

Professional Behavior Assessment: Building and Measuring Professionalism in Preservice Teachers

Kim Stoddard
Lyman Dukes III

Bonnie Braun
Mark A. Koorland

Margaret Hewitt
University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Influenced by national accreditation mandates, teacher preparation programs are beginning to examine more carefully the assessment and instruction of preservice teachers' professional behaviors and dispositions. We conducted a pilot evaluation to examine the outcomes of specialized instruction regarding professional behavior for preservice teachers in special education. The evaluation employed field setting supervisor ratings for each of eight preservice teachers. Field supervisor assessments occurred at six points during the semester. Four students were assigned to a special section of a normally required seminar in which we explicitly taught characteristics of basic professional behavior. Four other students were assigned to a typical seminar associated with the field experience offering didactic instruction alone about professional behavior. During specialized instruction students read, discussed, and authored their own hypothetical case studies about preservice students, and they rated the cases using both a faculty developed Professional Behavior Assessment (PBA) instrument and rubrics. Field supervisor ratings using the same PBA instrument did not clearly support one training approach over the other. Preservice teachers, however, reported that the discussion and rating of case studies provided a much clearer understanding of professional behavior. The challenges of performing reliable evaluation of growth in teacher professional behavior are discussed.

Key Words: Professional Behavior, Dispositions, Teacher Education, Assessment of Dispositions

The call came Friday afternoon from Ms. Miller, the principal at a middle school where we place our student teachers. She requested that LeeAnn not return to the school on Monday. She explained that because of LeeAnn's unprofessional behavior, she was no longer welcome in the school as a student teacher. It was not one error, according to Ms. Miller, but a combination of poor choices that resulted in the termination of the student teaching opportunity. Upon further query, Ms. Miller revealed that LeeAnn often arrived at 8:00 a.m. when the students' day was beginning rather than 7:15 when the teachers arrive. In addition, Ms. Miller reported that Mr. Anderson, her cooperating teacher, said that

on several occasions LeeAnn refused to conduct a lesson for his math class, and when challenged by a lesson she was presenting, she stopped teaching and asked Mr. Anderson to finish. Further, LeeAnn complained to other teachers that she thought Mr. Anderson was never available to answer questions or explain the expectations for the following school day.

The deciding factor, according to the principal, occurred that morning when LeeAnn asked her to unlock Mr. Anderson's classroom, as he was not available to do so. During the walk to the room, LeeAnn complained that Mr. Anderson often left her standing outside the room in the morning, that she never knew where he was, and that

he seemed to be too busy for her. Ms. Miller told LeeAnn it would be best that she finish her student teaching elsewhere.

LeeAnn seemed shocked by Ms. Miller's comments and insulted that she thought she displayed unprofessional behavior. She defended her late arrival, noting that when she arrived early Mr. Anderson was never there. When she refused to teach a lesson, it was not done in defiance, but because he provided it at the last minute. She was unsure what to do and thought she needed his help. In her opinion, her comments to other teachers and to the principal regarding Mr. Anderson were justified. She did not recognize that her actions, viewed in their entirety, were unprofessional. Circumstances like LeeAnn's prompted the authors to carefully examine the entry-level professional behavior of our preservice teachers.

Professional Behavior

Can the intrinsic characteristics of professional behavior be influenced by experiences provided during a teacher preparation program, or are an individual's past experiences and cultural upbringing so strongly influential that little change is ever evident (Noddings, 1996)? Within teacher preparation programs, specific teaching skills, strategies, and teacher expertise necessary to improve student achievement have been well defined and researched (Moore, 2000; Sullivan, 1999). Teaching practices proven effective for student populations representing various cultural groups are also well documented (Dillon, 1989; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990). The professional behavioral practices of protocol, ethics, and procedures (Bruneau, 1998) have only recently been addressed in teacher education programs. The challenge is twofold: 1) determining what is meant by professional and ethical behavior in teaching and 2) making a decision about how best to

implement this value-laden curriculum within the program.

