# AN INVESTIGATION OF VISITATION EXPERIENCES IN AN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
GEORGE ROBERT SCHNECK
1972

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN INVESTIGATION OF VISITATION EXPERIENCES IN AN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

presented by

George Robert Schneck

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D degree in Education

John M. Mason
Major professor

Date February 11, 1972

O-7639

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF VISITATION EXPERIENCES IN AN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

By

George Robert Schneck

Problem investigated. The purpose of this study was to compare an existing half day per week per term pre-service school visitation program at Michigan State University fall term 1968 to the full day per week per term pre-service school visitation program initiated winter term 1968 for prospective elementary teachers. The bases for the comparison involved: the expectations and desires of students relative to their school visitation experience and the extent to which these expectations and desires were fulfilled; and, the nature and extent of the observation and participation experiences encountered by the students.

Descriptive features and treatment of data. Pre-service students concurrently enrolled in Education 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level and the half day school visitation program fall term 1968, and pre-service students concurrently enrolled in 321-B and the full day school visitations program winter

term 1969 provided the study population. Each population responded to five questionnaires designed by the investigator to gather data relevant to eleven hypotheses isolated for investigation.

The questionnaire responses were analyzed for significance through the implementation of a two-tailed "t" test technique. A criterion level of significance was established at 0.05 for data analysis relevant to each variable.

Findings. The following findings resulted from an analysis of the data of the study.

1. Students in the half day school visitation population expressed a significantly greater number of expectations of the program than students in the full day school visitation population.

2. There was no significant difference in the number of desires, with respect to the school visitation program, identified by each population.

3. Students enrolled in the half day school visitation population realized a significantly greater proportion of their expectations and desires than students in the full day school visitation population.

4. Students in the full day school visitation population encountered a significantly greater number of participation and observation experiences than the students in the half day school visitation population.

5. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation population encountered a significantly greater variety of participation experiences than the students in the half day school visitation population.

6. Students in the full day school visitation population participated in a significantly greater variety of subject matter areas than the students in the half day school visitation population.

7. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program spent a significantly greater amount of time in participation activities than the students in the half day school visitation population.

8. Students in the full day school visitation population acquired a significantly greater number of behaviors considered desirable as preparation for teaching than students in the half day population.

9. A high percentage of students enrolled in the full day visitation program indicated an expectation and desire to be prepared by the methods instructors for the experiences they should get in the school visitation experiences.

10. A high percentage of the students enrolled in the full day school visitation program indicated that an opportunity to discuss in methods classes questions that arise as a result of the school visitations was important.

# AN INVESTIGATION OF VISITATION EXPERIENCES IN AN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

By

George Robert Schneck

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses a sincere appreciation to Dr. John M. Mason, Chairman of his doctoral committee, for his interest, guidance and support, throughout the identification, development, and completion of the study.

Appreciation is extended to the other members of the doctoral committee, Drs. Jane Smith, T. Wayne Taylor, and, George Meyers whose assistance in the design of the study and constructive criticism throughout its completion was invaluable.

He also expresses gratitude to Roy Gabrill a research consultant in the Office of Research Consultation for his aid in the implementation of the statistical analysis of the data.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. William V. Hicks Chairman of the Department of Elementary and Special Education and the staff for approval of the study and for professional assistance.

Finally appreciation is extended to his mother, sister, and brother for their support and prayers throughout his doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION. . . . . | 1 |
| | Recognition of the need for school visitation experiences in the training of prospective teachers. . . . . | 1 |
| | Need for the study . . . . . | 5 |
| | Purposes of the study. . . . . | 9 |
| | Hypotheses . . . . . | 10 |
| | Design of the study. . . . . | 11 |
| | Population . . . . . | 11 |
| | Source of data . . . . . | 12 |
| | Identification of terms. . . . . | 13 |
| | Treatment of data. . . . . | 14 |
| | Assumption of the study. . . . . | 14 |
| | Limitations of the study . . . . . | 15 |
| | Organization of the dissertation . . . . . | 15 |
| II. | REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . . | 17 |
| | 1. Surveys of institutional practices as related to laboratory programs. . . . . | 18 |
| | 2. Influences of laboratory programs with respect to the modification of attitudes and understandings of pre-service students. . . . . | 21 |
| | 3. Influences of laboratory programs on anxieties about student teaching and teaching. . . . . | 24 |
| | 4. Influences of laboratory programs on success in student teaching or teaching | 25 |
| | 5. Professional programs emphasizing laboratory experiences. . . . . | 26 |
| | 6. The implementation of modern technology in laboratory programs. . . . . | 28 |
| | 7. The status of research relative to pre-service laboratory experiences. . . . . | 30 |
| | Summary. . . . . | 32 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued


| CHAPTER | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| III. | DESCRIPTIVE FEATURES OF THE STUDY . . . . . | 36 |
| | The design of the study. . . . . | 36 |
| | Students in the study. . . . . | 37 |
| | A brief description of the "Block" program at Michigan State University. . . . . | 37 |
| | Background of the study. . . . . | 40 |
| | The construction of the instruments used in the study. . . . . | 42 |
| | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire I - Student perceived goals of the school visitation experience. . . . . | 44 |
| | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II - A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience. . . . . | 46 |
| | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II-A. A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during one visitation experience. . . . . | 49 |
| | Pre-service Student School Visitation Experience - "A summary of the observational experiences during the school visitation experiences" . . . . . | 51 |
| | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire III - "Goals attained by the students as a result of the school visitation experience . . . . . | 54 |
| | Administration of instruments - general features. . . . . | 54 |
| | Administration of Questionnaire I, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 56 |
| | Fall Term 1968. . . . . | 56 |
| | Winter term 1969. . . . . | 57 |
| | Administration of Questionnaire II fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 57 |
| | Fall term 1968. . . . . | 57 |
| | Winter term 1969. . . . . | 57 |
| | Administration of Questionnaire II A, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 58 |
| | Fall term . . . . . | 58 |
| | Winter term . . . . . | 58 |
| | Administration of the Observation questionnaire and Questionnaire III, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 58 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued


| CHAPTER | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| | Fall term 1968. . . . . | 58 |
| | Winter term 1969. . . . . | 59 |
| | Collection of data . . . . . | 59 |
| | Analysis of data . . . . . | 60 |
| | Summary. . . . . | 61 |
| IV. | ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . . | 63 |
| | Questionnaire I and associated hypotheses. | 63 |
| | Questionnaire III and associated hypotheses . . . . . | 66 |
| | Questionnaire II and associated hypotheses | 70 |
| | The Observation Questionnaire and associated hypothesis . . . . . | 74 |
| | Questionnaire II-A and associated hypotheses. . . . . | 75 |
| | Data not subjected to statistical analysis | 78 |
| V. | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . . | 80 |
| | Results and conclusions. . . . . | 81 |
| | Summary and discussion of the results and conclusions . . . . . | 84 |
| | Implications for teacher training institutions . . . . . | 89 |
| | Identification of problems for further research. . . . . | 90 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . | | 93 |
| APPENDICES . . . . . | | 94 |
| A. | Explanatory letter to the Director of Elementary Education of the Lansing Public Schools. | 98 |
| B. | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire I as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 101 |
| C. | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 119 |
| D. | Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II-A as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . | 131 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued Page

APPENDICES

E. Pre-service Student School Visitation Experience Observation Questionnaire as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 . . 149

F. Pre-service Student School Visitation Experience Questionnaire III as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. . . . . 168

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | The schedule for the administration of questionnaires fall term 1968, and winter term 1969. . . . . | 55 |
| 2. | Analysis of the number of expectations recorded by the half day and full day school visitation populations. . . . . | 64 |
| 3. | Analysis of the number of desires recorded by half day and full day school visitation populations . . . . . | 65 |
| 4. | Analysis of the achieved expectations recorded by the half day and full day school visitation populations. . . . . | 67 |
| 5. | Analysis of the achieved desires of the half day and full day school visitation populations . . . . . | 68 |
| 6. | Analysis of desirable teaching behaviors acquired by half day and full day school visitation populations. . . . . | 70 |
| 7. | Analysis of the variety of participation activities engaged in by half day and full day school visitation populations during the first seven weeks . . . . . | 71 |
| 8. | Analysis of the number of participatory activities experienced by half day and full day school visitation populations during the first seven weeks . . . . . | 72 |
| 9. | Analysis of the amount of time spent in participation experiences by half day and full day populations during the first seven weeks. | 73 |
| 10. | Analysis of the number of observation activities experienced by half day and full day school visitation populations . . . . . | 75 |

LIST OF TABLES--continued


| TABLE | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 11. | Analysis of the variety of participation experiences during one school visitation by half day and full day populations. . . . . | 76 |
| 12. | Analysis of participation in a variety of subject matter areas by half day and full day school visitation populations. . . . . | 77 |
| 13. | Achieved interactions between the methods courses and the school visitation experience winter term. . . . . | 79 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

This study was concerned with the expectations and/or desires of two groups of prospective elementary teachers relative to their school visitation experiences, and the extent to which these expectations and/or desires were fulfilled. The study also identified specific observational and participational experiences that these students encountered. The data collected relative to these anticipations and experiences were used to compare a half day per week school visitation program to a full day per week visitation program for prospective elementary teachers.

Recognition of the need for school visitation experiences in the training of prospective teachers. From the inception of teacher education programs in the United States, the desirability of blending elements of theory and practice has been recognized. The regulations governing the first public normal school in the United States, which opened in 1839 in Lexington, Massachusetts, indicated that the curricula should be designed to effect the following two objectives:

> First the attainment of a more thorough and systematic acquaintance with the branches usually taught in common schools, and an adequate foundation in other parts of knowledge highly useful to the skillful teacher; and secondly, the art of imparting instruction to the youthful mind, which will be taught in its principles and illustrated by opportunity for practice, by means of a model school.[1]

Two decades later, in 1859, these objectives were re-emphasized in a resolution adopted at the First Annual Convention of the American Normal School Association. The resolution read as follows:

> Resolved: that this education of teachers should not only be theoretical but also practical; and that, to this end, there should be either a school of observation and practice in immediate connection with the normal school, and under the same Board of Control, or that there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice.[2]

The position taken by the American Normal School Association regarding the desirability of practical training for the education of pre-service teachers influenced the organizational patterns and curricular offerings of the normal schools. Observation of techniques in teaching and managing a school, participation in grading of papers and working with individuals, and the teaching of small groups or isolated lessons were features of the experiences provided for pre-service teachers in the normal schools. However, in

---

[1]Vernon L. Mangun. The American Normal School. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1928. p. 120.

[2]E. I. F. Williams. The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942. p. 10.

general, practical experiences varied greatly both in variety and in time allotment in normal schools throughout the United States.

The main type of program for pre-service teachers in which such activities as the observation of teaching techniques and actual participation in classroom practices were experienced was the so-called "student teaching" requirement. While the "student teaching" experience has since become a requirement for teacher certification, many educators have also contended that individuals preparing for teaching should have more experiences in the classroom than those normally provided by the usual student teaching programs. In an effort to provide additional experiences, several colleges and universities have initiated pre-service school visitation experiences prior to student teaching as an integral part of the elementary teacher education program.

While the need for definitive standards for the governing of the professional laboratory and student teaching experiences was recognized early by educators, no specific recommendations were made with respect to pre-student teaching experiences until the report of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1948. This report is commonly referred to as "the Flowers Report." The report was the work of a sub-committee of the Committee on Standards and Surveys of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Within the framework

of the report, mandates were set forth for the inclusion of extensive pre-student teaching laboratory experiences. The report not only outlined the functions of pre-student teaching laboratory experiences, but also emphasized the need for early and continued experiences in such training. The report reads in part as follows:

> The need for direct experience, to give meaning to ideas and to develop functional understanding that leads beyond verbalization to the ability to implement ideas in action, applies equally at all levels of maturity. The nature of the student's preceding experiences in a given area, rather than the age of the learner or his position in the educational ladder, is the criterion for determining the amount and place of direct experience. Direct laboratory experiences, therefore, should be an integral part of each of the four years of college.[3]

The "Flowers Report" had a significant impact upon teacher training institutions throughout the United States. A proliferation of new and varied types of pre-service school visitation programs was initiated as a result of this report. Stiles states that:

> One of the most significant developments in teacher education in the past two decades has been the expansion of organized "professional laboratory experiences" as an integral part of many pre-service teacher education programs.... These activities embrace guided observation of, and participation with, children, youth and adults in a wide range of school and community situations.[4]

---

[3]John G. Flowers, Allen D. Patterson, Florence Stratemeyer. "Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching." In: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. First Yearbook. Oneonta: The Association, 1948. pp. 91-92.

[4]L. J. Stiles, and others. Teacher Education in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press, 1960. p. 230.

Need for the study. It seems to the writer that "The Flowers Report" should have focused the attention of researchers on the pre-service school visitation phase of the teacher education program. During the background study needed to compose the standard governing professional laboratory experiences, the sub-committee discovered and reported that nowhere, in all the laboratory experiences, were practices more confusing and in need of research than in the area of pre-student teaching laboratory experiences.[5] A few studies appear in the literature which attack this problem, over the next ten years. Their impact was so slight however, that Ulry in 1959 stated that there still existed: "... Great need for research concerning strong and weak points and possible results of the programs in teacher education."[6] This sentiment was echoed again in a study by Halfaker in 1962, when he concluded as follows:

1. The extent of professional growth achieved by students during participation in the various types of laboratory experiences provided prior to student teaching should be investigated.

2. Appraisal studies need to be made of the nature and scope of professional laboratory experiences

---

[5]American Association of Teachers Colleges, Sub-Committee of the Committee on Standards and Surveys - School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta: The Association, 1948. p. 17.

[6]L. O. Ulry. "The Program of Field Service Projects In Education of the College of Education the Ohio State University." Dissertation Abstracts 20: 2161; No. 6, 1959.

provided for students prior to student teaching.[7]

Reviews of the literature concerning pre-service laboratory experienced programs carried out between 1962 and 1968 all support the premise that this phase of the teacher education program has been neglected by researchers. Mauker in 1962 reports that: "... there was no research evidence that the time spent in the field experience program might not be spent more advantageously in academic pursuits."[8] In 1963, Reynard states that: "Professional laboratory experience seems to be the area least challenged in teacher education." Cyphert and Spaights in 1964, in analyzing research in teacher education over a ten year period, conclude pessimistically that:

> Where one peruses the changes made in teacher education over the past decade, or projects ahead for the next ten years, he is struck by the undeniable evidence that virtually all of those who are planning the improvement of teacher education are operating, and are likely to continue to operate, by applying their subjective insights-hunches and hypotheses growing out of experience to reorganizing portions of their programs. They have neither pre- nor post-

---

[7]Philip Halfaker. "Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided Prior to Student Teaching for Secondary Student in Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1962. p. 162.

[8]J. W. Mauker. "Imperitives for Excellence in Teacher Education"-In: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Foundations for Excellence. Fifteenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1962. p. 7.

> innovative empirical data concerning the validity of their changes.[9]

Three years later in 1967, Estes indicated that the conclusions of Cyphert and Spaights were valid. As a result of his review of the literature, he reached the following conclusions:

1. Little has been done in the field of education which provides a basis for classifying, by educational authority, professional laboratory experiences as being suggested, necessary or effective, nor has there been development of a set of criteria which measures the effectiveness of specific laboratory experiences.

2. Based on certain data, it would seem that more than one half of the institutions are not concerned about objectively measuring the effectiveness of professional laboratory experiences.[10]

Several generalizations emerge as a result of the investigator's review of the literature. (1) Pre-service school visitation programs have been recognized as one important phase of the teacher education program since the establishment of the normal schools. (2) There has been progressive emphasis upon the need for earlier exposure to pre-service school visitation and other pre-service laboratory programs. (3) Researchers have essentially failed to focus their attention on the school visitation phase of the teacher education program.

---

[9]Federick Cyphert, and Ernest Spaights. An Analysis and Projection of Research in Teacher Education. Cooperative Research Project no. F-015. Columbus: The Ohio State University Foundation, 1964. p. 2.

[10]Sidney Estes. "A Status Study of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences in Elementary Teacher Education." Dissertation Abstracts 28: 4022A; No. 10, 1968.

An investigation undertaken at Michigan State University at the beginning of the Fall term of 1968 further emphasized the institutional need to investigate pre-service school visitation programs. As one phase of a study of changes instituted in the elementary "Block" program, the Elementary and Special Education department was planning an evaluation of the department's pre-service school visitation program. At this time, neither the personnel nor the research design had been selected to carry out this portion of the research.

The "Block" program at Michigan State University is a part of the professional sequence normally enrolled in by elementary education majors during their junior year. It is a fifteen hour sequence which includes common elements, special methods courses, and a half day school visitation program. During the 1967-68 school year, the faculty and students involved with the "Block" program had indicated that a need existed for changes to be made in the structure of the program. In response, the Elementary and Special Education department had proposed several changes which would be instituted at the beginning of the Winter term of 1968.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of these changes, an evaluation committee was appointed by V. W. Hicks, chairman of the Elementary and Special Education department. Because of personal interest in the school visitation aspect of the program, the writer sought the opportunity to

independently investigate the changes affecting the school visitation program. Approval for the investigation by the author was given by the chairman of the research committee and the department chairman.

Purposes of the study. The main purpose of the study was to compare the half day per week per term pre-service school visitation program to the full day per week per term pre-service school visitation program as implemented at Michigan State University fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. Problems inherent in implementating this purpose were:

1. The construction of instruments to gather data for the comparison which would allow the investigator to:
    a. secure student opinion as to their expectations and desires relative to the activities (participation and non-participation) which would be provided by the visitation program;
    b. secure student opinion as to the degree to which their expectations and desires were realized by the visitation program;
    c. secure information relative to specific activities (participation and non-participation) which students experienced during their school visitation period as well as about those which they did not experience; and,
    d. secure student opinion as to their changes in behavior as a result of their visitation experiences.
2. Identify the interactions that occurred within the "Block" courses as a result of the pre-service school visitation programs.

Hypotheses. With respect to the purposes of the study the following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

1. Students participating in the full day visitation program will express a number of expectations with respect to the school visitation program equal to that of students participating in the half day school visitation program . ($H_{01}: M_1 = M_2$)

2. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will express a number of desires with respect to the school visitation program equal to that of students participating in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{02}: M_1 = M_2$)

3. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will realize a proportion of their expectations equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{03}: M_1 = M_2$)

4. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will realize a proportion of their desires equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{04}: M_1 = M_2$)

5. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing a variety of participation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program during the first seven weeks of the school visitation program. ($H_{05}: M_1 = M_2$)

6. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing a number of participation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program during the first seven weeks of the school visitation program. ($H_{06}: M_1 = M_2$)

7. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing a number of observation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{07}: M_1 = M_2$)

8. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will report acquiring a variety of behaviors which are considered to be desirable

as preparation for teaching equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{08}: M_1 = M_2$)

9. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report an amount of time spent in participation experiences during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{09}: M_1 = M_2$)

10. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report a variety of participation experiences during one school visitation equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{010}: M_1 = M_2$)

11. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing participation activities in a variety of subject matter areas equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{011}: M_1 = M_2$)

Design of the study. The study was carried on as an integral part of the elementary education "Block" program at Michigan State University fall term and winter term 1968-69. The study was so designed that group data could be collected on the students enrolled in the "Block" program. In order to insure a consistency of method of data collection, all data were collected during regularly scheduled university class periods.

Population. The students enrolled in Education 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 and who were concurrently enrolled in the school visitation program constituted the populations for the study. There were 261 students enrolled in 321-B in the fall term 1968 and 199 students enrolled in

321-B winter term 1969. Of these students only those who were also enrolled in the visitation program and who returned usable questionnaire response sheets became a part of the study.

Source of data. The data were collected by means of a questionnaire technique. A brief summary of these questionnaires appears below.

1. Questionnaire I - Student perceived goals of the school visitation experiences. The questionnaire was designed to gather information relative to the variety of experiences students expected and/or desired to encounter during their visitation experience.

2. Questionnaire II - A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during the first seven weeks of the visitation experience. The questionnaire was designed to elicit information relative to the number of times and the duration of these times, that students were able to actively participate in various activities during the first seven weeks of the visitation experience.

3. Questionnaire II-A. - A summary of the participation activities engaged in by Block students during one visitation experience. The questionnaire was designed to gather information relative to the number of times and the subject matter area that a student had the opportunity to participate in various activities during one visitation experience.

4. Observation Questionnaire. - A summary of the observational experiences during the school visitation experience. The questionnaire was designed to provide a record of the observations that the students had made about selected phases of the teaching-learning situation during their visitations.

5. Questionnaire III. - Goals attained by students as a result of the school visitation experience. The questionnaire was designed to gather information

relative to the students' judgments as to whether or not they had achieved their expectations and/or desires as stated in questionnaire one.

Identification of terms. The terms or phrases listed below should be considered within this paper to have the meaning attributed to them by the accompanying definition.

1. Pre-service school visitation program at Michigan State University. A program in which elementary education majors enrolled in the methods "Block" sequence are assigned to and visit elementary classrooms in the Lansing Public Schools.

