

Performance of Pre-Service Teachers and Client Satisfaction in Public Schools

Dr. Eleuteria R. Pacpaco, Dr. Necy Cesaria V. Romo and Mr. Edmar Paguirigan

Received: February 4, 2019; **Accepted:** February 11, 2019; **Published:** February 15, 2019

Abstract: This study aimed to determine the level of performance of the Bachelor of Elementary Education pre-service teachers of the University of Northern Philippines in their final demonstration teaching and the level of satisfaction of the clients with the overall teaching performance of the pre-service teachers. The study used the descriptive-correlational method of research and survey method was used to gather all the data needed in the investigation. It found out that the overall performance of the student teachers is “outstanding” and the clients are “very much” satisfied with the BEED teaching interns. The researcher recommend that there needs to still give the pre-service teachers a pre-deployment seminar-workshop to enhance more their capability along practice teaching.

Citation: Eleuteria R. Pacpaco, Necy Cesaria V. Romo and Edmar Paguirigan. 2019. Performance of Pre-Service Teachers and Client Satisfaction in Public Schools. International Journal of Current Innovations in Advanced Research, 2(2): 15-24.

Copyright: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. **Copyright©2019;** Eleuteria R. Pacpaco, Necy Cesaria V. Romo and Edmar Paguirigan.

Introduction

Student teaching is meant to be an internship experience during which the student teacher is gradually given the full load of a working teacher and for several weeks teaches under supervision. It is the opportunity to implement pedagogical practices and theory, under the control of 'veteran' teachers, who are certified in regular and/or special education. Although universities provide qualified, usually state certified clinical supervisors, who work as adjunct professors, it relinquishes direct daily control of the student teacher's activities to the school and cooperating teacher. It has been argued that student teaching is the most important component of any teacher training program. Most teachers claim that the most important elements in their professional education were the school experience found in student teaching. Cooperating teachers are generally understood to be classroom teachers who participate in the education program by agreeing to work with student teachers in their classroom (Montgomery, 2000).

The past two decades have been times of heightened emphasis on changing structures between universities and public schools towards collaboration as means of improving the education and preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers. Research indicates there has been less partnership and collaboration between schools and universities in preparing that teacher preparation for the future (Moore, 2001). A quality driven field experience cannot be accomplished without a cooperative partnership with K+12 schools. Goodlad (1994) observed that the joining of schools (and school district) and universities is commonly purposive and mutually beneficial; linkages are a virtually untried and, therefore, unstudied

phenomenon. There must be a collaborative effort between the college of education at the university and the schools to maximize resources and efforts to improve the quality of the pre-service teacher.

The Holmes Group issued the challenge to focus attention on the formation of university/public school partnerships as a means of bringing practicing teachers and administrators together with the university faculty in collaboration efforts to improve teaching and learning on the part of their respective students. They examined partnerships and identified three types of collaboration: cooperative, symbiotic and organic. In cooperation, the relationship is a short-term collaboration in which information is shared or a service is provided by one partner to the other. Moores (2001) described the key features of symbiotic collaboration as being a mutual and reciprocal relationship, which does not lead to any change within partners. In an organic collaboration model, partners are equally vested in the goals and issues of the collaborative relationship, and the process ultimately changes both partners. Several studies concur that a significant premise of a successful university/public school partnership is that the relationship progresses beyond cooperation and symbiosis to an organic collaboration model.

The quality of student teaching has significant and positive effects on teacher outcomes because it is a cornerstone of teacher preparation, which provides opportunities for student teachers to link theory and practice. That is why; the role of cooperating teachers is vital (Ronfeldt and Reininger, 2012). Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1987) noted that cooperating teachers set the effective and intellectual tone and also shape what student teachers learn by the way they conceive and carry out their roles as teacher educator. Traditionally, student teaching practicum has been viewed as critical to the development of pre-service teachers' pedagogical skills, socialization into the teaching profession, and as the most effective preparation for teaching and learning the professional role of a teacher.

Previous studies suggest that cooperating teachers who provide guided teaching experience on a daily basis have strong influence on student teachers' practice. They have played and continue to play significant roles in the process of the development of student teachers. The cooperating teachers are the most influential individual in pre-service teacher undergraduate preparation (Cook, 2007). Cook (2007) suggests that a cooperating teacher is the individual most responsible for the quality of experience the student teacher receives. For their key role, the above authors concluded the qualities cooperating teachers bring to the student teaching experience must be considered and better understood. Moreover, Smith (2001) argued that cooperating teachers help to convert student teachers into teachers by taking full responsibility of the student teacher's instruction. Ironically, not much emphasis and effort have focused on how they feel about the student teachers they are handling organization and implementation of this student teaching practicum.

