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ABSTRACT

In the latter part of the 1980's, contracting by the Correctional Service of Canada with private and public institutions accelerated. This contracting included provision of educational programs. Therefore, as a result of a new emphasis upon Canadian literacy education during the same period, there arose a need to select numbers of contract personnel who would be effective in prison adult basic education teaching.

Subsequently, eighteen teachers in the Ontario and Pacific Regions of the Correctional Service of Canada were subjects of a study that sought information about effectiveness criteria to assist in the selection of teachers for prison adult basic education teaching. The Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors rating instrument established an upper quartile that identified five prison adult basic education teachers perceived as most effective, and a lower quartile of five prison adult basic education teachers perceived as least effective. Teachers completed the Demographic Data Questionnaire, providing information about academic education, teaching experience, additional training and education, and certification. They then participated in a structured, oral interview, the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey, responding to questions about their teaching strategies and their personal beliefs regarding the effects of prison education. Three experienced correctional educators rated these responses according to criteria that
suggested possession of qualities such as sense of mission, structure, and empathy. Three teachers from the high group also responded to the Supplementary Questionnaire, which asked for their perceptions of their own schooling, relevant life experiences, and attitudes to their students as individuals.

Analysis of the results of the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors indicated statistically significant differentiation between the two groups on each of eleven criteria, with greatest differentiation for the criteria original, overall effective, adaptable, and stimulating. Analysis of responses to the Demographic Data Questionnaire showed that in the high group there was a greater percentage of teachers who had recently been involved in supplementary training and continuing education experiences. The low group of teachers possessed more years of experience in public/parochial school teaching than did teachers in the high group. The three correctional educators who rated the subject teachers' responses to the Correctional Teachers Interview Survey found that the teachers in the high group scored better on the characteristics clarity, desire to help students grow, structure, and empathy than did teachers in the low group. Analysis revealed that both the students who rated the eighteen teachers on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors instrument and the three correctional educators who rated the responses of the same teachers to the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey had, according to these ratings, similarly placed eight of the ten subject teachers in their respective high and low groups. The
Supplementary Questionnaire revealed that three teachers from the high group possessed similar experiences in their personal and professional backgrounds and currently employed similar teaching strategies.

Findings from this study have suggested that teachers who are perceived effective may possess behavioral characteristics, life and work experiences, and similar teaching strategies that distinguish them from those who are perceived to be low in effectiveness. Appropriate application and interview techniques could be designed to elicit information about these distinguishing elements.
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Chapter I: Introduction

A. General Comments

Canadian prison documents from the nineteenth century contain some evidence of educational activity in Canada's first penitentiaries where clergymen were some of the first teachers of what is now termed literacy education. Subsequently, after the Penitentiary Commission Report of 1849 a teacher was hired to work under the supervision of a chaplain. From that time, some forms of adult basic education instruction continued in Canadian penitentiaries (Correctional Service of Canada, 1987). By the 1950s, most of these institutions had personnel who were designated as teaching staff although many of them were vocational or trades teachers. However, by the 1970s, educational and training services were also provided by teachers from school boards, colleges, universities, or by individuals under the terms of personal service contracts with the Correctional Service of Canada.

The 1980's brought considerably more public attention to Canadian prison education. Partially as a result of a continuing public demand for improvements to the entire Canadian Justice system, the federal government declared in 1986 (Leblanc, 1986) that the achievement of functional literacy by all federal prisoners was a priority goal for the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). In order to meet this goal, the procedure of contracting with agencies for educational services, especially in adult basic education, was accelerated. The involvement of contract agencies in prison education was based on several assumptions, including one which indicated that these agencies would provide more expertise at less cost to
the CSC than services provided through increases in the direct hiring of teachers by the CSC (McKenzie, 1986). Therefore, school districts, community colleges, and private agencies became more heavily involved. This involvement made it necessary for these groups either to orient current personnel to correctional education or to hire new persons for this work. Thus, the identification of teachers who would prove to be effective as educators in a corrections setting became the responsibility of the administrators within these educational agencies.

Challenges encountered in the accomplishment of this task arose from several conditions. First, many of these administrators had had little first-hand experience in correctional education. Moreover, there was a dearth of relevant research to which they could refer for guidance in making prison programming decisions. Although the accumulated wisdom in the fields of public school, adult, and special education was available to them, these areas did not necessarily provide, even collectively, definitive answers to all prison adult basic education issues.

As I will review in the literature, there had already been criteria established for the selection of adult basic education instructors. Moreover, most agencies that became involved in adult basic education activity in corrections had had successful experiences in the field of adult basic education prior to their prison involvement. However, the question persisted: Do teachers in this new environment require some different or additional behaviors or characteristics for effective prison teaching?

Moreover, these administrators were unable to rely on hiring teachers with training that had been designed especially for the new endeavour. No correctional teacher training program existed at that time in Canada. A
professional group, the Correctional Education Association, included Canadians in its membership, but its growth in Canada up to this time had been slow.

Indeed, the growing numbers of teachers being hired for work in Canadian prisons represented all types of training activities and professional affiliations. This variety had contributed a broad range of expertise, but it had also injected the possibility of inconsistency into the process in terms of teachers' values, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors. In fact, the only criterion for hiring provided by the CSC in their contracts with educational agencies was one that eliminated a number of educators with adult education experience: Adult basic education teachers were required to have a valid teaching certificate.

Another situation that formed part of this entire scenario was the general perspective toward education held by many personnel in corrections. In fact, their primary interests included the security and good order of their institutions, not education. Therefore, any advice on hiring that came from this group would usually be influenced by those interests. Perhaps fortunately, the formal inclusion of CSC employees in any process for the selection of teachers who were employees of another agency was usually discouraged to avoid any suggestion of an employer/employee relationship between CSC and the contract agency. In addition, as the literature review will indicate, correctional policy regarding the overall purpose of prisons was routinely changing and was routinely affecting the expectations of prison education in different ways.

Although such policy was often subject to political and economic pressures, it appeared to many who were concerned about prison education that its best interests would be served when program strategies were
developed with reference to well-researched data on educational endeavours in prisons. In this way, correctional education might have an opportunity to be educational as well as correctional. In particular, the establishment of criteria for the selection of potentially effective teachers for prison programs required the attention of Canadian educators and researchers.

Even in the United States, where correctional education had had a longer and more extensive history, there had not been a large body of data on teacher effectiveness in prisons. Therefore, Miller's work, *A Study of Maryland Prison Teachers Perceived to be Effective*, was intended as a response to that lack (1987a). At the time of Miller's research, the Maryland State Department of Education had anticipated increased activity in prison education. Miller's purpose was to identify selection criteria and to develop a structured interview guide to aid in the hiring of teachers for the Maryland program.

B. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to build on Miller's work by using the instruments of her study, as well as some of her methods, and by applying them to a Canadian setting: adult basic education programs in two regions of the Correctional Service of Canada.

The undertaking of the current study was rationalized also in terms of the general need for some kind of structured interview for hiring prison teaching personnel. The literature on effective interviewing had indicated that selection criteria, especially those covering items of a non-factual nature, ought to be asked within structured, not informal, interviews. When interviewers ask the same questions in a routine manner, there is not only
less chance of discrimination, but also more chance of consistency between raters than in non-structured interviews. In addition, consistent interview criteria used in tandem with consistent evaluation procedures could assist agencies to continue to refine their selection procedures (Stewart and Cash, 1978). Under these conditions, quality-control in the recruitment and placement of prison adult basic education teachers could become a reality.

Although Miller was able to find behaviors and characteristics that discriminated between the high and low groups in her study, she was unable to generate sufficient data from which to develop a structured interview guide. For example, raters of responses to the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS) were unable to rate for patience and flexibility by means of the CTIS Guide; the interview questions did not seem to generate responses that adequately indicated those qualities. Therefore, I designed six additional questions which were used to interview three of the teachers from the group rated highly effective on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors. The purpose of including these additional questions in this study was to see if these questions, related to the actual experiences of the subjects, generated responses that could be rated in terms of specific behavioral characteristics such as empathy, flexibility, patience, etc., by three independent raters.

C. Research Questions

The current study sought information pertaining to these questions:

1. What characteristics/behaviors differentiate between two groups of Canadian adult basic education prison teachers, one that is rated high in effectiveness and one that is rated low in effectiveness on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors scale? The Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors is a scale
of perceived effectiveness in ten sets of variables — harsh/kindly, partial/fair, dull/stimulating, cursory/probing, inflexible/adaptable, autocratic/student-centred, evading/responsible, limited/knowledgeable, stereotyped/original, disorganized/systematic — as well as in overall effectiveness.

2. What differences are there between these high and low groups in terms of their length of experience in correctional, public school, or other kinds of teaching; their education and training; their other work experiences that were preparatory to teaching; and their recent professional development experiences?

3. What differences are there between these high and low groups in terms of specific behavioral characteristics that have been found to be relevant to prison teaching, such as the following: sense of mission, gestalt, sense of structure, patience, flexibility, rapport drive, desire to see students grow, investment, sense of efficacy, self-awareness, concern about social justice, empathy, understanding of disadvantaged students, clarity, capacity for goal setting, and positive expectations of students?

4. What past experiences relevant to their teaching, and what perceptions about their students and their work, do some teachers have in common who are in the group rated high in effectiveness?

D. Limitations of the Study

The most obvious limitation of this study is the size of both the initial sample, eighteen, and the size of the low and high in effectiveness groups: five. The time of year available for data collection in the Ontario Region, July and August, had meant that several potential subject teachers
had been replaced with substitutes who did not qualify as subjects because of limited time served. In addition, the level of classroom activity in adult basic education diminished during these months in some of the institutions.

Only three of these teachers were in charge of classrooms of female students, so that no generalizations or comparisons can be made regarding female students' perceptions as compared to male students' perceptions.

The inclusion of subject teachers from only two regions is also a limiting factor, in terms of the applications of the findings to other prison adult basic education classrooms in the Correctional Service of Canada, despite the fact that the overall program objectives for that entire system are the same. In addition, this study is limited to only contracted teachers: teachers who are employed by educational institutions that hold contracts to deliver educational services for the CSC.

Particularly with the demographic data, the small sample precluded any extensive statistical analysis. In addition, respondents to this questionnaire were not always able to remember specific details pertaining to their past experience or training, so that inaccuracy may be a factor in this self-reported data.

My own involvement in some of the adult basic education programming under study as well as in the conduct of this research may also present limitations. As this was an independent study, without research funding that might have permitted assistance in the administration of the ETR rating form or in the interviews, time and finances limited assistance of this kind. However, the practice of interviewing by colleagues who are themselves involved in these activities was an element common to both regions involved in the study; that is to say, a applicant is not usually
interviewed only by an outsider who is unknown to the applicant. Moreover, the cooperative and supportive way in which all respondents entered into this study has suggested that the quality of their participation was not affected in a negative way by my active involvement and that they viewed the study as an important venture in their field of work. With reference to the Supplementary Questionnaire, the open and enthusiastic manner of all participants was reflected in their responses.

The Supplementary Questionnaire was administered in an attempt to provide additional information about three teachers who had been perceived as effective by their students, their head teachers, and themselves. Their perspectives of their students, their working environments, and their own experiences are, of course, limited to their situations alone. Nevertheless, the wealth of insights from these subjects could add to earlier information on the same topics (Munby, 1983; Duguid, Ed., 1985).

E. Definition of Terms

Adult basic education: refers in this study to basic literacy, academic upgrading for high school completion or its equivalency, English language training, and employment orientation.

Adult education: "... describes a set of organized activities for mature men and women carried on by a wide variety of institutions for the accomplishment of specified educational objectives" (Malcolm Knowles)

Adult learner: "... an autonomous, experience laden, goal seeking, 'now' oriented, and problem-centred individual" (Adult Basic Education, 1987, p. 241)
Canadian justice system: the policies, institutions, and procedures for dealing with criminal offenders from the time of their arrest to their release from custody or supervision.

Case management team: "prison personnel directly involved with the offender in developing, revising, reviewing, and coordinating his/her scheduled plan of program activity" (Plecas, 1986, p. 87)

Cognitive skills: according to Ross and Fabiano, aspects of the thinking process that may be of either an impersonal nature ("dealing with the physical world and with time, movement and space") or an interpersonal one ("the capacity to understand people, and to solve interpersonal problems") (1985, pp. 35-36).

Contracted personnel: prison personnel who are not employed directly by the CSC, but who deliver services under the terms of a legal agreement either as individuals (personal service contracting) or through non-profit (e.g., an academic institution) or profit (e.g., a consultancy firm) organizations.

Core programming: term used by CSC to refer to programming that is considered fundamental to their offerings and, therefore, under national jurisdiction.

Correctional Service of Canada (CSC): the federal government agency responsible for administering the prison terms and conditional release of persons sentenced to two years or more (Plecas, 1986).

Corrections (lower case "c"): term commonly used provincially and federally to refer to the system assigned with the task of incarcerating all persons assigned to them by the courts.

Corrections (upper case "c"): used to refer to the Correctional Service of Canada.
Education and training programs: academic services ranging from literacy training to post-secondary courses and accredited vocational training. These services are delivered either by accredited CSC or contracted personnel.

Federal: in this study, refers to the Government of Canada.

Functional literacy: "the reading, writing, and arithmetic skills necessary to function adequately in his or her environment" (Thomas, 1976).

Head teacher: a teacher within a group of colleagues in one campus or prison location who is given responsibilities for communication within that group, for liaison with prison personnel, as well as with the administrators of the contract agency. In this study the term is used interchangeably with the term senior instructor.

Individualized instruction: "implies some degree of planned differentiation in the treatment of students in the same class" (Good & Brophy, 1984, p. 248). In the classrooms of this study, students work at their own rate, toward learning objectives established by the developers of the adult basic education program, although some instructors have developed learning materials and objectives relevant to individual student needs.

Life skills: program activity that may include training in post-release survival skills, communication skills, problem solving, anger management, parenting skills, and so on.

Living skills: the term used to refer to all programming in federal Corrections that involves some kind of training in the acquisition of skills that equip an individual to live and communicate in a productive manner and which may have been formerly referred to as life skills (Fabiano, 1989).
Prison: any institution which holds adults committed by the courts for illegal behavior for periods longer than a few days (Canadian Committee on Corrections, 1969, p. 307).

Prison education: opportunities in federal institutions for inmates who wish to improve literacy, obtain vocational skills, or achieve university credits.

Prisoners: term used to refer to, and usually preferred by, individuals who have been assigned to a correctional institution by the courts. The term is used interchangeably with the terms inmate and offender.

Programmed instruction: a teaching process in which the curriculum materials contain both directions to the student and subject content.

Provincial: in this study, pertains to one or all of the ten provinces of Canada.

Self-directed learning: a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes (Knowles, 1975, p. 18).

Senior instructor: a teacher within a group of colleagues in one campus or prison location who is given responsibilities for communication within that group, for liaison with prison personnel, as well as with the administrators of the contract agency. The term is used interchangeably in this study with the term head teacher.

Special programming: term used by CSC to refer to programming that responds to local or other special needs and, therefore, under local jurisdiction (i.e., under either a region or an institution).
Teacher/instructor: for purposes of this study, these terms are used as synonyms; however, the term instructor is used more frequently in community college literature than is the term teacher. Teacher: one who instructs, educates, trains, imparts knowledge; instructor: a college teacher ranking below an assistant professor.

F. Organization of the Study

Chapter II includes reviews of the following: the literature on the development of correctional education in Canada; and research and literature on teacher effectiveness, adult and adult basic education and prison teaching in the United States and Canada. Chapter III describes the methodologies used in the study. Analyses of all data are made in Chapter IV. Chapter V includes a summary of all findings, and, from these, conclusions and recommendations are made.
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review is divided into four parts. The first part focusses on the development and characteristics of federal correctional education in Canada. The second part reviews contemporary literature and research on teacher effectiveness. The third part examines literature on both adult education and adult basic education teaching from Canada and the United States. Finally, current literature and research pertaining to United States and Canadian prison teaching at both the adult basic education and the university levels are reviewed.

A. DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION IN CANADA: THE FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE

Miller (1987a) cited the work of Michael Reagen and Donald Stoughton in their School Behind Bars (1976) and of Albert R. Roberts in Sourcebook on Prison Education (1971) to review the history and development of correctional education in the United States. Although these works have not been discussed here, the background provided by her review was relevant to this study because, while Canadian law has been influenced by English precedent, Canadian penitentiaries were established according to the concepts originally set forth by American Quakers who saw prisons as a substitute for capital and corporal punishment.

Canadian penitentiary development, and indirectly the development of educational and social programming, has been recorded at frequent intervals by several Royal Commission and sub-committee reports to the Canadian Parliament since the British North America Act of 1867 put penitentiaries
under federal jurisdiction. In addition, documents prepared by the Correctional Service of Canada, including conference, public relations, and planning documents, offered considerable information on the development of policy regarding education within the Canadian system. Finally, an historical framework for this development was described in the work of Owens (1984).

Following the 1832 Report of the Commissioners on Penitentiaries, and the Penitentiary Act of 1834, Canada's first penitentiary opened at Kingston in 1835. The theme of the Act had been both deterrence and rehabilitation, but in Kingston the punitive character of prisons prevailed, as did the rule of strict silence for the majority of a prisoner's days and nights.

During the 1840's, when overcrowding in the Kingston penitentiary was followed by riots and fires, the first inquiry into the prison's operations took place in 1848 and 1849 (Canadian Committee on Corrections, 1969). After this inquiry, a teacher was employed, under a chaplain's direction, to give individual instruction during evening hours; however, this activity was designed to be only a facet of a prisoner's total education, which was to be religious, moral, industrial and vocational. (Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada, 1977).

As Owens (1984) pointed out, however, even prison inspectors saw very early that this total education concept was not a reality. Recidivism at 25% was taken as an indication that reformation through education was failing; only the chaplains remained champions of their ideal: reform through religion.

After Confederation in 1867, the penitentiary system was expanded into the 1900's through the construction of institutions across Canada: in New Brunswick, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia.
Proliferation of educational opportunities did not follow this, however, either in academic or vocational areas. Although new Inspector Reports advocated more education, the prisons were mainly institutions that emphasized hard labor, either in make work or contract activity (1984).

At the beginning of the 1900's, the punitive nature of prisons still dominated: the ball and chain, hosing, and handcuffs were still used. Reading was then permitted at night in cells, however, for those who had displayed good behavior. Limited group instruction for education was also introduced in Kingston at the turn of the century (Sub-Committee Report, 1977).

The same report showed that the period from 1914 to 1939 was a transitional period with respect to education and recreation in prisons; some social activity, such as visits from friends, was increased.

By the late 1930's, prisoners were allowed to pursue higher education in their cells during leisure hours, although any costs of this were borne by the prisoner or his family. After several penitentiary disturbances, a 1936 Royal Commission issued The Archambault Report in 1938, which encouraged more educational, recreational and social activity outside of working hours. Higher education by means of correspondence courses was also permitted at this time. (Sub-Committee Report, 1977)

The Archambault Report seemed to reflect a society that was more concerned with rehabilitation than retribution, and education was seen as the key to this rehabilitation. However, World War II postponed the effect of this new attitude upon the Canadian penal system.

In 1947 The Gibson Report on prisons echoed the same conclusion as the Archambault document, the majority of whose recommendations had not been followed (Owens, 1984).
In this post-war period, disturbances, overcrowding and rising numbers of incarcerated men in Canadian prisons prompted another investigation by the Fateaux Committee in 1953. In this committee's report, the concept of rehabilitation was defined more clearly and the system was referred to as "corrections" in a statement that explained that the new goal of this system was "the total process by which society attempts to correct the anti-social attitudes or behavior of an individual..." (cited in Correctional Service of Canada's Beyond the Walls, 1987, p.9). During this period, behavioral scientists became involved in developing social and recreational programs that focused on the criminal's acts, viewed as outcomes of his psychological or sociological background. Behind this involvement and this new concept of corrections was what has been referred to as the medical model, with its psychological emphasis on the criminal mind and its deficiencies. Educational and social programming reflected this model. Policy during this period emphasized vocational programming, but its development was spotty throughout the system (Owens, 1984).

The reforms articulated in the Fateaux Committee report were advocated during the next decade. In 1960 the MacLeod Committee, which had been established by the Minister of Justice, E. Davie Fulton, presented the Correctional Planning Report. As a result of this document, The Penitentiary Act was revised in 1961. The Act introduced widespread change into Canadian prisons, resulting at first in considerable unrest among both prison populations and prison employees (Sub-Committee, 1977).

In 1969 the Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections (The Ouimet Report), was submitted to the Solicitor-General of Canada. This report did not deal in detail with the education of prisoners, but did present a broad picture of correctional practice, from policing to parole. A brief reference
suggested that the new emphasis on using adult education techniques in prisons might be beneficial: "Changing an inmate's educational level from grade 4 or 5 to high school matriculation may frequently have more effect on his future than trade-training or similar programs" (p. 37). The report also referred to the conflict between the main functions of the system: treatment and security. This report went on to stress the value of treatment in the community and the re-education of all persons who are part of the system, such as judges and prison staff, regarding the purposes of the system.