2. Half day school visitation program. A program in which elementary education "Block" students at Michigan State University spend one-half day each week of the term in an elementary or junior high school.

3. Full day school visitation program. A program in which elementary education "Block" students at Michigan State University spend one full day each week of the term in an elementary or junior high school.

4. Participation activity. Any activity in which a student engages during a school visitation which involves interaction with students, teacher, materials, and/or non-teaching personnel.

5. Non-participation activity. Those activities engaged in by students which are primarily observational in nature.

6. Expectations. Expectations are the activities which the students anticipate that the school visitation program will provide as well as the changes in behavior that he anticipates will take place as a result of the visitation experience.

7. Desires. Desires are the activities which the students would like the school visitation program to provide, as well as the changes in behavior that he would like to have take place as a result of the visitation experience.

8. Behaviors considered desirable as preparation for teaching. This phrase should be understood to

include only those behaviors listed in Questionnaire I and III part D of each. These were:

a. a feeling of ease when working with children;

b. an ability to identify characteristics of a given age group;

c. an ability to construct appropriate lesson plans;

d. an ability to plan for and work with two groups simultaneously;

e. the development of a judgment of the time necessary to teach a lesson;

f. a recognition of an acquisition of motivational techniques;

g. a sense of the individual's suitability to work at a given grade level;

h. a sense of the suitability of teaching as a career for the individual; and,

i. a sense of competency regarding the appropriateness of curricular patterns.

Treatment of data. The questionnaire response sheets were submitted to the Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State University. Frequency counts and percentages were obtained for each item on the questionnaires. The data on the response sheets were then key punched for use in the Control Data Process 3600 computer. The hypotheses of the study were analyzed using a two-tailed test of significance technique.

Assumption of the study. The following statements represent the basic assumptions under which this study was carried out.

1. Students were intellectually honest in their responses to the questionnaire instruments.

2. Information which was lost because of incomplete return of the questionnaires was random over both terms and the remaining samples were representative of the total population.

3. The questionnaires were valid instruments for the collection of data with respect to the stated aspects of the visitation experiences.

4. The information collected on the expectation and or desire questionnaire fall term 1968, was not significantly contaminated by the late administration of this questionnaire.

5. The data collected were not affected by students responding on the face of the questionnaires fall term and on IBM scoring sheets winter term.

6. The differences in the course organization of the "Block" program fall 1968 and of the winter 1969 did not significantly affect student attitude with respect to the visitation programs.

Limitations of the study. The investigation was limited to the study of two school visitation programs as they related to: student perceptions of their expectation and/or desires of the programs; their recall of the participation activities they experienced; and, the non-participation experiences they encountered. No attempt was made to ascertain differentiations between student groups on the basis of I.Q., sex, age, grade point averages, the student's minor, or term enrolled in the Block Program.

Organization of the dissertation. This chapter presents a statement of the problem investigated and develops a rationale for the study. The recognition of the importance

of school visitation experiences in the training of prospective teachers, a discussion of the need for the study, a statement of the purposes of the study, the hypotheses tested, design of the study, source of data, identification of terms, treatment of data, assumptions of the study, and the limitations of the study are also included in this chapter.

Chapter II presents a selected review of the literature relevant to pre-student teaching laboratory programs. Chapter III describes the "BIock" program at Michigan State University, the background of the study, the design of the study, the student population involved in the study, the construction of the instruments, the administration of the instruments, the statistical tools used, and the method of analysis. Chapter IV presents the analysis of the collected data. The presentation of the conclusions which are supported by the study, as well as some educational implications and suggested problems for future related research are given in Chapter V.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The main purpose of this study was to investigate and to compare two pre-service school visitation programs in the preparation of prospective elementary teachers. The literature in this chapter has, therefore, been limited primarily to studies related to pre-student teaching laboratory programs which are implemented through elementary schools. In order to facilitate the reporting of studies pertinent to this investigation, the chapter has been divided into seven sections: (1) surveys of institutional practices as related to laboratory programs, (2) influences of laboratory programs with respect to the modification of attitudes and understandings of pre-service students, (3) influences of laboratory programs on anxieties about student teaching and teaching, (4) influences of laboratory programs on success in student teaching and teaching, (5) professional programs emphasizing laboratory experiences, (6) the implementations of modern technology in laboratory programs; and (7) the status of research relative to pre-service laboratory programs.

The literature published prior to 1948 was almost devoid of studies which related theory to practice in the

education of elementary teachers. Sinclair[1] reported that he was unable to find the phrase 'Professional Laboratory Experience' in the literature until after the publication of First Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (A.A.C.T.E.) in 1948. The importance of this yearbook as a catalyst to the development of the laboratory program component of pre-service teacher education was also emphasized by Jones.[2] For the above reasons, the investigator made no extensive attempt to review literature prior to 1948.

1. Surveys of institutional practices as related to laboratory programs. In this section, general patterns common to large groups of institutions are reported. The more unique patterns and trends are cited in the succeeding sections.

The level of acceptance, on the part of teacher training institutions, of laboratory programs has been an area of concern to investigators. Frantz,[3] in 1958,

---

[1]William W. Sinclair. "An Analysis of Three Pre-Student Teaching Experiences in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1948.

[2]Isabelle F. Jones. "A Study of the Various Types of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences to Succees in Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts, 16: 709; No. 4, 1956.

[3]Merlin Frantz. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided Prior to Student Teaching for Students Preparing to be Secondary Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, 20: 211; No. 1, 1959.

implemented a questionnaire survey of colleges holding membership in the A.A.C.T.E. His findings indicated that professional laboratory experiences were widely accepted as a part of the training which should be received by prospective teachers in 1970. Turns[4] also used a questionnaire technique to gather data relative to professional laboratory experiences prior to student teaching from 442 institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education. The results indicated that 86 per cent of the institutions did provide laboratory programs prior to student teaching.

While the acceptance and implementation of professional laboratory experiences reported were widespread, there appeared to be little agreement amongst institutions as to the types and extent of experiences to which students should be exposed. Frantz[5] found, in his survey of teacher education institutions, that 83 per cent had programs which included observation activities while only 41.9 per cent had programs where the students assisted classroom teachers. Turns[6] also reported that observational experiences were emphasized to a greater degree than were participatory experiences. In a survey of eighteen Oklahoma institutions,

---

[4]Tom Turns, "The Determination and Evaluation of Professional Laboratory Experiences Prior to Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 2780; No. 6, 1970.

[5]Frantz, loc. cit.

[6]Turns, loc. cit.

Deever, Williams, and Flynn[7] could find little consensus as to: whether observation was more important than participation or vice versa, the number of hours students should spend in observation; or, the order in which the two types of experiences should occur. Using the criteria of Standard VI of the A.A.C.T.E. as a guide for examining the laboratory programs of 110 elementary teacher training institutions, Estes,[8] in 1967, concluded that a wide divergence existed amongst the institutions relative to their adherence in their laboratory programs to the criteria stated in the Standard VI. He concluded that the reasons for this divergence were undetermined.

Another area examined in some of the institutional surveys was the placement of laboratory experiences in the professional sequence. Callahan[9] reported that in the thirty six institutions with the most extensive first-hand experience programs of the 237 originally surveyed, the laboratory experiences were given the greatest stress in the third year.

---

[7]R. Merwin Deever, Chester Williams, and Edward Flynn Jr. "Professional Laboratory Experiences in Oklahoma." Journal of Teacher Education, 16: 497-505; No. 4, 1960.

[8]Sidney Estes, "A Status Study of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences in Elementary Teacher Education." Dissertation Abstracts, 28: 4022; No. 10, 1968.

[9]Sterling Callahan. The Role of Non-Student Teaching "First-Hand Experiences in Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Dissertation Abstracts, 14: 1047; No. 1, 1954.

The concentration of laboratory experiences in the third year was also noted by Turns.[10]

After examining the characteristics of 115 institutions involving laboratory schools in their programs, Elliott[11] concluded that a weakness of many programs was the lack of integration of pre-student teaching experiences with all phases of the students' programs.

A finding shared by two studies may account for some of the variations relative to program emphases noted in the preceding paragraphs. Estes[12] in 1967 and Elliott[13] in 1970 both concluded that the evaluation of laboratory experience programs was a neglected area in the institutions surveyed.

2. Influences of laboratory programs with respect to the modification of attitudes and understandings of pre-service students. Three studies reviewed in this section used the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (M.T.A.I.) to assess attitudinal changes in students as a result of

---

[10]Turns, loc. cit.

[11]Leeland Elliott. "The Nature and Quality of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences in Campus Laboratory Schools Affiliated with State Colleges and Universities." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 1119; No. 3, 1970.

[12]Estes, loc. cit.

[13]Elliott, loc. cit.

laboratory programs or experiences. Cox,[14] in 1960, studied 122 students enrolled in a human growth and development course. An experimental group was assigned to children and youth groups in addition to instruction in the course. Members of the control group received instruction only. On the basis of M.T.A.I. pre and post test data, he concluded that the changes in attitude occurring could be attributed to instruction rather than to field experience. Ingle and Robinson,[15] in 1965, reported that there was no demonstratable difference in pre-service students' attitudes towards children as a result of one group having a week of observation coupled with a course in educational psychology, and the other group having no observation experience. Fehl[16] applied the M.T.A.I. as a pre and post test to a group concurrently enrolled in a principles and practice course and an observation-participation program. While the mean scores shifted positively, the difference was not significant.

Attitudinal changes were investigated by Butts and

---

[14]Dan Cox. "An Objective and Empirical Study of the Effects of Laboratory Experience in a Professional Education Course Prior to Student Teachings." The Journal of Experimental Education, 29: 89-94, September 1960.

[15]Robert Ingle and Edward Robinson. "An Examination of the Value of Classroom Observation for Prospective Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 15: 75-78, December, 1965.

[16]Patricia Fehl. "The Effects of an Observation-Participation Program on Attitudes and on Concepts." Dissertation Abstracts, 27: 3338; No. 10, 1967.

Steinbach[17] as a part of a comparative study of the effect of practice with elementary children or with peers in a science methods course. They concluded that students who taught children developed attitudes similar to the students who taught peers.

The effect of laboratory experiences on the development of understanding was reported by two investigators. Levine,[18] in a follow-up report on sophomores who had participated in school office work as a freshman, stated that the students felt they had attained an increased familiarity with four areas relating to school and classroom operation. One result of this increased familiarity was an understanding that teaching meant much more than just being with children.

Turney and Stoneking[19] involved students in intensive observation and selected participation experiences concurrently with course work. They concluded that students achieved a much deeper understanding of the professional responsibilities of teachers and an understanding of the nature and importance of professional problems faced by teachers.

---

[17]Alan Steinbach and David Butts. "A Comparative Study of the Effect of Practices with Elementary Children or with Peers in the Science Methods Course." Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6: 316-21; No. 4, 1969.

[18]Madeline Levine. "Extending Laboratory Experiences: Part II." Journal of Teacher Education, 12: 29-35, March 1961.

[19]David Turney and Lewis Stoneking. "A Professional Sequence for the Development of Career Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 16: 281-85, September, 1965.

3. Influences of laboratory programs on anxieties about student teaching and teaching. No disagreement appeared to exist with respect to the effectiveness of laboratory programs in reducing the anxiety of students relative to student teaching or teaching. Colvin[20] assigned twenty-one students in one section of a course entitled 'Introduction to Teaching' to an observation-participation program for one half day each week to a selected teacher and class. On the basis of interviews and written materials used to collect data about students, she concluded that as a result of the program students became less anxious about teaching. Fehl[21] constructed and applied the Student Teaching Problems Rating Scale to juniors enrolled in an observation-participation program. She found that the post test results indicated a significant lessening of anxieties about student teaching. Female students accounted for most of this change. The same instrument (S.T.P.R.S.) was used by Funk[22] in an experimental study. He used this instrument as a pre and post test with students who were concurrently enrolled in foundations and methods courses, and an observation

---

[20]Cynthia Colvin. "Achieving Readiness for Student Teaching Through Direct Experience." Dissertation Abstracts. 19: 3229; No. 11, 1958.

[21]Fehl, loc. cit.

[22]Haldon Funk. "The Effect of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences on Selected Attitudes and Concepts of Prospective Elementary Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts International, 29: 3020; No. 4, 1969.

participation program; and students enrolled only in the course work. The students concurrently enrolled in the observation-participation program and courses showed a significantly greater reduction in their anxieties towards student teaching.

4. Influences of laboratory programs on success in student teaching or teaching. Edualino[23] used a check list to identify the types and amounts of experience a group of students had with students prior to student teaching, and a rating scale to determine their success in student teaching. The conclusion reached was that students who have had experiences with children in church related activities during their high school years are more successful in student teaching than students who have not had these experiences. She also stated that the more hours of experience a student has with children the less frequent is the occurrence of problems related to instructional methods, the easier it is for students to solve discipline problems, and the better he is satisfied with student teaching. A similar conclusion was reported by Jones.[24] She stated that all types of pre-student teaching experiences considered in the study were conducive to success in student teaching.

---

[23]Emilio Edualino, "The Relationship Between Successful Student Teaching and Pre-Student Teaching Experiences with Children." Dissertation Abstracts, 19: 468; No. 1, 1958.

[24]Isobel Jones, loc. cit.

While a relationship does appear to exist between success in student teaching and laboratory experiences prior to student teaching, this relationship may not exist between success in teaching and pre-service laboratory experiences. Eustice,[25] in 1968, concluded that there was no general relationship between non-academic pre-service experiences of teachers and subsequent teaching ratings.

5. Professional programs emphasizing laboratory experiences. The literature cited in this section relates primarily to institutional efforts to devise significant programs for extending the blending of theory and practice, and for including laboratory experience at an earlier stage in professional education of prospective teachers. The studies are cited chronologically. Doll and Macdonald[26] described a program at New York University which emphasized a forty-credit program covering an academic year plus the month of June. The program stressed: the students' role in his own learning; individualization of instruction; integration of education courses; and, the maximizing of experiences in schools, school systems, and community agencies. Within the laboratory portion of the course,

---

[25]David Eustice. "The Relationship of the Non-Academic Pre-service Experiences of Teachers and Teaching Success. Dissertation Abstracts, 23: 2023; No. 4, 1962.

[26]Ronald Doll and James Macdonald. "A New Departure in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 11: 572-575, December, 1960.

students observed in kindergarten through grade twelve, observed teacher tasks, took field trips to community agencies, participated in two student teaching experiences. Course work was taught as it related to the preparation for the laboratory activities and also occurred between the laboratory activities. A program described by Scrivner[27] (1961) emphasized the establishment of laboratory centers in communities and the forming of teams composed of students and instructors. Visitation by the teams to the schools began in the sophomore year.

Observation experiences form the basis for the development of the course content of a block course at Northern Illinois University described by Waimon (1961).[28] At San Francisco State College, a program described by Wilhelms (1961)[29] alternates blocks of time in laboratory experiences with time on the campus. Students work with a three man instructional team striving to achieve a balance between theory and practice.

While some institutional changes have been occurring,

---

[27]A. W. Schrivner. "A Professional Laboratory Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, 12: 48-51, March 1961.

[28]Morton Waimon. "Observing Classroom Action Systems." Journal of Teacher Education." 12: 466-70, December, 1961.

[29]Fred Wilhelms. "Exploring New Paths in Teacher Education." Theory Into Practice, 3: 12-16, February, 1964.

it is of interest to note that Hunter and Amidon (1966)[30] emphasized the need for contact with children throughout the educational sequence. They suggested early experiences with the teaching of one child or very small groups of children. Hersh,[31] in 1969, after an intensive search of the literature, concluded that a need exists to provide increased opportunities for prospective teachers to learn and test theory in a context of reality. The conclusions of Hersh[32] support the finding reached earlier (1967) by Estes,[33] that teacher education institutions seem to be maintaining status quo with respect to professional laboratory experiences.

6. The implementation of modern technology in laboratory programs. Because the focus of the investigator's study involved school visitation programs, only a limited number of studies are cited in this section which investigates the comparative effectiveness of laboratory programs with Closed Circuit Television and kinescope recordings.

---

[30]Elizabeth Hunter and Edmund Amidon. "Direct Experience in Teacher Education: Innovation and Experimentation." Journal of Teacher Education, 17: 282-9, Fall, 1966.

[31]Richard Hersh. "An Analytical Approach to the Professional Training of Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 265; No. 1, 1970.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Estes, loc. cit.

Turns,[34] Clemens,[35] Edualino,[36] and Estes[37] all concluded in separate studies that the use of modern technological devices (eg. television tapes - closed circuit T.V.) must be considered by institutions as an important adjunct to laboratory experience programs.

Many studies appeared in the literature in the early part of this decade attempting to establish the potential of television as a laboratory experience. Adolphson[38] for example, compared the effectiveness of selected observational procedures in developing teacher perception. Included in Adolphson's study were observations by closed circuit television, kinescope recordings, and direct observation. He concluded that the nature and extent of the observation rather than the media was the significant factor. Chabe[39] found that guided televiewing of a class was almost as

---

[34]Turns, loc. cit.

[35]James Clemens. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided Prior to Student Teaching in Secondary Teacher Education Programs of Selected Institutions in Illinois." Dissertation Abstracts International, 30: 4302; No. 10, 1970.

[36]Edualino, loc. cit.

[37]Estes, loc. cit.

[38]Louis Adolphson. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Selected Observational Procedures in Developing Teacher Perception." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1961.

[39]Chabe. "An Experiment with C.C.T.V. in Teacher Education." Peabody Journal of Education, 40: 24-30, July, 1962.

effective as actual guided classroom observations when pre-service students were attempting to identify the skills, attitudes, and appreciations children acquired from a lesson. Fulton and Rupiper[40] compared the use of a motion picture of children with actual observation of children. They concluded that the problems that occur with direct observation can be alleviated successfully with the use of audio-visual materials. Altenhein[41] compared pre-service students' reaction towards classroom observation and closed circuit television. The response of students prompted the conclusion that more is learned through observations.

7. The status of research relative to pre-service laboratory experiences. A review of the literature related to research in pre-service laboratory experiences revealed no one who felt that the research in this area was adequate. Universally authors noted apathy on the part of institutions and researchers. In 1962 Mauker expressed the strong feeling that "Nowhere in the literature was there research evidence that the time spent in the field experience program might not be spent more advantageously in academic

---

[40]W. R. Fulton and D. J. Rupiper. "Observation of Teaching: Direct Vs Vicarious Experiences." Journal of Teacher Education, 13: 157-164, June, 1962.

[41]Margarete Altenhein. "C.C.T.V. or Classroom Observation: Which Shall it Be?" Peabody Journal of Education, 40: 296-300, May, 1963.

pursuits."[42] Reynard in a summary of educational research in 1963 stated that: "Professional laboratory experiences seem to be the area least challenged in teacher education."[43] Halfaker[44] emphasized that the need existed to investigate the growth of students due to participation in professional laboratory experiences. Ort,[45] in 1966, identified more specifically some unresolved issues that needed to be examined. For example, how a student profits from the laboratory experience, how behavioral changes are modified, how much experience students need, when should experiences occur, and what kinds of cooperative school-college ventures should be instituted. He felt that it was essential that such problems be investigated in order to ascertain the effectiveness of pre-student teaching laboratory experiences.

---

[42]J. W. Mauker. "Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education." Foundation for Excellence, A.A.C.T.E., The Association, Washington D.C., 1962, p. 7.

[43]Harold Reynard. "Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers." Review of Educational Research, 33: 375-6, October, 1963, p. 7.

[44]Phillip Halfaker. "Professional Laboratory Experience Provided Prior to Student Teaching for Undergraduates in Secondary Education in Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Bloomington, Indiana University, 1962, p. 166.

[45]E. P. Ort. "Pre-student Teaching Laboratory Experiences." In: Partnership in Teacher Education. Editors, E. Brooks Smith, Hans Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. A Joint Publication of the A.A.C.T.E. and AST, Washington D.C., 1966, Sec. V, Part X, p. 296.

Summary. The studies cited in this chapter were grouped into seven categories. The categories and a summary of the research in each category appears below.

1. Surveys of institutional practices as related to laboratory programs. Studies by Frantz (3)* and Turns (4), indicated a widespread institutional acceptance of professional laboratory programs as a part of teacher training programs.

Varied findings were reported with respect to the role of observation and participation activities in the laboratory program. Frantz (3) and Turns (4) identified observation experiences as receiving the greatest emphasis. Within the institutions surveyed by Deever, Williams and Flynn (7) and Estes (8) no consensus existed relative to institutional emphasis.

The laboratory programs received the most emphasis in the third year of school according to Callahan (9) and Turns (4). Elliot (11) and Estes (8) concluded that there was widespread lack of concern relative to the evaluation of laboratory experiences.

2. Influences of laboratory programs with respect to the modification of the attitudes and understandings of students. Ingle and Robinson (15), Cox (14), and Fehl (16)

---

*Indicates previously cited study.

agreed that observation experiences combined with course work does not modify the attitudes of students more significantly than class work alone. Turney and Stoneking (19) concluded that the students in their study did acquire a deeper understanding of the nature and importance of professional problems.