Within this large body of research, it is surprising that few studies focused on satisfaction of cooperating teachers at the elementary level. Therefore, it would seem essential that those persons selected as cooperating teachers would be given the opportunity to evaluate the performance of their student teachers and to provide continuing feedback to determine their level of satisfaction. Koerner *et al.*, (2002) study, 'Exploring roles in student teaching placements,' found that most all participants agreed that good cooperating teachers and supervisors were perceived to be good mentors and role models; they were professionals who took their time to share their knowledge of good teaching, and offered support and encouragement (2002). Koerner *et al.*, (2002) also found that professional dispositions and

personal qualities were important attributes of cooperating teachers. Professional dispositions included such attributes as mentoring, collegiality and openness.

Enz and Cok (2002), in their study of student and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the roles and functions of cooperating teachers, had the same findings when they concluded that, cooperating teachers ought to be selected because they demonstrate the qualities of effective mentors. In addition to instructional and management strengths, the authors found that effective cooperating teachers should be caring, active listeners who are sensitive to the views of others and who are able and willing to articulate the intricacies of their craft and the subtleties of the school culture. While effective teaching is perceived as an important attribute of a cooperating teacher, Tannehill and Goc-Karp (2002) argued that this attribute does not translate to good supervision. They noted that most cooperating teachers have been selected on the false assumption that they are effective teachers, and, therefore, they should be effective supervisors. They concluded that effective teaching does not address issues related to being an effective supervisor, which include, but are not limited to: observation skills, analysing teaching performance, and conferencing.

The past two decades have been times of heightened emphasis on changing structures between universities and public schools towards collaboration as means of improving the education and preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers. Research indicates there has been less partnership and collaboration between schools and universities in preparing that teacher preparation for the future (Moores, 2001). Furthermore, Didham suggested that university supervising teachers and cooperating teachers should attend a yearly training together to ensure continuity of programming and mentoring. Brown (2009) pointed out that teacher preparation institutions show a lack of concern for the competency of supervisors of student teachers. Philips and Bagget-McMinn (2000) found that, although many states have their own procedural requirements for eligibility to supervise students teachers, most institutions seem to use the requirements only as guidelines, enabling waivers of those requirements when the emergencies arise. Goodlad (1994) suggested that cooperating teachers will not be anything special unless they are selected with deliberate care as there is more to a teacher's job than what occurs in the classroom.

Supervision of student teachers involves the participation of cooperating teachers, student teachers, and university supervisors. Each party has responsibilities that are outlined on the Student Teaching Handbook (Higher Education Council, 1998, 2007). At the beginning of the semester, student teachers are placed in schools to work with cooperating teachers to develop their teaching skills. University supervisors collaborate with collaborating teachers as they supervise interns and evaluate their teaching practices. Inservice elementary teachers who are selected as cooperating teachers are required to supervise and guide student teachers as they plan and teach.

Elementary pre-service teachers are enrolled in a course called, School Experience, in the second half of their third year to complete a series of assignments in elementary classrooms (e.g., observe classes, learn school policies and procedures). The pre-service teachers are expected to meet with their university supervisors to discuss their observations and turn in their field notes and assignments. The internship is a yearlong experience, and elementary pre-service teachers are enrolled in two practicum courses in their fourth year. In groups of 2 or 3, student teachers prepare and teach lessons at 1st through 4th grade levels under the supervision of their cooperating teachers for 14 weeks. Each week, student teachers meet with their university supervisor to discuss their teaching experiences and reflect on their

teaching. At the end of the semester, they submit a portfolio that includes lesson plans, and student evaluation and peer observation forms. There are no selection criteria for cooperating teachers due to large number of student teachers. Any in-service elementary teacher can be considered as a potential cooperating teacher. The purpose of the study is to determine the level of public school personnel's' satisfaction on pre-service teachers deployed in their schools along the following criteria: Grooming; Attitude; Attendance and Participation; Lesson Planning; Classroom Management; Use of Instructional Materials; and Actual Teaching. It will also look into the level of practice teaching performance of the pre-service teachers in terms of the following criteria: Actual Teaching; Lesson Planning; Classroom Management; Participation (Other Activities); Attendance; and Attitude. Lastly, It will determine the significant relationship between the public school personnel's' satisfaction on pre-service teachers deployed in their schools and their practice teaching performance.