Defining Professional Behavior

Professional behavior for educators is often defined as the process in which an individual engages while making ethical or moral decisions regarding dilemmas that occur as part of the act of teaching. Bridges (as cited in Ben-Peretz, 2001) contends that teachers must follow an implied professional code of conduct. Beyer (1997) goes one step further and defines moral behavior as the thinking that takes place in determining what is the correct thing to do in a situation when there are differing actions and incongruent philosophical underpinnings for each of these actions. Another understanding of the "disposition" towards professionalism is the empathic disposition; that is, responding sensitively to a student based on that individual's perspective rather than the teacher's own perspective. Darling-Hammond (2000) suggests that this characteristic is critical to the success of a teacher in urban diverse schools.

Although some professional behaviors appear to be so basic that they seem to be obvious, those skills may be the most difficult to teach. The more ambiguous entry level professional behaviors of teaching include "getting along with colleagues," showing initiative, being tactful with comments, and "fitting into the workplace," and are often overlooked or not specifically addressed in many teacher preparation programs (Stoddard, Braun, & Hewitt, 2003). A review of early childhood curriculums in institutes of higher education (Freeman & Brown, 1996) indicated an increased interest in ethical issues and professionalism in the early 1980s with diminishing interest into the 1990s. In a 1995 survey of early childhood teacher educators, only three hours of class time were devoted to matters of ethics and

professionalism (Freeman & Brown, 1996). As Kipnis (1987) contends, the lack of emphasis on professional behavior may result from a perception that individuals drawn to the teaching profession possess stronger ethical characteristics than those in other professions.

More recently, there has been renewed interest in the practices of professional behavior. Those hiring new teachers, including personnel directors and administrators, often “bemoan the lack of civility, failure to respect others, [and] refusal to accept responsibility” (Hamberger & Moore, 1997 II 1). The importance of teaching preservice teachers to engage in behaviors such as appropriate professional collaboration and student advocacy is critical if the education system is to continue to evolve and meet the needs of all students. Not surprisingly, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) lists collaboration as one of the key elements of accomplished teaching (Helms, 2001).

Addressing Professional Behavior and Dispositions within the Teacher Education Curriculum

Teacher preparation programs are beginning to devote more attention to professional behavior with an emphasis on assessing student dispositions. National accrediting bodies have shifted from concern regarding attitudes toward evidence of dispositions. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2003) defined dispositions as “the values, commitments and professional ethics that influence behaviors.” Controversy continues regarding how best to actively teach students these proactive dispositions, because many preservice teachers appear to be strongly influenced by observing the practices of the cooperating/mentor teachers with whom they are placed (Huffman, Holifield, & Holifield, 2003; Yee, 1969). Various

approaches have been employed to influence professional behaviors, including direct instruction, expert advice, and a collaborative approach. Gonzalez Rodriguez & Sjostrom’s (1998) study of forty-five preservice elementary education majors used the collaborative approach effectively to improve professional behavior. Students wrote in reflective journals using topics based on individual responses from the previous week’s journals. The reflective journals helped the preservice teachers critically analyze their processes for teaching and making ethical decisions. The importance of providing opportunities to think critically and practice the skills of deliberation is critical to the success of imbuing empathic dispositions (McAllister & Irvine, 2002).

Teacher education programs such as the one at Indiana University (IU) have revised their curriculum to include a focus on social justice, practices with a moral inquiry base, implementation of democratic strategies, and activities that infuse several education disciplines (Beyer, 1997). The IU faculty believes that renewed emphasis on the discussion of moral dilemmas will assist preservice teachers in preparing for their careers.

Teaching About Professional Behavior and Assessment

The authors at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg realized that inappropriate professional behavior (e.g. lateness, inappropriate dress, lack of follow through) limited students’ professional development. Lack of knowledge about entry-level professional behavior seemed to be a contributing factor. We believed that student knowledge about the professional behavior we valued was a first step to developing professional dispositions, and subsequent changes in behavior. We sought to determine if teaching about professional

behaviors by using a professional behavior assessment instrument as part of instruction would help to make explicit the professional behaviors we valued.