The 1977 Report To Parliament contained significant comments concerning the effects of the widespread reforms that had been initiated by the 1961 Penitentiary Act, especially upon maximum security penitentiaries. It suggested that the reforms were incomplete because they had merely reached the surface of the system, but had not changed attitudes of personnel within it. The report's most scathing indictment appeared to be that:

There is little in the system to stimulate inmates to reform, to correct the behavior and morality that brought them into prison. Thus the Canadian Penitentiary Service has failed the Canadians who paid highly and must continue to pay for the reformative processes that they can only hope can succeed inside the big wall. (Sub-Committee, 1977, p. 18)

No doubt with the purpose of encouraging the penetration of this big wall from the outside, this report recommended the "aid and cooperation of the education officials in every community near a penitentiary" (p. 113). Other recommendations encouraged social interaction between inmates, between inmates and staff, between inmates and visitors, and between inmates and outside groups such as social agencies and community groups.

Soon after this document, a study more specific to prison education and training was conducted in 1978 by the Ontario Institute for Studies in
Education (O.I.S.E.). The document resulting from this study revealed that educational studies other than higher education focussed only on vocational training and preparation for the General Education Development (G.E.D.) test and that these studies were offered mainly by instructors employed by the Correctional Services of Canada (CSC). However, a questionnaire administered to inmates, administrators and instructors revealed that they agreed that any prison curriculum should be developed outside the prison system, but adapted to prisoner needs, if necessary (Griffin, 1978).

At this time, programming within the Canadian prisons appeared to have been driven by yet another concept, referred to in the literature as the opportunities model. No distinct timeline was drawn between the latter and the medical model; however, in the seventies there was the provision of the opportunity for education and training to those who wished to access these programs. Prisoners were expected to take on responsibility for their stay in prison and to plan with staff for their education and training while incarcerated. In other words, the offender's sentence was based on his criminal behavior, rather than on some kind of diagnosed deficiency that required curing by personnel in the system.

Since the 1970's, both American and Canadian educators, like Yarborough (1981) and Dennison (1979), have advocated the participation of community colleges in prison education programming with the view to bringing the outside to the inside of prison walls. The growth in numbers of community colleges in Canada in the late 1960's and early 1970's supported such a possibility. The O.I.S.E. report had documented the working together of a community college and a federal prison for the first time to give a credit program of instruction.
During that period in Canada, however, educational programming for prisoners at the university level received greater attention from the public as well as from some universities and researchers. Under contract with CSC, universities such as Queen's in Kingston and the University of Victoria offered courses and degree study to prisoners.

The curricula of these universities first emphasized the humanities, and the universities' administrators argued that such curricula assisted prisoners to gain insights into themselves. Stephen Duguid, who in 1984 began directing the Simon Fraser University (SFU) Prison Education Program in the Pacific Region, soon included the social sciences along with the humanities in the SFU curriculum, and stated: "The assumption underlying this emphasis is that prisoners who are later confronted with social and/or political issues will be better equipped to tolerate alternate views, issues and politics" (Duguid, 1985, p.9).

In 1984, during the final months of a Liberal government in Ottawa, a new CSC task force was formed, whose mandate was to develop a statement of values, to propose amendments and changes to CSC policies, practices and organizational units, as well as to propose mechanisms for improvement to the system. This committee, chaired by Ole Ingstrup, made it clear that the system should no longer be influenced by an opportunities model, but by an active motivation ideology. This Task Force on the Mission and Organizational Development of CSC prepared the Report on the Statement of CSC Values. The proposed Mission stated: "The Correctional Service of Canada, as part of the criminal justice system, contributes to the protection of society by exercising safe, secure and humane control of offenders while helping them become law-abiding citizens (Task Force on the Mission and Organizational Development of CSC, 1984, p.46)."
Although the implementation of this report was not immediate, changes in programming emphases soon became evident.

The Minutes of the 1985 Annual CSC Conference for Education and Training in Ottawa included an account of statements by the Director of Education, Dr. Lawrance Isabelle, whose words were summarized:

(Isabelle)... referred to the accumulated literature on education in corrections and crime prevention which must continue to be used in the planning of future educational programs for offenders. The essence of these has been to stress the importance of the development of cognitive skills and exposure to moral issues. (Annual Conference of Education and Training Division, 1985, p.1)

This conference also addressed the topic of illiteracy in the prisons, self-directed learning, libraries, use of contract staff, Native Indian education, and vocational programs.

Of special relevance to the current study was the preponderance of negative arguments recorded in these minutes toward the employment of contract staff [at that time mainly those who were on personal service contracts] by CSC in correctional education and training. For example, it was stated: "Attitudinal problems of permanent staff exist, among all divisions, but the attitudinal problems created among contract staff are more serious, since they feel under-valued and have a weak status within the organization" (p. 14); and also: "Education in corrections represents a form of work which is extremely demanding; research has shown that when very demanding work is required of people with no job security, they tend to develop attitudes which are hostile to the host organization; this is in evidence among our contract staff" (p.14).

Also in 1985, the Commissioner for the Correctional Service of Canada received the Education and Training Program Review. This document examined the nature of current expenditures, which, it stated, then approximated $25
million per year for the education of federal inmates. Major conclusions made in the Review included:

Correctional research has established that many of the correctional programs which have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing recidivism are of an educational nature. These have been programs which have been aimed at the development of thinking skills, and at the improvement of social and interpersonal knowledge and skills. (Education and Training, p.9)

It is estimated that an additional $3 million needs to be spent in these two areas: $.8 million for literacy, and $2.2 more for Life Skills. Meeting these needs can be attained through the allocation of additional resources, or through a process of re-allocating existing funds. These funds would be obtained either as additional allocations or through cancellation or revision of some existing activities. (p. 14)

This Review also recommended:

Pending the completion and review of a study that will take into consideration all of the relevant factors (institutional security, staff "burnout", program relevance, and program focus) it is recommended that institutions retain existing person years and use them according to their own criteria. Once the larger review has been completed, a national policy will be implemented regarding the delivery of educational programs by contracted or by permanent staff. (p. 17)

The reported 1984-85 costs for major educational service contracts totalled $9,195,038. The Pacific Region, for example, had contracted with Fraser Valley College to the amount of $640,000 and with Simon Fraser University for $548,952. In Ontario, the Frontenac Board of Education and Loyalist College had received a total of $1,918,023 while Queen's University programming totalled $203,528. (Annual Conference, Appendix 2.)

In December of 1985, as part of a number of reviews that had completed studies of components of CSC operations, the Report of Task Force #8 presented a Review of Offender Support Programs. This "Sawatsky Report", referring to Task Force #8 leader Terry J. Sawatsky (1985), made several...
recommendations, based on consultations with administrators and staff in all CSC regions, that had several implications for prison education:

Recommendation #24: That CSC place greater emphasis on basic literacy programs and consider the possibility of making literacy "compulsory" (p.4).

Recommendation #25: That educational programs should be considered "core" up to and including secondary level (p.4).

Recommendation #33: That CSC place greater emphasis on "living skills programs" as a "core" programming requirement (p.5).

Recommendation #34: That CSC accept that all staff have a responsibility to assist offenders in correcting their behavior and to develop their "living skills" through day to day "common sense" interventions (p.5).

This review also stated, however, that opinion in the field toward university level courses was "that transferability of this educational experience to the outside community is minimal" (p.34). Some field staff had expressed the opinion that university courses, because of their costs, are not accessible to all citizens outside prison. Therefore, it was stated in the review: "...while university is a 'nice to have' program, it is not essential- not "core" and could be reduced if necessary" (p.35).

By the middle of the 1980's, the problem of illiteracy in both the United States and Canada had been receiving widespread attention. The need to combat illiteracy in Canada was brought to the attention of the Canadian taxpayer in the Speech from the Throne in the fall of 1986.

The public's attention was also directed at the illiteracy of prison populations. In December of 1986, the Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada, Rheal J. Leblanc, made a presentation to the Solicitor
General of Canada, James Kelleher, based on extensive assessment and study of literacy levels in Canadian federal prisons. This study had shown: "Approximately one-half of inmates tested did not achieve a grade 8 equivalency score on standardized testing during the reception process" (Leblanc, 1986, p.2).

Additionally, it pointed out: "Based on the 1981 Canada Census, it is estimated that between 20-30% of Canadians have less than grade 9 education. Therefore, the rate of illiteracy among inmates is roughly twice that of the general public" (p. 2).

This concern for raising literacy levels in prisons was emphasized by a National Conference on Offender Literacy, sponsored by the Correctional Service of Canada and held in Ottawa in May of 1987. James Kelleher pointed out in his address at this gathering: "In the last year, only about 150 inmates completed the Adult Basic Education program. The program is available; inmates are free to enroll; they have not done so, at least not in the numbers that the need indicates they should" (Kelleher, 1987, p.3). He went on to indicate major changes in educational programming for federal prisoners:

1. A literacy competency level would be established at grade eight equivalency, rather than grade five, for all inmates. (p. 4)

2. Completion targets for the next three years were now set with the goal of achieving "a level of literacy among inmates comparable to that of the Canadian public in general." In numbers this was to be 600 grade eight completions in 1988; 1200 in 1989; 1800 in 1990. (p. 4)

3. Incentives to encourage inmate participation would be introduced, such as making participation a prerequisite for inmate employment and including literacy achievement in parole planning. (p.5)
Although the budget for programs of Adult Basic Education had now been more than doubled for 1987-88, Kelleher stated that "...the resources required for this initiative will be found through allocation of existing resources within the Correctional Service, such as travel reduction and cutbacks in research and consulting fees" (p. 7).

The comprehensive and detailed Education Plan drafted for the Prairie and Pacific Regions in September of 1988 reflected a continuation of this CSC focus on prison education (Education and Personal Development Division, 1988). The objectives of the education program stated in the 1988 plan included the following statements in Objective 2.1: "Criminal behavior is an issue evolving from a lack of personal responsibility to which a sound education can contribute. Education serves to inform people so as to assist their decision making, particularly when choosing right from wrong" (2.1). Within this objective, the document also stated the overall mission of the Education and Personal Development Division: "To help offenders to develop personal and social skills, to acquire educational qualifications and to learn responsible behavior" (2.1). Tied to this mission statement was the objective: "To encourage offenders to participate in provincially accredited educational programs which will help them to improve their knowledge and skills" (2.1). The sub-objective also stated was the following: "To enable inmates to develop a sense of self-esteem through personal accomplishment" (2.1). Success criteria for the ABE program were also stated: "Success is measured by the average grade level advancement in each institution and more significantly by the number of inmates who complete Grade 8 in language and mathematics" (2.4).

The plan for the entire federal system with regard to the ABE or functional literacy level was that 2000 inmates would achieve that level in
all of Canada's federal prisons during the period 1987-89 (2.4). Another clear message within this document was also that other personnel in the institutional structure would be involved in these activities, particularly the Case Management Team. Also of relevance to this study was an issue centred on contracting: "Contracts for the appointment of teachers will be of up to three years duration where possible, but not exceeding four years duration" (3.2).

Supporting this educational plan, and, in fact, appearing to integrate it into the wider mandate of the Canadian corrections system, was the announcement, in February 1989, of the Mission of the Correctional Service of Canada, which read as follows:

The Correctional Service of Canada, as part of the criminal justice system, contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control. (Correctional Service of Canada, 1989, p.4)

This pronouncement had been preceded by the appointment of a new Commissioner for the CSC, Ole Ingstrup, who had chaired the 1984 Task Force on the Mission and Organizational Development of the Correctional Service of Canada.

This statement, along with its five Core Values, its Guiding Principles and its Strategic Objectives, appeared to reflect not only the spirit but also the language of the 1984 Task Force document. The key emphases in this new document included staff development and the integration of the offender into the community. It was met with optimism by most program and education personnel within Canadian prisons, but by cynicism from other, such as some security-oriented personnel and the press (Makin, 1989, pp. A1, A8).
However, this document had been issued at a time of federal budget cuts, so that its objectives were not supported by additional funding, but rather by a renewed emphasis on programming.

A critical point in prison education history appeared to have arrived: Educational initiatives, coming to a large extent from the system itself, appeared to be supported by correctional policy and top-level administrators in that system. In addition, program developers, both CSC and contract personnel, continued to recognize several authorities in the fields of cognitive and moral development, including Kohlberg (1975), deBono (1981), and Ross (1985; with Fabiano, 1988).

As a result of this recognition, another concept had become part of correctional thinking, and part of its language as well: the cognitive model, which according to Collins: "...restores an ethical dimension of education and provides a practical alternative to the medical model's fixing techniques" (Education and Personal Development, 1988, p. 105).

By means of this model, corrections at the federal level had re-assumed the task of rehabilitation, through education. Although the Canadian public seemed to be presenting a get-tough attitude toward prisoners, and although cynicism surrounding CSC's new Mission had been identified within the system as well as without (Makin, 1989, p. A8), the new Commissioner of CSC, Ole Ingstrup, stated: "We must actively encourage offenders to benefit from the opportunities provided, as we believe that long-term protection of society cannot be accomplished by incarceration alone" (p. A1).

With this rehabilitative role, however, came renewed emphasis upon program accountability in the federal corrections system, including the education programs within that system. For example, in 1989, a proposal was approved to carry out a five year longitudinal study, from 1990 to 1995, of
offenders who had participated in adult basic education and other institutional programming (Fabiano, 1989). Expectations of correctional teachers would continue to be defined, at least in part, by the changing values of the system in which they worked, just as for over one hundred and fifty years the values of Canadian society have helped define expectations of its education system.

In summary, the review of the literature on the development and characteristics of federal correctional education in Canada has illustrated many attempts to make education a significant activity of the system, but each early attempt was met with limited success. Nevertheless, the last fifteen years have seen some initiatives upon which succeeding ones have been built: the Griffin report for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; the contracting out of teaching positions; the increased involvement of colleges and universities; the various task forces and reviews; and the participation of Canadian correctional education leaders in the literacy movement.

In the latter part of the 1980's, scrutiny of the system provided by various sectors of society, such as rights groups, politicians, and educators, appeared to motivate correctional planners to develop new policies and rationalizations for educational programming. These policies and rationalizations, with the inclusion of many references to theories and research related to moral and cognitive development (Ross and Fabiano, 1985), now appear to have provided direction for the future.

However, the literature has also illustrated the continuing presence of conflicting or changing purposes of prisons and of the educational enterprises therein. Such conditions have influenced and will continue to influence the expectations formed of prison educational programs and their
teachers just as the current or accepted societal definitions of education influence expectations of any educational program in any sector of society.

B. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

In this section I have traced the development and changes in the modern perspectives of teacher effectiveness, employing as a framework the four phases of research, from 1939 to the 1980's, that were identified by Evertson and Green (1986). These phases overlap in time, and, in the case of Phase III and IV, parallel each other. Unfortunately, most of the research cited within this framework has arisen from studies within public schools, not adult basic education classrooms; so that generalization from the public school to the adult basic education context is unlikely. However, since prison adult basic educational research is in its infancy, such an examination could provide relevant suggestions for further development in terms of either effectiveness variables or methods of research. Research examples which could suggest some relevant approaches for prison adult basic education research have been included in each phase. The description of each phase concludes with comments that refer to the degree of relevancy to prison education the phase might have. Finally, this section is not intended as a definitive catalogue of effectiveness research. Instead, for a recent inventory and review of contemporary effectiveness studies since the 1970's, one is referred to an article by G. Patrick O'Neill (Canadian Journal of Education 13:1, 1988). Upon considering 150 primary and secondary sources, he identifies "The 20 most promising instructional research factors on teaching effectiveness" (p. 164). O'Neill also provides his own categorization as well as definitions for these 20 factors.
Phase I: (1939-1963 ca).

The early years of this exploratory phase focused on whether or not effectiveness could be measured. Most studies continued from the previous decades to involve the compiling of lists of teachers whom students considered effective or good; then, those who were considered experts, such as supervisors, principals, and college professors, contributed their findings to similar inventories (Miller, 1987a, p. 29). Up to the late 1940's, measuring teacher effectiveness by other means was less common. Miller points out that measuring teacher effectiveness by changes in students was practiced in only eighteen of seventy-nine studies that took place between 1905 and 1948. However, some exploratory, often experimental, research in these years did identify both instructional and classroom behaviors, including teacher-learner interactions.

In some early work on teacher-learner interaction, Flanders conducted numerous studies that included the development and use of an interaction analysis observation system (FIAC), which isolated ten verbal responses on the psychological social level, among them directness/indirectness. More than 100 other researchers made use of this scale in subsequent research. One of his own experimental studies had shown that both attitude development and achievement were significantly better for the class of indirect teachers (Biddle and Anderson, 1986, p. 233).

Another example of classroom interaction research is Kounin and Gump's (1961) work in elementary schools, involving interviews of 174 children, to determine influence of punitive and non-punitive first grade teachers upon their pupils' behaviors and attitudes to school work. The fact that they
used only three pairs of teachers did not provide conclusive evidence, but their study did show that teacher behavior influences both cognitive and affective outcomes.

In the early 1960's Ryans (1964) took another direction, and conducted an extensive teachers' characteristics study involving 6000 teachers. The study involved self-reporting on traits such as self-confidence and cheerfulness, contact with other people, and childhood experiences. This information was then correlated with the teachers' emotional stability indicators. Ryans found differences between the self-reports of the teachers with high emotional stability and of the teachers with low emotional stability; for example, the high stability people expressed more self-confidence and had had happier childhood experiences than the low emotional stability group.

Stern (1963), suggested several approaches to the measurement of non-cognitive variables involved in teaching, and indicated that the fields of sociology, psychology, psychometry, and perception might shed light on these variables, such as attitudes and values. (pp. 398-447). Stern's review of 34 studies on indirect and direct instruction possibly has relevance to this current study because most of what he reviewed contained research involving college classrooms. Stern believed that his review showed that acquisition of knowledge is largely unaffected by whether directness or indirectness is employed by the teacher, but that attitude change toward self and others is affected by a democratic teaching style.

Westbury (1988) suggests that the work of Medley and Mitzel at the end of this period has provided direction to current research efforts by identifying four types of effectiveness variables: presage; context; process; and product. Furthermore, she points out that these researchers had
predicted that the process or classroom behavior variables were the ones that held the most promise for effectiveness research. Evertson and Green (1986) state that the publication of "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation" by Medley and Mitzel marked the end of Phase I.

Prison adult basic education research appears to have begun its development in much the same way as research began in other educational areas. Rating instruments have been used in adult basic education studies (as illustrated in the review of adult and adult basic education), in the work of Miller, and in the current study. Whether we shall move through the development of suitable observation instruments and from there to an examination of process-product variables could depend upon correctional as well as educational objectives. Presently, Corrections Canada does measure the success of its adult basic education programming in terms of outcomes or products: the number of Fundamental or Grade Eight Equivalency completions per institution, region, and nation. In addition, research at the national level of Corrections has been planned to assess the effect of adult basic education completion upon the offender and ex-offender (Fabiano, 1989).

Phase II: (1958-73).

During this phase, attention to many aspects of the teaching and learning processes came under scrutiny, for it was a period of intense criticism of Canadian and United States educational systems. Terms such as mastery learning, individualized instruction, programmed learning, and open-area classrooms became familiar phrases, as answers were sought to the apparent crisis in education (Good & Brophy, 1984). There was considerable attention paid to the development of research instruments. Included in this phase were descriptive, experimental and training studies. Instructional
development based on the latter was emphasized. Category systems and paradigms of effectiveness were created.

Also during this period, Biddle and Ellena (1964), writing in *Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness*, in a pragmatic fashion defined effectiveness as "...the ability of a teacher to produce agreed upon educational effects in a given situation or context" (p.20). On the other hand, teacher competence is described as "...one or more abilities of a teacher to produce agreed upon educational effects" (p.18).

They went on to assign the task for ensuing research: "The problem will be resolved only when an adequate catalogue of educational contexts is provided so as to allow assessment of various teacher abilities for their effect in each" (p.20).

Biddle and Ellena supported the use of observation techniques, a priori classification, and objective instruments such as questionnaires and interview schedules. They did not support the use of existing teacher records, self-reports or ratings.

Bohlken and Giffin (1970) attempted to tie together the concepts of learning and attitude to learning, again stressing effectiveness as being multi-dimensional. They cited the seven point Trust Scale that Giffin had developed with Morton Deutsch. The scale allowed a student to rate an instructor according to 13 criteria: scholarly, disrespectful, unknowledgeable, kind, emphatic, passive, fast, meek, expert, bold, dishonest, aggressive, and uninformed.

The 1960's work of Carl Rogers began its influence in North American education circles during this phase. Rogers' concept of the "helping relationship" had included three conditions of interpersonal functioning, in this case for helpers or counsellors: empathy, unconditional regard, and
congruence (Rogers, 1981). After the mid-60's, the concept of rapport and the significance of the teacher-pupil relationship received considerable attention in the educational literature. For example, Jack Thompson (1969) examined teacher behavior in relation to this concept of Rogers, and concluded that relationships, not behaviors, were the key to perceptions of teachers by students. Innovations in classroom teaching were influenced by theories in group dynamics and group processes. Janet Crist (1972), of the opinion that the teacher should be a guide and helper rather than the primary source of student information, cited the opinion of Schmandt who reflected on the role of the teacher as influenced by these new theories:

The new teacher will have to be more of a master of people than of data. He will have to provide guidance and inspiration. He will teach what questions to ask and how to ask them. He will bring the students together for discussion groups, laboratory exercises, workshops, and study groups. (p. 3-4)

We see in this phase that there were many questions raised that are presently being raised in reference to prison education. For example, several items on the Giffin Trust Scale resembled those in the Vickers instrument used by Miller (1987a). Classroom climate is a significant concern in adult education as well as in prison education. Furthermore, many of the concepts regarding the role of the teacher (Thompson, 1969; Crist, 1972) have become important practices within adult and adult basic education. We now have seen that the parameters of teacher effectiveness research had extended, and had done so in several directions. Many methods as well as more kinds of classrooms were considered in the studies of this period. In all, this was a phase of many unanswered questions, and they remained to be examined, if not answered, in what has become known as the post-Sputnick period—the earlier decade of Phase III.
Phase III: (ca 1973 to present)

In the United States, considerable impetus for measurement of effectiveness was provided in this period by several pieces of legislation requiring all applicants for a teaching licence to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness. One example cited by Gage (1975) was the Stull Act of 1972 in California which required all school districts to evaluate their teachers. Research emphasis concentrated on finding a relationship between teacher behaviors and student achievement. At the same time, another school of thought gave curricula, not methods, more attention. Proponents of the "curriculum model" viewed the classroom as a gestalt, a system of interlocking parts that could not be analyzed in isolation. Teacher-proof curricula and textbooks were promoted widely for a time, and teacher training was de-emphasized.