3. Influences of laboratory programs on anxieties about student teaching and teaching. The findings of Colvin (20) indicated that laboratory experiences reduce anxieties about teaching while those by Fehl (16) and Funk (22) indicated observation-participation programs reduce anxieties about student teaching.

4. Influences of laboratory programs on success in student teaching or teaching. There appears to be significant relationship between the activities involving children prior to student teaching, and student teaching success according to the results of studies by Edualino (23) and Jones (2). A study by Eustice (25) concluded that there is no significant relationship between non-academic preservice experiences and subsequent teaching ratings.

5. Professional programs emphasizing laboratory experiences. The programs cited each had one or more unique features. The program described by Doll and Macdonald (26) was based upon a 40 credit program stressing a wide range of laboratory experiences, and the integration of

education courses. Programs described by Scrivner (27) and Wilhelm (29) were based upon the formation of student-instructor teams. A unique program at Northern Illinois University described by Waiman (28) used observation experiences as the basis for the development of the course content. While these innovations are an encouraging sign, Hersh (31) reviewed the literature in 1969 and concluded that a need still exists to develop opportunities for students to test theory in a context of reality.

6. The implementation of modern technology in laboratory programs. Turns (4) Clemens (35) Edualino (23) and Estes (8) all encourage institutions to investigate the possible uses of technological devices in laboratory programs. The studies of Adolphson (38), Chabe (39), and Fulton and Rupiper (40) compared the use of various media as observation experiences with classroom observation in an attempt to compare their relative effectiveness. In these studies no one method was shown to be significantly more effective than another. Direct observation was judged to be superior to Closed Circuit Television as an observation method in a study by Altenhaus (39).

7. The status of research relative to pre-service laboratory experiences. Mauker (42) expressed concern that the rationale for field experience has not been substantiated. Reynard (43) summarized a review of literature stating that

the validity of laboratory experiences has not been adequately challenged. Halfaker (44) and Ort (45) suggested a need to investigate how students change as a result of laboratory experiences. Estes (8), in 1968, noted that over 50 percent of the institutions he surveyed were not concerned with objectively measuring the effectiveness of laboratory experiences. Mauker (40), in 1969, reported that he felt that the evaluation of teacher education programs occurred, all too often, at the lowest level.

# CHAPTER III

## DESCRIPTIVE FEATURES OF THE STUDY

The design of the study. The study was conducted as an independent supplement to the overall evaluation of the "Block" program in elementary education at Michigan State University during the fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. The study was designed to compare the half day per week per term pre-service school visitation program during the fall term 1968 with the full day per week per term pre-service school visitation program implemented winter term 1969. In order to facilitate this comparison, the study was designed basically to:

1. identify the expectations and/or desires of the students in the study populations with respect to the school visitation programs;
2. identify the participation and non-participation activities encountered by students of the study populations in the school visitation programs;
3. identify interactions which occurred within the "Block" program as a consequence of the school visitation experience; and,
4. identify the achieved expectations and/or desires of the study populations in the school visitation programs.

The questionnaire technique was employed as a means for collecting data. Five questionnaires were constructed by the investigator. The questionnaires were administered

to the students in the science sessions of the methods course 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level. The hypotheses, as listed in Chapter I, were analyzed by a two-tailed test of significance technique and the analyses provided the basis for the comparison of the two programs.

Students in the study. The student enrolled in Education 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level, fall term 1968 and those enrolled in 321-B winter term 1969 comprised the populations for the study. There were 261 students enrolled in the course during the fall term and 199 students in 321-B, winter term 1969.

It is to be noted that some students were not taking the visitation program and were therefore eliminated from the study. In some instances student response sheets to specific questionnaires were not useable and thus the reported number of students responding to the various questionnaires varies from instrument to instrument.

A brief description of the "Block" program at Michigan State University. The "Block" program for prospective elementary teachers, as implemented at the time of this study, consisted of specified education courses and visitation experiences in the Lansing Michigan area. The education courses of the program comprised a fifteen credit hour "block" in which students normally enrolled during one term

of their junior year. The courses provided for the instructional methods aspect of the total teacher education program. Inherent in the blocking of these methods courses into a professional term was the assumption that this arrangement would foster cooperative staff planning which would result in both minimizing the overlapping of course content and preventing areas of methodology from being left out of the sequence. The assumption also was accepted that students would reap more benefits if the methods courses were taken simultaneously and not scheduled over a longer time period than one term. The courses were grouped into the professional term as follows:

Education 321-A - Common Elements

Education 321-B - Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary level

Education 321-C - Language Arts, Social Studies and Reading at the elementary level

The classes in each subject matter component of Education 321 A-B-C at the time the study began provided for both large and small group instructional techniques. The time allotted to large group instruction was two hours per week each for Mathematics, Science, Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies, and Common Elements. The small group instruction was limited to approximately forty students and consisted of a one-hour allotment per subject per week. This division of time was devised in order to provide a climate which would foster interaction between students and also between the students and the instructor.

One instructor was responsible for Education 321-A. While students enrolled in Education 321-B as a unit, the course was organized into a science section and a mathematics section with different instructors handling the respective sections. Education 321-C was organized on a three section basis with a different instructor for Language Arts, Social Studies, and Reading respectively.

The visitation aspect of the curriculum of the "Block" program was given direction by another assumption about the training of prospective elementary teachers. The assumption was that it is essential to a teacher training program that a means be provided through which the enrolled students may interact, within one term, on a theoretical and a practical level with methodological techniques. The implementation of this assumption was provided through two required activities associated with the "Block" sequence.

The first activity required each student to contact school officials within his home town area and arrange to visit an elementary classroom for a period of one week. Because this was done prior to fall term registration at Michigan State University, it was appropriately called the September Experience. This experience was designed to allow the student to observe current methodological practices being employed in elementary cIassrooms, and to give him a practical point of reference as he entered his methods courses.

The second activity took place during the term in which the student was registered for the "Block" program. The student was assigned to a classroom in a Lansing area public school. He was required to spend a specified period of time in this classroom one day each week of the term. The program was called the School Visitation Experience. Clinical experiences were not clearly delineated for this program. However, normally the student spent one portion of his time observing various facets of the teaching act, and the remaining portion participating in various activities carried out by teachers during the school day. It was expected that the student would become able to integrate theory and practice with a greater degree of expertise as a result of this visitation experience.

Background of the study. During the 1967-68 school year the Elementary and Special Education Department at Michigan State University initiated a study of the "Block" program in order to determine how to increase its overall effectiveness. The study arose as a result of some questioning of the effectiveness of the existing program and the need to continulally evaluate the department's goals. Two major considerations which were of immediate concern were: 1) to increase the interaction between students and faculty in the methods courses in order to allow students to identify more closely with the program and to express ideas with respect to methodology; and 2) to increase the opportunity for students to relate theory to practice.

Through the efforts of a departmental committee, modifications in the program were suggested in the form of a proposal for faculty consideration. The modified program, as suggested, was as follows:

> Lecture: One two-hour lecture each week would be presented in each of the subject matter areas of Education 321B and Education 321C, namely Mathematics, Science, Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies. Education 321A (Common Elements) would have no large group lecture presentations.
>
> Small Groups: No small groups would be organized for Mathematics, Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies. In Science, a small group session of 25-30 students would be retained and would meet one hour weekly for laboratory and demonstration experiences. Common Elements (Education 321A) would meet two hours per week in small groups of fifteen students. These sections would be staffed by regular faculty and graduate assistants.
>
> School Visitation: Students would be assigned to the Lansing area public school classrooms for one full day each week.

On June 25, 1968, the staff of the Elementary and Special Education Department at Michigan State University approved the proposal to revise the "Block" program. The program was approved for a two term trial period to be initiated winter term, 1969, and ending at the close of spring term, 1969.

A research committee was appointed by Dr. William V. Hicks, Chairman of the Elementary and Special Education Department, to develop evaluative criteria relating to the effectiveness of the approved changes. The author's study was conducted independently of the departmental evaluation. However, since it was related to the various phases of

program changes being analyzed by the research committee, departmental support for this study was sought and approval was received.

The present study had as its focus the school visitation portion of the "Block" program, and involved investigating perceptions of prospective elementary teachers with respect to selected phases of the school visitation experience. Since the visitations were to be conducted mainly in the Lansing Public Schools, an explanatory letter was sent to the Director of Elementary Education of the Lansing Public Schools. This letter explained briefly the background, purposes, and design of the study and solicited the approval of the Lansing school system. A follow-up telephone conversation with the director of elementary education affirmed the approval of the study as it related to the Lansing Public Schools. A copy of this letter is found in Appendix A.

The construction of the instruments used in the study. As stated earlier, the study was primarily designed to ascertain the expectations and/or desires of students relative to their school visitation experience. In addition, the study was also concerned with the variety and number of participatory and observational experiences encountered by students during their visitation experience. Since a review of the literature revealed no instruments suitable for the collection of such information, five questionnaires were

constructed by the investigator in order to gather the data necessary for the study. Three major sources were used to establish the categories of items and to serve as the basis for the generation of specific items. These sources were: (1) the literature pertaining to school visitation programs involving prospective elementary teachers, (2) interviews with staff members working with the "Block" program at Michigan State University; and, (3) the guidelines for elementary majors taking their "Block" program in the Honors College at Michigan State University.

Two of the five questionnaires were constructed to secure information about goals and experiences which the student felt would and/or should be implemented in the school visitation program, and the extent to which these goals and experiences had been achieved. The remaining three questionnaires were constructed to identify specifically the number and variety of participatory and non-participatory experiences encountered by students during their school visitation experiences. The five questionnaires were:

1. Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire I - Student perceived goals of the school visitation experience,

2. Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II - A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during the first seven weeks of the visitation experience,

3. Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II-A - A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by students during one visitation experience,

4. Pre-service Student School Visitation Observation Questionnaire - A summary of the observational experiences during the school visitation experience; and,

5. Pre-service Student School Visitation Experience Questionnaire III - Goals attained as a result of the school visitation experience.

Pre-service Student School Vistation Questionnaire I - Student perceived goals of the school vistation experience. This instrument was designed to ascertain the expectations and/or desires of the "Block" program students as to the educational experiences they might encounter in the school visitation aspect of the "Block" program at Michigan State University. The statements in the questionnaire to which the students were asked to respond were grouped into five categories representing various aspects of the school visitation program. The categories were:

1. Perceived goals relative to the non-participation or observation phase of the school visitation experience,

2. Perceived goals relating to the students' participatory role in the school visitation experience,

3. Perceived goals relating to the interaction of the student with school personnel,

4. Perceived changes occurring in the student as a result of the school visitation experience; and,

5. Perceived relationships existing between the methods courses and the school visitation experience.

It should be noted that category five in the above list is unique to the questionnaire as it was administered winter term. The addition of this category was instituted

in order to collect data which would provide an insight as to whether or not the learnings and experiences acquired by the students as a result of their school visitation experience were being utilized by the "Block" instructors in their methods classes. The foci of the seven questions in category five were related to (a) the responsibility of the instructor to give direction to the student as he became involved in the school visitation program; and (b) the opportunities provided by the instructors in the methods classes for discussions concerning questions that arise as a result of the school visitation program.

The questionnaire as administered winter term, requested the student to react to a series of statements related to the school visitation experience on the basis of the choices available to him in the following response key.

Key

Space 1.--if you expect the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

Space 2.--if you desire the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience. (Like to have the event occur)

Space 3.--if you neither expect nor desire the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

Space 4.--if you both expect and desire the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

He was further directed to indicate his choice from the above key by recording it on a five choice I.B.M. response sheet. Thus, in following examples from Questionnaire I, part A., the student would, if he expected the occurrence of

each phenomenon, record his choices in space one on the response sheet adjacent to the number corresponding to the questionnaire statement number.

EXAMPLE

In the non-participation or observation portion of the visitation experience I: (Key choice)

1 2 3 4 1. to acquire knowledge concerning skills of planning and conducting learning activities that implement specific, identifiable goals.

1 2 3 4 2. to learn techniques for motivating students.

1 2 3 4 3. to learn techniques for handling classroom organization and procedures.

Copies of the questionnaire as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 including the students' responses to the individual items are located in Appendix B.

Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II - A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience. This questionnaire was designed to elicit:

1. responses relative to the types of activities in which "Block" students played an active role during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience,

2. responses with respect to the number of times and the average duration of time that a student was participating in each activity; and,

3. information relative to the nature of the planning and teaching of lessons when this activity was engaged in by a respondent.

The questionnaire was composed of fifty-five items. The items were grouped into two sections. The first section identified twenty-seven tasks in which the student might have had a participatory role one or more times. The second section contained twenty-eight items to which only those students who had planned and taught a lesson or activity were to respond. These items related to the nature of the planning and the method of instruction used by these students in their lesson or activity.

Because of the distinct nature of the two sections of the questionnaire, separate response keys were provided for each section. The response keys for the twenty-seven items of the first section of the questionnaire were as follows:

| Key A | Key B |
|---|---|
| blank - no participation | 6--3-7 minutes |
| 1 - one participation | 7--8-12 minutes |
| 2 - two participations | 8--13-17 minutes |
| 3 - three participations | 9--18-22 minutes |
| 4 - four participations | 10--over 22 minutes |
| 5 - five participations | |
| (If you participated more than five times, write that number to the left of the question number on the answer sheet) | |

The directions associated with this key requested the student to select one response from each key for each of the twenty-seven activities. The first response identified the number of times a student had participated in a given activity, while the second response identified the average length of time the student spent in each participation.

The responses were recorded on a ten choice I.B.M. response sheet. The example below was included in the directions to the students winter term, and exemplifies the procedures used in responding to the items.

> Example: If you took attendance five times and it required about ten minutes each time, you would mark the answer sheet as follows:
>
> Answer sheet configuration
>
> 1. 1=2=3=4=5x6=7x8=9=10=
>
> Questionnaire Items
>
> During the first seven weeks I was able to participate in the class in the following manner:
>
> __ __ 1. take attendance
>
> __ __ 2. direct drill work

The directions for the second section of Questionnaire II asked the students to respond to the items only if he had planned and taught a lesson(s), or planned and directed an activity(ies). The items related to:

1. from whom the student had received help in planning his lesson,
2. the emphasis of the lesson,
3. the method of presentation used; and,
4. the activity engaged in by students.

The students were asked to respond by marking the number of times that those statements which characterized the lesson(s) taught or the activity(ies) directed occurred. The responses were recorded on a ten choice I.B.M. Response sheet. A sample of the items in this section of the questionnaire is duplicated below:

SAMPLE

A. The topic of the lesson was chosen:
___ 1. by me
___ 2. by the teacher involved
___ 3. jointly with the teacher observed
___ 4. jointly with a block instructor
___ 5. with the students

If, for example, the student had taught 3 lessons and the topic of the lesson was chosen once by the teacher involved and twice by the student alone he would indicate his response on the answer sheet as follows:

Sample Answer Sheet

1. 1=2x3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=
2. 1x2=3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=
3. 1=2=3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=
4. 1=2=3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=
5. 1=2=3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=

The remaining descriptive phrases would not be marked because they do not apply in this instance. Copies of Questionnaire II as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 including the students' responses to the individual items are located in Appendix C.

Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire II-A. A summary of the participatory activities engaged in by "Block" students during one visitation experience. Questionnaire II-A was designed to collect data relevant to four aspects of the participatory activities engaged in by students during the visitation experience occurring the week

the questionnaire was to be administered. The questionnaire provided the basis for collecting data relevant to:

1. the types of activities engaged in by students during this week;
2. the length of time spent in participation in each activity;
3. the subject matter within which the participation occurred; and
4. the nature of the planning and teaching of a lesson or activity where this applied.

Because the data sought in Questionnaires II and II-A were both based upon the types of activities engaged in by students, the items and the two sections were similar. Questionnaire II-A, however, asked students to respond relative to the subject matter area within which the participation occurred and thus the first section required different response keys. The response keys used for the first section were as follows:

| Key A | Key B |
|---|---|
| 1--3 to 7 minutes | 1-art |
| 2--8 to 12 minutes | 2-music |
| 3--13 to 17 minutes | 3-mathematics |
| 4--18 to 22 minutes | 4-language arts |
| 5--over 23 minutes | 5-reading |
| | 6-science |
| | 7-social studies |
| | 8-spelling |
| | 9-geography |

The directions associated with this section of the questionnaire as it was administered winter term requested the student to select one response from each key for each item only if he participated in the listed activity. The directions further stated that the student should mark his

choice from Key A on the scoring sheet on the odd numbers, and his choice from Key B on the even numbers on the scoring sheet which corresponded to the numbers below (response 5 and 6) on the questionnaire. If the student had participated for fifteen minutes during science class he would mark his responses as follows:

Answer sheet configuration

5. 1=2=3x4=5=6=7=8=9=10=

6. 1=2=3=4=5=6x7=8=9=10=

Sample item

Today I was able to participate in class in the following manner:

Correct and analyze papers

___ 5

___ 6

The key and directions for the second section of the questionnaire were the same as in Questionnaire II. Copies of this questionnaire as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 including the students' responses to the individual items are located in Appendix D.

Pre-service Student School Visitation Experience - "A summary of the observational experiences during the school visitation experiences." The Observation Questionnaire was designed to ascertain the observations that the students had made about all phases of the teaching-learning situation during their school visitations, and the subject matter areas

in which the observations were made. The items in the questionnaire were grouped into eleven categories. The categories were:

1. type of classroom organizational pattern
2. type of approach to subject matter
3. types of instructional materials used
4. levels of abstraction in teaching method
5. use of audio-visual and resource materials
6. goals of instruction
7. methodological techniques
8. activities for children
9. techniques of questioning
10. phases of classroom management
11. school services and professional responsibilities

In order to facilitate date collection the format of the questionnaire was arranged as in the following sample from part B of the questionnaire.

Sample items

B. Subject matter areas (i.e. Reading, Music, etc.) were taught in the classroom:

| | Soc. Studies | Read. | Science | Lang. Arts | Math | Others specify |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. as separate and discrete subjects. | x | x | | x | x | |
| 2. incidentally (only when a question or application arose | | | x | | | |
| 3. as they aided in the solving of a problem (core) | | | | | | |
| 4. combined with one or more other subjects | | | | | | |
| 5. OTHER (specify) | | | | | | |

The directions accompanying the questionnaire requested the student to mark an "x" in the subject column when the descriptive phrase applied. If the statement did not apply they were to make no response. If for example in looking at the items in the sample, a student had seen all subjects listed except for science taught only as separate and discrete subjects, and science taught only incidentally he would place "x's" as has been done in the sample. Copies of the questionnaire as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 including the students' responses to individual items are located in Appendix E.

Pre-service Student School Visitation Questionnaire III - "Goals attained by the students as a result of the school visitation experience." Questionnaire III was designed to ascertain the attainment of the student perceived expectations and/or desires of the school visitation program. For this reason the items and categories contained in the questionnaire were exactly the same as those in Questionnaire I.

The student for this questionnaire, however, was asked to respond as to whether (1) he was able, or (2) he was not able, to attain the stated goals as a result of the school visitation experience. Copies of the questionnaire as administered fall term 1968 and winter term 1969 including the students' responses to the individual items are located in Appendix F.

Administration of instruments - general features. A pattern for the administration of the questionnaires was constructed by the investigator so as to maintain a high degree of consistency with respect to their administration, between fall and winter terms. The salient features of the administration of the questionnaires are given in Table 1, page 55. The table indicates that with the exception of Questionnaire I the questionnaires were administered during equivalent weeks of the fall and winter terms. The table also indicates that all questionnaires were administered in the science section of Education 321B. Thus, no outside time

Table 1.--The schedule for the administration of questionnaires fall term 1968, and winter term 1969.

| Fall Term Questionnaire Administration | | | Winter Term Questionnaire Administration | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Week | Day M T W T F | Where Administered | Week | M T W T F | Where Administered |
| Sept. 26-27 | | | Jan. 2-3 | | |
| Sept. 30-4 | | | Jan. 6-10 | 1 | 321-B Science Lect. |
| Oct. 7-11 | | | Jan. 13-17 | | |
| Oct. 14-18 | | | Jan. 20-24 | | |
| Oct. 21-25 | | | Jan. 27-31 | | |
| Oct. 28-Nov. 1 | | | Feb. 3-7 | | |
| | | | Feb. 10-14 | | |
| Nov. 4-8 | 1 | Ed. 321-B Sci.Lect. | Feb. 17-21 | 2 2 2 | 321-B Science Lab. |
| Nov. 11-15 | 2 2 2 | Ed. 321-B Sci. Lab. | Feb. 24-28 | 3 3 3 | 321-B Science Lab. |
| Nov. 18-22 | 3 3 3 | Ed. 321-B Sci. Lab. | March 3-7 | 4,5 4,5 4,5 | 321-B Science Lab. |
| Nov. 25-29 | | | | | |
| Dec. 2-6 | 4,5 4,5 4,5 | Ed. 321-B Sci. Lab. | | | |

Key:

1 Questionnaire I
2 Questionnaire II
3 Questionnaire II-A
4 Observation Questionnaire
5 Questionnaire III

was required on the part of the students. In every case the questionnaire completion was initiated at the beginning of the class period. Questionnaires I, III, and the Observation Questionnaire were administered in the large lecture sessions of the science section of Education 321-B. Questionnaire II and II-A were administered during the small group sessions. The time allotted for the completion of the questionnaires fall and winter terms were kept equivalent. When verbal directions were given fall term, care was taken to insure that essentially the same verbal directions were given winter term.

