

The researcher then compared the final gradings which the engineering tutor and the food studies tutor had given with those of the three student video recordings. The results were as follows:

Student A	Self assessment	Grade A
	Visiting tutor	Grade A
	Food studies tutor	Grade A
	Engineering tutor (1)	Grade A
	Engineering tutor (2)	Grade B
	Engineering tutor (3)	Grade B
Student B	Self assessment	Grade B
	Visiting tutor	Grade B
	Food studies tutor	Grade B
	Engineering tutor (1)	Grade B
	Engineering tutor (2)	Grade B
Student C	Self assessment	Grade A
	Visiting tutor	Grade A
	Food studies tutor	Grade B
	Engineering tutor (1)	Grade B
	Engineering tutor (2)	Grade B

An examination of these findings used in isolation from the Field Studies did not allow the researcher to accept or reject the two null hypotheses generated for the study. These findings were, however, interesting in

relation to the third area of investigation which was outlined in Chapter Three.

The third area involved the examination of the extent to which the ratings provided by individual tutors were a fair and reliable assessment of the student's ability.

It must be stressed again that the three student nurse teachers who participated in the Video Studies represented a very narrow range of very able student ability.

It was therefore not surprising that, within this narrow range, there was so little agreement between the tutors involved. This key issue will be discussed further.

The findings raised concerns in relation to the reliability and therefore the validity of the assessment methods which were being investigated. The first concern was that there was little agreement between tutors from the same Faculty who would have been responsible for a teaching method group in similar disciplines. This would have involved the detailed preparation of students for supervised teaching experience. Implicit in this preparation is the development, discussion and demonstration of appropriate teaching characteristics. These characteristics, which include stress on the value of student activity, etc. can be found in Appendix 2.1. The findings led the researcher to suppose that there was a lack of common understanding between tutors as to the perception of a teaching characteristic being "very appropriate" or "appropriate".

The second concern was that the nurse tutors who were observing the video of Student A, showed little agreement. An important factor here could have

been that of specialist nursing knowledge. The nurse tutors may have been influenced by the content of the lesson and less by its organisation and management. If they perceived the factual knowledge used by Student A as being less than satisfactory, they would have graded the lesson accordingly.

Another factor could have been related to the professional backgrounds of the nurse tutors. Some nurse tutors had the qualification of Registered General Tutor and others, the qualification of Registered Mental Health Tutor; these differing backgrounds could have influenced their judgement of Student A's performance.

Returning to the tutors who did demonstrate broad agreement when observing the same lessons, namely the engineers and the food studies tutor, there are several reasons which could be given to explain this finding.

Engineers and food studies tutors are generally involved in teaching subjects which have a high practical input. Emphasis is placed on the development of a "knowledgeable doer". In order to achieve this goal, the characteristics of teaching such as having a suitable lesson plan, managing the class in an effective manner, ensuring the clarity of explanation and analogy, would be given a high priority.

Although these agreements were demonstrated, the researcher was led to suppose that, in the main, the methods of assessment being used fell short of the level of reliability which is desirable.

(b) The Field Studies

This data provided a means of assessing the extent to which there were similarities and differences between the self assessments of the students and the assessments made by the teaching staff. Thirty-six self assessment ratings were made by thirty-six students. Thirty-six assessment ratings were made by twenty assessors. The lesson titles and the subject specialism of the staff who assessed them appear in Appendix 8, Table A.

Complete data from the Field Studies is contained in Appendix 8, Tables A to J.

Supervisor assessments and student self assessments have been summarised in Appendix 8, Table B. Information included shows the number and percentages of each response together with minima, maxima, means and standard deviations for each rating. The number of assessors and students who indicated "very appropriate" and "appropriate" demonstrated that there was broad agreement between the assessments made by the tutors and the self assessments made by the students. This finding in itself was not surprising and could have been anticipated given the positive and confident approach of this group of students to the course.

In order to ascertain the extent of agreement between assessors and students, however, it is necessary to examine the extent of agreement or disagreement between individual students and assessors.

The thirty-six lesson topics have been listed in Appendix 8, Table C and the ratings for which there was precise agreement between student and assessor identified with an asterisk. This table demonstrated the occasions on which the tutor and student were in complete agreement when using the rating

"very appropriate" and "appropriate" for each of the thirty-six lesson variables. Considerable differences could then be seen which were examined further in Table D. Here, the lessons were shown where complete agreement with the ratings occurred. This number of lessons was relatively small.

Planning Abilities

Variable 1, the plan of intent: in only six of the thirty-six lessons was there complete agreement that the plan was "very appropriate", and in only three lessons out of thirty-six was there complete agreement that the plan was "appropriate". This finding is surprising if consideration is given to the importance attached to this topic.

Variable 6, the combination of content and method: by contrast showed that although there was complete agreement with only two tutors and students on "very appropriate", there was agreement with twelve tutors and students on the rating of "appropriate". This would seem to contradict the low ratings of agreement given for the lesson plan, since the combination of content and method would have been explicit within it. Variable 6 also posed a problem since it was the only one in which consideration of the content, that is, the accuracy of the knowledge or skill being imparted, was mentioned. The assessor was required to rate the content in conjunction with the methods to be used. Hence there was not a specific variable amongst the thirty-six, which could be used by a subject specialist in order to indicate the appropriateness of the teaching material.

This factor would have been less important when the assessor did not share the same professional background as the student, for example, if a teacher of mathematics were to be assessing a student nurse teacher. In this case, the mathematics tutor would not be expected to comment on the accuracy of the

content, but would concentrate on assessing the methods being used to teach the content.

Another interesting finding related to Variable 7, the aids used: the time spent during the course, developing materials on this topic, is considerable. Student nurse teachers who, in the main, have had previous teaching experience are often very skilled at creating or obtaining suitable teaching aids. That only two tutors and two students out of thirty-six agreed that the aids for the lesson were "very appropriate" was surprising. Even more surprising was the finding that only seven tutors and students agreed that the teaching aids were "appropriate".

Each of the nine variables related to planning ability would have been discussed at length during the course. Even where the number of tutors and students in agreement were higher, however, for example, Variable 5, variation in student activity, the overall levels of agreement remained relatively low.

Performance Abilities

Variables 9-27 were concerned with performance abilities. Overall, the level of agreement between tutors and students was low. For example, in Variable 10, opening the lesson, only three tutors and three students agreed on the rating "very appropriate" and only eight tutors and students agreed on the rating "appropriate".

Two variables within the category of performance abilities did demonstrate a higher level of agreement. These two were Variable 16, questioning, and Variable 21, group work. In Variable 16, nine tutors and students agreed on the rating of "very appropriate" and "appropriate". In Variable 21, twelve

tutors and students agreed on "very appropriate", and six tutors and students agreed on the rating of "appropriate"

A great deal of emphasis is placed on the construction and analysis of questions in teaching method groups. This is one of the more complex lesson variables, demanding the recognition by both the tutor and student of differing types of questions, for example, open, closed, leading or hypothetical.

Information derived from these two variables indicated a more common understanding of what was involved in questioning and group work. The assessment rating did not, however, permit a close scrutiny of this kind and the results led the researcher to suppose that, where the tutor and student agreed, an effective choice of questioning style was being used throughout the lesson.

The results of Variable 21, group work, were also interesting bearing in mind the stress laid on interactive methods of teaching. For many students on the course, other than nurses, this aspect of teaching method was particularly challenging. Many had not experienced group work when they had previously been students. They were more familiar with didactic methods such as lectures and laboratory sessions. The student nurse teachers, in their professional work, were more used to working with groups of either student nurses, patients or clients. This experience would have given them confidence to use and experiment with group work during their supervised teaching placement.

The last pair of variables which are worthy of note concerned Variable 19, explanation, and Variable 23, the level of the lesson. Here, the level of agreement between tutors and students was relatively high for the rating of

"appropriate". This finding demonstrated that there was a degree of common understanding in relation to the explanation of content, matching the academic level of the class being taught.

Social Relationships

In Variables 28-33, the level of agreement between tutors and students was higher than the level in the two previous categories.

In Variable 29, student's attitude to the class, twelve tutors and students agreed on the rating "very appropriate" Nine tutors and students agreed on the rating "very appropriate" for Variable 30, the attitude of the students to the student teacher. The degree of rapport, Variable 31, demonstrated that ten tutors and students agreed on the rating "very appropriate" This finding is not surprising considering the professional backgrounds of the students. As Registered Nurses, they would be expected to demonstrate skill in establishing rapport with others. As Registered Nurses taking on the role of student teachers, many of them had the confidence to rate themselves highly on these three variables.

Another interesting finding, however, was that this expression of student confidence did not emerge from the results of Variable 28, the learning environment created.

These results demonstrated a low level of agreement and yet the researcher would have anticipated that high levels of agreement on Variables 29, 30 and 31 would have been associated with a high level of agreement in relation to the learning environment. The level of agreement for Variable 33, classroom management, was particularly low. Two tutors and students agreed on the rating "very appropriate", and six tutors and students agreed on the rating

"appropriate". Classroom management is a complex variable. Its success would have been, to a large extent, dependent on good classroom relationships. These relationships had, in the main, been rated as being "very appropriate", and yet agreement on the management of the classroom was low.

This finding could have occurred as a result of tutors assessing classes in which social interaction was not only planned but positively encouraged by the student nurse teachers. Not all tutors are committed to group work and other forms of class activity. When requested to assess relationships in the class, these tutors may have assessed them positively at that moment but when they were asked to assess classroom management cumulatively, that is, at the end of the lesson, the tutors may have judged the class to have been disorganised, noisy, and lacking in disciplined behaviour.

The result from Variable 33 could also have been related to the complexity of classroom management. Opportunity existed for confusion to occur over what elements constituted classroom management. Did the management relate to the students in their class and their behaviour? Did the management relate to the use of materials or equipment? Did the management relate to both of these issues?

In order to answer these questions, the results from Variable 9, the management of the environment, were examined. This variable was included in the category of planning abilities and related to the organisation of the classroom before the students arrived. This organisation would have involved the student teacher in checking that adequate seating, lighting and ventilation was available. All equipment needed for the lesson would have been assembled and the lesson begun promptly. It was interesting to note that twelve tutors and students agreed on the rating "appropriate" for Variable 9. This finding could, again, be explained by using the nature of the professional

skills which nurses use in the organisation of patient or client care. The results from Variable 9 did not seem to have influenced the level of agreement for Variable 33. The researcher therefore supposed that classroom management was being perceived as relating exclusively to the class and its behaviour.

Post Performance Analysis

Variables 34-36 were concerned with post performance analysis. This section was not for the consideration of the student's performance as might have been expected, but was assessing the use of testing methods by the student during the lesson.

Variable 34, testing methods, and Variable 35, administering the testing methods, demonstrated rare instances of the assessors being less generous in their use of "very appropriate" and "appropriate" than were the students.

This finding may have related to the fact that this aspect of teaching was not given, on the whole, as much emphasis on the course as other aspects received. It was therefore interesting to note that without great emphasis being placed by the tutors, on the skill of devising, administering and interpreting tests, the student teachers assessed their performance as being largely "very appropriate".

There was, however, little evidence of complete agreement for Variables 33 and 34, as can be seen from Table D.

Variable 36, the learning which took place, demonstrated another interesting finding. In spite of the previous teaching experience of these students, only three tutors and students were in complete agreement in their use of the

rating "very appropriate", and only ten tutors and students were in complete agreement in their use of the rating "appropriate".

The assessment of this variable did not include written feedback from the class, although several teachers did make a point of asking for class comment towards the end of the lesson. It was not possible, using Table D, to state whether the findings bore any relation to the lessons being taught. Apart from those lessons where complete agreement occurred in the final grades given by tutors and students, no pattern or relationship could be detected.

The lessons were concerned with different topics and were taught with differing levels of student nurses, using various methods. As can be seen from Appendix 8, Table E, in only eight out of the thirty-six lessons, was there complete agreement in grading between tutors and students. These agreements are indicated by asterisks.

One tutor and student agreed on a Grade A, six tutors and students agreed on a Grade B, and one tutor and student agreed on a Grade C. The definitions of these grades are indicated in Appendix 8, Table J.

The Lessons

When each of these eight lessons was analysed more closely, the following findings emerged:

From the eight lessons in which agreement in grading occurred, six of the tutors were nurses. This demonstrated that, even though the overall number of tutors and students agreeing was small, the agreement between tutors who were nurses was high.

The reasons for this finding could be related to the nurse tutors and the student nurse teachers having a more common understanding of the assessment process.

From the eight lessons, Lesson 11 (Appendix 8, Table G2), and Lesson 29 (Appendix 8, Table G7), demonstrated the highest number of agreements. Lesson 3 (Appendix 8, Table G1) demonstrated the lowest number of agreements on variables.

Lesson 11, Counselling

Out of the twenty variables on which the tutor and a student agreed, fifteen were described as "very appropriate" and five were described as being "appropriate".

It is interesting that, in view of these ratings, the overall lesson was graded as B, rather than as a Grade A. The ratings for the lesson would appear to have fulfilled the description of a Grade A performance. The assessor was a nurse tutor.

Lesson 29, Parkinson's Disease

From the twenty variables on which the tutor and student agreed, two were described as being "very appropriate", and eighteen were described as being "appropriate". The overall Grade B, given in this instance, appeared to match both the assessor's individual ratings and the individual ratings of the student.

This result demonstrated the highest level of reliability in the study. It was also interesting because both tutor and student were nurses.

Lesson 3. Hearing

All of the nine variables on which the tutor and student agreed were assessed as being "appropriate".

Lesson 20, Children in Hospital

This lesson was assessed as Grade A by both assessor and student (Appendix 8, Table G4).

This finding is interesting because on this occasion, the assessor was a psychologist. Within Lesson 20, there was agreement on seventeen variables. Each of these variables was assessed by both tutor and student as being "very appropriate". Eight of the eighteen performance abilities were assessed as being "very appropriate". This demonstrates a high degree of student confidence is supported by the ratings of the assessor.

On twelve occasions, the tutor graded the students more highly than the students graded themselves (Appendix 8, Table E). This happened regardless of the tutor's professional background. There was also a tendency for the individual lesson variables to be rated more highly by the assessors than by the student (Appendix 8, Table C).

The reasons for these findings could have related to the fact that the students knew that this was a research exercise and would not count towards their final teaching experience grade.

It might also have been related to the fact that these student teachers were experienced qualified nurses, some of whom already had other teaching qualifications, e.g. City & Guilds 730, Registered Clinical Teaching Certificate. The students could therefore have been judging their performance against previous criteria and have decided that they did not yet fulfil the requirements for a "very appropriate" rating.

Whether the students' self-assessment ratings would have been higher if those research findings had been incorporated into the overall grading for supervised teaching experience is a difficult question to answer.

The researcher's current experience within nurse education, using the work of Kathleen Bondy, would suggest that provided adequate time is given to the preparation for self-assessment, the concept helps practitioners to be more objective and to talk about their performance. When the self-assessment comments are integrated by students into their learning contracts, with the support of nurse teachers, students are then able to identify for themselves, strengths and weaknesses. Further strategies can be planned so that the strengths in their performance of nursing skills can be enhanced and the weaknesses in their performance can be improved.

Written Comments

Written comments from the Field Studies are contained in Appendix 8, Tables H & I. Both assessors and student nurse teachers made relatively little use of this part of the assessment criteria sheets (Appendices 5 & 6, p.3).

Data demonstrating assessor's written comments (n36)

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	LESSONS
Planning Abilities	4	8, 17, 20, 23
Performance Abilities	11	5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25
Social Relationships	10	5, 8, 13, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30
Post Performance Analysis	1	20

Data demonstrating student nurse teacher's written comments

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF COMMENTS	LESSONS
Planning Abilities	14	2, 4, 5, 9, 13, 17, 18, 27, 18, 27, 28, 30, 32
Performance Abilities	12	1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 17, 18, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32
Social Relationships	2	4, 18
Post Performance Analysis	3	4, 17, 18

The researcher considered firstly the number of occasions where both the assessor and the student chose to comment on the same category. These comments did not necessarily demonstrate agreement.

Planning Abilities

Lesson 17 - Blood Cells

Student's Written Comments

"I feel this anatomy and physiology session was much better than my previous performance. I understand the subject. In the past I did not have a good knowledge base in anatomy and physiology."

Assessor's Written Comments

"Some difficulty with complex abstract concepts."

Performance Abilities

Lesson 17 - Blood Cells

Student's Written Comments

"Although there is room for improvement, I actually felt that I was teaching and not just verbalising about something which I did not understand."

Assessor's Written Comments

"Some content a problem at times, methods good."

Performance Abilities

Lesson 18 – Parkinson’s Disease

Student’s Written Comments

"Felt constrained by the one-hour slot. Lesson lacking in sparkle.
Nursing care to similar to a very good session yesterday."

Assessor’s Written Comments

"Large group, well managed."

Social Relationships

Lesson 18 – Parkinson’s Disease

Student’s Written Comments

"Would not have wished to use the desks but the students required
it."

Assessor’s Written Comments

"Perhaps insist on moving the desks."

The category for which the assessors provided the highest number of written comments was Performance Abilities. Even then, only eleven assessors out of thirty-six made use of this part of the assessment sheet.

Examples of these comments include:

"Felt that the overall idea was reasonable but student response was not forthcoming particularly prior to coffee. Is an assessor's presence providing an automatic dampening effect on the question and answer discussion?"

"Interesting and stimulating lesson, excellent rapport."

"More care should be taken with the visual reinforcement of material."

The category for which the students provided the highest number of written comments was Planning Abilities. Even then, only fourteen students from thirty-six felt able and/or willing to comment on this aspect of their performance.

Examples of these comments include:

"I would have preferred more time and space in order to use a workshop approach."

"I found it difficult to remind myself that these students had only spent one week learning about patients in hospital and had not seen a ward nor any basic equipment."

"I felt I had to hurry the lesson along to ensure that the content had been covered, so perhaps a re-think of the lesson plan might be appropriate?"

As the assessor and the student were requested not to discuss the amended criteria sheets after having completed them, the researcher had no means of ascertaining whether the subsequent verbal feedback included reference to these written comments or not.

As so few participants made written comments, it is difficult to generalise from the results.

There was in two cases, however, Lesson 17 and 18, evidence that the written comments reflected a shared concern. Lesson 17 demonstrated student anxiety about the level of anatomy and physiology required for the session. The assessor of Lesson 17, a nurse tutor, also expressed concern in relation to the teaching of abstract concepts.

Lesson 18 contained specific written reference to the students' use of desks. The assessor's written comments also reflected this concern by indicating that the student should have insisted on the desks not being used if this strategy was necessary to the effectiveness of the lesson as a whole.

It would appear from the findings of the written comments that the students are more concerned with the planning aspects of the lesson. The assessors appear more concerned about performance abilities. This is perhaps not surprising given the professional background experience of the student nurse teachers. They would be familiar with the importance of planning in relation to patient or client care and would transfer this concept into their role as student teachers.

Earlier findings from the Field Studies have, however, demonstrated that there was disagreement between the students and assessors in relation to planning abilities.

It must be emphasised again that the findings from the Field Studies related to a narrow range of very able student ability. The discrimination which was required here related to whether the student's teaching ability was "appropriate" or "very appropriate".

