This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

EDUCATIONAL FIELD EXPERIENCE:
THE STATE OF THE ART

presented by

KAREN LEE BARNARD ROTTINK

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PH.D. degree in ENGLISH

C. David Mead

Major professor

Date 11-9-77

O-7639

EDUCATIONAL FIELD EXPERIENCE:

THE STATE OF THE ART

By

Karen Lee Barnard Rottink

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1977

ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL FIELD EXPERIENCE:
THE STATE OF THE ART

By

Karen Lee Barnard Rottink

There has been a high attrition rate among teachers during their first five years of teaching. Lack of adequate training to meet the realities of the classroom situation as it is in the present and the ability to change as the pupils' needs change could be responsible for a large share of this attrition. Field Experience programs which involve the undergraduate in actual classroom teaching experiences prior to student teaching can provide learning situations to help prospective teachers meet the challenges of classrooms.

The first portion of this study investigated whether Field Experience does indeed change attitudes of undergraduates. It was demonstrated that Field Experience does change undergraduates' attitudes regarding various aspects of teaching and Field Experience. Fifteen of the twenty-two items on the Attitudinal Survey were shown to have had statistically significant (at the 5% level or better) response variations between the pre- and post-tests in either the English 214, 301 and/or the English 408 group(s). The analysis of attitudinal essay responses further documented the direction and

types of changes due to Field Experience. The direction of change is not crucial since the original attitudes were not uniform and there is no "CORRECT" attitude. Some undergraduates changed their attitudes about teaching as a career while others found their original attitudes reinforced by Field Experience. Specific aspects of teaching situations such as discipline, book selection, and interaction with students also proved to be fertile areas of attitudinal change based on Field Experience.

The second and more important portion of this study involved a questionnaire to determine what types of Field Experience programs are used at colleges and universities throughout the U.S.A. This is of value to those establishing and/or revising Field Experience programs. Beyond the initial delineation of program components, evaluation procedures, and future projects, there was also a section analyzing the interrelationship of the data from the questionnaire with success ratings of various programs. High success ratings were demonstrated to be statistically related to two dominant factors: (1) organization of the Field Experience program and (2) supervision of the Field Experience program.

As a result of all the input of the Attitudinal Survey and the questionnaire, a Field Experience operational model was proposed. This model is a sequential skill-building program which begins in the freshman year and continues through the senior year. The model provides for assisting undergraduates in determining their aptitude and satisfaction with teaching as a career as well as assisting them in developing their teaching skills.

I dedicate this dissertation to my loving husband, Bruce A. Rottink, Ph.D., whose encouragement and assistance inspired me to finish this finite task which will never have to be done again.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee, Dr. C. David Mead, Dr. Stephen Judy, and Dr. James Stalker for their support and assistance in the lengthy task of completing this dissertation and for their encouragement throughout my doctoral studies. I would also like to thank Marilyn and Stuart Wilson for their input during the planning of the study and their friendship when all seemed hopeless. Thanks also to Cal and Marilyn Schneider for their continued urgings for me to complete this dissertation. Without these people and, of course, my good husband Bruce, I'm certain I never would have been able to sustain the enthusiasm to finish a task which seems so much a part of my past rather than my present.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The True-to-Life Parable of the Student Teacher and the Greeting

The young, pretty beginning student teacher could hardly believe what was happening when the classroom teacher was unexpectedly called from the room on her first day. Leslie had to take over all the teacher's responsibilities immediately. She was not prepared to deal with the second graders' greeting of "Hi, Fuck Face!" nor the bedlam which followed. When she finally got home that night, she looked bedraggled and, as her father put it, "like she had been put through a knot hole." Leslie was shaken. All this was not fitting into her theory of education or any other notion she held dear about teaching. Moral: Be prepared to cope with classroom realities or suffer the consequences.

Leslie had left the ivory tower and now was having problems adjusting to the realities of the classroom. Fortunately, Leslie was a superstar who met the challenge and succeeded. A person of lesser talents might not have. Afterwards, Leslie said she wished she had some intensive field experience to prepare her for the realities of teaching. Besides learning what to expect, Leslie would have learned some approaches to dealing with students before she was left on her own.

A publication of the National Education Association presents it this way:

> The great majority of teachers will begin under normative conditions and will struggle in isolation. A few will falter and leave within the first year and, again, 50% will be gone in five years under present conditions for starting a career in eduation.[1]

Think of it: 50% of our teachers drop out within five years. There is something wrong somewhere. Why is it so complacently accepted when teachers drop out of their chosen careers so readily?

It may be that the type of teacher training provided lacks sufficient contact between the teaching candidates and the school students they are supposedly learning to teach. Before a person becomes a doctor, he/she has many years of experience in direct contact with patients prior to internship and residency. During these experiences the student learns how to deal with the pressures and demands of his profession while he/she still has someone to turn to for guidance. Throughout all of this there are also tremendous volumes of knowledge to be mastered regarding the technical side of the medical profession. This is akin to the teacher's mastery of subject matter and educational theory. One answer, in so far as there is an answer, to the attrition problems among career teachers rests with increased Field Experience which brings the teaching candidate and the school students together so the realities of the school context and teacher role become familiar and easily handled prior to entry into the profession. This procedure provides ample opportunity for undergraduates to reject teaching as

---

[1]Richard E. Collier, Internships in Teacher Education 47th Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: The Association for Student Teaching of the National Education Association, 1968), p. 139.

an unsuitable career before they go through an entire four or five year professional preparation program. In addition, the concrete experience promotes skill building in the prospective teacher.

Here is a list of specific improvements teacher training candidates want according to Charles Gonzales in his essay on "Student Power and Education of Teachers."

> We want more connection between 'life like it is' in the schools and our preparation. We do not want education courses taught by unqualified, inexperienced graduate students on their way to doctorates, graduate students who frequently have never been in the schools. In fact, we may want far fewer 'courses.' The lecture, the textbook, and the essay exam just are not doing the job. We want independent study programs, experience in other cultures, individualization of instruction. We want a willingness to be something other than traditional. . . . We want to get in the schools for intensive and extensive experiences while we are learning, and we want professors who will help us figure out how to teach in relation to the needs of society <u>today</u>.[2]

In other words formerly acceptable approaches no longer are valid today. The teacher education program must actually go beyond teaching for today and teach a way of analyzing and thinking which will enable those so trained to adjust to change when today's needs give way to yet undetermined needs of future students.

Ned Flanders deals with just such a task in his article "Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Education." He says:

> We provide them with knowledge of individual differences, patterns of human growth and development, theories of learning, all without any assurance whatsoever that

---

[2]Charles Gonzales, "Student Power and Education of Teachers," in <u>Teacher Education: Future Directions</u>, ed. Margaret Lindsey (Washington, D.C.: A Report of the 50th Annual Conference of the Association for Student Teaching, 1970), p. 76.

> this knowledge is essential to teaching. We do all this enthusiastically. But we seldom place our students in situations where they can inquire, where they can see themselves in their present situation, make a diagnosis, try out a plan of action, receive feedback information, and then try again. We seldom ask our students to conceptualize a problem.[3]

Field Experience does unmistakably put the undergraduate in the position of inquiring, diagnosing, planning, acting and evaluating the results, all with the opportunity to try again if the first approach fails to get the hoped-for results.

Some educators speak of the cognitive and affective aspects of learning and never really know how to deal specifically with non-cognitive skills, particularly in human relationships. Edmund Amidon has devised a series of categories for interaction analysis which helps concretize the types of activity teachers and Field Experience participants generally engage in with students while not realizing the consequences of the types of interaction they use. Training in these categorization contexts probably makes student teachers and Field Experience undergraduates more aware of levels of discourse and their impact. Because of this increased awareness, they can consciously manipulate the types of talk (behavior) that will positively affect the students. Here are the "Categories for Interaction Analysis."

---

[3]Ned A. Flanders, "Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Education," in Theoretical Basis for Professional Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education 44th Yearbook, writing committee chaired by Cecilia J. Lanby (Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, 1965), p. 68.

Teacher-indirect influence	1.	Accepts feeling
	2.	Praises or encourages
	3.	Accepts or uses ideas of students
	4.	Asks questions
Teacher-direct influence	5.	Lecturing
	6.	Giving directions
	7.	Criticizing or justifying authority
Student talk	8.	Student talk-response
	9.	Student talk-initiation
	10.	Silence or confusion[4]

When student teachers were given five hours of training over seven weeks of interaction analysis, they, by the end of student teaching

> . . . (1) talked less, (2) resisted to a greater degree the tendency to become more direct at the end of student teaching than they were at the beginning, (3) gave fewer directions, and (4) asked more questions in immediate responses to their pupils' voluntary contributions. The pupils in the experimental classes, when compared with those in control classes: (1) talked more, (2) talked more spontaneously, (3) talked at greater length per contribution, and (4) interjected their own ideas into the discussions more freely.[5]

Interaction analysis offers a tool for Field Experience participants to integrate into their teaching experiences. It makes them more aware, more analytical of what is happening when they observe interaction and when they participate. This will enable them to perceive what is happening between themselves and the students and to attempt changes in the interaction which would facilitate better learning for the students. This ability to sense what students need and to adapt to those needs will serve the prospective teacher well over a long career.

---

[4]Flanders, "Integrating," p. 72.

[5]Ibid., p. 78.

Effectively expressed another way:

> The sort of precept-oriented approach to methodology that is characteristic of a principles-type teacher training is simply inadequate for today's era of rapid change. Any professional program, indeed any experience within a program, must be assessed in terms of its contribution to the trainee's capability of functioning over time in a series of changing styles, modes, roles, many of these unknown and unpredictable at present. The professional needs a set of behaviors which begin with a way of looking at things, a way of diagnosing, a way of postulating alternative actions, a way of estimating probabilities, a way of deciding and implementing, a way of evaluating outcomes, a way of feeding the meaning of outcomes back into his way of looking at things. If during his professional training he can learn to behave in such a tactical cycle of operations, he will be in a position to change knowledgeably as the demands of his clients and environment change.[6]

Random exposure of undergraduates to schools and students will not in itself develop the type of professional teacher described above. So, Field Experience must be organized and supervised to provide the most effective learning for the undergraduates. Florence Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey emphasize this in their book Working With Student Teachers:

> While students have many direct laboratory experiences as part of their everyday living, to capitalize on desirable learning, laboratory experiences should be a planned part of each year of their college work. Such planning should involve preparation for, guidance during, and careful follow-up activities. The best contribution is made to students' growth when they are helped to select experiences in terms of their needs, when they are guided in analysis of their experiences, and when what is learned is fed back into their organized program of activities. For this reason laboratory experiences must be part of a total program, not isolated activities unrelated to other learning experiences.[7]

---

[6]Collier, Internships, p. 148.

[7]Florence Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working With Student Teachers (New York: Teachers College Press, 1958), p. 46.

This necessity of organization and supervision is borne out in the study presented in this dissertation. The most effective programs are well organized and well supervised.

Because there is so little in print regarding Field Experience programs and their structure and development, this study was undertaken while I was Field Experience Coordinator for the Department of English at Michigan State University. This research involves two parts. Part one is an attitudinal survey involving pre- and post-tests administered to Michigan State University undergraduates participating in Field Experience during winter and spring terms in 1973. This portion of the thesis was designed to determine whether or not Field Experience actually changes attitudes. If no attitudinal changes occurred then the value of Field Experience would be questionable. In fact, many statistically significant attitudinal changes did occur. This lends credibility to the Field Experience program and justifies the expenditure of effort to examine the various aspects of Field Experience.

The second, and more important, part of the research is based on hundreds of six-page questionnaires which were mailed to both English and education departments at colleges and universities throughout the United States. The questionnaire solicits information concerning whether the respondents have a Field Experience program and if so, what the components of the program are, how the program is evaluated, how the coordinator functions, and what future innovations are being planned for the program. It is my hope that this vast amount of data will illuminate the status of

Field Experience and will shed light on directions for future Field Experience development at various colleges and universities throughout the United States. If the large response and many unsolicited favorable comments from the respondents via the questionnaire are any indication, the study has already partially accomplished its goal of illuminating options.

The third part of the thesis is a Field Experience model which is the outgrowth of the Attitudinal Survey and Field Experience Questionnaire. The model, of course, is more useful than the specific data collected from Michigan State University students in the Attitudinal Survey since the model provides a framework which can be used and/or modified by Field Experience personnel at colleges and universities throughout the nation.

A detailed explanation of the Field Experience program developed at the Department of English at Michigan State University is described in an article written by Dr. Stephen Judy and myself printed in English Education, April, 1974.

Hopefully, with further development of Field Experience programs, people like Leslie in my true introductory parable will be better prepared for student teaching and will also be realistic enough about a teaching career that they will not become drop-outs from the teaching profession.

CHAPTER I

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Background of Development of This Study

During the 1972-73 academic year, I was one of two Field Experience coordinators hired by the Department of English at Michigan State University--East Lansing. Both coordinators were also involved in teaching undergraduates in the Department of English while directing the Field Experience program. The English Education Field Experience was an integral part of three different English Education classes at the undergraduate level. In addition, Field Experience could be taken for credit without any association with any of these English Education classes. Most of the undergraduates involved in Field Experience were enrolled in one of the three English Education classes. These classes were English 214, "Writing for Teachers," English 301, "Literature and the Adolescent," and English 408, "Problems in Teaching of Reading and Writing."

English 214 emphasized creative writing rather than expository writing and was organized so that the undergraduates worked in teams of about four to plan writing experiences for their Field Experience in a public school classroom, execute their plans, and evaluate their successes and shortcomings after each lesson. English 214 class sessions at M.S.U. were "idea sessions" where the instructors tried various approaches to stimulate creative writing

with various media input and mood setting. These sessions were used by some undergraduates as a model for their Field Experience lesson plans and by other undergraduates as take-off points for inventing their own lesson ideas. This course was predominantly populated with sophomores and juniors who had no student teaching experience. At the close of the quarter, English 214 put on a Saturday Writing Workshop for middle school students.

English 301, "Literature and the Adolescent," focused on the reading and teaching of adolescent literature in creative ways. Selections relevant to adolescent experiences were read and explored. Often the undergraduates presented "creative responses" to the novels such as collages, paintings, poems, role playing, and video-taped short plays written by the undergraduates on the same theme as the assigned novels. This type of creative response provided the prospective teachers with ideas on how to plan lessons that went beyond having students read, discuss, and then write the deadly, dull rendering--a book report. The undergraduates utilized these ideas in their Field Experience class lessons. English 301 was an interesting exploration of ideas via the reading of and response to adolescent novels. Like English 214, English 301 was populated primarily with sophomores and juniors who had had no prior student teaching experience.

English 408, "Problems in the Teaching of Reading and Writing for Teachers," was generally taken by seniors, most of whom had already student taught and were finishing their requirements for bachelor's degrees. The course focused almost exclusively on

diagnosis of reading difficulties. Dr. Kenneth Goodman's Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI) was the main diagnostic tool. Much class time was devoted to having undergraduates learn how to administer and interpret the RMI. The Field Experience was designed so that undergraduates could work with one public school student who was experiencing difficulty with reading. The course's strength was the philosophical attitude it imparted regarding reading as an integrated language skill rather than a series of technical sound sequences. Meaning, not pronunciation, was the heart of reading. Since English 408 was a tutoring Field Experience rather than the group type Field Experience common to English 214 and 301, plus the additional difference that the English 408 undergraduates had had student teaching experience, it seemed very appropriate to use the English 408 undergraduate responses in my research as a single category. The English 408 responses serve as a contrast to the combined English 214 and 301 group.

My first step in this research project was to determine whether or not Field Experience had any real effect on undergraduates' attitudes regarding various aspects of teaching and the Field Experience itself. This was important in establishing the validity of creating and improving Field Experience programs at colleges and universities throughout the U.S.A. On a subjective level, I could see positive results from the Field Experience program, but I needed to objectify and measure whether Field Experience made changes in undergraduates before proceeding to collect and study the data concerning the components of multitudes of Field Experience programs.

In order to determine whether or not Field Experience affected undergraduates' attitudes, I developed an "Attitudinal Survey for Field Experience Participants."

The Attitudinal Survey

The "Attitudinal Survey for Field Experience Participants" (see Appendix A) was designed as an easily administered pre- and post-Field Experience tool to measure undergraduates' attitudes before and after a term of Field Experience. The twenty-five questions were selected to solicit undergraduates' attitudes on various ideas they held about teaching and the Field Experience itself. The format was one which the undergraduates were familiar with, since they had filled in many course and instructor evaluation forms using the same format of selecting a position in response to a statement. The positions were "strongly agree," "agree," "neutral," "disagree" to "strongly disagree." I made no attempt to determine "proper" attitudes; I only measured the actual changes in attitudes. This study demonstrates the changes in attitudes due to Field Experience.

The first question of the Attitudinal Survey was a Yes, No question to help me determine the respondents' previous experience in the schools in the teaching role. Since it was not designed to determine attitude, it cannot provide attitudinal information in the same form as the other questions.

The last question asked for an essay response regarding what they expected to learn from Field Experience (pre-test) and what

they actually learned (post-test). The essay responses were analyzed in a separate section from the other questions and provided a deeper look at the types of changes in attitudes and ideas which were a result of Field Experience.

The pre-tests and post-tests were administered by the English 214, 301, and 408 instructors both winter and spring quarters.

When all the data was gathered from the classes in both quarters, I tabulated it. This involved itemizing each response to each question. I placed the responses into the two groups mentioned earlier: (1) English 214 and 301, and (2) English 408. Of course, I also grouped the responses as to whether they were pre-test or post-test responses. I did this so that statistical analysis using the Chi-square method could show what statistically significant shifts in attitudes occurred after the Field Experience.

I chose the Chi-square method of analysis after consulting Michigan State University's computer consultant, James Mullen. He suggested this method, since it provides the best analysis of questionnaire-type studies. I also consulted Bruce A. Rottink, Research Forester and statistician, regarding the selection of the method of analysis of data. He concurred with the computer consultants' recommendation.

The data gathered in this study are enumeration data; that is, they are the results of counting responses to various questions on a survey form or questionnaire. Enumeration data, even without Chi-square analysis or any other form of statistics, are a valid research attainment. Gallileo didn't invent the mutable universe or

movement of the stars, but he observed it and reported it and that information eventually changed the perception of people regarding not only the universe but the relationship of man to the universe. The results of my Attitudinal Survey and Field Experience Questionnaire present information which has never been gathered on such an extensive scale before. These data, when analyzed, provide insight regarding the power of Field Experience to change attitudes as well as the extent to which a particular aspect of Field Experience is used nationally and whether that feature is related to program success.

Enumeration data can be used for many purposes, among which is that of determining if there is any relationship between the way respondents answered two individual questions. For instance, a survey might ask if the respondent owns a Rolls-Royce automobile as one question. A second question might be "Is your annual income over $50,000?" The surveyor then wants to determine if there is any relationship between owning a Rolls-Royce and having an annual income of greater than $50,000.

An excellent way to make a statistically valid determination as to whether or not there is a relationship between the answers to two different questions is to construct a contingency table and perform a Chi-square test on the table. This technique is recommended and outlined in Principles and Procedures of Statistics by Steele and Torrie, two noted statisticians. This book is a nationally used text for graduate level statistics classes.