Administration of Questionnaire I, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969:

Fall term 1968. The study began with the administration, in the science lecture section of Education 321-B, of Questionnaire I on November sixth. At this time a brief introduction to the study was presented and the students were assured that their responses would be treated confidentially by the investigator. Students were also advised that other questionnaires would be administered throughout the term.

The questionnaire had been designed to serve as a means of collecting student responses to items which they expected and/or desired to experience in their visitations. Because the questionnaire was not administered until the sixth week of the term it was necessary to ask the students to

respond to the items as well as possible, in a manner which would exclude biases they had developed during their prior visitation experiences. Twenty minutes provided sufficient time for the students to complete the questionnaire.

Winter term 1969. The first full week of winter term was January sixth through tenth. At the first science lecture session of Education 321-B on January seventh, the investigator administered Questionnaire I. The introduction to the study presented fall term was repeated for the winter term students in the study. Twenty minutes provided sufficient time for all students to complete the questionnaire.

Administration of Questionnaire II fall term 1968 and winter term 1969.

Fall term 1968. The questionnaire administration continued with the distribution of Questionnaire II during the seventh full week of classes. The questionnaire was completed in the small group science sessions which met on November eleventh, thirteenth, and fifteenth. All students completed the questionnaire in fifteen or less minutes.

Winter term 1969. Questionnaire II was distributed during the seventh week of winter term. It was completed by the students during the small group science sessions of February seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth. All students completed the questionnaire in the fifteen minutes allotted for its completion.

Administration of Questionnaire II A, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969.

Fall term. The administration of the questionnaires continued with the presentation by the investigator of Questionnaire II A during the eighth week of fall term. Students completed the questionnaire in the small science group sessions on November eighteenth, twentieth, and twenty-second. Twenty minutes were required for the completion of the questionnaire by all students.

Winter term. The winter term administration of Questionnaire II-A in the small science group sessions on February twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh. These dates fell within the eighth full week of classes. Twenty minutes provided sufficient time for the completion of the questionnaire.

Administration of the Observation questionnaire and Questionnaire III, fall term 1968 and winter term 1969.

Fall term 1968. The final questionnaire administration of the fall term took place during the last week of fall term classes. During this week both the Observation questionnaire and Questionnaire III were administered. One hour and ten minutes were required for the completion of the questionnaires (fifty minutes for the Observation questionnaire and twenty minutes for Questionnaire III). The questionnaires were completed in the small science group sessions on December second, fourth, and sixth.

The investigator was faced with a unique problem with respect to the group of students meeting on Friday the sixth, since, during the second half of this week the students in the "Block" had been subjected to an unusually heavy schedule of testing. This was due partially to exams within the "Block" sequence courses, and also to procedures being used by the Elementary Education department in their overall evaluation of the "BIock" sequence. Fatigue from these evaluation procedures was evident in students toward the end of the week. The investigator, in consultation with the director of the study, decided that if the group meeting on Friday were exposed to an hour and ten minutes of questionnaire completion, biased results could occur. For this reason these students were asked to complete only Questionnaire III. The students were able to complete Questionnaire III in twenty minutes.

Winter term 1969. The final administration of questionnaires winter term occurred on March third, fourth, and fifth in the small science group sessions during the last week of classes. At these times both the Observation questionnaire and Questionnaire III were distributed for completion. The students were able to complete the questionnaires in one hour and ten minutes.

Collection of data. The data collection involved the retrieval of questionnaire responses from the two student groups fall term 1968 and winter term 1969.

The instruments as administered fall term required the students to mark items on the face of the questionnaires. Consequently, in order to facilitate the handling of the responses, it was necessary to transfer the marking of each individual questionnaire to I.B.M. response sheets. This task was completed by two students that the investigator felt were competent to carry out the task. Checks were made to insure the accuracy of the transfer of the data.

The fall term I.B.M. response sheets, together with those from winter term were assigned identification numbers. These response sheets were then submitted to the Michigan State University Office of Evaluation Services, through whose facilities the questionnaire responses were transferred to data cards suitable for use with the Control data Corporation 3600 computer.

Analysis of data. As previously stated, the data analyzed in the study originated from student responses to items on five questionnaires. The purpose of the analysis was to compare the half day pre-service school visitation program as instituted fall term 1968 with the full day pre-service school visitation program as instituted winter term 1969. Differences between the two programs were measured by means of two tailed "t"-tests (p 0.05) performed on the following eleven dependent variables: the number of expectations with respect to the school visitation program expressed by students, the number of desires with respect to

the school visitation program expressed by students, the proportion of expectations realized by students, the proportion of desires realized by students, the variety of participation activities experienced during the first seven weeks, the number of participation activities experienced during the first seven weeks, the number of observation activities experienced, the variety of behaviors considered to be desirable as preparation for teaching acquired, the amount of time spent in participation activities during the first seven weeks, the variety of participation experiences occurring during one visitation; and the participation activities in a variety of subject matter areas experienced. A "t"-test computer routine was available through the Computer Services Library at Michigan State University. Separate data decks were prepared for each population and verified for accuracy. The decks were then submitted to the Computer Center for analysis by the Control Data Corporation 3600 computer.

Summary. Data related to eleven variables were collected from two student populations. The populations involved in the study were: the students concurrently enrolled in Education 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level, and the half day school visitation program fall term 1968; and the students concurrently enrolled in Education 321-B, and the full day school visitation program winter term 1969. The emphasis of the study

was to compare the half day school visitation program with the full day school visitation program on the basis of the eleven variables.

Five questionnaires were constructed and administered by the investigator to the two student populations in order to collect data relevant to the variables as identified in the hypotheses listed in Chapter I. The questionnaires were administered during regularly scheduled university class periods.

The questionnaire data relevant to the hypotheses were analyzed using a "t"-test routine through the facilities of the Michigan State University Computer Center's Control Data Corporation 3600 computer. A 0.05 level of confidence was selected for the purpose of testing all hypotheses.

# CHAPTER IV

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected relative to the hypotheses identified in Chapter I. The data were analyzed through facilities of the Michigan State Computer Center's Control Data Corporation 3600 computer. The data relevant to each of the eleven hypotheses were subjected to a two tailed "t"-test routine available through the Michigan State University Computer Services Library. The 0.05 level of significance was the criterion against which all results were checked. In order to facilitate the reporting of the analysis of data, each questionnaire and its related hypotheses are discussed in a separate section.

Questionnaire I and associated hypotheses. The questionnaire was constructed to elicit information relative to the expectations and/or desires of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program fall 1968 and winter term 1969. The responses to the questionnaire items were used in testing Hypothesis One and Hypothesis Two which were stated as follows:

1. Students participating in the full day visitation program will express a number of <u>expectations</u> with respect to the school visitation program equal to that of students enrolled in the half day program ($H_{01}: M_1 = M_2$); and,

2. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will express a number of <u>desires</u> with respect to the school visitation program equal to that of students participating in the half day school visitation program ($H_{02}: M_1 = M_2$)

The data relative to the first hypothesis were analyzed using a two tailed "t"-test. The significant aspects of the data analysis appear in Table 2 below. The table presents data identifying the number of subjects in each population, the means, the standard deviations, the "t"-ratio; and the level of significance of the "t"-ratio.

<u>Table 2.</u>--Analysis of the number of <u>expectations</u> recorded by the half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 175 | 81.19 | 14.40 | 13.84 | $<.0005$ |
| Full Day | 181 | 55.75 | 19.76 | | |

Table 2 indicates that 175 students in the half day program and 181 students in the full day program responsed to the items on Questionnaire I. The mean number of <u>expectations</u> recorded by the half day population was 81.19 which was greater than the mean of 55.75 recorded by the

full day population. The data analysis yielded a "t"-ratio of 13.84 which was significant at a level greater than 0.0005.

On the basis of the analysis of data summarized in Table 3, the first hypothesis ($H_{01}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) was rejected. The data indicated that students in the half day school visitation program expressed a significantly greater number of expectations relative to the school visitation program than did students in the full day school visitation program.

The analysis of data relevant to the second hypothesis encompassed the desires recorded by the half day and full day school visitation populations. Significant aspects of the t-test analysis appear below in Table 3. Identified are the sample sizes, the means, and standard deviations, the "t"-ratio, and the level of significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 3.--Analysis of the number of desires recorded by half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 175 | 90.60 | 15.01 | 1.60 | .093 |
| Full Day | 181 | 87.61 | 18.63 | | |

Table 3 indicates that 175 students in the half day school visitation population, and 181 students in the full

day s

I. T

popul

day p

a "t

level

hypo

was

no s

reco

the

of t

nair

ques

the

vis

to

on

Hypo

sta

day school visitation population responded to Questionnaire I. The mean number of desires identified by the half day population respondents was 90.60 and the mean of the full day population respondents was 87.61. The analysis yielded a "t"-ratio of 1.60 which was significant at the 0.093 level.

Because the criterion level set for the rejection of hypotheses was not reached, the second hypothesis ($H_{02}:M_1=M_2$) was not rejected. The analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between the number of desires recorded by the half day school visitation population and the full day school visitation population at the 0.05 level.

The reader may wish to examine the response patterns of the sample populations to specific items from Questionnaire I. These data are given in Appendix B.

Questionnaire III and associated hypotheses. This questionnaire was used to elicit information relative to the goals attained by students as a result of the school visitation program. The response of the sample populations to the items on this questionnaire as well as to the items on Questionnaire I, provided the data necessary to test Hypotheses Three and Hypothesis Four. These hypotheses stated:

> 3. Students participating in the full day visitation program will realize a proportion of their expectations equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{03}:M_1=M_2$)

4. Students participating in the full day school visitation program will realize a proportion of their desires equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{04}: M_1 = M_2$)

The "t"-test analyses for the third and fourth hypotheses required the raw data from Questionnaire I identifying the expectations and desires of students to be matched with the raw data from Questionnaire III which identified the goals reached by students as a result of the visitation experience. The combining of these data allowed the proportion of expectations achieved as well as the proportion of desires achieved by each student to be calculated.

The data significant to the testing of the third hypothesis appears in Table 4 below. Identified in the table are the number of students completing the involved questionnaires, the means, the standard deviations, the "t"-ratio, and the level of significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 4.--Analysis of the achieved expectations recorded by the half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 128 | .74 | .24 | 13.21 | $<.0005$ |
| Full Day | 142 | .26 | 1.39 | | |

The data in Table 4 indicates that the "N" of each population has been reduced when compared to the "N" of the

sample groups in Table 2 and Table 3. This difference can be attributed primarily to the necessity for students to have completed both Questionnaire I and III in order to be included in the populations identified in Table 4.

The group means for the half day and full day populations were .74 and .26 respectively. The means are expressed in terms of the proportion of identified expectations achieved and thus are less than 1.00 in each instance.

The analysis yielded a "t"-ratio which was significant at a level greater than 0.0005, and thus the third hypothesis ($H_{O3}: M_1 = M_2$) was rejected. The significant difference indicated that the half day population achieved a greater proportion of their expectations than did the full day population.

The data analysis relative to the fourth hypothesis is presented in Table 5. The table specifies the sample size, the mean, the standard deviation, the "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 5.--Analysis of the achieved desires of the half day and full day school visitation populations

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 128 | .8115 | .1525 | 13.21 | $<.0005$ |
| Full Day | 142 | .4081 | 1.0452 | | |

The data in Table 5 reflect the same unique features identified for Table 4. The number of respondents were the same, namely 128 in the half day population and 142 in the full day population. The mean proportion of achieved desires was calculated to be .81 for the half day population and .41 for the full day population. A "t"-ratio of 13.21 was determined and was significant at a level greater than 0.0005.

Because the 0.05 level of significance was exceeded, the fourth hypothesis ($H_{04}:M_1=M_2$) was rejected. The significant difference indicated that the half day population realized a greater proportion of their desires than did the full day school visitation population.

Nine items on Questionnaire III provided the data for analysis of Hypothesis Eight which stated:

> 8. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report acquiring a variety of behaviors which are considered desirable as preparation for teaching equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{08}:M_1=M_2$)

The data from the nine items was subjected to a "t"-test which yielded the analysis summarized in Table 6. The table includes the number of students in the sample populations, the mean, the standard deviation, the "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 6 indicates that 223 students in the half day population and 189 students in the full day population responded to the nine questionnaire items. Group means of 4.90 and 6.62 were established for the half day and full day

Table 6.--Analysis of desirable teaching behaviors acquired by half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 223 | 4.90 | 2.07 | 8.64 | $< 0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 189 | 6.62 | 1.94 | | |

populations respectively. The analysis yielded a "t"-ratio of 8.64 which was significant at a level greater than 0.0005.

The eighth hypothesis ($H_{08}: M_1 = M_2$) satisfied the criterion level and was rejected. The data indicated that the full day population acquired a significantly greater number of behaviors considered desirable for teaching than did students enrolled in the half day population.

The reader interested in examining group responses to specific items on Questionnaire III is directed to Appendix F.

Questionnaire II and associated hypotheses. The first twenty seven items of Questionnaire II were designed to elicit information relative to the number of times each individual had participated in listed activities during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience and the average length of time spent in each participation. The data collected on these items were used to test Hypotheses Five, Six, and Nine which were stated as follows:

sum

inc

the

of

Pop

Hal

Fuj

tio

5. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing a variety of participation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program during the first seven weeks of the school visitation program ($H_{05}:M_1=M_2$)

6. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report experiencing a number of participation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program during the first seven weeks of the school visitation program ($H_{06}:M_1=M_2$)

9. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report an amount of time spent in participation experiences during the first seven weeks of the school visitation experience equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program ($H_{09}:M_1=M_2$).

The data analysis relevant to the fifth hypothesis is summarized in Table 7. The summary which appears below includes the number of students in the populations, the means, the standard deviations, the "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 7.--Analysis of the variety of participation activities engaged in by half day and full day school visitation populations during the first seven weeks.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 201 | 9.59 | 4.70 | 6.83 | $<0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 173 | 12.92 | 4.70 | | |

The data in Table 7 indicate that a half day population of 201 and a full day population of 173 responded to

the first twenty seven items of Questionnaire II. Group means of 9.59 and 12.92 were established for the half day and full day populations respectively. A "t"-ratio of 6.83 was identified and its significance was found to be greater than 0.0005.

The established criterion was met by the "t"-ratio and resulted in the rejection of the fifth hypothesis ($H_{05}$:$M_1=M_2$). The data revealed that students enrolled in the full day school visitation program reported experiencing a significantly greater variety of participatory experiences than did students enrolled in the half day school visitation program.

The summary of the "t"-test analysis of the sixth hypothesis is presented in Table 8, below. The data included in the summary are the number of students in the populations, the means, the standard deviations, the "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 8.--Analysis of the number of participatory activities experienced by half day and full day school visitation populations during the first seven weeks.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 201 | 23.50 | 15.26 | 6.93 | $<0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 173 | 35.49 | 18.15 | | |

Table 8 indicates that 201 students in the half day program and 173 students in the full day program provided the

sample populations for the examination of the sixth hypothesis. The mean number of participations for the half day population was 23.50 and for the full day population was 35.49. A "t"-ratio of 6.93 was calculated which was significant at a level greater than 0.0005.

The sixth hypothesis ($H_{06}:M_1=M_2$) was rejected. The data indicated that the number of participation experiences engaged in by the full day school visitation students was significantly greater than the number of experiences engaged in by the half day school visitation students during the first seven weeks of the program.

The summary of "t"-test data for the ninth hypothesis follows, in Table 9. The table contains data relevant to population sizes, means, standard deviations, "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 9.--Analysis of the amount of time spent in participation experiences by half day and full day populations during the first seven weeks.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 201 | 23.84 | 12.45 | 7.43 | $<0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 173 | 39.73 | 17.29 | | |

Table 9 established that data relative to the ninth hypothesis were collected from a half day population of 201 and a full day population of 173. The mean determined for

the half day population was 23.84 and the mean for the full day population was 39.73. The "t"-ratio of 7.43 was significant beyond the 0.0005 level.

On the basis of the significance of the t-ratio the ninth hypothesis ($H_{09}:M_1=M_2$) was rejected. It was concluded that the full day group spent a significantly greater amount of time in participatory activities than the time spent by the half day school visitation group during the first seven weeks of the program.

Appendix C identifies the response patterns of the half day and full day population to each item in Questionnaire II.

The Observation Questionnaire and associated hypothesis. The data collected from the Observation Questionnaire were used in the testing of the seventh hypothesis which stated:

> 7. Students enrolled in the full day visitation experience will report experiencing a number of observation activities equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation experience ($H_{07}:M_1=M_2$).

Data pertinent to the testing of the hypothesis appear in Table 10. Located below, the table reports population sizes, means, standard deviations, "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 10 identifies respondent populations of 154 half day participants and 183 full day participants. The mean number of observation activities experienced by half day

Table 10.--Analysis of the number of observation activities experienced by half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 154 | 32.41 | 11.49 | 8.19 | < 0.0005 |
| Full Day | 183 | 42.82 | 11.67 | | |

group was 32.41 and by the full day group 42.82. A "t"-ratio of 8.19 was calculated which had a significance greater than 0.0005.

The difference in means was significant beyond the criterion level and the seventh hypothesis ($H_{07}:M_1=M_2$) was rejected. The data indicated that the number of observational activities experienced by the full day population exceeded significantly that of the half day school visitation population.

The group responses to the observation experiences included in the Observation Questionnaire may be of interest to the reader. A summary of the responses to the items on the Observation Questionnaire is located in Appendix E.

Questionnaire II-A and associated hypotheses. Two hypotheses were analyzed using data from Questionnaire II-A. These were the tenth and eleventh hypotheses which were stated in the following manner.

is co

Means

of th

Table

Popul

Half

Full

ques

day b

Means

full

"t"-p

0.000

basis

10. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report a variety of participation experiences during one school visitation equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program. ($H_{o10}: M_1 = M_2$)

11. Students enrolled in the full day school visitation program will report participation in a variety of subject matter areas equal to that of students enrolled in the half day school visitation program.

The analysis of data relevant to the tenth hypothesis is contained in Table 11 which identifies population sizes, means, standard deviations, and "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 11.--Analysis of the variety of participation experiences during one school visitation by half day and full day populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 108 | 6.20 | 3.48 | 7.36 | $< 0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 115 | 10.56 | 5.13 | | |

The data in Table 11 indicated that responses to the questionnaire were received from 108 students in the half day program and 115 students in the full day program. Group means of 6.20 and 10.56 were calculated for the half day and full day populations respectively. The analysis yielded a "t"-ratio of 7.36 which was significant at level greater than 0.0005.

The tenth hypothesis ($H_{o10}: M_1 = M_2$) was rejected on the basis of the criterion established for hypothesis rejection.

The data indicates that full day school visitation populations encountered a greater variety of participation activities during one visitation than did members of the half day school visitation population.

The eleventh hypothesis, which concerned participation activities in various subject matter areas, is summarized below in Table 12. Identified in the table are population sizes, means, standard deviations, the "t"-ratio, and the significance of the "t"-ratio.

Table 12.--Analysis of participation in a variety of subject matter areas by half day and full day school visitation populations.

| Population | N | $\bar{X}$ | $\sigma$ | t | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Half Day | 107 | 3.11 | 1.32 | 5.42 | $<0.0005$ |
| Full Day | 116 | 4.22 | 1.69 | | |

The data in Table 12 reveal a group mean of 3.11 for the half day population and 4.22 for the full day population. The "t"-ratio was 5.42 and was significant at a level greater than 0.0005.

The eleventh hypothesis was rejected; the significant difference indicated that the full day population encountered participation in a greater variety of subject matter areas than the half day school visitation population.

Data not subjected to statistical analysis. Data related to selected interaction between the methods courses and the school visitation experience were collected from winter term (full day) subjects. The addition of seven items to Questionnaire I and III facilitated the collection of data. The items used and a summary of the responses of the students to the items appears in Table 13 located on page 79.

Although no statistical treatment had been designed in the study to examine these items, the relative degree of expected and desired interaction as well as the achieved interaction is suggested by the percentages. The table indicates that the greatest interaction occurred in areas relative to the opportunity provided to students to discuss their experiences in the school visitation program with the instructors and students of the methods courses. These areas were also given the highest rating by students on the basis of their expectations and/or desires. The least interaction appears to have occurred in areas relating to the preparation for the visitation experiences and the identification of goals for the total program and each visitation.