After reviewing the literature and engaging teacher practitioners, preservice teachers and colleagues in discussion, we agreed upon the need for specific entry level professional behaviors within six domains. The six domains would serve as the core behaviors needed for preservice teachers to succeed in a school setting. Further, we believed that the core behaviors were necessary to develop initial rapport with students, colleagues, and the families/caregivers of the students in their student teaching settings. The six professional domains include the ability to: 1) demonstrate responsibility and punctuality, 2) react favorably to supervision, 3) demonstrate appropriate collaborative behavior with professionals and colleagues, 4) demonstrate organization and effort, while striving for excellence, 5) express enthusiasm and interest in teaching and class work, and 6) demonstrate ethical professional behavior and concern for children.

Subsequently, we sought to explore workable strategies for instruction about and measurement of the six domains. We wanted to determine whether explicit instruction based on the content and assessment of the six domains in a required on-campus practicum seminar would generalize to performance in a field-based practicum. We also wanted to compare the outcomes of the explicit seminar instruction to those of a seminar providing general instruction about professionalism without a focus on the assessment component. What follows are the evaluation strategies and findings.

Assessing Professional Behaviors

The Professional Behavior Assessment.

To evaluate the usefulness of instruction planned to create dispositions supporting professional behavior, a measurement strategy is required. Two elements are needed, a measurement instrument and measurement tactics. We developed a Professional Behavior Assessment (PBA) instrument (See Appendix 1) reflecting the six professional domains intended for instruction. Additionally, we used a three-point scale for describing student competency levels within each domain. Specifically, students in field placements would be rated in each PBA domain in terms of demonstrating a particular level of competency. The three levels were designated as, “Does not meet competency”, “Competent”, or “Competent plus.” The PBA requires raters to make judgments about observable behaviors that are stated in a manner requiring some inference on the rater’s part (e.g., recognizing and rating “reacts favorably to supervision” requires greater inference than a statement such as, “complies with all supervisor requests within twenty-four hours”). Because behavior descriptors required inference, carefully created rubrics were provided to assist raters in understanding the content and three possible levels of each professional domain.

For instructional purposes, raters received written scenarios about hypothetical students functioning at each of the three competency levels, as shown in Appendix 2. For example, in one scenario Julie, among other things, has been late three of five days each week. Therefore, in the domain titled “demonstrates responsibility and punctuality to class and teaching placement”, Julie would be rated as “does not meet competency” because lateness, to the extent portrayed in this

scenario, would represent “frequent tardiness”. Frequent tardiness is listed in the rubric for the “Does not meet competency” level. By using sample scenarios to prepare raters, a clearer understanding of the six domains and competency levels could be achieved. Additionally, a greater likelihood of consistency between raters occurs.

Measurement Tactics

Because we wanted to evaluate improvement over a semester, and compare the special seminar to the typical on-campus seminar, we choose to use a repeated measures strategy. The preservice students were rated using the PBA at equally spaced intervals during the semester to document each student’s progress in the six professional domains. Because supervising or cooperating teachers are typically asked to evaluate students at various points during the semester, repeated use of the PBA aligns with typical preservice supervision practices.

Pilot Use of the PBA with Repeated Measures

Participants. Participants included eight students in a preservice teacher preparation program, one male and seven females. Participant ages ranged from 21 to 35. All students were in the first year of their teacher preparation program. The practicum and co-requisite seminar were the first in a series of six field experiences. Students were placed in various elementary school classes for the practicum. The students were enrolled in a master’s level teacher preparation program that resulted in licensure in both elementary education and special education.

Supervising teachers. The eight supervisors (one for each preservice teacher) were certified public school elementary level teachers with a minimum of 5 years experience. All had taken a supervision

course required by the State Department of Education. These teachers received compensation in the form of free registration for university courses. All teachers had supervised preservice students during other semesters.

Professional Behavior Assessment. The Professional Behavior Assessment (PBA) was an instrument developed by the authors and described earlier. Within and across individuals the frequency of scorings in the various competency level categories was tabulated approximately every two weeks (i.e., six measures were obtained on each student during the fifteen week semester), and changes in competency level ratings were noted over the semester. The hypothesis was that if students progressed in developing their professional behavior competency, then one would expect to see over time progressively more scorings in the “Competent plus” category across the six professional domains.