Statement of the problem

This study sought to answer the following problems:

1. What is the level of performance of the pre-service teachers in their final demonstration teaching?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of the clients with the overall teaching performance of the pre-service teachers?
3. Is there a significant difference in the satisfaction of clients between and among the cooperating schools?

Scope and Delimitation

This study focused on determining pre-service teachers teaching performance and clients satisfaction. The pre-service teacher being evaluated is delimited to the fourth year Bachelor of Elementary Education students of the University of Northern Philippines-College of Teacher Education for School year 2018-2019.

Methodology

Research Design

The study used the descriptive-correlational method of research. Survey method was used to gather all the data needed in the investigation.

Research Instrument

The principal device that was utilized by the researchers in this study was a survey questionnaire which was formulated by the researchers and validated by experts. *Mean and standard deviation* was used to describe the level of assessment and administrative capability. *Analysis of variance* was used determine the significant difference of clients satisfaction between and among the cooperating schools.

Population and Sample

The respondents of the study were the 160 public school personnel (teachers and administrators) of the different cooperating schools in Ilocos Sur. The Bachelor of Elementary Education of the University of Northern Philippines-College of Teacher Education of School year 2017-2018 were the pre-service teachers evaluated.

Ethical Considerations

In the conduct of the research, the researcher was guided with the following ethical considerations: research participants were not subjected to harm in any ways or whatsoever; respect for the dignity of the research participants was prioritized; full consent was obtained

from the participants prior to the study; the protection of privacy of the research participants; adequate level of confidentiality of the research data was ensured; any deception or exaggeration about the aims and objectives of the research was avoided; affiliations in any forms, sources of funding, as well as any possible conflicts of interests were declared; any type of communication in relation to the research were done honestly and with transparency; any type of misleading information, as well as representation of data findings in a biased way were avoided.

Results and Discussions

Table 1. Level of Public School Personnel's' Satisfaction on Pre-Service Teachers

Items	x	Descriptive Rating
A. Grooming		
1. always wears complete uniform in the school	4.92	Very Much
2. wears appropriate make-up (girls)	4.68	Very Much
3. has a proper haircut (boys) and fixed hair (girls)	4.83	Very Much
4. is clean-looking	4.87	Very Much
5. Overall, grooming was	4.82	Very Much
Overall	4.82	Very High
B. Attitude		
1. always greets people in the school	4.73	Very Much
2. obeys the school personnel	4.77	Very Much
3. shows respect to people in the school	4.82	Very Much
4. behaves well inside and outside the school	4.79	Very Much
5. Overall, attitude was	4.78	Very Much
Overall	4.78	Very Much
C. Attendance and Participation		
1. helps in cleaning the classroom	4.80	Very Much
2. participates in school-related activities	4.79	Very Much
3. comes to school regularly	4.77	Very Much
4. attends the flag ceremony	4.77	Very Much
5. Overall, participation was	4.78	Very Much
Overall	4.78	Very High
D. Lesson Planning		
1. prepares lesson plan before teaching	4.63	Very Much
2. submits lesson plan on time.	4.53	Very Much
3. makes an organized detailed lesson plan	4.60	Very Much
4. rewrites lesson duly checked by the cooperating teacher	4.64	Very Much
5. Overall, lesson planning was	4.57	Very Much
Overall	4.60	Very Much
E. Classroom Management		
1. pays attention to routine matters in the classroom	4.76	Very Much
2. handles disciplinary problems effectively	4.54	Very Much

3. maximizes positive interaction	4.72	Very Much
4. develops caring, and supportive relationships	4.86	Very Much
5. Overall, classroom management was	4.70	Very Much
Overall	4.72	Very Much
F. Use of Instructional Materials		Very Much
1. prepares instructional materials before teaching	4.78	
2. has instructional materials in teaching	4.80	Very Much
3. makes durable and useful instructional materials	4.70	Very Much
4. creates varied instructional materials	4.74	Very Much
5. Overall, use of instructional materials was	4.72	Very Much
Overall	4.75	Very High
G. Actual Teaching		Very Much
1. has mastery of every lesson taught	4.73	
2. engages students with different teaching strategies	4.73	Very Much
3. provides varied learning tasks	4.76	Very Much
4. facilitates the class very well	4.73	Very Much
5. Overall, actual teaching was	4.71	Very Much
Overall	4.73	Very Much
As a Whole	4.74	Very Much

On Grooming: As seen on the table, grooming has an overall mean on 4.82 described as “Very High.” Taking the item separately “Always wears complete uniform in the school” got the highest mean rating of 4.92 describes as “Very Much”. This shows that practice teachers always wear their complete uniform whenever they go the cooperating schools where they are deployed. “Wears appropriate make-up (girls)” got the lowest mean rating of 4.68 described as “Very Much” respectively. This means that not all practice teachers wear appropriate make-up every time they go to the school where they are deployed. 4.78 described as “Very Much.”