Table 13.--Achieved interactions between the methods courses and the school visitation experience winter term.

| Percent of Students Achieving Interaction | Percent of Students and/or Desiring Interaction | Questionnaire Items |
|---|---|---|
| | | I was able to: |
| 29.1 | 86.1 | 120. be introduced to the school and its program by the methods instructor. |
| 48.1 | 81.2 | 121. have the role that I am to play in the school explained to me. |
| 32.8 | 94.5 | 122. have the experiences I should get in the school outlined to me. |
| 83.1 | 97.7 | 123. have the opportunity to discuss with methods instructors questions that arise as a result of the school visitation. |
| 83.1 | 96.4 | 124. have the opportunity to discuss in class questions that arise as a result of the school visitations. |
| 32.8 | 86.2 | 125. be given direction relative to a focus for each week's visitation. |
| 56.1 | 95.0 | 126. receive help in planning lessons from my methods instructors. |

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this study was to compare the half day per week per term pre-service school visitation program to the full day per week per term pre-service school visitation program as instituted at Michigan State University fall term 1968 and winter term 1969. The bases for the comparison involved: the expectations and desires of students, the participation activities engaged in by students; and, the non-participation or observation activities encountered by students.

The primary concern identified through a selected review of the literature was an institutional apathy towards initiating research which would evaluate the effectiveness of pre-service laboratory programs. Few studies could be isolated which related to student perceptions relative to pre-service school visitation programs or which directly related to the amount of value of the time spent in visitation experiences. Thus, a need for research endeavors related to pre-service laboratory programs was established.

The study involved the student population enrolled in Education 321-B Teaching Science and Mathematics at the Elementary Level and the half day school visitation program

fall term 1968, and the student population enrolled in Education 321-B and full day school visitation winter term 1969. Five questionnaires were constructed to gather data from the two populations relative to their expectations and desires, the types and extent of participation experiences encountered, and the observational or non-participatory activities experienced; in the school visitation programs.

The data collected from the two populations were used in the analysis of the eleven variables isolated for investigation. A two tailed "t"-test was used to examine each variable.

Results and conclusions. Hypothesis One ($H_{01}:M_1=M_2$) involved the number of identified expectations of students with respect to the school visitation programs. The hypothesis was rejected and the analysis indicated that the half day population identified a significantly greater number of expectations than the full day school visitation population.

The number of desires identified by students relative to the school visitation programs was considered in the second hypothesis ($H_{02}:M_1=M_2$). No significant difference was found between the half day and full day school visitation populations. The result might be interpreted as indicating that the amount of time that a student in either of the two populations anticipated spending in a school visitation program did not significantly affect the number of goals that he desired to reach via the school visitation program.

The third hypothesis ($H_{03}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) examined the proportion of expectations achieved by students in the school visitation populations. The hypothesis was rejected and the data indicated that students enrolled in the half day program achieved a greater proportion of their expectations than students enrolled in the full day program.

The fourth hypothesis ($H_{04}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) considered the achieved desires of the school visitation programs. The analysis of data supported the rejection of the hypothesis and indicated that the half day school visitation population realized a significantly greater proportion of their desires than did the full day school visitation population.

The variety of participation activities engaged in by students during the first seven weeks of the visitation programs was considered in the fifth hypothesis ($H_{05}$:$M_1$=M2). The hypothesis was rejected and a significant difference in means supported the conclusion that full day school visitation provided the opportunity for students to engage in a greater variety of participatory activities than the half day program.

The sixth hypothesis ($H_{06}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) was related to the number of participation activities experienced by students during the first seven weeks of the visitation program. The analysis of data led to the rejection of the hypothesis. The significant difference indicated that the full day population encountered a greater number of participation activities than did the half day population.

The seventh hypothesis ($H_{07}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) examined the number of observation activities experienced by the school visitation populations. The hypothesis met the criterion for rejection and the analysis indicated that the number of observation activities experienced by the full day school visitation population exceeded significantly that of the half day population.

The eighth hypothesis ($H_{08}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) involved the acquisition of behaviors which are considered desirable as preparation for teaching. The hypothesis was rejected with the significant difference indicating a greater acquisition of the behaviors by the full day group.

The amount of time spent in participation activities during the first seven weeks of the visitation programs was the subject of the ninth hypothesis ($H_{09}$:$M_1$=$M_2$). The analysis of data supported the rejection of the hypothesis. The analysis also indicated that the half day school visitation population did not spend as much time in participatory activities as the full day population.

The analysis of data led to the rejection of the tenth hypothesis ($H_{010}$:$M_1$=$M_2$) which was concerned with the variety of participation activities encountered during one school visitation experience. The significant difference in means indicated that the full day school visitation population encountered a greater variety of participation experiences in one visitation experience. The agreement of this finding

with the findings relative to the fifth hypothesis lends support to the conclusion that the full day program was more effective than the half day program in providing for involvement of students in participation.

The final hypothesis, hypothesis eleven ($H_{011}$:$M_1=M_2$), was concerned with the participation in a variety of subject matter areas by the school visitation populations during one visitation. The analysis of data resulted in the rejection of the hypothesis. The analysis indicated that students enrolled in the full day school visitation program encountered participation experiences in a greater variety of subject matter areas.

Summary and discussion of the results and conclusions. The results and conclusions of this study may be summarized by the following statements.

1. The students in the half day school visitation experience recorded a greater number of expectations of the school visitation program than students in the full day program.

2. There was no significant difference in the number of desires that students in the half day and full day school visitation programs identified as goals of the visitation experience.

3. Students enrolled in the half day school visitation program realized a greater proportion of their expectations and desires than did students enrolled in the full day school visitation program.

4. When compared to students in the half day school visitation program the students in the full day program were able to achieve: a greater number and variety of participation experiences; participation experiences in a greater variety of subject matter areas; a greater amount of time spent in participation activities; experiences in a greater number of observation activities; and, a greater number of activities considered to be desirable as preparation for teaching.

It is interesting to note that a greater number of expectations were recorded by half day students than full day students. It would appear that students enrolled in the full day program should have had an equal, if not greater, number of expectations of the school visitation program based on the greater amount of time they were to spend in the school visitations. Several explanations, however, could account for this apparent disparity. Three possible explanations are discussed briefly in the succeeding paragraphs.

It is possible that the students enrolled in the half day school visitation program, because of the late administration of the questionnaire fall term, were highly aware of the variety of experiences the program was offering them at the time they were responding to the questionnaire items. As a result of this awareness, they identified an increased number of expectations of the program. The winter term population responding to the questionnaire the first week of the program would not have had this awareness and as a

consequence of their greater naiveté with respect to the program recorded fewer expectations. The investigator attempted to compensate for this effect in the administration of the questionnaire as noted in Chapter III.

Another explanation might be based upon the assumption that the late administration had no significant effect upon the responses of the students in the fall (half day) group, as was assumed in Chapter I. Instead, the term the student enrolled in the visitation program might have influenced the results. The fall term population in this case might have reflected a naiveté by marking a large number of expectations. If the communication was significant between the members of the population and the winter population prior to the winter administration of the questionnaire, a lessening of naiveté might occur within the winter group. A result of this might be a decrease in the number of expectations they would identify.

A third variable might also have been operating either alone or in conjunction with one of the above. The fall (half day) group was aware that they were participating not only in research being carried on by this investigator, but also in a larger departmental study. Both of these studies were being initiated during the fall term. It seems highly likely, then, that conditions existed which would encourage the operation of a halo effect. It is very possible that the effects would be greater fall term at the onset of the

research efforts than during the winter term continuation of the research.

The scope of the present study did not allow for the verification of the above explanations. The effect of the variables described in the explanations might be fruitful areas for further research.

The feasibility of an uncontrolled variable operating in Hypothesis One, as described above, appears to be given neither more nor less credence by the second conclusion in the summary. This conclusion resulted from the testing of Hypothesis Two, and indicated that there was no significant difference between groups in the number of desires identified relative to the school visitation program. The investigator would expect that the desires of the students in terms of what they would like a school visitation program to offer would be a more stable variable than expectations under the conditions of the late administration of the questionnaire fall term. Thus, the number of desires would be less likely to be modified by any of the contaminating variables identified in the above discussion.

The results as indicated in the third statement of the summary, that students in the half day school visitation program were able to realize a greater proportion of these expectations and desires than the full day population, also deserves additional comment. The assumption that as one increased the length of the visitations from a half day to a

full day the probability of students achieving an equal or a higher proportion of their expectations and desires would be increased, appears logical. This assumption was not borne out by the results. The results revealed by the analysis of data may be attributed to several factors which could have been operating within the groups studied. Two of these will be identified briefly in the following two paragraphs.

The shorter length of the visitations of the fall group may in fact be directly related to the increased attainment of the students' expectations and desires as the data indicates. In this instance the reaction of students, cooperating teachers, and "Block" instructors relative to length of the visitation experience would have to be examined. If the personnel concerned with the half day program reacted to the shorter involvement by an effort to schedule experiences more carefully, to evaluate progress more often and to plan more carefully for a variety of experiences than the full day personnel; the results of these efforts might be manifested in the responses of the fall term populations to the Questionnaires as a higher achievement of expectations and desires. This effort by the personnel, then, could overcome the assumed value of the increased time available in the full day visitation program for the attainment of student expectations and desires.

An alternative analysis could be based on a rejection of the assumption made by the investigator at the outset of

the study that the late administration of Questionnaire One fall term would not bias the data gathered. The administration of the questionnaire during the sixth week of the visitation experience fall term may have resulted in the students evaluating the program and their own progress at this point. If this evaluation led to an increased effort on their part to reach the expectations and desires characterized in the questionnaire items, their achievement in the follow-up questionnaire should have been high. There would be no corresponding effect in the full day program. This then could effect the result as noted in the summary statement.

The consistency of the findings relative to the fourth summary statement should be noted. The significant differences in each case were greater than 0.0005. The variables noted in this statement all related to specific activities encountered by students during the school visitation programs. In each case the significant difference was in the direction of the full day visitation program.

Implications for teacher training institutions. In view of the findings of this study, several educational implications appear to be justified with respect to designing and implementing school visitation programs as a part of the pre-student teaching laboratory experiences.

1. Students perceive the introduction to the school visitation program as important. Officials administering

such programs should be encouraged to institute a careful introduction to the program.

2. A high percentage of students expect and desire to be prepared for the types of experiences they are to receive in school visitation programs. Thus the implication could be made that prior information relative to each week's visitation experience would facilitate student participation.

3. Institutions should be aware of the importance to students of the interaction between the methods courses and the school visitation program.

4. Institutions designing or implementing a school visitation program should consider that a full day program (one day per week per term) is likely to permit students to become involved in a significantly greater variety and number of participation experiences than a half day program.

5. The implementation of a full day program will probably allow students to encounter significantly greater numbers of observational experiences than will a half day program.

6. In order to facilitate more desirable behavior changes, visitation programs should be at least one full day per week.

Identification of problems for further research. The review of literature indicated a need for research relative to the effectiveness of laboratory experiences prior to

student teaching. The literature also stressed that the research should move toward a more quantitative approach. This study has compared two pre-service school visitation programs with respect to the perceptions of students regarding the programs, and with respect to the types, number, and degrees of experiences students encountered as related to the time period of involvement. Additional study in the areas of student perceptions relative to school visitation programs, seems desirable. The investigator feels also that further studies are needed which attempt to derive optimum periods of time for school visitations as related to the achievement of student perceived goals of such programs, and as related to the involvement of students in selected participation and observation activities. Some specific problems generated by this study are:

1. Does the student who encounters more of the experiences (participation + non-participation) outlined in this study achieve greater success as a student teacher?

2. Would an increase in the time spent in school visitation programs result in a significantly greater exposure to a variety of participation and observation experiences?

3. Are student expectations and institutional expectations of school visitation programs similar?

4. Is there a relationship between the term enrolled in school visitation programs and the achievement of student expectations or desires?

5. Are the observational experiences encountered by students in school visitation programs appropriate to the methods and procedures outlined in professional courses?

6. Is there a relationship between the length of the school visitation program and the degree to which specific experiences are planned for students?

7. Does the day of the week on which a student makes his school visitation influence significantly the variety of observation and participation experiences he encounters?

8. Is one full day per week more effective in terms of achieving specified goals of a school visitation experience than an equivalent time allotment spread over five days per week?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS


A.A.C.T.E. Sub-Committee of the Committee on Standards and Surveys. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta: The Association, 1948, 340 pp.

Magnun, Vernon. The American Normal School. Baltimore: Warwick and York Inc., 1928. 235 pp.

Ort, E. P. "Pre-student Teaching Laboratory Experiences." In: Partnership in Teacher Education, editors, E. Brooks Smith, Hans Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, and Chandler Barbour. A Joint Publication of the A.A.C.T.E. and AST, Washington D.C., 1966, Sec. V, Part X. 496 pp.

Stiles, L. J., and others. Teacher Education in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press, 1960. 512 pp.

Williams, E. I. F. The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942. 273 pp.


## YEARBOOKS


Flowers, John G., Patterson, Allen, Shatemeyer, Florence. "Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching." In The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. First Yearbook. Oneonta: The Association, 1948, p. 228.

Mauker, J. W. "Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education." In: Foundation for Excellence, A.A.C.T.E., Fifteenth Yearbook Association, Washington D.C., 1962, 202 pp.

## DISSERTATIONS

Adolphson, Louis. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Selected Observational Procedures in Developing Teacher Perception." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1961.

Callahan, Sterling. The Pole of Non-Student Teaching "First-Hand Experiences in Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Dissertation Abstracts, 41: 1047; No. 1, 1954.

Clemens, James. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided Prior to Student Teaching in Secondary Teacher Education Programs of Selected Institutions in Illinois." Dissertation Abstracts International, 30: 4302; No. 10, 1970.

Colvin, Cynthia. "Achieving Readiness for Student Teaching Through Direct Experience." Dissertation Abstracts, 19: 3229; No. 11, 1958.

Edualino, Emilio. The Relationship Between Successful Student Teaching and Pre-Student Teaching Experiences with Children." Dissertation Abstracts, 19: 468; No. 1, 1958.

Elliott, Leeland. "The Nature and Quality of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences in Campus Laboratory Schools Affiliated with State Colleges and Universities." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 1119; No. 3, 1970.

Estes, Sidney. "A Status Study of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences in Elementary Teacher Education." Dissertation Abstracts, 28: 4022; No. 10, 1968.

Eustice, David. "The Relationship of the Non-Academic Pre-service Experiences of Teachers and Teaching Success. Dissertation Abstracts, 23: 2023; No. 4, 1962.

Fehl, Patricia. "The Effects of an Observation-Participation Program on Attitudes and on Concepts." Dissertation Abstracts, 27: 3338; No. 10, 1967.

Frantz, Merlin. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided Prior to Student Teaching for Students Preparing to be Secondary Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, 20: 211; No. 1, 1959.

Funk, Haldon. "The Effect of Pre-Student Teaching Laboratory Experiences on Selected Attitudes and Concepts of Prospective Elementary Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, 20: 211; No. 1, 1959.

Halfaker, Phillip. "Professional Laboratory Experience Provided Prior to Student Teaching for Undergraduates in Secondary Education in Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Bloomington, Indiana University, 1962. 206 pp.

Hersh, Richard. "An Analytical Approach to the Professional Training of Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 265; No. 1, 1970.

Jones, Isabelle F. "A Study of the Various Types of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences to Success in Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts, 16: 709; No. 4, 1956.

Sinclair, William W. "An Analysis of Three Pre-Student Teaching Experiences in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1948.

Turns, Tom. "The Determination and Evaluation of Professional Laboratory Experiences Prior to Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts International, 31: 2780; No. 6, 1970.

Ulry, L. O. "The Program of Field Service Projects in Education of the College of Education the Ohio State University." Dissertation Abstracts, 20: 2161; No. 6, 1959.

## PERIODICALS

Altenhein, Margarete. "C.C.T.V. or Classroom Observation: Which Shall it Be?" Peabody Journal of Education, 40: 296-300, May, 1963.

Chabe. "An Experiment with C.C.T.V. in Teacher Education." Peabody Journal of Education, 40: 24-30, July, 1962.

Cox, Dan. "An Objective and Empirical Study of the Effects of Laboratory Experience in a Professional Education Course Prior to Student Teachings." The Journal of Experimental Education, 29: 89-94, September 1960.

Deever, Merwin R., Williams, Chester, and Flynn, Edward Jr. "Professional Laboratory Experiences in Oklahoma." Journal of Teacher Education, 16: 497-505; No. 4, 1960.

Doll, Ronald, and Macdonald, James. "A New Departure in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 11: 572-575, December, 1960.

Fulton, W. R., and Rupiper, D. J. "Observation of Teaching: Direct Vs Vicarious Experiences." Journal of Teacher Education, 13: 157-164, June, 1962.

Hunter, Elizabeth and Amidon, Edmund. "Direct Experience in Teacher Education: Innovation and Experimentation." Journal of Teacher Education, 17: 282-9, Fall, 1966.

Ingle, Robert, and Robinson, Edward. "An Examination of the Value of Classroom Observation for Prospective Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 15: 75-78, December, 1965.

Levine, Madeline. "Extending Laboratory Experiences: Part II." Journal of Teacher Education, 12: 29-35, March, 1961.

Reynard, Harold. "Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers." Review of Educational Research, 33: 375-6, October, 1963, p. 7.

Scrivner, A. W. "A Professional Laboratory Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, 12: 48-53, March, 1961.

Steinbach, Alan, and Butts, David. "A Comparative Study of the Effect of Practices with Elementary Children or with Peers in the Science Methods Course." Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6: 316-21; No. 4, 1969.

Turney, David, and Stoneking, Lewis. "A Professional Sequence for the Development of Career Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 16: 281-85, September, 1965.

Waimon, Morton. "Observing Classroom Action Systems." Journal of Teacher Education." 12: 466-70, December, 1961.

Wilhelms, Fred. "Exploring New Patha in Teacher Education." Theory Into Practice, 3: 12-16, February, 1964.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

## EXPLANATORY LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION OF THE LANSING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing · Michigan 48823

College of Education · Department of Elementary and Special Education · Erickson Hall

November 19, 1968

Miss Grace Van Wert
Director of Elementary Education
Lansing Board of Education
3426 S. Cedar
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Miss Van Wert:

This communication is to present the general features of the design of a doctoral study that is anticipated as one feature of an overall study being made of the "elementary block" program at Michigan State University. The main purpose of the doctoral study is to ascertain students' perception and significance of visitation experiences in connection with their preservice educational program.

While this study does not involve any teacher time or specific evaluation of any given learning situation or teaching technique, we feel that you and your teachers would want to know that we anticipate a research study and we trust that the study will meet with your approval. The major features of the study including a brief review of the background for the study follows.

Background. The faculty of the Department of Elementary Education has decided to change some of the organizational aspects of the "elementary block". These changes will be implemented at the beginning of the Winter Term, 1969. In view of these contemplated changes, the faculty decided to attempt some comparative evaluation of the program as it has operated this term and as it will operate the following term. As you probably know, one feature that will be changed is the school visitation experience from one-half day to a full days' experience per week. This is the change that we hope to study relative to student perception and significance.

Design of the study. Questionnaire technique will be used to collect information with respect to student perceptions prior to visitation, to observation of their experiences, to participation, to perceptions as a result of their experiences, and to the significance of their experiences.

Questionnaires will be administered to only the students taking the elementary block. The questionnaire will be given during a regular university class period and will not involve outside

student time. Effort will also be made to ascertain the things that university instructors are doing in preparing the students for their visitation experiences and for any follow-up that occurs in relation to the visitations.

The students in the study will be those students enrolled in the "elementary block" at Michigan State University Fall Term, 1968 and Winter Term, 1969. The data will be treated as group data and will not be used in grading the students.

The investigator is Mr. George Schneck, a doctoral student who is on leave from Oshkosh State University. Mr. Schneck is a staff member of the Education Department of that University and teaches science methods courses. He is also involved in some student teaching supervision. The study has the approval of the departmental research committee headed by Dr. Martin and Dr. Vernon Hicks, Chairman, Elementary Education Department.

It is to be emphasized that this study will not attempt to evaluate any teaching situation or teacher and that all data will be treated as group data and individual schools or situations will not be identifiable.

We are most pleased to be associated with you and your teachers in the education of teachers and we trust that we may maintain the fine cooperation that now exists. If you have any specific questions concerning this study, I would welcome such questions.

Sincerely,

John M Mason

John M. Mason
Professor Education
333 Erickson Hall

JMM:pt

# APPENDIX B

## PRE-SERVICE STUDENT SCHOOL VISITATION QUESTIONNAIRE I
## AS ADMINISTERED
## FALL TERM 1968 AND WINTER TERM 1969

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE I

WINTER TERM

"Student-Perceived Goals of the School Visitation Experience"

A. Perceived goals relative to the non-participation or observation portion of the school visitation experience.

To the student:

Please react to the following statements. Indicate your reaction by marking the answer sheet with your choice from the key.

Key

Space 1.--if you expect the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

Space 2.--if you desire the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience. (like to have the event occur)

Space 3.--if you neither expect nor desire the occurrence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

Space 4.--if you both expect and desire the occurence of this phenomenon as a goal of this portion of the visitation experience.