Nevertheless, many researchers maintained a process-product approach. Biddle and Anderson (1986) included Ruth Soar and Robert Soar in this group. The Soars had conducted five major observational studies of public school classrooms. They looked at student outcomes in terms of emotional climate, teacher management, and curriculum emphasis. Seventy classrooms were observed, and the student achievement results were recorded in terms of gain since the beginning of the year. Again, there were findings concerned with indirect and direct teaching: "...simple-concrete pupil growth was found linked to 'directive' teaching in a straightforward manner- the more of the latter, the more of the former. In contrast, complex-abstract pupil growth reached its maximum with a moderate amount of 'directiveness' but fell off dramatically when 'directiveness' was further increased." (Biddle and Anderson, p. 233).
However, Dunkin and Biddle (1974), writing regarding classroom climate, had abandoned the variable of indirectness as a useful variable to be considered: "... our major finding concerning both climate and directness is that, as operationalized in this research tradition, they do not appear as promising concepts for the improvement of teaching" (p. 374).

Good, and his colleagues Biddle and Brophy, (cited in Miller, 1987a) reviewed several process-product studies which had linked teacher behavior to both student achievement and student attitudes. According to Miller:

Good et al confirmed the findings of the earlier reviews by Rosenshine and Furst, and Duncan and Biddle, as identifying teaching behaviors which correlate with student gains and/or student attitudes. A related finding, however, cited by Good et al from a 1974 Brophy and Evertson study was that teacher behavior involved in maximizing student learning was not always the same as the teacher behavior involved in developing positive student attitudes. The former finding appeared to be related to classroom management and curriculum organization; the latter finding was related to affective teacher variables such as warmth and student orientation. (p. 35)

Approaches in Phase III also included the subsequent writing of Brophy, who stressed in a 1975 paper that the students must be the units of analysis, and that to understand classroom processes their individual differences must be considered. He stressed the need for research that considered individual differences by arguing that applied behavior modification studies had shown that students differ in their responses to reward and that an individual student may change in his/her preference for a particular reward. He also argued that most teacher behavior is directed at individual students; moreover, student differences affect teacher behavior. His review had included secondary as well as elementary school studies.

In a later essay reviewing literature on classroom process, Lightfoot (1978) suggested reasons for the earlier focus upon the teacher, not the student:
Exaggerating the dominance of the teacher and neglecting the power and presence of children in the classroom research seems to support the irresponsible, dependent and powerless roles assigned to children in our culture. Cultural perspectives on children are reinforced by sociological conceptions of the functions and purposes of the schools in contemporary society. (ERIC ED 166 317, Abstract)

This kind of critique emerged mainly from the philosophical foundations of ethnography, as Marilyn Westbury (1988) points out in her examination of both process-product and ethnographic research, the latter being applied during this phase to educational settings.

Later, Fisher and Berliner (1979) criticized the educational movement that had supported competency based training and evaluation of teachers. They enumerated problems with current instrumentation, methodology, and statistical procedures in the study of effectiveness, insisting that the affective domain and the content of the learning must be considered as one entity. They also pointed out that research had shown that effectiveness over time, measured as a correlative of student achievement, was unstable, often because an independent variable such as home background was unstable. A philosophical view expressed during the same period suggested that teachers were born, not made, and supported the argument that teachers must find what works for them (Fenstermacher, 1978).

Other research examples in this phase were studies by Kenny, Hentschel, and Elpers (1972), Gafner, Whitfield, and Shores (1978), and Jamieson and Brooks (1980).

The Kenny et al study examined student-perceived teacher roles at four different school levels: elementary school, middle school, high school, and college. All students were asked to name three qualities of both good and bad teachers. These written responses were coded and scored according to procedures adapted from studies at Western Michigan University. Two
significant findings were that the differences between sexes in assigning teacher qualities were relatively few and minor and that the single most important teacher quality at all four school levels was the "Attitude Toward Students".

Gafner et al investigated the concept of warmth, particularly with reference to non-verbal behaviors related to it. Seventy-five high school students participated in the study, which included a rating scale, requiring observations of specified teacher behavior by means of videos and interviews of students. According to Gafner et al: "Results show that students perceive teacher warmth primarily through nonverbal channels of communication, and that certain behaviors, with a high degree of statistical confidence, can be said to contribute to their perceptions of teacher "warmth" (p.16). These six behaviors were smiles, nods, gestures, body movements, use of time, and laughs (p.15).

Jamieson and Brooks (1980) looked at the influence of students' ability levels upon their perceptions of 15 teacher presage characteristics and nine behaviors. The Classroom Teacher Inventory was administered to 529 science students. Results of this survey suggested that high ability students seemed to value a teacher's subject area training, but low-ability students may value a teacher's ability to develop rapport with students.

Taking a philosophical approach to a roles concept, Fenstermacher (1978) considered three possible roles of teachers, and labeled them The Executive, The Therapist, and The Liberationist. While knowledge was the major emphasis in the first role, the student was the focus of the second. The Liberationist, a possible third role, considered content that was mind liberating. In his view, each major subject field had a set of manners appropriate to that field and without manner, content would not be
liberating. Therefore, the goal of The Liberationist approach is for a learner to acquire both moral virtues (honesty, integrity, etc.) and intellectual ones (reasonableness, curiosity, etc.).

Some of these kinds of approaches were examined by Good and Brophy (1984) and reviewed by them in Looking in Classrooms. In this work, they discussed the relative merits of individualized and group instruction. They cited their 1979 review of effective instruction in basic skills, which had indicated that active interaction with students by teachers brought better results than reliance on curriculum materials. Then, after reviewing the evolution of individualization, including careful examination of research related to mastery learning and the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI), they presented their view that both whole-class instruction and individualization could be both beneficial and limiting, that is to say there could be boredom or lack of success in either for some students at some time. In their view, however, individualization at its best was "an attempt to blend individual, small-group, and whole-class activities according to the needs of the students and the goals of the program" (p.259).

Many of the variables considered in this phase are those which could have considerable relevance for our study of adult basic education in prisons: individual differences of students; perceptions of teacher roles; verbal and non-verbal communication; teacher roles; individual, small group, and whole group instruction; student goals vis-a-vis program goals. All of these presently concern us in this field and present many possibilities for new research.
Phase IV: (ca 1972-present; parallels Phase III)

The emphasis on the teaching-learning processes and on human interaction has been continued from the seventies into the present. In addition, attention in this phase has been extended from social interaction at a behavioral level to interaction at a cognitive level. For example, Winne and Marx (1977) expressed a view that learning and information processing was not just a sociological process and that the mental lives of teachers and students ought to be examined. They suggest in "Reconceptualizing Research on Teaching" that research ought to proceed from the stage of knowing that the mental lives of teachers and students do influence each other to the stage of knowing how they influence each other. Their position is that "Like the teacher, the student also can be depicted as a dynamic decision maker participating in instruction as he chooses to attend, analyze, or process in some other way the information impinging on him from the instructional environment" (p. 669). They also stress that various environmental and interpersonal events modify and maintain the behavior of both students and teachers in classrooms.

The work of Schon and others has provided considerable encouragement for this approach to the study of effectiveness. Schon refers to "reflection in action" as a way of describing how members of most professions think and act as they move from situation to situation. In his conclusion to The Reflective Practitioner, Schon (1982) describes the constraints placed by bureaucratic organizations upon reflective practice. His example is the urban public school, with its system of rules and hierarchical administration. He acknowledges the threat inherent in reflection-in-action for such systems. He also speaks in this chapter of organizational learning, and defines the conditions for such learning:
An organization capable of examining and restructuring its certain principles and values demands a learning system capable of sustaining this tension and converting it to a productive public inquiry. An organization conducive to reflective practice makes the same revolutionary demand. (p. 338)

The administrators of Canada's prison bureaucracies may not be ready to embrace reflection-in-action as a means to or a reason for change. However, the teaching professionals within the prisons could find value in activities based on the concept, faced as they are with one problem situation after another on a daily basis. A faculty development project based on this concept is described by Smith and Schwartz (1988) in their paper Improving Teaching by Reflecting on Practice. Beginning with a definition of effectiveness as "...the extent to which the consequences of our actions match our intentions", (p. 5) Smith and Schwartz describe seven steps taken in a three day workshop that examined some issues teachers dealt with in their practice. These steps or headings were "identify a situation..., generate data..., build a diagnosis..., develop and expand it..., move from diagnosis to action..., surface basic values..., and reframe the situation" (p. 4). In this way, the writers contend, the teachers have become classroom researchers and are reflecting in as well as on action (p. 28).

Classroom research could provide another interesting avenue leading to the examination of teacher effectiveness in prisons. In Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty, K. Patricia Cross and Thomas A. Angelo (1988), postulate: "The research most likely to improve teaching and learning is that conducted by teachers on questions they themselves have formulated in response to problems and issues in their own teaching" (p. 2). While acknowledging that there are some generic teaching methods that are appropriate for all teachers, they believe that there are some methods that are subject or 'domain' specific (p. 5) and that the latter ought to be
developed further by means of classroom research, which involves both students and teachers in analyzing what goes on in classrooms. Their handbook provides college faculty with techniques for assessing academic skills and knowledge, students' self-awareness and self-assessment of learning skills; and assessing student reactions to teaching and their courses (p. 6).

Butt (1983) suggests another research approach to understanding teacher behaviors: the examination of "teacher's voice" as a way of finding what is done in classrooms. By his definition, teacher's voice is "...the tone quality, the feelings that are conveyed by the way a teacher speaks..." (p. 100). He cites Flanders: "Through examining the transformational quality of significant experiences in personal and professional lives, we can apprehend a teacher's formation or development in an educative as well as a training sense" (p. 100). Butt sees biography as a way of getting to the real feelings and attitudes that shape the thinking of the teacher. Then, he goes on to say that teaching "as experienced" by teachers will help to understand teacher thinking and its relationship to teacher behaviors. However, Butt sees various methods of data collection as equally worthwhile, and he points out the difficulty of interpreting data. But he suggests that the researcher ought to look for those moments of insight that the subjects themselves perceive. He goes on to suggest that the application of this kind of research could be a way of clarifying the thinking of curriculum theorists, who could then better understand curriculum development in terms of the stages of their own development.

Pratt (1988a) cites Grimmett et al who appeared to express a similar approach in terms of the teacher. Pratt refers to this perspective as "Critical Reflection on Knowledge and Values", which in Grimmett's words
views teachers as "...setting problems, framing and re-framing situations to formulate testable solutions..." (p.3). In Pratt's view: "Effectiveness is not assessed by placing someone's teaching against a set of objectively agreed upon standards but rather by clarifying the relationship between a particular set of values and beliefs and a teacher's intentions, actions and judgement within a particular teaching context" (p. 5). He concludes by suggesting that experienced teachers are more capable of considering contextual variations in these terms and "...for highly experienced and confident teachers the balance may shift further to emphasize the relationship between values and professional practice" (p.5).

This examination of the development of values and beliefs has also been part of the research and literature of Perry, whose model of cognitive and ethical development has been applied by him and by others to young and older adults in several settings and educational areas, particularly in curriculum and counselling (1970). His theories have also been studied in connection with faculty development, particularly in post-secondary institutions (Parker, 1978, Kurfiss, 1977). In the late 1980's, instructional development programs in British Columbia and Washington have included consideration of his ideas in their courses and workshops (Burton, 1989).

Perry's model has been applied to the development of perspective on moral/social issues, as well as to academic tasks, and he suggests that development in any of these may not always be static, but changing according to situation; that is to say there can be regression as well as progression. This aspect of his theory is reminiscent of phenomena noted in the literature on long term incarceration (Zamble and Porporino, 1988). The exploration of this theory in terms of the prison environment remains a possibility for further research. For example, it may be valuable to know at
what position a teacher's thinking is, relative to the persons and conditions within the milieu she/he is working or will be working.

Phase IV has introduced another approach to the research on teacher effectiveness: the examination of the teacher's thinking and values. This approach had been suggested in the early part of this phase by such theorists as Dunkin and Biddle (1974):

...much of teaching is presumably coping behavior on the part of the teacher and is thus subject to beliefs held by the teacher concerning the curriculum, the nature and objectives of the teaching task, expectations for pupils, and norms concerning appropriate classroom behavior. Thus, a reasonably good predictor of the classroom behavior of the teacher can presumably be obtained by finding out what the teacher thinks she prefers to, ought to, and will do in the classroom. (p.412)

As will be reviewed in the literature from Canadian prison education, this approach appears appropriate for an examination of effectiveness in the context of correctional teaching.

This second part of the literature review has been a summary of the development of research approaches to teacher effectiveness from 1939 to the present. Examples of studies in the general field of teacher effectiveness have been provided for each of the four phases in this time period. Many studies have been conducted to find the characteristics of the most effective teachers. Research designs have included field studies; presage-process experiments, with attention given to the characteristics of the teacher as an independent variable; process-process ones in which behavior of both teacher and student have been considered; and process-product, in which classroom events and the academic or attitudinal results of those events have been examined. The most recent literature has
indicated that the specific context of that classroom must be considered, including how students and teacher interact on both the affective and the cognitive level.

However, the literature has not provided definitive answers to many of our questions about effectiveness in prison teaching. Is the teacher expected to influence student's social behavior, to help students acquire academic knowledge, to motivate student learning, to create a positive classroom climate, to develop rapport with students, or to present a positive role model? One of these? All of these? Or do we ignore all of these questions and accept instead the academic's ideal as postulated by McCarthy:

The philosophy of any education program, if it is truly to be called educational, must be based on the assumption that, as an activity, learning is undertaken solely for the sake of learning itself. Education is not a process with utilitarian purpose, nor is it a means to an end, except the end of developing the mind. Neither is it a process of indoctrination, which eliminates true thinking, nor one of training, which simply reproduces a predetermined array of thoughts and behaviors. (McCarthy, 1985, p.44)

C. ADULT AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION TEACHING

This section contains an examination of several adult education concepts as well as a review of some studies and surveys that have emphasized the identification and classification of competencies for adult basic education teachers and literacy teachers.

Adult Education Concepts

The definition of competencies in this area was again linked to the prevailing definition(s) of education. In this regard, since the 1960's North American practice in adult education has been greatly influenced by adult educators such as Malcolm Knowles of the United States and Roby Kidd
of Canada. In addition, Paulo Freire's perspectives have called attention to the consideration of the learner's cultural context and to the use of the learner's own dialogue and experiences from that context.

In the late 1960's Knowles and Kidd emerged as advocates of the adult learner and of andragogy. The adult learner has usually been defined by these and other adult educators as "...an autonomous, experience laden, goal seeking, 'now' oriented, and problem-centered individual (Adult Basic Literacy Curriculum Guide and Resource Book, 1987, p.241). "Andragogy" was originally defined as the teaching of adults. However, in 1980, Knowles revised this definition by substituting the word "people" for "adults". In his revised and updated The Modern Practice of Adult Education (1980), he suggests that pedagogy and andragogy are not dichotomous, but are at two ends of a spectrum of dependent/self-directing behavior. He also suggests that pedagogy and andragogy are "...two alternative models for testing out the assumptions as to their 'fit' with particular situations." (p. 43)

Andragogy drew attention to the developmental aspects of an adult's education process and the methods appropriate to his/her development. Developing the student's skills for self-directed learning was one of the primary goals of adult education and an important concept of andragogy according to Knowles. Through self-directed learning an individual adult could learn whatever he/she needs for complete self-development. To foster self-directed learning, the adult educator functions in many ways: diagnosing; planning; motivating; selecting appropriate methodology; providing resources; and evaluating (Adult Basic Literacy, 1987).

Criticism of adult education practice based on the principles of andragogy has been voiced in several ways. Collins (1988) employed the metaphor of the prison in his critique, suggesting that self-directed
learning, with its methods, materials, and examinations (i.e. as detailed in the functions of the adult educator in the preceding paragraph) is as controlling to an adult learner as are the surveillance methods of a prison to an inmate. He cited many other critics of current adult education approaches, and then summed up:

...Continued focus (surveillance) on the adult learner under the rubric of self-directed learning becomes a panoptic technique through which adult educators are themselves able to escape self-reflection on what it is they do and what they are. (p. 106)

Pratt (1988b) joins in criticizing the concept of andragogy as confusing and lacking in credibility. He focusses his criticism on learner control, suggesting that adults can be both self-directed and dependent in their learning, and that andragogical practice ought to be carried out according to the development of the learner and the requirements of that which is to be learned.

Adult Basic Education Teaching

The practices of adult basic education and literacy instruction have developed within the adult education field. Until the mid-60's, teachers in Adult Basic Education (ABE) had come primarily from elementary and secondary schools and had continued with methodologies from those experiences. However, special competencies were identified about this time, and training needs were identified (Pearce, 1966; Davison, 1969).

Pearce reported on a study made by Modesto Junior College in which students, teachers and administrators identified characteristics of an effective ABE teacher. Methodology in this primary study included group discussion, brainstorming and questionnaires with students, and a case
history approach that included in-depth interviews of teachers. From this study, teacher characteristics identified were as follows: 1. understanding; 2. flexibility; 3. patience; 4. humor; 5. practicality; 6. creativity; 7. preparation. Also from this study, an interview schedule was designed for screening potential teachers for employment. Interviews were also to include requests for background information, attitudinal measurement and reactions to position statements and hypothetical situations concerning education.

In Canada, Davison conducted a survey of adult basic education teachers in British Columbia and completed a thorough review of the literature and research in the ABE field to 1969. Based on these, she grouped teacher characteristics related to effectiveness in this field into three categories: knowledge, skills and attitudes. Knowledge referred to knowledge of the following: subject matter; the sociological, psychological and physiological peculiarities of adult illiterates; adult learning principles and adult education process; community conditions; economics and its effect upon all individuals; and interpersonal and intergroup dynamics. Davison included the following under skills necessary for adult basic education teachers: developing a program around the needs, interests and goals of the students; diagnosing problems and adapting instruction to the students' needs; motivating student interest and response; and testing and evaluation. The attitudes that she cited as important were the following: enthusiasm for the subject matter; capacity to be challenged by this work and readiness for experimentation and innovation; commitment that students can learn; and empathy.

Mocker (1974) classified and ranked 291 competencies for adult basic education instructors in a way similar to Davison's categories, but Mocker
substituted behavior for skills. His work was intended to assist in the development of training activities for prospective teachers. Mocker suggested also that these competencies could be used as criteria for hiring new teachers in this field.

In the same year, Aker (1974) provided *A Guide for Competency Based Teacher Training in Adult Basic Education*, while suggesting that there is no consistent overall set of characteristics which define the 'good' teacher. Nevertheless, he proceeded to enumerate approximately twenty-four qualities of ABE teachers, defined in terms of students' educational gains, changed behavior, and favorable attitudes. His somewhat trite summary of the issue was that good teaching is both a science and an art.

Much of what has occurred in North American adult basic education has actually been development in literacy education, so that the definition of education as posed by Freire, who has written about literacy with eloquence, presented considerable relevancy to this study. In summary, to Freire education is one of two things: a process that dominates people or one that frees illiterates from their 'culture of silence', treats them as equals with rich experiences and capacities, and involves them as 'subjects' in all aspects of their education. The former system Freire calls 'banking' education; the second he calls 'dialogical' or 'problem posing' education, which results in learners being able to 'name' their world, to reflect critically on the 'problems of men in and with the world' and to act to solve those problems (Adult Basic Literacy Curriculum Guide and Resource Book, p.246).

With influences from educators like those cited in the preceding, ABE studies in the 1980's continued to focus on instructors' competencies. From others in this field, direction has been given for the training of adult
educators. Examples are Ulmer (1980); Rossman and Powers (1981); and Nunes and Halloran (1987).

Ulmer wrote that successful adult basic education teachers required, as well as content knowledge, the ability to relate to adult learners; mastery of techniques to transmit that knowledge; and competency in interpersonal relationships.

Rossman and Powers reported somewhat differently in "Perceptions of Adult Basic Education Administrators and Teachers Regarding Skills of Teaching". In their findings, perceptions of twenty skills were not statistically different on any skill but interpersonal relations.

The study of Nunes and Halloran ranked eight characteristics of the effective ABE teacher: understanding of the adult learner; personal qualities; knowledge of the field; knowledge of teaching techniques; creativity (innovation); communication/interpersonal skill; professionalism; and management/organization. However, the training plan articulated in this document then listed "teachable skills". "Personal qualities" and "creativity", ranking #2 and #5 respectively, were omitted in the list. Thus, it appears we must find a way to look for these, if teachers cannot be trained for them.