An analysis of the Field Studies did not reveal a serious lack of broad agreement between tutors and students (Appendix 8, Table B). None had awarded an R grade when the other had awarded either grade A or B.

This broad agreement provided, however, only a crude measure and might have been anticipated from the ability of the students who participated. A much finer measure of discrimination has been possible by further analysis of the data produced (Appendix 8, Tables C & G). This has demonstrated that, within the broad agreement shown, there was considerable disagreement.

Although the study does not demonstrate a strict statistical justification for rejecting the first null hypothesis that there is, in general, no relationship between the ratings given by Polytechnic tutors and the self-assessment ratings given by students, when they are both using the amended assessment criteria sheets, there was a considerable measure of agreement between the self-assessments of student nurse teachers and tutors. This finding provides strong grounds for placing confidence in the ability of students to provide assessments which are in broad agreement with those of their assessors.

The measure of agreement was not as high as the researcher would have wished, but was not unexpected in view of the narrow range of ability which was being investigated.

These student nurse teachers had gained professional qualifications before the commencing of the Course. They had a very positive attitude in relation to

the assessment procedures required to complete successfully their period of supervised teaching experience. Several of the student teachers had gained previous teaching qualifications and/or teaching experience.

Given this confident and experienced group of student teachers, it was not surprising that, within the broad agreement demonstrated between assessors and students, there was also considerable disagreement.

It would have been difficult, without additional descriptive criteria, for the assessors to make the distinction between "very appropriate" and "appropriate", such that it always corresponded with the students' self-assessment.

The study does not demonstrate a strict statistical justification for rejecting the second null hypothesis that there is, in general, no relationship between the professional background of the Polytechnic tutors and the ratings which they give to student nurses when they are using the amended assessment criteria sheets.

Data from the field studies, however, showed that there was a measure of broad agreement between the ratings given to student nurse teachers by Polytechnic tutors with differing professional backgrounds (Appendix 8E). As twenty-six of the thirty-six lessons were assessed by one professional group, that is, Nurse Tutors, care must be taken with the interpretation of this finding. Although a measure of broad agreement was demonstrated between Polytechnic tutors with differing professional backgrounds, the differences between tutor assessments needs to be minimised.

Data from the video studies showed that with only three out of sixteen tutors with differing professional backgrounds was there a high level of agreement when they were observing the same videoed lessons.

This measure of agreement was not as high as the researcher would have wished.

Chapter Four has included an analysis of the findings from the video and Field Studies. These findings have demonstrated that, although there was broad agreement between the assessors and the student nurse teachers, within this broad agreement there was disagreement. It has been emphasised that, because of the narrow range of ability being investigated, this disagreement was by no means complete.

These findings suggest that the methodologies which the researcher used, could, with refinement, have yielded a more sensitive instrument for examining the assessment process.

The limitations of the research design were as follows:

1. A pilot study which used the amended assessment criteria sheets was not undertaken prior to the main study commencing. Such a study could have alerted the researcher to the need to develop a more detailed description of the rating scale. For example, what were the precise differences between "inappropriate", "appropriate" and "very appropriate"? Nevertheless, without additional tutor training, it is unlikely that this would have led to more accurate assessments.
2. The investigation in which only student nurse teachers participated did not permit the total population of student teachers to be studied. Contrasting student nurse teacher self-assessments with the self-assessments of students from other disciplines within the Faculty, for example chemists, mathematicians, and biologists, would have permitted the researcher to explore a wider range of teaching ability.

This wider representation would have enabled those students with much less teaching experience to be compared with student nurse teachers whose previous teaching experience was considerable.

3. With hindsight, a research design in which the researcher conducted assessment interviews with both students and tutors would have established whether or not there was a relationship between their written ratings and/or comments and those ratings and/or verbal ratings which were shared in discussion.
4. The preparation of the thirty-six student nurse teachers to develop the practice of self-assessment could have been undertaken through the use of extra tutorials. In this way, the same degree of discussion and simulated practice would have been available to each student. It was fortunate that, in most cases, the practice of self-assessment had already begun and the student nurse teachers were able to participate in the activity with some confidence.

This research did not consider other factors to do with teacher effectiveness such as intelligence, motivation, sense of humour, perception or empathy. These factors could well be used as a basis for further research in this area.

With these limitations in mind, Chapter Five will consider the conclusions which can be drawn from the study. Recommendations for future practice will also be explored.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

This research arose out of anxieties expressed by student teachers in relation to the practical assessments carried out during supervised teaching experience.

The students were concerned with the apparent lack of consistency in the tutors' assessments of their lessons. These results related to the written assessment (Appendix 2.2), and the individual assessor's interpretation of the assessment criteria (Appendix 2.1).

Although some research had been undertaken into the assessment of supervised teaching experience in Post Compulsory Education, very little had been published relating to the contribution which could be made to the development of teaching skills and the value of assessment by students assessing themselves, during supervised teaching experience.

This research was designed to explore the potential value of "self-assessment" in the development of teaching skills. In particular, the aims of the study were, therefore:

1. To examine the extent to which there are similarities and differences between the self-assessments made by the student nurse teachers and the assessment made by the teaching staff.
2. To examine the relationship between the professional background of the teaching staff and their assessments of the student nurse teachers.

3. To examine a method of self-assessment which would be of value to student teachers and teaching staff.
4. To make proposals regarding the potential use of such a method during the Certificate of Education Course.

The first aim was explored using the null hypothesis that there is, in general, no relationship between the ratings given by Polytechnic tutors and the self-assessment ratings given by student nurse teachers when they are both using the amended assessment criteria sheets.

Although the findings from the study do not allow this hypothesis to be rejected on strictly statistical grounds, self-assessments of classroom performance by students have been shown to correspond broadly with those provided by tutors who observed them teaching, or who observed video recordings of their lessons.

By comparing the self-assessments of student teachers with those of the assessors using both video and field studies, it was possible to demonstrate that there was a considerable measure of agreement between the two groups involved.

It has also been possible to identify some important differences within the ratings used.

An analysis of the video studies showed that with only three tutors was there evidence of a high level of agreement when they were observing the same video-recorded lesson. This finding raises issues in relation to the inter-rater reliability of the current assessment process.

The first of these is that there were differences in the way in which tutors were interpreting the criteria for assessing teaching behaviour. These differences in interpretation related largely to the use of "very appropriate" and "appropriate" in the rating scale.

Secondly, the tutors were differing in their overall judgements of the three videoed lessons. These differences have implications for the consistency with which the student teachers are being assessed and justifies their concerns described in Chapter Two.

The success of any observational system is contingent upon the ability of the observer to perceive patterns of behaviour accurately and to make appropriate judgements. This accuracy, in turn, relies on a common understanding of the patterns of behaviour being observed. The addition of a rating scale to the current assessment sheet was used in part to enable the assessor to sharpen his or her perception of the students' behaviour.

In an attempt to improve the objectivity of assessments, assessors were provided with descriptions of the characteristics looked for at each grade. Nevertheless, although there was agreement between tutors in grades awarded to the video lessons, this was less than is desirable.

The implications from this finding relate to the preparation and development of assessors in the Polytechnic and the host Colleges. At present, there is no formal programme to prepare new or existing staff to assess the student teachers undertaking the Certificate of Education Course. It is assumed that tutors have the necessary skills to fulfil this task and that little guidance or education is necessary.

On only eight lessons out of thirty-six did tutors and students show complete agreement on the overall grading which was awarded.

The disagreements which were demonstrated occurred in each of the four teaching behaviour categories, that is, planning ability, performance ability, social relationships, and post performance analysis. The category where there was less disagreement, however, occurred in social relationships.

On only twelve occasions were the students more generous in their self ratings than the assessors. This finding is important because, should self-assessment become part of the overall grade, some students may feel pressurised to become "self flattering", and these findings should therefore be interpreted with caution.

This notion of self flattery did not appear to be a feature of this study. The students were, if anything, demonstrating caution in their approach to self-assessment. It could be argued that because the students knew the self-assessment procedure was part of a research study and, as such, would not count as part of the overall grade, they did not take the activity seriously. (Experience of working with this professional and highly motivated group of mature students did not provide any indication that any of them had other than a serious and careful approach to the provision of their self appraisals.) Even though the majority of students had undertaken some form of teaching before commencing the course, they appeared, in the main, to be indicating that there was still more skill to be mastered before they could award themselves an A grade.

The success of any scheme of self-assessment is dependent on the ability of the observer and the observed, to perceive patterns of behaviour accurately and to make appropriate judgements.

The use of matching rating scales in both the assessors' and the students' assessment sheets was intended in part to sharpen the perception of both. Although less imprecise assessments were produced in the data from the Field Studies, the level of agreement between student and tutor, and particularly between tutor and tutor, was lower than is desirable.

The implications of this finding again emphasise the need for the preparation and development of assessors in the Polytechnic and host Colleges.

The second aim was explored using the null hypothesis that there is, in general, no relationship between the professional background of the Polytechnic tutors and the ratings which they give to student nurse teachers when they are using the amended assessment criteria sheets.

Although the findings from the study do not allow the second null hypothesis to be rejected on strictly statistical grounds, there was a measure of broad agreement, although differences between tutor assessments of the same videoed lessons were sufficient to justify a recommendation that additional training be provided for them in order to minimise these differences.

It has been emphasised earlier that these findings relate to a very narrow band of good teaching ability. All the students were very positive in their attitude to the course. Each had benefitted from previous teaching courses and/or teaching experience. Bearing these factors in mind it is not surprising that there should have been some lack of agreement between the assessors' use of the ratings provided. The discrimination which was required by the assessors largely concerned the interpretation of the ratings "very appropriate" and "appropriate". As the students were already skilful teachers, absolute agreement between assessors attempting to discriminate between "very appropriate" and "appropriate" would have been difficult to achieve.

The measure of agreement was considered high enough, however, to justify the introduction of self-assessment as part of the process of developing teaching skills. This finding also emphasises the need for in-service tutor training if their assessments are to carry the credibility needed for them to perform their role adequately.

In general terms, the amended assessment criteria sheets offered an improvement on the current means of assessing students and enabling students to assess themselves. The weakness of these structured assessment sheets, amended for the research, could be minimised by consultation and the provision of training for tutors, mentors and students, prior to the study commencing.

At present, neither the teacher nor the student can be dogmatic about what constitutes "good" teaching, since there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes a competent practitioner. An exploration, however, of shared meaning in relation to the essential outcomes of supervised teaching experience would provide a forum for tutors, mentors and students to take the development of teaching competence further. This exploration should also tackle issues which arise from assessments being provided by non-subject specialists. To what extent is it reasonable for an engineer to judge the lesson given by a student nurse teacher? How is the content, rather than the pedagogy, to be assessed?

Although the overall responsibility for educating and training teachers for Post Compulsory Education remains with the Polytechnic staff, the views of experienced mentors and student teachers are important since they are largely responsible for fostering the subsequent development of students in Further and Higher Education.

It may therefore be timely for those involved in the process of assessment to consider undertaking an evaluation of its effectiveness. Assessment visits are costly, both in time and money. If such a relatively low level of reliability is being demonstrated, with the use of the current assessment method, consideration should be given to the incorporation of other, less traditional methods of assessment.

The third aim of the study was to examine a method of self-assessment which would be of value to student teachers and teaching staff. Although reference is made in the course documentation to "self evaluation" (Appendix 3), this process is not always undertaken in practice as has been highlighted earlier.

Three strategies were examined in relation to developing a method of self-assessment.

The Use of Learning Contracts

Learning contracts are not currently included in the process of assessing teaching experience. A learning contract has been defined by Mazhindu (1990) as:

"A written or verbal agreement or commitment reached between the parties involved in an educational setting, regarding the particular amount of student work or learning, utilizing selected learning resources on the one hand, and the amount of institutional credit or reward for this work on the other, and recognizing that the agreement can cover various lengths of time, any amount of work, and all disciplines and/or areas of knowledge"

A specific form of learning contract could be developed for use during Phases Two to Four of supervised teaching practice. This would enable students to set their own goals for supervised teaching experience and to grade themselves on their performance. This self-grading would become part of the overall grading awarded for supervised teaching experience by the personal tutor.

The learning contracts would also enable the students to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching behaviour. For example, a weakness in the use of role play might be identified. The students would need to write down which resources they were going to use in order to remedy this weakness. They might include a need for additional supervised practice focusing exclusively on role play techniques. The personal tutor would then monitor the degree to which the student was successful in gaining access to the resources which he or she had identified. Copies of the learning contracts would be incorporated into the continuous assessment documentation.

The Use of a Bondy Framework for the Continuous Assessment of Teaching Experience

The documentation which will now be described is not currently part of the assessment process. The proposed documentation would replace the blank assessment form (Appendix 2.1). The following strategy has been used in nurse education by Williams (1987) (Appendix 9.2).

The framework, developed by Katherine Bondy, has been described in Chapter One. The author has proposed a further adaptation to be used as a basis for continually assessing teaching practice (Appendix 10). Each learning goal would be analysed and essential outcomes defined. Each essential outcome

would be assessed diagnostically, formatively and summatively, at prescribed intervals throughout Phase Two and Four of supervised teaching experience. The student teacher's self-assessment for the diagnostic and formative stages would also be documented. The degree to which the summative assessment might incorporate the student's self-assessment grade would need further discussion. By using this approach to continuous assessment, the process would be more clearly defined for both teaching staff and students. This clear definition would also be enhanced by building into educational practice, systems for standard setting. An exploration of the process of setting educational standards is outside the scope of this study but it is an area of concern and debate which could be pursued in future research.

The use of this proposed system for the continuous assessment of teaching practice would need considerable co-operation from and liaison with the host College staff, as it is they who would be undertaking a large number of the diagnostic and formative assessments. This issue will be explored further in the discussion relating to potential use of such a method.

Modifying the Student Profile

Sections of the current student profile should be re-designed to incorporate the self-assessment gradings and self-assessment comments made by student teachers during Phase Two and Four. It would also be appropriate to reconsider the current division made between "thinking", "teaching" and "involvement".

The student profile would also contain the summative grades awarded during teaching experience. These grades, in conjunction with the supervised teaching experience file, would assist the personal tutor in deciding which overall grade to award each student. A "case conference", involving the tutor

from the Polytechnic and the staff in the host Institution who had assessed the student's teaching performance, could be held prior to this final grade being decided. A collaborative exercise such as this could be used to discuss assessments and self-assessments undertaken diagnostically, formatively and summatively. This would sharpen the assessors' perception of the teaching behaviour required from the students. The process would also assist the assessors to reach shared interpretation of behaviour based on a common understanding of its meaning.

The fourth aim was to make proposals regarding the potential use of such a method of self-assessment during the Certificate of Education Course.

In order to implement the strategies described in Aim Three, it would be necessary to undertake the following procedures:

A sub-group of the Board of Studies for the Certificate in Education Course should consider a re-evaluation of the current procedures relating to the assessment of supervised teaching experience.

The sub-group should firstly consider the possibility of exploring further the assessment strategies which the researcher has outlined. This exploration should also include representatives from the host Institutions (and possibly an external examiner). It would also be important to involve these representatives when the essential criteria for the learning outcomes were being devised.

The sub-group should also consider in the first instance whether the students should provide a self-assessed grade for the summative lessons. Consideration must also be given as to whether a summative self-assessment grade should be taken into account in the overall grade for supervised teaching experience.

Changes in the process of assessing practice could also affect the process of assessing theory. These changes may, in turn, necessitate a fundamental re-appraisal of the whole course curriculum.

If such changes were to be piloted in the Polytechnic, in relation to the assessment of practice, a programme of staff development would need to be prepared.

This programme of preparation would need to be mandatory for all newly-appointed and existing teaching staff. The topics to be addressed in both the Polytechnic and the host Institutions would include:

- strategies for exploring the principles and practice of self-assessment
- strategies for the introduction of learning contracts
- an in-depth analysis of the work of Katherine Bondy
- an exploration of this work adapted for the practice of teaching
- an exploration of the new documentation for continuous assessment
- the use of continuous assessment documentation using video-taped lessons to improve reliability
- compiling student profiles
- discussion relating to the inclusion of self-assessment grades in the overall grading scheme

- clarification of the role of supervisor, mentor and assessor in both the Polytechnic and the host Institution.

Once these programmes of preparation have begun, it will be necessary to plan sessions of co-supervision and co-assessment. In this way, experienced supervisors/assessors can work with those members of the teaching staff who are less experienced and who would benefit from working with an effective role model.

Recommendations

1. All areas of the practicum need to be clearly and unambiguously articulated so that the discrepancies between the activities in the Polytechnic and the host Colleges are minimised.
2. There should be a re-evaluation of the teaching characteristics currently reflected by the assessment criteria sheet to ensure that they adequately reflect the elements required.
3. This re-evaluation should incorporate the requirements for the supervision and assessment of students. Implicit here is the need for training programmes for all concerned, to ensure that the interpretation of the requirements is reliable.
4. Policy on the supervision and assessment of students by non-subject specialists should be clarified and justified in accordance with the response of the Polytechnic to current issues in this area.