In the non-participation or observation portion of the visitation experience I:

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 98 / 6 | 62 / 23 | 7 / 2 | 8 / 149 | 1. | to acquire knowledge concerning skills of planning and conducting learning activities that implement specific, identifiable goals. |
| 92 / 1 | 73 / 52 | 8 / 1 | 2 / 126 | 2. | to learn techniques for motivating students. |
| 119 / 5 | 42 / 27 | 7 / 1 | 7 / 147 | 3. | to learn techniques for handling classroom organization and procedures. |

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 / 8 | 89 / 69 | 7 / 1 | 6 / 102 | 4. | to learn techniques for handling small group instruction. |
| 67 / 8 | 96 / 84 | 8 / 5 | 4 / 83 | 5. | to learn techniques for handling individualization of instruction. |
| 33 / 9 | 132 / 68 | 4 / 10 | 6 / 93 | 6. | to have the opportunity to observe the teaching of all subject matter areas during the term. |
| 64 / 4 | 101 / 72 | 7 / 9 | 3 / 95 | 7. | to learn techniques for handling discipline problems. |
| 54 / 6 | 107 / 103 | 2 / 10 | 12 / 61 | 8. | to learn a variety of evaluative techniques. |
| 83 / 4 | 82 / 74 | 6 / 5 | 4 / 96 | 9. | to learn techniques for building rapport with children |
| | | | | | to acquire skills in the use of the following, where they are the basic instructional aid: |
| 122 / 23 | 43 / 26 | 5 / 2 | 5 / 129 | 10. | Textbooks |
| 12 / 5 | 114 / 94 | 1 / 72 | 48 / 9 | 11. | Radio Programs |
| 19 / 9 | 123 / 112 | 2 / 29 | 31 / 30 | 12. | Television Programs |
| 54 / 14 | 97 / 66 | 6 / 18 | 18 / 82 | 13. | Incidental Materials |
| 59 / 14 | 100 / 98 | 9 / 6 | 7 / 61 | 14. | "Modern Curriculum Materials" (AAAS, SMSG, etc.) |
| 73 / 19 | 87 / 72 | 5 / 4 | 10 / 85 | 15. | Teacher Assembled Materials |
| 13 / 14 | 4 / 66 | / 10 | 157 / 90 | 16. | The Library |

B. <u>Perceived goals relating to my participation in the visitation experience</u>.

| Fall (upper) Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | 10 | 4 | 112 | 17. | to be strictly an observer without any active participation. |
| 1 | 1 | 176 | 2 | | |
| 48 | 90 | 5 | 32 | 18. | to participate as a co-worker with the teacher in the planning and implementation of learning experiences. |
| 7 | 95 | 12 | 65 | | |
| 13 | 25 | 1 | 136 | 19. | to participate mainly as a student assistant, without any independent responsibilities. |
| 59 | 10 | 95 | 16 | | |

To the student:

The following are a list of activities in which you may have an opportunity to participate. Please apply the key to the degrees of involvement listed in each case.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Audio-visual presentation(s) |
| 48 | 70 | 3 | 54 | 20. | Plan |
| 13 | 73 | 60 | 32 | | |
| 10 | 35 | 1 | 129 | 21. | Assist with |
| 23 | 35 | 3 | 119 | | |
| 32 | 34 | | 109 | 22. | Direct alone |
| 9 | 64 | 93 | 13 | | |
| | | | | | Games |
| 58 | 38 | 3 | 76 | 23. | Plan |
| 16 | 69 | 24 | 69 | | |
| 47 | 47 | 1 | 80 | 24. | Assist with |
| 20 | 28 | | 130 | | |
| 25 | 16 | | 134 | 25. | Direct alone |
| 15 | 66 | 33 | 66 | | |
| | | | | | Supplying supplementary materials |
| 55 | 52 | 1 | 67 | 26. | Plan |
| 15 | 69 | 57 | 38 | | |
| 20 | 17 | | 138 | 27. | Assist with |
| 25 | 44 | 6 | 103 | | |
| 13 | 4 | 1 | 157 | 28. | Direct alone |
| 7 | 62 | 84 | 25 | | |

| Fall (upper) Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Marking of papers |
| 73 | 27 | 2 | 73 | 29. Plan |
| 13 | 49 | 65 | 50 | |
| 39 | 12 | 1 | 123 | 30. Assist with |
| 22 | 31 | 9 | 118 | |
| 13 | 33 | 2 | 127 | 31. Direct alone |
| 14 | 41 | 81 | 42 | |
| | | | | Handling special situations-group singing, folk dancing, etc. |
| 39 | 53 | 2 | 81 | 32. Plan |
| 9 | 85 | 49 | 35 | |
| 19 | 53 | 1 | 102 | 33. Assist with |
| 17 | 38 | 11 | 114 | |
| 29 | 16 | 3 | 127 | 34. Direct alone |
| 10 | 69 | 69 | 31 | |
| | | | | Personal assistance to pupils |
| 62 | 26 | 7 | 80 | 35. Plan |
| 7 | 81 | 30 | 61 | |
| 68 | 47 | 6 | 54 | 36. Assist with |
| 14 | 39 | 4 | 121 | |
| 15 | 10 | 1 | 149 | 37. Direct alone |
| 10 | 65 | 40 | 65 | |
| | | | | Setting up apparatus |
| 64 | 44 | | 67 | 38. Plan |
| 29 | 49 | 52 | 49 | |
| 20 | 19 | | 136 | 39. Assist with |
| 34 | 31 | 6 | 109 | |
| 23 | 21 | 2 | 129 | 40. Direct alone |
| 24 | 42 | 70 | 43 | |
| | | | | Reading to students |
| 46 | 35 | 3 | 91 | 41. Plan |
| 12 | 79 | 15 | 73 | |

| Fall (upper) Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 59 | 53 | 6 | 57 | 42. Assist with |
| 19 | 33 | 9 | 118 | |
| 18 | 32 | | 125 | 43. Direct alone |
| 14 | 65 | 23 | 77 | |
| | | | | Making of bulletin board(s) |
| 48 | 48 | 3 | 76 | 44. Plan |
| 28 | 63 | 37 | 51 | |
| 20 | 22 | 2 | 131 | 45. Assist with |
| 31 | 26 | 9 | 113 | |
| 16 | 23 | | 136 | 46. Direct alone |
| 20 | 57 | 51 | 52 | |
| | | | | Poster construction |
| 37 | 47 | 1 | 90 | 47. Plan |
| 18 | 65 | 49 | 48 | |
| 20 | 24 | 1 | 130 | 48. Assist with |
| 23 | 32 | 16 | 108 | |
| 11 | 21 | | 143 | 49. Direct alone |
| 17 | 50 | 64 | 48 | |
| | | | | Handling of discipline problems |
| 35 | 71 | 1 | 68 | 50. Plan |
| 7 | 60 | 93 | 19 | |
| 9 | 33 | 1 | 132 | 51. Assist with |
| 15 | 63 | 44 | 58 | |
| 8 | 25 | | 142 | 52. Direct alone |
| 7 | 33 | 129 | 10 | |
| | | | | Analyzing pupil work for creativity |
| 25 | 82 | 2 | 66 | 53. Plan |
| 9 | 91 | 53 | 26 | |
| 17 | 33 | | 125 | 54. Assist with |
| 12 | 69 | 6 | 93 | |
| 22 | 15 | 3 | 135 | 55. Direct alone |
| 5 | 63 | 95 | 16 | |

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Drill |
| 68 | 40 | 4 | 63 | 56. Plan |
| 23 | 65 | 48 | 43 | |
| 38 | 44 | 1 | 93 | 57. Assist with |
| 25 | 32 | 10 | 113 | |
| 22 | 24 | | 129 | 58. Direct alone |
| 19 | 56 | 59 | 45 | |
| | | | | Helping pupils solve problems |
| 69 | 32 | 3 | 71 | 59. Plan |
| 10 | 81 | 33 | 54 | |
| 41 | 29 | 1 | 104 | 60. Assist with |
| 18 | 50 | 2 | 110 | |
| 10 | 34 | | 131 | 61. Direct alone |
| 10 | 69 | 53 | 47 | |
| | | | | Creative activities - poetry, plays, etc. |
| 35 | 67 | 3 | 70 | 62. Plan |
| 13 | 93 | 44 | 29 | |
| 15 | 55 | 1 | 104 | 63. Assist with |
| 15 | 52 | 8 | 105 | |
| 6 | 42 | | 127 | 64. Direct alone |
| 6 | 74 | 76 | 23 | |
| | | | | Planning and conducting field trips |
| 20 | 83 | | 72 | 65. Plan |
| 4 | 84 | 72 | 19 | |
| 3 | 30 | | 142 | 66. Assist with |
| 13 | 55 | 16 | 96 | |
| 7 | 30 | | 137 | 67. Direct alone |
| 3 | 45 | 119 | 12 | |
| | | | | Incidental learning situations- current affairs |
| 33 | 76 | 3 | 63 | 68. Plan |
| 14 | 87 | 42 | 36 | |

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | 40 | | 118 | 69. Assist with |
| 19 | 49 | 6 | 105 | |
| 21 | 23 | 1 | 130 | 70. Direct alone |
| 11 | 73 | 69 | 26 | |
| | | | | Individualization of instruction |
| 62 | 49 | 3 | 61 | 71. Plan |
| 13 | 90 | 39 | 36 | |
| 36 | 45 | 3 | 91 | 72. Assist with |
| 17 | 45 | 4 | 112 | |
| 2 | 34 | | 138 | 73. Direct alone |
| 7 | 78 | 56 | 39 | |
| | | | | Planning parties and picnics |
| 19 | 76 | | 79 | 74. Plan |
| 7 | 86 | 53 | 33 | |
| 5 | 26 | | 144 | 75. Assist with |
| 12 | 54 | 17 | 97 | |
| 6 | 23 | | 144 | 76. Direct alone |
| 4 | 56 | 103 | 16 | |
| | | | | Pupil publications |
| 16 | 59 | 1 | 99 | 77. Plan |
| 3 | 81 | 84 | 11 | |
| 5 | 21 | | 149 | 78. Assist with |
| 13 | 65 | 32 | 70 | |
| 2 | 19 | | 154 | 79. Direct alone |
| 1 | 47 | 123 | 8 | |
| | | | | Parent teacher conferences |
| 6 | 80 | | 88 | 80. Plan |
| 5 | 48 | 114 | 12 | |
| 3 | 17 | | 155 | 81. Assist with |
| 9 | 71 | 50 | 50 | |
| 16 | 21 | 1 | 137 | 82. Direct alone |
| 3 | 26 | 144 | 6 | |

| Fall (upper) Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Conducting group discussions |
| 37 | 60 | 2 | 76 | 83. Plan |
| 16 | 77 | 34 | 51 | |
| 25 | 50 | 1 | 98 | 84. Assist with |
| 17 | 49 | 5 | 106 | |
| 13 | 25 | | 137 | 85. Direct alone |
| 11 | 77 | 50 | 39 | |
| | | | | Supervising students during recess, lunch, etc. |
| 37 | 65 | 3 | 70 | 86. Plan |
| 32 | 41 | 51 | 55 | |
| 24 | 52 | 1 | 98 | 87. Assist with |
| 41 | 25 | 14 | 99 | |
| 16 | 7 | | 151 | 88. Direct alone |
| 16 | 34 | 74 | 55 | |
| | | | | Administering and interpreting standardized test data |
| 66 | 26 | 3 | 80 | 89. Plan |
| 9 | 54 | 102 | 15 | |
| 31 | 31 | 3 | 111 | 90. Assist with |
| 16 | 74 | 29 | 61 | |
| 8 | 19 | | 148 | 91. Direct alone |
| 3 | 33 | 133 | 10 | |
| | | | | Teaching specific skills in various subject areas |
| 12 | 104 | | 59 | 92. Plan |
| 18 | 81 | 51 | 29 | |
| 6 | 16 | | 152 | 93. Assist with |
| 17 | 56 | 8 | 99 | |
| 21 | 23 | 1 | 130 | 94. Direct alone |
| 8 | 78 | 67 | 26 | |

C.

Fa
Wi

1

2

4

2

8
1

3
8

3
9

46
7

82
7

46
3

77
8

C. Perceived goals relating to interaction with school personnel.

I will have the opportunity to talk with the following personnel connected with the school operation:

| Fall (upper) Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | 62 | 1 | 64 | 95. | other teachers, |
| 11 | 21 | 7 | 140 | | |
| 26 | 50 | 1 | 98 | 96. | visiting teacher, |
| 6 | 68 | 13 | 92 | | |
| 25 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 97. | subject area consultants, |
| 5 | 98 | 15 | 62 | | |
| 48 | 92 | 3 | 31 | 98. | principal, |
| 9 | 47 | 9 | 115 | | |
| 26 | 120 | 1 | 27 | 99. | counselor(s), |
| 8 | 97 | 11 | 64 | | |
| 89 | 63 | 7 | 15 | 100. | custodial staff. |
| 15 | 57 | 57 | 49 | | |

Through discussions with various personnel I will:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 112 | 2 | 28 | 101. | Obtain insights into the nature and role of various professional organizations, |
| 8 | 67 | 17 | 87 | | |
| 31 | 64 | 1 | 78 | 102. | Examine the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom, |
| 9 | 58 | 15 | 98 | | |
| 46 | 85 | 2 | 41 | 103. | Gain insights into the role of special consultant staff connected with the school system, |
| 7 | 95 | 8 | 70 | | |
| 82 | 77 | 3 | 12 | 104. | Become aware of special programs for special groups of children, |
| 7 | 57 | 1 | 115 | | |
| 46 | 101 | 1 | 26 | 105. | Become aware of the diagnostic procedures for identifying special children. |
| 3 | 95 | 8 | 75 | | |

I will have the opportunity to examine:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 77 | 83 | 4 | 10 | 106. | Cumulative folders, |
| 8 | 111 | 18 | 43 | | |

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58<br>10 | 102<br>90 | 1<br>8 | 13<br>72 | 107. | Methods of reporting to parents, |
| 58<br>15 | 100<br>33 | 3<br>3 | 13<br>129 | 108. | Teachers manuals used in subject matter areas, |
| 58<br>12 | 100<br>22 | 1<br>5 | 14<br>141 | 109. | School facilities, |
| 124<br>16 | 40<br>47 | 7<br>3 | 3<br>114 | 110. | Methods of record keeping. |

D. Changes I will expect to occur in me as a result of the visitation experience.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 127<br>9 | 24<br>19 | 6<br>3 | 7<br>148 | 111. | I will feel more at ease in working with children in a classroom situation. |
| 90<br>10 | 68<br>33 | 5<br>4 | 11<br>132 | 112. | I will be able to identify more precisely the characteristics of a given age group. |
| 114<br>7 | 43<br>72 | 12<br>8 | 5<br>92 | 113 | I could construct, on my own, daily lesson plans appropriate to a given grade level. |
| 105<br>6 | 58<br>85 | 6<br>9 | 5<br>79 | 114 | I could construct, on my own, daily lesson plans so that I could work with one group while the rest of the class was engaged in another activity. |
| 37<br>7 | 125<br>75 | 2<br>6 | 9<br>90 | 115. | I would be able to judge how long a planned lesson would take to implement. |
| 39<br>4 | 125<br>112 | 2<br>9 | 8<br>53 | 116. | I would have a "storehouse" of techniques that are usually motivating to this age group. |
| 47<br>7 | 116<br>56 | <br>7 | 11<br>109 | 117. | I would be able to identify specific reasons why I was, or was not, suited to work at this grade level. |
| 37<br>13 | 126<br>51 | 2<br>10 | 9<br>105 | 118. | I would be able to identify specific reasons why teaching was or was not a suitable career choice for me. |

Pal
Wir
E.
Wir

| Fall (upper) / Winter (lower) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 86 | 77 | 2 | 9 | 119. | I will feel more competent in deciding what curricular pattern is most satisfying to the children of this age group. |
| 8 | 76 | 8 | 87 | | |

E. Perceived relationship between the methods courses and the school visitation program.

Winter only

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 51 | 37 | 70 | 120. | To be introduced to the school and its program by the methods instructors. |
| 18 | 40 | 27 | 89 | 121. | To have the role that I am to play in the school explained to me. |
| 11 | 19 | 8 | 141 | 122. | To have the experiences I should get in school outlined to me. |
| 7 | 22 | 1 | 148 | 123. | To have the opportunity to discuss with methods instructors questions that arise as a result of the school visitations. |
| 8 | 71 | 23 | 77 | 124. | To have the opportunity to discuss in class questions that arise as a result of the school visitations. |
| 7 | 57 | 6 | 108 | 125. | To be given direction relative to a focus for each week's visitation. |
| 15 | 80 | 32 | 41 | 126. | To be able to receive help in planning lessons from my methods instructors. |

"S

A.

I

* Exp

* Des

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE I

FALL TERM

"Student-Perceived Goals of the School Visitation Experience"

A. Perceived goals relative to the non-participation portion of the visitation experience.

To the student:

Please react to the following statements. Indicate by check in the appropriate column whether you expect*, or desire*, the occurrence of these phenomena as goals of this portion of the visitation experience. (If you both expect and desire the occurrence of the phenomenon check both columns. If you neither expect nor desire the occurrence do not check either column)

| I | expect | desire: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1. To acquire knowledge concerning setting and conducting learning activities that implement specific, identifiable goals. |
| | | | 2. To learn techniques for motivating students. |
| | | | 3. To learn techniques for handling classroom organization and procedures. |
| | | | 4. To learn techniques for handling small group instruction. |
| | | | 5. To learn techniques for handling individualization of instruction. |
| | | | 6. To have the opportunity to observe the teaching of all subject matter areas during the term. |
| | | | 7. To learn how to handle discipline problems. |
| | | | 8. To learn a variety of evaluative techniques. |

*Expect-Synonmymes might be; to look for, to intend, to have in prospect, or to count upon.

*Desire-Synonmymes might be; to hope, wish for, or to be glad of.

| I | expect | desire: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 9. To learn techniques for building rapport with children. |
| | | | 10. To acquire skills in the use of the following, where they are the basic insrructional aid. |
| | | | a. Textbooks |
| | | | b. Radio Programs |
| | | | c. Television Programs |
| | | | d. Incidental Materials |
| | | | e. "Modern" Curriculum Materials |
| | | | f. Teacher Assembled Materials |
| | | | OTHER (Please specify) g. |
| | | | OTHER (Please specify) h. |
| | | | 11. |
| | | | 12. |
| | | | 13. |

B. Perceived goals relating to my participation in the visitation experience.

| I | expect | desire: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1. To be strictly an observer without any active participation |
| | | | 2. To participate mainly as a student assistant, without any independent responsibilities. |
| | | | OTHER (Please specify) 3. |

B. (continued)

In the following statements mark each of the vertical columns with your choice from the key.