Evaluation Strategy

Repeated Measures Multiple Baseline Design. A modification of a repeated measures multiple baseline design across students was used. In general, a multiple baseline design is employed in single subject research when it is desirable to note change across individuals, behaviors, or settings at different points in time. The design is useful for monitoring individuals, and for noting whether an intervention creates change in an outcome measure when a return to baseline or before treatment condition is considered undesirable or impossible (Alberto & Troutman, 2003; Gay, 1987). Typically, multiple baseline designs use three or more sets of repeated measures across individuals, behaviors or settings. For our evaluation, because of the availability of only two sets of students, repeated PBA measures of four students in the specialized seminar were compared to

the repeated PBA measures of the other four students in the traditionally taught seminar.

For each student, supervising teachers completed the PBA six times during the semester. PBA's were scheduled so all eight students received PBA ratings in their practicum sites at the same points during the semester.

Both seminars ran concurrently and instruction in both began with similar content, but after the fourth week of the fifteen-week semester, instruction for four students in one of the seminar sections changed to focus explicitly about the PBA professional behavior domains. The students in the other seminar section received instruction about professional behavior; however, no instruction about the PBA and its specifics were provided. The instructor in the specialized seminar taught using scenarios and required students to use a PBA to rate the hypothetical students in the scenarios as part of their lessons. An outline of the instruction for the seminars using the PBA appears below.

Seminar 1. The instructor introduced and gave a rationale for the lesson to ensure that students understood what was meant by professional behavior. The instructor distributed the PBA, explaining its parts and domains, and then stated, "Today we're going to see what you believe is or is not professional behavior. Read the case study of Patrick and complete the PBA to the best of your ability." After students had accomplished this, the instructor reviewed answers. "For scenario #1, does Patrick score 'does not meet competency', 'competent', or 'competent plus'?" Then the instructor requested, "Tell me what behavior indicators tell you Patrick is competent in Domain 1." Students were prompted by the instructor to make another choice if they had made an inappropriate choice about a PBA category and a short discussion was held about why students should consider

rethinking their answer. The instructor followed the same procedure for each domain.

Seminar 2. The instructor reviewed the main ideas from the previous seminar. "Last session we went over Patrick's scenario and his sense of Professional Behavior". Today we're going to examine Emily's case." The instructor followed the same procedure for Emily as for Patrick above.

Seminar 3. The instructor reviewed what had occurred in the last seminar. "Last session we discussed over Emily's situation and her sense of professional behavior. Today we're going to investigate Julie's case." The instructor followed the same procedure used for the Patrick and Emily scenarios. Students were asked to create a scenario and a PBA answer key for a hypothetical case study as an assignment for the next session.

Seminar 4. The instructor selected one student to distribute his/her case study. The other students analyzed and scored the case study. The instructor reviewed the answers. The author took the lead and explained the rationale for selection of choices.

Seminar 5, 6, & 7. The instructor followed the procedure of Seminar 4 with another student sharing a case study. This procedure was repeated for each subsequent seminar.

Final Comments on the Method. Because only four students received the specialized content beginning the fourth week of the semester, we believed that if the field-based measures for those students in the specialized seminar demonstrated a change in level or trend after PBA-focused instruction began, compared to the measures of those in conventional instruction, then the specialized instruction was likely to have influenced the professional behaviors. Because the scenarios with PBA-based

instruction occurred at the same time for four students, it is only possible to note outcomes of the specialized instruction once for each of those students in this pilot. Consequently, it is impossible to evaluate the influence of the PBA-based lessons with much confidence. Nevertheless, any noted change in the students receiving PBA-based lessons exceeding that of the students receiving typical instruction about professional behaviors could provide some support for further work and evaluation efforts.

Findings

Students received baseline PBA ratings in their field placements before specialized instruction in the on-campus seminar actually began (i.e., during the first three meetings of the specialized seminar in which instruction was conventional and did not use the scenarios and PBA rating activities). Interestingly, and not surprisingly, some students received “Competent Plus” ratings from the very beginning: two of the four students in the PBA-based seminar and one of the four in the conventional seminar obtained the highest rating in most if not all categories. Unfortunately, encountering a measurement ceiling meant that no further growth would be detectable for those students, and we would not be able to evaluate growth in PBA ratings. Consequently, only three students in the conventionally trained group and two students in the specialized seminar offered us the opportunity to observe score increases. All of these students, at the beginning of the semester scored three or fewer competency plus ratings.