5. Strategies to develop modes of self-assessment should be explored.
6. Training programmes are also required to increase the inter-rater reliability of student assessments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSON, L.W. POWELL, J.P. & SMOTH, E.M. (1987)
Competent Teaching and its Appraisal
Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education
An international journal
Vol.12, No.1, pp.66-72

ALEXANDER, R.J. CRAFT, M. LYNCH, J. Eds (1984)
Change in Teacher Education, Context and Provision since Robbins
London and New York
Holt Rinehard and Winston

ASHCROFT, K. GRIFFITHS, M. (1989)
Reflective Teachers and Reflective Tutors: school experience in an initial
teacher education course
J.E.T. Vol.15, No.1, pp.35-51

AYER, S.J. (1986)
Teaching Practice Experience: linking theory to practice
Journal of Advanced Nursing, Vol.11, pp.513-519

BALCH, P. & BALCH, P. (1987)
The co-operating teacher
University Press of America

BECHER, R. & ADE, W. (1982)
The relationship of field placement characteristics and
students potential field performance abilities to clinical
experience performance ratings
Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2)

BERNBAUM, G. PATRICK, H. REID, K. (1982)
The structure and process of initial teacher education within
universities in England and Wales

BLUMBERG, A. (1982)
Supervision and Teachers: a Private Cold War
Berkeley, California, McCutchan

BONDY, K. (1984)
Clinical evaluation of student performance: the effects of criteria on
accuracy and reliability
Research in Nursing and Health, Vol.7, pp.25-33

BOOTHROYD, W. (1977)
Teaching practice supervision
British Journal of Teacher Education, pp.243-250

- BOUD, D. (1989)
 The Role of Self-Assessment in Student Grading
 Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education
 An international journal
 Vol.14, No.1, pp.20-30
- CALDERHEAD, J. (1984)
 Teacher's classroom and decision-making
 Holt Rinehart and Winston
- CALDERHEAD, J. (1987)
 The quality of reflection in student teachers' professional learning
 European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.3, pp.269-278
- CALDERHEAD, J. (1988)
 Learning from Introductory School Experience
 Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.14, No.1, pp.75-83
- CLARK, C. (1987)
 The Incoherence of "Teaching Quality"
 Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol.11, No.2, pp.106-114
- COLLIER, K.G. (1959)
 The Criteria of Assessment
 Education for Teaching, Vol.48, pp.36-40
- COPE, E. (1970)
 Staff and School Practice
 Education for Teaching, Vo.81, No.2
- COPE, E. (1971)
 School experience in teacher education
 University of Bristol
- CORPORAAL, A.H. (1987)
 Six shared dimensions concerned "Good Teaching"
 European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.1, pp.57-65
- D.E.S. (1988)
 Teaching in Schools
 HMSO
- D.E.S. Circular 3/84 (1984)
 Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses
 HMSO
- D.E.S. (1983)
 Teaching Quality (White Paper)
 London HMSO

D.E.S. (1985)
Better Schools (White Paper)
London HMSO

DEWEY, J. (1904)
The relation of theory to practice in education
Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific
Study of Education, Part 1, pp.9-30

DEWEY, J. (1933)
How we think
New York, Heath

DOHERTY, J. BURTON, V. (1986)
Attitude to the Self and Attitude to the Teacher: an exploratory study
Durham and Newcastle Research Review, Vol.10, No.56, pp.279-284

DOYLE, W. (1977)
Learning the classroom environment: an ecological analysis
Journal of Teacher Education, 28

DUFFY, P. (1987)
Student Perceptions of Tutor Expectations for School-based Teaching Practice
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.3, pp.261-268

EISNER, E. (1975)
Educational Connoisseurship and Educational Criticism. Their Form and
Function in Educational Evaluation
Vol.10
(Occasional Paper), Stanford

ELLIOT, J. (1987)
Educational theory, practical philosophy and action research
British Journal of Education Studies, Vol.25, pp.149-170

EVANS, H. (1987)
Learning from experience: the case of field experiences in teacher education
Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol.11, No.2, pp.58-70

EVANS, K.M. (1951)
A critical survey of methods of assessing teaching ability
British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.21

FLANDERS, N. (1970)
Analysing teaching behaviour
Addison-Wesley

FLOWERS, J. et al (1948)
School and Community Laboratory Experiences
in Teacher Education
Oncota, NY, American Association of Teachers Colleges

FRITH, D.S. MACINTOSH, H.G. (1984)
A teacher's guide to assessment
Stanley Thornes

GAGE, N.L. (1972)
Teacher effectiveness and teacher education
Pacific Books, California

GASKELL, P. (1975)
Patterns and changes in the perspectives of student teachers:
a participant observation study
Unpublished doctoral dissertation
Harvard University

GIBSON, R. (1977)
The Value of Teaching Practice
Education in the North, Vol.16, pp.23-30

GITLIN, A. ROSE, E. WALTHER, C. MAGLEBY, L. 1985)
Why supervisors behave as they do, relationships of beliefs, socialization and
practice
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.11, No.1, pp.50-62

GOLDHAMMER, R. ANDERSON, R.H. and KRAJEWSKI, R.J. (1980)
Clinical Supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers
New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston

GOODALL, C.J. (1985)
A student tutor's evaluation of his teaching placement
Nurse Education Today, Vo.5, No.3, pp.95-100

GOODMAN, J. (1984)
Reflection and Teacher Education
Interchange 15(3), pp.9-25

GRIFFIN, G. et al (1983)
Clinical preservice teacher education: final report of
a descriptive study
Austin, University of Texas Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education

HANDEL, G. LAUVAS, P. (1988)
Promoting Reflective Teaching
S.R.H.E.

- HART, N. (1987)
 Student teachers' anxieties: four measured factors and the relationship to
 pupil disruption in class
 Educational Research, Vol.29, No.1, pp.12-18
- HERSH, R., HULL, R. and LEIGHTON, M. (1982)
 Student teaching in
 H. MITZEL (ed.) The Encyclopaedia of Educational Research
 5th edition, New York, Free Press
- HELLAWELL, D. (1987)
 Control and responsibility in teacher education and training in England and
 Wales
 European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.1, pp.7-15
- HINKLEMAN, K.W. and LONG, N.D. (1973)
 Method for decreasing subjective evaluation in pre-clinical dentistry
 Journal of Dental Education, Vol.37, pp.13-18
- HIRST, D. and PETERS, R.S. (1970)
 in The Logic of Education
 Teaching
 Harper Row
- H.M.I. (1979)
 Developments in the B.Ed. Degree Courses
 HMSO
- H.M.I. (1983)
 Teaching in Schools: The Content of Initial Training
 HMSO
- H.M.I. (1987)
 Quality in Schools
 HMSO
- HOGAN, P. (1983)
 The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers
 Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.9, No.1, pp.30-45
- HOGBEN, D. (1980)
 Research on Teaching and Teacher Training
 Australian Journal of Education 24, 1, pp.56-66
- HORE, T. (1971)
 Assessment of teaching practice: an attractive hypothesis
 British Journal of Educational Psychology, No.41, part 3

HOYLE, E. MEGARRY, J. (1989)
Professional development of teachers
World Year of Education
London, Kogan Page

HUSSELL, I. (1974)
Changes in the educational options of student teachers associated with college
experience and school practice
Research in Education, No.11, pp.43-50

JENKINS, R.G. (1984)
An investigation into some of the problems of practical teaching within the
initial teacher education course

KANE, I. (1987)
The four horsemen of change
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.1, pp.33-40

KARMOS, A.H. and JACKS, C.M. (1977)
The role of significant others during the student's teaching practice
Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.28, No.5, pp.51-55

KEINY, S. and DREYFUS, A. (1988)
Teachers' Self-Reflection as a Prerequisite to their Professional Development
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.15, No.1, pp.53-63

KERRY, T. (1982)
The New Teacher
D.E.S. Teacher Education Project

KNOWLES, M. (1984)
The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species
Houston, Gulf Publishing

KOUNIN, J.S. (1970)
Discipline and Class Management in Classrooms
Holt Rinehart and Winston

KREMER-HAYON, L. (1986)
Supervisor's Inner World: Professional Perspectives
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.9, No.2, pp.181-187

KREMER-HAYON, L. MOORE, M. NOVAT, R. (1986)
Dogmatism in teacher education practices: aptitude-treatment interaction
effects
Research in Education, No.36, pp.19-25

- KREMER, L. BEN-PERETZ, M. (1984)
 Teachers' self-evaluation concerns and practices
 Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.10, No.1, pp.53-60
- KREMER-HAYON, L. (1987)
 Perceived teaching difficulties by beginning teachers: personal and
 environmental antecedents
 Research in Education, No.37, pp.25-33
- KYRIACOU, C. (1986)
 Effective teaching in schools
 Blackwall
- LACEY, C. (1977)
 The socialization of teachers
 London: Methuen
- LANIER, J. (1984)
 The Future of Teacher Education: two papers
 Occasional Paper No.79
 East Lansing, Institute for Research on Teaching
- LASLEY, T. APPLGATE, J. ELLISON, C. (1986)
 The expectations and problems of university supervisors of early field
 experience
 Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.12, No.2, pp.127-140
- LAWLER, S. (1990)
 Teachers Mistaught
 Centre for Policy Studies
- LAZAROWITZ, R. DREYFUS, A. JUNGWIRTH, E. (1986)
 Consonances and dissonances between student teachers and co-operative
 teachers in secondary school biology
 Research in Education, No.36, pp.27-38
- LEWIS, A. (1987)
 Supervised Teaching Practice: A Survey at Thames Polytechnic
 Student Union, unpublished
- LIEBERMAN, A. (1982)
 Practice Makes Policy in
 A. Lieberman and W. McLaughlin (eds)
 Policy-making in Education
 Chicago Press, pp.249-269
- LOACKER, G. and JENSON, P. (1988)
 The power of performance in developing problem-solving
 and self-assessment abilities
 Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. xiii, no.2, pp.128-150

LORTIE, D. (1975)
School teacher: A Sociological Study
Chicago: University of Chicago Press

MAZHINDU, G. (1990)
Contract Learning Reconsidered
Journal of Advanced Nursing, Vol.15, No.1, pp.101-109

McCULLOCH, M. (1979)
School experience in initial B.Ed/B.Ed.Hons. degrees validated by the Council
for National Academic Awards
C.N.A.A.

McCURDY, B. (1962)
A study of the availability of certain basic experiences provided off-campus
student teachers in terms of indicated needs
Unpublished doctoral thesis
School of Education, University of Indiana

McINTOSH, R.G. (1968)
An approach to the Analysis of Clinical Settings for Teacher Education
American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago

McNAMARA, D.R. (1984)
in
ALEXANDER, R. et al (eds)
Change in Teacher Education, Contexts and Provision since Robbins
London and New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston

McQUALTER, J.W. (1985)
Becoming a teacher: preservice teacher education using personal construct
theory
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.11, No.2, pp.177-186

MERCER, D. and ABBOTT, I. (1989)
Democratic Learning in Teacher Education
Partnership, Supervision in Teaching Practice
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.15, No.1, pp.141-148

MIDDLETON, D. (1981)
Observing Classroom Processes. E 364, Block 3
The Open University

MILLER, C. and PARTLETT, M. (1973)
Up to the mark, a research report on assessment
Centre for Research in the Educational Sciences
University of Edinburgh

NORRISH, R. (1975)

An examination of schedules of criteria related to teacher competence
British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.1, pp.87-95

PARLETT, M. and HAMILTON, D. (1976)

Evaluations as illuminations in

G. Glass (ed)

Evaluation studies: review annual, vol.1, pp.140-157

PATRICK, H. BERNBAUM, G. and REID, K. (1981)

The Way We Were: the Staff of the University Departments of Education

U.C.E.T. Conference Paper

London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers

PERCY, K.A. (1972)

Lecturers' Objectives and the College Curriculum in

Education for Teaching, Spring Vol.

PERL, M.F. (1978)

Pupil and teacher agreement on their assessment of student teachers

Journal of Educational Research, Vol.78

POLLARD, A. and TARN, S. (1987)

Reflective Teaching in Primary School

Methuen

POVEY, R.M. (1975)

A comparison of three methods of evaluating teachers' performance in a
college of education

British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.45, pp.279-285

RICORD, O. (1986)

A Developmental Study of the "Teaching Self" in Student Teaching

Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.12, No.1, pp.65-76

ROBERTSON, J.D.C. (1957)

An analysis of the views of supervisors on the attributes of successful
graduate teachers

British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.27, No.2, pp.115-126

ROSENSHINE, B. (1971)

Teaching Behaviourist Student Achievement

N.F.E.R.

SAUNDERS, E. and SAUNDERS, C. (1980)

The Assessment of Teaching Practice: A Study

Ulster Polytechnic

SCHON, D.A. (1983)
The Reflective Practitioner
London: Temple Smith

SCRIVEN, M. (1967)
in
Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation
The Methodology of Evaluation
American Educational Research Association
Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No.1
Rand-McNally, Chicago

SEVILLE, R. (1975)
Systems analysis and its application to teacher education
British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.1, pp.163-190

SHAW, K. and DOWNES, L.W. (1971)
Unitary and Discrepant Goals in a College of Education
British Journal of Education Studies, xix, 2, June

SIMON, A. and BOYER, E. (1968)
Mirrors of Behaviour
Vol.1-6 and Vol.7-14
Philadelphia, Research for Better Schools

SMYTH, J. (1984)
Teachers as collaborative learners in clinical supervision: a state of the art
review
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.10, no.1, pp.24-38

SORENSEN, G. (1967)
What is learned in teaching practice?
Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.18, No.2

SPRINTHALL, N. and SPRINTHALL, L. (1980)
Adult development and leadership training in
D. Corrigan and K. Howey (eds)
Special Education in Transition
Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children

STANTON, H.E. (1974)
Teaching practice and its supervision by university personnel
Education News, Vol.14, No.11

START, K.B. (1974)
Establishing children's learning as the criteria for teacher effectiveness
Educational Research, Vol.16, pp.206-209

STENEHOUSE, L. (1975)
An introduction to Curriculum Research and Development
London: Heinemann

STEVENS, J. T. and SMITH, C.L. (1978)
Supervising Teacher Accountability
Evaluation by the student teacher
Peabody Journal of Education, 55

STONES, E. and MORRIS, S. (1972)
The assessment of practical teaching
Educational Research, Vol.14, pp.110-119

STONES, E. and MORRIS, S. (1972)
Teaching Practice: Problems and Perspectives
London: Methuen

STONES, E. (1974)
How long is a piece of string? (Problems in evaluating teaching practice)
SRHE

STONES, E. (1983)
Further Education and Pedagogy
Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol.7, No.2, pp.3-11

STONES, E. (1984)
Supervision in Teacher Education: A Counselling and Pedagogical Approach
London: Methuen

STONES, E. (1984)
An Inset Course in the Training of Student Teacher Supervisors
Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol.8, No.3, pp.3-14

STONES, E. (1987)
Teaching Practice Supervision: A Bridge Between Theory and Practice
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.1, pp.67-69

ST. J. NEILL, S.R. FITZGERALD, J.M. JONES, B. (1983)
The relationship between reported awareness of non-verbal communication and
rated effectiveness in probationer and student teachers
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.9, No.1, pp.16-29

STUBBS, M. and DELAMONT, S. (1976)
Explorations on Classroom Observation
Wiley

SUMNER, R. (1986)
Second Evaluation Report on Records of Achievement Project
Essex County Council Education Department
National Foundation for Educational Research, Slough

SWEZEY, R.W. (1981)
Individual Performance Assessment
Reston Publishing, Virginia

TAYLOR, W. (1969)
Society and the Education of Teachers
London: Faber

THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (1978)
Module 1-6 Provide lab experiences for prospective teachers
1-7 Plan the student teacher's experience
1-8 Supervise student teachers

TIBBLE, J.W. (1971)
The Future of Teacher Education
Routledge Kegan Paul

TURNEY, C. et al (1982)
Supervisor Development Programmes
Sydney University Press

TURNEY, C. et al (1985)
A New Basis for Teacher Education: the practicum curriculum
Sydney Academic Press

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS (1974)
Teacher Education. The teacher's point of view
N.F.E.R.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION (1971)
The education and training of teachers

UNIVERSITY OF YORK (1977)
Practicon Handbook
York, Ontario

VAN ORT, S. et al (1986)
Developing and implementing a model for evaluating teaching effectiveness
Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship, Vol.18, No.3, pp.114-117

VONK, J.H.C. (1983)
Problems of the Beginning Teacher
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.6, No.2, pp.133-150

- WILSON, J. (1980)
Philosophy and Education: Retrospect and Prospect
Oxford Review of Education, Vol.6, pp.41-52
- WISE, A. (1977)
Why educational policies often fail: the hyper-rationalization hypothesis
Journal of Curriculum Studies, 9, 1, pp.43-57
- WOODS, D. et al (date?)
Self assessment in the context of the McMaster problem-solving programme
Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. xiii, No.2, pp.107-127
- WUBBELS, T., CRÉTON, H.A. and HOOYMAYERS, H.P. (1987)
A school-based teacher induction programme
European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.10, No.1, pp.81-94
- YATES, J. (1982)
Student Teaching: Results of a Recent Survey
Educational Research, Vol.24, No.3, pp.212-215
- ZEICHNER, K. (1986)
Content and Contexts: Neglected Elements in Studies of Student Teaching
as an Occasion for Learning to Teach
Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol.12, No.1, pp.5-24
- ZEICHNER, K. and TABACHNICK, B.R. (1985)
Social Strategies and Institutional Control in the
Socialization of Beginning Teachers
Journal of Education for Teaching, 5, pp.1-25
- ZEICHNER, K. and TABACHNICK, B.R. (1982)
The Belief Systems of University Supervisors in an Elementary
Student Teaching Programme
Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(2), pp.34-54

APPENDICES

1. Supervised teaching experience handbook
- 2.1 Current assessment criteria sheet
- 2.2 Current assessment report form
3. Student profile
4. Host college report form
5. Amended assessment criteria sheets – assessor
6. Amended assessment criteria sheets – student
7. Data from the Video Studies
 - Table A
 - 1 Raw Data Student A
 - 2 Tutors involved in the assessments
 - 3 Correlation matrix
 - Table B
 - 1 Raw Data Student B
 - 2 Tutors involved in the assessments
 - 3 Correlation matrix
 - Table C
 - 1 Raw Data Student C
 - 2 Tutors involved in the assessments
 - 3 Correlation matrix
8. Data from the Field Studies
 - Table A Lesson titles, The Professional Background of the Assesors, No.36
 - Table B Complete Data Variables 1-37, Lessons 1-36
 - Table C Data demonstrating complete agreement between Assessor and Student, Variables 1-36
 - Table D Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement between Assessor and Student occurred, Variables 1-36
 - Table E Data demonstrating complete agreement in grading between Assessor and Student, Lessons 1-36
 - Table F Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement in grading with Assessor and Student occurred
 - Table G Data demonstrating the relationship between agreed lesson gradings and their variables
 - G1 Lesson 3 Hearing
 - G2 Lesson 11 Counselling
 - G3 Lesson 17 Blood cells
 - G4 Lesson 20 Children in hospital
 - G5 Lesson 21 Assertiveness
 - G6 Lesson 22 Diabetes
 - G7 Lesson 29 Parkinson's disease
 - G8 Lesson 33 Mental health
 - Table H Data demonstrating Assessor's written comments
 - Table I Data demonstrating Student Nurse Teacher's written comments
 - Table J Definition of grades awarded
- 9.1 Guidelines for the Clinical Assessment Criteria Document
- 9.2 Clinical Assessment Document
10. A Suggested Teaching Assessment Document

THAMES POLYTECHNIC

FACULTY OF POST COMPULSORY TEACHER EDUCATION

FULL-TIME CERTIFICATE IN EDUCATION

SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE HANDBOOK 1987/88

This handbook is intended to provide essential information and to **interpret the Tasks and Learning Goals** to cover both Phase II (23 November - 11 December 1987) and Phase IV (1 February - 25 March 1988) of the course. It should be studied in conjunction with the course handbook where the phase aims, method for their achievement and the learning goals for yourself are listed (pages 12, 20 and 21).

INDEX

Para. No.	Page
1. The Purpose of Course Phases II and IV	1
2. Sector Completion Criteria	1
3. Documentation	1
4. Criteria for Assessment	1
5. Personal Relationships within your STE College	2
6. Mentors	2
7. Phase II - Tasks and Learning Goals:	3
7.1 Observation	3
7.2 Teaching	3
7.3 Investigation	3
7.4 Tutors' visits	4
7.5 Timetables	4
8. Observation Schedule for Practical Teaching	5
9. Assessment Scheme for Practical Teaching	6
10. Phase IV - Tasks and Learning Goals:	7
10.1 Observation	7
10.2 Teaching	7
10.3 Investigation	7
10.4 Your Role and Status within the College	8
11. Timetables	9
12. Tutors' Visits	10
13. Assessment	10
14. Illness	10
15. Contact during STE .	10

NOTES FOR MENTORS - page for detachment

THE PURPOSE OF THE NOTES WHICH EMANATE FROM THIS STUDYGUIDE IS TO ASSIST THE STUDY OF EDUCATION BY A COURSE MEMBER OF THE FACULTY OF POST COMPULSORY TEACHER EDUCATION. THEY WILL NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.