Briefly, using the example indicated above, the procedure is as follows:

The responses of each individual surveyed are placed into a contingency table, based on how they responsed to the two questions under consideration. For our example, say 300 people had incomes of less than $50,000 per year and of these people 290 did not own a Rolls-Royce and 10 did. One hundred people had income greater than $50,000 per year and of this group 70 did not own a Rolls-Royce while 30 did. The contingency table for this observed data would look like this:

		Income greater than $50,000		
		Yes	No	Total
Own a Rolls-Royce	Yes	30	10	40
	No	70	290	360
	Total	100	300	

The Chi-square test starts by assuming that whether or not you own a Rolls-Royce is not a function of your income, but rather that Rolls-Royce ownership is randomly distributed over all income groups. If that were true, one would predict that the values in the contingency table should be as follows:

		Income greater than $50,000		
		Yes	No	Total
Own a Rolls-Royce	Yes	10	30	40
	No	90	270	360
	Total	100	300	

In this table as in the previous table, 10% of the respondents to the survey own a Rolls-Royce, and there are 100 respondents with incomes greater than $50,000 and 300 respondents with less income. The Chi-square test examines the size of the difference between the predicted values and the values that were actually observed in the survey results by the following formula for each of the four values in the contingency table:

$$X \frac{(\text{observed value-predicted value})^2}{\text{predicted value}}$$

Summing the values of X for each of the four categories in the contingency table gives the value of Chi-square. A standard table of Chi-square values can be referred to in determining if the observed data deviated from the predicted values significantly more than you would expecte due to random chance. If the calculated Chi-square value is greater than the tabulated data, you can confidently state that the responses to the second question were not independent of the responses to the first question. Or, in terms of our example, you can state that whether or not someone owned a Rolls-Royce was affected by whether or not the person's income was greater than $50,000.

Of course, on any questionnaire there are considerably more than two variables. The Chi-square method examines the relationship of any two variables, so there are many Chi-square tests performed to see if assorted pairs of questions are related to each other by more than just chance. I used Chi-square analysis for the

attitudinal survey to see if there were statistically significant changes in the attitudinal responses between pre- and post-tests on individual questions, and I used Chi-square analysis on the questionnaire responses to see if any of the questions and their responses were related to success ratings the Field Experience programs were given by the respondents themselves.

Statistical significance can vary in intensity. In other words, the probability of two items being related by more than mere chance can be lesser or greater. Statisticians agree that the 5% level is sufficient to declare statistical significance. This means the chance of the two items being randomly related is five in one hundred and there are ninety-five chances out of one hundred that the two items are related by more than mere chance. There are times when statisticians use higher levels of significance (2-1/2% and 1/2%) to show that interrelationships are particularly strong. All three of these levels have been employed in this dissertation.

The Questionnaire

After analyzing the Attitudinal Survey, I could show that statistically significant attitudinal changes occurred due to Field Experience. I could also demonstrate the personal nature of some of these changes based on the essay question analysis which showed in detail individual perceptions and their fluctuation. I was then ready for step two in the research process: design and distribution of a six-page questionnaire whose purpose was to accumulate information on the multitude of Field Experience programs that existed

throughout the U.S.A. This information is important to document the state of the art in Field Experience and to provide a sharing of insights and ideas which would help me design a model for Field Experience programs and help others designing and/or improving Field Experience programs to use the latest knowledge in their endeavor. This ultimately could assist in providing better teacher education and therefore better-prepared teachers who will be less likely to falter early in their careers.

The Field Experience Questionnaire (see Appendix D) was designed to solicit specific rather than vague answers whenever possible and to also allow, no, encourage the respondents to add their own individual items to the listed responses. This was accomplished by using a predominantly multiple choice format with an "Other, please specify" category. Some questions called for more of a short answer-essay format. Some use a Yes, No response pattern.

The first step in designing the questionnaire was to define Field Experience so the various recipients would be working under a common definition. I specifically distinguished Field Experience from student teaching.

Next I determined the basic information that might prove helpful in identifying the respondent and his/her institution. This information was not specifically used in the presentation of the data in order to avoid any misunderstandings or embarrassment of universities or their staff.

Since the questionnare would be mailed to hundreds of universities and colleges (to both English and education departments)

which may or may not have had Field Experience programs at the time, I decided to ask the question, "Does your department have a Field Experience program?" first. To save the respondents time, if their institutions had no Field Experience, they could merely answer questions 1-3 and not get involved with the rest of the questionnaire.

The questions regarding Field Experience program components were next. This involved such items as types of Field Experience offered, length of time the program had been offered, etc. The next section of questions dealt with evaluation of Field Experience. This included an estimate of Field Experience effectiveness in the respondent's opinion as well as types of evaluation instruments, etc.

The last page of the questionnaire asked about future projections related to Field Experience. There was an opportunity to share new ideas for developing Field Experience programs. Many of the ideas for the questions were derived from my experience as Field Experience coordinator at M.S.U. The questionnaire was reviewed by faculty members at M.S.U. (Dr. C. David Mead, Dr. Stephen Judy, Dr. James Pickering, and Mrs. Marilyn Wilson) and by a reading teacher at Eastern High School in Lansing, Michigan, Mr. Stuart Wilson. I then revised some aspects of the questionnaire. A cover letter was also written to explain the purpose of the study to the participants.

The five hundred questionnaires were mailed to department chairmen of universities and colleges listed in the 1973 Modern Language Association Directory of American Colleges and Universities. The specific schools were listed in alphabetical order, and

I selected the recipients in a stratified random sample. I started with A and chose every twelfth school listed. That provided a sample of both large and small institutions.

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire is primarily of a documentary nature. It delineates what exists and provides a wealth of ideas for those who are developing or improving a Field Experience program. The function of documenting what exists is a valid form of research in and of itself, but I took it one step further and ran some Chi-square tests to see which responses correlated in a statistically significant manner with success ratings of the programs. This provided some interesting insights.

The important contribution this research makes to human knowledge is not primarily involved with the manipulation of statistics but in the area of collecting information which provides insight into what other Field Experience programs are offering. Such information can assist those who are structuring or restructuring a Field Experience program so they will not have to go through the arduous task of trying blindly to assemble a program strictly by trial and error. Thus, it is my hope that more and better Field Experience programs will be developed in part due to the accumulation of knowledge from this study.

CHAPTER II

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Attitudinal Survey Statistical Analysis

The pre- and post-Field Experience survey was designed to measure any changes in attitude due to field experience. The survey also reveals the undergraduates' perceptions of teaching and Field Experience. A change in an undergraduate's attitude or understanding from what it was prior to Field Experience indicates that something is happening which is probably due to the Field Experience, thus demonstrating the validity of Field Experience in making an impact on participants. The "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" scale measures the extent of agreement or disagreement the undergraduate feels regarding the statements on the inventory. The responses to the pre-test are grouped together for both winter and spring quarter, 1973. The post-test responses for those quarters also formed a group for analytical purposes. The responses were further categorized by the courses the undergraduate was enrolled in. English 214, "Writing for Teachers," and English 301, "Literature for Adolescents," comprised one group while English 408, "Problems of Reading and Writing in the Schools," composed the other group. The reason for this grouping was that most 408 students were seniors who already had Field Experience and/or student teaching. They might well have had a change of attitude based upon

the experiences prior to the pre-test. So it is helpful to examine the responses and compare them to the English courses 214 and 301 group responses which did not include undergraduates with past Field Experiences or student teaching. In all cases, group totals were compared to other group totals for all response alternatives. Not every person answered all the questions (although most did). Therefore, the total number of respondents for each question may vary. A Chi-square test was computed for each pre- and post-test paired question. This test revealed whether there had been a change in attitude of the group from the pre-test to the post-test, which was statistically significant at the 5% level. In some cases the statistical significance (SS) was higher: at either the 2-1/2% level or the 1/2% level according to the Chi-square values. These responses were even more important than those signified by the 5% level. A copy of each of the two attitudinal survey forms is printed in the Appendix A.

For purposes of analysis the English 214 and 301 group will be examined first. These undergraduates were mostly sophomores and juniors who had little or no previous experience in the schools. The English 214 class was designed to focus on Creative Writing, while the English 301 class focused on Adolescent Literature.

English 214 and 301 Analysis

For ease of examination, the paired questions which revealed a statistically significant change between the pre- and post-test will be grouped together and examined first. Then the paired

questions which did not reveal statistically significant changes will be analyzed. These non-statistically significant respnses provided information which helps establish a composite picture of the attitudes the undergraduate held before and after Field Experience. There are apparently some aspects of teaching and Field Experience that do not lend themselves to great change due to the direct contact with teaching situations which Field Experience provides. Prior to examining the paired questions, a brief explanation of question one is in order. Question one states, "I have not been in a junior or senior high school since I was in high school myself." Unfortunately, many students misinterpreted this question. Because of its negative wording, it is unclear whether a yes response means a person has been in school since his own experience or whether it means the student agrees with the statement itself and has not been in school recently. Therefore, this question was disregarded as uninterpretable. A summary of responses to the remaining questions is located in Table 1, page 29.

English 214 and 301 Paired Questions With Statistically Significant Changes

> Question 4, pre-test. "I expect my supervising teacher will be very cooperative."
>
> Question 3, post-test. "My supervising teacher was very cooperative."

This question showed a statistically significant change in attitude at the 1/2% level. No one in either the pre- or post-test survey strongly disagreed, but the shift occurred in the large

number who strongly agreed on the post-test. The overall reaction to supervising teachers was very positive regardless of the misgivings some students had prior to the experience.

> Question 6, pre-test. "I expect my supervisor and I will have almost no time to discuss the experiences which I will encounter during Field Experience."
>
> Question 5, post-test. "My supervising teacher in the school had almost no time to discuss the experiences I encountered during Field Experience."

This shift in attitude was statistically significant at the 1/2% level, particularly from the neutral to the disagree and strongly disagree categories. Besides revealing that many undergraduates had not formulated an opinion regarding the amount of time the supervising teacher would have to spend with them, the post-test responses showed that many of the undergraduates felt that they were given a considerable amount of the supervisor's time.

> Question 11, pre-test. "I generally knew what I was supposed to be doing during Field Experience."
>
> Question 10, post-test. "I generally knew what I was supposed to be doing during Field Experience."

This attitudinal shift was significant at the 5% level. There was no stark contrast, but the number who strongly agreed and agreed rose slightly. So, overall, it seems that although on the pre-test most undergraduates felt they knew what they were supposed to do, even more of them felt they actually did know what to do. This could be attributed to good instruction on campus before Field Experience and the continued support of the undergraduates while

doing Field Experience. The post-test confidence expressed in this area could also be attributed to the in-school supervising teachers.

> Question 12, pre-test. "There will be no one I can turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience."
>
> Question 11, post-test. "There was no one I could turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience."

This was significant at the 1/2% level. In other words, some undergraduates felt they would have no one to turn to for help during Field Experience while only one felt that was true afterwards as revealed by the post-test. This shows that the undergraduates' perception of supportive services available to them during Field Experience was positive.

> Question 13, pre-test. "There are many non-teaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paper work, etc., which sap a teacher's time and energy."
>
> Question 12, post-test. "There were many non-teaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paper work, etc., which did sap my teacher's time and energy."

This attitude showed a very large change which was significant at the 1/2% level. The shift was from expecting those extra duties to sap much of the teacher's time and energy to a realization based on Field Experience observation that at least the teachers they observed were not bogged down with these duties. This was one of the most statistically significant changes in attitude that occurred during Field Experience.

Question 14, pre-test. "Teachers do not have enough time to get to know each student individually."

Question 13, post-test. "The teachers I observed did not have enough time to get to know each pupil in their classrooms individually."

This change in attitude was significant at the 2-1/2% level. A few undergraduates felt, prior to Field Experience, that teachers wouldn't know their students individually. This number was reduced on the post-test. The classroom contact convinced more undergraduates that teachers do have time and do get to know their students.

Question 17, pre-test. "The students with good memories get the best grades in junior and senior high schools generally."

Question 16, post-test. "The students who had good memories got the best grades in the school where I did my Field Experience."

Undergraduates began with a large spread of responses, the predominant sentiment being disagreement. The post-test responses revealed an attitudinal change significant at the 2-1/2% level. It seems a large number entered a neutral response. This could be due to the fact that most Field Experience undergraduates were not involved in grading students nor in observing teachers grading students. Therefore, they had no basis for an opinion in the post-test. Several undergraduates made notations on the attitudinal survey affirming that they had no intention of encouraging memorization, but that they would emphasize reasoning and anticipating which are higher levels of understanding.

Question 18, pre-test. "The English teachers generally have free and unrestricted choice of what material they will teach."

Question 17, post-test. "The English teachers in the school where I was assigned generally had free and unrestricted choice of what they taught."

There was a statistically significant difference at the 2-1/2% level for this pair of responses. Generally the attitude swayed from a few who agreed on the pre-test to nearly five times as many agreeing on the post-test. The number who disagreed was reduced by more than half on the post-test. Overall, most of the undergraduates felt before Field Experience that some censorship or "guidance" was imposed on the teacher. Most of the undergraduates came to believe that this was not the case based upon their Field Experience contact. I suspect that this was solely based on observation, not discussion with the teachers, since most undergraduates, when asked, did not seem to understand how a school board goes about adopting and purchasing textbooks. The teacher may appear to have freedom but is generally limited to the books that the school owns, particularly for required reading materials.

Question 19, pre-test. "As far as I know there is currently no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for classes."

Question 18, post-test. "As far as I know there is currently no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for classes."

There was a highly significant shift in attitude here at the 1/2% level. The neutral category nearly tripled while those who

disagreed dropped. Those who agreed increased over three times. It is interesting that while this question is very similar to question number 18 pre, 17 post, and the shifts were in the same direction on both pairs of responses (and in approximately the same amounts), the earlier pair of responses were somewhat less statistically significant than this pair. This could be due to the fact that the undergraduates never saw a committee selecting books, while they did observe many teachers who appeared to have complete choice in what they taught since no one was present telling them what to do.

> Question 22, pre-test. "Classes in the schools are mostly lecture in nature."
>
> Question 21, post-test. "Classes I observed in the school were mostly lecture in nature."

This presents a fine picture of unmet expectations for many of the undergraduates. While eleven expected lecture classes, only three observed them. Those who didn't expect lectures were nearly half of the number who did not observe lectures. The changes are highly significant at the 1% level. This change of ideas could be non-representative of what exists in schools generally, since the schools and the teachers that Field Experience undergraduates were placed with were, in most cases, noted for their innovations in teaching.

> Question 24, pre-test. "Composition classes in the schools generally strive for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing."
>
> Question 23, post-test. "Composition classes in the school I did my Field Experience in strived for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing."

This attitude changed quite a bit, a change which was highly statistically significant at the 1/2% level. While some remained neutral in both cases, there was nearly a uniform reversal of the number who agreed with the number who disagreed that schools generally strive for expository efficiency, not enjoyment of writing. The post-test response was based on a selective Field Experience which for the English 214 students deliberately focused on creative writing.

English 214 and 301 Paired Questions With No Statistically Significant Changes

> Question 2, pre-test. "I feel apprehensive about teaching in a public school."
>
> Question 1, post-test. "Now that I have had Field Experience I feel much less apprehensive about teaching."

A bit of clarification regarding the wordings of the pre- and post-test question is necessary here. The pre-test question is phrased so an "agree" response indicates apprehension about teaching whereas the post-test question is phrased so an "agree" response indicates lessened apprehension about teaching. In order to analyze for an attitudinal change, the responses to these questions had to be examined in light of the shift in the question phraseology. When that was corrected for, the responses were found not to be statistically significant.

Some respondents were more apprehensive and some much less apprehensive after Field Experience. This could well be due to the concretization of what the teaching or Field Experience involved.

A person is often more likely to be apprehensive about some poorly defined future challenge than about something familiar, whose dimensions are somewhat more defined. On the other hand, a person who has had a difficult time during Field Experience would be more likely to be apprehensive about teaching.

> Question 3, pre-test. "Finding interesting material will be difficult."
>
> Question 2, post-test. "Finding interesting material to use with the students during Field Experience was difficult."

There was no significant change in the response to this question. Zero of the people strongly agree in either the pre- or post-test. Twenty-three disagreed or strongly disagreed on the pre-test, while 31 disagreed or strongly disagreed on the post-test. Since no one was seriously concerned with finding interesting material as being a problem, either before or after Field Experience, there was no significant change.

> Question 5, pre-test. "Behavior and discipline will be a major problem in my Field Experience teaching."
>
> Question 4, post-test. "Behavior and discipline were a problem in my Field Experience teaching."

Behavior and discipline were not generally expected to be a problem, nor were they deemed a problem afterwards. This shows no significant change in attitude. There are several possible explanations as to why the undergraduates did not expect or have many disciplinary problems. One reason might be that the humanistic attitudes they held regarding their relationship to students (see

attitudinal essay responses) precluded discipline as a problem. They intended to get to know the students and to be friends, not authoritarian instructors. Another possible explanation is that a large percentage of this group knew they would be team teaching with three other undergraduates in the room at all times. That may have provided a sense of security. Another reason could be that some of these undergraduates would be tutoring on a one-to-one basis, where discipline is hardly ever a problem. Also, the undergraduates who were teaching whole classes nearly always had the regular teacher in the room or close at hand. Often the classroom control the regular teacher establishes will be transferred to his or her surrogates. Most of the undergraduates indeed did not have discipline problems, yet there were a few who did.

> Question 7, pre-test. "I would like my supervising teacher to tell me exactly what to do each time I am there."
>
> Question 6, post-test. "I wanted my supervising teacher to tell me exactly what to do each time I was there."

This attitude showed no statistically significant change between pre- and post-test groups. Only two people wanted to be told exactly what to do by the supervising teacher. No one on the post test wanted this extensive guidance. Part of the reason for this constant attitude might be that undergraduates wanted to experiment with their own ideas and/or implement plans they made in conjunction with English 214 or 301 class sessions. Some undergraduates did at different times throughout these classes come to the

Field Experience coordinators and M.S.U. instructors for ideas on what and how to teach next week's Field Experience lesson. All this indicates that they neither wanted nor preferred the supervising teacher to do all the work of planning for them.

> Question 8, pre-test. "I believe that school students will generally respond favorably to my teaching during Field Experience."
>
> Question 7, post-test. "The students generally responded favorably to my teaching during Field Experience."

Again there is no statistically significant attitudinal change here. Overall, most undergraduates expected and received favorable response to their teaching during Field Experience. That was very gratifying to the undergraduates, particularly those who were trying to decide if they should become teachers.

> Question 9, pre-test. "I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience."
>
> Question 8, post-test. "I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience."

No one strongly disagreed with the statement. Nearly everyone responded favorably to this question on both pre- and post-tests; thus, there was no statistically significant attitudinal change. This indicates a strongly favorable attitude toward Field Experience by nearly all undergraduates before and after. They valued the experience even though it demands time and effort.

> Question 10, pre-test. "The amount of time Field Experience required will tax me throughout the term."

Question 9, post-test. "The amount of time Field Experience required taxed me thoughout the term."

This question solicited varied responses depending on the time commitments the undergraduates already had. Generally, the Field Experience is listed in the M.S.U. catalogue along with the course and indicates that at least one-half of a day per week should be reserved for going to the school. Then whoever enrolls for the course can plan the rest of his or her schedule around this commitment. On occasion, someone inadvertently omits this half a day specification in the catalogue, causing much Field Experience scheduling confusion and several students with overextended commitments in other areas. Thus, the response to the query depends upon the individual's schedule. There is no statistically significant shift in opinion on this question. Few were at either extreme on the pre- or post-test. The three middle categories--"agree," "neutral," and "disagree"--were relatively constant except for an increase in "disagree" on the post-test. In other words, more students did not feel taxed by the time requirement on the post-test, although this was not a statistically significant level.

Question 15, pre-test. "I think schools probably have changed very much since I was in school."

Question 14, post-test. "I think schools probably have changed very much since I was in school."

