

保育実習における評価のあり方に関する一考察 — 学生の自己評価と実習施設の評価の比較分析に基づいて —

浅井 拓久也（児童学科）

Evaluation of Practices in Nursery School: Comparative Analysis of Students' Self-Evaluation and Nursery Schools' Evaluation

Takuya Asai

Department of Child Studies, Kamakura Women's University

Abstract

In this study, the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities were analyzed to examine the ideal evaluation method in a nursery internship. The results of Mann-Whitney U test and multiple regression analysis revealed that the self-evaluation of the students was higher than the evaluation of the facilities in all the items on the evaluation sheet, and there was a difference between the evaluations. On the basis of the above results, we proposed two evaluating methods for practical training: clarification of the basis of evaluation and implementation of intermediate evaluation using evaluation forms during the nursery internship.

Key words: practices in nursery school, evaluation, Mann-Whitney U test, multiple regression analysis

キーワード：保育実習、実習の評価、Mann-Whitney の U 検定、重回帰分析

Background

The self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities in nursery internship play an important role in establishing learnings from the internship. This is because students can objectively review their own practical training through the self-evaluation, and objectively

grasp their own growth points and issues by comparing their self-evaluation with the evaluation of practical training facilities. The Minimum Standard also states that “rather than taking an external view that the evaluation of facilities was good or bad, it is important that the minute examination of each item allows the students themselves to reflect comparatively on their practical training and lead to

more accurate self-understanding and setting of the next self-assignments,” and that “it is important that teachers in university or college provide supports so that students can conduct more objective and concrete self-evaluation through their instructions after the nursery internship” (National Association for Nursery Teachers’ Training, 2018, p.150).

On the background of the importance of the evaluation in the nursery internship, numerous researches have been carried out in order to analyze the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities and obtain suggestions for the way of effective practical training guidances from the result. For example, a comparative analysis of the results of the evaluations by students and practical training facilities using the same evaluation forms (Hase, 2015; Yuki, 2016; Hirasawa, 2020), a comparative analysis of the evaluation results using different evaluation sheets (Okada, 2020), and a cross-analysis of student self-evaluations, the guidance of teachers and practical training facilities, and the needed factors such as attitude, knowledge and skills in the nursery internship (Masunami and Hori, 2012) have been conducted. However, these studies simply aggregated and compared responses. Merely comparing the students’ self-evaluation with the evaluation of the practical training facilities by items, there was also no analysis of what the students and the facilities put emphasis on when evaluating, and whether it was commonly understood in both sides. It would have been possible to make a more precise analysis of both the students’ self-evaluation and the practice facility’s evaluation if it had been possible to clarify which items each student and practice facility emphasized and to what extent, in addition to comparing the items on the evaluation form.

Therefore, this study aims to reveal what the relation between self-evaluation of students and evaluation of practical training facilities is, and

what the students and practical training facilities attach importance to among various items, and propose how the evaluation in the nursery internship should be based on the result.

Methods and Data

Survey Overview

The subjects of the survey were 88 students who were enrolled in designated childcare teacher training facilities (junior college) in the metropolitan area and completed Nursery Internship I (nursery school), and 86 practical training facilities in which the students practiced the training. The survey was performed in the first class of Nursery Internship Guidance II. The reason why the survey was conducted in the first class is that the memory at the time of practical training changes or becomes ambiguous as time elapses after the completion of Nursery Internship I, and thus the reliability of self-evaluation by students cannot be guaranteed. And, it is because the class of the Guidance II may affect the self-evaluation of the students as the lesson of the class progresses. As for the survey methods, the students accessed the Google form from the QR code, and entered the self-evaluation of Nursery Internship I on the same evaluation sheet as the practical training facilities. The evaluation form of the practicum facility sent to the junior college was used for this survey.¹⁾

The evaluation form used in this survey was the one of the junior college in which the survey targets are registered. The items of the evaluation sheet consisted of “Greeting and wording to staff and parents,” “Clothing,” “Understanding of instructions,” “Observing time and regulations,” “Self-healthcare” as items showing practical attitudes, “Awareness of purpose for practical training,” “Aggressiveness to issues” as items indicating motivations for the internship, “Understanding of

children development,” “How to write and summarize training logbook,” “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher” as items showing practical skills, and “Comprehensive evaluation” as an item showing the evaluation of the whole practical training. For each item, students and facilities were required to give a rating of S (particularly excellent), A (excellent), B (appropriate), C (effort required), or D (not acceptable).