1. THE PURPOSE OF COURSE PHASES II and IV

The purpose of these phases is to provide opportunities for you to put into practice the skills and procedures that have been proposed in the Teaching Method, Special Method and Teaching Aids sectors of Phase I and III, linking them closely with Learning Theory, and to enable you to make first-hand investigations relating to all other sectors of the course.

2. SECTOR COMPLETION CRITERIA

To achieve these purposes and to complete the sectors for Phases II and IV you are required to carry out a number of structured tasks linked to Learning Goals, and to produce written evidence that you have made a reasonable and satisfactory attempt at achieving the tasks set for each phase thus fulfilling the Learning Goals.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you complete these tasks; **any reports you produce should be concise and incisive.**

3. DOCUMENTATION (STE File)

You are required to keep a loose-leaf type file, indexed for ease of reference, which **must be available at all times** for progress discussions between visiting tutors, yourself, and your Mentor.

Your completed STE file is to be handed to personal tutors at the end of each phase. The contents of your file, together with your assessment for practical teaching are considered in deciding your final STE assessment.

Your 'STE File' should contain:

- a) A diary giving a very **brief** account of your day-to-day activities during STE.
- b) Observation notes and evaluations as detailed under Learning Goals 2 and 3 for Phase II and Learning Goal 1 for Phase IV.
- c) Plans of intent for all lessons or part lessons taught as detailed under Learning Goals 4 and 5 for Phase II and 5 for Phase IV.
- d) The reports of all other tasks described in the following pages.
- e) Reports given to you by tutors who have visited you.

NB: If you are in learning situations to which pre-planning and formalised record-keeping do not lend themselves, e.g. open-access, some practical classes, remedial classes, guidance should be sought from your tutor.

4. ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Please refer to the Course handbook, page 35, for a statement concerning the assessment of STE.

When tutors come to visit you while you are teaching, particularly during Phase IV, they are required to decide on a grade for the teaching they have seen on that occasion. The following criteria will be used to influence their decisions, particularly regarding whether the teaching has been of pass (A, B or C grades) or fail (grade R) standard. If an R grade is awarded, tutors are instructed to inform you of that fact.

7. PHASE II - OBSERVING, TEACHING AND INVESTIGATING

Below is a description of the major 'tasks' to be performed during Phase II, the completion of which should enable you to achieve a number of the Learning Goals for Phase II as set out on page 12 of the course handbook.

7.1 THE OBSERVATION TASK (Learning Goals 2,3 and 8)

This task is achieved by 'sitting-in' on lessons given by other teachers: you should seek, in co-operation with the Head of Department, the agreement of several teachers to go into their classes and observe their teaching for a total of not more than twelve lessons. Greatest benefit will be obtained by choosing as wide a **variety** of teaching/learning situations as possible (e.g. lessons, workshop sessions, lectures, laboratory work, practical classes, discussion groups, project work).

You are asked, in Goal 2, to apply 'appropriate schemes of analysis' to the teaching you observe. Please make quite sure that the teachers observed are fully aware of what you are doing and that they agree to it. It is emphasised that you **must not** offend the teachers involved - you should simply attempt to examine what you perceive during the observation. Page 5, headed '**Observation Schedule for Practical Teaching**' is appended as a general guide for the observation of lessons.

From your observations it should be possible to assemble sufficient information to achieve Learning Goal 3. Goal 8 may require additional contact with students in or out of the classroom.

7.2 THE TEACHING TASK - THIS TASK IS THE CENTRAL ACTIVITY OF STE.

It should fulfil Learning Goals 4,5,6 and 7 for Phase II. You are asked to teach a total of at least six lessons during Phase II; this should amount to a minimum of about twelve hours of direct teaching contact, depending on the length of lesson and the type of teaching involved in your subject specialism.

Learning Goal 4 suggests that you might start by teaching only part of a lesson in co-operation with the regular class teacher and that you should discuss your performance with him or her at the end of the lesson.

Any teaching you undertake must be planned and you must produce written evidence of that planning which should be in accordance with work done in the Teaching Method and Special Method sectors.

To improve and develop your practical teaching ability you are asked to analyse your own teaching performance. Page 6 headed '**Assessment Scheme for Practical Teaching**' is included in this handbook to give you some guidelines for this. The regular class teachers may sit in the classroom while you are teaching and their opinion may well be of great help to you in answering some of the more subjective questions in the scheme.

7.3 THE INVESTIGATION TASK

Learning Goals 1, 8 and 9 require you to make investigations into the way that further education is run and into some aspects of the

8. OBSERVATION SCHEDULE FOR PRACTICAL TEACHING
(for use when observing other teachers' lessons)

The following questions may help your observations:-

- a) Which class did you observe? Record details of the course, year, subject, topic, number and age range of students, duration of class etc.
- b) Broadly speaking, what type of learning/teaching situation was it? (e.g. lecture, lesson, workshop, seminar, laboratory practical etc.)
- c) Record as many identifiable activities as you observe, paying particular attention to the difference between teacher-centred and student-centred activities. How was the time divided between these various learning activities that took place?
- d) Were any learning aids etc. used during the class? If so were they effective?
- e) How did the teacher deal with individual differences in the class?
- f) Did the students seem to have any difficulty regarding the pace or level of the lesson?
- g) What factors helped or hindered the students' involvement in the learning process? (beside use of language, questioning etc.).
- h) How did the students become aware of the intended learning outcomes?
- i) Was any test, quiz, problem solving activity or the results of practical work used to check that learning had taken place?
- j) Did any circumstances arise during the class which prevented it proceeding as intended? (e.g. interruptions from outside, factors relating to the physical environment, unforeseen gaps in student knowledge, student behaviour, etc.)
- k) What do you think the teaching intentions for this lesson were?
- l) Were there any other features of this lesson worthy of comment?

10. PHASE IV

During this Phase the three tasks of Phase II: **OBSERVING, TEACHING AND INVESTIGATING** are continued and developed. Please refer to pages 20 and 21 of the course handbook for details of the Learning Goals for this Phase.

10.1 THE OBSERVATION TASK - LEARNING GOALS 1 and 2 - EVALUATING LESSONS

During the whole of this Phase you should observe a total of about twelve lessons or twenty-one hours of teaching, whichever is the less.

It should now be possible for you to look more deeply into such things as the teachers' strategies, communication patterns, the language development, personality and motivation of the students, etc.

N.B. The purpose of following a group of students for a day (Learning Goal 2) is different here from Phase II.

10.2 THE TEACHING TASK - THE CENTRAL ACTIVITY OF PHASE IV should contribute to the achievement of Learning Goals 3,5,6,7,8,9 and 10, which are extensions of similar Goals in Phase II.

You should organise, in co-operation with your Head of Department, a timetable which involves you in teaching a total of about forty to forty-five lessons or eighty hours of teaching. This should amount to an average of about ten hours teaching per week throughout the Phase. You might consider starting with four in the **first** week, building up to twelve hours per week for the **last four** weeks (the actual time may have to be adjusted according to the hours available in your department).

TEACHING STRATEGIES AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES (Learning Goals 6 & 7): Since the teaching strategies you use should be **appropriate** to the situations in which you use them, it will be necessary for you to negotiate to teach in as wide a variety of situations as possible within the constraints of your department and your own subject expertise.

10.3 THE INVESTIGATION TASK - LEARNING GOALS 3,4 and 12

Goals 3 and 4 are intended to enhance your understanding in relation to the courses you teach on STE, and to compare and contrast them with other courses which take place in the college. You should examine the general nature of the curriculum; the course aims; the level and currency of the qualifications gained; the learning strategies used to achieve the aims; the patterns of attendance and the assessment methods used. Some of the information will come from your work in the Observation Task.

Learning Goal 4 asks you to examine the structure of a course which is 'different in style' from courses with which you are already familiar. This may mean going outside the department to which you are attached. You should observe at least one lesson from the course which you select.

TO COLLEGE MENTORS,

In asking colleges to nominate mentors, the Faculty of Post Compulsory Teacher Education is seeking to enhance the greatly appreciated contribution made by the many educational establishments that have, for many years, accepted the students of Garnett College during their Supervised Teaching Experience. We are very aware of the work-load of teachers during term-time and we do not wish to appear to be making excessive demands upon your time. Therefore what is set out below should be regarded as a list of items that might be undertaken if time permits.

As the Mentor we would ask you to act as a contact and facilitator for our students during their Supervised Teaching Experience; a person to whom they may refer for information or who might direct them to other staff and sources of information to enable them to carry out the various tasks required according to our course specification. We would appreciate it if you are able to act as an adviser/tutor to help our students develop their skills as teachers. We recognise that this is primarily the role of the staff of the Faculty, but we cannot always be on the spot during STE to give help when it is most needed. You might very well decide that the student should call for help from us if the situation really demands it.

If you can assist in the assessment function, this too would be helpful. For many years it has been our practice to ask colleges to make an assessment of our students' teaching abilities to supplement our own assessment. From close contact with our students and by observing some of their teaching, a mentor is in a good position to provide such an assessment for us. Each student has been provided with a page headed 'Assessment Scheme for Practical Teaching' which might help you if you are able to undertake this work. If you are uncertain about assessment, a faculty tutor will be only too willing to discuss it with you.

The Supervised Teaching Experience Handbook, which is given to each student and which is also circulated to all colleges which host our students for their STE, gives details of the tasks which the students are expected to perform, and describes the administrative procedures which we ask them to follow. One or two points from this handbook should be brought to your attention.

1. The students are asked to teach a total of at least six lessons (or about twelve hours) during the Autumn Term (Phase II) and eventually an average of **ten hours per week** during the Spring Term (Phase IV) allowing for a progression from four hours per week to twelve hours per week in the last four weeks.
2. They are asked to observe about sixteen hours of teaching during Phase II and about twelve lessons or twenty-one hours of teaching during Phase IV depending on the length of lessons.
3. To enable us to achieve the scheduled number of visits to students we are asking them to **arrange their timetables for the first week of Phase IV before the end of Phase II** so that they can start teaching during the first week.

We greatly appreciate your help in acting as Mentor and we hope that your involvement in teacher training is enjoyable. Should any difficulties arise or if you have any queries or would like any further information please contact us on 01-789 6688 and ask for the STE Control Room, and we will arrange for a tutor to contact you.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA SHEET

ASSESSMENT SCHEME FOR PRACTICAL TEACHING (for use when evaluating your own teaching)

This scheme is also issued to tutors and mentors as a guide to assessing your teaching.

- (a) **Planning Abilities**
- Was there a plan of intent for the lesson?
 - Were the objectives stated clearly?
 - Were the objectives suitable?
 - Did the plan allow for such things as:
 - stimulus variation
 - sequencing
 - checks on learning
 - variation of student ability?
 - Was the combination of content and method selected appropriate to:
 - the objectives
 - the previous experience of the students?
 - Were suitable aids prepared?
 - Were demonstrations/materials properly prepared?
 - Was the physical environment well managed?
- (b) **Performance Abilities**
- Was the opening of the lesson effective?
 - Did voice, appearance and manner help learning?
 - Was skill displayed in the use of:
 - questions
 - aids
 - discussion
 - demonstrations
 - explanation
 - analogy
 - illustration?
 - Was the pace and level of presentation suitable?
 - Was the progress of the lesson related to student response?
 - Was the teacher adaptable when necessary?
 - Were learning checks used?
 - Was there an attempt at the end to bring together the planned and unplanned events, and to relate them to the short and long-term objectives?
- (c) **Social Relationships**
- What was the teacher's attitude to his/her students?
 - What was the attitude of the students?
 - Was rapport established?
 - Did the teacher induce co-operation?
 - Had the teacher the ability to:
 - motivate
 - reinforce
 - inspire?
 - Were the students involved?
- (d) **Post-Performance Analysis**
- Was the testing relevant to the objectives?
 - Were suitable procedures used?
 - Was the teacher skilled in their use?
 - Did learning occur?
 - Was the teacher able and willing to use this information to improve his/her own performance?

Appendix 2.2

Name of College :
 Lecturer's Name :
 :
 :
 Number of Students :
 Number of Learners in Class :
 Date/Topic of Lesson :

	CIA	H Bs	ScT
IN-SERVICE			
PRE-SERVICE			
ANNEXE			
CENTRE (NAME)			



operating Avery Hill and Garnett
 City of Post Compulsory Teacher Education
 TIME PRE-SERVICE CERTIFICATE IN EDUCATION COURSE

IDENT PROFILE

Name	
Faculty Group Number	
Session	Tutor
Candidate Number	

PERSONAL DETAILS

Permanent Address	Tele.		Temporary Address	Tele.	
-------------------	-------	--	-------------------	-------	--

Qualifications	Age
Teaching experience	Other Experience

SUPERVISED TEACHING EXPERIENCE (Phases II and IV)

Department	Tele.	
Mentor		

TEACHING UNDERTAKEN

Subject	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Level of class							
Aggregate hours							
Assessed by							

TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES, ACTIVITIES, TASKS

COMMENTARY

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT TITLE

COURSE STANDARDS ATTAINMENT

	Coursework	S.T.E.	Major Assignment	Overall
Assessed grade				
Grade				

Appointement

ABLE TO RE:

Miss/Ms/Dr

for the Certificate in Education (Further Education) at this Polytechnic on a pre-service course, beginning in

number and specialised in the teaching of

led aspects	COMMENTS	Phases I and III
h to se ice, Method ; uality of ents tions to /group work ships staff) ent in other ctivities qualities, nterests nent to		authorised <input data-bbox="1153 1024 1326 1087" type="checkbox"/>

led aspects	COMMENTS	Phase V
h to Phase V : undertaken signment f work rk , reliability originality onal potential		

URES	tutor	student		authorised	
------	-------	---------	--	------------	--

Sources	Suggested aspects	COMMENTS
	STE placements and teaching undertaken -Approach to STE	Phases II and IV
STE file Post-STE tutorials	Thinking statement of lesson intentions structuring of content schemes of work self evaluation (written and oral) observation notes	
Written observations of visiting tutors Peer mentors Observation	Teaching management of learning situations presentation of material personal communication abilities use of resources and AVA classroom relationships adaptability evaluation of student learning	
Peer mentors	Involvement commitment to teaching participation in Departmental or College activities investigations relationships with colleagues reliability resourcefulness initiative	
	teaching potential	

RADES (B,C,R)	thinking		teaching		involvement		OVERALL	
---------------	----------	--	----------	--	-------------	--	---------	--

GROUP ATTACHMENTS and COURSEWORK ASSIGNMENTS					PHASES I and III	
director	group	leader	attend / or x	assignment (short title)	min. req.	grade
SM1					2	
SM2						
SM3						
R					1	
M						
L					3	
T						
C						
P						
					6	

GROUP ATTACHMENTS and COURSEWORK ASSIGNMENTS					PHASE V	
M					2	
D						
e						
Re						
le					2	
C						
il						
oc						
sy						
					4	

Manresa House
Holybourne Avenue
London SW15 4JF

GARNETT COLLEGE

College:

Name of Student:

General Assessment of Teaching Ability

(Give mark on the six-point scale):

E	-	exceptional
VG	-	very good
G	-	good
S	-	satisfactory
M	-	marginal
F	-	fail

Report: It would be of great help to Garnett College if you, or the member of your staff concerned, could give a short report under the following headings:

Planning Abilities

Performance Abilities

Social Relationships

Post Performance Analysis

General Comments

Signed

It would be helpful if you could return this form before Easter.

GARNETT COLLEGE

Assessment scheme for practical teaching, Please rate the student on the appropriate scale by circling the statement which best describes the lesson.

TOPIC

LEVEL OF STUDENTS

PLANNING ABILITIES	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
1. The plan of intent was	4	3	2	1	0
2. The lesson objectives were	4	3	2	1	0
3. Indicate the appropriateness of the following strategies:					
Variation in activity	4	3	2	1	0
Sequencing	4	3	2	1	0
Variation in student ability	4	3	2	1	0
4. The combination of content and method was	4	3	2	1	0
5. The aids which the student prepared were	4	3	2	1	0
6. The demonstration which the student prepared was	4	3	2	1	0
7. The management of the physical environment was	4	3	2	1	0
PERFORMANCE ABILITIES					
8. The opening of the lesson was	4	3	2	1	0
9. The statement of lesson objectives was	4	3	2	1	0

PLANNING ABILITIES

	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
--	----------------	--------	--------------------	----------	-------------------

Indicate the appropriateness of:

10. The student's

appearance	4	3	2	1	0
tone of voice	4	3	2	1	0
personality	4	3	2	1	0
eye contact	4	3	2	1	0

Indicate the appropriateness of:

11. The student's use of

questions	4	3	2	1	0
aids	4	3	2	1	0
discussion	4	3	2	1	0
explanation	4	3	2	1	0
analogy	4	3	2	1	0
group work	4	3	2	1	0
role play	4	3	2	1	0

12. The level of the lesson was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

13. The pace of the lesson was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

14. The student's ability to adapt to individuals' need was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

15. The checks used on learning were

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

16. The lesson summary was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

17. The learning environment created was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

18. The student's attitude to the class was

	4	3	2	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

PLANNING ABILITIES	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
19. The attitude of the class to the student was	4	3	2	1	0
20. The degree of rapport established was	4	3	2	1	0
21. The student's use of language in the class was	4	3	2	1	0
22. The classroom management was	4	3	2	1	0
POST PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS					
23. The testing methods which were used in relation to the objectives were	4	3	2	1	0
24. The use of the testing methods was	4	3	2	1	0
25. The learning which took place was	4	3	2	1	0

OVERALL GRADE AWARDED

A

Extremely suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, exceptionally sensitive management of the whole class. Understands and is responsive to the students' needs. Evaluates learning effectively.

B

Suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, sensitive oversight of the whole class. Demonstrates good relationships with the students. Attempts to evaluate learning.

C

Limited attempt to choose appropriate content and method. Suitable evidence of structure but this became muddled at times. Inconsistency in class management but some attempt made to recognise students' needs. Little evidence of evaluating learning.

R

Poor understanding of content and method. Material inappropriate and inaccurate with little evidence of planning; fails to manage the class as a whole or to recognise students' needs. Fails to evaluate learning.

Please circle your specialist area

NURSE ENGINEER MATHEMATICIAN PHYSICIST CHEMIST BIOLOGIST

Other, please specify:

ALL INFORMATION GIVEN WILL BE TREATED IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE

Thank you for your co-operation

LESLEY MUNRO

**Please use this space to add any other comments which you feel
are relevant to the assessment or this lesson**

GARNETT COLLEGE

Assessment scheme for practical teaching, Please rate yourself on the appropriate scale by circling the statement which best describes the lesson.