This opinion did not change according to the statistical significance test probably due to the fact that most of the respondents had only been out of high school only 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 years--too short a time for a large amount of change to occur. The

response to this question would be dependent upon what type of school the undergraduates had graduated from and what type of school the undergraduates had Field Experience in since there was a number of different types of schools, ranging from a unipac entirely independent study high school to a free school, to a traditional large, inner city junior high. There was some change in attitude on this question, but not at a statistically significant level.

> Question 16, pre-test. "High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age."
>
> Question 15, post-test. "High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age."

Assessment of high school students' social and political awareness did not vary significantly due to Field Experience according to the pre- and post-test. There was about a balance of those who agreed and those who disagreed that high school students are more socially and politically aware than the undergraduates were at that age. That really isn't unusual since some of the undergraduates were probably less socially and politically aware when they were in high school than other undergraduates were at the same age.

> Question 20, pre-test. "A quiet classroom is good because more learning will occur in a quiet setting than in a noisy one."
>
> Question 19, post-test. "A quiet classroom is good because more learning did occur in a quiet setting than a noisy one."

The predominant response to this question was disagree and strongly disagree in both the pre- and the post-test. There was an

increase in the neutral category on the post-test, too. Statistically significant differences did not, however, occur. Most undergraduates did not equate quiet with increased learning, but the increase in the post-test neutral category could possibly be attributed to those students who observed unproductively noisy classrooms, that is, classes where the noise was not a result of increased learning involvement but a sign of the chaos and lack of control.

> Question 21, pre-test. "What is taught in most classrooms is most likely to be irrelevant to the personal needs of the student."
>
> Question 20, post-test. "What was taught in the classrooms I observed was most likely irrelevant to the personal needs of the students."

This observation generally was "disagreed" with both before and after Field Experience. Needless to say, there was no statistically significant difference in the pre- and post-responses. It is interesting that these undergraduates have faith in the relevance of what is taught in public schools at a time when many people have accused schools of being irrelevant to student needs.

> Question 23, pre-test. "Lecture type classes are the best for educating junior and senior high students."
>
> Question 22, post-test. "Lecture type classes are the best for educating junior and senior high students."

No one strongly agreed or even agreed to this statement, either before or after Field Experience. This is not true for any other item on the survey. Of course, since there is such a concentrated response in the disagreed-strongly disagreed categories on

both the pre- and post-tests there is no statistically significant change in attitude. They felt both before and after Field Experience that lecture type classes were not the best for junior and senior high students.

Summary of English 214 and 301
Pre- and Post-Test Results

In summary of the analysis of the English 214 and 301 group on responses, several things can be said. Out of twenty-three paired question responses, twelve pairs revealed a statistical significance in attitudinal change due to Field Experience. Seven of the twelve statistically significant shifts were significant at the 1/2% level, the highest level on the Chi-square chart. Four more were statistically significant at the 2-1/2% level or less which is higher than the minimum of 5% level acceptable for statistical significance. In other words, this analysis statistically documents that attitudinal changes did occur due to Field Experience.

To restate some of the attitudinal shifts for English 214 and 301: undergraduates generally became less apprehensive about teaching. They found their supervising teachers very much more cooperative than they had anticipated; they also found that the supervising teachers did have time to discuss Field Experience. The undergraduates felt they knew what to do during Field Experience even better then than they had anticipated. They felt more assured that support was available to them during Field Experience. They learned that general supervision of lunchrooms and the paperwork did not sap as much of the teacher's time as they had thought; they

TABLE 1.--English 214 and 301 Attitudinal Survey Statistical Analysis.

Question	SA	A	N	D	SD	Statistical Significance	Question Numbers
Apprehensive about FE	1	10	10	15	7	Not SS	2. Pre-test
	13	22	11	4	0		1. Post-test
Difficulty finding materials	0	9	11	17	6	Not SS	3. Pre-test
	0	7	14	24	7		2. Post-test
Cooperative supervisors	9	25	9	0	0	SS at 1/2% level	4. Pre-test
	30	18	2	3	0		3. Post-test
Discipline problems	0	4	17	20	3	Not SS	5. Pre-test
	0	3	13	22	14		4. Post-test
Supervisors--no time	0	3	14	23	2	SS at 1/2% level	6. Pre-test
	0	5	2	31	14		5. Post-test
Be told what to do	1	1	5	27	8	Not SS	7. Pre-test
	0	0	4	25	22		6. Post-test
Favorable student response	3	22	15	0	0	Not SS	8. Pre-test
	10	33	9	1	0		7. Post-test
Personal enthusiasm for FE	23	16	3	0	0	Not SS	9. Pre-test
	16	29	4	2	0		8. Post-test
Tax their time	3	12	12	12	2	Not SS	10. Pre-test
	1	13	10	25	3		9. Post-test
Know what to do	2	25	6	8	3	SS at 5% level	11. Pre-test
	9	37	4	2	1		10. Post-test
No one to turn to	2	19	5	8	7	SS at 1/2% level	12. Pre-test
	1	1	2	29	19		11. Post-test
Non-teaching demands	6	20	9	6	1	SS at 1/2% level	13. Pre-test
	0	3	6	18	24		12. Post-test
Teachers didn't know students	0	9	9	20	5	SS at 2-1/2% level	14. Pre-test
	2	4	4	26	16		13. Post-test
Schools changed	5	15	6	14	3	Not SS	15. Pre-test
	16	20	5	7	3		14. Post-test
More social awareness	3	14	9	14	2	Not SS	16. Pre-test
	4	14	14	16	2		15. Post-test
Memorizers get best grades	1	9	10	17	4	SS at 2-1/2% level	17. Pre-test
	1	2	26	13	6		16. Post-test
Unrestricted choice of material	0	4	8	25	5	SS at 2-1/2% level	18. Pre-test
	4	19	14	10	1		17. Post-test
No committees for book censorship	0	5	5	23	9	SS at 1/2% level	19. Pre-test
	0	18	14	13	2		18. Post-test
Quiet classroom is necessary	0	2	3	25	12	Not SS	20. Pre-test
	1	1	11	28	9		19. Post-test
What's taught is irrelevant	2	9	7	19	6	Not SS	21. Pre-test
	1	5	8	28	10		20. Post-test
Mostly lectures	1	11	10	17	6	SS at 1% level	22. Pre-test
	0	3	4	30	13		21. Post-test
Lecture is best	0	0	3	18	17	Not SS	23. Pre-test
	0	0	4	27	22		22. Post-test
Expository proficiency	7	16	10	9	0	SS at 1/2% level	24. Pre-test
	2	6	10	23	7		23. Post-test

were convinced that teachers do have time and do get to know their students individually. They now believe that teachers have unrestricted choice of materials they will teach; they became undecided on the question of whether students with good memories get the best grades generally. They came to the conclusion that there was no person or committee who passed judgment on literature selection for classes. They realized that classes in the schools were not mainly lectures. They saw that, at least in the schools they participated in, writing was not taught primarily for expository proficiency.

These are the only attitudes which the multiple choice questions measured. A rich source of further attitudinal change is the essay response to the pre- and post-tests. Excerpts from this will be cited and anzlyzed in this chapter.

Undergraduate Responses From the English 408 Class

As mentioned earlier, the pre- and post-test results of English 408 classes were analyzed and computed separately from the English 214 and 301 group because the English 408 students generally had more Field Experience and student teaching so their responses might be affected by this, and their tutoring of reading. The results are summarized in Table 2, page 41.

Paired Questions for English 408 With Statistically Significant Changes

Question 2, pre-test. "I feel apprehensive about Field Experience teaching in the school."

Question 1, post-test. "Now that I have had Field Experience, I feel much less apprehensive about teaching."

As in the English 214 and 301 group, this question was adjusted for in the English 408 group due to the wording in the pre- and post-test form. Unlike the English 214 and 301 group, the English 408 group did show a statistically significant shift in attitude at the 5% level. The shift was in the direction of feeling little or no apprehension about teaching toward more neutral and less emphatic feelings of a lessened apprehension. This might be due to the tutoring nature of the English 408 experience which might not directly affect the undergraduate's feelings regarding whole class teaching.

Question 3, pre-test. "Finding interesting materials to use with the students during Field Experience will be difficult."

Question 2, post-test. "Finding interesting materials to use with the students during Field Experience was difficult."

These undergraduates generally anticipated little or no difficulty finding materials, but found in many cases that there was difficulty. This was statistically significant at the 1/2% level. One reason for the difficulty of finding materials might be that the English 408 students were tutoring junior and senior high school students with reading disabilities. In general there is less material available of the high interest, easy reading variety than regular classroom material.

Question 5, pre-test. "Behavior and discipline will be a major problem in my Field Experience teaching."

Question 4, post-test. "Behavior and discipline were a major problem in my Field Experience."

This statistically significant (1/2% level) attitudinal change occurred mostly from the neutral to the disagree and strongly disagree categories. In general, the undergraduates found discipline no problem, probably because they were primarily tutoring on a one-to-one basis where personal interaction is sufficient to promote trust.

Question 6, pre-test. "I expect that my supervising teacher will have almost no time to discuss the experiences which I will encounter during Field Experience."

Question 5, post-test. "I expect that my supervising teacher had almost no time to discuss the experiences which I had encountered during Field Experience."

This response reveals an interesting shift, statistically significant at the 1/2% level. The undergraduates tended to be neutral or to disagree. Many expected their supervisors to have time to talk with them, but they found their supervisors were, in fact, often too busy to spend much time with them. This could be explained by the fact that the undergraduates were tutoring on a one-to-one basis, and in many cases the reading center director was either too busy administering a staff of volunteers or was engaged in direct teaching during the hours the English 408 students were in the schools. This generally left no mutual free time. Sometimes an undergraduate might tutor a student directly from a subject

matter class without the reading center as an intermediary. The classroom teacher then continued his or her whole class teaching and didn't generally even see the tutor, let alone discuss the pupil's progress or problems with him or her. All of these factors could contribute to the English 408 students' change in attitude due to this Field Experience.

> Question 7, pre-test. "I would like my supervising teacher to tell me exactly what to do each time I am there."
>
> Question 6, post-test. "I wanted my supervising teacher to tell me exactly what to do each time I was there."

Although no one strongly agreed with this statement, a few agreed while some were neutral with only one neutral on the post-test afterwards. The jump was from those who disagreed on the pre-test to a much larger number who disagreed on the post-test. This was statistically significant at the 2-1/2% level. In other words, several undergraduates became more certain that they did not want to be told exactly what to do.

> Question 9, pre-test. "I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience."
>
> Question 8, post-test. "I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience."

The 5% level of statistical significance was attained for this set of responses. There was a slight increase in the number of undergraduates who disagreed and strongly disagreed with this question. The number who agreed fell by ten. This negative feeling about Field Experience might be due to the very slow and often

frustrating nature of the tutoring process in reading weaknesses. One hour a week for ten weeks is hardly enough to show any actual reading progress, and it is difficult for the tutor to keep in mind that he or she is helping, even when no visible improvement is there.

Because the reading difficulty is often tied up with the youngster's self-concept and general academic failure, it is not merely a matter of tutoring in reading, but in building confidence and self-worth so the student will try to read rather than avoid reading altogether. Some tutors indicated their frustrations in these areas on the essay response, too.

> Question 11, pre-test. "I generally know what I am supposed to be doing during Field Experience."
>
> Question 10, post-test. "I generally knew what I was supposed to be doing during Field Experience."

A mild change at the 5% level in attitude occurred here. Those who agreed dropped slightly while the number who disagreed and strongly disagreed increased slightly. Perhaps the reason for this is related to the frustrations involved in tutoring reading which were mentioned earlier. Perhaps that indicates that tutoring reading should not be used as an introductory Field Experience since it presents very difficult problems for the tutor.

> Question 13, pre-test. "There are many non-teaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paperwork, etc., which saps a teacher's time and energy."

Question 12, post-test. "There were many non-teaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paperwork, etc., which sapped my supervisor's time and energy."

Even though these undergraduates had generally been in schools before, their English 408 Field Experience changed their minds on this point. Significant at the 1/2% level, the change was from the high number who agreed to the low number who agreed on the post-test. The number who strongly disagreed rose from two to eleven. In other words, they found, to their surprise, the teachers were not burdened with lunchroom and study hall supervision, etc.

Question 17, pre-test. "The students who have good memories get the best grades in junior and senior high generally."

Question 16, post-test. "The students who have good memories got the best grades in the school I did my Field Experience in."

The neutral category doubled between pre- and post-test here. All other categories decreased. This was a statistically significant shift (1/2% level). Probably most of the English 408 students did not observe or interact with teachers grading students in any way so they couldn't agree or disagree.

Question 18, pre-test. "English teachers generally have free and unrestricted choice of what material they will teach."

Question 17, post-test. "Teachers in the school I was assigned to generally had free and unrestricted choice of the material they would teach."

It seems the Field Experience did not clarify this point. The neutral group increased nearly five times what it was. Those

who disagreed dropped considerably, too. The shifts were highly significant at the 1/2% level.

> Question 19, pre-test. "As far as I know there is currently no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for classes."
>
> Question 18, post-test. "As far as I know there is currently no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for class."

The statistically significant shift occurred when the neutral category increased and the disagree category decreased. The high level of statistical significance (1/2%) is exactly that of the similar question dealing with choice of teaching materials. The same shift to neutral and away from disagree occurred there, too.

> Question 22, pre-test. "Classes in the schools are mostly lecture in nature."
>
> Question 21, post-test. "Classes I observed were mostly lecture in nature."

Three changes occurred here but no definite pattern emerged. This is why the statistical significance was only 2-1/2%. Most disagreed both before and after while the number who were neutral doubled as did those who strongly disagreed. One thing that can be said is that most undergraduates felt that classes were not generally lecture in nature. The seven who agreed dropped to zero after the Field Experience.

> Question 24, pre-test. "Composition classes in the schools generally strive for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing."

> Question 23, post-test. "Composition classes in the school where I did my Field Experience strived for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing."

Even though English 408 undergraduates were not involved in a writing class, there was a highly statistically significant change (1/2%) in attitude regarding this writing question. The eighteen who agreed that expository proficiency was generally stressed changed to only one (post) who agreed this was true in the school where Field Experience occurred. The neutral category nearly tripled.

English 408 Paired Questions With No Statistically Significant Changes

> Question 4, pre-test. "I expect my supervising teacher will be very cooperative."
>
> Question 3, post-test. "I expect my supervising teacher was very cooperative."

This was not significant statistically. Most of the undergraduates expected the supervising teachers would be cooperative and most found they were. This is hardly unusual since these undergraduates had had Field Experience previously and generally found this to be true.

> Question 8, pre-test. "I believe the school students will generally respond favorably to my teaching during Field Experience."
>
> Question 7, post-test. "The students generally responded favorably to my teaching during Field Experience."

There was no statistically significant attitudinal shift on this question. Most expected and received favorable response. This

was very encouraging both to the undergraduates and to the Field Experience coordinators.

> Question 10, pre-test. "The amount of time Field Experience requires will tax me throughout the term."
>
> Question 9, post-test. "The amount of time Field Experience requires taxed me throughout the term."

On the pre-test there was a fairly even distribution among agree, neutral, and disagree. The post-test responses were similarly distributed. The responses were individualized due to personal schedules and time commitments.

> Question 12, pre-test. "There will be no one I can turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience."
>
> Question 11, post-test. "There was no one I could turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience."

These responses did not change significantly from pre- to post-tests. In nearly all cases the undergraduates disagreed or strongly disagreed with the question thereby indicating they felt someone was available to help.

> Question 14, pre-test. "Teachers do not have enough time to get to know each school student individually."
>
> Question 13, post-test. "The teachers I observed did not have enough time to get to know each pupil in their class individually."

The responses to this question represented no statistically significant shift. There was no predominant sentiment expressed regarding this attitude.

Question 15, pre-test. "I think schools probably have changed very much since I was in high school."

Question 14, post-test. "I think schools have probably changed very much since I was in high school."

More students strongly agreed or agreed than disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, but there was no attitudinal change on a statistically significant basis.

Question 16, pre-test. "High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age."

Question 15, post-test. "High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age."

Again, there is no statistically significant change in attitude here. Those who felt one way or another about the social and political awareness of students seemed to maintain the same feelings as a group. It was nearly balanced among the number of those who felt a positive and those who felt a negative response was appropriate.

Question 20, pre-test. "A quiet classroom is good because more learning will occur in a quiet setting than in a noisy one."

Question 19, post-test. "A quiet classroom is good because more learning occurred in a quiet setting than in a noisy one."

Most of the undergraduates disagreed with this statement both before and after Field Experience. There was no statistically significant change here.

Question 21, pre-test. "What is taught in most classrooms is most likely irrelevant to the personal needs of the student."

Question 20, post-test. "What was taught in most classrooms I observed was irrelevant to the personal needs of the students."

There was no statistically significant change here. Most students either disagreed or were neutral with only one person strongly agreeing. This is important since they believed the curriculum to be relevant and then deemed it relevant after seeing what was being taught primarily in the area of reading.

Question 23, pre-test. "Lecture type classes are the best for educating junior and senior high school students."

Question 22, post-test. "Lecture type classes are the best for educating junior and senior high school students."

No statistically significant changes occurred here. Most felt that lectures were not the best and continued to feel that way.

Summary of English 408 Attitudinal Pre- and Post-Test Results

Of the twenty-three pairs of pre and post attitudinal questions directed at undergraduates taking English 408, thirteen revealed a statistically significant change in attitude. Eight of these were statistically significant at the highest level, 1/2%. These included difficulty in finding materials, the amount of time the superivising teacher would have for them, whether discipline would be a problem, whether non-teaching demands sapped their supervising teacher's energy, whether teachers have free choice of

TABLE 2.--English 408 Attitudinal Survey Statistical Analysis.

Question	SA	A	N	D	SD	Statistical Significance	Question Numbers
Apprehensive about FE	1 8	1 14	2 12	13 6	23 2	SS at 5% level	2. Pre-test 1. Post-test
Difficulty finding materials	0 7	3 12	10 5	18 14	11 1	SS at 1/2% level	3. Pre-test 2. Post-test
Cooperative supervisors	8 12	17 10	17 12	1 7	0 1	Not SS	4. Pre-test 3. Post-test
Discipline problems	0 0	1 0	10 0	23 16	7 22	SS at 1/2% level	5. Pre-test 4. Post-test
Supervisors--no time	0 8	6 10	13 10	18 5	5 8	SS at 1/2% level	6. Pre-test 5. Post-test
Be told what to do	0 0	4 0	7 1	14 26	16 13	SS at 2-1/2% level	7. Pre-test 6. Post-test
Favorable student response	3 7	26 29	11 3	2 2	0 0	Not SS	8. Pre-test 7. Post-test
Personal enthusiasm for FE	10 9	26 16	5 6	1 4	0 6	SS at 5% level	9. Pre-test 8. Post-test
Tax their time	0 2	12 9	13 5	12 19	3 6	Not SS	10. Pre-test 9. Post-test
Know what to do	2 7	30 24	7 6	3 6	0 6	SS at 5% level	11. Pre-test 10. Post-test
No one to turn to	0 0	0 1	3 8	26 20	13 12	Not SS	12. Pre-test 11. Post-test
Non-teaching demands	5 2	23 4	5 9	7 14	2 11	SS at 1/2% level	13. Pre-test 12. Post-test
Teachers didn't know students	2 1	16 9	6 9	14 12	4 8	Not SS	14. Pre-test 13. Post-test
Schools changed	10 13	20 11	3 8	7 8	2 2	Not SS	15. Pre-test 14. Post-test
More social awareness	5 4	16 13	10 12	10 11	9 1	Not SS	16. Pre-test 15. Post-test
Memorizers get best grades	1 0	12 3	16 32	10 3	3 1	SS at 1/2% level	17. Pre-test 16. Post-test
Unrestricted choice of material	1 0	8 11	5 23	21 4	6 0	SS at 1/2% level	18. Pre-test 17. Post-test
No committees for book censorship	0 0	4 7	8 25	27 3	4 2	SS at 1/2% level	19. Pre-test 18. Post-test
Quiet classroom is necessary	0 0	0 2	3 9	29 24	10 5	Not SS	20. Pre-test 19. Post-test
What's taught is irrelevant	1 0	7 4	6 13	22 16	5 8	Not SS	21. Pre-test 20. Post-test
Mostly lectures	0 0	7 0	6 13	25 17	5 10	SS at 2-1/2% level	22. Pre-test 21. Post-test
Lecture is best	0 0	1 0	3 8	18 20	20 14	Not SS	23. Pre-test 22. Post-test
Expository proficiency	1 0	18 1	10 26	8 5	4 4	SS at 1/2% level	24. Pre-test 23. Post-test

materials to teach from, whether good memorizers get the best grades, whether a committee selects books for the school system, and whether expository proficiency is more highly stressed than enjoyment of writing in the schools.