In summary, affective and cognitive interactions have received considerable attention in the adult and adult basic education literature, where much of the focus has centred upon the learners, their needs, and the kinds of teaching that are required to meet those needs. However, the major part of this literature reflects a large body of informed opinion based on surveys and descriptions of current practice rather than on experimental or clinical research.
The application of adult education literature to current education practice in Canadian prisons has had some limitations. First of all, the prison system is currently quite directive, employing positive and negative incentives, designed to persuade an offender who is below the grade eight level to enrol in an adult basic education program. The prisoner is not perceived as self-directed in terms of his/her educational plans. The self-directed concept of the adult education literature appears as more congruent with the opportunities model—now a part of prison education history. Moreover, some current research (Ross & Fabiano, 1985) portrays the offender as deficient, or as possessing developmental lags in cognitive skills, particularly skills of social cognition: self-control, reasoning, perception, problem solving. This is not a portrayal that matches the popular definition of the adult learner.

On the other hand, the literature more specific to literacy and adult basic education focuses as much on the teacher as on the learner, and emphasizes the personal qualities of the teacher, particularly good interpersonal skills, skills that have received a high level of attention in literature on prison education.

PRISON TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

This part of the literature review will focus on prison teaching at both the basic and higher education levels. The review looks first at the work done in the United States, where correctional education was first delimited as a specific area of professional activity, deals in some detail with some Canadian universities’ work in prisons, and then concludes with an examination of the current emphasis on teaching for cognitive development.
As Miller (1987a) indicates, structured research on correctional teachers' effectiveness was in its infancy in 1987. On the other hand, the prisoners and programs designed for them had been objects of research in a variety of disciplines. For example, On Prison Education, edited by Lucien Morin and published in 1981, contained eighteen papers and essays, only one of which examined directly the teacher's role in prison education: D.K. Griffin's essay, Competencies of Correctional Educators.

A model for prison ABE programming in the United States was presented in 1969 at the National Work Conference on Goals of Adult Basic Education in Corrections. This conference officially launched ABE in Corrections (ABEC), and defined the ABEC goals in terms of its clientele: self-realization, social productivity, economic efficiency and civic responsibility (Ryan & Silvern, 1969, Eds.).

The role of the teacher did receive attention when the need to train teachers for corrections was identified. Writing in 1973, McAfee rationalized that this training was necessary because the prison students often had backgrounds different from students in other educational situations, the institutions presented unfamiliar conditions to teachers; and the inmates often had previous negative educational experiences. He stressed that the potential prison teacher must be knowledgeable in a wide range of topics that included the following:

1. how to teach various ages;
2. teaching materials;
3. psychology and sociology of the incarcerated;
4. history, management and environment of corrections;
5. how to handle inmate aggression and behavior problems;
6. know roles of other staff;
7. dynamics of the delinquency and crime causation.

In addition, he stressed that a trainee must have a stable personality, emotional maturity and be able to handle unusual situations.

Gubser (1977) commented on the successful student of this program:

"The successful corrections education major is a streetwise, mature, sensitive and highly communicative individual. Those with a missionary zeal, with little else to offer, are the first to find the program unacceptable to their needs." (p.24)

Miller's review contains themes and emphases similar to those contained in the literature cited in the preceding paragraphs. She cites studies by Gunnel (1973), Magee (1974), who articulated elements of teacher effectiveness; and Arshad (1975) and Pollack (1979), who described typical concerns of correctional teachers: lack of communication with prison administrators; conflict with security priorities; concern for personal safety; confusion over functions of prisons; and the stressful effects of the prison environment upon both teachers and students (cited in Miller, 1987a, pp. 49-51).

These conditions must be met, the literature indicated, by teachers who possess unique qualities and who also prefer multiple roles within the prison education program (Pinton, 1981). Pinton summarized his views of the characteristics and behaviors (roles) of the prison teacher, and in doing so seems to predict the current challenges in Canadian prison education:

The educator is expected to help in the achievement of all social and academic skills; he should be able to be a model in his profession and as a citizen; he should be patient, understanding, ready to listen and honest enough to correct errors of judgement and maturity as well as those of logic. (p.5)
A more recent article by Miller (1987b), based on her own research in prison teacher effectiveness, gives us information about the perceived characteristics of highly effective teachers. Statistically significant differentiation between two groups of teachers was found in the behaviors stimulating, original, and student-centred. The teachers in the group who were seen as highly effective had updated their teaching skills during the two years prior to the study, and had had less correctional experience than the group seen as low in effectiveness. Her study also showed that, although subject teachers, as well as other teachers in her sample, were rated highest on the behaviors knowledgeable and fair, these two behaviors were those that had distinguished least between the high in effectiveness and low in effectiveness groups. Conversely, all subject teachers and teachers in the low group, were rated lowest on the behaviors stimulating, and original. In addition, the high group was rated lowest on stimulating: the behavior that had distinguished most between the high in effectiveness and low in effectiveness groups. Ratings by experienced correctional teachers of interviews of subject teachers indicated that the responses of the highly effective teachers showed evidence of investment, a desire to help students grow, and self-awareness. Miller had intended that her research would provide her with enough information from which she could design a structured interview guide capable of selecting potentially effective prison educators. However, several of her questions, some posed in an hypothetical context, did not generate sufficient information about the interviewees for the raters to evaluate on the criteria within the rating guide. (Appendix D). However, the rating instrument, Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors, did
indicate behaviors that appeared to distinguish, based on student, supervisor, and self-perceptions, the highly effective from the low in effectiveness prison teachers (Appendix A).

Pinton's (1981) views had alluded to the concepts of cognitive and moral development, major concepts in Canadian prison education literature in the latter part of the 1980's. Griffin (1979, 1980); Duguid (1981, 1985); and Ross (1988) are cited here as proponents of this focus. In addition, the recent work of Zamble and Porporino suggests that programs with this focus must be directed at prisoners very early in their period of incarceration.

Speaking at a time when many correctional teachers in Canada were still employed directly by CSC, Griffin (1979) described the ideal professional image: "Correctional educators are compared with other correctional workers and with other educators. When they represent the best aspects of corrections, and of education as well, their professional image will be secure" (Summary).

In the next year he elaborated on this position in a paper at the 34th Annual Conference of the American Correctional Education Association. He described three kinds of competencies, which seemed to elaborate on Pinton's statements: "...they are competencies which enable students...to correct deficiencies in perception, in concept-formation, and in response repertoire" (1980, p.4). These competencies, he argued, will be understood when the teacher is willing to deal with issues of a social, political, and ethical nature. In the same paper, Griffin elaborated:

Most of us have not been forced to analyze our own values clearly enough to be able to deal with this kind of situation (the need to deal with issues of a social, political, and ethical nature). Some teachers, in fact, hold basically anti-social attitudes themselves, and should be in another line of work. Our values, perceptions, and cognitive concepts are necessarily inter-related.
None can be neglected without risk to the others. The competencies required of the correctional educator, then, include personal qualities as well. Adequate competencies cannot exist independently of them, for the teacher, and for the learner. (p. 10)

In a collection of writings edited by Morin (1981), Duguid describes the egalitarian relationships between university staff and students in the prison program of the University of Victoria, and the democratic atmosphere that had evolved within the program. Duguid referred to Lawrence Kohlberg's moral reasoning scale and suggested that a directive educational approach ought to take place within prison. This process would include a core curriculum of English literature and history and a variety of instructors who encourage discourse on social and moral issues. He suggested, however, that for this type of student "...no one course or instructor is the key to the developmental process. Instead, the education program as a whole is responsible and the primary cause of change agent may vary with each student" (p. 50).

Duguid (1985) also edited the paper, "The Prisoner As Student", which summarizes prison university instructors' responses to a questionnaire about their students' academic abilities, attitudes, and career goals. In this paper, instructors also comment on the impact of the prison on their teaching style, sometimes comparing their on-campus teaching experiences with prison ones. The paper includes a reference to the challenge to the university teacher concerning the role or position with respect to the imaginary line that divides prison staff and prisoner. He points out that while this challenge was greater in the prisons with higher security, most of the instructors were able to maintain an educational focus; therefore, in
one instructor's words: "The position taken should not be a middle position, but should favor the prisoner in a direct educational posture. This does not invite conflict with the prison authority" (p. 17).

Other instructor comments in this paper were revealing: "The biggest problem is avoiding appearing two-faced. This is primarily a structural problem; that is, the classic relationship between university and society/prison must be maintained and accepted by the contracting parties" (p. 17); and "My teaching is much more personal than on a university campus - ranging from spoon-feeding to harassment...I try to get away from authoritarian confrontations and encourage development...(p. 18); ...To be successful in prison, your teaching style should be forceful and enthusiastic" (p. 18); "The teacher needs to be honest, informal, accessible to challenge but firm. Arrogance is a definite liability" (p. 19).

Each of these instructors sees himself as outside, but not against the influence of the prison, or its authority; education is an activity that puts the instructor with the student, but not against the institution. Unlike those educators described by Griffin, the instructors do not see themselves as part of a "correctional" process.

Although Ross's work in the area of cognitive development relates more directly to offender behavior and re-education, it could have implications for the prison classroom teacher. Speaking at the Region VI Correctional Education Association Conference in Vancouver in October, 1988, Ross referred to his and others' research on offender rehabilitation programs: "...almost every single successful program [aimed at offender rehabilitation] shared one characteristic in common: they included some technique which could be expected to have an impact on the offender's thinking" (p. 1). His search of the literature had "...revealed a
substantial body of empirical studies which indicate that many but not all offenders evidence developmental delays in the acquisition of a number of cognitive skills" (p. 1).

Ross concluded his comments with these remarks:

Despite what we academics might say about education being a justifiable goal in its own right - the public and policymakers (sic) are becoming more and more demanding that correctional programs serve not just offender-centred goals but socially-centred goals as well. (p. 4)

Ross's view of correctional programs for the future was that "...rehabilitation is possible. But it requires multi-faceted programs conducted with integrity and honesty by qualified staff and supportive environments" (p. 4).

In Time to Think, written by Ross and Fabiano (1985), cognitive training techniques were outlined: didactic teaching; small group discussion; audio-visual techniques; reasoning exercises and games; role playing and modelling; individual and group counselling. In a presentation at a professional day for British Columbia Correctional Educators Association (BCCEA) members, Fabiano (1989) described how these elements were presented in cognitive skills training courses being piloted in several federal institutions and correctional centres in Canada. She also went on to say that these elements are essential elements of living skills as well as of adult basic education programming.

The research work of Zamble and Porporino (1988), Behavior, and Adaptation in Prison Inmates, suggests not only that the correctional programs should address the thinking patterns and the living and coping skills of inmates, but also that such programs should be introduced immediately upon incarceration, before the inmate settles into a routine which dulls perceptions or appears to obviate the necessity for change.
Their research was conducted over a one and three quarter year period in ten Ontario prisons. In Porporino's words: "...a prison has the effect of creating a behavioral deep-freeze. The behavior they bring to prison with them becomes fixed and development stops, like a photograph in a fixative" (p. 9).

The cognitive processes of the teachers in some Canadian prison programs have been examined in exploratory work by Munby (1986) of Queen's University. His case study, Professional Perspectives of Penitentiary Instructors, examines how four teachers in adult basic education and secondary school prison programs viewed their students; the prison classroom and its surrounding environment; and the teacher's role within this environment. Munby's intention had been to make linguistic analyses of interviews with these teachers, largely in terms of the metaphor contained in the interviews. While this goal was not achieved, his work has provided an excellent picture of the tension and stress felt by the four in their classroom, and of their attitudes and behaviors under that stress and tension. Because this study was conducted just prior to the current initiatives in literacy education in Canadian federal prisons, and was carried out when a contract agency other than the Kingston Learning Centre provided the program, the relevance of Munby's work to this current study may only be historical in nature. However, his interview strategies have suggested another way to examine more deeply the context of prison classrooms, particularly the teachers' perspectives of their work and of their students within that context.

Munby conducted from six to eight interviews with each of the four teachers, each interview usually one week apart. Each teacher was asked to discuss one of eight topics that dealt with aspects of his own background, a
typical day, his working environment, his students, and his courses, and was prompted with Munby's comments, based on the latter's observations during a classroom visit. Beyond the utilization of these techniques, these interviews were quite unstructured and free-flowing. He made no attempt to compare each interview, but was able to analyze each for recurring themes within the discourse.

What implications could this research have for teacher effectiveness in prisons? First, it may suggest that existing adult basic education programming and curricula should be evaluated in terms of their cognitive skills training content. Second, adult basic education teachers in Canadian prisons could soon be expected to teach such content, as well as to model the various facets of cognitive skills training as enumerated by Ross (1988): self-control, meta-cognition, interpersonal skills, creative thinking, critical reasoning, and social perspective taking. The most recent research, which relates to teacher thinking and teacher development, could provide direction to Canadian prison teachers, particularly those involved in cognitive skills training. Once again, we have seen that teacher effectiveness continues to be defined in terms of both external as well as internal conditions.

When viewed as a whole, the literature of this study has traced developments related to teaching in Canadian prison adult basic education programs. At first influenced by British and American thinking about prisons, and then controlled by Canadian government policies, federal correctional institutions have slowly reached a point at which education has become a recognized part of their mission, their goals, and their activity. While the prison classrooms in which that activity takes place are different in many ways from the classrooms outside prisons, prison teachers have come
from the same kinds of training and experiences as other classroom teachers. Therefore, this review has included an examination of what characteristics, behaviors, values, and attitudes are possessed by teachers outside and inside prison walls. In addition, some research activities, methods, and instruments, perhaps relevant to the prison classroom context, have been identified. Knowledge of this context, however, is limited to a relatively small number of educators as well as researchers. This review has illustrated that improvement in this regard has been facilitated by the involvement of outside agencies such as colleges and universities in the activities of prisons. These institutions, together with professional organizations such as the Correctional Education Association, will continue to focus on the improvement of teaching and learning in Canadian prisons. Supported by enlightened correctional policy, the future for educational activity therein seems promising. Although issues of funding and security remain, and despite the fact that the definition of "education" is unclear inside Canadian prisons as well as outside, these prisons do seem to be moving closer to the concept postulated in a paper by Morin and Cosman (1985, p. 13), presented at the World Assembly of Adult Education in Buenos Aires, Argentina:

...The entire prison is educational....Each participant ...has a role to play in the overall plan. The educational approach therefore implies that the prison itself must be educated before it can become educational. This means that unless it is able to exert its influence throughout the entire institution, with its host of duties, attitudes, roles and beliefs, the educational approach will be an impossibility.
Chapter III: Methodology

The population and sample, the research instruments, the methods of data collection, and the procedures taken to protect confidentiality are described in this chapter.

A. Population and Sample

The subjects of this study were adult basic education teachers who were under contract through their employers to federal correctional institutions in the Pacific Region and the Ontario Region of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). At the time of the study, approximately forty contract teachers were employed at this level of educational activity in twelve institutions within the two regions. In British Columbia (Pacific Region), one of two employers was Fraser Valley College (FVC), a community college that had delivered adult basic education programming since the College's opening in 1974, but which had been involved in that activity in Corrections only since 1983. In Ontario the employer was the Kingston Learning Centre (KLC), which had been established in 1982 as a private school to provide services for adults and children with learning disabilities, and which also had provided literacy programmes in the Kingston community since that time. In 1987 KLC had received its first contract to deliver adult basic education programming in the Ontario Region of the CSC.

All eighteen subjects had been certified to teach in the province in which they were presently employed, and most held degrees. All were engaged in teaching students in programs designed to improve prisoner literacy up to the pre-General Education Development (G.E.D.) level. All
had been employed a minimum of six months, full time or part time, in their current positions. Vocational instructors were not included in the sample because, at the time of the study, in most of the correctional institutions in Canada these instructors were employees of the Correctional Service of Canada. There are several differences in contractual obligations and in certification between these and contract employees.

While curriculum content differed between these two regions, adult basic education program objectives, as determined by the Correctional Service of Canada, were the same, as were methods of instruction. That is to say, various combinations of individualized instruction, limited use of computer assisted instruction, and occasional small group activity were commonly utilized.

All adult basic education teachers from both contract agencies were asked to participate, and all those who were available when the interview portion of the study was being carried out did participate. Although at the outset there appeared there would be approximately 40 potential subjects, later it was found that summer schedules, teacher turnover, or non-ABE teaching assignments had prevented the inclusion of many of these subjects. Twenty-one teachers from both regions were interviewed; however, three subjects were later eliminated from the study because their data from all instruments was not obtained. Therefore, eighteen teachers made up the subject group: ten from Pacific and eight from Ontario Region. Eight institutions were represented in the total sample.

The respondents to the Supplementary Questionnaire were three teachers from the group perceived as highly effective according to the results of the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors rating instrument.
B. Instruments

The decision to use rating and interview instruments designed by Miller (1987a) and Vickers (1979) as well as the Miller methodology was made because of similar conditions in the Maryland and the Canadian teaching situations: adult basic education programming; recent emphasis on literacy programming; employment of subject teachers by contracting agencies; similar certification requirements and working conditions; continuous entry and high turnover in the student populations; a representation of various security levels within the samples; a largely, but not exclusively, male population.

The following instruments were used in this study:

1. Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors (ETB): This instrument had been designed by Vickers in 1979 and was tested for its validity in a study that year. With the ETB, Vickers had rated two groups of community college teachers, one of these groups having been identified earlier as effective by virtue of their nomination to the Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation (Miller, 1987a). In Vickers' study, three perceiver groups - subject teachers, their supervisors, and former students - rated, with a significant difference, the nominated teachers and a control group of teachers, satisfying a .05 criterion on several variables (1987a). The variables in the ETB of Vickers are ten sets of characteristics: harsh/kindly, partial/fair, dull/stimulating, cursory/probing, inflexible/ adaptable, autocratic/student-centred, evading/responsible, limited/ knowledgeable, stereotyped/original, disorganized/systematic. One item was added to these by Miller: an item that asked for a rating on overall teaching effectiveness.
2. **Demographic Data Questionnaire (DDQ)** (developed by Miller, 1987a) (Appendix B). This was given minor modifications for the Canadian subjects in this study. This instrument included questions about respondents' teaching, educational, and training experience; additional experience in teaching methodology and curriculum; certification and endorsement; and current teaching assignment. Additional questions for informational purposes, such as sex, age, and language, were also part of the modified questionnaire (Modified form: Appendix C).

3. **Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS)** (developed by Miller and administered orally in the present study): a structured interview guide consisting of seven questions concerning the following: why the respondents had chosen teaching as a career; what contributions they thought they made to incarcerated students; what personal rewards they received from teaching in prison; what techniques they used to combat the stress encountered on the job; what techniques the respondents would use to develop individualized programs, promote learning, and develop a positive classroom climate for a hypothetical group of five students described in the interview form. Finally, the respondents were asked to describe the two most important goals that these students should have achieved at the end of their first term with the instructor (Appendix D).

4. **Correctional Teacher Interview Survey Guide** (by Miller): used to rate the teachers' responses to the CTIS on a set of three personal characteristics for each response. Each characteristic, assumed to be relevant to teacher effectiveness, was rated on a seven point bipolar rating scale (Appendix E). The items in this guide were developed on the basis of six themes identified by English and cited by Miller, together with nine other characteristics identified in the literature on teaching.
effectiveness with inner-city students and incarcerated learners (Miller, 1987a, p. 68). The different characteristics or variables included in this
guide for rating teachers' responses were as follows: sense of mission,
investment, desire to help students grow, sense of efficacy, concerned
about social justice, empathy, rapport drive, self-awareness, patience,
flexible, understanding of disadvantaged students, gestalt, sense of
structure, clarity, positive expectations, capacity for goal setting.

5. The Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ) was developed so that
additional information could be elicited from three teachers from the
high-in-effectiveness group about their own perceptions of their
kindergarten (K) to grade twelve (12) schooling; their life experiences
relevant to teaching in prison; their attitudes to teaching in a prison
adult basic education program and to several of their students as
individuals (Appendix F). Questions concerning these real situations were
developed because the literature had revealed that much can be learned from
examining the thinking that professionals do about what they do (Schon,
1982; Butt, 1983; Munby, 1986). The CTIS, on the other hand, had contained
several questions of an hypothetical nature, so that comparisons between
the responses to these two types of question could be instructive.

The first three items of the Supplementary Questionnaire required the
respondents to describe past school and life experiences and to reflect
upon those experiences.

Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 were designed to generate responses that could
be rated on several variables in the Modified CTIS Guide by three
independent raters because Miller had been unable, with the questions of
the CTIS, to generate sufficient data from which to develop a structured interview guide. For example, in Miller's study there had been a low frequency of rater response indicated for patient and flexible.

A final question, "What could be done about the things that you do not like?" (i.e., about teaching in a prison ABE program) was included for information purposes.

6. Modified CTS Guide: (Appendix G) This guide is a modification of the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey Guide. This modified form contained all the rating criteria of the original, with the exception of lacks clarity/possesses clarity and good sense of structure/poor sense of structure. These criteria had not been defined in Miller's original form and there appeared to be overlap between these and gestalt and focus. In their place, I added one item: ability to get along with others. This item had been cited by Miller as a characteristic identified in the literature on teaching effectiveness with inner-city students and incarcerated learners (1987a, p. 68). On this modified form, items were not organized as in the original, but they were grouped so that they accompanied particular questions on the Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ) (Appendix F).

Question #3, "What other life experiences do you feel may have prepared you for teaching in a prison?" was rated on the characteristics of self-awareness, sense of mission and capacity for goal setting (focus).