On Attitude: As reflected on the table, attitude got an overall mean rating of 4.78 described as “Very Much.” “Shows respect to people in the school” obtained the highest mean rating of 4.82 described as “Very Much” and “Always greets people in the school” got the lowest mean rating of 4.73 described as “Very Much” respectively. This means that practice teachers knows how to respect all the teaching staff, personnel and learners of the school.

On Lesson Planning: As depicted on the table, lesson planning obtained an overall mean rating of 4.60 **described** as “Very Much.” “Rewrites lesson duly checked by the cooperating teacher,” got the highest mean rating of 4.64 described as “Very Much” and “Submits lesson plan on time.” got the lowest mean rating of 4.53 described as “Very Much” respectively. This means that practice teachers knows how rewrite their plan after their cooperating teachers has checked it but some of them are not passing their lesson plan on time.

On Classroom Management: As seen on the table classroom management got an overall mean of **4.72** described as “Very Much.” “Develops caring, and supportive relationships” got

the highest mean rating of 4.86 described as “Very Much.” and “Handles disciplinary problems effectively” got the lowest mean rating of 4.54 described as “Very Much” respectively. This means that practice teachers knows how to care and support their learners but as a beginners they are learning how to handle disciplinary problems effectively. Handling disciplinary problems is not an easy task especially to those who are still beginning.

On Use of Instructional Materials: As depicted on the table, the use of instructional materials obtained an overall mean rating of 4.72 described as “Very Much.” Taking the item separately “Has instructional materials in teaching” got the highest mean rating of 4.80 described as “Very Much” and “Makes durable and useful instructional materials” got the lowest mean rating of 4.70 described as “Very Much” respectively. This shows that every time that these practice teachers teach they always prepare instructional material because with the use of these they find it easier to teach but not all of them prepare durable and useful instructional materials.

On Actual Teaching: The table shows that actual teaching got an overall mean rating of 4.73 described as “Very Much” “Provides varied learning tasks” obtained the highest mean rating of 4.76 described as “Very Much,” and “Has mastery of every lesson taught,” Engages students with different teaching strategies,” and “Facilitates the class very well” obtained the lowest mean rating of 4.73 described as “Very Much” respectively. This means that they know how to give different learning activities to master the lessons that they are teaching.

Table 2. Summary of Public School Personnel’s Satisfaction on Pre-Service Teachers

Items	x	Descriptive Rating
1. Grooming	4.82	Very Much
2. Attendance and Participation	4.78	Very Much
3. Lesson Planning	4.78	Very Much
4. Classroom Management	4.72	Very Much
5. Use of Instructional Materials	4.75	Very Much
6. Actual Teaching	4.73	Very Much
7. Grooming	4.74	Very High
As a Whole	4.76	Very Much

As seen on the table, the summary of public school personnel’s Satisfaction on Pre-Service Teachers got an overall mean of 4.76 described as “Very Much”. Grooming got the highest mean rating of 4.82 and Classroom Management got the lowest mean rating of 4.72 described as “Very Much” respectively. This shows that the practice teachers knows how to dressed up as they go to their cooperating school and face their learners but they are still learning how to manage well their classroom.

Table 3. Level of Practice Teaching Performance of the Pre-Service Teachers

Items	x	Descriptive Rating
1. Actual Teaching	38.87	Outstanding
2. Lesson Planning	24.77	Outstanding
3. Classroom Management	14.37	Outstanding
4. Participation (Other Activities)	9.80	Outstanding
5. Attitude	4.90	Outstanding
6. Attendance	4.91	Outstanding
As a Whole	97.11	Outstanding

As reflected on the table, as a whole, the level of practice teaching performance of the pre-service teachers got a mean score of 97.11 described as “Outstanding.” Actual Teaching got the highest mean of 38.87 and Attitude got the lowest mean of 4.90 described as “Outstanding” respectively. This implies that practice teachers are well prepared when it comes to actual teaching. They try their best to teach their learners in order for them to understand well the lesson they have prepared.