Only two of the twenty-three attitudinal pairs were statistically significant at the 2-1/2% level. They were: (1) wishing the supervising teacher would tell them exactly what to do and (2) whether the classes in public school were mostly lecture in nature.

Two pairs were also statistically significant at the 5% level, the minimum for statistical significance: (1) enthusiasm for Field Experience and (2) knowing what to do during Field Experience.

In all of these thirteen areas, the English 408 students' attitudes changed after Field Experience. This shows that even with these more experienced seniors, there is still significant learning that occurs during Field Experience.

Comparison of English 214, 301 With English 408 Attitudinal Survey Responses

A summary of the comparison of English 214, 301 and 408 is shown in Table 3. Twelve of the twenty-three paired questions reveal identical statistical significance for both the English 214, 301 and the English 408 groups. Of interest are the pairs where there was no statistical significance in one group while the other group registered a shift in attitude highly significant at the 1/2% level.

Some plausible explanations could clarify these stark contrasts between the two groups of respondents. The first contrasting

TABLE 3.--Comparison of English 214 and 301 With 408 Attitudinal Responses.

Question Nos.	Question	English 214 and 301	English 408
Pre-test A* 3 Post-test B** 2	Difficulty finding materials	Not SS	SS at 1/2% level†
Pre-test A 4 Post-test B3	Cooperative supervisors	SS at 1/2% level	Not SS
Pre-test A 6 Post-test B 5	Supervisor--no time	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 5 Post-test B 4	Discipline problems	Not SS	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 7 Post-test B 6	Be told what to do	Not SS	SS at 2-1/2% level
Pre-test A 8 Post-test B 7	Favorable student response	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 9 Post test B 8	Personal enthusiasm for FE	Not SS	SS at 5% level
Pre-test A 10 Post-test B 9	Tax their time	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 11 Post-test B 10	Know what to do	SS at 5% level	SS at 5% level
Pre-test A 12 Post-test B 11	No one to turn to	SS at 1/2% level	Not SS
Pre-test A 13 Post-test B 12	Non-teaching demands	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 14 Post-test B 13	Teachers don't know students	SS at 2-1/2% level	Not SS
Pre-test A 15 Post-test B 14	Schools changed	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 16 Post-test B 15	More social awareness in public students	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 18 Post-test B 17	Unrestricted choice of materials	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 17 Post-test B 16	Memorizers get best grades	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 19 Post-test B 18	No committees for book censorship	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level
Pre-test A 21 Post-test B 20	What's taught is irrelevant	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 20 Post-test B 19	Quiet classroom is necessary	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 22 Post-test B 21	Mostly lectures	SS at 1% level	SS at 2-1/2% level
Pre-test A 23 Post-test B 22	Lecture is best method	Not SS	Not SS
Pre-test A 24 Post-test B 23	Expository proficiency	SS at 1/2% level	SS at 1/2% level

*A indicates pre-test form 1 given winter, 1973.

**B indicates post-test given winter and spring, 1973.

†Statistical significance (SS) at 1/2%, 2-1/2% and 5% levels is valid. Most significant at 1/2%.

pair was number 3 (pre), 2 (post) which dealt with difficulty in finding materials for Field Experience teaching. The English 214 and 301 had no statistically significant change. The belief was that materials would not be difficult or hard to find, and they weren't. English 408 had a large shift in attitude regarding materials. They began with the feeling that materials would not be difficult to obtain and shifted to the feeling that they were quite difficult to find. This shift was significant at the 1/2% level. Probably the English 408 undergraduates needed more specialized materials for weak readers who wanted easy but interesting books. These materials are less available in many schools and college libraries. So the English 408 students who probably had no difficulty finding books for their previous Field Experience or student teaching did realize the difficulty in locating reading materials that would be of interest to the weak readers.

Question number 4 (pre), 3 (post) deals with expectations about the cooperativeness of the supervising teacher. The English 214, 301 group shifted from a more neutral stance to a strong agreement that the supervising teacher was cooperative. This shift was statistically significant at the 1/2% level. The English 408 undergraduates thought their supervising teachers would be cooperative, and they were. Perhaps this was due to their previous Field Experience supervising teachers having been helpful and cooperative; thus, they expected the same to be true once again. Overall, the English 408 response here showed more optimism and confidence and less uncertainty than the English 214, 301 pre-test revealed.

The Field Experience itself proved that the prior apprehension or uncertainty was unwarranted generally.

The question of discipline being a problem, number 5 (pre), 4 (post), was another area of contrast between group resonses. The English 214, 301 group had no statistically significant change in attitude. They did not think discipline would be a problem and it was not. The English 408 group had an attitudinal change that was significant at the 1/2% level. The shift was from neutral to disagree and strongly disagree. This meant that they found discipline was not a problem. Perhaps this was due to the one-to-one tutoring situation.

Question number 12 (pre), 11 (post) shows that there was a significant change at the 1/2% level in the English 214, 301 group. These undergraduates expected generally that there would be no one to turn to for help during Field Experience and discovered that this was not so. The English 408 group had no significant change. They believed from the start someone would be available to help and there was help available. These English 408 students might well have based their initial positive feelings on their positive experiences during other Field Experiences. They found there were at least three professionals to turn to for help: the supervising teacher, the undergraduate coordinator, and the undergraduate instructor.

Thus, it seems that, overall, the differences due to English 408 students having had previous Field Experience generally proved to be optimisitic, or, as in one case, neutral. Positive

Field Experiences can contribute to a less apprehensive and more positive attitude regarding an upcoming in-school teaching experience.

Attitudinal Survey Essay Response

The single essay question on the attitudinal survey pre-test and post-test was designed to elicit insights into what the Field Experience students thought regarding Field Experience, both before and after their Field Experience. The pre-test essay question was: "What, if anything, do you expect to learn from Field Experience?" The responses were usually quite open and sincere, sometimes revealing insecurity and vague or general expectations. The post-test essay question was: "What, if anything, did you learn in Field Experience? Be specific (what surprised you, shocked you, interested you, etc.)." These answers were decidedly more specific, based on concrete experiences. The responses from the post-test essay were more specific and concrete, probably due to the less abstract nature of the post-test undergraduates' thinking.

The comments regarding pre- and post-tests have been based on three groups of undergraduates' responses: those from English 214 and 301, and 408. In nearly every case, the English 408 students had had previous Field Experience and student teaching so their responses were based on far more school contact and experience than were the responses from the English 214 and 301 students who, on the whole, had not student taught, were sophomores and juniors, and generally had not been in recent contact with schools.

There are several types of comments the undergraduates made: concern for themselves in regard to their ability and potential as teachers, humanistic concern for the welfare of the public school students, and concern regarding the school and its influences on public school students.

The students' comments can best express their attitudes. Looking first at the pre-tests, one finds the general category comments plus statements related directly to the university course goals (writing for English 214 and literature for English 301). The most frequently expressed concern in this group was: "Do I want to teach? Am I able to be a good teacher?" One dedicated student phrased it this way: "Most of all--I hope to find out that I <u>can</u> teach--and that I like to teach." Another student wrote:

> I expect to get a taste of what student teaching will be like. I hope to learn about my personal attitudes and teaching methods which are favorable and unfavorable to my students. If the students' reaction to me is a favorable one, and they seem excited about learning, then I'll have a great deal of confidence in myself as a future teacher. If it is not a favorable one, I would have serious qualms as to the validity of my decision to be an English teacher.

One student took the Field Experience and English 214 to see if she did want to teach. She was a sophomore at the time:

> Seeing as the background at Michigan State University in teaching experience is totally lacking during the first three years of college--I expect at the least to become reaquainted with high school "routine" in general. I have no idea really if I even want to teach because I feel that experience has been so limited to me that I can't objectively say yes, I would like to teach. My standards are such that I wish I knew if I were proficient in the teaching field before ending in the student teaching so close to the close of my college experience.

The more experienced English 408 undergraduates did not generally show as much concern in their pre-test essay responses regarding indecision about teaching as a career. By this time the English 408 students, on the whole, had decided, based on previous Field Experience and/or student teaching, that teaching was for them. Therefore, for them their Field Experience was not a time of personal "testing the waters." Instead, for many, it was a time to find materials, learn about reading, and try out some ideas while tutoring a weak reader. All the English 408 undergraduates tutored on a one-to-one basis rather than teaching groups or whole classes as most of the English 214 and 301 undergraduates did. (While this one-to-one tutoring in reading is an ideal way to begin helping a weak reader it is unfortunately nearly impossible for a regular classroom teacher to use the techniques on a one-to-one basis in a class of 30. This lack of transfer can produce some frustration when the undergraduates are faced with an entire class of weak readers, but it is a useful situation for instructing the undergraduates in reading teaching.)

There were also many comments relating to humanistic relationships with the public school students' well-being. One respondent said:

> I hope to learn new means of relating to the student. I also hope to be able to come to know and understand more fully what the students want both academically and enjoyment wise.

Methods and materials were of great interest to many students. They expected to learn from the college course and Field

Experience new ways to interest students in English. The next statement is from a student who in her mid-twenties had returned to college after being a telephone operator for several years. She stated:

> I hope to gain more understanding of what types of things specifically interest junior high and high school students today (realizing they are a variety of people with a variety of interests. I can't help feeling some areas may interest them in common). I expect to try out some ideas, make some mistakes, and get many new ideas from the students and from my mistakes. I hope to get my feet wet and stabilize some ideas I can use student teaching next term (and teaching) especially in the area of teaching writing, one of my weaker areas.

Some students are looking for a basis for a personal philosophy of teaching when they begin Field Experience: "I hope to develop some basis or ideas about how to become an effective teacher."

One vague expectation was cited by a young woman who became a team partner with the young man who made the last statement: "I'm not expecting to learn anything definite, that is, I'm not expecting the problems of teaching will be made clear to me. I more or less want to feel myself out and see how I respond in the classroom."

Some students' ideas were specific enough to know they wanted to be placed in a junior high situation. (Others preferred senior highs.)

> Being assigned to a junior high level school and also being interested in actually teaching this level one day, I'm looking forward to finding out a great deal about just what a junior high age person is like. Their maturity, the things that interest them and the problems which are most commonly theirs.

Along with those hoping to receive ideas about methods and materials, some students want an opportunity such as Field Experience to experiment with their own ideas:

> A whole new field is opening up for me and now I will have an opportunity to apply the ideas I have been accumulating and learn just how far I can experiment without an administrative body breathing down my neck. I'm sure I'll learn what my potentials are and those of a group of students. I'm just beginning to put thoughts into practice and have <u>much</u> to learn and to share with and from those students.

It is clear from statements such as these that undergraduates are anxious to "get their feet wet," to actually try teaching, rather than sit and absorb theory about teaching for years. This theory can only be truly meaningful to them as it relates to their own experience.

The post-test essay responses for this same group (English 214 and 301) were generally more specific and concrete than the pre-test and provided specific things to think about and react to. It is usually harder to accurately anticipate exactly what will happen than it is to reflect on what did occur.

The post-test essay question asked what the undergraduates learned from their Field Experience, and it also solicited responses regarding what surprised, shocked, and interested the undergraduates. Their attitudes were more agitated and perhaps less idealistic than on the pre-test. For instance:

> What impressed (and distressed) me most was the general "brain drain" I saw at the school. Kids are wasting away--not able to read and write--while they pass on. I felt that the black child I tutored was quite bright--he read fairly well orally for me, was enthusiastic about

> projects, and liked to write. When I told the supervisor this, she said . . . "Kim appears to be bright, but he really isn't." He had just read Murders in the Rue Morgue for me (by his own choice) and he's written several imaginative stories for me. He has problems, but not of the degree (in my opinion) that my supervisor believes. I wonder how long it will be until he's convinced he's stupid.

Another sample of what impressed one Field Experience undergraduate:

> What really frustrated me was the apathy on the part of the students and the amount of back talk to the teacher. Maybe these are routine problems, but they seemed to bother me. I really was shocked at the use of drugs at the junior high level and drugs freely sold outside of the school. (School name) also has attendance problems with 30-35 students enrolled per class but no more than 20 show up on a given day, further illustrating the apathy on the part of the students. The experience really showed me the importance of being able to relate to students, being friendly yet maintaining control. I also saw the need to break away from standard classes and involve the students in what they are being taught--for example, with the use of media and asking them how they would like to cover a particular topic. So all in all though the experience was frustrating at times, it just made me more determined to try to reach these kids before it is too late.

Definitely less idealistic, this statement reveals an attitude of undaunted optimism--I will conquor the obstacles! At least now, due to Field Experience, this young woman knows a little about what she will be up against, realistically speaking.

One undergraduate had a fantastic learning experience under an excellent, experienced teacher.

> I saw a fine teacher at work, disciplining, shaping, watching those impressionable creatures before her--always with humor, candor--and insight and finally, I guess I saw me, in front of a classroom of young life--talking, responding, relating to these tangles of energy. I was unsure what to expect, I did not know if I could have them understand me or what I wanted from them--in Field Experience my doubts, at least partially, have be been answered.

Regarding materials and methods, one undergraduate whose Field Experience was in an elementary school felt:

> I became aware of how much a teacher conveys her own values to the students in her choice of topics, materials and words . . . . My biggest conflict with the supervisor was concerning the teacher's role as authority figure--I am much more informal, physically open, etc.

This awareness of the teacher's position in transmitting and shaping values either as an authoritarian or not will help this undergraduate to consider what, as well as how, she will teach. This allows self-examination and growth both before and during a teaching career. Too often teachers have not been able to look at themselves with the insight and ability to change which this undergraduate demonstrates.

As previously stated, many undergraduates expressed a concern about their choice of teaching as a career on the pre-test. For some their decision to teach was confirmed while others decided realistically not to pursue any further teaching training. It was interesting to note that the two who positively decided not to go into teaching careers had a successful Field Experience and did well. Their exposure to the school situation convinced them that they did not want to teach although they learned they could do a good job of teaching.

> This is going to sound weird and I do not mean to put down high school English teachers, but I have pretty much come to the conclusion that I do not want to teach within the high school environment. What we did I enjoyed, but I could not take a steady diet of it. I would become very, very bored. I do not think it would be the challenge I need because the type of English taught in high school is so superficial. The kids rarely do more than brush the

> surface and literature means too much to me to deal with it in such a shallow manner. I am not the crusader type who could inspire the kids to an appreciation of literature, and I have no patience for things like grammar and other equally thrilling goodies. . . . I am terribly, terribly glad that I discovered this now rather than my senior year. Now I have time to find something else to do. This class is great because it does give English education majors a chance to really find out what they are getting themselves into.

To balance this young lady's decision not to teach there were many who decided teaching was for them. The insights obtained while in the schools and talking to teachers helped some develop their personal teaching philosophies and positive determination:

> _____ _____ (teacher) had an idea about education, she tried it, found that many people did not agree, stuck with it and now runs a classroom that is alive, exciting, spontaneous, and still full of controversy. This Field Experience gave me the opportunity to talk with one individual who did not let the system beat her--it gives me a little better attitude for my own teaching perspectives.

Some very practical, concrete teaching and cooperating skills were developed by many undergraduates in the English 214 class since the undergraduates had to work as a team of four in both preparing and presenting each Field Experience lesson. For some it was the first time they had to work as a team on anything, and it required much assumption of responsibility and an attitude of cooperativeness, a willingness to help each other, not compete with each other. Here is one team member's statement:

> I learned how to work with other people (the others in my group) in a classroom situation and in planning lessons. I got some practice in working with a whole class of kids at once--(most of my previous experience was with individual kids or small groups). I also learned how to plan a lesson and afterwards look back and critically judge what we did right and wrong.

This team planning experience could prove very useful during a teaching career whether the teacher is team teaching or just sharing ideas with other teachers. A member of another team said: "Team teaching was new to us and we were fascinated! It is the best way to teach in my opinion."

The team approach was also helpful in getting undergraduates into the teaching of a whole class rather painlessly. They shared all phases of planning, presentation, and evaluation and never felt alone:

> It got me back in touch with junior high students and made me less afraid of student teaching. I felt at ease in the classroom and enjoyed working with the students. The experience was valuable and worthwhile.

This insight is one all prospective teachers could profit from. Education is not merely a rehash of what we learned now being passed on intact to the upcoming generation. That perhaps was sufficient before rapid social and technological change turned things around so what was valid for a former generation no longer holds true in toto for today's youth. This necessitates that teachers change the curriculum, renew it and themselves as time goes on. There is often no model to follow when one is pioneering change so this man was merely getting a taste of future demands the educational situation will place on him to respond creatively to new pupil needs and priorities.

Two changes one undergraduate noticed involved changed curriculum and teacher-pupil relationships:

> English classes today, at least at (school), have so much more to offer; many books rather than one standard set of literature books for the kids. I also saw a different viewpoint of the kids in relation to the teachers. When I was in school, the teacher was inhuman but I see where teachers are in a more human relation to their students.

This undergraduate's statement summarizes most of the Field Experience participants' feelings:

> I was hesitant about doing it (Field Experience), but once involved I thoroughly enjoyed it. I feel that it is the only way to enter your own classroom, and I would like to see more Field Experience available. It was interesting, challenging, informative, and rewarding.

The overwhelming number of comments about Field Experience indicated positive learning occurred in nearly every case. Many undergraduates learned whether or not teaching was an appropriate career for them, whether they could relate to students, what methods and materials seemed to function best for them in dealing with individual student needs, and what role the school plays in the lives of both students and teacher training program to actually form a basis for decision making, whether it was to change a method or to change a career.

Field Experience Questionnaire

The attitudinal survey discussed in depth in Chapter I basically revealed that Field Experience has the capacity to change attitudes of teachers-in-training. In some cases, the prospective teachers decide that teaching is not what they want to do with their lives; in other cases the teaching candidates learn of very concrete problems and rewards that teaching involves. In any case, the Field

Experience is an opportunity for reality training so the educational curriculum for prospective teachers becomes less abstract and divorced from the real students in real schools that the new teachers will have to interact with eventually. In other words, Field Experience is an effective mode for educating future teachers. Knowing this, an abundance of information regarding Field Experience programs at colleges and universities throughout the United States becomes very useful in planning effective types of Field Experiences at any given college or university. The state of the art is such that although the Society for Field Experience Education is actively promoting incorporation of Field Experience into college and university curriculums, there has been very little extensive research published on the variety of Field Experience programs extant. This study is an attempt to remedy the problem: a paucity of information on Field Experience programs across the nation.