Upon receiving the specialized training, both low scoring students in that group did, in fact, show an increase in the number of competency plus scorings, obtaining five and six competent plus ratings

(out of six possible) by the end of the semester. Of the three initial low scorers in the conventional seminar only one improved over the semester, and achieved five competent plus ratings. In the conventional group two of the three initial low scorers scored zero and one competency plus rating at the end of the semester. The third low scorer never exceeded two competency plus ratings.

In summary, both of the initial low scorers in the specialized seminar scored high by their last field observation. Only one of the three initial low scorers in the conventional group scored high by the last observation. While a positive score pattern might be associated with membership in the specialized seminar group, unfortunately, because of the measurement limitations, no clear conclusion about the influence of such training on fostering professional behavior can be drawn.

Discussion

This pilot evaluation prompts a number of observations about our assessment and specialized training. First, the need for sensitive measures exists. Our measurement system possessed only three rating levels within each professional behavior domain, limiting its utility in accurately describing student improvement. Our initial thinking focused on the perceived advantages of simplicity, and that a system with fewer gradations would facilitate preparation of the supervising teachers in the field sites while producing greater scoring reliability. We now believe a need exists for examining use of varied point scales for rating professional behavior.

Clearly, difficulties with instrument reliability and sensitivity need to be addressed. In the future, more preparation of the field supervisors in PBA use is warranted. Professionals involved in teacher

preparation must also consider the inherent challenges imposed in asking field-based supervisors to rate the professional conduct of student interns. Some challenges are related to evaluator beliefs that may interfere with use of a particular evaluation instrument. For example, some teachers believe that a student cannot or should not show growth until the end of the semester. Others believe it is wise to give student teachers the benefit of the doubt and initially rate students liberally while overlooking problems. Although the supervisor may intend to be supportive of the student, providing an inflated initial rating makes the instrument problematic for showing growth in professional behavior. Other beliefs or values about the rating activity also are influential.

Rater regard for the importance of the rating activity can influence outcomes. Careful rater instruction can, to some extent, address the necessity of rating, however, today's classroom demands can negatively affect the time teachers allocate to student-teacher rating and supervising responsibilities. We asked raters to rate the preservice teachers six times. Use of a greater number of repeated measures may be needed to increase the sensitivity of the rating process, but increased work demands on supervising teachers can adversely affect cooperation. An area for future research may be exploring teacher beliefs about rating student teachers and perhaps using that information in a diagnostic fashion to tailor teacher supervisor preparation about the importance and helpfulness of realistic appraisals of student professionalism.

Second, elementary education students come to teacher preparation programs with widely varying experiences and dispositions toward the world of work and professionalism. Pre-assessment, even before field site placement, may help to identify those students who have developed

a professional orientation to operating in field sites. Often an excellent predictor of professional behavior is previous volunteer experiences with students in the schools before entering a preservice program. Providing differentiated experiences for preservice teachers may be more appropriate when great differences are observed in students during the early stages of field placement. Exploring pre-assessment and differentiated instruction in a systematic fashion would be appropriate for future research.

Third, teacher preparation, or our best lessons, may not be as powerful a variable as believed for certain knowledge, skills, or dispositions. In fact, evidence suggests that upon entering the classroom, induction-level teachers often revert to instructional behavior used either by a cooperating teacher during the internship period or use instructional behaviors that exist in memory of their own schooling (Lampert & Ball, 1999). Lortie (1975) describes this predilection for the use of previously learned instructional methods as a function of the "apprenticeship of observation." That is, students spend at least twelve years observing traditional instructional methodology, and the durability of this experience should not be underestimated.

Last, preservice teachers reported that they acquired greater understanding of the expectations for classroom teachers. From the outset the preservice teachers demonstrated clarity regarding the difference between not meeting expectations of a PBA domain area and being competent in an area. The apprentices, however, had much less appreciation of the difference between being competent and being outstanding (i.e., "Competent Plus"). For example, initially the students believed that arriving at their school placements on time and remaining until work hours ended

qualified as outstanding, or “Competent Plus” behavior. Preservice teachers were surprised to learn that our perception about competent plus performance meant the student teacher would need to arrive early and/or stay past required work hours in order to meet the “Competent Plus” designation. The preservice teachers reported that the opportunity to examine case studies and to develop and dialogue about case studies developed by other students resulted in improved understanding of what constitutes a high-quality teacher. Preservice teachers reported that learning about and engaging in class activities that highlighted the professional behavior domains positively influenced their professional classroom behavior. Furthermore, the preservice teachers indicated that the case study method for instruction in professional behavior should be used with all preservice teachers at our institution.