Statistical Analysis

As the first step, in order to clarify the difference between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities, the difference in mean value between the students' self-evaluation and the evaluation of the training facility was calculated for each item of the evaluation form, and the normality was confirmed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality (modified by Lilliefors), followed by the Mann-Whitney U test. Next, for the purpose of revealing what students and practical training facilities emphasize among various items, multiple regression analysis (stepwise method) was carried out in which the “Comprehensive evaluation” in the evaluation sheet was input as a dependent variable and other items as independent variables.² For the analysis, the estimate from S to D was replaced with the number from 5 to 1. IBM SPSS Statistics v 24 was used for the analysis.

Informed Consent to Research

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Review Committee of Akikusa Gakuen Junior College (Approval No. 2020-15). All participants were provided with the full disclosure and explanation of the purpose and the procedure of this research. Then written informed consent was obtained from all the participants.

Findings and Discussion

Table 1 shows the mean value of the student self-evaluation and the evaluation of the practical training facilities by each item.

Table 1 Mean value of self-evaluation of students and evaluation of practical training facilities

Items	Students (N=88)	Facilities (N=86)
Greeting and wording to staff and parents	4.06 (.748)	3.65 (.779)
Clothing	4.56 (.641)	3.88 (.710)
Understanding of instructions	3.88 (.622)	3.56 (.696)
Observing time and regulations	4.65 (.623)	3.93 (.809)
Self-healthcare	4.42 (.956)	4.01 (.833)
Awareness of purpose for practical training	4.03 (.702)	3.62 (.722)
Aggressiveness to issues	3.83 (.791)	3.50 (.715)
Understanding of children development	4.06 (.764)	3.31 (.637)
How to write and summarize training logbook	3.55 (.741)	3.37 (.783)
Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	3.86 (.591)	3.34 (.662)
Comprehensive evaluation	3.65 (.607)	3.55 (.667)

Note 1. Standard deviation in parentheses

Note 2. “Comprehensive evaluation” has a missing value, so N=83

In “Greeting and wording to staff and parents,” the mean value of students was 4.06, while that of practical training facilities was 3.65. In “Clothing,” the score of students was 4.56, but that of practical training facilities was 3.88. In “Understanding of instruction,” the value was 3.88 for students and 3.56 for practical training facilities. In “Observing time and regulations,” the mean value of students was 4.65 and that of practical training facilities was 3.93. In “Self-healthcare,” the score was 4.42 for students and 4.01 for the facilities. In “Awareness of purpose for practical training,” the mean value of students was 4.03 and that of practical training facilities was 3.62. In “Aggressiveness to issues,” the score of students was 3.83, while that of practical training facilities was 3.50. In “Understanding of children development,” the value of students was 4.06 and that of practical training facilities was 3.31. In “How to write and summarize training logbook,” the mean value of students was 3.55, while that of the facilities was 3.37. In “Und

erstanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher,” the mean score was 3.86 for students and 3.34 for the training facilities. In “Comprehensive evaluation,” the mean score of students was 3.65 and that of practical training facilities was 3.55.

Table 2 indicates the difference in mean value between the student self-evaluation and the evaluation of the practical training facilities in descending the order of the difference.

Table 2 Difference in mean value between self-evaluation of students and evaluation of practical training facilities

Items	Mean Value difference
Understanding of children development	0.75
Observing time and regulations	0.72
Clothing	0.68
Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	0.52
Greeting and wording to staff and parents	0.41
Self-healthcare	0.41
Awareness of purpose for practical training	0.41
Aggressiveness to issues	0.33
Understanding of instructions	0.32
How to write and summarize training logbook	0.18
Comprehensive evaluation	0.10

“Understanding of children development” was 0.75, “Observing time and regulations” was 0.72, “Clothing” was 0.68, “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher” was 0.52, “Greeting and wording to staff and parents” was 0.41, “Self-healthcare” was 0.41, “Awareness of purpose of practical training” was 0.41, “Aggressiveness to issues” was 0.33, “Understanding of instructions” was 0.32, “How to write and summarize training logbook” was 0.18, and “Comprehensive evaluation” was 0.10.