The basic research design consists of a stratified random sample of four-year (or more) colleges and universities in the United States. The sample was drawn from the 1973 Modern Language Association college directory. The directory listed the colleges and universities alphabetically and then provided information regarding names of department chairmen--specifically for Education Departments and English Departments. Questionnaires (see Appendix D) were mailed to both the Education Department and the English Department of each college or university sampled. That provided data predominantly on secondary education teacher training Field Experience programs operating in both (or either) the Education

Department and the English Department of each institution of higher education. Five hundred twenty-four questionnaires were mailed to approximately 262 colleges and universities. Completed questionnaires were received from 241 people. Since it is a lengthy (six pages) questionnaire, this 40.9% response is very large and gratifying. The overwhelming response seems to indicate that many educators are vitally interested in Field Experience program development. (Another indicator of this high level of interest was that 98.8% of the respondents requested copies of the research results when completed.) This large sample group included institutions with enrollments ranging from 1,000 to over 40,000.

The Field Experience Questionnaire, besides obtaining general information about the college or university responding, defined Field Experience, inquired about Field Experience program components, evaluation, and future projections. Predominantly, the questions are of a multiple choice nature with one additional choice being "Other, please specify" to make provisions for cases where the suggested choices were too constricting or inappropriate. Some questions are open-ended and have no suggested responses.

A thorough computer program was run on the results of the questionnaires to establish correlations of statistical significance between different facets of the Field Experience programs studied. The Chi-square test was applied to determine statistical significance at levels of 1/2%, 2-1/2%, and 5%--5% being the lowest valid statistically significant correlation. The computer program itself was designed and applied by the Michigan State University Computer

Center Consultant. It is a computer program adaptable for analysis of multiple choice questionnaires on any type of information. Bruce Rottink, researcher, also assisted in interpreting the computer printout, particularly the Chi-square values.

The questionnaire itself contains 42 questions. It begins by defining Field Experience:

> Field Experience (FE) as described here is a program sponsored by a university department where prospective undergraduate teaching candidates are placed in schools to observe and participate in the tutoring and/or teaching of the school students. Field Experience Programs are distinct from student teaching programs.

On occasion, the written comments of a few respondents would seem to indicate that they were including student teaching in their Field Experience program for purposes of responding to this questionnaire. Unfortunately, the comments never were clear enough in these few cases to be certain that they were including student teaching so those responses were evaluated as if they included Field Experience only.

After the definition of Field Experience there is a section for information about the respondent: his/her name and position, department, university, address, university enrollment size, and the date the questionnaire was completed. All questionnaires were mailed from East Lansing, Michigan, spring term, 1973, and responses were received no later than June 1973.

After the basic university information questions, the directions for answering the rest of the inquiries were printed:

> Circle either YES or NO on the yes-no type questions. Circle as many answers as are appropriate to your situation on the multiple choice type questions. TO SAVE YOU TIME: If your department does NOT have a Field Experience Program, please answer the first three questions only. If your department DOES have a Field Experience Program, please respond to all the inquiries.

The directions made it possible for universities with no Field Experience program to quickly complete the questionnaire while those with programs had an opportunity to go into greater depth and give much information about the components, evaluation and future projections of their programs.

An itemized response to each question is presented here. A copy of the questionnaire itself is presented in Appendix D. For clarity, the individual questions will be listed with their answers as the responses are presented.

> Question 1. "Does your department have a Field Experience Program?"

YES 64.7% (156 responses), NO 35.3% (85 responses). Nearly 46% more respondents had Field Experience programs than did not have programs. This is true even though those respondents without programs had only three questions to answer as opposed to the 42 questions posed for those with programs. Perhaps this indicates that those universities with Field Experience programs are more interested in the state of the art than those who do not have Field Experience programs. It might also mean that there are more universities with Field Experience programs than without them.

Question 2. "If no, has your department given consideration to instituting a Field Experience Program?"

YES 39.5%, NO 60.5%. About forty percent of the universities who responded but had no Field Experience program had considered instituting a program. People in this situation could be helped greatly by information such as is in this study. The data could provide ideas on which to build their programs.

Question 3. "If your department has given some thought to instituting a Field Experience Program, please indicate what state your deliberations are in."

a. We plan to implement a program next fall. (NO, 84.4%, YES 15.6%)
b. We have talked about a Field Experience Program, but no decisions have been made. (NO, 37.5%, YES, 62.5%)
c. A pilot study is underway. [NO, 87.5% (28), YES 12.5% (4)]
d. We are waiting for funding. [NO 98.9% (31), YES 3.1% (1)]
e. Other, please specify. [NO 81.3% (26), YES 18.7% (6)]

By far, the most frequent situation for those responding to this question was that no decisions have been made.

Field Experience Program Components

Question 4. "What types of Field Experience does your department offer?"

a. Observing in the schools. [NO 3.8% (6), YES 96% (150)]
b. Tutoring in the schools. [NO 13.5% (21), YES 8 86.5% (135)]
c. Small group activity direction in the schools. [NO 18.58% (29), YES 81.4% (127)]
d. Teaching of entire class in the schools. [NO 39.5% (62), YES 60.3% (94)]
e. Preparation of innovative materials for teacher use. [NO 53.8% (84), YES 46.1% (72)]

f. Staffing of a learning resources center, including material preparation. [NO 75.6% (118), YES 24.4% (38)]
g. Presentation of mini courses in the schools. [NO 65.4% (102), YES 34.6% (54)]
h. Intern program for extensive participation in the schools while remaining a full-time student on campus. [NO 62.2% (97), YES 37.8% (59)]
i. Other, please specify. [NO 86.5% (135), YES 13.5% (21)]

Observation, tutoring, and small group activity are the most frequently engaged in types of Field Experience. Somewhat over half teach an entire class in the schools, and slightly under half work on the preparation of innovative material for teacher use. Over one-third of the programs have an intensive intern program for undergraduates who are simultaneously full-time college students. Mini courses are presented by 34.6% while only 24.4% staff a learning resource center including material preparation.

The "other" responses include such activities as Field Experience placement in social agencies and recreational programs as well as bringing students to campus for tutoring and providing a class geared to high school teaching where the undergraduates grade actual papers and present mini lessons to their peers.

The September experience which provides undergraduates an opportunity to visit public school prior to beginning fall term at the university and one-month teacher aide programs both have short duration but attempt to provide more depth by having the undergraduates in the school on a daily basis.

Question 5. "How long has your Field Experience program been in operation?"
1 year 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 more than 10

Thirty-seven and three-tenths percent of the respondents indicated their Field Experience programs had been in operation 2 to 3 years. Another 30.1% had operated 4, 5 or 6 years. A mere 7.8% had existed 7, 8, 9, or 10 years. Sixteen and three-tenths percent had been operating for 10 years or more. On the other end of the spectrum, 8.5% were in their first years of operation. All this reveals that the respondents were affiliated with programs at a multitude of experiential levels.

Question 6. "What are the goals of your Field Experience program?"

a. To screen prospective teachers. [NO 37.2% (58), YES 62.8% (98)]
b. To provide pre-student teaching experience. [NO 5.8% (9), YES 94.0% (146)]
c. To supplement the methods course. [NO 29.5% (46), YES 70.5% (110)]
d. To provide a relatively pressure-free situation for undergraduates to experiment with creative teaching ideas. [NO 66.6% (104), YES 33.3% (52)]
e. Other, please specify. [NO 75% (117), YES 25% (39)]

The "other" category was predominated by goals related to helping undergraduates determine their own vocational goals, screen themselves, and form a commitment to teaching. Assisting teachers, children, and the community are examples of another type of goal frequently mentioned. Confronting schools as a political entity, exploring differentiated staffing patterns, and preparing materials for student teaching are also mentioned as goals for specific Field Experience programs. One obvious purpose of Field Experience also given is to relate theory to practice.

The most frequently agreed-upon goal for Field Experience is to provide pre-student teaching experience (94.2%). This is important to note since this seems to be the only predominant goal for Field Experience among the respondents. Next most agreed-upon goal is to supplement the methods course. This is laudable since traditionally methods courses have been theoretical and abstract, usually lecture in nature, offering no practical opportunity for the undergraduates to either see if the methods work when applied by others or to attempt to apply them themselves.

Interestingly enough, over 66% of the respondents did not aim to provide a relatively pressure-free situation for their undergraduates to experiment with creative teaching ideas. Once student teaching has begun the student is under a tremendous amount of pressure to "succeed," and in many cases failure to adjust to the student teaching situation (no matter how abnormal the particular situation might be) means career failure since the student teacher probably will not get a job. All this pressure during student teaching works against creativity and exploration of one's personal translation of methods expounded by college professors. Yet these educators seemed not to see any great need for the undergraduates to experiment and be creative prior to student teaching, particularly during Field Experiences. This seems counterproductive since the teaching profession is in a state of change and finding new ways of relating to students' needs is the heart of truly good teaching. Yet over 66% of the Field Experience program respondents do not encourage this pressure-free experimentation at perhaps the

only preprofessional level where a nonpunitive situation could be readily structured. If the undergraduates are not encouraged to creatively work out their own teaching philosophy and methods during Field Experience, when will they be able to develop this?

A little over 62% of the respondents use the Field Experience program to screen the prospective teachers. This is nearly the same percentage of those programs which are not designed to be pressure-free, creative situations (66%). This could indicate that if a program is designed to screen out the poor prospective teachers, then the program cannot allow even the very best candidates the freedom to develop their own ideas and practices.

Perhaps a solution to this is the natural self-screening that always occurs because of the concrete exposure to the classroom variables. Even undergraduates who could become effective teachers might decide that this is not the career they prefer. Likewise, an unsuccessful candidate could freely choose, without stigma (and prior to the end of his college training), that he does not prefer to pursue the teaching profession. Screening by the college educators would not be entirely eliminated since student teaching could remain a trial period with its screening functions. Yet, if more Field Experiences were not designed to screen, <u>all</u> the participants in the Field Experience would be provided more freedom to learn.

Question 7. "In what ways are teachers in the schools involved in your Field Experience program?"

a. They provide a class for undergraduates to teach. (NO 25.0% (39), YES 75.0% (117)]

b. They provide students for undergraduates to tutor. [NO 15.4% (24), YES 84.6% (132)]
c. They provide verbal feedback and evaluation on particular lessons. [NO 27.6% (43), YES 72.4% (113)]
d. They help undergraduates plan lessons and activities. [NO 50% (78), YES 50% (78)]
e. They encourage undergraduates. [NO 26.9% (42), YES 73.1% (114)]
f. They grade undergraduates on their teaching or tutoring. [NO 73.07% (114), YES 26.9% (42)]
g. Other, please specify. [NO 78.8% (123), YES 21.2% (33)]

More teachers participate in Field Experience programs by providing students to be tutored (84%) than by providing a class to be taught (75%). These were the top two means of teacher participation in Field Experience programs. Providing feedback (72%) and encouraging undergraduates (73%) were also functions the teachers frequently performed. That sounds good but it is noteworthy that in about 27% of the situations reported on in this study, the teachers neither provide feedback nor do they encourage undergraduates in Field Experience programs. That seems a shame since the classroom teacher is the professional who knows all the public school situation variables the best (including particular student needs and problems) and is perhaps best able to assist the Field Experience participant in at least evaluating his efforts. This low number of teachers who actually provide feedback is even more startling when one realizes that 50% of the teachers do help undergraduates plan lessons and activities. This seems to indicate a lack of professional teacher input during the evaluation stage of each lesson or activity. Regardless of the success level of the instructional activity, much could be gained by careful reflection on the "whys"

of the experience, particularly when the reflection process is assisted by input from an experienced teacher.

In only 26.9% of the programs do teachers actually grade undergraduates on their Field Experience performance. This appears to be a low percentage in relation to the 66.7% of the respondents in question 6 who did not purport to provide a relatively pressure-free Field Experience for undergraduates. The 62.8% who said their program was designed to screen prospective teachers in question 6 must use some means other than, or in addition to, teacher grading to screen their undergraduates since only 26.92% of the programs have a component involving teachers grading undergraduates.

The teachers are involved in the program in several "other" ways in addition to the six functions mentioned in the questionnaire. Frequently they provide classes for undergraduates to observe. Several respondents drew a distinction between grading and evaluation of the undergraduates in Field Experience. The teachers evaluate but do not grade in some programs. A few universities have actually gotten public school teachers involved in teaching methods classes on campus and in planning various types of Field Experience with university faculty members. Teachers do frequently also provide a model and sometimes act as team leader in certain types of programs. One respondent made it clear that, because of the diversity of experiences available in Field Experience, not every function is fulfilled each time by every teacher who participates in Field Experience.

Question 8. "What types of schools do you place your Field Experience undergraduates in?"

a. Public [NO 3.2% (5), YES 96.8% (151)]
b. Private [NO 59.6% (93), YES 40.4% (63)]
c. Parochial [NO 50% (78), YES 50% (78)]
d. University laboratory school [NO 91.7% (143), YES 8.3% (13)]
e. Private free school [NO 85% (134), YES 14.1% (22)]
f. Drop-in center for school drop-outs [NO 87.8% (137), YES 12.2% (19)]
g. Academic interest centers for advanced high schoolers [NO 97.4% (152), YES 2.6% (4)]
h. Other. Please specify. [NO 87.8% (137), YES 12.2% (19)]

The nearly unanimous choice regarding the type of school a Field Experience person is placed in is a public school (96.8%). Parochial and private schools which might be considered overlapping types of schools are used by between 40% and 50% of the universities surveyed. Nearly the least used option is university laboratory school (8.3%). This is perhaps due to the decline of university lab schools in proportion to the number of public schools used for student teaching placement. Although use of a university lab school has certain advantages such as easy access for undergraduates, thereby eliminating transportation problems, it also can be an unrealistic school environment, unlike any regular classroom in the community.

The use of private free schools (14.1%) and drop-in centers for school drop-outs (12.2%), while not frequent, does indicate a flexible program in several instances which provides for not only the "ordinary" types of classroom experiences but also varied classroom settings which attempt to meet felt needs of particular segments of our society's youth.

The most frequently mentioned "other" type of placement was in day care centers, head start, and upward bound classes. Some programs make placements at summer camps, church and civic organizations as well as neighborhood centers. Adult basic education and community education programs are also involved in some Field Experiences. Schools for the handicapped and special education schools also participate. This is particularly good since more and more states are currently passing laws to grant education to the handicapped and most prospective teachers have little or no prior experience with handicapped people and their special learning needs. This type of Field Experience can help prepare undergraduates for the new special education career opportunities or, at the very least, help them decide whether this type of career is appropriate for them.

Question 9. "How are participating teachers selected?"

a. They are recruited from graduate classes. [NO 93.6% (146), YES 6.4% (10)]
b. They are recruited through student teacher placement files. [NO 84.6% (132), YES 15.4% (24)]
c. They volunteer based on information from a letter to the school. [NO 53.8% (84), YES 46.2% (72)]
d. They volunteer based on information from a personal visit by your department representative. [NO 41.7% (65), YES 58.3% (91)]
e. Other, please specify. [NO 66.0% (103), YES 34.0% (53)]

The majority of universities reported that they selected their participating teachers for Field Experience from volunteers who were informed about the program via a personal visit by the university's department representative (58.3%). Letters, rather

than personal visits, provide the information necessary for teacher volunteers to participate in 46.2% of the Field Experience programs. A mere 6.4% of the teachers are recruited from graduate classes. Only 15% recruit through student teacher placement files. This seems to indicate a definite distinction between the Field Experience program and the student teaching program in an overwhelming majority of institutions, a distinction which is probably beneficial since Field Experience programs are not the same as student teaching programs and student teaching program models and restrictions could hamper development of innovative, need-meeting, well-functioning Field Experience programs.

The overwhelming "other" response to question 9 was that principals or school administrators select the participating teachers. Some respondents said teachers volunteer and one said that the teachers "beg for help." In another case, the university coordinator negotiates with the administration of a whole school district so the Field Experience program can operate in a large number of schools. One person said they recruit teachers from a continuing education class while still another said the teachers are identified and recruited by students. All these methods have merit, and some are more suited to a specific university's needs than others. The important fact remains that the flexibility in recruiting teacher participants reflects the variety of programs and individual needs.

Question 10. "Do you compensate participating teachers in any way?"

NO 66.0% (95), YES 34.0% (49). A mere 34% of the Field Experience programs do compensate the participating teachers.

Question 11. "If yes, how?"

a. Money--amount?_____ (NO 87.8%)
b. Released time from teaching. (NO 94.8%)
c. Extra classroom assistance in activities and/or tutoring. (NO 80.7%)
d. A social event such as a dinner. (NO 89.1%)
e. Personal visits from your department representative to thank them. (NO 74.3%)
f. Thank-you letters. (NO 77.5%)
g. Compiled lists of innovative teaching suggestions developed by Field Experience undergraduates, if the teachers want them. (NO 94.2%)
h. Other, please specify. (NO 90.4%)

Generally speaking, the majority of universities do not compensate the school teachers in any way (66.0%). This figure would perhaps have been even higher except question 11 enumerates possible types of compensation including such nonmonetary forms as thank-you letters. Nearly 88% of the universities who do compensate teachers in some way do not compensate teachers with any amount of money. The programs which actually do compensate teachers do not use any particular type of compensation predominantly such as released time from teaching, special dinners, innovative lists of teaching ideas, etc. Any one of these methods is used by on 25% or less of the 34% who said they do compensate teachers. Overall, the very limited compensation pattern displayed here would seem to indicate that teachers are generally not paid for the Field Experience work and often are not remembered in nonmonetary ways. That

could mean that teachers participate for personal reasons such as satisfaction and a sense of professional responsibility to train new teachers. Thus their intrinsic motivation probably is very strong or they would not participate at all.

The few programs that pay teachers generally pay about $40-$60 per quarter. One program that currently pays teachers is moving away from the monetary compensation and is trying to emphasize assistance a Field Experience undergraduate can provide a classroom teacher. Most programs, however, do not perceive the role of the Field Experience student as a mere clerical assistant but do encourage the undergraduate's participation in many phases of classroom involvement.

According to the "other" remarks, several universities give tuition grants to teachers for graduate study as well as faculty identification cards and university library privileges. One provides access to the university curriculum materials center while another sends a newsletter with teaching ideas to the participating teachers. All these serve as a type of compensation to teachers who undertake the responsibility for a Field Experience undergraduate.

Question 12. "Do you have some type of orientation for field experience participants?"

NO 9.21% (13), YES 90.78% (128).

Question 13. "If yes, what does your orientation involve?"

a. A university person on campus explaining to undergraduates what to expect in the schools. [NO 25% (39), YES 75% (117)]

b. Teachers coming to campus for a group meeting with undergraduates. [NO 87.2% (136), YES 12.8% (20)]
c. Undergraduates attending a regular departmental meeting in the school before entering any classrom situation. [NO 80.1% (125), YES 19.9% (31)]
d. Undergraduates attending a special meeting at the school with only those teachers who will participate directly in the Field Experience program. [NO 69.9% (109), YES 30.1% (47)]
e. Undergraduates are expected by the individual classroom teachers and are placed in the classroom immediately upon arrival at the schools and remain with that teacher throughout the Field Experience. [NO 53.8% (84), YES 46.2% (72)]
f. Undergraduates go to their classroom teacher who suggests and arranges observational activities throughout the school as a preliminary to settling into a routine with a particular teacher and set of responsibilities. [NO 67.9% (106), YES 32.0% (50)]
g. Other, please specify. [NO 84.6% (132), YES 15.4% (24)]

Over 90% of the 141 university respondents stated that they had some type of orientation for Field Experience participants. These universities have varying types of orientations, the most frequent method being a university person on campus explaining to the undergraduates what to expect in the schools (75%). This is probably the easiest and cheapest type of orientation since no one has to go out to the schools to actually see the situation or talk to actual teachers. It seems that often this on-campus preparation is accompanied by some other type of orientation.