TOPIC

LEVEL OF STUDENTS

PLANNING ABILITIES	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
1. The plan of intent was	4	3	2	1	0
2. The lesson objectives were	4	3	2	1	0
3. Indicate the appropriateness of the following strategies:					
Variation in activity	4	3	2	1	0
Sequencing	4	3	2	1	0
Variation in student ability	4	3	2	1	0
4. The combination of content and method was	4	3	2	1	0
5. The aids which I had prepared were	4	3	2	1	0
6. The demonstration which I had prepared was	4	3	2	1	0
7. The management of the physical environment was	4	3	2	1	0
PERFORMANCE ABILITIES					
8. The opening of the lesson was	4	3	2	1	0
9. My statement of lesson objectives was	4	3	2	1	0

PLANNING ABILITIES

	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
--	----------------	--------	--------------------	----------	-------------------

Indicate the appropriateness of:

10. appearance	4	3	2	1	0
tone of voice	4	3	2	1	0
personality	4	3	2	1	0
eye contact	4	3	2	1	0

Indicate the appropriateness of
the use of:

11. questioning	4	3	2	1	0
aids	4	3	2	1	0
discussion	4	3	2	1	0
explanation	4	3	2	1	0
analogy	4	3	2	1	0
group work	4	3	2	1	0
role play	4	3	2	1	0
12. The level of the lesson was	4	3	2	1	0
13. The pace of the lesson was	4	3	2	1	0
14. My ability to adapt to individuals' need was	4	3	2	1	0
15. The checks used on learning were	4	3	2	1	0
16. My summary at the end of the lesson was	4	3	2	1	0

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

17. The learning environment which I created was	4	3	2	1	0
18. My attitude to the students was	4	3	2	1	0

PLANNING ABILITIES	Very Approp	Approp	Not Very Approp	Inapprop	Not Applicable
19. The attitude of the students to me was	4	3	2	1	0
20. The degree of rapport established was	4	3	2	1	0
21. My use of language in the classroom was	4	3	2	1	0
22. The classroom management was	4	3	2	1	0
POST PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS					
23. The testing methods which I used in relation to the objectives were	4	3	2	1	0
24. The way in which I administered the testing was	4	3	2	1	0
25. The learning which took place was	4	3	2	1	0

OVERALL GRADE AWARDED

A

Extremely suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, exceptionally sensitive management of the whole class. Understands and is responsive to the student's needs. Evaluates learning effectively.

B

Suitable choice of content and method. Clear, structured material, sensitive oversight of the whole class. Demonstrates good relationships with the students. Attempts to evaluate learning.

C

Limited attempt to choose appropriate content and method. Suitable evidence of structure but this became muddled at times. Inconsistency in class management but some attempt made to recognise students' needs. Little evidence of evaluating learning.

R

Poor understanding of content and method. Material inappropriate and inaccurate with little evidence of planning; fails to manage the class as a whole or to recognise students' needs. Fails to evaluate learning.

ALL INFORMATION GIVEN WILL BE TREATED IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE

Thank you for your co-operation

LESLEY MUNRO

Please use this space to add any other comments which you feel
are relevant to the assessment or this lesson

Student A			Raw Data													Lesson Variables (n.36)	
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	2.0	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	Plan of intent	1
3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	Lesson Objective	2
3	3	3	3	3	4	3	1	2	3	2	3.2	3	3	4	2	Variation in activity	3
4	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	Sequencing	4
4	3	3	4	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2.7	Variation student activity	5
3	3	4	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	Comb. content & method	6
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	3	4	0	3	3	4	Aids	7
0	0	4	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3	Demonstration	8
4	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	Management	9
3	4	4	4	3	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	3	Opening lesson	10
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	3	Statement lesson obj.	11
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	Appearance	12
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	Tone of voice	13
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	3	Personality	14
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	Eye contact	15
3	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	Questioning	16
4	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	Use of aids	17
4	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	Discussion	18
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	Explanation	19
3	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	0	0	3	3	3	3	2	3	Analogy	20
3	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	Group work	21
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	Role play	22
4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	Level	23
3	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	Pace	24
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	0	Student adapting	25
3	3	3	3	4	4	3	1	1	3	3	3	4	2	2	3	Checks on learning	26
3	3	3	3	4	4	3	1	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	3	Summary	27
4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	Learning environment	28
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	Student's attitude to class	29
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	Attitude of class	30
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	Degree of rapport	31
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	Use of language	32
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	0	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	Classroom management	33
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	2.9	3	2.7	2	Testing methods	34
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	2	3	2.9	3	2.7	2	Administering tests	35
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	0	3.0	3	3	3.2	2.9	3	2.7	2	Learning which took place	36
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	Grade awarded	37

Student A	Nurse	Food Studies	Engineer	Mathematician	Nurse	Psychologist	Chemist	Engineer	Physicist	Psychologist	Engineer	Nurse	Biologist	Nurse	Nurse
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

Assessors

Tutors involved in the video studies. Student A. Position on the correlation matrix (Table A3)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	Student A															
2		Nurse														
3			Food Studies													
4				Engineer												
5					Mathematician											
6						Nurse										
7							Psychologist									
8								Chemist								
9									Engineer							
10										Physicist						
11											Psychologist					
12												Engineer				
13													Nurse			
14														Biologist		
15															Nurse	
16																Nurse

1. Student A
2. Nurse
3. Food Studies
4. Engineer
5. Mathematician
6. Nurse
7. Psychologist
8. Chemist
9. Engineer
10. Physicist
11. Psychologist
12. Engineer
13. Nurse
14. Biologist
15. Nurse
16. Nurse

Student A correlation matrix

1	0.087	0.061	0.193	-0.205	-0.030	-0.158	-0.084	0.051	0.039	-0.000	0.026	-0.091	0.036	-0.007	-0.022
34	1	0.707	0.707	0.403	0.061	0.317	0.415	0.699	0.756	0.672	0.612	0.456	0.433	0.256	0.437
35	34	1	0.869	0.602	0.159	0.318	0.208	0.657	0.489	0.733	0.405	0.601	0.383	0.169	0.358
35	34	36	1	0.470	0.030	0.318	0.145	0.578	0.489	0.651	0.405	0.444	0.264	0.218	0.243
35	34	35	35	1	0.419	0.325	0.208	0.341	0.128	0.489	0.038	0.444	0.304	0.062	0.357
35	34	35	35	35	1	0.168	0.448	0.262	0.007	0.398	0.065	0.262	0.143	0.195	0.211
35	34	36	36	35	35	1	0.402	0.279	0.319	0.513	0.290	0.272	0.484	0.384	0.382
30	30	30	30	30	30	30	1	0.351	0.449	0.701	0.467	0.262	0.483	0.316	0.493
33	33	33	33	33	33	33	29	1	0.689	0.717	0.347	0.432	0.346	0.172	0.468
33	33	33	33	33	33	33	29	33	1	0.613	0.616	0.298	0.570	0.439	0.399
35	34	35	35	35	35	35	30	33	33	1	0.496	0.598	0.575	0.447	0.519
34	34	35	35	34	34	35	30	33	33	34	1	0.416	0.304	0.529	0.418
34	33	34	34	34	34	34	29	32	32	34	33	1	0.364	0.487	0.294
35	34	37	36	35	35	36	30	33	33	35	35	34	1	0.503	0.262
35	34	36	36	35	35	36	30	33	33	35	35	34	36	1	0.224
33	32	34	34	33	33	34	28	31	31	33	33	32	34	34	1

Student B	Raw Data									Lesson Variables (n.36)		
4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	Plan of intent	1
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	Lesson Objective	2
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	Variation in activity	3
4	3	2.9	2.7	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	Sequencing	4
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	Variation student activity	5
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	Comb. content & method	6
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	Aids	7
3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	Demonstration	8
4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	Management	9
3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	Opening lesson	10
3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	Statement lesson obj.	11
4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	Appearance	12
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	Tone of voice	13
4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	Personality	14
4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	Eye contact	15
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	Questioning	16
3	3	3	3	4	3	2	0	3	3	3	Use of aids	17
4	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.6	2.7	2	3	Discussion	18
4	3	3	3	4	2	2.6	2.7	3	3	3	Explanation	19
3	0	3	0	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	Analogy	20
4	3	3	2	4	0	3	3	2	4	4	Group work	21
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	Role play	22
3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	Level	23
3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	Pace	24
3	3	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	Student adapting	25
4	2	3	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	Checks on learning	26
3	3	2.9	2	3	3	3	3	2.7	3	3	Summary	27
4	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	Learning environment	28
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	Student's attitude to class	29
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	2	3	3	Attitude of class	30
3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	Degree of rapport	31
3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.7	3	2	Use of language	32
4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	Classroom management	33
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	Testing methods	34
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	Administering tests	35
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	2	3	Learning which took place	36
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	Grade awarded	37
Student B	Nurse	Food Studies	Engineer	Mathematician	Nurse	Psychologist	Chemist	Engineer	Physicist			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			

Assessors

Tutors involved in the video studies. Student B. Position on the correlation matrix (Table B3)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Student B									
2		Nurse								
3			Food Studies							
4				Engineer						
5					Mathematician					
6						Nurse				
7							Physicist			
8								Chemist		
9									Engineer	
10										Physicist

- 1 Student B
- 2 Nurse
- 3 Food Studies
- 4 Engineer
- 5 Mathematician
- 6 Nurse
- 7 Physicist
- 8 Chemist
- 9 Engineer
- 10 Physicist

Student B Correlation matrix

1	0.089	0.296	0.177	0.196	-0.107	0.011	-0.340	-0.107	0.249
34	1	0.285	0.469	0.103	0.265	0.419	0.279	0.340	0.480
36	34	1	0.748	0.289	0.283	-0.258	-0.038	0.044	0.022
34	34	34	1	0.150	0.251	-0.189	0.175	0.072	0.150
35	34	35	34	1	-0.042	0.211	0.286	-0.017	0.378
34	33	34	33	34	1	-0.066	-0.047	0.323	0.240
35	34	35	34	35	34	1	0.421	0.160	0.330
32	30	32	30	31	30	31	1	0.033	0.153
35	34	35	34	35	34	35	31	1	0.052
35	34	36	34	35	34	35	31	35	1

Student C		Raw Data								Lesson Variables (n.36)	
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Plan of Intent	1	
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Lesson Objective	2	
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Variation in activity	3	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	Sequencing	4	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Variation student activity	5	
4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	Comb. content & method	6	
3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	Aids	7	
0	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	Demonstration	8	
3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	Management	9	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Opening lesson	10	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Statement lesson obj.	11	
3	4	3	3	3	3	4	0	4	Appearance	12	
3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	Tone of voice	13	
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	Personality	14	
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	Eye contact	15	
3	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	Questioning	16	
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.0	3	Use of aids	17	
3	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	Discussion	18	
3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	Explanation	19	
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	Analogy	20	
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Group work	21	
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	Role play	22	
3	4	3	3	3	3	4	0	3	Level	23	
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Pace	24	
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Student adapting	25	
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Checks on learning	26	
3	4	4	4	4	5	4	0	3	Summary	27	
3	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	4	Learning environment	28	
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	Student's attitude to class	29	
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Attitude of class	30	
4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	Degree of rapport	31	
3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	Use of language	32	
3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	Classroom management	33	
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Testing methods	34	
0	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	Administering tests	35	
3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	Learning which took place	36	
4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3.0	3	Grade awarded	37	
Student C	Nurse	Food Studies	Engineer	Mathematician	Nurse	Psychologist	Chemist	Engineer			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			

Assessors

Tutors involved in the video studies. Student C. Position of the correlation matrix (Table C3)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Student C	Nurse	Food Studies	Engineer	Mathematician	Nurse	Physicist	Engineer	Physicist

- 1 Student C
- 2 Nurse
- 3 Food Studies
- 4 Engineer
- 5 Mathematician
- 6 Nurse
- 7 Physicist
- 8 Engineer
- 9 Physicist

Student C correlation matrix

1	0.130	0.356	0.398	0.440	0.361	0.061	0.421	0.400
34	1	0.453	0.548	0.488	0.224	0.194	0.224	0.398
34	35	1	0.832	0.946	0.600	0.194	0.209	0.680
34	35	36	1	0.781	0.529	0.226	0.213	0.732
34	35	36	36	1	0.554	0.164	0.213	0.612
34	34	35	35	35	1	0.004	0.233	0.510
34	35	36	36	36	35	1	0.338	0.267
24	24	25	25	25	24	25	1	0.209
34	35	37	36	36	35	36	25	1

Table A

Lesson titles and the professional background of the assessor

	<u>Lesson Titles</u> (n36)	<u>Assessed By</u> (n36)
1.	Intracellular pressure	Physicist
2.	Homeostasis	Nurse
3.	Hearing	Nurse
4.	Observations	Nurse
5.	Arthritis	Nurse
6.	Labelling	Engineer
7.	Diabetic Surgery	Physicist
8.	Acute Psychiatric Care	Mathematician
9.	Catheter Update	Nurse
10.	Oxygentherapy	Nurse
11.	Counselling	Nurse
12.	Breast Surgery	Nurse
13.	Patient Hygiene	Nurse
14.	Bereavement (1)	Engineer
15.	Body Temperature	Nurse
16.	Bereavement (2)	Nurse
17.	Blood Cells	Nurse
18.	Parkinson's Disease (1)	Nurse
19.	Violence	Nurse
20.	Children in Hospital	Psychologist
21.	Assertiveness (1)	Educationalist
22.	Diabetes	Nurse
23.	A Balanced Diet	Nurse
24.	Schools of Psychology	Nurse
25.	Abortion	Mathematician
26.	Leukaemia	Nurse
27.	Peptic Ulceration	Nurse
28.	Ward Orientation	Nurse
29.	Parkinson's Disease (2)	Nurse
30.	Essay Writing	Nurse
31.	Abdominal Surgery	Nurse
32.	Epistaxis	Nurse
33.	Mental Health	Nurse
34.	Diabetes	Physicist
35.	Pain Control	Physicist
36.	Assertiveness (2)	Nurse

Table B

Complete Data Variables 1–37 (Lessons 1–36)

VARIABLE 1 The Plan of Intent

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 1		Very appro	Appro	Not very appro	Inappro	Not applic
Raw scores	Student	10(27.8%)	26(72%)	-	-	-
	Assessor	27(75%)	8(22.2%)	-	-	1(2.8%)
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	3	3.28	4	45	
	Assessor	0	3.67	4	.75	

VARIABLE 2 The Lesson Objectives

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 2		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	13(36.1%)	22(61.1%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
	Assessor	26(72.2%)	9(25%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.33	4	.53	
	Assessor	2	3.69	4	.52	

VARIABLE 3 Variation in Activity

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 3		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	4(30.6%)	23(63.9%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
	Assessor	14(38.9%)	19(52.8%)	8(8.3%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.25	4	.55	
	Assessor	2	3.31	4	.75	

VARIABLE 4 Sequencing

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 4		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	9(25%)	23(63.9%)	4(11.1%)	-	-
	Assessor	17(47.2%)	19(52.8%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.14	4	.58	
	Assessor	3	3.47	4	.50	

VARIABLE 5 Variation in student ability

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 5		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	3(8.3%)	29(80.6%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	-
	Assessor	8(22%)	22(61.1%)	3(8.3%)	3(8.3%)	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	1	2.94	4	.52	
	Assessor	0	2.89	4	1.02	

VARIABLE 6 Combination of content and method

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 6		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	6(16.7%)	27(75%)	3(8.8%)	-	-
	Assessor	18(50%)	15(41.7%)	3(8.3%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.08	4	.49	
	Assessor	2	3.42	4	.64	

VARIABLE 7 Aids used

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 7		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	9(25%)	23(63.9%)	2(5.6%)	-	2(5.6%)
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	15(41.7%)	-	-	2(5.6%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	3.03	4		.90
	Assessor	0	3.36	4		.95

VARIABLE 8 Demonstration

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 8		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	5(13.9%)	9(25%)	1(2.8%)	-	21(58.3%)
	Assessor	2(5.6%)	3(8.3%)	-	-	21(86.1%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	1.36	4		1.65
	Assessor	0	47	4		1.19

VARIABLE 9 Management of the Environment

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 9		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	11(30.6%)	16(44.4%)	9(25%)	-	-
	Assessor	14(38.9%)	22(61.1%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.06	4		.74
	Assessor	3	3.39	4		1.49

VARIABLE 10 Opening the Lesson

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 10		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	9(25%)	25(69.4%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	16(44.4%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.19	4		.52
	Assessor	2	3.50	4		.55

VARIABLE 11 Statement of Lesson Objectives

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 11		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	8(22.2%)	21(58.3%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	3(8.3%)
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	14(38.9%)	2(5.6%)	-	1(2.8%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.83	4		1.07
	Assessor	0	3.39	4		.83

VARIABLE 12 Appearance

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 12		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	10(27.8%)	22(61.1%)	2(5.6%)	-	2(5.6%)
	Assessor	33(91.7%)	3(8.3%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	3.06	4		.91
	Assessor	3	3.92	4		.28

VARIABLE 13 Tone of Voice

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 13		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	9(25%)	23(63.9%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	-
	Assessor	29(80.6%)	7(19.4%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	1	3.11	4		.66
	Assessor	3	3.81	4		.40

VARIABLE 14 Personality

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 14		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	11(30.6%)	24(66.7%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
	Assessor	28(77.8%)	8(22.2%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.28	4		.51
	Assessor	3	3.78	4		.42

VARIABLE 15 Eye Contact

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 15		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	15(41.7%)	20(55.6%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
	Assessor	26(72.8%)	10(27.8%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.39	4		.54
	Assessor	3	3.72	4		.45

VARIABLE 16 Questioning

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 16		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	12(33.3%)	20(55.6%)	4(11.1%)	-	-
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	15(41.7%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.22	4		.63
	Assessor	2	3.47	4		.60

VARIABLE 17 Aids

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 17		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	11(30.6%)	20(55.6%)	1(2.8%)	-	4(11.1%)
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	15(41.7%)	-	1(2.8%)	1(2.8%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.94	4		1.15
	Assessor	0	3.42	4		.79

VARIABLE 18 Discussion

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 18		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	16(44.4%)	12(33.3%)	4(11.1%)	-	4(11.1%)
	Assessor	9(25%)	25(68.4%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	3.00	4		1.25
	Assessor	2	3.19	4		.52

VARIABLE 19 Explanation

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 19		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	7(19.4%)	23(63.9%)	5(13.9%)	-	1(2.8%)
	Assessor	15(41.7%)	19(52.8%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.97	4		.76
	Assessor	2	3.36	4		.58

VARIABLE 20 Analogy

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 20		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	5(13.9%)	14(38.9%)	8(22.2%)	1(2.8%)	8(22.2%)
	Assessor	14(38.9%)	13(36.1%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	5(13.9%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.19	4		1.35
	Assessor	0	2.83	4		1.34

VARIABLE 21 Group Work

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 21		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	14(38.9%)	10(27.8%)	4(11.1%)	-	8(22.2%)
	Assessor	15(41.7%)	11(30.6%)	1(2.8%)	-	9(25%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.61	4		1.53
	Assessor	0	2.64	4		1.60

VARIABLE 22 Role Play

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 22		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	6(16.7%)	4(11.1%)	-	-	26(72.2%)
	Assessor	6(16.7%)	5(13.9%)	-	-	25(69.4%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	1.0	4		1.63
	Assessor	0	1.08	4		1.06

VARIABLE 23 The level of the lesson

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 23		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	7(19.4%)	26(72.2%)	3(8.3%)	-	-
	Assessor	21(58.3%)	14(38.9%)	-	-	1(2.8%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.11	4		.52
	Assessor	0	3.50	4		.76