Table 3 represents the outcome of Mann-Whitney test.

Table 3 Result of Mann-Whitney test

Items	Average rank		U value	Significance
	Students (N=88)	Facilities (N=86)		
Greeting and wording to staff and parents	99.23	75.50	2752.000	.001 **
Clothing	108.53	65.98	1933.500	.000 ***
Understanding of instructions	98.43	76.31	2822.000	.001 **
Observing time and regulations	110.04	65.19	1865.500	.000 ***
Self-healthcare	101.28	73.40	2571.000	.000 ***
Awareness of purpose for practical training	100.59	74.11	2632.500	.000 ***
Aggressiveness to issues	98.25	76.5	2838.000	.002 **
Understanding of children development	110.66	63.80	1746.000	.000 ***
How to write and summarize training logbook	93.58	81.28	3249.000	.081
Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	106.35	68.21	2125.000	.000 ***
Comprehensive evaluation	89.93	81.84	3306.500	.232

Note 1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Note 2. “Comprehensive evaluation” has a missing value, so $N=83$

The self-evaluation of students was significantly higher than the evaluation of practical training facilities in “Greeting and wording to staff and parents” (U value = 2752.000), “Clothing” (U value = 1933.500), “Understanding of instructions” (U value = 2822.000), “Observing time and regulations” (U value = 1865.500), “Self-healthcare” (U value = 2571.000), “Awareness of purpose of practical training” (U value = 2632.500), “Aggressiveness to issues” (U value = 2838.000), “Understanding of children development” (U value = 1746.000), and “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher” (U value = 2125.000). In “How to write and summarize training logbook” (U value = 3249.000) and “Comprehensive evaluation” (U value = 3306.500), there was no significant difference between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the facilities.

Table 4 denotes the results of the multiple regression analysis in which the “Comprehensive evaluation” in the evaluation sheet is used as a dependent variable and other items are used as independent variables for the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the practical training facilities.

Table 4 Results of multiple regression analysis for self-evaluation of students and evaluation of practical training facilities (Top: Students [$N=88$], Bottom: Facilities [$N=83$])

	Non-standardization	Standard error	Standardization	Significance
Understanding of instructions	.351	.079	.359	.000 ***
Greeting and wording to staff and parents	.229	.065	.282	.001 **
Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	.238	.084	.231	.006 **
How to write and summarize training logbook	.148	.066	.180	.028 *
Note 1. Adjusted $R^2 = .567$, Standard error = .400, $F=29.454^{***}$				
Note 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$				
	Non-standardization	Standard error	Standardization	Significance
Aggressiveness to issues	.228	.075	.247	.003 **
Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	.216	.061	.209	.001 **
Understanding of instructions	.238	.063	.244	.000 ***
Awareness of purpose for practical training	.233	.071	.255	.002 **
Clothing	.148	.051	.159	.005 **
Note 1. Adjusted $R^2 = .839$, Standard error = .268, $F=96.880^{***}$				
Note 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$				

“Comprehensive evaluation” in the self-evaluation of students was significantly influenced by “Understanding instructions,” “Greeting and wording to staff and parents,” “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher,” and “How to write and summarize training logbook” (Adjusted $R^2 = .567$, Standard error = .400, F value = 29.454, significance = .000). In the “Comprehensive evaluation” in the evaluation of the practical training facilities, “Aggressiveness to issues,” “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher,” “Understanding of instructions,” “Awareness of purpose for practical training” and “Clothing” had a significant effect (Adjusted $R^2 = .839$, Standard error = .268, F value = 96.880, significance = .000).