The second most frequent type of orientation provides really very little preparation. The undergraduates are expected by the individual teachers and are placed in the classroom immediately upon arrival and remain with that teacher throughout the Field Experience (46.2%). Unfortunately, this offers no chance for the

undergraduate to explore the school or talk to the teacher(s) prior to the first classroom contact. It also can cause communication problems between teacher and undergraduate since they have not previously established together the division of responsibilities or exactly what roles they will fulfill in relation to each other and the class.

Thirty-two and one-half percent of the universities do use the orientation procedure in which the undergraduates go to their classroom teacher who suggests and arranges observational activities throughout the school as a preliminary to settling into a routine with a particular teacher and set of responsibilities. This remedies some of the problems of the previously mentioned routine since the undergraduates can get an idea of what is going on and how they fit in before getting into a permanent arrangement.

Nearly as frequently used is the meeting at the school between undergraduates and the Field Experience faculty (30.1%). This provides for communication between teachers and undergraduates but not for observation of classrooms of active students.

The least often used method of orientation is for teachers to come to campus to meet with undergraduates (12.8%). This puts the transportation burden on the teachers and generally means they must give up personal time after all their school duties are finished to attend an on-campus meeting. Since the teachers in most cases are already donating their time and services to the Field Experience program, it seems only natural to make the meetings as convenient as possible for the teachers. Therefore, it is not

surprising that few Field Experience programs require the teachers to come to campus to orient the undergraduates. Besides, it makes a great deal of sense for the undergraduates to become familiar with the school itself.

There were many "other" responses regarding various types of orientation. One of the most original was a slide/tape presentation made by Field Experience students for new Field Experience students to orient them to the program and the schools. Instead of having observation prior to participation in the classroom activities, one program reserves the latter third of the semester for observation on the basis that after one experiences something first hand, one is more able to evaluate and utilize ideas which are subsequently observed. Perhaps the best sequence would be observe, participate, and observe since that would avoid the shock of participation prior to any observation and rumination on the nature of the classroom situation and would also provide the opportunity to seek out other approaches after one realizes what the situation is from first-hand experience.

Several "other" responses indicate that written material serves to orient both students and teachers to the goals and modes of participation available in Field Experience. Often the Field Experience is done in conjunction with a specific university course so the professor does much of the orientation and school contact.

Question 14. "If you do not have orientation, do you think one would be beneficial?"

NO 0% (0), YES 100% (24). It seems that eleven more people without an orientation answered this question than answered the question 12 yes/no part. All of the respondents who have no orientation felt having one would be beneficial.

Question 15. "Does your department have any forum for sharing what is happening in Field Experience at various schools within your program?"

NO 44.4% (64), YES 55.6% (80). It is interesting to note that the majority of university departments do have some forum for sharing information regarding field experience at various schools (55.6%) but a significant minority (44.4%) do not have any mechanism to promote this exchange of ideas. It would seem to be beneficial for undergraduates to learn of experiences others have at different schools so they have a broader perspective than a single experience can directly provide.

Question 16. "Does your department have any person(s) whose specific responsibility is to oversee, supervise, schedule and/or coordinate the Field Experience Program?"

YES 86.4% (133), NO 13.6% (21). The vast majority of Field Experience programs do have a person designated specifically to coordinate Field Experience.

Question 17. "If yes, how many persons are so involved?"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 more than 10

Fifty-four percent had one to two coordinators while 27.4% had three to four coordinators. The frequency dropped considerably as the number of coordinators rose. Ten and three-tenths percent

indicated five to ten coordinators while only 8.1% indicated over ten coordinators. It seems reasonable that the fewer the number of coordinators, the more efficient the operation since fewer faculty members would be paid for these responsibilities and they wouldn't be overlapping in their responsibilities and contacts with the schools.

Question 18. "How is this person(s) funded?"

a. Not funded. [NO 90.4% (141), YES 9.6% (15)]
b. Through regular faculty salary. [NO 26.3% (41), YES 73.7% (115)]
c. Through a graduate assistantship. [NO 87.8% (137), YES 12.2% (19)]
d. Through a special grant. [NO 98.7% (154), YES 1.3% (2)]
e. Given university credits instead of money. [NO 99.4% (155), YES .6% (1)]
f. Counts toward his/her teaching load. [No 79.5% (124), YES 20.5% (32)]
g. Other, please specify. [NO 98.1% (153), YES 1.9% (3)]

Close to ten percent (9.6%) of the Field Experience coordinators are not funded at all. Most of them are funded through a regular faculty salary (73.7%). In only 20.5% of the cases do the supervisory duties count toward the person's teaching load. This seems to indicate that although most of the coordinators are on faculty payrolls, the Field Experience coordination is considered an added responsibility which does not necessarily lighten one's teaching load. It might be possible to conclude from this that most Field Experience coordinators have more responsibilities than other teaching faculty, but that they do not get extra pay for assuming the coordinating responsibilities.

Twelve and seventeen-hundredths percent of the coordinators are funded through a graduate assistantship while an almost negligible number are funded through a special grant (1.3%) or through university credits instead of money (.6%).

One "other" remark indicates that in one program the college, school, and state share the funding responsibility of the Field Experience coordinator. That is great since all the agencies would be highly involved in the program rather than leaving all the responsibility to the university.

Question 19. "What are the responsibilities of this coordinator(s)?"

a. Make arrangements for placing undergraduates with school teachers. [NO 21.2% (33), YES 78.8% (123)]
b. Schedule undergraduates with teachers for appropriate time slots. [NO 40.4% (63), YES 59.6% (93)]
c. Act as an idea-resource person for undergraduates to consult with concerning classroom activities and problems. [NO 50.6% (79), YES 49.4% (77)]
d. Visit the schools involved in the Field Experience Program. [NO 32.0%(50), YES 67.9% (106)]
e. Observe undergraduates while teaching. [NO 57.7% (90), YES 42.3% (66)]
f. Evaluate the undergraduates during Field Experience. [NO 51.9% (81), YES 48.1% (75)]
g. Grade the undergraduates during Field Experience. [NO 65.38% (102), YES 34.6% (54)]
h. Serve as a contact for the teachers, especially when problems arise with particular Field Experience undergraduates. [NO 34.4% (49), YES 68.6% (107)]
i. Other, please specify. [NO 92.9% (145), YES 7.1% (11)]

The most common responsibility for a coordinator is to make arrangements for placing undergraduates with school teachers. Yet only 78.84% of the coordinators were responsible for making placement

arrangements. The figure is lower than one might anticipate. This statistic raises the question of who actually is responsible for making placement arrangements in 21.15% of the university departments responding to the question. One apparent alternative is that the undergraduate himself must make contact with the schools and arrange his own placement. This would seem much less efficient than coordinator placement and would place a greater burden on the public schools and teachers since they would have to respond to literally hundreds of individual calls each grading period just to arrange undergraduate placements alone. It is easy to see why the vast majority of coordinators do take on the placement phase of Field Experience.

The second and third most often engaged in responsibility among coordinators is to serve as a contact for the teachers, especially when problems arise with particular Field Experience undergraduates (68.6%) and to visit the schools involved in the Field Experience program (67.9%). This means that in over 30% of the programs the coordinators never visit the schools nor do they make themselves available to teachers to help with problems that might arise concerning undergraduates in the schools. This could be quite detrimental to the success of these Field Experience programs since the schools cannot be fully in touch with the intimate details of the experimental situation the undergraduates are being sent into and could thus be ineffective in dealing with what is actually happening to the undergraduates during Field Experience. In addition, about the same number of coordinators who do not visit

the schools do not concern themselves with the mundane problems the school personnel face with particular undergraduates. There is a potential for many problems to arise that will not be solved since the coordinator does not function as a liaison-trouble shooter. These problems could severely hamper the future of the Field Experience program (e.g., teachers might refuse to participate again due to an unresolved problem) and, at the very least, the undergraduate's learning experience might be tainted by a problem that could have been resolved if the coordinator had made himself available for consultation when problems arose.

Somewhat over half (59.6%) of the coordinators schedule undergraduates with teachers for appropriate time slots. Since over 78% of the coordinators make placement arrangements and only 59% do specific scheduling, approximately 19% of the coordinators who make general placement arrangements do not actually handle the scheduling of students.

Nearly 50% of the coordinators act as an idea-resouce person for undergraduates to consult with concerning classroom activities and problems. In view of the fact that 68.6% of the coordinators do act in this capacity when teachers have problems with undergraduates, it seems that the undergraduates more frequently have no access to the coordinator regarding a Field Experience problem while teachers have somewhat more access to coordinators regarding a Field Experience problem. This seems a shame since the undergraduate is the inexperienced participant who is most likely to run into problems he cannot handle well without some guidance.

The tempering factor here might be that while the coordinator is not available to the undergraduate, the college instructor might be. This, of course, depends upon the structure of the Field Experience. If the Field Experience is not done in conjunction with a college classroom segment, then the undergraduate may not have anyone except the coordinator to rely on.

Only 34.6% of the coordinators grade their Field Experience participants so the observation of the undergraduates while they teach (12.3%), and the evaluation of undergraduates (48.1%) must not always be associated with grading. This is a positive indication that coordinators are not merely going into the classroom to pass some mysterious, career-sealing final judgment, but they are truly involved in the growth of the undergraduate during Field Experience.

The "other" responses include having the coordinator serve as resource person to the teachers. This would work especially well when the coordinators are based in the public schools. Another role the coordinator assumes is that of counselor of undergraduates regarding graduate schools and career placement. It is evident that the coordinator generally has a vast variety of responsibilities including public relations, placement, and even coordinating federal work/study students in Field Experience placement positions. One university has eight resident supervisors on its staff. They are situated in the schools and direct "Field Study in Education," "Instructional Aide Practicum," and "Planning for Teaching Seminar." This demonstrates a very high level of commitment to Field Experience programs on the part of both the university and the schools.

Question 20. "How many university classes per grading period are coordinated through your Field Experience program?"

0	1.6%
1	13.8%
2	12.2%
3	17.0%
4	5.7%
5	15.4%
6	5.7%
7	3.3%
8	3.3%
9	0.0%
10	4.0%
More than 10	16.3%

Either a Field Experience program coordinates more than ten classes per grading period (16.3%) or it coordinates under five classes generally. The most frequent number of classes coordinated at one time is three (17%). Next most frequent is five (15.4%) and then one (13.8%).

Question 21. "Approximately how many undergraduates do you handle in your Field Experience program in one university grading period?"

1-5	4.0%	
6-10	5.3%	
11-15	4.0%	
16-20	4.6%	
21-25	5.3%	1-50 = 37.7%
26-30	4.6%	
31-35	1.3%	
36-40	4.6%	
41-45	0.0%	
46-50	4.0%	
51-60	2.6%	
61-70	2.6%	
71-80	6.0%	51-100 = 19.8%
81-90	3.3%	
91-100	5.3%	
101-125	6.0%	
125-150	7.9%	101 and up = 42.4%
More than 151	28.5%	

Thirty-seven percent of the programs coordinate between one and fifty students. Only 19.8% coordinate 51 to 100 students. These two groups comprise 57.5% of the respondents; the remainder of the programs assist over 100 students per grading period.

Question 22. "Do undergraduates receive university credit for Field Experience?"

NO 29.7%, YES 70.3%.

Question 23. "If yes, are they semester or quarter credits?"

a.	Semester	YES 70.4% (76)
b.	Quarter	YES 25.9%
c.	Other	Yes 3.7%

Approximately 70% of the university departments offering Field Experience offer university credit to the participating undergraduate. A majority of the Field Experience programs offered for credit are run on a semester (70.4%) rather than a quarter basis (25.9%). That seems to indicate that the length of the majority of Field Experiences is a semester, which affords more time for the continuous school contact than does a quarter.

The "other" comments reveal that credit is given for the course which requires Field Experience as a component, but that generally Field Experience is not an independent activity for which university credit is given.

Question 24. "How many credits do undergraduates receive during a grading period?"

0	3.6%
1	4.8%

2	17.8%
3	21.4% = 65.4%
4	26.2%
5	8.3%
6	3.6%
7	7.1%
8	0.0%
9	3.6%
10	1.2%
More than 10	2.4%

Sixty-five and four-tenths percent of the Field Experience programs offered between two and four credits per term. A few offered no credit (3.6%) and a few offered more than ten credits (2.4%). The small percentage receiving zero credits (3.6%) does not square with the results in question 22 which indicate that 29.7% of the programs do not offer university credit for Field Experience. The only explanation which presents itself is that those respondents who answered "no" to question 22 did not respond to question 24, probably because they felt that number 24, like 23, was meant only for those programs which do offer credit.

> Question 25. "If the number of credits is variable, please explain how you determine the number of credits. For example, four hours per week in the school might be worth 1 credit while ten hours per week might be worth 4 credits."

The explanations given are so diverse that it suffices to say that credit is given on a variable basis. Some classes require a specific number of contact hours before a course grade is given. In other cases, the undergraduates must participate in a certain number of instructional activities which are specified in contract form. The diversity of the credit requirements is a healthy indicator that flexibility to meet undergraduate needs is available.

Question 26. "How often do the undergraduates participate in the schools?"

a.	Once a month.	2.6%
b.	Twice a month.	1.3%
c.	Once a week.	34.0%
d.	Twice a week.	27.6%
e.	Daily	34.6%
f.	Other, please specify.	0.0%

One hundred fifty-six people responded to this question. Daily at 34.6% is the most often used category of participation in the schools with once a week running a very close second at 34%. Twice a week at 27.6% is also a very common frequency.

Once a month (2.6%) and twice a month (1.3%) are not the preferred participation frequencies. This is probably due to the fact that for the most benefit to be derived, the undergraduate needs the most exposure to the school situation and the students he works with. The daily contact allows the Field Experience participant to see the same students day after day and to observe their response patterns in a way which weekly or monthly visits could never provide. For example, if an undergraduate worked in the school every Monday morning, he would not have the experience of seeing how the students act and respond on Friday morning. As every teacher knows, there can be quite a difference from day to day as well as week to week and particularly prior to holidays.

Question 27. "How many hours per week do the Field Experience undergraduates participate in the schools?"

0	0%
1/2	0%
1	3.5%

2	16.5%
3	19.5% = 52.5%
4	16.5%
5	9.6%
6	10.4%
7	1.7%
8	0.9%
9	3.5%
10	1.7%
11-15	4.3%
16-20	3.5%
More than 20	8.7%

Fifty-two and five-tenths percent of the programs involve between two and four hours per week participation of the schools. Another 20% involve five or six hours per week. Over 8% of the programs included more than twenty hours per week in the schools. That is a substantial percentage of programs requiring over twenty hours per week since Field Experience by definition in this study is distinct from student teaching programs which are often full-time in the school.

Question 28. "May a student enroll for Field Experience more than once?"

NO 35.7%, YES 64.3%. Not quite twice as many departments allow a student to enroll for Field Experience repeatedly as those which do not permit re-enrollment. Probably it is beneficial to be able to re-enroll since each different placement in each different school with each different teacher will provide more learning experiences for the undergraduate.

Question 29. "May a graduate student enroll for Field Experience?"

NO 38.8%, YES 61.2%. Far more departments allow graduate students to enroll for Field Experience (61.2%) than those which do not allow them to enroll (38.8%). If a graduate student intends to teach in the schools after his graduate work is completed, it is beneficial for him to be able to keep in contact with the age-level and school situation he wants to teach in later. The Field Experience can be the basis for contacts with programs and types of schools the graduate student may never have considered teaching in prior to his exposure. It is commendable that well over half the Field Experience programs reported on here do provide for graduate student enrollments.

Evaluation of Field Experience

Question 30. "Do you conduct a formal evaluation of your Field Experience Program?"

NO 3917%, YES 60.3%.

Question 31. "If yes, how often?"

a.	Every term.	YES 74.5%
b.	Once a year.	YES 20.2%
c.	Once every two years.	YES 1.1%
d.	Other, please specify.	YES 4.2%

There were 94 respondents to question 31. Approximately three-fourths of them evaluate the program every term (74.5%) while another 20.2% evaluate annually. So, approximately 90% of the programs that do evaluate do so once a year or more. There are,

however, 39.7% of the total number of respondents who report no evaluation component in their program at all.

The "other" response indicates continuous evaluation and often informal evaluation based on verbal feedback to the professors involved.

> Question 32. "How does your department evaluate your Field Experience Program?"
>
> a. Coordinator(s) make a report. YES 46.8%
> b. The cooperating teachers fill out evaluation questionnaires. YES 55.1%
> c. The undergraduates fill out evaluation questionnaires. YES 59.6%
> d. The school students fill out evaluation questionnaires. YES 8.3%
> e. Professors involved in the program fill out evaluation questionnaires. YES 25.6%
> f. There is a large evaluation meeting for undergraduates, teachers, professors, and coordinator(s) to air opinions of Field Experience. YES 13.5%
> g. Other, please specify. YES 13.5%

Since there were 347 responses to the various choices in question 32, it is apparent that people answered more than one way, which is entirely appropriate since several, if not all, their evaluation procedures could be used simultaneously to evaluate a given program.

The most often used method of evaluation is to have undergraduates fill out evaluation questionnaires (59.6%). Nearly as frequently used is the method of having teachers fill out questionnaires (55.1%). A report from the coordinator(s) is used in 46.8% of the departments. In comparatively few programs is the large evaluation meeting procedure used (13.5%). This is probably due to

the difficulties encountered when an attempt is made to get a large group of people who work in different areas of a city together physically for a meeting which the participants are not paid for nor required to attend.

In only 8.3% of the cases do the school students participate in the Field Experience Program evaluation procedure by filling out questionnaires. While it is true that the students can tell whether they learned from or enjoyed a particular experience with an undergraduate, the school students do not know the value of the Field Experience program in the development of skilled undergraduate prospective teachers.

"Other" responses involve verbal feedback, informal discussion among staff, meetings between teachers and professors, a written coordinator's report, student-kept logs of hours and activities, student description and evaluation of experiences, and weekly meetings of the university staff involved in the Field Experience program. Again, not all of these are used in any one program but several methods are often used in a single program.

Question 33. "To what extent does your Field Experience Program meet the needs of your undergraduates?"

a.	Completely.	YES 1.3%
b.	To a large extent.	YES 59.2%
c.	Somewhat.	YES 36.9%
d.	Other, please specify.	YES 2.5%

One hundred fifty-seven responses were made to this question. Of course, all the responses to this question are subjective, but it is interesting that even 1.3% felt their program completely

meets the needs of their undergraduates. The vast majority (59.2%) felt that their programs meet the needs to a large extent. This shows quite a high level of satisfaction on the respondents' part. Nearly 37% felt their program somewhat met the needs. No one responded to the "not at all" category which shows that any program is an improvement over no program, in the respondents' estimation.

A constant need to improve the program and make the Field Experience compulsory in one year are the two "other" comments regarding the success of the programs.

> Question 34. "How do you account for the degree of success you judge your program to be having?"

The overwhelming response to this question was that the field experience was relevant to the undergraduate's needs since it allowed an opportunity to put theory into practice. Other types of responses related to this main one such as, the undergraduates are highly motivated. Also, a dedicated staff and fine professional teachers who were willing to participate in Field Experience programs were credited with some of the success of various programs. At times, emphasis was placed on the strictly volunteer nature of Field Experience. Hence, unmotivated undergraduates and teachers do not participate so those who choose to work at it are highly motivated.