Clearly more work is needed in developing and assessing the professional behavior dispositions that teacher preparation programs value. Without consistent assessment and measurement tools, further questioning and subsequent answers about the usefulness of the teacher education curriculum and pedagogy will be difficult. Teacher preparation programs benefit from operating in a reflective manner to continually improve and serve the needs of preservice teachers and their eventual employers. Assessment systems must be able, moreover, to support the increased demands on teacher preparation programs to demonstrate the usefulness of their instructional activity.

References

- Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2003). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2001). The impossible role of teacher educators in a changing world. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 48-56.
- Beyer, L. E. (1997). The moral contours of teacher education. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(4), 245-256.
- Bruneau, S. (1998). Adding PEP (Protocol, Ethics, and Policies) to the preparation of new professionals. *Ethics and Behavior*, 8(3), 249-267. Retrieved March 6, 2005, from <http://www.questia.com>.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 166-173.
- Dillon, D. R. (1989). Showing them that I want them to learn and that I care about who they are: A microethnography of the social organization of a secondary low track English-reading classroom. *American Education Research Journal*, 26(2), 227-259.
- Freeman, N., & Brown, M. (1996). Ethics instruction for preservice teachers: How are we doing in ECE? *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 17(2), 5-18.
- Gay, L. R. (1987). *Educational research* (4th ed.). New York: Merrill.
- Gonzalez Rodriguez, Y. E. & Sjostrom, B. R. (1998). Critical reflection for professional development: A comparative study of nontraditional adult and traditional student teachers. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(3), 177-183.
- Hamberger, N. M. & Moore, R. L, Jr., (1997). From personal to professional values: Conversations about conflicts. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, 4, 301-310. Retrieved March 6, 2005, from <http://www.questia.com>

- Helms, R. G. (2001). NBPTS: The highest form of certification. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 38(1), 20-23.
- Huffman, S., Holifield, M., & Holifield, A. (2003). Student management: Teacher interns wrestling with assumptions. *Education*, 124(1), 120-124.
- Kipnis, K. (1987). How to discuss professional ethics. *Young Children*, 42(4), 26-30.
- Lampert, M., & Ball, D. L. (1999). Aligning teacher education with contemporary K-12 reform visions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315-340.
- McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2002). The role of empathy in teaching culturally diverse students: A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 5, 433-448.
- Moore, K. B. (2000). Successful and effective professional development. *Early Childhood Today*, 15(3), 14-16.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2003). *Program standards for Accreditation of schools, colleges and departments of education*. Washington DC: NCATE.
- Noddings, N. (1996). On community. *Educational Theory*, 46(3), 245-268.
- Stoddard, K., Braun, B., & Hewitt, M. (2003, November) *Making a Difference: Providing a Path to the Heart of Teaching*. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children. Biloxi, Mississippi.
- Sullivan, B. (1999). Professional development: The linchpin of teacher quality. *ASCD Infobrief* 18. Retrieved March 6, 2005, from <http://www.questia.com>
- Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60(4), 327-332.

About the Authors

Kim Stoddard, Ph.D. is an associate professor of special education in the College of Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of Florida.

Bonnie Braun, Ph.D. is Coordinator of Clinical Experiences for the College of Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. She earned her Ph.D. in Special Education from the University of South Florida Tampa.

Lyman L. Dukes III, Ph.D. is an assistant professor of special education in the College of Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Connecticut.

Mark A. Koorland, Ph.D. is a professor of special education in the College of Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Florida.

Margaret Hewitt, Ph.D. is an associate professor in the Department of Childhood Education in the College of Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of South Florida.

Appendix 1. Professional Behavior Assessment Instrument.

Professional Behavior Assessment						
Please circle the appropriate observation number:						
Observation:	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six

- Instructions:**
- 1) Please mark each domain for level of competency.
 - 2) This information is confidential.