From the above results, it was found that there was a big difference in the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities, and there was also a difference in the item emphasized. Consequently, when the students are notified of the evaluation of the practical training facilities in the guidance after the internship, the evaluation may not be immediately understood and convinced to the students. Certainly, there are some items in which the difference between the student’s

self-evaluation (3.55) and the facility’s evaluation (3.37) is small (0.18), as in “How to write and summarize training logbook,” and these are comparatively easy for the trainees to understand and accept. There were no significant differences between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of practical training facilities (Table 3). Many students have difficulty in writing training logbooks, and since their self-evaluation is low, it would be easy to accept that the evaluation of practical training facilities is also low. However, for example, the mean value of the self-evaluation of students for “Clothing” and “Observing time and regulations” was 4.56 and 4.65, respectively, which was the first and second highest among all items, while the difference from the evaluation of practical training facilities was 0.68 and 0.72, respectively, showing a large difference. The mean score of self-evaluation of students for “Understanding of children development” was 4.06, the fourth highest among all items, but the mean value of evaluation of the facilities was 3.31, the lowest among all items, and the difference in mean value between the two items was 0.75, the largest among all items. There was a significant difference between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the

facilities for these items (Table 3). Therefore, if it is not persuasive why these differences arise, it may be difficult for students to accept the evaluation of the practical training facilities.³

In addition, the practical training facilities emphasized “Awareness of purpose for practical training” and “Aggressiveness for issues” which expressed the motivation in the nursery school practical training, but the students did not. The students put emphasis on “How to write and summarize training logbook,” which they often felt bad at, but the facilities did not (Table 4). If the students and the facilities had conducted the nursery internship without making a common understanding of what they would attach importance to during the training term, it is somewhat likely that the guidance and advice provided from the facilities would not have been effective for the students.

Conclusion and Implication

In this study, the self-evaluation of the students and the evaluation of the practical training facilities were analyzed in order to examine the ideal way of the evaluation in the practical training. As the result, in the comparison of the mean value (difference) by items, the self-evaluation of the students was higher than the evaluation of the practical training facilities on all items of the evaluation sheet, and there was the difference in both evaluations. These differences were significant for the items except for “How to write and summarize training logbook” and “Comprehensive evaluation.” Regarding what items were emphasized, “Understanding of instructions” and “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher” were commonly emphasized for both students and the facilities. However, students placed importance on “Greeting and wording to staff and parents,” “How to write and summarize training logbook,” and whereas practical training facilities accentuated

“Aggressiveness to issues,” “Awareness of purpose for practical training,” and “Clothing.”

Based on the above, there are two suggestions on how the evaluation should be conducted in the nursery internship. First, the rationale for the evaluation should be clarified. In particular, the reason for the evaluation of the practical training facilities. This is because, when there is a difference between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the practical training facilities, it is necessary that the reasons of the evaluation of the practical training facilities are stated in order for the students to understand and accept the evaluation. From the point of view of the teachers who instruct the students, it is hard to effectively instruct the students if the bases for the evaluation have not been clearly entered, because it is difficult to collect opinions from the practical training facilities, even if the students’ opinions on the evaluation of the facilities can be heard after the practical training. By clarifying the reason why such evaluations were made in the side of the facilities, it is possible to understand and infer where and how the self-evaluation of the students has differed from the evaluation of the facilities, and it will lead to the fruitful guidance for the students.

Of course, it might be argued that there are issues associated with demanding busy nursery teachers to clarify the rationale for each of the multiple items, and that there are issues with the reliability of students’ self-evaluation in the first place. However, as long as students are accepted as childcare interns, there is also a responsibility in the training facilities, and it is the part of the responsibility that the training facilities should fulfill to clarify the bases for their own evaluation. In addition, it may not necessarily be possible to say that students’ self-evaluation is unreliable. If there is a difference between the student’s self-evaluation and the evaluation of the training facilities, it is not preferable to accept the evaluation of the facilities

unilaterally without minute inspection. What is important is not whether either evaluation is credible or not, but the fact that both evaluations are different, and to maximize the learning from the practical training for the students by working to close the gap. To this end, it is essential to provide a basis for judging why such the scores have been marked.⁴