Table 4. Significant Relationship between the Level of Satisfaction and Practice Teaching Performance of the Students

Practice Teaching Performance Client Satisfaction	Actual Teaching	Lesson Planning	Classroom Management	Participation (Other Activities)	Attitude	Attendance	Overall
1. Grooming	-0.0168	0.1162	-0.1436	-0.2206*	-0.0344	0.0062	-0.0567
2. Attendance and Participation	-0.0071	-0.0950	-0.0441	0.0578	0.0819	0.2663*	-0.0088
3. Lesson Planning	-0.0673	-0.1033	-0.0781	0.0497	0.0052	0.2898*	-0.0512
4. Classroom Management	0.0879	0.1177	0.0925	0.0878	0.1034	0.1968	0.1304
5. Use of Instructional Materials	0.0167	0.0814	0.0646	0.0140	-0.1101	0.2433*	0.0583
6. Actual Teaching	0.0421	0.0152	0.0563	0.0991	0.0133	0.2680*	0.0721
7. Grooming	0.0977	0.0505	0.0896	0.1208	0.0276	0.2154*	0.1138
Overall	0.0421	0.0152	0.0563	0.0991	0.0133	0.2680*	0.0721

As seen on the table the overall performance of the pre-service teachers does not have significant relationship with the overall satisfaction of clients.

However the overall attendance of the students has a significant relationship with the satisfaction of the clients (0.2680*). This imply that the higher number of attendance of the students create higher satisfaction of the clients.

In particular, attendance is significantly related to clients’ satisfaction in terms of Attitude (0.2663*), Participation (0.2898*), classroom management (0.2433*), use of instructional materials (0.2680*) and actual teaching (0.2154*). This imply that with great number of attendance, the students learn to impose a good attitude, improve their ability to write worthy lesson plans, develop better understanding of managing the class, utilize efficiently varied instructional materials, and they are able to teach effectively their lesson. Thus, there is satisfaction guaranteed for the clients.

Conclusion

With the aforementioned findings, here are the following conclusions;

1. The overall performance of the student-teachers was “Outstanding” with a mean rating of 97.11
2. The overall satisfaction of the public school personnel was “Very High” with a mean rating of 4.76

3. There is no significant relationship between the overall satisfaction of the clients and the overall performance of the pre-service teachers.

Recommendations

1. Even though that the over-all performance of the pre-service teachers was “Outstanding” there is still a need to give the pre-service teachers a pre-deployment seminar-workshop to enhance their capability along practice teaching.
2. Pre-service teachers should always undergo values orientation seminar before they will be deployed in the different cooperating schools in the Department of Education to ensure that these cooperating teachers would be satisfied with their attitude towards the different members of the school in general
3. Another research using other variables should be conducted to ensure the satisfaction of the clients especially in the Department of Education.

References

1. Brown, N.R. 2009. What can you learn in three minutes? *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 26(5): 345-354.
2. Cook, L. 2007. When in Rome: Influences on Special Education Student-Teachers' Teaching. *International Journal of Special Education*, 22(3): 118-130.
3. Enz, B.J. and Cook, S.J. 1992. Student Teachers' and Cooperating Teachers' Perspectives of Mentoring Functions: Harmony or Dissonance?. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992). Eric Documents Reproduction Service, No ED 350-291.
4. Fwimann-Nemer, S. and Buchmann, M. 1987. When is student teaching teacher education? *Teaching and teacher education*, 3(4): 255-273.
5. Goodlad, J.I. 1994. *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, PO Box 44305, San Francisco, CA 94144-4305.
6. Higher Education Council. 1998. Faculty-School Partnership. [Fakulte okul isbirligi] YOK/World Bank National Education Development Project Preservice Teacher Education. Ankara, Turkey: YOK.
7. Higher Education Council. 2007. Teacher preparation and faculty of education [Öğretmen yetiştirme ve eğitim fakülteleri] (1998-2007). Ankara, Ankara, Turkey: YOK.
8. Koerner, M., Rust, F.O.C. and Baumgartner, F. 2002. Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2): 35-58.
9. Montgomery, B. 2000. The student and cooperating teacher relationship. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 18(2): 7-15.
10. Moores, D. 2001. *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles and practices*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
11. Phillips, T.M. and Baggett-McMinn, S. 2000. Southeastern Selection Criteria For Cooperating Teachers. *Education*, 121(1): 177-185.

12. Ronfeldt, M. and Reininger, M. 2012. More or better student teaching?. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8): 1091-1106.
13. Smith, J.P. 1991. Cooperating teachers. *Music Educator Journal*, 78: 250-30.
14. Tannehill, D. and Goc-Karp, G. 1992. The student teaching practicum: Placement trends and issues. *Physical Educator*, 49(1): 39.