VARIABLE 24 The pace of the lesson

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 24		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	4(11.1%)	23(63.9%)	8(22.2%)	-	1(2.8%)
	Assessor	20(55.6%)	13(36.1%)	3(8.3%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.81	4		.74
	Assessor	2	3.47	4		.64

VARIABLE 25 Adapting to individual need

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 25		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	4(11.1%)	24(66.7%)	8(22.2%)	-	-
	Assessor	18(50%)	15(41.7%)	2(5.6%)	-	1(8.3%)
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	2.89	4	.57	
	Assessor	0	3.36	4	.82	

VARIABLE 26 Checks on learning

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 26		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	6(16.7%)	24(66.7%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	2(5.6%)
	Assessor	15(41.7%)	17(47.2%)	3(8.3%)	1(2.8%)	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.86	4	.92	
	Assessor	1	3.86	4	.73	

VARIABLE 27 Lesson summary

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 27		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	5(13.9%)	22(61.1%)	7(19.4%)	-	2(5.6%)
	Assessor	11(30.6%)	21(58.3%)	1(2.8%)	-	3(8.3%)
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.78	4	.89	
	Assessor	0	3.03	4	1.04	

VARIABLE 28 Learning environment

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 28		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	12(33.3%)	23(63.9%)	1(2.8%)	-	-
	Assessor	24(66.7%)	11(30.6%)	-	1(2.8%)	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.31	4		.52
	Assessor	2	3.64	4		.54

VARIABLE 29 Attitude of student teacher to students

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 29		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	18(50%)	18(50%)	-	-	-
	Assessor	28(77.8%)	7(19.4%)	-	1(2.8%)	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	3	3.50	4		.50
	Assessor	1	3.72	4		.61

VARIABLE 30 Attitude of students to student teacher

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 30		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	13(36.1%)	20(55.6%)	3(8.3%)	-	-
	Assessor	24(66.7%)	12(33.3%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.28	4		.61
	Assessor	3	3.67	4		.47

VARIABLE 31 Degree of rapport

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 31		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	13(36.1%)	21(58.3%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
	Assessor	24(66.7%)	11(30.6%)	-	-	1(2.8%)
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.31	4	.57	
	Assessor	2	3.64	4	.54	

VARIABLE 32 Use of language

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 32		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	9(25%)	27(75%)	-	-	-
	Assessor	22(61.1%)	14(38.9%)	-	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	3	3.25	4	.43	
	Assessor	3	3.61	4	.49	

VARIABLE 33 Classroom management

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 33		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	10(27.8%)	20(55.6%)	6(16.7%)	-	-
	Assessor	13(36.1%)	21(58.3%)	2(5.6%)	-	-
		Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency distribution	Student	2	3.11	4	.66	
	Assessor	2	3.31	4	.57	

VARIABLE 34 Testing methods

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 34		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	6(16.7%)	18(50%)	5(13.9%)	-	7(19.4%)
	Assessor	11(30.6%)	20(55.6%)	2(5.6%)	1(2.8%)	2(5.6%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.31	4		1.29
	Assessor	0	2.79	4		.87

VARIABLE 35 Administering testing methods

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 35		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	4(11.1%)	18(50%)	6(16.7%)	1(2.8%)	7(19.4%)
	Assessor	11(30.6%)	19(52.8%)	2(5.6%)	-	4(11.1%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.31	4		1.29
	Assessor	0	2.92	4		1.16

VARIABLE 36 The learning which took place

		4	3	2	1	0
Question 36		Very appro.	Appro.	Not very appro.	Inappro.	Not applic.
Raw scores	Student	6(16.7%)	24(66.7%)	4(11.1%)	-	2(5.6%)
	Assessor	19(52.8%)	14(38.9%)	-	-	3(8.3%)
		Min	Mean	Max		Standard Dev.
Frequency distribution	Student	0	2.89	4		.87
	Assessor	0	3.28	4		1.10

VARIABLE 37 Grades awarded

Question 37	4 Very appro.	3 Appro.	2 Not very appro.	1 Inappro.	0 Not applic.
Raw scores Student	2(5.6%)	20(55.6%)	2(5.6%)	0	*
Assessor	17(42.2%)	15(41.7%)	3(8.3%)	0	**
	Min	Mean	Max	Standard Dev.	
Frequency Student distribution	2	3.0	4	0.41	
Assessor	2	3.4	4	0.64	

12 (33.3%) did not award themselves grades

* 1 (2.8%) did not award a grade

Data Demonstrating Complete Agreement Between Assessor and Student, Variable 1 – 36

1. Plan of Intent	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	0	3	
2. Homeostasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	3	4	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	4	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	4	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	4	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	2	

2. Lesson Objectives	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	3	
2. Homestasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	4	*
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	2	2	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	3	*
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	4	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	4	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	3	3	*
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	*

3. Variation in Activity	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	4	4	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	3	*
10. Oxygen therapy	3	4	
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	3	3	*
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	4	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	3	3	*
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	4	*
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	3	4	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	4	
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery	2	3	
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	2	2	*
34. Diabetes (2)	3	4	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

4. Sequencing	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	2	
2. Homestasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	3	4	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	3	3	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	3	3	*
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	3	4	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	4	
30. Essay Writing	3	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	2	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	4	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

5. Variation in student Ability	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homeostasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	2	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	0	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	3	3	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	3	4	
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	3	3	*
15. Body temperature	3	3	*
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	2	
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	0	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	0	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	3	3	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	4	
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	1	
32. Epistaxis	3	4	
33. Mental health	2	2	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	3	4	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

6. Combination of Content and Method	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	2	
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	2	
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery	2	2	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	2	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

7. Aids Used	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	0	3	
2. Homestasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	3	2	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	3	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	4	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	3	3	*
24. Schools of psychology	3	4	
25. Abortion	3	4	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	0	0	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	2	
30. Essay Writing	3	4	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	2	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

8. Demonstration	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	0	0	*
2. Homestasis	0	0	*
3. Hearing	0	0	*
4. Observations	0	2	
5. Arthritis	0	-	
6. Labelling	0	4	
7. Diabetic surgery	0	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	0	-	
12. Breast surgery	0	-	
13. Patient hygiene	0	4	
14. Bereavement (1)	0	-	
15. Body temperature	0	0	*
16. Bereavement (2)	0	0	*
17. Blood Cells	0	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	0	0	*
19. Violence	0	4	
20. Children in hospital	0	0	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	0	4	
22. Diabetes (1)	0	3	
23. A balanced diet	0	3	
24. Schools of psychology	0	0	*
25. Abortion	0	0	*
26. Leukaemia	0	0	*
27. Peptic ulceration	0	0	*
28. Ward orientation	0	0	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	0	3	
30. Essay Writing	0	0	*
31. Abdominal surgery	0	0	*
32. Epistaxis	0	0	*
33. Mental health	0	0	*
34. Diabetes (2)	3	4	
35. Pain control	0	0	*
36. Assertiveness (2)	0	0	*

9. Management of the Environment	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homestasis	3	2	
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	2	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	2	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	4	*
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	4	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	3	3	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	4	
28. Ward orientation	3	4	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	3	4	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

10. Opening the Lesson	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	2	3	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	3	4	
12. Breast surgery	4	2	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	4	-	
23. A balanced diet	3	4	
24. Schools of psychology	3	3	*
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	3	3	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	4	*
30. Essay Writing	4	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

Table C

11. Statement of Lesson Objectives	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	2	4	
2. Homestasis	3	0	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	-	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	3	4	
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	0	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	1	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	2	2	*
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	3	3	*
24. Schools of psychology	3	3	*
25. Abortion	0	0	
26. Leukaemia	3	4	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	4	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	3	4	
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

12. Appearance	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homeostasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	2	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	-	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	4	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	-	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	4	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	4	4	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

13. Tone of Voice	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	4	3	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	2	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	2	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	4	1	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	4	*
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	4	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

14. Personality	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	4	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	4	*
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

Table C

15. Eye Contact	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	4	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	4	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

16. Questioning	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	3	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	3	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	2	
11. Counselling	4	3	
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	3	3	*
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	4	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	2	3	
26. Leukaemia	3	2	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	4	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	2	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	2	2	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	3	4	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

17. Aids Used	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homeostasis	2	3	
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	3	0	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	3	4	
24. Schools of psychology	3	4	
25. Abortion	4	0	
26. Leukaemia	3	3	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	0	
28. Ward orientation	-	0	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	4	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

18. Discussion	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	3	0	
3. Hearing	3	-	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	-	
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	3	4	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	3	4	
14. Bereavement (1)	3	3	*
15. Body temperature	3	3	*
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	4	
19. Violence	3	3	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	2	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	3	4	
26. Leukaemia	3	2	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	4	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	3	2	
33. Mental health	2	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	4	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

19. Explanation	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homestasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	3	3	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	2	2	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	3	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	2	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	4	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	2	
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

20. Analogy	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homestasis	0	3	
3. Hearing	0	3	
4. Observations	4	0	
5. Arthritis	3	-	
6. Labelling	2	2	*
7. Diabetic surgery	0	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	0	2	
11. Counselling	3	-	
12. Breast surgery	4	2	
13. Patient hygiene	3	2	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	4	0	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	2	2	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	3	0	
20. Children in hospital	-	-	
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	0	0	*
26. Leukaemia	4	4	*
27. Peptic ulceration	3	-	
28. Ward orientation	4	-	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	-	
30. Essay Writing	3	4	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	1	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	2	
35. Pain control	2	-	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

Table C

21. Group Work	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homestasis	3	4	
3. Hearing	0	3	
4. Observations	4	0	
5. Arthritis	0	-	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	3	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	0	0	
11. Counselling	3	3	*
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	0	0	
16. Bereavement (2)	4	3	
17. Blood Cells	0	0	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	4	*
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	3	4	
26. Leukaemia	4	4	*
27. Peptic ulceration	2	2	*
28. Ward orientation	0	-	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	0	2	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

Table C

22. Role Play	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	0	0	*
2. Homestasis	0	0	*
3. Hearing	0	0	*
4. Observations	0	0	*
5. Arthritis	0	-	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	0	0	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	0	0	*
9. Catheter update	0	0	*
10. Oxygen therapy	0	0	*
11. Counselling	0	4	
12. Breast surgery	0	-	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	4	*
15. Body temperature	0	0	*
16. Bereavement (2)	0	0	*
17. Blood Cells	0	0	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	0	0	*
19. Violence	0	0	*
20. Children in hospital	0	0	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	0	0	*
22. Diabetes (1)	0	-	
23. A balanced diet	3	4	
24. Schools of psychology	0	0	*
25. Abortion	0	0	*
26. Leukaemia	0	2	
27. Peptic ulceration	0	0	*
28. Ward orientation	0	-	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	0	0	*
31. Abdominal surgery	0	0	*
32. Epistaxis	0	0	*
33. Mental health	0	0	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	2	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	0	0	*

23. The Level of the Lesson	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	2	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	4	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

24. The Pace of the Lesson	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	3	4	
12. Breast surgery	4	2	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	2	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	4	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	2	2	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	2	2	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

25. Students' Adapting to Individual Need	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homestasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	-	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	2	
11. Counselling	4	3	
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	3	3	*
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	2	
19. Violence	3	3	*
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	3	4	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	2	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	2	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	3	3	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	2	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

26. Checks on Learning	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	3	*
2. Homestasis	3	2	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	3	3	*
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	3	3	*
13. Patient hygiene	3	3	*
14. Bereavement (1)	3	0	
15. Body temperature	3	2	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	3	3	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	1	0	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	4	3	
32. Epistaxis	2	4	
33. Mental health	4	1	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	3	3	*
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	2	

27. Lesson Summary	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	2	2	*
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	3	3	*
5. Arthritis	2	3	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	3	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	4	1	
12. Breast surgery	-	2	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	0	0	*
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	2	
23. A balanced diet	3	3	*
24. Schools of psychology	3	3	*
25. Abortion	3	2	
26. Leukaemia	0	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	4	
28. Ward orientation	3	3	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	4	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	3	3	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

28. The Learning Environment Created	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	1	
12. Breast surgery	–	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	3	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	3	4	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

29. Student's Attitude to Class	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	4	*
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	4	3	
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	4	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	4	*
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	4	*
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

30. Attitude of Class to Student	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	3	
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	4	*
14. Bereavement (1)	4	2	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	3	4	
33. Mental health	3	3	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

31. Degree of Rapport	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	4	*
2. Homestasis	3	4	
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	2	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	4	4	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	4	*
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	4	*
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	4	3	
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	2	3	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

Table C

32. Use of Language in the Classroom	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	4	3	
6. Labelling	3	3	*
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	4	*
10. Oxygen therapy	4	3	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	4	*
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	4	3	
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	4	3	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	4	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	4	3	
31. Abdominal surgery -	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	3	3	*
33. Mental health	3	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

Table C

33. The Classroom Management	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	4	
2. Homeostasis	3	3	*
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	3	4	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	3	4	
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	2	
15. Body temperature	3	2	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	4	
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	3	*
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	4	3	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	4	
23. A balanced diet	4	3	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	3	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	3	4	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	3	*
31. Abdominal surgery	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	3	4	
33. Mental health	2	4	
34. Diabetes (2)	4	2	
35. Pain control	3	4	
36. Assertiveness (2)	4	3	

34. Testing Methods Used	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	0	
2. Homestasis	0	2	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	3	0	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	0	4	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	4	*
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	3	*
10. Oxygen therapy	3	2	
11. Counselling	4	4	*
12. Breast surgery	3	2	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	3	0	
15. Body temperature	3	0	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	4	
19. Violence	3	4	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	0	0	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	3	3	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	1	0	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	3	3	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	0	
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	2	3	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	2	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

35. Administration of the Testing	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	3	0	
2. Homestasis	0	2	
3. Hearing	4	3	
4. Observations	3	0	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	0	3	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	3	3	*
10. Oxygen therapy	2	2	*
11. Counselling	4	3	
12. Breast surgery	3	2	
13. Patient hygiene	3	2	
14. Bereavement (1)	0	0	*
15. Body temperature	3	0	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	2	
18. Parkinson's (1)	3	4	
19. Violence	4	3	
20. Children in hospital	4	3	
21. Assertiveness (1)	0	0	
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	3	4	
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	0	0	*
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	2	3	
28. Ward orientation	3	3	*
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	3	*
32. Epistaxis	4	3	
33. Mental health	2	1	
34. Diabetes (2)	3	2	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	4	

Table C

36. The Learning Which Took Place	Assessor	Student	Complete Agreement
1. Intra cerebral pressure	4	0	
2. Homeostasis	3	2	
3. Hearing	3	3	*
4. Observations	4	3	
5. Arthritis	3	3	*
6. Labelling	0	4	
7. Diabetic surgery	4	3	
8. Acute psychiatric care	4	3	
9. Catheter update	4	2	
10. Oxygen therapy	3	3	*
11. Counselling	4	3	
12. Breast surgery	4	3	
13. Patient hygiene	4	3	
14. Bereavement (1)	4	3	
15. Body temperature	4	3	
16. Bereavement (2)	3	3	*
17. Blood Cells	3	3	*
18. Parkinson's (1)	4	3	
19. Violence	4	4	*
20. Children in hospital	4	4	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	3	3	*
22. Diabetes (1)	3	3	*
23. A balanced diet	4	4	*
24. Schools of psychology	4	3	
25. Abortion	3	4	
26. Leukaemia	4	3	
27. Peptic ulceration	3	3	*
28. Ward orientation	4	3	
29. Parkinson's (2)	3	3	*
30. Essay Writing	3	2	
31. Abdominal surgery	3	2	
32. Epistaxis	4	4	*
33. Mental health	3	3	*
34. Diabetes (2)	4	3	
35. Pain control	4	3	
36. Assertiveness (2)	3	2	

Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement between assessor and student occurred. Variables 1-36

1. Plan of Intent

Assessor

27 very appropriate

8 appropriate

Student

10 very appropriate

26 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

6 very appropriate

Lesson

7. Diabetic surgery

8. Acute psychiatric care

11. Counselling

12. Breast surgery

23. A balanced diet

32. Epistaxis

3 appropriate

Lesson

10. Oxygen therapy

14. Bereavement (1)

31. Abdominal surgery

2. Lesson objectives

Assessor

26 very appropriate

19 appropriate

Student

13 very appropriate

22 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

8 very appropriate

Lesson

- 4. Observations
- 7. Diabetic surgery
- 11. Counselling
- 13. Patient hygiene
- 21. Assertiveness
- 23. A balanced diet
- 25. Abortion
- 28. Ward orientation

6 appropriate

Lesson

- 9. Catheter update
- 10. Oxygen therapy
- 22. Diabetes
- 18. Parkinson's disease
- 31. Abdominal surgery
- 35. Pain control

3. Variation in Activity

Assessor

14 very appropriate

19 appropriate

Student

4 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

6 very appropriate

Lesson

2. Homestasis
6. Labelling
14. Bereavement (1)
20. Children in hospital
23. A balanced diet
26. Leukaemia

10 Appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure
3. Hearing
5. Arthritis
7. Diabetic surgery
9. Catheter update
15. Body temperature
17. Blood cells
18. Parkinson's disease
22. Diabetes
24. Schools of psychology
25. Abortion

4. Sequencing

Assessor

17 very appropriate

19 appropriate

Student

9 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

5 very appropriate

Lesson 7. Diabetic surgery

14. Bereavement (1)

19. Violence

23. A balanced diet

10 appropriate

Lesson 5. Arthritis

8. Acute psychiatric care

10. Oxygen therapy

11. Counselling

17. Blood cells

18. Parkinson's disease

21. Assertiveness (1)

22. Diabetes (1)

24. Schools of psychology

27. Peptic ulceration

5. Variation in Student Ability

Assessor

8 very appropriate

22 appropriate

Student

3 very appropriate

29 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

1 very appropriate

Lesson 13. Patient hygiene

13 appropriate

Lesson 1. Intracerebral pressure

5. Arthritis

7. Diabetic surgery

8. Acute psychiatric care

12. Breast surgery

14. Bereavement (1)

15. Body temperature

16. Bereavement

17. Blood cells

21. Assertiveness (1)

22. Diabetes (1)

28. Ward orientation

30. Essay writing

6. Combination of Content and Method

Assessor

18 very appropriate

15 appropriate

Student

6 very appropriate

27 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson

6. Labelling

8. Acute psychiatric care

12 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

3. Hearing

5. Arthritis

11. Counselling

12. Breast surgery

15. Body temperature

16. Bereavement (1)

21. Assertiveness (1)

22. Diabetes (1)

25. Abortion

29. Parkinson's disease

30. Essay writing

7. Aids Used

Assessor

18 very appropriate

15 appropriate

Student

8 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson 6. Labelling

11. Counselling

7 appropriate

Lesson 5. Arthritis

7. Diabetic surgery

17. Blood cells

19. Violence

22. Diabetes

23. A balanced diet

27. Peptic ulceration

8. Demonstration

Assessor

2 very appropriate

3 appropriate

Student

5 very appropriate

9 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

- very appropriate

1 appropriate

Lesson 10. Oxygen therapy

9. Management of the Environment

Assessor

14 very appropriate

22 appropriate

Student

11 very appropriate

16 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

5 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 8. Acute psychiatric care
 - 16. Bereavement (2)
 - 20. Children in hospital
 - 21. Assertiveness (1)
 - 34. Diabetes (2)