Secondly, both the students and the practical training facilities ought to implement the interim evaluation using the evaluation sheet during the practical training. In this study, the self-evaluation of the students and the evaluation of the facilities after the practical training were compared and analyzed. As a result, there were various differences in both sides. It will be difficult to obtain a sufficient effect even if the childcare practice is implemented with such large differences. Accordingly, instead of submitting the evaluation of the practical training in a lump sum at the end, it is preferable to visualize the difference between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the facilities through the intermediate evaluation using the evaluation form at the turning points and the milestones of the practical training, to clarify what the remaining period should be, and to obtain a common understanding of what and how items should be evaluated and emphasized, so as to bridge the gap between the self-evaluation of students and the evaluation of the facilities. Certainly, the nursery teachers may be instructing students while keeping in mind each item of the evaluation sheet. However, by explicitly confirming the recognition (evaluation) of the students and facilities at the present time in accordance with the evaluation form, it is possible to prevent discrepancies between the students and the facilities in terms of the viewpoint of the evaluation, the evaluation method, and the items to be emphasized.

In the mid-term evaluation during the practical training, it may also be associated with a visiting

guidance by teachers. Given that the guidance is frequently provided at the halfway point of the internship, and that teachers garner various opinions from students and practical training facilities at the time of the visiting guidance, it is possible for teachers to stand between students and practical training facilities, conduct interim evaluations using the evaluation sheet, and provide guidance to fill the gap between the evaluations. Previous studies have revealed that the instructions for trainees to experience the significance of the visit guidance are the proxies for their opinions and feelings, and the coordination between them and the training facilities (Asai and Asai, 2019). If the teachers carry out the intermediate evaluations using evaluation forms during the visit guidance, it would also be a significant instruction of the visiting guidance for students.⁵

As a future problem, there is the examination of evaluation form itself. The form used in this study has double-barreled items such as “Greeting and wording to staff and parents” and “Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher” and cannot be said to be reliable as an item. There is also doubt about the relationship between the major categories of “Practical Attitudes,” “Motivations” “Practical Skills” and subcategories. This study was used without modifying the form, because the survey also aims to serve as a grasp of the present state of the research participants, and it is positioned as a starting point research for the big theme of ideal way of evaluation in the practical training. In further research, it will be necessary to review the evaluation sheet from the viewpoint of refinement and verification of the finding obtained in this study.

Notes

- 1 The evaluation form is shown below.

Figure 1. Evaluation sheet

Evaluation Form of Practice 1 in Nursery School

xyz junior college

Department		Practice Instructor	Title	
Student ID number			Name	
Name				
Period	From / /20xx to / /20xx			
Work Status	Attendance day(s)	Absence days(s)	Lateness day(s)	Early Leaving day(s)
*Circle the appropriate symbol out of a 5-point scale: S (particularly excellent) A (excellent) B (appropriate) C (effort required) D (not acceptable)				
Items of evaluation		Evaluation		Special remarks
Practical Attitudes	Greeting and wording to staff and parents	S A B C D		
	Clothing	S A B C D		
	Understanding of instructions	S A B C D		
	Observing time and regulations	S A B C D		
	Self-healthcare	S A B C D		
Motivations	Awareness of purpose for practical training	S A B C D		
	Aggressiveness to issues	S A B C D		
Practical Skills	Understanding of children development	S A B C D		
	How to write and summarize training logbook	S A B C D		
	Understanding of content of childcare and roles of childcare teacher	S A B C D		
Comprehensive Evaluation		S A B C D		
*If the evaluation is D, fill in the reason and situation.				
*comprehensive comments				
We evaluated as above. / / 20xx		Nursery School Director		

2 The relationship between the number of independent variables and the number of samples is somewhat challenging, and thus this point will be addressed as a future issue.