Question #4, "Describe five students who are enrolled in your class at the present time," was rated on patient, flexible, understanding of disadvantaged students, gestalt, positive expectations, desires to help students grow, empathy, and rapport drive.

Questions #5 and #6, "What do you like about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?" and "What do you dislike about teaching in a
prison adult basic education program?" were rated on investment, sense of efficacy, concerned about social justice, and ability to get along with others.

C. Data Gathering Procedures

Permission to conduct this research was provided by the administrators of the two contract agencies involved, Fraser Valley College and the Kingston Learning Centre; by the management of the eight institutions; and by the personnel responsible for approving research activity in the Ontario and Pacific Regions of The Correctional Service of Canada.

In addition to providing all teachers and administrators with oral and written information about their proposed involvement in this study, I made personal contact with all but one of these persons before they did participate. In addition, I visited the Kingston Learning Centre and met with many of its employees at their institutions prior to a second trip that involved the actual data gathering activities. Informed consent forms were completed by all subject teachers (Appendix I); those who completed the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors (ETB) were informed in that document's covering page that their participation constituted their consent (Appendix A).

Data gathering for this study was conducted in four parts: Part I was the rating of all teachers who were available for inclusion when this part of the study was conducted. I conducted fourteen of the eighteen rating sessions, assuming that my familiarity with the prison classroom dynamic and environment and my ease in dealing with students were important to the success of the data collection. The rating for each teacher was done voluntarily by their students, their head teachers/senior instructors, and
themselves. The size of the students' respondent group was determined by the numbers in attendance on the day of the rating and by the numbers of students who possessed the requisite reading level. (In some cases, the latter factor had limited the size of the student respondent group to less than ten for Miller as well.) Therefore, student respondent groups ranged in size from three to fifteen. Five respondents who spoke English as a second language, but who were literate in their own language, received, from a peer tutor, an oral translation of the form in their own language. A French translation of the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors had been created and was offered for use but was not required. The subject teacher was not present at the time of the rating, but welcomed me (or, in four classrooms, a designated head teacher to whom I had given an orientation) to the classroom. Before leaving the room, the classroom teacher briefly explained why the study was being conducted.

I (or the other proctors) distributed the rating form, Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors (ETB), to each group of students. On the cover page/directions sheet of each form had been written the name of each teacher; on the other pages had been written a number that designated the subject teacher. Students were instructed to return only the pages containing the numbered pages, and not to write their names on the pages that were returned to the proctor.

I then read aloud the directions on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors (ETB) and answered student questions about the procedure before and during the administration of the rating. When the completed forms were returned, they were placed in an envelope, sealed, and subsequently turned over to a research assistant for computer tabulation.
Responses to the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors by head teachers/senior instructors and by the teachers themselves were not proctored. These respondents completed the form either at work or in their spare time, whatever situation was more convenient. Each form was identified only by number when they were returned to me. I forwarded them to the research assistant for tabulating.

Part II was the completion of the Demographic Data Questionnaire by all participating teachers. These forms were labelled only by number when returned to me for forwarding for tabulation.

Part III was the interviewing of all participating teachers according to the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS). All interviews were conducted orally, not in written form as in Miller's study. Miller had found that the kind of responses obtained from these written interviews had differed little in substance from the oral responses to the same questions, which had been asked of six additional volunteer respondents outside her study. Each of Miller's oral interviews had generated slightly more information than the written ones had generated (1987a, p. 122).

I conducted all but three of the interviews with the CTIS used in the study. Three were done by a head teacher in Kingston because the schedule of my visits there had prevented my contacting three of the respondents for whom I had done classroom ratings. The possibility of my influencing the responses of the teachers from my own region had been considered; however, the difficult logistics involved in directing someone else to conduct all the interviews in both regions were also considered, and, therefore, the latter strategy was eliminated as a possibility. Neither the interviewer in Kingston nor I had any knowledge of what ratings from the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors had been assigned to the interviewees.
The interviews, usually lasting forty minutes, were recorded on audio cassettes, which had been numbered to match the numbers on the rating sheets to protect the respondents' anonymity during the rating of their responses. During the questioning, prompting was limited to asking for specific examples when one of the respondents seemed to have missed entirely that point of the question.

These tapes were rated separately according to the CTIS Guide by each of the three independent raters. These raters were not employed in the adult basic education programming at the time of the study but had had previous experience as contract teachers in the Canadian Federal Corrections system. One of the raters has had seven years experience providing instructional skills training for community college instructors and was involved at the time of the study in researching teaching styles and strategies that are appropriate for an adult setting. The second independent rater has had extensive teaching and curriculum development experience in non-traditional and cross-cultural settings, as well as in the prison setting. The third rater had been involved in the first attempts of a contract agency to establish adult basic education programs in two federal prisons, which had involved extensive liaison with correctional and teaching personnel; this rater had also served as a teacher in and coordinator of those programs and was teaching in an adult basic education program at the time of the study.

None of the raters was aware of the results of Miller's or Vicker's research related to teacher effectiveness. Nor did the raters know to which group (high or low in effectiveness) any of the subject teachers had been assigned. Moreover, each tape was identified only by number.
Part IV included the use of the Supplementary Questionnaire and the Modified Correctional Teacher Interview Survey Guide and the following procedures:

a. I interviewed three teachers from the high in effectiveness group. Each teacher was asked the seven questions of the Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ) (Appendix F). Responses were interspersed with my comment, but I made no attempt to direct with this comment; rather, I allowed the subjects to control the length of each response. Interviews lasted from forty-five minutes to two hours. Actual prompting was limited to one interview when I once asked the respondent to give specific examples to illustrate her/his statement.

b. These interviews took place at least six months after the first interviews for the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (Appendix D). They were audio-recorded, and each interview was typed verbatim.

c. The three independent raters evaluated the teachers' transcribed responses to questions #3 to #6 inclusive on the SQ by means of the Modified Correctional Teacher Survey Guide. The raters were not told that the respondents were from the group of teachers who had been rated as highly effective. The three sets of responses had been assigned a set of numbers that was different from the set that had been assigned for the earlier responses of the same teachers.

d. I collated all responses to the Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ) and examined each collation question by question and examined these collations for themes and other commonalities.
D. **Confidentiality**

In addition to the measures described in the procedures, other methods have been employed to protect the anonymity of all persons involved in this study. No institutions, teachers, students, or other personnel have been named. I have taken particular care to delete any information in the responses to the **CTIS** and the **Supplementary Questionnaire** that would identify specific students or classrooms, including place names, nationalities, birthplaces, and details of prisoners' sentences.
Chapter IV: Findings

In the following chapter, the analyses and results from the use of all four instruments will be presented. Figures and tables have been included to illustrate these findings.

A. The Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors

1. Methods of Analysis

The Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors was completed by each of eighteen teachers, each teacher's senior instructor/head teacher, and from three to fifteen of each teacher's students who possessed a reading level of approximately grade seven or above. For each of the eleven defined evaluation items for each teacher, a mean score was calculated, consisting of the head teacher's score, the teacher's own score, and all his/her students' scores. (This method gave no heavier weighting to the self-rating or to the head teacher rating than any one of the student's ratings.) From this, a total mean score for each teacher was computed combining the means of all eleven items. Question K was not included in the average, but the substance of the responses to K was compared in terms of the most and least effective groups.

2. Range and Frequency of Scores

From a possible score of 77.00 for the eleven rated questions, the lowest mean score (derived from the total of ratings by all students, head teacher, and the subject's own rating) scored by any teacher was 54.93. The highest total mean score was 71.44.

The t-tests were performed to see if there was any significant
difference between the teachers' self-evaluations and the evaluations of either the supervisors or the students. The t-tests were also performed to see if there was any significant difference between the evaluations of the supervisor and the students. The difference was not statistically significant in any of these cases (p > .10).

These total mean scores on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors for each teacher were rank ordered. Five teachers whose mean scores ranked lowest were identified as belonging to the group perceived as least effective (low group), and five teachers whose mean scores ranked highest were identified as belonging to the group perceived as most effective (high group).

A t-test was performed on the difference between the means of the high and the low groups with \( t = 10.943; \ p < .01 \) for 10 df.

Scores for the low group ranged from 54.93 to 57.84. Scores for members of the high group ranged from 67.84 to 71.44.

This sample of eighteen yielded upper and lower quartiles of five subject teachers, as shown in Table 1.

There was less proximity between the upper quartile and the middle scores (1.11) than between the lower quartile and the middle ones, where there was a 3.16 difference. However, there was a greater range difference in the upper quartile (3.56) than in the lower quartile (2.91). Scores for individual teachers on individual items ranged from 0 to 7. A visual inspection was made of all the ratings from the student who gave the "0" rating. It was determined that all of the other ratings by this student were "0" or "1." As this "halo effect" was absent in all other students' responses, his/her responses could be attributed to factors other than the student's perception of the teacher. Nonetheless, the exclusion
Table 1

Distribution of Total Mean Scores for All Subject Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of this score would not have changed the subject teacher's placement in the low in effectiveness group, although that teacher's ranking would have changed from last to first within the low group.

Mean scores for individual teachers on individual items ranged from 4.25 to 6.86. Only two teachers received the mean rating of 4.25, assigned to Item L, *overall effectiveness*. One teacher received a rating of 6.86 on two items: D, *fair/partial*; and F, *student-centred/autocratic*.

3. Ranking of Behaviors

The mean scores for the total group on each evaluation item ranged from 5.38 to 6.16. The lowest mean score, 5.38, for the teachers as a group, was for Item C with bipolar opposites of *stimulating/dull*. The highest mean score, 6.16, was for Item H with bipolar opposites of *knowledgeable/limited*.

The total group mean scores for the eleven behaviors on the instrument *Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors* are listed in rank order in Table 2.

4. Teacher Behaviors on Individual Items

Mean scores on individual items for the high group ranged from a low mean score of 5.98 for Item C: *stimulating/dull* to a high mean score of 6.48 for Item L: *overall effectiveness*. The total mean score for the low group was 56.57. Mean scores for the low group ranged from a low score of 4.63 for the item measuring the behavior *stimulating/dull* (C) to a high score of 5.82 for the item measuring the behavior *knowledgeable/limited* (H). The total mean score for the high group was 69.02. The lowest mean score received by both groups and by the total sample was for the rating on the behaviors *stimulating/dull*. Comparisons of item mean scores for teachers in the low and the high group are depicted in Figure 1.
### Table 2

**Rank Order of Variables on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors for Group of All Subject Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.158</td>
<td>Knowledgeable/Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.891</td>
<td>Student-Centred/Autocratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>Kindly/Harsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.867</td>
<td>Responsible/Evading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.771</td>
<td>Fair/Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.768</td>
<td>Adaptable/Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.701</td>
<td>Systematic/Disorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.685</td>
<td>Probing/Cursory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.661</td>
<td>Original/Stereotyped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.377</td>
<td>Stimulating/Dull</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Comparison of Item Mean Scores for Teachers Perceived to be in the Most and Least Effective Groups on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors.

Note: A) Item means are rounded to the nearest tenth.

B) Scale range is not absolute: 3.5 to 6.5.

(Adapted from Miller, 1987a)
a. Ranking of Differences

Score differentials between the high and low groups were computed. Differences in scores between high and low groups were indicated for all items, but greatest differences between the two groups were for the behaviors original/stereotyped (I): 1.708; overall effectiveness (L): 1.496; and adaptable/flexible (E): 1.459; and stimulating/dull (C): 1.357. Less difference was shown between the behaviors knowledgeable/limited (H): 0.638; systematic/disorganized (J): 0.738; and evading/responsible (G): 0.878. The rank ordering of these differences is shown in Table 3.

Because overall effectiveness is not a single behavior, the fourth ranked differentiating variable, stimulating/dull (G) was included with adaptable/flexible (E) and original/stereotyped (I) in the following analysis.

The differences between the high and low groups on the sets of characteristics stimulating/dull (C), adaptable/inflexible (E), and original/stereotyped (I) were subjected to a one-tailed t-test and found to be significantly different: t = 9.032; df = 18; p < .005. The difference between the high and low groups on the sets of characteristics responsible/evading (G), knowledgeable/limited (H), and systematic/disorganized (J) were also significant: t = 3.636; df = 18; p < .005.

When the high and low groups' scores were combined, a z-test indicated a statistically significant difference between the scores on the characteristics lettered C, E, and I and the scores on the characteristics lettered G, H, and J: z = -2.16; p = .0154.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original/Stereotype</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable/Inflexible</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating/Dull</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing/Cursory</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Centred/Autocratic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindly/Harsh</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evading/Responsible</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic/Disorganized</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable/Limited</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Item K

All teachers in both the high and low groups received responses to Item K, which required the respondent to name one or two additional characteristics of an effective teacher and to rate the subject teacher on the characteristic(s). A total of one hundred responses ([40 students' + 5 self-evaluations + 5 supervisors'] x 2) were possible for the high group and ninety-two ([36 students' + 5 self-evaluations + 5 supervisors'] x 2) were possible for the low group. Forty-six (46%) responses were received for the high group, and forty-seven (51%) for the low group. This response was characterized by a slightly lower student response (48.75%) for the high than the low (50%) group (Table 4). However, the number of supervisors' responses appears to have affected the result of this overall response to Item K for the two groups: only two of five supervisors responded for the
high group, with a total of three characteristics named; four of five supervisors responded in the low group with a total of eight of a possible ten characteristics. Only in the low group did one teacher receive two item ratings (4.0) that were lower than 5.0 from a supervisor. One teacher in the low group did not complete an ETB.

The supervisor responses to Item K included the behaviors optimism, realistic and sense of humour for the high group and optimism, pragmatic, sense of humour, empathetic, accessible and assertive for the low group. For both groups sense of humour was named three times by supervisors; optimism and empathetic were named twice. From the high group, only two subject teachers received a supervisor rating of 7: one for realistic and another for sense of humour.

The student respondents to Item K generated fifteen different responses for the high group, with the characteristic sense of humour named nine times. The characteristic patience was named four times by these students. For the low group, there were seventeen different responses, but only sense of humour was named with any frequency (three times).

Several different behaviors were named in response to Item K, but not more than twice; of the thirty-six responses named for the low group of teachers, eight behaviors were given a rating of 3.0 or below: attractive, encouraging student ideas, not institutionalized, works with whole class, cultural, treats students as adults, provides treats, knowledgeable. For the high group, only one teacher received a rating of 3.0 or below on Item K: two students gave a 2.0 rating for the teaching behavior providing donuts.
5. Summary of Findings from the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors

A group of five teachers perceived as least effective and a group of five teachers perceived as most effective were identified by the mean ratings on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors for eighteen subject teachers in the Adult Basic Education programs within two regions of the Correctional Service of Canada: Ontario and Pacific. The total mean scores for each of the eleven defined scale items were lower for the low group than for the high group. The total sample mean score (63.42) was also lower than the total mean score for the high group (71.44).

Total mean scores awarded to individual teachers ranged from 54.93 to 57.84 for members of the low group and from 67.84 to 71.44 for members of the high group. The range of difference between the items for the two groups in this study was narrow: 1.708 to 0.638, reflecting the narrow range of item mean rating scores.

Nevertheless, the behaviors which appear in this study to be separating the two groups of teachers are original/stereotyped, overall effectiveness, adaptable/flexible, and stimulating/dull. The behaviors that appear least important in separating these two groups are knowledgeable/limited, systematic/disorganized, and evading/responsible. In terms of difference, limited/knowledgeable was ranked eleventh.

Although the behavior knowledgeable/limited did not appear as a discriminating element of effective teaching, by contrast it does receive a high ranking in terms of mean scores for the subject teachers. The low group and the high group ranked first in knowledgeable/limited and also in overall effectiveness; the total sample ranked highest in knowledgeable/limited.
Furthermore, while the behavior original/stereotyped appeared as one of the most significant behaviors separating the high and the low groups, this behavior was the one for which the total group and the low group received mean scores in the low range. These rankings are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order of Variables on Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Low Group</th>
<th>High Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>High Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable/Limited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Centred/Autocratic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindly/Harsh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible/Evading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Partial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable/Inflexible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic/Disorganized</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing/Cursory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original/Stereotyped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating/Dull</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Demographic Data Questionnaire (DDQ)

1. Methods of Analysis

From the teachers’ responses to the Demographic Data Questionnaire, comparisons were made between the high and the low groups in terms of teaching experience, professional development activity, certification credentials, and academic background.

The responses to most questions were tabulated manually. This procedure revealed that several responses could not be quantified, despite the fact that some of the original questions on the Miller instrument had been modified for Canadian participants. An extensive statistical analysis was deemed inappropriate, due to the small sample.

2. Years and Types of Teaching Experience

Subject teachers were asked about the length of time they had taught in correctional settings, public schools, and other settings which included trade schools, colleges/universities, parochial schools, schools for the handicapped, or any other settings. Group means for each item were calculated for the high group and the low group. The total mean score for correctional teaching experience for members of the low group was 1.9 years, a difference of only 0.6 years from the high group. The maximum experience in the low group was 4.4 years. The total mean score for correctional teaching experience for the high group was 2.5 years. The maximum score was 4.7 years. This score also represented the longest correctional teaching experience in the entire sample of eighteen teachers. Four of the low group and three of the high group had had two years or less in correctional teaching (Figure 2).
Figure 2. Comparison of Mean Length of Teaching Experience for High and Low in Effectiveness Groups in Corrections, Public/Parochial Schools, and Other School Settings.
In response to the question on time spent in regular public school teaching, the low group generated four out of five responses and the mean years of experience in the public schools for this low group was 7.5 years. For the high group, the mean for years of experience in public school teaching was 2.4 years. The maximum score for the low group was 23 years; for the high group it was 12.75 years. The minimum scores for both groups was 0.0. The low group presented a higher mean for experience in the public school: 7.5; while the high group had a mean of 2.4.

Five teachers in the low group generated 8 responses to the question on experience in other settings. Three teachers in the high group generated five responses to this question. Respondents could check more than one of these categories (Table 6). The mean years of experience in other settings for the low group was 7.8 years, with a maximum of 25.5 years and minimum of 1.0. The mean for years of experience in other settings for the high group was only 0.4 years, with a maximum of 1.0 years and a minimum of 0.5 years. The low group also had a higher frequency of parochial school teaching (3), yielding a mean of 1.9 parochial teaching years; the high group had no parochial teaching experience. Both groups' experiences were similar in kind outside of parochial schools: college/institute; school for the handicapped; and learning centres (other). The low group's public and parochial experience totalled 9.4 years. The high group had 2.4 years public/parochial experience.
Table 6

Comparison of Education and Training Received by Teachers in the High and Low Groups According to the Demographic Data Questionnaire

Frequencies of responses from the low group which indicated experience in various settings were as follows:

- (a) vocational school 1
- (b) college/institute 1
- (c) university 1
- (d) parochial school 3
- (e) school for the handicapped 1
- (f) other 1
- (g) no response 2

Frequencies of responses from the high group indicating experience in various settings were as follows:

- (a) vocational school 0
- (b) college/institute 2
- (c) university 1
- (d) parochial school 0
- (e) school for the handicapped 1
- (f) other 1
- (g) no response 2
3. **Education and Training Received**

Respondents provided information which indicated whether or not they possessed college/university degrees, the kinds of degrees they possessed, and what other teacher preparation they possessed if they did not have a degree. They were also asked to provide information about the number of education courses in teaching methodology or curriculum development taken, and the number of credit hours or units earned. They were then asked to indicate the professional development activity they had attended during the two years prior to completion of the survey. Student teaching experience or other direct teaching practice and the length of time spent in each were indicated. A comparison of this information in terms of the low and high groups is shown in Table 7.

Four of the five teachers in the low group reported earning college/university degrees; one teacher did not possess a degree. Five of the teachers in the high group reported have college/university degrees. Other preparation for teaching reported by members of the low group not possessing degrees was teacher's college.
Table 7

Comparison of Education and Training Received by Teachers in the High Group and Teachers in the Low Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Training</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/College Degree</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree - Bachelor's</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree - Master's</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree - PhD</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree/Other Preparation</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Methodology/Curriculum</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Methodology/Curriculum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Courses Last 2 Years</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of These Courses Per Group</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Teaching Practice</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Kinds of Other Practice</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two of the teachers in the low group reported possession of the bachelor's degree as the highest degree held; two teachers in the low group reported having a master's degree. In the high group, four of the five teachers held a bachelor's degree as their highest degree; one teacher held a master's degree; no teacher in either the low or high groups held a doctoral degree.

Because a variety of methods of reporting credits and/or credit hours was reflected in responses to the item about course work related to teaching methodology and/or curriculum development, these credits were not quantified for purposes of comparison; instead, comparisons for the high and low groups were made between the numbers of teachers taking methods courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels and by way of continuing education courses.

Four of the five teachers in the low group reported that they had taken undergraduate courses related to teaching methodology and/or curriculum development; no teachers reported that they had taken graduate courses. One teacher had taken continuing education courses. In the high group, four of the five teachers reported that they had taken undergraduate courses related to teaching methodology/curriculum development; one teacher had taken graduate courses related to these areas; four teachers had taken continuing education courses.

Professional development experiences within the two years prior to the survey were reported by three of the five teachers in the low group. In the high group, four of the five teachers reported professional development experience. The total number of courses taken by the low group was 10, yielding a mean for professional development courses taken by this group as 2.0. The total number of courses taken in this area by the members of the
high group was 13, yielding a mean of 2.6. These professional development experiences were similar in kind for both groups: English as a Second Language, Literacy and Learning Disabled workshops; stress management seminars; counselling and interpersonal skills training.