An all around explanation of success was: "Students want to do it, schools et al. need them, professors are willing to volunteer their time."

Financial backing from the university and much experience at running Field Experience programs were mentioned by one respondent.

Another respondent explained it this way: Field Experience "provides for reality testing for career choice and allows students to approach other parts of teacher education program with sounder interest and goals." It is exactly this much needed concretization of goals and theory that Field Experience can provide.

Question 35. "What are the primary virtues of your Field Experience Program?"

a. Exposure of undergraduates to teaching. YES 95.5%
b. Well-organized. YES 31.2%
c. Well-supervised. YES 31.4%
d. Provides contact between schools and university so ideas are shared. YES 65.4%
e. Other, please specify. YES 7.7%

One hundred fifty-six responses were made to this question. The 95% response of success being due to the exposure of undergraduates to teaching is the highest. The sharing of ideas between the schools and the university is credited for Field Experience success by 65.4%. Good organization and supervision were both credited in slightly over 30% of the responses.

Several respondents mentioned in the "other" category that the program's virtue is that it allows self-selection regarding careers in teaching. The program also builds rapport between the university and the community. And, of course, when the undergraduates are in the schools they are able to form relationships with people who might provide job contacts when the time comes. All

these are virtues of the Field Experience program in addition to the insight and skill building that occurs while the undergraduates participate in observational and instructional activities in the schools.

Question 36. "What types of Field Experience problems have you encountered?"

a. Transportation of undergraduates to and from schools. YES 62.8%
b. Lack of time for teacher feedback to undergraduates. YES 53.8%
c. Some teachers are unable to relinquish control of class so field experience undergraduates can try their own ideas. YES 41.0%
d. Lack of communication between teachers and the university concerning problems encountered with Field Experience undergraduates. YES 33.9%
e. Student absence limits tutorial contact. YES 15.4%
f. Undergraduates and/or teachers do not know what to do. YES 20.5%
g. Other, please specify. YES 12.2%

Transportation of undergraduates to and from schools seems to be the most frequent problem of Field Experience (62.8% of the 156 responses to this question). It is not a simple problem since so many people going to so many schools on different days are difficult to transport. Possibly a bus would help but if the route got too long, scheduling would become a terrible concern since the undergraduates intersperse classes on campus with their Field Experience time commitments. At Michigan State University there is an office of volunteer programs which has a university van available to transport those in need. That helps alleviate the transportation crunch but does not solve it entirely.

The second most frequent Field Experience problem is lack of time for teacher feedback to undergraduates (53.8%). This is critical since public school teachers have so many classes scheduled consecutively that unless undergraduates happened to have the class prior to the teacher's planning period, they would not have more than five minutes to discuss the day's experiences. Much learning occurs during the feedback and discussion and often many anxieties and fears are alleviated when the teacher can suggest alternative ways of handling a situation.

Some teachers are unable to relinquish control of the class so the Field Experience undergraduates can try their own ideas. This is a problem in 41% of the programs reporting here. The one sure-fire method of overcoming this problem is to have the teachers agree in advance to leave the room and not return until it is time for the next class. In order for this to work, the undergraduate(s) who is assuming responsibility for the class should have prior experience with a teacher present. Not all undergraduates can or want to assume full responsibility for the class.

Lack of communication between teachers and the university concerning problems encountered with Field Experience undergraduates is a problem in 33.9% of the Field Experience programs. This type of problem has to be tackled by the university coordinator. He must make routine contacts both by phone and in person with the teachers as well as the undergraduates. He must make himself available so that when a problem arises, a communication channel has already been established and the necessary information will be

transmitted rather than held back in frustrated silence. Sometimes the best way to get at a solution to the problem is to have all the individuals involved sit down and discuss the situation and recommend solutions that could be tried. At least airing the problem relieves much of the tension generally. That way the student can learn in a more relaxed atmosphere and the teacher will not be hostile toward the Field Experience program.

Twenty percent of the programs experienced problems concerning the teachers or the undergraduates not knowing what to do. This can be alleviated through a good pre-placement orientation involving the teachers, undergraduates and university instructors (not necessarily all at once). This is the time to explain what is to be done and what the Field Experience program is trying to achieve. As follow-up, the coordinator and/or the university instructors must make themselves available for consultation so if an undergraduate or a teacher does not understand what to do next, some guidance is available. The Task Pack (see Appendix C) can also help by providing a suggested list of specific activities the undergraduate discusses with the teacher and agrees to complete.

Student absence limiting tutorial contact is a problem in 15.4% of the programs. There is very little that can be done to improve attendance records of public school students. Possibly scheduling tutoring for several times a week instead of once a week would help since the student would likely be there for at least one of the sessions and the tutor could build a better rapport with him, and that relationship would perhaps motivate the student to

attend school for his tutoring sessions. Sometimes the attendance situation is completely out of the control of any school personnel. It might be helpful to have a back-up assignment where a tutor tutors more than one student per week and if one is absent, he can tutor the other and then perhaps spend any extra time visiting areas of the school such as the library to acquaint himself with the students, teachers, facilities, and materials as much as possible.

Problems in Field Experience can be viewed as opportunities, particularly opportunities to strengthen the ties between the university and the school and to allow undergraduates to grow and learn to handle every day conflicts and to know when to turn to another for help.

"Other" problems include administrative delays in placing students, Field Experience not always being related to the teaching field the undergraduate is preparing for (this might be particularly true in community organization placements), and standardization of experience for all. Coordinating the requirements given by the cooperating teacher, resident supervisor and the psychology professors caused some problems in one case. Also, some teachers seem to be afraid of college students, and they cannot explain or justify some of their actions or methods to the undergraduates. In all cases, the problems are related to how to best implement Field Experience learning and, regardless of problems, there seems to be agreement that the mere exposure to students in classroom situations and outside of school situations does increase the prospective teachers' knowledge of aspects of teaching. The problem lies with

how to best implement Field Experience so the undergraduates get the most possible from the experience.

Question 37. "What steps are you taking to deal with your main Field Experience Problems?"

Overwhelmingly, the most frequent responses concerning steps being taken to deal with Field Experience problems suggest that more communication, contact, and meetings between all three parties involved in Field Experience is vital. Often this is done by increasing supervisory time (and sometimes personnel) so that more supervision is provided. Sometimes it is done by having the undergraduates remain after school to meet with teachers.

The next most frequent response deals with the transportation of undergraduates to public schools. Many departments are organizing car pools and some are limiting placement to schools near the university.

Only one response dealt with money as a problem. That department was searching for funds from foundations. Most of the other respondents felt communication was the largest obstacle they were trying to surmount.

Many left this answer space blank. A few boldly said they were "hoping" or "doing nothing" about their problems. Two were trying to computerize their program, and several were attempting to "meet the needs of all students" via flexibility in their programs.

On-going evaluation and advising of undergraduates as well as detailed orientation sessions for undergraduates and teachers seem to help alleviate confusion during Field Experience.

One respondent thinks public relations is the key to overcoming Field Experience problems. This person also wants a university-wide coordinator for all Field Experience from business to bank interns to social workers.

Some mirth was introduced by the response "Quiet, patient coercion." It would be interesting to have more details on this approach to problem solving.

And one very flattering response was "Studying Field Experience Questionnaires!!!"

So everything from nothing to increased communications to car pools to patient coercion is being employed to deal with various Field Experience problems.

> Question 38. "Does your department use any forms for evaluation of Field Experience?"
>
> NO 48.6%, YES 51.4%.

> Question 39. "If yes, please attach copies of any forms you have available when you return this questionnaire. Thank you."

Slightly over half the programs do use forms in their evaluation but far fewer than that returned any forms. The forms generally are designed to help the teacher evaluate the undergraduate's performance and potential as a teacher. They pose questions similar to those on student teaching evaluation forms such as rating how well the person knew the subject matter, related to the class, controlled himself, etc. One form has three recommendation choices at the bottom: "(1) Recommend that the student progress to the next

level of teacher preparation. (2) Recommend that he be given more exposure and experience in particular types of situations to help him develop certain limited skills. (3) Recommend that he be given career counseling at the university placement bureau so he can pursue some other career." The evaluation forms merely formalized the informal process which is ongoing in Field Experience developing of skills and insights related to teaching.

> Question 40. "Do you intend to implement any program variations in Field Experience in the near future? For example, setting up a reading and writing center at a local school where one university class prepares materials and supervises the exciting learning activities that the students participate in; or working directly through school reading centers to enable Field Experience undergraduates interested in reading problems to work in close contact with a reading specialist rather than a classroom teacher, etc.

Slightly under half (48.9%) of the respondents indicated that they intend to implement program variations in Field Experience. It is just such people who can best benefit from the wealth of material in this study.

> Question 41. "Please describe the proposed changes in your Field Experience Program in as much detail as possible."

This question elicited essay responses from a number of people. Various types of changes were described.

A few respondents indicated that they planned to have Field Experience during the university interim period which generally ranged from three to four weeks. This opportunity could be utilized by the undergraduates to get involved with an entirely different

type of school environment than he had previous contact with, perhaps rural or urban. One university even arranged special dorm space near inner city areas so undergraduates could obtain experience in these locations.

Several universities planned to expand Field Experience to other departments within the university such as art education, children's literature, business, social work, and reading. This might also involve undergraduate placement in local agencies other than schools.

A few universities stated they were moving toward competency-based teacher education with individualized experiences in Field Experience. Perhaps this would culminate in a full year internship in the final year.

It is interesting that while most Field Experience programs are becoming more structured, formalized and available for credit, one university is attempting to discontinue the credit Field Experience and go to a completely volunteer program which would not be so costly to undergraduates. This might be beneficial, but it could lead to reduced levels of commitment from the undergraduates who have less at stake in a volunteer program. Also, it might reduce the level of supervision from the university, thus limiting the effectiveness of the training the participants receive.

Basically, the general directions of Field Experience development are (1) toward more and more particpation "on location" in the public schools, even to the point of teaching educational methods classes and seminars in the public schools, and (2) toward

involving undergraduates earlier and more extensively in the Field Experience program.

> Question 42. "Would you be interested in receiving a monograph which deals with Field Experience Programs in universities throughout the United States when it is made available?"

Respondents nearly unanimously (98.8%) desired a monograph regarding Field Experience Programs at universities throughout the United States. There is a high level of interest in developing Field Experience programs as evidenced by the high level of positive response to this question and the high level of response to the questionnaire in general. Field Experience fills a need in the undergraduate's training program and simultaneously draws universities and schools into a closer mutual understanding.

Success Ratings of Field Experience Programs Analyzed in Conjunction With Other Variables in the Questionnaire

Certainly, any information from this study which helps illuminate why a given Field Experience program is a success could be very useful to others developing Field Experience programs. Question 33, "To what extent does your Field Experience program meet the needs of your undergraduates?" can help ascertain which components of a Field Experience program are statistically significant in relation to the success in meeting undergraduates' needs. The first answer, "a. Completely," shows a very high success rating of the respondents' Field Experience programs. Only 1.3% of the respondents said their programs completely met their undergraduates'

needs. Response 33a showed statistical significance with two items on the questionnaire: 35b, "The Field Experience program is well-organized," and 35c, "It is well-supervised." It appears that organization and supervision are the most important factors in a successful Field Experience program. Not even frequency of contact with the schools surpasses organization and supervision as key items in the program's success.

Response 33b which indicated that programs met undergraduates' needs "To a large extent" was chosen by 59.2% of the respondents. Twelve factors showed statistical significance when analyzed in relation to 33b.

Question 20 referring to the number of classes coordinated per grading period was statistically significant for those responding "To a large extent" on number 33. Three classes per grading period was the most frequent response to question 20.

Daily participation in the schools (26e) was highly statistically significant with 33b. This probably could be due to the continuous exposure the undergraduates have to the classroom situation. They have more learning opportunities and get to know the students better when they attend daily rather than periodically.

Question 33b is also statistically significant in relation to response 30 which reveals 60.3% of the programs conducting a formal evaluation of Field Experience. This demonstrates a high level of program sophistication since neophyte programs generally are struggling with more basic problems than that of formalized evaluation.

Responses 31a and 31b also are statistically significant in relation to number 33b. Formal Field Experience evaluation is conducted every term and once a year, according to these responses. This frequency of evaluation seems related to the success of a program at meeting undergraduates' needs.

Having cooperating teachers fill out evaluation questionnaires (32b) and holding a large evaluation meeting for undergraduates, teachers, professors, and coordinators to air opinions on Field Experience (32f) are also statistically significant in relation to 33b.

All the primary virtues which are listed in question 35 were statistically significant in relation to 33b. The virtues are "a. Exposure of undergraduates to teaching; b. Well-organized; c. Well supervised; d. Provides contact between schools and university so ideas are shared." All of these appear to play some part in the success of a program.

The last question which is statistically significant in relation to 33b is number 38, "Does your department use any forms for evaluation of Field Experience?" Fifty-one and four-tenths percent do use forms. Apparently the use of evaluation forms is related to program success.

To summarize, of all these factors, organization and supervision seem to be the most influential in relation to a Field Experience program's success. Daily participation in the schools is also positive as are frequency of evaluation, type of evaluation, and forms for evaluation. No longer is it sufficient to

laugh off the ivory tower image that universities have engendered of themselves in public schools. University personnel are working hard to bring reality into the theory of teacher education via Field Experience.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTED MODEL OF FIELD EXPERIENCE

The attitudinal survey and Field Experience questionnaire have revealed and verified some very basic and significant points. The attitudinal survey established that undergraduates' attitudes are changed due to Field Experience. Some undergraduates came to the realization that they don't want to teach as a career while others are more interested in teaching. Their specific ideas on some school-related items changed considerably.

The questionnaires, besides providing a wealth of information on the nature and components of existing Field Experience programs, also provides information regarding which factors are correlated with Field Experience success in meeting undergraduates' needs. The two factors most important to success are organization of the Field Experience and supervision of the program and undergraduates. All of this information leads to my offering some basic approaches and models of Field Experience which offer guidance for those colleges and universities which want to establish or revitalize a Field Experience program.

There are two basic approaches that people who direct Field Experience take regarding the student preparation and function of

Field Experience. These two stances were articulated at the 1973 convening of the Society for Field Experience Education in East Lansing, Michigan. One philosophy is that the Field Experience participant should be highly skilled and trained in the university classroom and only sent out to agencies in the "real world" as the culmination of his educational process during his senior year. The proponents of this approach boast of their highly skilled superstars who do a splendid job during their Field Experience. Because the students already have unique skills before they start Field Experience, the Field Experience coordinator has no difficulty placing them. After all, these students are the "cream of the crop" and have much to offer in the field. Unfortunately, since all their training has been theoretical and untested by the realities of compromise and physical demands in the non-academic realm, these undergraduates may at this late stage in their training realize how woefully unprepared they are to meet the actual job demands, or they might realize they do not really <u>like</u> this type of career. Even if the superstars triumph, what of the merely above-average student who finds himself unprepared to cope in the Field Experience situation at this level? Is he to be labeled a failure and forever doomed by a poor Field Experience evaluation when he never really had an opportunity to develop the skills necessary to cope in the non-university environment?

The other basic approach to student preparation and the function of Field Experience is that Field Experience itself is a continuous learning experience and that a person does not

necessarily know everything about the job before he undertakes it, but with supervision and individual pacing, he can develop coping skills better when in the field than by hearing isolated theory lectures in a university classroom. This approach necessitates long-range, continuous exposure to Field Experience situations which are not overwhelming but which do provide a testing ground for the undergraduates' ideas. Since, in the previous chapter, question 41 revealed that most Field Experience programs were progressing toward earlier and more in-depth preparation via Field Experience, they seem to support this second approach to Field Experience.

The model which can be drawn from this study is one which involves the undergraduate in Field Experience starting in his freshman year and continuing through his senior year. Of course, the senior is more skilled than the freshman due to his experience and education. To alleviate the pressure on the less skilled, this model calls for predominantly observational activities during the first Field Experience contacts. The undergraduate can get to know the students, teacher, administrators, and school environment during his freshman Field Experience. He can perform helpful gestures in the classroom such as assisting with paperwork and mechanical operations. This initial exposure should help the undergraduate decide if this is the type of career environment he wants to pursue. The task pack, a long list of things to do to get acquainted with a school and its people, is a useful tool (see Appendix C). The university supervisor can compose the tasks and the undergraduates choose which they will do and then get the signature of the public

school teacher as a contract for the undergraduate. This also helps alleviate misunderstandings between the undergraduate and teacher concerning the undergraduate's role in the classroom.

The next level of Field Experience is tutoring either individuals or small groups. This often isolates the Field Experience participant from the classroom environment so it is necessary that he already have had sufficient exposure to it to understand the context his tutoring occurs in. The tutoring is easier than whole class instruction because of the close relationship between the undergraduate and the student. Since there are virtually no discipline problems involved in tutoring, the undergraduate can concentrate on developing his ability to find good materials and use them effectively.

The third step in the continuum of Field Experience is whole class instruction. The number of things to coordinate simultaneously while conducting a class discussion, for example, is overwhelming at first. Still, many undergraduates are unaware of how skilled a teacher must be to direct an activity until they try to do it themselves. This also gives a good opportunity to deal with discipline problems. At some point in the whole class experience, the supervising teacher should leave the room and give complete authority to the undergraduate. Otherwise, the undergraduate will not know for certain that he is in charge and that the students are responding to him, not the regular teacher.

Throughout the continuum of Field Experiences, it is essential that the undergraduates have a university supervisor to act as

resource person and helper. If the university supervisor is located in the public school, so much the better. The important thing is that the Field Experience participants feel supported and that they have opportunities for input such as seminars and even theoretical discussions. The beauty of the Field Experience program is not to throw undergraduates into a sink-or-swim survival situation but to provide them with enough structure and experiences so they can develop their own skills and style of teaching. This continuous, developmental approach to Field Experience is very desirable according to both the attitudinal survey and the questionnaire responses examined in the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Collier, Richard E. Internships in Teacher Education 47th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association for Student Teaching of the National Education Association, 1968.

Flanders, Ned A. "Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Education." In Theoretical Bases for Professional Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education 44th Yearbook, pp. 68-91. Normal, Ill.: The Association for Student Teaching of the National Education Association, 1965.

Gonzales, Charles. "Student Power and Education of Teachers." In Teacher Education: Future Directions, pp. 61-79. Edited by Margaret Lindsey. Washington, D.C.: A Report of the 50th Annual Conference of the Association for Student Teaching, 1970.

Stratemeyer, Florence, and Lindsey, Margaret. Working With Student Teachers. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1958.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

PARTICIPANTS: POST-TEST

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE PARTICIPANTS: POST-TEST

Name_____

School Assigned to_____

Class Enrolled in_____

Directions: Circle SA if you strongly agree with the statement.
Circle A if you agree with the statement.
Circle N if you neither agree nor disagree.
Circle D if you disagree with the statement.
Circle SD if you strongly disagree with the statement.