Key:
E.--Expect
D.--Desire

(E.D. - Both expect and desire
Blank - Neither expect nor desire)

In the participation portion of the visitation experience, I expect, desire:

| to | Plan | Assist in | Direct Alone: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1. Audio-visual presentation(s) |
| | | | | 2. Games |
| | | | | 3. Supplying supplementary materials |
| | | | | 4. Marking of papers |
| | | | | 5. Handling special situation(s)-group singing, folk dancing, etc. |
| | | | | 6. Personal assistance to pupils |
| | | | | 7. Setting up apparatus |
| | | | | 8. Reading to students |
| | | | | 9. Making of bulletin board(s) |
| | | | | 10. Poster making |
| | | | | 11. Handling of discipline problems |
| | | | | 12. Analyzing pupil work for creativity |
| | | | | 13. Helping pupils solve problems |

| To | Plan | Assist in | Direct Alone: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 14. Drill work |
| | | | | 15. Creative activities - poetry, plays, etc. |
| | | | | 16. Planning and conducting field trips |
| | | | | 17. Incidental learning situations - current affairs |
| | | | | 18. Individualization of instruction |
| | | | | 19. Planning parties and picnics |
| | | | | 20. Pupil publications |
| | | | | 21. Parent teacher conference(s) |
| | | | | 22. Conducting group discussion(s) |
| | | | | 23. Class discussions |
| | | | | 24. Supervising pupils during recess, lunch etc. |
| | | | | 25. Administering and interpreting standardized test data |
| | | | | 26. Teaching specific skills in various subject areas |

C. Perceived goals relating to interaction with school personnel.

| I | Expect | Desire that: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1. I will have the opportunity to talk with personnel connected with the school operation. |
| | | | a. Other teachers |

C.--Continued

| I | Expect | Desire | that: |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | b. Visiting teacher |
| | | | c. Subject area consultants |
| | | | d. Principal |
| | | | e. Counselors |
| | | | f. Custodial staff |
| | | | 2. Through discussions with various personnel I will;<br>a. Obtain insights into the nature and role of various professional organizations. |
| | | | b. Gain insights into the role of special consultant staff connected with the school system. |
| | | | c. Examine the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom. |
| | | | d. Become aware of special programs for special groups of children. |
| | | | e. Become aware of the diagnostic procedures for identifying special children. |
| | | | OTHER (Please specify)<br>f. |
| | | | g. |
| | | | 3. I will have the opportunity to examine;<br>a. Cumulative folders |
| | | | b. Methods of reporting to parents |
| | | | c. Teachers manuals used in subject matter areas, |
| | | | d. School facilities, |

| I Expect | Desire that: | |
|---|---|---|
| | | e. Methods of record keeping |
| | | OTHER (Specify)<br>f. |
| | | g. |

D. Changes I will expect to occur in me as a result of the visitation experience.

| I Expect | Desire that: | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 1. I will feel more at ease in working with children in a classroom situation. |
| | | 2. I will be able to identify more precisely the characteristics of a given grade level. |
| | | 3. I could construct, on my own, daily lesson plans appropriate to a given grade level. |
| | | 4. I could construct, on my own, daily lesson plans so that I could work with one group while the rest of the class was engaged in another activity. |
| | | 5. I would be able to judge how long a planned lesson would take to implement. |
| | | 6. I would have a "storehouse" of techniques that are usually motivating to this age group. |
| | | 7. I would be able to identify specific reasons why I was, or was not, suited to work at this grade level. |
| | | 8. I would be able to identify specific reasons why teaching was, or was not, a suitable career choice for me. |
| | | 9. I will feel more competent in deciding what curricular pattern is most satisfying to the children. |

# APPENDIX C

## PRE-SERVICE STUDENT SCHOOL VISITATION QUESTIONNAIRE II
## AS ADMINISTERED
## FALL TERM 1968 AND WINTER TERM 1969

## QUESTIONNAIRE II

(Only on Winter Term)

Fall (upper)
Winter (lower)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | | | | 1 |
| | 14 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 6 | | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 14 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 15 | 10 | 30 | 31 | 27 | 7 |
| | 22 | 19 | 21 | 38 | 13 | 7 | 25 | 32 | 15 | 35 |
| 3 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 14 | 21 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 3 |
| | 19 | 26 | 26 | 18 | 34 | 7 | 24 | 19 | 34 | 45 |
| 4 | 24 | 22 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 15 | 25 | 3 |
| | 52 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 25 | 16 | 19 | 18 |
| 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| | 21 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| 6 | 3 | | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 |
| | 7 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 23 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 18 | 7 |
| | 42 | 38 | 19 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 43 |
| 8 | 23 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 2 |
| | 35 | 38 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 17 | 26 | 19 | 30 |
| 9 | 33 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 26 | 3 |
| | 31 | 40 | 25 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 25 | 25 | 16 | 35 |
| 10 | 21 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 21 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| | 29 | 27 | 18 | 5 | 7 | 37 | 17 | 15 | 6 | 7 |
| 11 | 30 | 32 | 26 | 40 | 35 | 17 | 35 | 25 | 72 | 14 |
| | 17 | 23 | 22 | 17 | 35 | 5 | 17 | 34 | 21 | 53 |
| 12 | 22 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 40 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | 34 | 24 | 20 | 12 | 7 | 74 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 13 | 21 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 17 | 4 |
| | 32 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 20 | 17 | 4 | 15 |

continued

Fall (upper)
Winter (lower)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 14 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 39 | 7 |
| | 16 | 18 | 22 | 14 | 21 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 28 | 34 |
| 15 | 30 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 29 | 3 |
| | 24 | 34 | 20 | 11 | 17 | 6 | 16 | 27 | 23 | 36 |
| 16 | 29 | 13 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 11 | 21 | 16 | 17 | 1 |
| | 32 | 26 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 24 | 32 | 19 | 11 |
| 17 | 35 | 19 | 14 | 16 | 20 | 7 | 22 | 30 | 39 | 6 |
| | 33 | 21 | 14 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 23 | 19 | 22 |
| 18 | 22 | 15 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 5 | 17 | 26 | 27 | 3 |
| | 27 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 14 | 18 | 13 | 14 |
| 19 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 3 |
| | 28 | 12 | 3 | | 3 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 14 |
| 20 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 4 |
| | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 4 |
| 21 | 6 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 22 | 28 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 44 | 8 |
| | 35 | 28 | 30 | 16 | 14 | | 6 | 15 | 19 | 81 |
| 23 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 2 | | 4 | 12 | 21 | 7 |
| | 34 | 42 | 28 | 8 | 8 | | | 24 | 29 | 61 |
| 24 | 19 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 27 | 4 |
| | 20 | 19 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 19 | 10 | 21 |
| 25 | 13 | 17 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 18 | 39 | 8 |
| | 30 | 26 | 28 | 13 | 17 | | 6 | 18 | 27 | 64 |
| 26 | 16 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 34 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 28 | 5 |
| | 29 | 36 | 38 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 9 | 35 | 28 | 53 |
| 27 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 7 | 11 | 19 | 39 | 8 |
| | 13 | 19 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 24 |
| 28 | 34 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| | 30 | 33 | 27 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

continued

Fall (upper)
Winter (lower)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 29 | 32 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | 18 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | | 1 |
| 30 | 33 | 4 | | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | 22 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 5 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 31 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8 | 46 | 18 | 7 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 |
| 32 | 48 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| | 40 | 29 | 23 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 1 |
| 33 | 31 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | 32 | 18 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 1 | | | 4 | |
| 34 | 6 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 20 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 35 | 15 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 24 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 1 | | | | | |
| 36 | 7 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 34 | 46 | 19 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| 37 | 31 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| | 29 | 53 | 35 | 15 | 9 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 31 | 24 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 39 | 52 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| | 32 | 32 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 40 | 22 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | 23 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 41 | 6 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 12 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 42 | 17 | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| | 18 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| 43 | 39 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 26 | 24 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 2 | | | | 1 |
| 44 | 27 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | | |
| | 35 | 57 | 22 | 17 | 2 | | | 4 | 2 | 1 |

continued

Fall (upper)
Winter (lower)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 45 | 21 | 5 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | 27 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | | |
| 46 | 33 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| | 17 | 25 | 23 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 |
| 47 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 12 | 8 | 7 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 18 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | | | | |
| 49 | 38 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| | 22 | 19 | 17 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| 50 | 52 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | | | | 1 |
| | 14 | 39 | 26 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |
| 51 | 11 | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 33 | 37 | 9 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 52 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 39 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 53 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| | 21 | 23 | 9 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| 54 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | |
| | 19 | 23 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | 3 |
| 55 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| | 33 | 25 | 26 | 11 | 9 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | |

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE II

WINTER TERM

"A Summary of the Participatory Activities Engaged in by Block Students During the First Seven Weeks of the Visitation Experience"

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to elicit information with respect to two aspects of your participation.
1. The number of times you have participated in a listed activity.
2. The average length of time spent in each participation.

Please respond by marking on the scoring sheet for each activity as follows:
1. One response from Key A to indicate the number of participations, and;
2. One response from Key B to indicate the average number of minutes per visitation.

Key A
blank - no participation
1 - one participation
2 - two participations
3 - three participations
4 - four participations
5 - five participations
(if you participated more than five times, write that number to the left of the question number on the answer sheet)

Key B
6--3-7 minutes
7--8-12 minutes
8--13-17 minutes
9--18-22 minutes
10--over 22 minutes

Example: If you took attendance 5 times and it took about 10 minutes each time, you would mark the answer sheet as follows:
1. 1=2=3=4=5=6=7=8=9=10=

During the first seven weeks I was able to participate in the class in the following manner:

___ ___ 1. take attendance

___ ___ 2. direct drill work

___ ___ 3. correct and analyze papers

___ ___ 4. administer a test

___ ___ 5. record grades

___ ___ 6. participate in a parent teacher conference

___ ___ 7. make an audio-visual aid

___ ___ 8. make an audio-visual presentation

___ ___ 9. supply supplementary materials for a class

___ ___ 10. set up apparatus

interact with one child

___ ___ 11. do remedial work

___ ___ 12. handle a discipline problem

___ ___ 13. direct an individual investigation

interact with a group of children

___ ___ 14. do remedial work

___ ___ 15. conduct group discussions

___ ___ 16. read to students

___ ___ 17. supervise play activities

___ ___ 18. supervise students during lunch, recess, etc.

___ ___ 19. handle special situations-group singing, folk dancing, etc.

___ ___ 20. plan a field trip

___ ___ 21. plan a party or picnic

___ ___ 22. plan a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 23. plan a lesson involving a group of students

___ ___ 24. plan for individualization of instruction

___ ___ 25. teach a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 26. teach a lesson involving a group within the class

___ ___ 27. implement individualization of instruction

To the Student:

The following are to be answered only if you have planned and taught a lesson(s), or planned and directed an activity(ies).

Directions:
Respond only to the statements that apply, using the Key below.

Key

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 - one time | 6 - six times |
| 2 - two times | 7 - seven times |
| 3 - three times | 8 - eight times |
| 4 - four times | 9 - nine times |
| 5 - five times | 10 - ten times |

A. The topic of the lesson was chosen:

___28. by me
___29. by the teacher observed
___30. jointly with the teacher observed
___31. jointly with the Block instructor

B. I received help in planning my lesson from:

___32. myself only
___33. teacher I was observing
___34. classmates
___35. Block instructors
___36. textbooks

C. The emphasis of the lesson concerned:

___37. concepts
___38. facts
___39. skills (language, etc.)
___40. attitudes

D. The method used was primarily one of:

___41. lecture
___42. lecture-discussion
___43. discussion
___44. discovery
___45. demonstration
___46. questioning
___47. reading
___48. listening

E. The activity engaged in by the children was one of:

___49. listening
___50. discussing
___51. constructing
___52. drawing
___53. writing

investigating
___54. individual
___55. group

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE II

FALL TERM

Directions: Choose one response from Key A to indicate the number of participations; and
2. One response from Key B to indicate the average number of minutes per participation.
3. Place your responses in the appropriate column.

Key A
blank - no participation
1 - one participation
2 - two participations
3 - three participations
4 - four participations
5 - five participations
(if you participated more than five times, write that number to the left of the question number on the answer sheet)

Key B
6--3-7 minutes
7--8-12 minutes
8--13-17 minutes
9--18-22 minutes
10--over 22 minutes

During the first seven weeks I was able to participate in the class in the following manner:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ____ | ___ | 1. take attendance |
| ____ | ___ | 2. direct drill work |
| ____ | ___ | 3. correct and analyze papers |
| ____ | ___ | 4. administer a test |
| ____ | ___ | 5. record grades |
| ____ | ___ | 6. participate in a parent teacher conference |
| ____ | ___ | 7. make an audio-visual aid (specify) |
| ____ | ___ | 8. make an audio-visual presentation |
| ____ | ___ | 9. supply supplemental materials for a class |
| ____ | ___ | 10. set up apparatus |
| ____ | ___ | 11. interact with one child |
| ____ | ___ | 11a. do remedial work |

___ ___11b. handle a discipline problem

c. direct an individual investigation

Other (specify)

d.

e.

___ ___ 12. interact with a group of children

___ ___ a. do remedial work

___ ___ b. conduct group discussions

___ ___ c. read to students

Other (specify)

d.

e.

___ ___ 13. supervise play activities

___ ___ 14. supervise students during lunch, recess, etc.

___ ___ 15. handle special situations-group singing, folk dancing, etc.

___ ___ 16. plan a field trip

___ ___ 17. plan a party or picnic

___ ___ 18. plan a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 19. plan a lesson involving a group of students

___ ___ 20. plan for individualization of instruction

___ ___ 21. teach a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 22. teach a lesson involving a group within the class

___ ___ 23. implement individualization of instruction

Answer statements A through E only if you planned and taught a lesson or activity:

A. The topic of the lesson was chosen:

_____1. by me
_____2. by the teacher observed
_____3. jointly with the teacher observed
_____4. jointly with a block instructor
Other (specify)
_____5.

B. I received help in planning my lesson from:

_____1. myself only
_____2. teacher I was observing
_____3. classmates
_____4. block instructors
Other (specify)
_____5.

C. The emphasis of the lesson concerned:

_____1. concepts
_____2. facts
_____3. skills (language, etc.)
_____4. attitudes

D. The method I used was primarily one of:

_____1. lecture
_____2. lecture-discussion
_____3. discussion
_____4. discovery
_____5. demonstration
_____6. questioning
Other (specify)
_____7.

E. The activity engaged in by the children was one of:

_____1. listening
_____2. discussing
_____3. constructing
_____4. drawing
_____5. writing
_____6. investigating
_____a. individual
_____b. group
Other (specify)
_____7.

# APPENDIX D

## PRE-SERVICE STUDENT SCHOOL VISITATION QUESTIONNAIRE II-A AS ADMINISTERED FALL TERM 1968 AND WINTER TERM 1969

# QUESTIONNAIRE II-A

(Only on Winter Term)

## PART I

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| | 1 | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 3 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 11 | | | | | |
| | 5 | 13 | 17 | 10 | 16 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | 12 | 5 | 14 | 5 | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 22 | 12 | 6 | | | 20 | | |
| 5 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 14 | | | | | |
| | 8 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 13 | | | | | |
| 6 | | 1 | 14 | 19 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | | |
| | | | 28 | 13 | 5 | | 5 | 9 | | |
| 7 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | |
| | 8 | 12 | 5 | | 6 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | 2 | 10 | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| | | | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 15 | | |
| 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | | |
| | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | |
| | | | 6 | 2 | | | | 2 | | |
| 11 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | |
| 13 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | | | |
| | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 13 | | | | | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 14 | 1 | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| | 2 | | 18 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | |
| 15 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | | | | | |
| | 3 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 11 | | | | | |
| 16 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | | | |
| | 1 | 3 | 20 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 17 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | | | | | |
| | 4 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 13 | | | | | |
| 18 | 6 | | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 2 | 3 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | |
| 19 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 14 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| 20 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | | | |
| | 3 | | 12 | 6 | 2 | 6 | | | | |
| 21 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 24 | | | | | |
| | 11 | 18 | 24 | 13 | 26 | | | | | |
| 22 | 4 | | 9 | 8 | 21 | 3 | 8 | | | |
| | 5 | | 22 | 17 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 8 | | |
| 23 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 15 | | | | | |
| | 3 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 15 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | 10 | 8 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 1 | | |
| | | 16 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 25 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 10 | | | | | |
| | 1 | 5 | 19 | 14 | 12 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | 3 | 3 | 31 | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 44 | | 1 | | | |
| 27 | 16 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 28 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 6 | | | | | |
| 28 | 2 | | 11 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| | 10 | 5 | 18 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 2 | | 2 | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 29 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 7 | 18 | 17 | 5 | 8 | | | | | |
| 30 | 1 | | 8 | 8 | 8 | | 2 | | | |
| | 6 | 5 | 18 | 8 | 6 | | | 7 | 3 | |
| 31 | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | | | | | |
| 32 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | 1 | | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 33 | 8 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | 27 | 8 | 3 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 34 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | | | | |
| | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| 35 | | 3 | 7 | 2 | 12 | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 4 | | | | | |
| 37 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 12 | | | | | |
| | 3 | | 19 | 11 | 28 | | | | | |
| 38 | 5 | | 2 | 3 | I2 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | 3 | 3 | 6 | 11 | I4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | |
| 39 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 9 | | | | | |
| 40 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 | | | | |
| | | | 7 | 3 | 7 | 1 | | | | |
| 41 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| 42 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 2 | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 43 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | | | | | |
| | 18 | 14 | 8 | 4 | 5 | | | | | |
| 44 | 2 | | 2 | 9 | 6 | | 2 | | | |
| | 4 | 8 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 45 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 4 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 5 | | | | | |
| 46 | 4 | | 4 | 5 | 4 | | 2 | | | |
| | | 2 | 10 | 4 | 8 | | 2 | 3 | | |
| 47 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 4 | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | 3 | 7 | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | 7 | 9 | | 4 | | | |
| 49 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 6 | | | | | |
| 50 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| | 2 | | 5 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 4 | | | 2 |
| 51 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| 52 | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 53 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 5 | | | | | |
| | | 4 | 17 | 13 | 9 | | | | | |
| 54 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | 3 | | 4 | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| 55 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | | | | | |
| | | 4 | 15 | 11 | 5 | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 57 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | |
| | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | | | | |
| 58 | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 9 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 60 | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 61 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 62 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| 63 | | 3 | | 3 | 9 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 8 | 3 | 20 | | | | | |
| 64 | 1 | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| | | | 25 | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| 65 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 6 | | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 14 | | | | | |
| 66 | | | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | 2 | | 23 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | | | |
| 67 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 3 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 10 | | | | | |
| 68 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 8 | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 7 | 12 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | |
| 69 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 15 | | | | | |
| | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 21 | | | | | |
| 70 | 3 | | 4 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | | | |
| | 1 | | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | |
| 71 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| | | 4 | 10 | 6 | 17 | | | | | |
| 72 | 3 | | | 4 | 5 | | 1 | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 24 | 2 | 6 | 3 | | | | |
| 73 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 15 | | | | | |
| | 2 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | | | | | |
| 74 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | 2 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 7 | | 2 | 2 | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 76 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |

## PART II

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | 18 | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| | 35 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 2 | | | | | |
| 2 | 9 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 6 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | 10 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 18 | 3 | 6 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 7 | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 9 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 8 | 4 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 6 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 27 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| 12 | 14 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 29 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| 13 | 5 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | 12 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 23 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 22 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 2 | | | | | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 15 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 4 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 16 | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19 | | | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | 12 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 20 | 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 11 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 21 | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 29 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| 22 | 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 23 | 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 20 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 24 | 9 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7 | 5 | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 26 | 12 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 26 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 27 | 17 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | 30 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | | | | |
| 28 | 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | |
| 29 | 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 11 | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |

continued

Upper (half day)
Lower (full day)

| Question Number | Response Number | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 10 | 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 32 | 9 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | 9 | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 34 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 24 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | | | | | |

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE II-A

WINTER TERM

"A Summary of the Participatory Activities Engaged in by Block Students During One Visitation Experience"

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to elicit information with respect to two aspects of your participation.

1. The number of times you have participated in a listed activity,
2. The subject matter area in which the participation occurred.

Please respond by marking on the scoring sheet for each activity as follows:

1. One response from Key A, marked on the odd numbers, and;
2. One response from Key B, marked on the even numbers.
3. If you did not participate in an activity do not respond in the spaces provided.

Key A
1--3 to 7 minutes
2--8 to 12 minutes
3--13 to 17 minutes
4--18 to 22 minutes
5--over 23 minutes

Key B
1--art
2--music
3--mathematics
4--language arts
5--reading
6--science
7--social studies
8--spelling
9--geography

Today I was able to participate in the class in the following manner:

take attendance
___1
___2

direct drill work
___3
___4

Correct and analyze papers
___5
___6

administer a test
___7
___8

record grades
___9
___10

participate in a parent teacher conference
___11
___12

make an audio-visual aid
___13
___14

make an audio-visual presentation
___15
___16

supply supplementary materials for a class
___17
___18

set up apparatus
___19
___20

interact with one child - without a written plan
___21
___22

a. do remedial work
___23
___24

b. listen to reading
___25
___26

c. give instructions
___27
___28

d. direct practice
___29
___30

e. direct an individual investigation
___31
___32

f. handle a discipline problem
___33
___34

g. other (specify)_____
___35
___36

interact with a group of children - without a written plan
___37
___38

a. do remedial work
___39
___40

b. plan with students
___41
___42

c. explain or give direction
___43
___44

d. direct practice
___45
___46

e. read to students
___47
___48

f. conduct group discussions
___49
___50

g. other (specify)_____
___51
___52

supervise play activities
___53
___54

supervise students during lunch, recess, etc.
___55
___56

handle special situations - group singing, folk dancing, etc.
___57
___58

plan a field trip
___59
___60

plan a party or picnic
___61
___62

plan a lesson involving the whole class
___63
___64

plan a lesson involving a group of students
___65
___66

plan for individualization of instruction
___67
___68

plan for individualization of instruction
___69
___70

teach a lesson involving the whole class
___71
___72

teach a lesson involving a group within the class
___73
___74

implement individualization of instruction
___75
___76

other (specify)_____
___77
___78

To the Student:

The following are to be answered only if you have planned and taught a lesson(s), or planned and directed an activity(ies).

Directions:
Respond only to the statements that apply, using the Key below.

Key

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 - one time | 6 - six times |
| 2 - two times | 7 - seven times |
| 3 - three times | 8 - eight times |
| 4 - four times | 9 - nine times |
| 5 - five times | 10 - ten times |

A. The topic of the lesson was chosen:
___1. by me
___2. by the teacher involved
___3. jointly with the teacher observed
___4. jointly with a block instructor
___5. with the students

B. I received help in planning my lesson from:
___6. no one
___7. the teacher I was observing
___8. classmates
___9. block instructor(s)
___10. other teachers
___11. books

C. The emphasis of the lesson concerned:
___12. concepts
___13. facts
___14. skills
___15. attitudes
___16. creativity

D. The method I used was primarily one of:
___17. lecture
___18. lecture discussion
___19. lecture demonstration
___20. discussion
___21. discovery
___22. demonstration
___23. questioning
___24. drill
___25. listening

E. The activity engaged in by the children was one of:

___26. listening
___27. discussing
___28. constructing
___29. drawing
___30. writing
___31. reporting
___32. reading

investigating

___33. individual
___34. group

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE II-A

FALL TERM

Key

0 - no participation
1 - 3-7 minutes
2 - 8-12 minutes
3 - 13-17 minutes
4 - 18-22 minutes
5 - over 23 minutes

A--art
M--music
Ma--mathematics
L--language arts
R--reading
S--science
SS--social studies
--other (please specify)

Directions:

Sslect and write in the appropriate number and letter from the key for each of the statements below. Use one of the available spaces for each participation.