As Table 7 shows, differences between the high and low groups appeared in the areas of continuing education and in other direct teaching practice. There is only a slight difference between these groups in "additional courses in last two years" category. This phenomenon may be a reflection of the current emphasis on activity in the literacy and E.S.L. areas of educational programming within CSC. Responses to the subject of student teaching indicated that student teaching experience had been provided, in the provinces or countries from which the subjects had come, in a variety of ways. Therefore, the responses to the questionnaire on this subject were difficult to quantify, although this activity was common to all teachers in both the high and low groups.

The question related to other opportunities for direct teaching practice, as part of the preparation for teaching, did yield a different frequency of response between the high and the low groups. The high group named 6 different kinds of other direct teaching practice and a total of 7 responses in this category. These were tutoring of the learning disabled, facilitating a stress management group, and teaching in one of the following skills areas: skiing, safety procedures, parenting, and music. The low group named 2 kinds of other direct teaching practice for a total of 2 responses from one teacher: group facilitating and life guarding.

4. Certification of Credentials

Reflecting the requirements of the contracts with agencies providing educational programming for the Correctional Service of Canada, each teacher
in the high and low groups was in possession of a teaching credential from the province in which she/he was presently employed, although one of these was a "letter of authority" from that province. In addition, three teachers from the low group held certificates from other provinces or countries; none of the teachers from the high group possessed certificates from outside the province in which they were presently teaching.

Dissimilarities among provinces in terms of certificate terminology (standard, basic, professional, etc.) made analysis of this item difficult. These dissimilarities also were reflected in the responses to the question about subjects endorsed on these certificates. Thirteen of the eighteen teachers from the entire sample did not report endorsements. The other part of this latter question, which dealt with subjects presently taught, also yielded inconsistent responses, possibly indicative of the multi-level, multi-subject, individualized instruction nature of the classrooms surveyed in this study.

5. Personal Data

Respondents were directed that their responses to questions about gender, age, and bilingualism (French/English) were not obligatory; nevertheless, all of the ten respondents in the high and low groups provided answers to all these questions.

There was the same distribution of male and female respondents in both the low and high groups: four respondents were female and one was male in each group. In the entire group of eighteen teachers, thirteen were female and five were male.

The ages of the respondents were surveyed in terms of groups organized in ten-year intervals, beginning with 20-29. The final age group was 65+. The teachers of the low group fell into the 30-39, 40-49, and 50-59
categories. The teachers in the high group were represented in the top three categories: 20-29, 30-39, and 40-49.

The eighteen teachers represented all age groups except 69+. The small low and high group samples makes comparison between them difficult, although the entire sample indicated the heaviest distribution (9) in the 40-49 age category.

One respondent in the entire sample indicated that he/she had attained French/English bilingualism.

6. Summary of Findings from the DDQ

As indicated, the small size of the high and low groups has rendered mostly inconclusive evidence with respect to demographics. The number of years of correctional teaching reported did not seem to differ in a meaningful way between the high and low groups of teachers. The teachers of both groups were inexperienced in the field of correctional teaching.

On the other hand, the number of years of public/parochial school experience reported by teachers in the low group was higher than the number of years reported by teachers in the high group, suggesting an inverse relationship between this public/parochial school experience and effectiveness.

Only two other areas may have rendered demographic data of any significance: the frequency of professional development activity for both groups is relatively similar, possibly reflecting some organizational emphasis upon professional development. Other direct teaching practice for members of the high group was more varied than for the low group.
C. Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS)

1. Methods of Analysis

A synopsis of the responses of all eighteen teachers was made. Then the substance and the frequency of kinds of responses, and the ratings received by teachers in the high and low groups, were compared.

The data from the CTIS were treated in several ways:

1. The mean for each item for each teacher was calculated from the three ratings, arrived at independently by three experienced correctional educators.

2. The group mean ratings of responses to the CTIS for the high, the low, and the entire group of 18 teachers were calculated and compared (Table 8).

3. The responses of the three raters to the CTIS Rating Guide were examined for frequency on each of the 21 characteristics. Notice was made of the frequency of a "N" or no response (Table 9).

4. The differences between the high and low group mean scores were ranked (Table 10).

5. The content of the responses for the teachers in the high and low groups was examined for kind and frequency.

6. The correctional educators' rankings on the CTIS of the teachers in the low and high in effectiveness groups were compared with the students' rankings of the same teachers on the ETB (Table 11).

2. Group Mean Ratings

The group mean ratings of the teachers in the high group were higher than the low group for all twenty-one of the characteristics evaluated for in the CTIS and according to the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey Guide. Twenty of the 21 scores for the low group were lower than the
corresponding scores for the entire group; each of the high scores for the high group was higher than the corresponding score for the total group of eighteen teachers. All group mean ratings are shown in Table 7.

Table 8
Comparison of Group Mean Ratings on the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey

Item A (1) Why did you choose teaching as a career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Entire - 4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Entire - 4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to help students grow</td>
<td>Entire - 4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item A (2) What are the most important contributions that you as an individual can make to incarcerated students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of efficacy</td>
<td>Entire - 5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 5.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 8 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for social justice</th>
<th>Entire - 4.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 3.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Entire - 4.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item B (1) Describe the greatest personal reward that you receive from working with incarcerated students?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Entire - 5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 5.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rapport drive</th>
<th>Entire - 5.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Entire - 5.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item B (2) What techniques do you use to maintain your personal equilibrium and balance while coping with the stress encountered in correctional work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>Entire - 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item C (1) What techniques would you use to develop a classroom climate which would enhance learning and promote positive group interaction?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of disadvantaged students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item C (2) How would you organize the instructional program(s) for these students?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 continued

Clarity
Entire - 4.81
High - 5.47
Low - 4.07

Gestalt
Entire - 4.67
High - 5.03
Low - 4.20

Item C (3) What are the two most important goals the students described above should achieve by the end of your first term as their teacher? Explain why the achievement of these goals is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive expectations</td>
<td>Entire - 5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for goal setting</td>
<td>Entire - 4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of disadvantaged students</td>
<td>Entire - 4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low - 4.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Analysis of Ratings and Responses Content

Responses to the CTIS were tallied for frequency, and their contents were inspected to discover patterns that distinguished the high group from the low group.
In responding to Item A(1), "Why did you choose teaching as a career?" the high group scored a group mean of 5.63 on the characteristic mission, 5.37 on investment, and 5.87 on desire to help students grow; the low group scored 4.90, 4.47, and 4.50 respectively on these characteristics. The entire group of eighteen teachers scored 4.89, 4.69, and 4.98 respectively on these characteristics. Only on the characteristic mission did the low group score higher than the entire group, but only by .001.

Respondents provided a variety of reasons for choosing teaching as a career. Fourteen of sixteen responses were personal, rather than altruistic in nature: challenging (2); role models (3); available/accessable/convenient profession (3); like people (2); and four other single responses. Two responses from the high group were "to help others". The fourteen "personal" reasons were evenly distributed between the high and low groups.

In responding to Item A (2), "What are the most important contributions that you as an individual can make to incarcerated students?" the high group scored a mean of 5.83 on sense of efficacy, 4.80 on concern for social justice, and 4.85 on the characteristic empathy. The low group scored 5.17, 3.87, and 4.27 respectively on these characteristics. The entire group scored 5.31 on sense of efficacy, 4.04 on concern for social justice, and 4.85 on empathy.

Responses to this question appeared to fall into four categories: future oriented (2 high, 4 low group), e.g. help them learn skills for the street; personal development (6 high, 4 low group), e.g. raised self-esteem; academic development (1 high, 0 low), e.g. to move them academically; and day-to-day prison survival (3 for high, 2 for low group), e.g. brighten people's days. The only difference perceived in these
responses was the theme of rehabilitation that emerged in the "future oriented" responses, more frequently given in the low group.

In responding to item B (1), "Describe the greatest personal reward that you receive from working with incarcerated students" the high group scored a mean of 5.60 on 

**mission**, 5.33 on 

**rapport drive**, and 5.80 on 

**investment**. The low group scored 5.03 on 

**mission**, 4.83 on 

**rapport drive**, and 4.83 on 

**investment**. The entire group scored 5.17, 5.03, and 5.12 respectively on the same characteristics.

Two kinds of responses dominated in this item: 1. the satisfaction gained from seeing students learn or accomplish something; and 2. seeing the student's attitude change. Four respondents in the high group indicated the personal reward of seeing students learn or accomplish something; one from the low group stated this reward; one from the high group stated "seeing the student's attitude change"; three from the low group also indicated this to be their greatest personal reward; two others from the low group stated "friendship" to be a reward and one other stated the carrying out of a "mission" to be a personal reward.

In responding to item B (2), "What techniques do you use to maintain your personal equilibrium and balance while coping with the stress encountered in correctional work?", the high group scored a mean of 5.90 on 

**self-awareness**, 5.50 on 

**patience**, and 6.33 on 

**flexibility**. The low group scored 5.10, 5.17, and 5.47 respectively on the same items. The entire group scored 5.44, 5.47, and 5.87 respectively on these items.

The responses to this item fell into five main categories; in addition there were four miscellaneous responses, all from the high group. These main categories and frequencies of each for each group are as follows: humour (4 high, 4 low); outside activities (2 high, 5 low); classroom group
techniques (2 high, 1 low); health related activities (0 high, 5 low); and support systems (1 high, 1 low).

In responding to Item C (1), "What techniques would you use to develop a classroom climate which would enhance learning and promote positive group interaction?" the high group scored 4.50 on understanding of disadvantaged students, 5.27 on empathy, and 5.20 on gestalt. The low group scored 4.33, 4.60, and 4.33 respectively on these items. The entire group of eighteen teachers scored means of 4.43, 4.97, and 4.94 respectively on these items.

The responses to this item were varied, but fell into two categories; one category related to academic learning and the other related to classroom climate. There was no marked difference in either the kind or frequency of responses in the first category. Responses and frequency in the first category were individual assessments and meetings (2 high, 3 low); individual curriculum relevancy (1 high, 2 low); team and peer learning (high 1, low 1); individualized instruction (3 high, 1 low); and high expectations (1 high, 0 low). In the category related to classroom climate, there emerged a distinct difference between how the high and the low group approached group activity in their classroom. Eight of the responses from the high group indicated that group activity (discussions, games, life skills type of exercises) were planned by the teacher for the entire group, although effort was made to prepare the students ahead in terms of being comfortable with group activity. Only two of the responses from the low group indicated that group activity was planned; instead, four respondents relied on spontaneous discussion to arise from the class, and from there the teacher would direct this activity, sometimes turning it into the "teachable moment". Other suggestions from the low group included setting up a space for each student, marked by pictures of interest to him.
In responding to Item C (2), "How would you organize the instructional program(s) for these students?" the high group scored 5.13 on structure, 5.47 on clarity, and 5.03 on gestalt. The low group scored 4.00, 4.07, and 4.20 respectively on these items. The entire group scored 4.61, 4.81, and 4.67 respectively on these items.

The responses to this item were somewhat repetitive of the responses to the preceding question: individualized instruction, small group learning activities, peer tutoring, regular individual meetings, group projects, assessments, group games and culturally relevant materials. What distinguished the responses, however, was the presence of more variety in the types of responses (14) from the high group than the low group (8). In both, the responses lacked specificity and structure in terms of the respondents' subject areas.

In responding to Item C (3), "What are the two most important goals that the students described above should achieve by the end of your first term as their teacher?" the high group scored 5.33 on positive expectations, 5.40 on capacity for goal setting, and 5.03 for understanding of disadvantaged students. The low group scored 4.66, 4.40, and 4.40 respectively on these items. The total number of eighteen teachers scored 5.01, 4.77, and 4.81 respectively on these items.

Because some teachers gave more than two responses to this question, the total responses for the high group were 14, and the total for the low group was 13. The goals stated were academic, interpersonal skill, or personal development in nature, and these were fairly evenly distributed between the high and the low groups; academic goals: 5 high, 3 low; interpersonal skill: 4 high; 4 low; and personal development: 5 high, 6 low.
In response to "Explain why the achievement of these goals is important", teachers gave reasons that were related to the goals' having value on "the street", for the student's own personal development, or for the creation of a good classroom climate. Again, the responses within these categories were distributed with relative evenness: 2 high, 2 low, for street value; 4 high, 3 low for personal development; and 1 high, 2 low for the creation of a good classroom climate.

The study showed consistent differences between the high and the low groups in terms of the 21 characteristics rated. When I examined the content of the responses to the CTIS, however, I found that Miller's CTIS categories were too narrowly defined for use with the smaller sample in the present study. There is inconclusive evidence that the high group appeared to get satisfaction from seeing students learn or accomplish something. There was some indication that the high group worked to develop classroom climate by means of some planned group activities.

4. Frequency of a "No Response (N)" by Raters on the CTIS Guide

An inspection of the computer-tabulated ratings on the CTIS Guide revealed a high frequency of an "N" response by raters for three characteristics: concern for social justice under Item A (2); patient and flexible under Item B (2). This high frequency was common for the low, high and entire group of subject teachers. Raters found that these three interview questions did not elicit responses that allowed the raters to judge them on these characteristics. Table 9 shows these frequencies.
Table 9

Frequency of No Response (N) by Raters on the CTIS Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Entire Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>High/Low Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible (18x3)</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Possible (10x3)</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about social justice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Summary of Findings from the CTIS and the CTIS Guide

All the group mean ratings for characteristics on the CTIS were higher for the group of teachers rated high in effectiveness than for the group rated low in effectiveness. The rankings of these differences from greatest to least are depicted in Table 10.
## Table 10

### Ranking of High/Low Group Mean Differences on the CTIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>High/Low Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A (1)</td>
<td>Desire to help students grow</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>C (3)</td>
<td>Capacity for goal setting</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
<td>Concern for social justice *</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A (1)</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>B (2)</td>
<td>Flexibility *</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>B (2)</td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>B (1)</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A (1)</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>C (3)</td>
<td>Positive expectations</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
<td>Sense of efficacy</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>C (3)</td>
<td>Understanding of disadvantaged students</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>B (1)</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>B (1)</td>
<td>Rapport drive</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>B (2)</td>
<td>Patience *</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>Understanding of disadvantaged students</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items receiving high frequency of No (N) response according to CTIS Guide.
The greatest differences between the two groups were shown for the characteristics **clarity**, **desire to help students grow**, **structure**, and **empathy**. All differences were greater than 1.00. However, the characteristic of **empathy**, like the characteristics of **high investment**, **strong sense of mission**, **high gestalt**, **good understanding of disadvantaged students**, was rated under two different scale items. **Empathy** was ranked both as a high and low difference between the two groups of teachers. The other four characteristics were not shown to be important indicators of difference between the high and low groups of teachers. The inconsistent ratings for **empathy**, therefore, did not seem to have provided reliable information for comparison of the high and low groups. On the other hand, although the characteristics of **clarity**, **desire to help students grow**, and **structure** were rated only in one item of the scale, their differences in ratings between the high and low groups of teachers may be important with respect to size as compared to all the other differences shown in Table 10. Finally, the lack of evidence for the characteristics **patience**, **flexibility**, and **sense of social justice** in teachers' responses could suggest that these characteristics require evaluation by other methods or by means of different questions.

6. Comparison of Rankings on the ETB and the CTIS

Because some institutions involved in the delivery of adult basic education programs in prisons use a teacher performance appraisal process that includes students' evaluations of their teachers, it could be informative to compare the students' ratings derived from the administration of the **Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors** instrument with the ratings according to the **Correctional Teacher Interview Survey** and its
Guide. In other words, how do the rankings of ratings by students on the ETB compare with ranking of teachers' ratings by three experienced correctional educators on the CTIS and its Guide?

The rankings of teachers from the high in effectiveness group --teachers V, W, X, Y, Z -- on the ETB and the CTIS were compared. Teachers V and W were ranked fifth and second respectively in the group of teachers by both the students and the correctional educators. Students ranked teacher X third in the high group on the ETB; the correctional teachers ranked teacher X first in the high group on the CTIS. Four of the five teachers (V, W, X, Z) were ranked in the high group by both their students and the correctional educators.

The rankings of teachers from the low in effectiveness group -- teachers P, Q, R, S, and T -- on the ETB and CTIS were compared: Teachers P and S were given the same rank in the group of ten teachers by both their students and the three correctional educators (raters). Students ranked teacher T last in this group; the three correctional educators ranked teacher T in the middle of the low group on the CTIS. Four of the five teachers (P, R, S, T) were ranked in the low group by both their students and the correctional teachers. The average CTIS rankings and the rankings by the students from the ETB are similar enough to meet the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test (Table 11: n=8, t=16.5; t > critical t; same location).
Table 11

Comparison of Rankings on the ETB and the CTIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>(average of 21 averages)</th>
<th>CTIS Rank</th>
<th>ETB Rank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rating by students only;

(n = 8; t = 16.5; t > crit t; same location)
D. **Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ)**

1. **Methods of Analysis**

Several methods were used to analyze the responses of three highly effective teachers to the Supplementary Questionnaire:

a. First the answers were collated, question by question. Then a tabulation was made of the frequency of the six "power themes" cited by Miller (1987a, p. 68): mission, empathy, rapport drive, investment, gestalt, and focus.

b. Responses for questions # 3 to # 6 of the Supplementary Questionnaire were rated by the same independent raters who had rated responses to the CTIS; for the Supplementary Questionnaire they used the Modified CTIS Guide.

c. These ratings were tabulated and mean ratings for each characteristic were computed for each of the three teachers.

d. The responses to question # 7, which asked what could be done about the things that the respondent did not like about working in a prison adult basic education program, were analyzed for kinds of responses and their frequency.

2. **Themes in Responses to the Supplementary Questionnaire**

As well as the power themes of mission, empathy, rapport drive, investment, gestalt, and focus, several common elements are present in all of the three teachers' responses. These are grouped according to the question that prompted the response:

Q #1. Describe you own school experience from K to 12 in terms of its institutions, teachers, and curricula.

All three teachers, while they did not actually hate school, did not like it or find it relevant, particularly before high school and
particularly in terms of curricula. They remembered the rote learning and the boredom, particularly at the lower grades. Although there were bright moments, these had come mainly from teachers who had given encouragement, recognition for individual talent, and who were friendly and kind. Each of the three teachers had experienced corporal punishment in the early grades, either by means of a ruler across the knuckles for work done incorrectly or by means of a strap for misbehavior. The strap hung in full view of the classroom in one respondent's elementary school classroom. Their conversation illustrates some of their experience:

a. "I don't remember anything specifically being a turn on, because I never did like school anyway...I was turned on when it came naturally and I did well..."

b. "I think the most vivid memory I have of my schooling is the first couple of days in both kindergarten and grade one. I started with the teacher basically calling me a stupid idiot and telling me that I didn't know anything..."

c. "I remember a couple of teachers that I really liked and a couple of teachers who especially terrified me who I didn't like, and we moved a lot too....so I think I kind of got screwed up in all of that..."

Q #2. Now, looking back, can you reflect on how your school experience may have influenced how you teach?

Comments on the learning process from these teachers indicated that they had applied some of the better practices of their own teachers, especially in the realm of affective behaviors, such as giving encouragement and recognition and showing caring when necessary. In
addition, while recognizing that a steady diet of rote learning had not helped them, they saw the value of this learning method in some instances, but incorporated with other methods.

These are some quotations from these responses:

a. "I am now able to use what I didn't like in my ways of teaching in a way of trying to understand what students wouldn't like.... And I'll present as many different ways (of learning) as possible of the same concept and make it as interesting until I am sure that they've got it and re-test it two weeks or months later."

b. "...another thing, I remember the teachers who could be at a certain time, when it was appropriate, part of our group, like the guy who got down and did push ups because he was dared to,"

c. "The other thing I remember from school is you know when you suddenly become a real person to a teacher, ... when you suddenly take on your character and you are a real individual... you know that because your relationship with the teacher takes on another dimension ...I remember really appreciating that from several teachers in high school who made me feel like an adult...who made me feel like my ideas were worth something to them and that they cared about me. So I find it difficult to teach to a whole group when I don't know anything about the individuals in the group."

Q #3. What other life experiences do you feel may have prepared you for teaching in a prison?

The raters had some difficulty rating for both focus and mission in the responses to this question; there were "N" ratings by two raters and relatively low mean scores were given for these characteristics to all three teachers. On the other hand, this question yielded responses from all teachers on which the raters were able judge the characteristic
self-awareness, and for which these response received consistently high ratings.

The life experiences of these three are remarkably alike in many ways: employment in non-traditional work (both male and female); employment in a wide variety of areas, and world travel before teaching in a prison adult basic education program. Through their descriptions of these experiences, they explained insights into how these experiences had equipped them to develop rapport, to empathize, or to provide role models to their students. Some of their discourse illustrates their perceptions of these life experiences:

a. "I think probably the most significant thing is that...I dropped out of school for 10 years and went back as an adult...my life, my role change with --(wife). To me that's significant. I can see the male macho being played out. With what I know it helps me in redirecting thinking when I go through that.

b. "So, there were all kinds of non-traditional jobs that I had where I was the token woman. Like in lumber mills...working in fish canneries...cooking in gold mines. It also put me in touch with...people who come from economically disadvantaged or culturally disadvantaged backgrounds.

c. "We were working with pre-adolescent juveniles from age 10 to 12 and we were trying to get them on the straight and narrow before they became, you know, real hard core juvenile delinquents. ... just day-to-day meeting people, and realizing that not all people come from the same backgrounds that I do...learning to accept other peoples values, even though they may be different from your own. ...the first time I went in teaching with the Native group. In that month I learned more about people
and myself than in any other period of time because it was a group I knew nothing about."