1. Now that I have had Field Experience, I feel much less apprehensive about teaching.
   SA A N D SD

2. Finding interesting materials to use with the students during Field Experience was difficult.
   SA A N D SD

3. My supervising teacher was very cooperative.
   SA A N D SD

4. Behavior and discipline were a major problem in my Field Experience teaching.
   SA A N D SD

5. My supervising teacher in the school had almost no time to discuss the experiences I encountered during Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

6. I wanted my supervising teacher to tell me exactly what to do each time I was there.
   SA A N D SD

7. The students generally responded favorably to my teaching during Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

9. I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

10. The amount of time Field Experience requires will tax me throughout the term.
   SA A N D SD

11. I generally know what I am supposed to be doing during Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

12. There is no one I can turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

13. There are many nonteaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paper work, etc., which sap a teacher's time and energy.
   SA A N D SD

14. Teachers do not have time to get to know each public school student individually.
   SA A N D SD

15. Schools have changed very much since I was in high school.
   SA A N D SD

16. High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age.
   SA A N D SD

17. The students who are good memorizers will get the best grades.
   SA A N D SD

18. English teachers generally have free and unrestricted choice in what material they will teach.
   SA A N D SD

19. There is no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for classes.
   SA A N D SD

20. A quiet classroom is good because more learning will occur in a quiet setting than in a noisy one.
   SA A N D SD

21. What is taught in the classroom is most likely irrelevant to the personal needs of the students.
   SA A N D SD

22. Classes in the public school are mostly lecture in nature.
SA A N D SD

23. Lecture type classes are the best.
SA A N D SD

24. Composition classes in the public school strive for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing.
SA A N D SD

What, if anything, do you expect to learn in Field Experience? Be specific.

(Use the space here to answer this last question. If needed, the back is also available.)

8. I feel enthusiastic about Field Experience.
   SA A N D SD

9. The amount of time Field Experience required taxed me throughout the term.
   SA A N D SD

10. I generally knew what I was supposed to be doing during Field Experience.
    SA A N D SD

11. There was no one I could turn to for ideas and support during Field Experience.
    SA A N D SD

12. There were many nonteaching demands like study hall supervision, lunchroom supervision, office paper work, etc., which sapped my teaching supervisor's time and energy.
    SA A N D SD

13. The teachers I observed did not have enough time to get to know each pupil in their classrooms individually.
    SA A N D SD

14. I think schools have changed very much since I was in high school.
    SA A N D SD

15. High school students are much more socially and politically aware than I was at that age.
    SA A N D SD

16. The students who were good memorizers got the best grades in the school I did my Field Experience in.
    SA A N D SD

17. The English teachers in the school I was assigned to generally had free and unrestricted choice of what material they teach.
    SA A N D SD

18. As far as I know there is currently no person or committee which passes judgment on the teacher's literature selection for classes.
    SA A N D SD

19. A quiet classroom is good because more learning occurred in a quiet setting than a noisy one.
    SA A N D SD

20. What was taught in the classroom(s) I observed was most likely irrelevant to the personal needs of the students.
SA A N D SD

21. Classes I observed in the school were mostly lecture in nature.
SA A N D SD

22. Lecture type classes are the best for educating junior and senior high school students.
SA A N D SD

23. Composition classes in the school I did my Field Experience in strived for expository proficiency, not enjoyment of writing.
SA A N D SD

24. What, if anything, did you learn in Field Experience? Be specific. (What surprised you, shocked you, interested you, etc.) If you need more space to answer this question, use the back.

APPENDIX C

FIELD EXPERIENCE TASK PACK

APPENDIX C

FIELD EXPERIENCE TASK PACK

Michigan State University
Department of English

To the Student: This "Task Pack" contains a list of more than fifty activities that are appropriate for Field Experience work. They range widely in complexity and topic, from observing classes to teaching them, from assigning compositions to inspecting reading tests. Read through the Task Pack and check off about twenty activities which you would find interesting and profitable. If you haven't done Field Experience before, you may want to concentrate on observation or small group activities; if you have been in the program before, you may prefer more direct involvement. If you have ideas that aren't listed here, add them at the end.

When you have been assigned to a teacher, show him or her your list. The teacher, in turn, will tell you which of the activities are most appropriate or suitable for this particular situation. The two of you should work out a mutually acceptable list of tasks and make a tentative sequence for your participation in the class.

The activities are "inquiry oriented," designed to help you raise and seek answers to all manner of questions about the way schools and teaching work. Use your Field Experience Journal to report your "findings" and to raise further questions.

Above all, the Task Pack is meant to be used flexibly. Teachers and students should feel free to modify their plans as often as necessary as circumstances, interests, and possibilities change.

_____ Interview several students about their experiences with and attitudes toward writing. What kinds of writing do they like to do? Are they more interested in non-print media like film and television?

_____ Interview several teachers about the writing programs they teach. How often do they ask kids to write? On what topics? How do teachers evaluate and grade themes? Do they ask for revisions?

_____ Observe how teachers open lessons. What happens in the first few minutes of the classes you observe? Which approaches seem most successful?

_____ Observe the teacher/class interaction pattern. What kinds of questions does the teacher ask? What questions promote the best discussions? Whic don't work? Which kids answer? Can you detect a flow of conversation in the class?

_____ Check out the room environment in several classes. In what ways is it (or isn't it) conducive to learning? Make a list of inexpensive ways of improving the institutional environment.

_____ Make an informal study of the resources available to the English teacher. Look for A-V equipment, learning centers, resource centers, discarded materials. Also look for neglected sources, like the band room, the art room, or the shop.

_____ Visit the school library and talk to the librarian. What range of books is available? How large is the book budget? How does the librarian make selections? (Also talk with some kids and find out what they're doing there.)

_____ Find out who is in charge of discipline in the school and have a talk with him or her. (It's usually an assistant principal.) Find out about discipline problems and the way they're handled. What is the attitude toward teachers who have problems of this sort.

_____ Visit a local library or the State of Michigan library and study what is available for 13-18 year olds. How does the attitude and tone of the public library differ from school libraries?

_____ Interview the department chairman of the school and find out how the English department works. How often does it meet? For what purposes? Does it control the curriculum?

_____ Where do lists of approved and "disapproved" books originate in your school? How can a teacher get approval for a new book? To what extent does censorship seem to be a problem? Do teachers worry about parental protests?

_____ Interview several teachers about the fine art of lesson planning (and the making of lesson plans). How do teachers plan? Do they write down their ideas? In what forms? Are they required to submit plan books at any time? To whom?

_____ Read a story to a small group or to a class and have them write a sequel using the same characters.

_____ Bring in examples of haiku or fables and have the group read and discuss how they are different from other literature. Encourage them to try writing these forms. These can be collected and dittoed as a poetry book.

_____ Encourage students to share something they have written with a larger group. How can you help kids overcome the inhibitions often associated with sharing?

_____ Ask students to keep a dream journal and bring it to your meeting with them. Discuss some of the entries (if the students don't mind).

_____ Play some background music and let students do free writing that follows the mood.

_____ Encourage a group to write a drama and then act it out, or have another group act it out. Alternatively, have a group do a dramatic reading into a tape recorder to be played back for themselves or others in the class.

_____ After collecting some writing from a class, staple a blank sheet of paper to each piece and pass them around for other students to write comments. (Proceed cautiously lest some kids just fool around or write clever, but irrelevant graffiti). Study the kinds of comments the kids make. How do they differ from what you as a teacher would say? Make certain the kids get their papers back.

_____ Set up the mechanism for an in-class newspaper. Everyone can contribute articles and ads, or help ditto and distribute the paper.

_____ If enough interest exists, help the students form a poetry club that can continue even after you leave the school for the quarter.

_____ Help students edit and revise some of their written work. Figure out for yourself what kinds of comments do and do not prove helpful to young writers.

_____ Have a group write a magazine for the class. Use the format of a well-known national magazine. This can be straight or satirical.

_____ Discuss how people speak differently to different individuals and groups. Help the students learn to observe these natural shifts in tone and rhetoric in their own and others' speech.

_____ Encourage media participation by helping the class produce a movie. The students can write the script, edit it, dramatize it, and actually film it themselves. Don't rush it; this may require most of the term.

_____ Help students produce a slide-show (35 mm. slides plus a taped sound track).

_____ Sound tapes can be a form of composition. The students should decide what they want to communicate and then search for parts of records and environmental sounds to express their ideas and mood.

_____ Have students write a radio play and present it. Don't forget sound effects. Check a commercially recorded set of sound effects (Marshall Music has a good collection) or have students make and record their own.

_____ Visit bookstores to see what materials of interest to teenagers are available, or . . . help a teacher arrange a field trip to a bookstore.

_____ Help students set up a paperback bookstore in their school.

_____ Get a copy of the many reading workbooks in use in the schools. Analyze and evaluate them. Talk with the reading teacher to compare notes. Also talk to kids who have used the books.

_____ Look over and evaluate the different kinds of reading tests given in the schools. What kinds of problems do you perceive in the tests. Could they be corrected?

_____ Observe the materials available in the reading room. Are they largely commercial or teacher-made? What ideas do you have for making materials using everyday things like package labels to encourage reading development. Try out some ideas.

_____ Study approaches to remedial reading and talk them over with a teacher.

_____ Observe a remedial reading class in action. What learning goes on? What non-learning? Do you think such classes are helpful? What alternatives, if any, can you come up with?

_____ Develop some creative writing assignments which grow from the literature a class is discussing. Test them out.

_____ Offer students a large choice of reading materials and study their choices. Can you predict which kids will choose which titles?

_____ Lead a class in the non-verbal response to literature, letting the kids express their ideas through collage, sculpture, film, photographs, etc.

_____ Storytelling can be done by either you or the students. Encourage them to make up some stories.

_____ In-class choral reading with assigned characters and a narrator often helps increase interest and comprehension in reading. Help a small group plan and present a choral reading of some interesting literature.

_____ Help a group discover the pleasures of puppetry to dramatize something they have written.

_____ Ask a group to read and dramatize an interesting short story.

_____ Bring in records and have students bring in some, too. Listen to the lyrics. Encourage the students to get the lines down on paper and to consider what the song writer was trying to communicate.

_____ Gather a variety of materials on a particular theme; e.g., self-discovery, unknown worlds. Present them to the students for independent exploration.

_____ Help motivate a "remedial" reading student and build his self-confidence about reading. Find materials he will <u>want</u> to read--the driver's manual, perhaps--and show him the extent to which he <u>already</u> can read for his own purposes.

_____ Ask a student to tell you a story, an experience, or some directions. Write it down exactly as he says it, using regular English spelling (or tape-record it). Type it up and bring it back next week for him to <u>read</u>. This helps to build confidence since the student will be able to read his own writing well.

_____ Find some fantastically interesting short stories or a novel and read to a student. If possible, have a copy along for the student to follow.

_____ Bring magazines of interest for students who don't read much. Help them discover new magazines and enjoy them.

_____ Ask a student a question based on the captions of a picture. Encourage the student to read the caption silently and to explain the picture to you. This encourages reading for meaning, but it also provides visual help to support decoding.

_____ Take a group of students to the school library and help them find materials of interest. Show them how to find books for themselves, but do not deliver a lecturette on the form and function of the card catalogue.

_____ Encourage your students to write and illustrate a book, either for their own age level or elementary school children. (Instructions for bookbinding are available.)

_____ Experiment with asking pre-reading questions that will alert the students about what to look for while reading; e.g., "What happens to the main character to make him change his mind?" "How would you react if you were facing the same problem as the main character?"

_____ Explore strategies for helping students cover "content" texts --the history book, the biology text. Consider some of the ways reading this kind of material differs from reading literature.

List your own supplementary or replacement activities here:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

FIELD EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FIELD EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

DEFINITION: Field Experience (FE) as described here is a program sponsored by a university department where prospective undergraduate teaching candidates are placed in schools to observe and participate in the tutoring and/or teaching of the school students. Field Experience Programs are distinct from student teaching programs.

Your Name and Position_____

Department_____University_____

Address_____

University Enrollment: 1-5,000 5,000-10,000 10,000-20,000
20,000-30,000 30,000-40,000 40,000-50,000
Over 50,000

Date_____

DIRECTIONS: Circle either YES or NO on the yes-no type questions. Circle as many answers as are applicable to your situation on the multiple choice type questions.

TO SAVE YOU TIME: If your department does NOT have a Field Experience Program, please answer the first three questions only.

If your department DOES have a Field Experience Program, please respond to <u>all</u> the inquiried.

1. Does your department have a Field Experience Program? YES NO

2. If no, has your department given consideration to instituting a FE Program? YES NO

3. If your department has given some thought to instituting a FE Program, please indicate what stage your deliverations are in.
   a. We plan to implement a program next fall.
   b. We have talked about a FE Program, but no decisions have been made.
   c. A pilot program is underway
   d. We are waiting for funding.
   e. Other, please specify:
   f. Other, please specify:

FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAM COMPONENTS:

4. What types of Field Experience does your department offer?
   a. Observing in the schools.
   b. Tutoring in the schools.
   c. Small group activity direction in the schools.
   d. Teaching of entire classes in the schools.
   e. Preparation of innovative materials for teacher use.
   f. Staffing of a learning resource center, including material preparation.
   g. Presentation of mini courses in the schools.
   h. Intern program for extensive participation in the schools while remaining a full-time student on campus.
   i. Other, please specify:

5. How long has your FE program been in operations?

   1 year 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 more than 10

6. What are the goals of your FE Program?
   a. To screen prospective teachers.
   b. To provide pre-student teaching experience.
   c. To supplement the methods course.
   d. To provide a relatively pressure-free situation for undergraduates to experiment with creative teaching ideas.
   e. Other, please specify:
   f. Other, please specify:

7. In what ways are teachers in the schools involved in your FE Program?
   a. They provide a class for undergraduates to teach.
   b. They provide students for undergraduates to tutor.
   c. They provide verbal feedback and evaluation on particular lessons.
   d. They help undergraduates plan lessons and activities.
   e. They encourage undergraduates.
   f. They grade undergraduates on their teaching or tutoring.
   g. Other, please specify:

8. What types of schools do you place your FE undergraduates in?
   a. Public
   b. Private
   c. Parochial
   d. University laboratory school
   e. Private free school
   f. Drop-in center for school drop-outs
   g. Academic interest centers for advanced high schoolers
   h. Other, please specify:

9. How are participating teachers selected?
   a. They are recruited from graduate classes.
   b. They are recruited through student teacher placement files.
   c. They volunteer based on information from a letter to the school.
   d. They volunteer based on information from a personal visit by your department representative.
   e. Other, please specify:

10. Do you compensate participating teachers in any way? YES NO

11. If yes, how?
   a. Money -- amount?_____
   b. Released time from teaching.
   c. Extra classroom assistance in activities and/or tutoring.
   d. A social event such as a dinner.
   e. Personal visits from your department representative to thank them.
   f. Thank you letters.
   g. Compiled lists of innovative teaching suggestions developed by FE undergraduates, if the teachers want them.
   h. Other, please specify:
   i. Other, please specify:

12. Do you have some type of orientation for the FE participants? YES NO

13. If yes, what does your orientation involve?
   a. A university person on campus explaining to undergraduates what to expect in the schools?
   b. Teachers coming to compus for a group meeting with undergraduates.
   c. Undergraduates attending a regular departmental meeting in the school before entering any classroom situation.
   d. Undergraduates attending a special meeting at the school with only those teachers who will participate directly in the FE Program.
   e. Undergraduates are expected by the individual teachers and are placed in the classroom immediately upon arrival at the school and remain with that teacher throughout the FE.
   f. Undergraduates go to their classroom teacher who suggests and arranges observational activities throughout the school as a preliminary to settling into a routine with a particular teacher and set of responsibilities.
   g. Other, please specify:
   h. Other, please specify:

14. If you do not have an orientation, do you think one would be beneficial? YES NO

15. Does your department have any forum for sharing what is happening in FE at various schools within your program? YES NO

16. Does your department have any person(s) whose specific responsibility is to oversee, supervise, schedule, and/or coordinate the FE Program? YES NO

17. If yes, how many persons are so involved?

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More than 10

18. How is this person(s) funded?
    a. Not funded.
    b. Through regular faculty salary.
    c. Through a graduate assistantship.
    d. Through a special grant.
    e. Given university credits instead of money.
    f. Counts toward his/her teaching load.
    g. Other, please specify:

19. What are the responsibilities of this coordinator(s)?
    a. Make arrangements for placing undergraduates with school teachers.
    b. Schedule undergraduates with teachers for appropriate time slots.
    c. Act as an idea-resource person for undergraduates to consult with concerning classroom activities and problems.
    d. Visit the schools involved in the FE Program.
    e. Observe undergraduates while teaching.
    f. Evaluate the undergraduates during FE.
    g. Grade the undergraduates during FE.
    h. Serve as a contact for the teachers, especially when problems arise with particular FE undergraduates.
    i. Other, please specify:
    j. Other, please specify:

20. How many university classes per grading period are coordinated through your FE Program?

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More than 10

21. Approximately how many undergraduates do you handle in your FE Program in one university grading period?

    1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-45 45-50

    51-60 61-70 71-80 81-90 91-100 101-025 126-150 More than 151

22. Do undergraduates receive university credit for FE? YES NO

23. If yes, are they semester or quarter credits?
    a. Semester
    b. Quarter
    c. Other, please specify:

24. How many credits do undergraduates receive during a grading period?

    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10 More than 10

25. If the number of credits is variable, please explain how you determine the number of credits. For example, four hours per week in the school might be worth 1 credit while ten hours per week might be worth 4 credits.

26. How often do the undergraduates participate in the schools?
    a. Once a month.
    b. Twice a month.
    c. Once a week.
    d. Twice a week.
    e. Daily.
    f. Other, please specify:

27. How many hours per week do the FE undergraduates participate in the schools?

    0 ½ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11-15 16-20 More than 20

28. May a student enroll for FE more than once? YES NO

29. May a graduate student enroll for FE? YES NO

EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE:

30. Do you conduct a formal evaluation of your Field Experience Program? YES NO

31. If yes, how often?
    a. Every term.
    b. Once a year.
    c. Once every two years.
    d. Other, please specify:

32. How does your department evaluate your FE Program?
    a. Coordinator(s) make a report.
    b. The cooperating teachers fill out evaluation questionnaires.
    c. The undergraduates fill out evaluation equestionnaires.
    d. The school students fill out evaluation questionnaires.
    e. Professors involved in the program fill out evaluation questionnaires.
    f. There is a large evaluation meeting for undergraduates, teachers, professors, and coordinator(s) to air opinions on FE.
    g. Other, please specify:
    h. Other, please specify:

33. To what extent does your FE Program meet the needs of your undergraduates?
    a. Completely
    b. To a large extent
    c. Somewhat
    d. Not at all
    e. Other, please specify:

34. How do you account for the degree of success you judge your program to be having?

35. What are the primary virtues of your FE Program?
    a. Exposure of undergraduates to teaching.
    b. Well-organized.
    c. Well-supervised.
    d. Provides contact between schools and university so ideas are shared.
    e. Other, please specify:
    f. Other, please specify:

36. What types of FE problems have you encountered?
    a. Transportation of undergraduates to and from schools.
    b. Lack of time for teacher feedback to undergraduates.
    c. Some teachers are unable to relinquish control of class so FE undergraduates can try their own ideas.
    d. Lack of communication between teachers and the university concerning problems encountered with FE undergraduates.
    e. Student absence limits tutorial contact.
    f. Undergraduates and/or teachers don't know what to do.
    g. Other, please specify:

37. What steps are you taking to deal with your main FE problems?

38. Does your department use any forms for evaluation of FE? YES NO

39. If yes, please attach copies of any forms you have available when you return this questionnaire. Thank you.

FUTURE PROJECTIONS:

40. Do you intend to implement any program variations in Field Experience in the near future? For example, setting up a reading and writing center at a local school where one university class prepares materials and supervises the exciting learning activities that the students participate in. OR Working directly through school reading centers to enable FE undergraduates interested in reading problems to work in close contact with a reading specialist rather than a classroom teacher, etc.
    YES NO

41. Please describe the proposed changes in your Field Experience Program in as much detail as possible.

42. Would you be interested in receiving a monograph which deals with Field Experience Programs in universities throughout the U.S. when it is made available? YES NO

PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE TO RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

Mrs. Karen L. Rottink
Field Experience Coordinator
Department of English
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN THIS STUDY.