Professional Domain	Does not meet	Competent	Competent Plus
Demonstrates responsibility and punctuality to class and teaching placement	Excessive absences, frequent tardiness	Regular attendance, Does not leave early	Shows initiative by giving more time than designated for class
Reacts favorably to supervision	Tends to reject or does not follow constructive criticism	Follows through on suggestions	Receptive and responsive to suggestions / exhibits positive attitude
Demonstrates appropriate collaborative behavior with professionals and colleagues	Does not participate in team interaction / exhibits negative attitude	Participates positively in team interaction but does not initiate	Respects others opinions / supports group-problem solving / encourages positive interactions / maintains confidentiality
Demonstrates organization and effort; Strives for excellence	Assignments are generally late or incomplete	Assignments are on time and meet minimum requirements	Demonstrates initiative, resourcefulness, higher-level thinking, creativity and reflective thought in teaching and assignments
Expresses enthusiasm and interest in teaching and class work	Lack of effort, no enthusiasm in teaching or class work	Demonstrates effort and interest in teaching and class work	Consistently maintains high interest and enthusiasm for class work and teaching
Demonstrates ethical professional behavior and concern for children and their families	Engages in "gossip"; complains about school problems and issues related to students / families	Attempts to problem solve and is not involved in negative communication about school / students / families	Displays professional behavior and collegiality; acts as child advocate; proactively seeks solutions for school problems / challenging students, families

Appendix 2. Scenarios of Hypothetical Preservice Students.

Patrick

Patrick is a student teacher in a third grade classroom and has been in his placement for six weeks. The teacher's day starts at 7:15 am and Patrick always arrives promptly at 7:15. His mentor teacher has observed him twice, finding that Patrick read all her suggestions and even asked for further explanation regarding classroom management to ensure he understood what the mentor teacher meant by "withitness." He has attended team meetings with his teacher and observes all that happens during the team meeting. He hands in assignments to his university on time and demonstrates considerable creativity and reflective thought. It was obvious Patrick spent considerable time in his efforts to complete the assignments and used the Internet for additional resources on two of the projects. He has attended one family conference with his teacher regarding a student who is exhibiting aggressive behavior in the classroom. He listened to the family member's point of view and worked with the family member to create a solution that will reduce the aggressive behavior. Patrick was observed by his university supervisor to be very enthusiastic in his presentation of the lesson. Clearly, Patrick is passionate about teaching.

Emily

Emily is a student teacher in a third grade classroom and has been in the class for nine weeks. She always arrives at school on time and stays until the teacher day ends. Because of her work schedule, she leaves as soon as teachers are allowed to depart to get to her job. Her mentor teacher has observed her four times and is concerned that Emily is not listening to the teacher's post observation suggestions. The mentor teacher believes Emily has some good basic skills, but needs improvement. Emily tends to defend and rationalize why a particular incident occurred rather than reflect on it and try to improve the situation. Because of her work schedule, Emily still has not had much opportunity to work with other staff. She seems afraid of some of the teachers and has not really tried to get to know them. This has resulted in some miscommunication and negative feelings between Emily and some of the teachers. Emily's assignments are always completed and turned in on time. However, she never seems to go above and beyond what is required. She seems tired a great deal of the time during the school day and although her lessons are complete they lack enthusiasm. Her after-school job, which requires her to work until 2:00 am every day, may be the cause. She also seems impatient with some of the more challenging students and believes that poor parenting causes most of her students' problems.

Julie

Julie is a student teacher in a fifth grade classroom and has been there for four weeks. She has had car trouble the first few weeks and has been late three out of five days each week. Her mentor teacher has observed her one time. Julie listened intently and improved her teaching behaviors based on her teacher's feedback. She has shown excellent leadership skills during team meetings. She has taken the lead on a few activities and assisted the team in creating some wonderful learning activities. Julie's car trouble has also affected her timeliness with assignments. She forgets or hands in assignments late. She seems to be giving a good effort in the classroom and seems interested in the topics she has covered thus far. She has shown impressive leadership relative to the needs of her students. She is an advocate for her children at the team meetings and states the case for each student in an articulate and professional manner.