Q #4. Describe five of the students enrolled in your classroom at the present.

The two power themes most frequently demonstrated in each of the teachers' responses were empathy, and rapport drive. Their discourse also provided many examples of their efforts to involve students in their own learning. Several of their students were often withdrawn, if not in states of depression; angry, if not threatening; and slow to catch on to basic concepts, if not learning disabled. From these accounts are seen frequent examples of patience offered when belligerence had been the student behavior, or attempts to communicate with a non-communicative newcomer. In all cases, the teachers had taken that extra step with these students to find them interesting, relevant, and challenging materials to work with. They saw good classroom climate as important, and developed this in part by having planned group activities such as games or discussions. They also encouraged peer tutoring to improve better classroom climate, as well as to motivate each in the tutor pair by the encouragement that can come from such an arrangement. To all these teachers, education in this setting was more than books: it was socialization, a positive experience, a time for growth.

Quotes: "... so he's working on stuff that's relevant to him, to what is the immediate goal and he shows some commitment to that goal because he's applied for a student loan...the main thing I can say with him is how I use the buddy system to capitalize on the education environment. To make it positive."
"There's not a heck of a lot of motivation for him either ... . He's under a deportation order back to ----, and ---- will deport him immediately to ---- where he will be shot. And so the motivation is that he can die in two languages!

"I've had to be careful not to give him so much (work to do)...because he'll literally rip up his books and then I'll have to act. I gave him a card at one point because his sister had died and he was not allowed to go to the funeral. ...I think that that did more for his education than almost anything else and that was really the turning point in our relationship when he started to see me as an individual who cared about him as an individual..."

Q #5. What do you like about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?

This question and question # 6 were grouped together on the Supplementary Questionnaire for rating of responses for the characteristics high investment, sense of efficacy, concerned about justice, and ability to get along with others. There was relative consistency for the ratings on sense of efficacy, but inconsistency for the ratings on the other three items.

Inconsistencies were also present in the content of these responses. Despite the fact that these three persons had brought very similar school and life experiences with them to their prison teaching, their reasons for liking what they did in prison were quite different. One felt that the non-traditional teaching setting, unlike the public school setting, suited that person's "personal style". Two of the teachers liked the variety in their work, One teacher's description of what he/she liked sounded as though she/he got an emotional "high" from arriving at work every day, and
wanted to be even more involved, on a day-to-day basis, in the social and educational development of prison students. One of the teachers liked the fact that she/he was a force for good in both an academic and a social way. The quantity of response to this question was dramatically different. When transcribed, the response of Teacher #12 covered 1 1/2 single-spaced pages; the response of Teacher #11 consisted of six lines; and the response of Teacher #10 consisted of ten lines. Some of their conversation illustrates their diverse views of their work:

a. "I like the fact that when there are rewards, they're pretty dramatic. That you really do seem to be good for some inmates, both academically and socially; that a teacher's interaction with inmates can influence them positively.

b. "I just don't want to teach them how to spell, I want them to remember the day they learned how to spell truck and they learned it by spelling fuck first because they'll never forget how to spell that word."

c. "...the public school system, it gets a conservative, middle class personality. I'm not; I like to be all classes to all people and I think that's my one big thing against working in a public school...."

Q #6. What do you dislike about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?

The frequencies of the power theme high investment and of the other three elements that were rated from this question's response have already been discussed in relation to question # 5 in the preceding section.

Unlike the content of the responses to question # 5, the content of the responses to # 6 showed considerable unanimity. The topics that were unanimously expressed were the bureaucratic processes that got in the way of teaching and learning, the intrusion of prison administration into
educational matters, the lack of convenient access to teaching resources (such as labs and video equipment), and the overriding influence of security functions (vis a vis educational processes). In addition, Teacher #12 spoke at length about the situation he/she saw himself/herself in with fellow teachers in the same prison. The lack of a shared philosophy toward teaching in a prison was a major concern for this teacher. In this teacher's words: "...it's not a question of they're bad teachers and I'm a good one or I'm a bad teacher and they're good ones. We're just different but I feel that I'm constantly being judged..."

Despite these conditions, however, the responses of all three on the characteristic sense of efficacy were rated consistently and relatively high: Teacher #10: 6.0; Teacher #11: 5.6; Teacher #12: 5.6.

Q# 7. What could be done about the things that you do not like?

The responses to this final question could be quantified in the same proportions as the responses to Question #5. Teacher #12 spoke in specifics, the synopsis of which is as follows:

a. More effort on the part of both teachers and institutional staff to understand one another's perspectives.

b. Impress upon the developers of the prison contracts (especially the contract agency) that dollars must be dedicated to the improvement of classroom space.

c. More opportunities for science activities and other activities that will make learning more "hands on". This could involve allaying the fears of security by making them more aware of what we are doing in our classrooms with respect to such activities.

d. The broadened role of a teacher, which would involve that teacher in more than a student's academic requirements. Corrections needs to
recognize, for example, that there is a counselling role for teachers or other contract staff who have counselling skills. This role could be performed in concert with the case management team.

e. More effort on the part of our employers to hire persons who share similar philosophies about the purposes of prison education.

f. The creation and enforcement of a no-smoking regulation that is acceptable to everyone, probably by the creation of a designated area.

Teacher #10 spoke of the need to raise the awareness of case managers and other prison personnel about the problems faced by teachers as they attempt to carry out their teaching duties. Personnel at all levels, for example, need to become committed to "following through" in their duties that have an effect upon students' education.

Teacher #11 summed up succinctly what could be done: "I think that if Corrections' Mission Statement is really adopted not only just in word but in deed that prisons might become happier places and that would make our work a lot easier... I think that what could be done is that prisoners could be treated more humanely by the system."

3. Ratings on the Supplementary Questionnaire for Items #3 to #6

The total mean ratings on the Supplementary Questionnaire for each of the three teachers were 5.92 for Teacher #10; 5.9 for Teacher #11; 5.36 for Teacher #12. Teacher #10 had scores ranging from 4.0 on the characteristics mission and focus to a high of 6.6 on positive expectations. Teacher #11 had scores ranging from 4.0 on the characteristic concern for social justice to 6.6 on the characteristic desires to help students grow. Teacher #12 scored a low rating of 3.0 on mission and a high of 6.6 on concerned about social justice.
There was some consistency among the raters in their individual ratings for patient, flexible, and gets along with others. Scores on patient were as follows: Teacher #10: 6,7,5; Teacher #11: 7,5,6; Teacher #12: 5,5,5. Scores on flexible were as follows: Teacher #10: 7,7,5; Teacher #11: 6,6,6; Teacher #12: 5,3,5. On the characteristic gets along with others, Teacher #10 scores were 7,6, and 6. Teacher #11 scores were 5,6, and 6. Teacher #12 scores were 5,5, and 4.

The rankings of the three teachers according to these individual scores showed consistency with the rankings of their total mean scores on the entire questionnaire: Teacher #10: 6.0 patient; 6.3 flexibility; Teacher #11: 6.0 patient; 6.0 flexibility; Teacher #12: 5.0 patient; 4.3 flexible.

Two of the raters were unable to rate on the characteristic concerned about social justice for Teacher #11; one of these raters was also unable to rate Teacher #10 on this characteristic. Two raters also found insufficient evidence on which to rate mission for Teachers #10 and #12; two raters also found insufficient evidence to rate for focus in the responses of Teachers #11 and #12.

Ratings for gets along with others were as follows: Teacher #10: 6.3; Teacher #11: 5.6; Teacher #12: 4.6. Again, these teachers were rated on this characteristic in a rank order that is consistent with the ranking of patient, flexible, and is also consistent with the ranking of each teacher's total mean score.

The mean scores for each of the three teachers on each characteristic on the Supplementary Questionnaire are shown in Table 12.
### Table 12

**Teachers' Mean Scores for Each Characteristic According to the Modified CTIS Guide on the Supplementary Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TEACHER # 10</th>
<th>TEACHER # 11</th>
<th>TEACHER # 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand disadvantaged students</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expectations</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport drive</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of efficacy</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about social justice</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets along with others</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires to help students grow</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of the Supplementary Questionnaire Findings

I interviewed three teachers from the group of teachers who had been rated as highly effective on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors. All three expressed similar feelings about their own school experiences such as lack of relevancy, corporal punishment, and general disinterest. However, there were common recollections of teachers who had been kind, who had shown some special interest in the student, or who had taught a course in which these subjects had done well as a result of their own natural ability.

These three also had shared similar life experiences, which they perceived to have had some relevancy for their prison teaching: non-traditional work, travel, and a variety of employment experiences before becoming a prison adult basic education teacher.

On the other hand, reasons given for liking their present work were different in quantity and substance. One spoke about liking the fact of being a force for good; another felt that this job matched her personal style; a third enumerated the things he liked, with items ranging from the students' sense of humour to the day-to-day variety and excitement of prison work. According to their responses to the question about what they do not like about prison teaching, there was common agreement that there were effects upon their work from the negativenss of the prison; bureaucratic procedures, staff hostility, and lack of humaneness were cited as examples of negative sources.

The teacher responses concerning their students provided a wealth of material on which to rate for several of the characteristics named on the rating guide. There was a strong presence of empathy, sense of awareness, desire to help students grow, and flexible among these teachers, despite
the fact that they often worked with students who appeared depressed, angry, and unmotivated. **Empathy** was rated highly for all three teachers.

Although ratings for two teachers were consistently similar to each others, Teacher #12 stood out somewhat as an anomaly. The quantity of this teacher's responses, the strong emergence of themes such as **concerned about social justice**, **investment**, and **empathy**, contrasted with lower ratings for **mission**, **focus**, and **gestalt**, could suggest more involvement with the affective rather than with the cognitive behaviors of students.

The raters did find difficulty in rating teacher responses for Teachers #10 and #12 on **concerned about social justice**. The responses that were received for Question #7, however, suggest that it may have been appropriate to have included this question for rating on this characteristic.

The responses of the **Supplementary Questionnaire** present a detailed description of the teaching situations of three effective teachers. Their perceptions and reflections support some of the findings of Miller and of other parts of the current study. Some of the **Supplementary Questionnaire** responses have added to our information about the dynamics of an adult basic education classroom in a prison.

The overall findings from the responses to the **Supplementary Questionnaire** provide support for the use of such a questionnaire and the **CTIS Guide** to rate the interviews of teachers who have had experience in individualized, adult basic education programmes. Even with persons who have had only student teaching experiences, they could respond with reference to Question #4 about individual students whom they had taught.
In addition, the question #3 about life experiences, even if the person had had no prison experience, could be questioned about life experiences in relation to teaching disadvantaged or other high risk students.

E. Summary Of Findings from Entire Study

By using the rating instrument Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors, I have identified five teachers (the highly effective group) who were rated higher than another group of five teachers (the low in effectiveness group) on eleven characteristics or behaviors by themselves, by three to fifteen of their students, and by their supervisors. The ETB indicated statistically significant differentiation between these two groups on each of eleven criteria, with greatest differentiation for the criteria original, overall effective, adaptable, and stimulating.

The findings from the Demographic Data Questionnaire, while inconclusive, suggest teachers in the highly effective group have a higher percentage of teachers who have been involved in additional training experiences and in continuing education. The highly effective group named six different kinds of other direct teaching practice; the low group named only two kinds. The high in effectiveness group had less public/parochial school teaching experience than the low in effectiveness group.

All of the group mean ratings for the twenty-one characteristics on the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey were higher for the the highly effective group than the low in effectiveness group. Differences greater than 1.00 were shown for clarity, desire to help students grow, structure and empathy.
However, the ratings of the responses of both groups to the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey show that CTIS did not generate sufficient information by which to rate teachers on some of the characteristics measured by the CTIS Guide; for example, a low frequency of rater response was indicated for concerned about social justice, patient, and flexible.

Nevertheless, there was a significant consistency between students' rankings of teachers on the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors (ETB) and the correctional educators' rankings of the same teachers' responses to the Correctional Teachers Interview Survey (CTIS).

The Supplementary Questionnaire provided additional information on three teachers from the highly effective group. This information was primarily related to their life experiences prior to prison teaching. Although they were not asked specifically about their training for teaching, they did not refer in any way to that formal training as preparation for work in prison. One of the three did say, however, that nothing at university had been a preparation for this work. On the other hand, all three teachers described similar kindergarten to grade twelve school experiences. All cited non-traditional employment, and travel which, in their minds, had prepared them for correctional work.

Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 provide an overview of the findings of the entire study.
Table 13
An Overview of Qualities Identified by the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors: Characteristics with Greatest Differential in Ratings Between High and Low Groups

- Original
- Overall Effective
- Adaptable
- Stimulating

Table 14
An Overview of Information Related to Teachers Perceived High in Effectiveness from the Demographic Data Questionnaire

1. Had varied kinds of experience in direct teaching practice
2. Had limited public/parochial school teaching than the low group
3. Had high level of participation in continuing education

Table 15
Qualities Rated Higher on the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS) for Teachers Perceived Most Effective

1. Clarity
2. Desire to help students grow
3. Structure
Table 16

Response Patterns Demonstrated on the CTIS

**Item Response Pattern**

A(1) No pattern

A(2) No pattern; little evidence to rate on concern about social justice

B(1) Their greatest personal reward: seeing students learn or accomplish something

B(2) No pattern; little evidence rate on patient or flexibility

C(1) Techniques for developing positive classroom climate: by some planned group activity

C(2) No pattern

C(3) No pattern
Table 17

Characteristics Receiving Ratings of 6.0 and Above with the Modified CTIS Guide for Three Highly Effective Teachers Who Responded to the Supplementary Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #10</th>
<th>Teacher #11</th>
<th>Teacher #12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive expectations</td>
<td>Desires to help students</td>
<td>Concerned about social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>grow (6.6)</td>
<td>justice (6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (6.6)</td>
<td>Empathy (6.3)</td>
<td>Empathy (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness (6.3)</td>
<td>Flexible (6.0)</td>
<td>Self-Awareness (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible (6.3)</td>
<td>Patient (6.0)</td>
<td>Investment (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets along with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires to help students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grow (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter V: Conclusions

In this final chapter, the problem is restated in the first section. Conclusions based on the data and findings from the four instruments, the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors, the Demographic Data Questionnaire, the Correctional Teacher Survey, and the Supplementary Questionnaire are presented. Then, implications and recommendations are suggested for correctional teacher selection and development. Finally, suggestions are made for further research.

A. Restatement of the Problem

Criteria are required for the selection of persons who have the potential to be effective correctional educators. In addition, information based on such criteria is required for the development of continuing education courses and teacher training programs for Canadian correctional instructors.

Criteria could be used that are based on characteristics and behaviors of practising correctional teachers who have been perceived to be highly effective. The current study was intended to build on the work of Miller, who had identified several such personal characteristics and behaviors in "A Study of Maryland Prison Teachers Perceived to be Effective" (1987a).

The current study included the use of Miller's instruments and some of her methodology within a Canadian educational setting with conditions similar to those in her study. In addition, this activity was supplemented
with an additional questionnaire, which was used to interview three prison teachers who had been identified as highly effective by means of the ETB instruments.

B. Conclusions

The eighteen correctional teachers who participated in this study were employed by two organizations, the Kingston Learning Centre and Fraser Valley College. KLC is a private company and FVC is a community college. Each of these organizations had been contracted by the Correctional Service of Canada to deliver adult basic education programs in a total of sixteen federal prisons in two regions of the CSC: Ontario and Pacific. As contract teachers, and not correctional employees, they experience both the positive and negative effects of their contracted positions. Their working situations involve both students and Corrections personnel and are usually challenging and sometimes frustrating. Nevertheless, this study has shown that these well qualified teachers have accepted the challenges involved in combatting illiteracy among Canada's prison populations and have dealt with the frustrations of their work with a wide variety of skills and behaviors.

This study has shown that this group of teachers is rated highly for being knowledgeable and student-centred. However, it has been able to differentiate, by means of the Evaluation of Teacher Behaviors rating scale, between two groups of teachers within this sample of eighteen. Differentiation is based on perceived effectiveness according to mean ratings of eleven behaviors and characteristics.

Teachers of the group found highly effective ranked higher than the low in effectiveness group on the characteristics of original, overall effective, adaptable, and stimulating. The characteristics original and
stimulating had also been differentiating characteristics in the Miller study.

When respondents to this rating instrument were asked to list and rate other teacher behaviors that are important, sense of humour was named most frequently for the group of five highly effective teachers. Millers' study had included sense of humour along with respectfulness, skillfulness, and understanding of students as characteristics that differentiate between the high and the low groups. The responses of three effective teachers on the Supplementary Questionnaire generated high ratings on empathy. The responses of two of these teachers shared in generating high ratings on self-awareness, flexible, and desires to help students grow.

The Demographic Data Questionnaire yielded data that indicated that the teachers in the high in effectiveness group had had a greater variety of experiences in direct teaching practice. However, because all subjects in the current study had been in correctional teaching less than 4.7 years, this kind of experience was not a differentiating factor between the high and low groups. The high group's average corrections teaching experience was 2.4 years; the low group's was 1.9 years.

The highly effective teachers in this study had less public school teaching experience than the teachers who were low in effectiveness: high group, 2.4 years; low group 7.5 years. In addition, the mean for years of experience in other (than public school) settings outside corrections was lower for the highly effective group (0.4) than for the low group (7.4.). This experience for the low group had included a mean of 1.9 years in parochial teaching. The high group had no parochial teaching experience. In terms of total teaching experience outside Corrections, the high group had a mean of 2.8 years; the low group had a mean of 15.3 years.
In the response of these highly effective teachers to the Correctional Teachers Interview Survey, raters gave high ratings for clarity, desire to help students grow, and structure. Miller's study had also given high ratings for desire to help students grow as well as for self-awareness and investment.

The Supplementary Questionnaire, with different questions than were on the CTIS, but which were rated with a guide containing the same rating scale and all but three of the same criteria, also yielded responses from three effective teachers that received high ratings on empathy, desire to help students grow, flexible, and self-awareness. The modified guide did not rate for clarity and structure, but did include the characteristic gets along with others. There was no evidence of no response (N) for the characteristics patient and flexible as on the CTIS, although raters found evidence of concerned about social justice in the responses of only one teacher to the Supplementary Questionnaire.

Thus, the profile of the highly effective teacher, based on the findings from this study includes elements of originality, adaptability, stimulating, flexibility, and sense of humour. The desire to help students grow and clarity were also highly rated and frequent characteristics among these teachers. Responses to the Supplementary Questionnaire illustrated that three of these teachers perceive both academic and social development as important, and they emphasize relevancy in how and what they teach. One of the ways the highly effective teachers strive to develop good classroom climate is to conduct some kind of planned group activity, such as discussions or group games. The three effective teachers also revealed in their responses to the SQ that there were several other common elements in
their experiences. Each of them perceived that a variety of life experience -- including non-traditional work, a variety of kinds of employment, and travel -- had been good preparation for teaching in prisons. Although they did not perceive their own school experiences to have been entirely satisfactory, their responses seemed to indicate that they are still aware of some of the affective behaviors, like kindliness and encouragement, that worked well with themselves as students.

C. Implications and Recommendations

The overall findings of this study and the literature that we have reviewed have indicated that there are several perceived characteristics that may distinguish between effective and non-effective teachers. Teachers who possess originality, clarity, structure, flexibility/adaptability, empathy, desire to help students grow, self-awareness, and a sense of humour ought to be considered for employment in prison adult basic education programs. These characteristics should be combined with some experience with individualized instruction, curriculum development that includes an emphasis on relevancy, and some familiarity with group processes. Experience that appears to be relevant to prison teaching is not necessarily that which is of long duration but which is various, such as a variety of teaching situations, employment other than teaching, and life experiences that bring persons in touch with others from many segments of society.

The combined findings of the Correctional Teacher Interview Survey and the Supplementary Questionnaire have provided support for using the CTIS Guide to rate the interviews of teachers who have had some experience in
individualized adult basic education programs. Even persons who have had only student teaching experience in this kind of instructional setting could respond with reference to question #4 about actual students with whom they have worked on an individual basis. In addition, question #3 about life experience, even if the interviewee has had no prison experience, could refer to teaching disadvantaged or other high risk students. Questions #3 to #7 inclusive in the Supplementary Questionnaire (SQ) have yielded sufficient response from three effective teachers for ratings on all the characteristics of the Modified CTIS Guide. Used in conjunction with an application form that would include questions requiring information related to academic background, training, and previous employment, it could provide a detailed picture of an applicant for teaching in a prison adult basic education program. Use of these procedures under controlled conditions could yield reliable support for them.

Although these criteria outlined from the study's results could be utilized for selection of potential prison adult basic education teachers, the study has also shown, particularly through the CTIS and SQ interviews, that the environment within which these people work has the potential for rapid burn-out, particularly at the higher levels of security. High turn-over of teachers, coupled with increased demand in Canada at the provincial level for qualified correctional teachers, gives some indication that professional development and training for this work ought to be given a higher priority by institutions for teacher education in Canada. In addition, the current demand for teachers at the public school levels has the potential for draining an already scarce source of applicants for correctional teaching.
The development of such programs shall require continued research in the field of correctional teacher effectiveness as well as in the study of training programs that already exist in other countries. Research related to the stress experienced by some teachers in institutions of higher security could prove valuable. Finally, perceptions held by corrections employees regarding contract teachers' effectiveness may also provide another realm for study.
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EVALUATION OF TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Note: You are not to sign the evaluation form. Neither your name nor the name of the instructor whom you are rating will be revealed at any time.