12 appropriate

- Lesson
- 3. Hearing
 - 5. Arthritis
 - 6. Labelling
 - 11. Counselling
 - 12. Breast surgery
 - 18. Parkinson's disease
 - 22. Diabetes
 - 25. Abortion
 - 26. Leukaemia
 - 29. Parkinson's disease (2)
 - 31. Abdominal surgery
 - 32. Epistaxis

10. Opening the Lesson

Assessor

19 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Students

9 very appropriate

21 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

3 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 14. Bereavement (1)
 - 28. Ward orientation
 - 29. Parkinson's disease (2)

8 appropriate

- Lesson
- 2. Homeostasis
 - 6. Labelling
 - 21. Assertiveness
 - 24. Schools of psychology
 - 26. Leukaemia
 - 27. Peptic ulceration
 - 31. Abdominal surgery
 - 32. Epistaxis

11. Statement of Lesson Objectives

Assessors

19 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Students

8 very appropriate

21 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson 19. Violence

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

7 appropriate

Lesson 6. Labelling

10. Oxygen therapy

16. Bereavement (1)

23. A balanced diet

24. Schools of psychology

27. Peptic ulceration

31. Abdominal surgery

12. Appearance

Assessor

33 very appropriate

3 appropriate

Student

10 very appropriate

22 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

7 very appropriate`

Lesson

7. Diabetic surgery
8. Acute psychiatric care
9. Catheter update
11. Counselling
19. Violence
20. Children in hospital
23. A balanced diet
28. Ward orientation
33. Mental health
34. Diabetes (2)

- appropriate

13. Tone of Voice

Assessor

29 very appropriate

7 appropriate

Student

9 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

8 very appropriate

Lesson

9. Catheter update

11. Counselling

19. Violence

20. Children in hospital

21. Assertiveness (1)

23. A balanced diet

28. Ward orientation

34. Diabetes (2)

5 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

7. Diabetic surgery

16. Bereavement (2)

31. Abdominal surgery

32. Epistaxis

14. Personality

Assessor

28 very appropriate

8 appropriate

Student

11 very appropriate

24 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

7 very appropriate

Lesson

9. Catheter update

11. Counselling

20. Children in hospital

23. A balanced diet

28. Ward orientation

30. Essay writing

34. Diabetes (2)

5 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

2. Homeostasis

16. Bereavement (2)

25. Abortion

31. Abdominal surgery

15. Eye Contact

Assessor

26 very appropriate

10 appropriate

Student

15 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

11 very appropriate

Lesson

7. Diabetic surgery
9. Catheter update
11. Counselling
13. Patient hygiene
19. Violence
20. Children in hospital
22. Diabetes
23. A balanced diet
28. Ward orientation
32. Epistaxis
34. Diabetes (2)

5 appropriate

Lesson

2. Homeostasis
6. Labelling
16. Bereavement (2)
25. Abortion
31. Abdominal surgery

16. Questioning

Assessor

19 very appropriate

15 appropriate

Student

12 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

9 very appropriate

Lesson

6. Labelling
8. Acute psychiatric care
9. Catheter update
19. Violence
20. Children in hospital
23. A balanced diet
24. Schools of psychology
28. Ward orientation
32. Epistaxis

9 appropriate

Lesson

2. Homeostasis
3. Hearing
5. Arthritis
15. Body temperature
16. Bereavement (2)
17. Blood cells
18. Parkinson's disease (1)
29. Parkinson's disease (2)
31. Abdominal surgery

17. Aids Used

Assessor

19 very appropriate

15 appropriate

Student

11 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

5 very appropriate

Lesson

11. Counselling

13. Patient hygiene

14. Bereavement (2)

19. Violence

32. Epistaxis

10 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

3. Hearing

7. Diabetic surgery

16. Bereavement (2)

17. Blood cells

21. Assertiveness (1)

22. A balanced diet

26. Leukaemia

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

18. Discussion

Assessor

9 very appropriate

25 appropriate

Student

16 very appropriate

12 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

6 very appropriate

Lesson 8. Acute psychiatric care

11. Counselling

20. Children in hospital

23. A balanced diet

24. Schools of psychology

28. Ward orientation

9 appropriate

Lesson 1. Intracerebral pressure

14. Bereavement (1)

15. Body temperature

16. Bereavement (2)

17. Blood cells

19. Violence

22. Diabetes (1)

29. Parkinson's disease (1)

30. Essay writing

19. Explanation

Assessor

15 very appropriate

19 appropriate

Student

7 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

5 very appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure
8. Acute psychiatric care
23. A balanced diet
26. Leukaemia
28. Ward orientation

14 appropriate

Lesson

2. Homeostasis
3. Hearing
5. Arthritis
6. Labelling
7. Diabetic surgery
8. Acute psychiatric care
10. Oxygen therapy
11. Counselling
13. Patient hygiene
16. Bereavement (2)
19. Violence
23. A balanced diet
25. Abortion
26. Leukaemia
27. Peptic ulceration
28. Ward orientation
30. Essay writing
31. Abdominal surgery

20. Analogy

Assessor

14 very appropriate

13 appropriate

Student

5 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

3 very appropriate

Lesson 1. Intracerebral pressure

14. Bereavement (1)

26. Leukaemia

0 appropriate

21. Group Work

Assessor

15 very appropriate

11 appropriate

Student

14 very appropriate

10 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

12 very appropriate

Lesson

6. Labelling
7. Diabetic surgery
8. Acute psychiatric care
13. Patient hygiene
14. Bereavement (1)
18. Parkinson's disease (1)
20. Children in hospital
23. A balanced diet
24. Schools of psychology
26. Leukaemia
32. Epistaxis
34. Diabetes (2)

6 appropriate

Lesson

11. Counselling
12. Breast surgery
22. Diabetes
29. Parkinson's disease (2)
30. Essay writing
31. Abdominal surgery

22. Role Play

Assessor

6 very appropriate

5 appropriate

Student

6 very appropriate

4 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

3 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 6. Labelling
 - 13. Patient hygiene
 - 14. Bereavement (1)

0 appropriate

23. The Level of the Lesson

Assessor

21 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Student

7 very appropriate

26 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

6 very appropriate

Lesson

6. Labelling

7. Diabetic surgery

11. Counselling

20. Children in hospital

21. Assertiveness (1)

23. A balanced diet

10 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

2. Homeostasis

3. Hearing

12. Breast surgery

16. Bereavement

17. Blood cells

23. A balanced diet

25. Abortion

27. Peptic ulcertaion

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

24. The Pace of the Lesson

Assessor

20 very appropriate

13 appropriate

Student

4 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson 19. Violence

23. A balanced diet

6 appropriate

Lesson 1. Intracerebral pressure

2. Homeostasis

17. Blood cells

25. Leukaemia

27. Peptic ulceration

29. Parkinson's disease

25. Student's Adapting to Individual Need

Assessor

18 very appropriate

15 appropriate

Student

4 very appropriate

24 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson 1. Intracerebral pressure

13. Patient hygiene

6 appropriate

Lesson 2. Homeostasis

6. Labelling

14. Bereavement (1)

16. Bereavement (2)

19. Violence

21. Assertiveness (1)

33. Mental health

26. Checks Used on Learning

Assessor

15 very appropriate

17 appropriate

Student

6 very appropriate

24 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

4 very appropriate

Lesson

7. Diabetic surgery
8. Acute psychiatric care
11. Counselling
28. Ward orientation

14 appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure
5. Arthritis
6. Labelling
9. Catheter update
10. Oxygen therapy
12. Breast surgery
13. Patient hygiene
16. Bereavement (2)
17. Blood cells
18. Parkinson's disease (1)
21. Assertiveness (1)
22. Diabetes (1)
23. A balanced diet
30. Essay writing

27. Lesson Summary

Assessor

11 very appropriate

21 appropriate

Student

5 very appropriate

22 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

0 very appropriate

13 appropriate

Lesson

2. Homeostasis
4. Observations
6. Labelling
7. Diabetic surgery
16. Bereavement (2)
18. Parkinson's disease (1)
21. Assertiveness (1)
23. A balanced diet
24. Schools of psychology
28. Ward orientation
29. Parkinson's disease (2)
32. Epistaxis
33. Mental health

28. The Learning Environment Created

Assessor

24 very appropriate

11 appropriate

Student

12 very appropriate

23 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

6 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 6. Labelling
 - 7. Diabetic surgery
 - 8. Acute psychiatric care
 - 19. Violence
 - 20. Children in hospital
 - 23. A balanced diet

7 appropriate

- Lesson
- 2. Homeostasis
 - 3. Hearing
 - 17. Blood cells
 - 25. Abortion
 - 27. Peptic ulceration
 - 31. Abdominal surgery
 - 33. Mental health

29. Student's Attitude to the Class

Assessor

28 very appropriate

7 appropriate

Student

18 very appropriate

18 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

12 very appropriate

- Lesson
1. Intracerebral pressure
 6. Labelling
 7. Diabetic surgery
 8. Acute psychiatric care
 11. Counselling
 19. Violence
 20. Children in hospital
 22. Diabetes (1)
 23. A balanced diet
 24. Schools of psychology
 28. Ward orientation
 30. Essay writing
 32. Epistaxis

3 appropriate

- Lesson
2. Homeostasis
 27. Peptic ulceration
 31. Abdominal surgery

30. Attitude of Students to Student Teacher

Assessor

24 very appropriate

12 appropriate

Student

13 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

9 very appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

6. Labelling

7. Diabetic surgery

11. Counselling

13. Patient hygiene

19. Violence

20. Children in hospital

23. A balanced diet

24. Schools of psychology

28. Ward orientation

6 appropriate

Lesson

2. Homeostasis

3. Hearing

17. Blood cells

25. Abortion

27. Peptic ulceration

33. Mental health

31. Degree of Rapport

Assessor

24 very appropriate

11 appropriate

Student

13 very appropriate

21 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

10 very appropriate

Lesson

1. Intracerebral pressure

6. Labelling

9. Catheter update

11. Counselling

15. Body temperature

19. Violence

20. Children in hospital

23. A balanced diet

24. Schools of psychology

28. Ward orientation

5 appropriate

Lesson

3. Hearing

17. Blood cells

25. Abortion

27. Peptic ulceration

32. Epistaxis

32. Use of Language

Assessor

22 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Student

9 very appropriate

27 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

5 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 9. Catheter update
 - 18. Parkinson's disease (1)
 - 19. Violence
 - 20. Children in hospital

7 appropriate

- Lesson
- 2. Homeostasis
 - 6. Labelling
 - 16. Bereavement (2)
 - 17. Blood cells
 - 27. Peptic ulceration
 - 31. Abdominal surgery
 - 32. Epistaxis

33. Classroom Management

Assessor

13 very appropriate

21 appropriate

Student

10 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

2 very appropriate

Lesson 19 Violence

20. Children in hospital

6 appropriate

Lesson 2. Homeostasis

5. Arthritis

10. Oxygen therapy

25. Abortion

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

30. Essay writing

34. Testing Methods

Assessor

11 very appropriate

20 appropriate

Student

6 very appropriate

18 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

3 very appropriate

Lesson 7. Diabetic surgery

11. Counselling

32. Epistaxis

8 appropriate

Lesson 5. Arthritis

9. Catheter update

16. Bereavement (2)

17. Blood cells

22. Diabetes (2)

23. A balanced diet

28. Ward orientation

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

35. Administering the Testing Methods

Assessor

11 very appropriate

19 appropriate

Student

4 very appropriate

18 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

0 very appropriate

7 appropriate

Lesson

5. Arthritis

9. Catheter update

16. Bereavement (2)

22. Diabetes (1)

28. Ward orientation

29. Parkinson's disease (2)

31. Abdominal surgery

36. The Learning Which Took Place

Assessor

19 very appropriate

14 appropriate

Student

6 very appropriate

24 appropriate

Complete agreement between assessor and student

3 very appropriate

- Lesson
- 19. Violence
 - 20. Children in hospital
 - 23. A balanced diet

10 appropriate

- Lesson
- 3. Hearing
 - 5. Arthritis
 - 10. Oxygen therapy
 - 16. Bereavement (2)
 - 17. Blood cells
 - 21. Assertiveness (1)
 - 22. Diabetes (1)
 - 27. Leukaemia
 - 29. Parkinson's disease (2)
 - 33. Mental health

Data demonstrating complete agreement in grading between Assessor and Student

<u>Lesson</u>	<u>Assessor</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Complete* Agreement</u>
1. Intracerebral pressure	B Physicist	-	
2. Homeostasis	B Nurse	-	
3. Hearing	B Nurse	B	*
4. Observations	A Nurse	-	
5. Arthritis	B Nurse	-	
6. Labelling	- Engineer	B	
7. Diabetic surgery	B Physicist	A	
8. Acute psych. care	A Mathematician	-	
9. Catheter update	A Nurse	B	
10. Oxygen therapy	B Nurse	-	
11. Counselling	B Nurse	B	*
12. Breast surgery	A Nurse	B	
13. Patient hygiene	A Nurse	B	
14. Bereavement (1)	A Nurse	B	
15. Controlling body temp.	A Engineer	B	
16. Bereavement (2)	B Nurse	-	
17. Blood cells	B Nurse	B	*
18. Parkinson's disease (1)	A Nurse	B	
19. Violence	A Nurse	-	
20. Children in hospital	A Psychologist	A	*
21. Assertiveness (1)	B Educationalist	B	*
22. Diabetes (1)	B Nurse	B	*
23. A balanced diet	A Nurse	B	
24. Schools of psychology	A Nurse	B	
25. Abortion	B Mathematician	-	
26. Leukaemia	A Nurse	-	
27. Peptic ulceration	C Nurse	-	
28. Ward orientation	A Nurse	B	
29. Parkinson's disease (4)	B Nurse	B	*
30. Essay writing	A Nurse	B	
31. Abdominal surgery	B Nurse	-	
32. Epistaxis	A Nurse	B	
33. Mental health	C Nurse	C	*
34. Diabetes	A Physicist	B	
35. Pain control	B Physicist	C	
36. Assertiveness (2)	C Nurse	B	

Data demonstrating the lessons in which complete agreement in grading between Assessor and Student occurredAssessors

A 17, B 14, C 4, R 0

Students

A1 B21 C1 R0

Complete agreement between assessor and student

A	Lesson	20.	Children in hospital
B	Lesson	3.	Hearing
		11.	Counselling
		17.	Blood cells
		21.	Assertiveness (1)
		22.	Diabetes (1)
		29.	Parkinson's disease (2)
C	Lesson	33.	Mental health

Data demonstrating the relationship between agreed lesson gradings and lesson variable

Table G1

Lesson 3. Title, Hearing. Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading, B

<u>Planning Abilities</u>	<u>Complete Agreement</u>
1. Plan of intent	
2. Lesson objectives	
3. Variation in activity	Appropriate
4. Sequencing	
5. Variation in student ability	
6. Combination of content and method	
7. Aids used	
8. Demonstration	
9. Management of environment	Appropriate
<u>Performance Abilities</u>	
10. Opening the lesson	
11. Statement of lesson objectives	
12. Appearance	
13. Tone of voice	
14. Personality	
15. Eye contact	
16. Questioning	Appropriate
17. Aids used	Appropriate
18. Discussion	
19. Explanation	Appropriate
20. Analogy	
21. Group work	
22. Role play	
23. The level of lesson	Appropriate
24. The pace of the lesson	
25. Adapting to individual student need	
26. Checks on learning	
27. Lesson summary	
<u>Social Relationships</u>	
28. The learning environment created	Appropriate
29. Students attitude to the class	
30. Attitudes of class to student	Appropriate
31. Degree of rapport	
32. Use of language	
33. The classroom management	
<u>Post Performance Analysis</u>	
34. Testing methods	
35. Administration of tests	
36. The learning which took place	Appropriate

Lesson 3

Agreed Grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|-------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 3. | Variation in activity |
| | 9. | Management of the environment |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 16. | Questioning |
| | 17. | Aids used |
| | 19. | Explanation |
| | 23. | The level of the lesson |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 29. | Learning environment |
| | 30. | Attitude of the class to student |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 36. | Learning which took place |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|

Lesson 11. Title, Counselling. Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading, B

<u>Planning Abilities</u>	<u>Complete Agreement</u>
1. Plan of intent	Very appropriate
2. Lesson objectives	Very appropriate
3. Variation in activity	
4. Sequencing	Appropriate
5. Variation in student ability	
6. Combination of content and method	Appropriate
7. Aids used	Very appropriate
8. Demonstration	
9. Management of environment	Appropriate
<u>Performance Abilities</u>	
10. Opening the lesson	
11. Statement of lesson objectives	
12. Appearance	Very appropriate
13. Tone of voice	Very appropriate
14. Personality	Very appropriate
15. Eye contact	Very appropriate
16. Questioning	
17. Aids used	Very appropriate
18. Discussion	Very appropriate
19. Explanation	Appropriate
20. Analogy	
21. Group work	Appropriate
22. Role play	
23. The level of lesson	Very appropriate
24. The pace of the lesson	
25. Adapting to individual student need	
26. Checks on learning	Very appropriate
27. Lesson summary	
<u>Social Relationships</u>	
28. The learning environment created	
29. Students attitude to the class	Very appropriate
30. Attitudes of class to student	Very appropriate
31. Degree of rapport	
32. Use of language	Very appropriate
33. The classroom management	
<u>Post Performance Analysis</u>	
34. Testing methods	Very appropriate
35. Administration of tests	
36. The learning which took place	

Lesson 11

Agreed grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 1. Plan of intent |
| | 2. Lesson objectives |
| | 4. Sequencing |
| | 6. Combination of content & method |
| | 7. Aids used |
| | 9. Management of the environment |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 12. Appearance |
| | 13. Tone of voice |
| | 14. Personality |
| | 15. Eye contact |
| | 17. Aids used |
| | 18. Discussion |
| | 19. Explanation |
| | 21. Group work |
| | 23. Level of the lesson |
| | 26. Check on learning |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Agreement with Variable | 29. Student's attitude to the class |
| | 30. Attitude of the class to the student |
| | 32. Use of language |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 34. Testing methods |
|-------------------------|---------------------|

Lesson 17. Title, Blood cells. Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading BPlanning AbilitiesComplete Agreement

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Plan of intent | |
| 2. Lesson objectives | |
| 3. Variation in activity | Appropriate |
| 4. Sequencing | Appropriate |
| 5. Variation in student ability | Appropriate |
| 6. Combination of content and method | |
| 7. Aids used | Appropriate |
| 8. Demonstration | |
| 9. Management of environment | |

Performance Abilities

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 10. Opening the lesson | |
| 11. Statement of lesson objectives | |
| 12. Appearance | |
| 13. Tone of voice | |
| 14. Personality | |
| 15. Eye contact | |
| 16. Questioning | Appropriate |
| 17. Aids used | Appropriate |
| 18. Discussion | Appropriate |
| 19. Explanation | |
| 20. Analogy | |
| 21. Group work | |
| 22. Role play | |
| 23. The level of lesson | Appropriate |
| 24. The pace of the lesson | Appropriate |
| 25. Adapting to individual student need | |
| 26. Checks on learning | Appropriate |
| 27. Lesson summary | |