3 In the field of the guidance after the nursery internship, in cases there were many issues in the training logbook, and thus overall evaluation was low, many students quickly understand and accept the evaluation. However, in cases there were issues regarding compliance with clothing, time, and regulations, it is probable that many teachers in charge of the practical training have experienced the fact that many students are not satisfied, except in cases they were explicitly instructed during the practical training. In addition, when it comes to the presence or absence of persuasive reasons, the evaluation and the reason are not necessarily linked, or the connection between the evaluation and the reason is frequently unclear, making it difficult for students to understand and agree to the evaluation of practical training facilities. The analysis of the relationship between the evaluation and the reason is beyond the scope of this paper. That said, there are some examples of the evaluation form analyzed in this study: “Greeting, wording, and behavior were good. Every morning, the student attended the classroom before 15 minutes, and observed the scheduled time” and the evaluation of “Greeting and wording to staff and parents” was B, “The student actively carried out the partial practical training and aspiringly tackled the internship” and the evaluation of “Awareness of purpose for practical training” and “Aggressiveness to issues” was B, and “The logbook was written in detail” and the evaluation of “How to write and summarize training logbook” was B. In addition to the difficult-to-understand and ambiguous issues of the items themselves, it is difficult for students to take in the evaluation of practical training facilities because the lack or ambiguity of the linkage between the evaluation and the reason.

4 The Minimum Standard includes reference

examples of the evaluation sheet for Nursery Internship I and the evaluation sheet for Nursery Internship II. Again, there are no places to fill in the grounds for the evaluation of individual items only by describing “what was done well and what needs to be done in the future” as a comprehensive finding (National Association for Nursery Teachers’ Training, 2018, p.140, p.142). However, as explained in the main text, if the rationale for the evaluation of the practical training facilities remains unknown, the difference between the self-evaluation of the students and the evaluation of the facilities cannot be filled out, and it is difficult to make the practical training effective. Also, in the evaluation form analyzed in this study, “special remarks” are placed next to the column for filling in the estimate. However, the phrase “special remarks” may be understood as something special to be conveyed (or should be conveyed) rather than a request for the basis of the evaluation. It is an improvement point in the future.

5 The Implementation of an interim evaluation at the time of visiting guidance may also be related to the issue of what sort of check sheets are used during the guidance. By making the check sheet the same as the evaluation sheet, it is possible to grasp the change of the self-evaluation of the students before, during and after the practical training, and also to clarify the relationship between the three evaluations and the evaluation of the practical training facilities. This issue will be considered further in future research.

References

- 1) Asai, T., & Asai, K. (2019). A Study on the Visiting Instructions in Practical Training at Nursery School: Focusing on Effects of Visiting Instruction for Student Teachers. *The Journal of Childcare and Education*, 6, 1-10.
- 2) Hase, H. (2015). A Study of evaluation of the

students' learning in child care and education training 1. *Annual Reports of Shijonawate Gakuen Junior College*, 48, 16-24.

確化と実習中に評価票を活用した中間評価の実施を提案した。

(2022年7月26日受稿)

- 3) Hirasawa, S. (2020). A Study on the Guidance of Childcare Practice: Consideration of Evaluation and Reflection. *Departmental Bulletin Paper of Nagoya Women's University*, 66, 225-237.
- 4) Masunami, T., & Hori, S. (2012) The Influencing Factors of Self-Evaluation Criteria in Practice Training for Childcare Workers. *Departmental Bulletin Paper of Kawaguchi Junior College*, 26, 155-166.
- 5) National Association for Nursery Teachers' Training. (2018). *Minimum Standard of Nursery Teachers' Practice Training: Version 2*. Tokyo. Chuohoki Publisher.
- 6) Okada, M. (2020). Examining childcare training guidance in childcare teacher training schools: Childcare training evaluation and self-evaluation from FY2015 to FY2018. *Aichi Gakusen University Review*, 2 (2), 157-164.
- 7) Yuki, T. (2016). The Relationships between the Evaluation of Training Program and Teaching Practice and the Preschool Teacher Efficacy of Students in a Training Course of Preschool Teachers. *Research Journal of Kokugakuin University Human Development*, (7), 87-107.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP20K02668 and JP20K02694.

要旨

本研究では、保育実習における評価のあり方について検討するため、学生の自己評価と実習施設の評価を分析した。Mann-Whitney の U 検定と重回帰分析による分析結果として、評価票のすべての項目で実習施設の評価より学生の自己評価が高く、双方の評価に差があったことが明らかとなった。以上の分析結果を踏まえて、評価の根拠の明