DIRECTIONS:
To evaluate an instructor on the characteristics in A through J below, first read the definitions at the two ends of the scale. After you have read the definitions, circle the number on the scale from 1 to 7 that in your opinion best describes the instructor. In Example I below, the number 6 has been circled, indicating that the rater regards the teacher who is being rated to be quite attractive in appearance. If the rater had considered the instructor to be extremely unimpressive in appearance, than a rating of 2 or 1 would have been appropriate. A rating of 4 would indicate a point midway between the two extremes, and a 3 or 5 would be slightly below or above the midpoint. If you feel you are unable to judge the instructor on a particular set of characteristics (as in Example II below), then circle the N.

Example I: Unimpressive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Attractive

In the example above, the number 6 is circled to indicate that the instructor is much more attractive than unimpressive in appearance.

Example II: Restricted 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Understanding

In Example II above, the N is circled to indicate that the rater feels she/he cannot evaluate the instructor on those behaviors.

Mozelle Carver Vickers, 1979
Now you are asked to rate the instructor whose name appears on the attached slip on the ten sets of characteristics that are provided.

**EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Harsh</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Kindly</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cross; curt; fault-finding; sarcastic; belittles efforts of students; is rejecting, disapproving toward students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(concerned for students; understanding; gives students deserved compliments; is helpful, caring, humanitarian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(shows prejudice toward some groups or individuals; gives special advantages or more attention to some)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(praises or criticizes on facts, not hearsay; treats students equally; allows students to explain views, is impartial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.</th>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Stimulating</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(uninteresting; monotonous; lacks enthusiasm, shows little skill in presenting materials or motivating students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(interesting; holds attention of students; provokes thinking; enthusiastic; challenging)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.</th>
<th>Cursory</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Probing</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(hurried or superficial in presentations; doesn't aim for depth of learning; gives tests that contain mostly trivial questions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(asks varied questions to promote thinking; examines thoroughly; helps students analyze, evaluate, and synthesize course material)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.</th>
<th>Inflexible</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Adaptable</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(rigid in conforming to routine; has trouble modifying explanations or activities to meet classroom situations does not adapt materials to individuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(flexible; individualized materials and adapts activities to students' needs; is always alert to need for clarification of points; meets unusual situations competently)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>1 2 3 4</th>
<th>Student-centered</th>
<th>5 6 7 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unyielding; discourages student opinion or participation; interrupts students although their discussion is relevant; exercises absolute authority)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(responsive to students; encourages and builds on student ideas and questions; guides without being mandatory or domineering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G. Evading 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Responsible 5 6 7 N
(avoiding making decisions; passes the buck; doesn't give students enough help; doesn't insist on individual or group standards)

### H. Limited 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Knowledgeable 5 6 7 N
(poor background in subject; narrow in scope, does not depart from text; answers questions incompletely or inaccurately; uses few illustrations from related areas)

### I. Stereotyped 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Original 5 6 7 N
(unimaginative and unoriginal; uses routine procedures without variation; not resourceful in answering questions or providing explanations)

### J. Disorganized 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Systematic 5 6 7 N
(doesn't plan for classwork; unprepared; wastes time; undecided as to next steps; objectives not apparent)

### K. List below any other teacher behaviors you think are important, and rate this instructor on those behaviors, just as you did above.

### L. Overall ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Overall effective 5 6 7 N
(students do not learn very much; do not improve skills; do not gain confidence)

(students add to knowledge; improve skills; gain confidence)
Appendix B  DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the appropriate answers or fill in the blanks.

1. How much experience have you had teaching in a correctional setting?
   ___________ years ___________ months

2. How much experience have you had in regular public school teaching?
   ___________ years ___________ months

3. Have you worked as a teacher in other settings? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Trade School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. College/University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Parochial School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. School for Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. (a) Do you hold (a) college/university degree(s)?
   Please check correct answer.

   Yes _______ No _______

   (b) What degree or degrees do you hold? (Please check)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS/M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D/D.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) If you do not hold a degree, please describe other preparation for teaching which you have received.


5. How many education courses have you taken that relate to teaching methodology and/or curriculum development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Courses</th>
<th>Credit Hrs.</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) What additional training (e.g. seminars, workshops or in-service) related to delivery of effective instruction have you received in the last two years?


6. Did you have student teaching experience?

a. ______ Yes _______ No

b. If yes, how long? _______ years _______ months

c. Did you receive other opportunities for direct teaching practice as a part of your preparation for teaching? (Please describe and indicate length of time).


_______ years _______ months
7. (a) Do you hold a teaching certificate from the State of Maryland?
___________ Yes  ___________ No
(b) Do you hold a teaching certificate from another state or foreign country?
___________ Yes  ___________ No
(c) If yes, what type of certification?
(Please Check)
(1) Standard Professional ___________
(2) Advanced Professional ___________
(3) Other ___________ ___________
(d) Subject(s) Endorsed?  (e) Subjects Currently Teaching?

8. The following questions of a personal nature are included for informational purposes only and will not affect the outcome of the study. Your input on these questions will be appreciated, but feel free to omit them if you wish. Please check appropriate answers:

(a) Female _____ Male _____

(b) White (not of Hispanic origin) __________
   Black (not of Hispanic origin) __________
   Asian or Pacific Islander __________
   American Indian or Alaskan Native __________
   Hispanic __________

(c) Age:
   20 - 29 __________
   30 - 39 __________
   40 - 49 __________
   50 - 59 __________
   60 - 69 __________
   69 + __________
Appendix C

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the appropriate answers or fill in the blanks.

1. How much experience have you had teaching in a correctional setting?

___________________ years ___________________ months

2. How much experience have you had in regular public school teaching?

___________________ years ___________________ months

3. Have you worked as a teacher in other settings? (Check all that apply)

Check | Years
--- | ---
a. Vocational | 

| 

| 

| 

b. College/Institute | 

| 

| 

c. University | 

| 

| 

d. Parochial School | 

| 

| 

| 

e. School for Handicapped | 

| 

| 

f. Other (specify) | 

| 

| 

4. (a) Do you hold a college/university degree(s)?

Please check correct answer.

Yes ______ No ______

(b) What degree or degrees do you hold? (Please check)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MSc/M.Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D/D.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) If you do not hold a degree, please describe other preparation for teaching which you have received.


5. How many education courses have you taken that relate to teaching methodology and/or curriculum development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Courses</th>
<th>Credit Hrs.</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) What additional training (e.g. seminars, workshops or in-service) related to delivery of effective instruction have you received in the last two years?


6. Did you have student teaching experience?

a. _______ Yes _______ No

b. If yes, how long? _______ years _______ months

c. Did you receive other opportunities for direct teaching practice as a part of your preparation for teaching? (Please describe and indicate length of time).


_______ years _______ months
7. (a) Do you hold a teaching certificate from the Province in which you are now employed?

_______Yes ________No

(b) Do you hold a teaching certificate from another Province or foreign country?

_______Yes ________No

(c) If yes, what type of certification? (Please Check)

(1) Standard Professional

(2) Advanced Professional

(3) Other

(d) Subject(s) Endorsed?

(e) Subjects Currently Teaching?


8. The following questions of a personal nature are included for informational purposes only and will not affect the outcome of the study. Your input on these questions will be appreciated, but feel free to omit them if you wish. Please check appropriate answers:

(a) Female _____ Male _____

(b) Age: 20 - 29 _____

30 - 39 _____

40 - 49 _____

50 - 59 _____

60 - 69 _____

65+ _____

(c) Bilingual (French/English) Yes No
CORRECTIONAL TEACHER INTERVIEW SURVEY

Designed by Miller. Administered orally in this study.

Please answer these questions as if you were responding to an oral interview. Register your initial response, and limit responding time to an absolute maximum of ten minutes for each numbered question, with no more than sixty minutes for the total survey. Do not go back and change answers.

A. (1) Why did you choose teaching as a career?
(2) What are the most important contributions that you as an individual can make to incarcerated students?

B. (1) Describe the greatest personal reward that you receive from working with incarcerated students.
(2) What techniques do you use to maintain your personal equilibrium and balance while coping with the stress encountered in correctional work?

C. Imagine that you have a small class of 5 incarcerated students for whom you have two purposes: to provide appropriate individualized instructional programs and to develop their skills in group interaction.

The ages, home environments, and grade levels of the students are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Grade Level Achievement</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>17 yrs. old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>19 yrs. old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>35 yrs. old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>20 yrs. old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>25 yrs. old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) What techniques would you use to develop a classroom climate which would enhance learning and promote positive group interaction?
(2) How would you organize the instructional program(s) for these students? (Use the subject area of your expertise; for example: social studies, reading, auto mechanics, special education, etc.)
(3) What are the two most important goals the students described above should achieve by the end of your first term as their teacher? Explain why the achievement of these goals is important.
Appendix E

Correctional Teacher Interview Survey (CTIS) Guide

Teacher # ___________________________ Rater ___________________________

Date ___________________________

To evaluate the above teacher on each of the questions on the CTIS, please read the definitions at the two ends of the scale for each set of characteristics. Circle the number from 1 (low) to 7 (high) that best evaluates that characteristic as indicated in the teacher's response to the question. Three sets of characteristics are to be evaluated for each question on the CTIS. If you feel you are unable to judge the teacher on a particular set of characteristics, based on the response given, then circle the N. Definitions for terms with asterisks are provided at the end of the evaluation guide.

Question

A. 1. Weak sense of mission* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Strong sense of mission
Low investment* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N High investment
Uninterested in growth of students 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Desires to help students grow

A. 2. Feels ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Sense of efficacy
Little concern for justice 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Concerned about social justice
Little or no empathy* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Possesses empathy

B. 1. Weak sense of mission* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Strong sense of mission
Little or no rapport drive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Strong rapport drive
Low investment* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N High investment

B. 2. Weak self-awareness 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Strong self-awareness
Impatient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Patient
Inflexible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Flexible

C. 1. Poor understanding of disadvantaged students 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Good understanding of disadvantaged students
Little or no empathy* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N Possesses empathy
Low gestalt* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N High gestalt
C. 2. Poor sense of structure | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | Good sense of structure
Lacks clarity | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | Possesses clarity
Low gestalt* | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | High gestalt

C. 3. Negative expectations | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | Positive expectations
Weak capacity for goal-setting | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | Strong capacity for goal-setting
Poor understanding of disadvantaged students | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N | Good understanding of disadvantaged students

*Mission - the belief that students can learn and want to learn, and that teachers can make significant contributions to the development of other people.

*Empathy - a special sensitivity to the feelings and states of mind of others.

*Rapport drive - a drive toward relationship building.

*Investment - a great sense of reward and reinforcement experienced by the teacher from the response of students.

*Gestalt - possession of a unique blend of structure and flexibility, viewing organization as a way to facilitate the learning process.

*Focus - possession of goals and a planned direction for life.

Definitions from Teacher Perceiver Academy
Selection Research Institute
Lincoln, Nebraska
APPENDIX F

Supplementary Questionnaire

1. Describe your own school experience from K-12 in terms of its institutions, teachers, and curricula.

2. Now, looking back, can you reflect on how your school experience may have influenced how you teach?

3. What other life experience do you feel may have prepared you for teaching in a prison?

4. Describe five of the students enrolled in your classroom at the present time.

5. What do you like about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?

6. What do you dislike about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?

7. What could be done about the things that you do not like?
Appendix G

Modified Correctional Teacher Interview Survey Guide

Teacher # ___________________________  Rater ___________________________

Date ___________________________

To evaluate the above teacher on each of the attached written responses, please read the definitions at the two ends of the scale for each set of characteristics. Circle the number from 1 (low) to 7 (high) that best evaluates that characteristic listed under the appropriate question. Definitions of several characteristics are given on page 2 of this form.

Question #3: What other life experiences do you feel may have prepared you for teaching in a prison?

Weak self-awareness  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Strong self-awareness
Weak sense of mission  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Strong sense of mission *
Weak capacity for goal setting (lack of focus)  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Strong capacity for goal setting (focus) *

Question #4: Describe five students who are enrolled in your class at the present time.

Impatient  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Patient
Inflexible  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Flexible
Poor understanding of disadvantaged students  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Good understanding of disadvantaged students
Low gestalt  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  High gestalt *
Negative expectations  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Positive expectations
Uninterested in growth of students  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Desires to help students grow
Little or no empathy  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Possesses empathy *
Little or no rapport drive  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N  Strong rapport drive *

Questions #5: What do you like about teaching in an adult basic education program?
Question # 8: What do you dislike about teaching in a prison adult basic education program?

- Low investment 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N
- Feels ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N
- Little concern for justice 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N
- Lacks ability to get along with others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N
- High investment *
- Sense of efficacy
- Concerned about social justice
- Ability to get along with others

The definitions below are from Teacher Perceiver Academy Selection Research Institute, Lincoln, Nebraska (as cited in Miller, 1987a, p. 169):

*Mission - the belief that students can learn and want to learn, and that teachers can make significant contributions to the development of other people.

*Empathy - a special sensitivity to the feelings and states of mind of others.

*Rapport drive - a drive toward relationship building.

*Investment - a great sense of reward and reinforcement experienced by the teacher from the response of students.

*Gestalt - possession of a unique blend of structure and flexibility, viewing organization as a way to facilitate the learning process.

*Focus - possession of goals and a planned direction for life.
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I agree to be interviewed by Heather Stewart, post-graduate student in Education at the University of British Columbia, or her designate.

This interview is part of Heather Stewart's research on teacher effectiveness in Canadian prison adult basic education.

I recognize that the material of the interview, and of the Demographic Data Questionnaire connected with the interview, is confidential, and that I can withdraw from the research at any time WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

SIGNATURE

DATE

I have received a copy of this INFORMED CONSENT FORM.

.............                    .............
YES                        NO

I have received a copy of the covering page to "An Evaluation Form To Rate Teacher Effectiveness in Canadian Prison Adult Basic Education".

.............                    .............
YES                        NO
Appendix J

Paraphrased Responses to the CTIS: High Group/Low Group

A (1) Why did you choose teaching as a career?

Z: I get energy from watching people learn; you learn what you teach.

Y: Contact with a person who was working with L.D. children in a camp moved my goal from medicine to teaching. I saw a woman doing great things with these students.

X: To help students and get personal satisfaction.

W: Found it suited me when I had taught informally in other occupations; liked it; decided to pursue it academically.

V: availability, accessibility of teaching

T: I do it naturally; I enjoy it.

S: Thought I could help people learn; like to work with people.

R: Gives me contact with people; variety; escape from boredom.

Q: to work with people; to influence people in a direct way; new challenge; had role models of teachers.

P: admired teachers from the age of eight; [layed school with my brother who was a slow learner; the occupation suited me as a mother so I could spend holidays, etc., with my children.

A (2) What are the most important contributions that you as an individual can make to incarcerated students?

Z: Help with self-esteem; change negative to positive self-concepts.

Y: Self-esteem raised by me; providing different alternatives to former life.

X: to move them thru something academically, which yields the by-products of self-esteem; also time is easier to do with education.

W: to help them become aware of the need to continue in education as a lifelong process; to see a need for it beyond the classroom.

V: 1. to give the opportunity for a relationship that is non-correctional 2. to provide non-sexual female relationships

T: Show them ways to use their time while incarcerated; resources in the community are modelled by me.

S: to help them learn skills for the street; to help them gain self-respect and a belief in being able to succeed in another way (than in crime).
R: Brighten people's days; give sense of achievement to them.

Q: Give students hope for the future and life beyond prisons. give new chance at life-hope-so they won't come back.

P: to show them my honest approach to life; to treat them as a whole person, like a non-prisoner; show them honesty, trust; give them confidence

B(1) Describe the greatest personal reward that you receive from working with incarcerated students.

Z: Watching someone grow in a personal way.

Y: Watching someone achieve something - like seeing a woman read her child's letter to her for the first time.

X: getting the sense that you've created something for someone- a quick flash about the learning on both sides.

W: to have a student say I helped him; on-going insight of helping someone get from one point to another-academically or otherwise.

V: to see students accomplish something;

T: I watch their eyes light up when they learn something.

S: to feel I've spent time with someone in a positive way; to see a non-belligerent man become accepting of himself.

R: Sense of relationship; see them as people as to be seen as people.

Q: When I see their attitude change; they have a new openness, a new hope; I can be their friend. A mission.

P: seeing someone change from angry to being positive about himself.

B(2) What techniques do you use to maintain your personal equilibrium and balance while coping with the stress encountered in correctional work?

Z: Have a good support network; talk about them; sense of humor-looking at the funny side of things in there.

Y: sense of humor; don't take myself too seriously.

X: sense of humor to distance myself; keep the belief that the good I do outweighs the bad of the institution; keep busy outside; take vacations.

W: on-going sense of humor; use group dynamics to improve classroom interaction and relieve classroom stress. have mutual respect in the classroom; I have an ability to size up a situation in a short time.

V: Have outside interests; leave it behind.
T: A sense of humor; I'm easy going; good diet; enough rest.

S: friend; reading; concerts; movies.

R: I do take prison home; I talk to people to whom I feel close to; I try to think of the funny things that happen.

Q: Humor in the classroom; Outside interests: people; reading;

P: relaxing more; changing own image; backing off; joking; losing weight.

C(1) What techniques would you use to develop a classroom climate which would enhance learning and promote positive group interaction?

Z: Use individualized instruction and group activities by focussing on an issue common to everyone.

Y: Use independent learning as a base; have a one-to-one session with them; assess individual needs; then draw in prison-related issues.

X: 1. have high and clear expectations; 2. incorporate group activities as part of the curriculum; 3. don't separate each of these out; but don't push group stuff at first.

W: use various relevant materials; draw on immediate environment; e.g. reading material; group discussions; games; life skills-type activities.

V: Individual programs; word, etc. games; discuss on films.

T: use videos to find common interest, spark spontaneous discussion.

S: diagnostic tests; find areas in common; use drama; find out personal interests.

R: Some people can never be included; Games, word games are possible if people like each other.

Q: Meet each on individual basis; show importance to each of what they are doing - to better themselves. personal discussion-backgrounds-family-why they are here - if they tell me; Gain their confidence; Relate learning material to their past work experience; This may lead to their story telling - to relevancy of what they are doing in class. Group interaction usually spontaneous; discussions develop a closeness, a bond.

P: give each student his own "space" in classroom; pictures; wall displays; teachable moments(only0 for discussions; then, turn these into a learning situation.
C(2) How would you organize the instructional programs for these students? (Use the subject area of your expertise.)

Z: 1. Find two or three students with a common deficiency for small group work or large group work. 2. Spend time with each student individually on a regular basis.

Y: Group in circle with me included; move teacher focus around; pairs work; group projects; games; discuss military strategies; use films to discuss issues.

X: Make clear at the first that the course has an oral component; 2. do other work on an individual basis.

W: assessment first; find appropriate text for individual; use peer teaching; find areas for remediation.

V: individual programs and unrelated group games.

T: work on personal agendas -daily- choose subject areas; do group things later.

S: find individual areas for improvement; do group projects; newsletter; writing for prison journal; letters; story writing and reading to each other.

R: if we forego curriculum guidelines (that are boring); lot can be done to incorporate cultural needs/interests.

Q: use learning stations; assess; individualize programs after individual conversations. Place at levels. Difficult to do group work in academic areas. Current events may work.

P: have specific "quiet times" for study. then I work with them individually; I do most of the marking; they initiate peer tutoring.

C(3) What are the two most important goals the students described above should achieve by the end of your first term as their teacher?

Z: 1. a feeling of comfort in the classroom 2. feelings of trust: student to student; student to teacher.

Y: 1. beginning to feel good about themselves; 2. feel that they've learned something. 3. Have interacted with people on a positive basis.

X: 1. to have achieved a sense of satisfaction from the program-enjoyed it-found it worthwhile; 2. has achieved something academically; 3. has participated in group work according to his abilities.

W: 1. have become self-directed; 2. have progressed in skill levels 3. have acquired and recognized their new skills - study and social interaction.

V: 1. to realize that they can do work. 2. have a feeling of success
T: 1. comfort in learning environment — with students and teacher; 2. interaction between students; 3. personal or content gains

S: 1. to realize they are group members; 2. that they respect others and themselves; 3. to express themselves in an acceptable way.

R: 1. Self-worth; 2. sense of achievement.

Q: 1. complete a certain section of work; but more important is to have a new look at themselves.; 2. have learned to cooperate, listen, accept advice from each other; each one teach one.

P: 1. have established a need for education in their lives; 2. have been putting forth a good effort—productive; 3. they are self-motivated.

Explain why the achievement of these goals is important.

Z: no answer.

Y: The latter is most important; achieving an amount academically is secondary. Their improved sense of well being—their reason for being—can be the key out of here. This may cut down on recidivism,

X: goals are important because commitment to the program is important for their completing of it. The third goal shows that education should address communication skills— they are needed as well as academic skills,

W: These goals are important for living.

V: Achievement of goals enforces one's self-image so that there is movement on to the next step.

T: Time will be eased by these goals; all people need goals; need pointing out by others.

S: Goals are important inside and outside the institution.

R: Goals important because it gives them hope for the future—new perspective.

Q: Goals important because they create harmony in the classroom.

P: They haven't taken responsibility for themselves before; these skills may transfer to other parts of their lives.

LEGEND: HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS—V, W, X, Y, Z.

LOW IN EFFECTIVENESS TEACHERS—P, Q, R, S, T.