Social Relationships

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 28. The learning environment created | Appropriate |
| 29. Students attitude to the class | |
| 30. Attitudes of class to student | Appropriate |
| 31. Degree of rapport | Appropriate |
| 32. Use of language | Appropriate |
| 33. The classroom management | |

Post Performance Analysis

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 34. Testing methods | Appropriate |
| 35. Administration of tests | |
| 36. The learning which took place | Appropriate |

Lesson 17

Agreed Grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 3. | Variation in activity |
| | 4. | Sequencing |
| | 5. | Variation in student ability |
| | 7. | Aids used |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 16. | Questioning |
| | 17. | Aids used |
| | 18. | Discussion |
| | 23. | Level of the lesson |
| | 24. | Pace of the lesson |
| | 26. | Checks on learning |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 28. | Learning environment created |
| | 30. | Attitude of the class to the student |
| | 31. | Degree of rapport |
| | 32. | Use of language |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 34. | Testing methods |
| | 36. | Learning which took place |

Lesson 20. Title, Children in hospital. Assessor, Psychologist. Agreed Grading A

Planning Abilities

Complete Agreement

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Plan of intent | |
| 2. Lesson objectives | |
| 3. Variation in activity | Very appropriate |
| 4. Sequencing | Very appropriate |
| 5. Variation in student ability | |
| 6. Combination of content and method | |
| 7. Aids used | |
| 8. Demonstration | |
| 9. Management of environment | Very appropriate |

Performance Abilities

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 10. Opening the lesson | |
| 11. Statement of lesson objectives | |
| 12. Appearance | Very appropriate |
| 13. Tone of voice | Very appropriate |
| 14. Personality | Very appropriate |
| 15. Eye contact | Very appropriate |
| 16. Questioning | Very appropriate |
| 17. Aids used | |
| 18. Discussion | Very appropriate |
| 19. Explanation | |
| 20. Analogy | |
| 21. Group work | Very appropriate |
| 22. Role play | |
| 23. The level of lesson | Very appropriate |
| 24. The pace of the lesson | |
| 25. Adapting to individual student need | |
| 26. Checks on learning | |
| 27. Lesson summary | |

Social Relationships

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| 28. The learning environment created | Very appropriate |
| 29. Students attitude to the class | Very appropriate |
| 30. Attitudes of class to student | Very appropriate |
| 31. Degree of rapport | Very appropriate |
| 32. Use of language | Very appropriate |
| 33. The classroom management | Very appropriate |

Post Performance Analysis

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| 34. Testing methods | |
| 35. Administration of tests | |
| 36. The learning which took place | Very appropriate |

Lesson 20

Agreed grading A

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 3. | Variation in activity |
| | 4. | Sequencing |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 12. | Appearance |
| | 13. | Tone of voice |
| | 14. | Personalisty |
| | 15. | Eye contact |
| | 16. | Questioning |
| | 18. | Discussion |
| | 21. | Group work |
| | 23. | The level of the lesson |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 28. | The learning environment created |
| | 29. | Student's attitude to the class |
| | 30. | Attitude of class to student |
| | 31. | Degree of rapport |
| | 32. | Use of language |
| | 33. | Classroom management |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 36. | Learning which took place |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|

Lesson 21. Title, Assertiveness (1). Assessor, Educationalist. Agreed rating B

Planning Abilities

Complete Agreement

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Plan of intent | |
| 2. Lesson objectives | Very appropriate |
| 3. Variation in activity | |
| 4. Sequencing | Appropriate |
| 5. Variation in student ability | Appropriate |
| 6. Combination of content and method | Appropriate |
| 7. Aids used | |
| 8. Demonstration | |
| 9. Management of environment | Very appropriate |

Performance Abilities

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 10. Opening the lesson | Appropriate |
| 11. Statement of lesson objectives | |
| 12. Appearance | |
| 13. Tone of voice | Very appropriate |
| 14. Personality | |
| 15. Eye contact | |
| 16. Questioning | |
| 17. Aids used | Appropriate |
| 18. Discussion | |
| 19. Explanation | |
| 20. Analogy | |
| 21. Group work | |
| 22. Role play | |
| 23. The level of lesson | Very appropriate |
| 24. The pace of the lesson | |
| 25. Adapting to individual student need | Appropriate |
| 26. Checks on learning | Appropriate |
| 27. Lesson summary | Appropriate |

Social Relationships

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 28. The learning environment created | |
| 29. Students attitude to the class | |
| 30. Attitudes of class to student | |
| 31. Degree of rapport | |
| 32. Use of language | |
| 33. The classroom management | |

Post Performance Analysis

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 34. Testing methods | |
| 35. Administration of tests | |
| 36. The learning which took place | Appropriate |

Lesson 21

Agreed grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 2. Lesson objectives |
| | 4. Sequencing |
| | 5. Variation in student ability |
| | 6. Combination of content and method |
| | 9. Management of the environment |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Agreement with Variable | 10. Opening the lesson |
| | 13. Tone of voice |
| | 17. Aids used |
| | 23. Level of the lesson |
| | 25. Adopting the individual student need |
| | 26. Checks on learning |
| | 27. Lesson summary |

Social relationships (n6)

No agreement

Post performance analysis

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 36. Learning which took place |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|

Lesson 22. Title, Diabetes (1). Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading B

<u>Planning Abilities</u>	<u>Complete Agreement</u>
1. Plan of intent	
2. Lesson objectives	Appropriate
3. Variation in activity	Appropriate
4. Sequencing	Appropriate
5. Variation in student ability	Appropriate
6. Combination of content and method	Appropriate
7. Aids used	Appropriate
8. Demonstration	
9. Management of environment	Appropriate
<u>Performance Abilities</u>	
10. Opening the lesson	
11. Statement of lesson objectives	
12. Appearance	
13. Tone of voice	
14. Personality	
15. Eye contact	Very appropriate
16. Questioning	
17. Aids used	Appropriate
18. Discussion	
19. Explanation	
20. Analogy	
21. Group work	Appropriate
22. Role play	
23. The level of lesson	Appropriate
24. The pace of the lesson	
25. Adapting to individual student need	
26. Checks on learning	Appropriate
27. Lesson summary	
<u>Social Relationships</u>	
28. The learning environment created	
29. Students attitude to the class	Very appropriate
30. Attitudes of class to student	
31. Degree of rapport	
32. Use of language	
33. The classroom management	
<u>Post Performance Analysis</u>	
34. Testing methods	Appropriate
35. Administration of tests	Appropriate
36. The learning which took place	Appropriate

Lesson 22

Agreed grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 2. Lesson objectives |
| | 3. Variation in activity |
| | 4. Sequencing |
| | 5. Variation in student ability |
| | 6. Combination of content and method |
| | 7. Aids used |
| | 9. Management of environment |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 15. Eye contact |
| | 17. Aids used |
| | 18. Discussion |
| | 21. Group work |
| | 23. Level of the lesson |
| | 26. Checks on learning |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 29. Student's attitude to the class |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Post performance analysis

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 34. Testing methods |
| | 35. Administration of tests |
| | 36. Learning which took place |

Lesson 29. Title, Parkinson's Disease (2). Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading B

Planning Abilities

Complete Agreement

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Plan of intent | Appropriate |
| 2. Lesson objectives | Appropriate |
| 3. Variation in activity | |
| 4. Sequencing | |
| 5. Variation in student ability | Appropriate |
| 6. Combination of content and method | Appropriate |
| 7. Aids used | |
| 8. Demonstration | |
| 9. Management of environment | Appropriate |

Performance Abilities

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 10. Opening the lesson | Very appropriate |
| 11. Statement of lesson objectives | Very appropriate |
| 12. Appearance | |
| 13. Tone of voice | |
| 14. Personality | |
| 15. Eye contact | |
| 16. Questioning | Appropriate |
| 17. Aids used | Appropriate |
| 18. Discussion | Appropriate |
| 19. Explanation | |
| 20. Analogy | Appropriate |
| 21. Group work | Appropriate |
| 22. Role play | Appropriate |
| 23. The level of lesson | Appropriate |
| 24. The pace of the lesson | |
| 25. Adapting to individual student need | |
| 26. Checks on learning | |
| 27. Lesson summary | Appropriate |

Social Relationships

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 28. The learning environment created | |
| 29. Students attitude to the class | |
| 30. Attitudes of class to student | |
| 31. Degree of rapport | |
| 32. Use of language | Appropriate |
| 33. The classroom management | Appropriate |

Post Performance Analysis

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 34. Testing methods | Appropriate |
| 35. Administration of tests | Appropriate |
| 36. The learning which took place | Appropriate |

Lesson 29

Agreed grading B

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|---------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 1. | Plan of intent |
| | 2. | Lesson objectives |
| | 5. | Variation in student ability |
| | 6. | Combination of content & method |
| | 9. | Management of environment |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 10. | Opening the lesson |
| | 11. | Statement of lesson objectives |
| | 16. | Questioning |
| | 17. | Aids used |
| | 18. | Discussion |
| | 20. | Analogy |
| | 21. | Group work |
| | 22. | Role play |
| | 23. | Level of the lesson |
| | 24. | Pace of the lesson |
| | 27. | Lesson summary |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 32. | Use of language |
| | 33. | Classroom management |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 34. | Testing methods |
| | 35. | Administration of tests |
| | 36. | Learning which took place |

Lesson 33. Title, Mental Health. Assessor, Nurse. Agreed Grading CPlanning AbilitiesComplete Agreement

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Plan of intent | |
| 2. Lesson objectives | |
| 3. Variation in activity | Not very appropriate |
| 4. Sequencing | |
| 5. Variation in student ability | Not very appropriate |
| 6. Combination of content and method | |
| 7. Aids used | |
| 8. Demonstration | |
| 9. Management of environment | |

Performance Abilities

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 10. Opening the lesson | |
| 11. Statement of lesson objectives | |
| 12. Appearance | Very appropriate |
| 13. Tone of voice | |
| 14. Personality | |
| 15. Eye contact | |
| 16. Questioning | Not very appropriate |
| 17. Aids used | |
| 18. Discussion | |
| 19. Explanation | |
| 20. Analogy | |
| 21. Group work | |
| 22. Role play | |
| 23. The level of lesson | |
| 24. The pace of the lesson | Not very appropriate |
| 25. Adapting to individual student need | Appropriate |
| 26. Checks on learning | Appropriate |
| 27. Lesson summary | |

Social Relationships

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 28. The learning environment created | Appropriate |
| 29. Students attitude to the class | |
| 30. Attitudes of class to student | Appropriate |
| 31. Degree of rapport | |
| 32. Use of language | |
| 33. The classroom management | |

Post Performance Analysis

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 34. Testing methods | |
| 35. Administration of tests | Not very appropriate |
| 36. The learning which took place | Appropriate |

Lesson 33

Agreed grading C

Planning abilities (n9)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 3. | Variation in activity |
| | 5. | Variation in student ability |

Performance abilities (n18)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 12. | Appearance |
| | 16. | Questioning |
| | 24. | Pace of the lesson |
| | 26. | Checks on learning |
| | 27. | Lesson summary |

Social relationships (n6)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 28. | Learning environment created |
| | 30. | Attitude of the class to the student |

Post performance analysis (n3)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Agreement with Variable | 34. | Testing methods |
| | 36. | Learning which took place |

Table H

Data Demonstrating Assessor's Written Comments

Lessons (N 36) Statements	Planning 1-9	Perf. 10-27	S/Rel. 28-33	P/P/A 34-36	Profession	Grade Awarded
Intracerebral pressure					Physicist	B
Homeostasis					Nurse	
Hearing					Nurse	B
Observations					Nurse	A
Arthritis		X	X		Nurse	B
Labelling					Engineer	-
Diabetic surgery					Physicist	B
Acute psych. nursing	X	X	X		Mathematician	A
Catheter update		X			Nurse	B
					Nurse	A
Oxygen therapy		X			Nurse	B
Counselling					Nurse	B
Breast surgery					Nurse	A
Patient hygiene			X		Nurse	A
Bereavement (1)					Nurse	B
Controlling body temp					Nurse	B
Bereavement (2)					Nurse	B
Blood cells	X	X			Nurse	B
Parkinson's disease (1)		X	X		Nurse	A
Violence					Nurse	A
Children in hospital	X	X	X	X	Psychologist	A
Assertiveness (1)		X			Educationalist	B
Diabetes			X		Nurse	B
A balanced diet		X	X		Nurse	A
Schools of psychology		X	X		Nurse	A
Abortion		X	X		Mathematician	B
Leukaemia					Nurse	A
Peptic ulceration					Nurse	C
Ward orientation					Nurse	A
Parkinson's disease (2)					Nurse	B
Essay writing			X		Nurse	A
Abdominal					Nurse	B
Epistaxis					Nurse	A
Mental health	X				Nurse	C
Diabetes					Physicist	A
Pain control					Physicist	A
Assertiveness (2)					Physicist	A

Planning	4 comments	Lessons	8, 17, 20, 33
Performance	11 comments	Lessons	5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25
Social relationships	10 comments	Lessons	5, 8, 13, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30
Post performance analysis	1 comment	Lesson	20

Data Demonstrating Student Nurse Teacher's Written Comments

Lessons (N 36) Statements	Planning 1-9	Perf. 10-27	S/Rel. 28-33	P/P/A 34-36	Grade Awarded to Self
Intracerebral pressure		X			C
Homeostasis	X	X			-
Hearing					B
Observations	X	X	X	X	-
Arthritis					-
Labelling	X	X			B
Diabetic surgery					-
Acute psych. nursing					-
Catheter update	X				B
Oxygen therapy					-
Counselling					B
Breast surgery					B
Patient hygiene	X	X			B
Bereavement (1)					B
Controlling body temp					B
Bereavement (2)					B
Blood cells	X	X		X	B
Parkinson's disease (1)	X	X	X	X	B
Violence					-
Children in hospital					A
Assertiveness (1)					B
Diabetes					B
A balanced diet	X	X			B
Schools of psychology	X	X			B
Abortion					-
Leukaemia	X				-
Peptic ulceration	X				-
Ward orientation	X	X			B
Parkinson's disease (2)					B
Essay writing	X	X			B
Abdominal					-
Epistaxis	X	X			-
Mental health					C
Diabetes					B
Pain control					-
Assertiveness (2)					-

Planning	14 comments	Lessons	2, 4, 6, 9, 13, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32
Performance	12 comments	Lessons	1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 17, 18, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32
Social relationships	2 comments	Lessons	4, 18
Post performance analysis	3 comments	Lessons	4, 17, 18

Definition of Grades Awarded

- A Extremely suitable choice of content and method. Clear structured material, exceptionally sensitive management of the whole class. Understands and is responsible to the student's needs. Evaluates learning effectively.
- B Suitable choice of content and method. Clear structured material, sensitive oversight of whole class. Demonstrates good relationships with the student. Attempts to evaluate learning.
- C Limited attempt to choose appropriate content and method. Suitable evidence of structure but this became muddled at times. Inconsistency in class management but some attempt made to recognise student's needs. Little evidence of evaluating learning.
- D Poor understanding of content and method. Material inappropriate and inaccurate with little evidence of planning. Fails to manage the class as a whole or fails or evaluate learning.

GUIDELINES FOR CLINICAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA DOCUMENT

Four levels of competency have been identified, each of which carries a description which is used to describe the performance of each specific clinical objective, which is essential for the unit of learning.

These four levels are labelled: Independent (I), Acceptable (A), Marginal (M), Dependent (D). The criteria for competence are divided into three areas:

1. Standard and procedures for the behaviour
2. Qualitative aspects of the performance
3. Assistance needed to perform the behaviour

1. **STANDARD:** The standard is interpreted in terms of SAFETY, ACCURACY, EFFECTIVENESS and ATTITUDE. This implies application of knowledge, psychomotor skill and appropriate attitudes when actions are performed related to the objective which is stated, within the context of the situation.

SAFE behaviour includes both physical and psychological aspects. The criteria for safety is that the behaviour does not cause harm by an action or an omission.

ACCURACY is assessed by the extent to which knowledge is applied in psychomotor and verbal, non-verbal or written communication.

EFFECTIVENESS refers to the achievement of the intended purpose of the behaviour.

ATTITUDE refers to the manner and demeanour of the student in the context of the situation.

2. **QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE:** This is based on the degree of skill in the behaviours related to the objective including co-ordination, ease of performance, economical use of time and equipment and the extent to which the student focuses on the patient.
3. **ASSISTANCE:** This refers to the AMOUNT AND TYPE of assistance required to demonstrate the behaviour. Cues can be directive or supportive and may be verbal or practical. They refer to what is necessary to maintain or promote the performance.

Each of these areas is observed simultaneously and must be taken together to determine the level of performance which could be expected at a future time in a similar situation. The behaviours are rated at the lowest level which is identified for any of the three areas.

SCALE	STANDARD	QUALITY	ASSISTANCE
Independent (I)	Safe Accurate Effective Attitude appropriate Each time	Confident & co-ordinated Economical use of time Able to focus particularly on the patient and responds to subtle cues	Minimal directive and supportive cues
Acceptable (A)	Safe Accurate Effective Attitude appropriate Most of the time	Some degree of confidence & co-ordination Reasonable use of time Usually focuses on the patient	Requires some directive and supportive cues
Marginal (M)	Some at risk actions or inaccuracies Effective Attitude appropriate Some of the time	Sometimes lacks confidence and co-ordination Some difficulty with timing Rarely able to focus on patient	Frequent directive and supportive cues
Dependent (D)	Frequent at risk actions and inaccuracies OR Attitudes often inappropriate	Lacking in confidence and co-ordination Difficulty with timing Rarely able to focus on patient	Continuous directive and supportive cues
X	Not observed or no opportunity to perform		

Jean Williams, February 1989 (adapted from K. Bondy 1983 & Williams 1988)

SCALE	STANDARD	QUALITY	ASSISTANCE
Independent (I)	Safe Accurate Effective Attitude appropriate Each time	Chooses extremely suitable content Chooses extremely suitable method Uses clear structured material Manages the whole class sensitively Understands student needs Responds to student needs Evaluates learning effectively	Minimal directive and supportive cues
Acceptable (A)	Safe each time Accurate Effective Attitude appropriate Most of the time	Chooses suitable content Chooses suitable method Uses clear structured material Sensitive oversight of the class Demonstrates good relationships Attempts to evaluate learning	Requires some directive and supportive cues
Marginal (M)	Some at risk actions and inaccuracies Effective Attitude appropriate Some of the time	Limited attempt to choose suitable content Limited attempt to choose suitable method Uses unclear, unstructured material Demonstrates inconsistency in class- room management Attempts to maintain good relationships Attempts to evaluate learning	Frequent directive and supportive cues
Dependent (D)	Frequent at risk actions Inaccurate Ineffective Attitude inappropriate	Failed to choose suitable content Failed to choose suitable method Uses unclear, unstructured material Unable to manage the class Fails to maintain good relationships Fails to evaluate learning	Continuous directive and supportive cues
X	Not observed No opportunity to perform		