Today I was able to participate in the class in the following manner:

___ ___ 1. take attendance

___ ___ 2. direct drill work

___ ___ 3. correct and analyze papers

___ ___ 4. administer a test

___ ___ 5. record grades

___ ___ 6. participate in a parent teacher conference

___ ___ 7. make an audio-visual aid (specify)

___ ___ 8. make an audio-visual presentation

___ ___ 9. supply supplemental materials for a class

___ ___ 10. set up apparatus

___ ___ 11. interact with one child - without a written plan

___ ___ a. do remedial work
___ ___ b. listen to reading
___ ___ c. give instructions

___ ___ d. direct practice
___ ___ e. direct an individual investigation
___ ___ f. handle a discipline problem
other (specify)
___ ___ g.

___ ___ 12. interact with a group of children - without a written plan
___ ___ a. do remedial work
___ ___ b. plan with students
___ ___ c. explain or give directions
___ ___ d. direct practice
___ ___ e. read to students
___ ___ f. conduct group discussions
other (specify)
___ ___ g.

___ ___ 13. supervise play activities

___ ___ 14. supervise students during lunch, recess, etc.

___ ___ 15. handle special situations - group singing, folk dancing, etc.

___ ___ 16. plan a field trip

___ ___ 17. plan a party or picnic

___ ___ 18. plan a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 19. plan a lesson involving a group of students

___ ___ 20. plan for individualization of instruction

___ ___ 21. teach a lesson involving the whole class

___ ___ 22. teach a lesson involving a group within the class

___ ___ 23. implement individualization of instruction

other (specify

___ ___ 24.

Respond to items 25-29 only if you planned and taught a lesson(s) or activity(ies).

Key: Respond by marking the number of times before the appropriate descriptive phrase.

25. The topic of the lesson was chosen:
___ a. by me
___ b. by the teacher involved
___ c. jointly with the teacher observed
___ d. jointly with a block instructor
___ e. with the students
other (specify)
___ f.

26. I received help in planning my lesson from:
___ a. no one
___ b. the teacher I was observing
___ c. classmates
___ d. block instructors
___ e. other teachers
___ f. books
other
___ g.

27. The emphasis of the lesson concerned:
___ a. concepts
___ b. facts
___ c. skills (specify) _____
___ d. attitudes
___ e. creativity
other
___ f.

28. The method I used was primarily one of:
___ a. lecture
___ b. lecture discussion
___ c. lecture demonstration
___ d. discussion
___ e. discovery
___ f. questioning
___ h. drill
___ i. listening
other
___ j.

29. The activity engaged in by the children was one of:
___ a. listening
___ b. discussing
___ c. constructing
___ d. drawing
___ e. writing
___ f. reporting
___ g. reading
___ h. investigating
1. individual
2. group
other (specify)
___ i.

# APPENDIX E

## PRE-SERVICE STUDENT SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE AS ADMINISTERED FALL TERM 1968 AND WINTER TERM 1969

Name_____

Student No._____

No. of Visitations_____

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

WINTER TERM

"A Summary of the Observational Experiences During the School Visitation Experience"

A. The Classroom organizational pattern in the school where I visited is best characterized by the pattern checked below.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 103 | Self contained | 7 | Departmentalized |
| 14 | Transitional | 1 | Ungraded |
| 12 | Platoon | 17 | Other (specify) |

Key
In statements B through L mark an X in the subject column when the descriptive phrase below applies. If a statement does not apply, make no response.

B. Subject metter areas (i.e., Reading, Music, etc.) were taught in the classroom:

| | Soc. Studies | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. as separate and discrete subjects. | 89 | 115 | 102 | 94 | 145 | |
| 2. incidentally (only when a question or application arose) | 28 | 29 | 43 | 27 | 36 | |
| 3. as they aided in the solving of a problem (core) | 30 | 21 | 32 | 27 | 32 | 3 |
| 4. combined with one or more other subjects. | 53 | 54 | 20 | 73 | 11 | 9 |
| 5. OTHER (specify | | | | | | |

C. The basic instructional materials used in the class(es) observed during the term were:

| | Soc. Studies | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. teacher assembled | 36 | 26 | 42 | 54 | 39 | 12 |
| 2. textbook oriented | | | | | | |
| a. single text | 71 | 76 | 60 | 72 | 112 | 10 |
| b. multiple text | 36 | 70 | 21 | 16 | 26 | 1 |
| c. programmed learning | 9 | 29 | 8 | 9 | 17 | |
| 3. modern curriculum materials | 29 | 33 | 43 | 14 | 56 | 1 |
| 4. incidental | 31 | 11 | 28 | 40 | 12 | 2 |
| 5. radio program | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 3 |
| 6. T.V. program | 5 | 3 | 13 | 21 | | 41 |
| 7. OTHER (specify) | | | | | | |

D. The class observed during the term made use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. actual objects or life situations that could be observed with the senses. | 49 | 19 | 104 | 25 | 63 | 8 |
| 2. models or replicas | 48 | 5 | 75 | 10 | 15 | 7 |
| 3. pictures of objects or situations | 94 | 51 | 64 | 41 | 48 | 9 |
| 4. mostly verbalization situations | 63 | 83 | 27 | 80 | 55 | 6 |
| 5. verbalization situations entirely | 13 | 24 | 12 | 20 | 9 | 1 |

E. During this term I observed learning experiences involving the teacher's use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. demonstrations | 18 | 35 | 69 | 10 | 49 | 15 |
| 2. Audio Visual materials | | | | | | |
| a. motion picture | 54 | 6 | 35 | 14 | 10 | 4 |
| b. film strip | 56 | 10 | 35 | 15 | 6 | 8 |
| c. posters-pictures | 63 | 30 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 6 |
| d. flannel board | 9 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 33 | 3 |
| e. overhead projector | 19 | 8 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 3 |
| f. record player | 28 | 10 | 2 | 27 | 4 | 26 |
| OTHER g. | | | | | | |
| 3. Field trips | 15 | 1 | 15 | 2 | | 5 |
| 4. Guest speakers | 15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 |
| OTHERS (specify) 5. | 1 | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | | |

F. During the term I observed learning experiences specifically designed to direct children towards:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. formation of new subject matter concepts | 68 | 29 | 83 | 38 | 111 | 6 |
| 2. the broadening of subject matter concepts | 78 | 70 | 66 | 62 | 90 | 12 |
| 3. modification of attitudinal behavior* | 68 | 34 | 28 | 32 | 22 | 9 |
| 4. acquisition of factual information | 79 | 38 | 83 | 44 | 111 | 6 |
| 5. development of skills** | 40 | 109 | 58 | 101 | 131 | 30 |
| 6. development of interests | 72 | 70 | 85 | 66 | 49 | 21 |

* The modification of attitudinal behavior as used here, relates to the receiving, perceiving, accepting and subsequent preference for a value or value-system. In a school it might take the form of units on community helpers (in 1st grade). In science experiences designed to lead towards open-mindedness.

** These fall into two categories.
Type A - relates to skills such as comprehending, discriminating problem solving, synthesizing, and perceiving when dealing with phenomena (ex. reading comprehension lessons, "feel boxes" in kindergarten).

Type B - Skills involving object manipulation or body manipulation. Using a pencil or using scientific apparatus would be examples.

G. In my observations I was able to identify techniques that I associate with:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Lectures | 53 | 23 | 39 | 33 | 50 | 1 |
| 2. Lecture demonstrations | 19 | 9 | 62 | 19 | 45 | 5 |
| 3. Leading class a. identify problems | 51 | 32 | 65 | 28 | 63 | 2 |
| b. refine problems | 19 | 13 | 31 | 10 | 32 | 1 |
| c. exchange ideas or information | 17 | 13 | 55 | 50 | 41 | 3 |
| d. prepare plans for investigation | 26 | 7 | 44 | 7 | 20 | 3 |
| e. illustrate explain clarify | 50 | 44 | 54 | 46 | 67 | 5 |
| f. interpret and draw conclusions | 40 | 20 | 52 | 25 | 45 | 3 |
| 4. individualized instruction | 21 | 112 | 19 | 55 | 112 | 2 |
| 5. questioning | 77 | 77 | 79 | 63 | 104 | 3 |
| 6. story reading | 40 | 96 | 9 | 60 | 7 | 4 |

H. This term I had the opportunity to see children engaged in:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. construction projects a. dioramas | 9 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| b. bulletin boards | 35 | 7 | 23 | 19 | 11 | 8 |
| c. posters | 24 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| d. maps | 26 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| e. models | 20 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| f. murals | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| g. puppets | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 5 |
| Other h. | | | | | | |
| i. | | | | | | |
| 2. Discussions* a. class | 94 | 53 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 3 |
| b. small group | 31 | 66 | 22 | 28 | 47 | 3 |
| 3. investigating individual interests | 36 | 52 | 34 | 32 | 31 | 8 |
| 4. group investigations | 40 | 8 | 45 | 8 | 17 | |
| 5. dramatizations | 17 | 25 | 5 | 21 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. reporting to class | 39 | 16 | 29 | 28 | 5 | 7 |
| 7. recitation drill | 30 | 51 | 20 | 39 | 43 | |
| 8. drill | 10 | 66 | 7 | 67 | 119 | 6 |
| 9. free play | 17 | 22 | 16 | 23 | 27 | 47 |
| 10. kinesthetic experiences | 3 | 3 | 18 | 2 | 14 | 18 |
| 11. simulation games | 12 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 32 | 4 |
| 12. test taking | 33 | 47 | 30 | 71 | 58 | 2 |
| 13. experiments | 4 | 1 | 63 | 3 | 8 | |
| 14. reviews | 36 | 26 | 32 | 28 | 46 | 3 |
| Other 15. | | | | | | |
| 16. | | | | | | |

*See I-3 for clarification

I. During these observations I had the opportunity to see the assessment of student progress through the use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. teacher designed tests | 42 | 41 | 27 | 40 | 70 | |
| 2. workbook assignments | 21 | 86 | 9 | 78 | 87 | |
| 3. homework assignments | 16 | 9 | 12 | 26 | 37 | |
| 4. standardized tests | 5 | 30 | 6 | 8 | 17 | 3 |
| 5. other commercial tests | 2 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| 6. pupil conferences | 4 | 19 | 5 | 8 | 16 | |
| OTHER (specify) 7. | | 39 | | 39 | 39 | |

J. The evaluation procedures employed above gathered information primarily about student progress in:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. skill development | 25 | 86 | 19 | 78 | 107 | 3 |
| 2. concept level attainment | 44 | 48 | 26 | 24 | 77 | 1 |
| 3. acquisition of facts | 52 | 27 | 49 | 35 | 89 | 1 |
| 4. attitudinal change | 25 | 19 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 1 |
| OTHER (specify) 5. | | | | | | |

K. When children responded to questions they answered in a manner that indicated that they were:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recalling information previously learned | 72 | 71 | 61 | 78 | 131 | |
| 2. analyzing a situation | 56 | 37 | 52 | 20 | 44 | |
| 3. making a judgment | 46 | 26 | 42 | 19 | 28 | |
| 4. creating a solution to a problem | 30 | 19 | 48 | 14 | 71 | |

L. During the visitations I observed techniques used in conjunction with the following situations:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. children entering for the beginning of the school day | 27 | 45 | 14 | 28 | 24 | 15 |
| 2. an occasionally disruptive student | 53 | 89 | 47 | 70 | 88 | 12 |
| 3. regulating the physical conditions of the class | 26 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 32 | 3 |
| 4. lagging student interest | 50 | 61 | 35 | 56 | 79 | 6 |
| 5. helping students to make transitions from one class activity to another | 44 | 65 | 38 | 55 | 58 | 9 |
| 6. general disorder | 29 | 38 | 28 | 42 | 44 | 8 |
| 7. directing "pupil helpers" | 22 | 34 | 9 | 20 | 32 | 1 |
| 8. closing the school day | 30 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 18 | 29 |

Key: Mark with an (X) those statements which are indicative of what occurred:

M. In talking with the teacher before or after class, I was able to:

124 1. see how she delimits a day's work

110 2. see how she writes her lesson plans

69 3. look at a cumulative folder

64 4. learn about the diagnostic procedures used to identify unique children in this school system

112 5. discover how a knowledge of an individual within the class is essential to knowing how to maximize his learning

86 6. identify the types of special programs offered to children by the school system

60 7. hear about the consultant help available to the faculty

78 8. examine the method of reporting student progress to parents

93 9. discuss the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom

27 10. learn about various aspects of professional organizations

OTHER

____11.

Name_____

Student No._____

No. of Visitations_____

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

FALL TERM

"A Summary of the Observational Experiences During the School Visitation Experience"

A. The Classroom organizational pattern in the school where I visited is best characterized by the pattern checked below.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 112 | Self contained | 7 | Departmentalized |
| 16 | Transitional | 11 | Ungraded |
| 14 | Platoon | 20 | Other (specify) |

Key
In statements B through L mark an X in the subject column when the descriptive phrase below applies. If a statement does not apply, make no response.

B. Subject matter areas (i.e., Reading, Music, etc.) were taught in the classroom:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. as separate and discrete subjects | 61 | 89 | 49 | 63 | 97 | 41 |
| 2. incidentally (only when a question or application arose) | 21 | 5 | 23 | 10 | 6 | 2 |
| 3. as they aided in the solving of a problem (core) | 12 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| 4. combined with one or more other subjects | 15 | 24 | 10 | 34 | 6 | 8 |
| 5. OTHER (specify) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

C. The basic instructional materials used in the class(es) observed during the term were:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. teacher assembled | 31 | 22 | 25 | 51 | 32 | 35 |
| 2. textbook oriented a. single text | 38 | 64 | 25 | 47 | 33 | 6 |
| b. multiple text | 10 | 24 | 3 | 11 | 17 | 1 |
| c. programmed learning | 1 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 |
| 3. modern curriculum materials | 12 | 23 | 21 | 7 | 20 | 4 |
| 4. incidental | 13 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 0 |
| 5. radio program | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 6. T.V. program | 6 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 7. OTHER (specify) | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

D. The class observed during the term made use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. actual objects or life situations that could be observed with the senses | 30 | 10 | 50 | 13 | 22 | 10 |
| 2. models or replicas | 25 | 9 | 24 | 13 | 24 | 8 |
| 3. pictures of objects or situations | 49 | 23 | 28 | 22 | 26 | 3 |
| 4. mostly verbalization situations | 34 | 50 | 8 | 60 | 36 | 7 |
| 5. verbalization situations entirely | 7 | 11 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 4 |

E. During this term I observed learning experiences involving the teacher's use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. demonstrations | 9 | 5 | 25 | 12 | 16 | 13 |
| 2. Audio Visual materials<br>a. motion picture | 15 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| b. film strip | 24 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| c. posters-pictures | 37 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 4 |
| d. flannel board | 4 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 1 |
| e. overhead projector | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| f. record player | 15 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 25 |
| OTHER<br>g. | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 3. Field trips | 9 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. Guest speakers | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OTHERS (specify)<br>5. | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 6. | | | | | | |

F. During the term I observed learning experiences specifically designed to direct children towards:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. formation of new subject matter concepts | 48 | 18 | 30 | 29 | 43 | 2 |
| 2. the broadening of subject matter concepts | 42 | 28 | 24 | 28 | 40 | 6 |
| 3. modification of attitudinal behavior* | 26 | 12 | 11 | 30 | 7 | 6 |
| 4. acquisition of factual information | 46 | 24 | 32 | 31 | 48 | 6 |
| 5. development of skills** | 14 | 51 | 10 | 59 | 61 | 18 |
| 6. development of interests | 31 | 22 | 26 | 18 | 11 | 19 |

*The modification of attitudinal behavior as used here, relates to the receiving, perceiving, accepting and subsequent preference for a value or value-system. In a school it might take the form of units on community helpers (in 1st grade). In science experiences designed to lead towards open-mindedness.

**These fall into two categories.
Type A - relates to skills such as comprehending, discriminating problem solving, synthesizing, and perceiving when dealing with phenomena (ex. reading comprehension lessons, "feel boxes" in kindergarten).

Type B - skills involving object manipulation or body manipulation. Using a pencil or using scientific apparatus would be examples.

G. In my observations I was able to identify techniques that I associate with:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. lectures | 29 | 13 | 8 | 26 | 23 | 7 |
| 2. lecture demonstrations | 12 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 9 |
| 3. leading class | | | | | | |
| a. identify problems | 29 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 4 |
| b. refine problems | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| c. exchange ideas of information | 37 | 16 | 20 | 28 | 11 | 5 |
| d. prepare plans for investigations | 9 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| e. illustrate explain clarify | 20 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 23 | 2 |
| f. interpret and draw conclusions | 16 | 20 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 2 |
| 4. individualized instruction | 13 | 66 | 3 | 27 | 45 | 10 |
| 5. questioning | 37 | 35 | 26 | 30 | 38 | 9 |
| 6. story reading | 14 | 64 | 2 | 27 | | 7 |

H. This term I had the opportunity to see children engaged in:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. construction projects a. dioramas | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 12 |
| b. bulletin boards | 16 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| c. posters | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| d. maps | 16 | | | | | 1 |
| e. models | 12 | 2 | 6 | | | 6 |
| f. murals | 12 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 11 |
| g. puppets | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 3 |
| Other h. | 8 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| i. | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| 2. discussions* a. class | 61 | 23 | 33 | 34 | 26 | 6 |
| b. small group | 8 | 28 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 1 |
| 3. investigating individual interests | 16 | 19 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 10 |
| 4. group investigations | 9 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. dramatizations | 8 | 7 | 2 | 7 | | 1 |
| 6. reporting to class | 15 | 11 | 8 | 15 | | |
| 7. recitation | 16 | 32 | 3 | 21 | 17 | 1 |
| 8. drill | 6 | 31 | 1 | 47 | 58 | 4 |
| 9. free play | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 31 |
| 10. kinesthetic experiences | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
| 11. simulation games | 7 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 8 |
| 12. test taking | 11 | 19 | 8 | 44 | 17 | 12 |
| 13. experiments | 1 | 3 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. reviews | 19 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 17 | 3 |
| Other 15. | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 16. | | | | | | |

*See I-3 for clarification

I. During these observations I had the opportunity to see the assessment of student progress through the use of:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. teacher designed tests | 20 | 15 | 10 | 30 | 27 | 1 |
| 2. workbook assignments | 7 | 40 | 3 | 52 | 44 | 3 |
| 3. homework assignments | 9 | 5 | 6 | 18 | 23 | 1 |
| 4. standardized tests | 4 | 11 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 1 |
| 5. other commercial tests | | 4 | | 2 | | 2 |
| 6. pupil conferences | 3 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| OTHER (Specify) 7. | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | |

J. The evaluation procedures employed above gathered information primarily about student progress in:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Other (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. skill development | 13 | 47 | 4 | 56 | 55 | 3 |
| 2. concept level attainment | 17 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 20 | 32 |
| 3. acquisition of facts | 26 | 14 | 22 | 33 | 44 | 24 |
| 4. attitudinal change | 10 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Other (specify) 5. | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |

K. When children responded to questions they answered in a manner that indicated that they were:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recalling information previously learned | 54 | 42 | 27 | 52 | 68 | 6 |
| 2. analyzing a situation | 31 | 21 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 5 |
| 3. making a judgment | 30 | 18 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 4 |
| 4. creating a solution to a problem | 16 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 24 | 3 |

L. During the visitations I observed techniques used in conjunction with the following situations:

| | Soc. Stud. | Read. | Sci. | Lang. Arts | Math. | Others (specify) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Children entering for the beginning of the school day | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 10 |
| 2. an occasionally disruptive student | 40 | 57 | 21 | 49 | 47 | 28 |
| 3. regulating the physical conditions of the class | 11 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 11 |
| 4. lagging student interest | 31 | 39 | 13 | 37 | 34 | 15 |
| 5. helping students to make transitions from one class activity to another | 27 | 34 | 15 | 26 | 31 | 20 |
| 6. general disorder | 23 | 20 | 12 | 25 | 24 | 20 |
| 7. directing "pupil helpers" | 9 | 12 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 13 |
| 8. closing the school day | 28 | 25 | 16 | 34 | 20 | 53 |

Key: Mark with an (X) those statements which are indicative of what occurred:

M. In talking with the teacher before or after class, I was able to:

67 1. see how she delimits a day's work

58 2. see how she writes her lesson plans

50 3. look at a cumulative folder

57 4. learn about the diagnostic procedures used to identify unique children in this school system

101 5. discover how a knowledge of an individual within the class is essential to knowing how to maximize his learning

57 6. identify the types of special programs offered to children by the school system

36 7. hear about the consultant help available to the faculty

63 8. examine the method of reporting student progress to parents

56 9. discuss the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom

16 10. learn about various aspects of professional organizations

OTHER

___ 11.

# APPENDIX F

## PRE-SERVICE STUDENT SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE III AS ADMINISTERED FALL TERM 1968 AND WINTER TERM 1969

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE III

WINTER TERM

"Goals attained by students as a result of the school visitation experience"

A. Goals attained as a result of the non-participation portion of the visitation experience.

To the student:

Please react to the following statements. Indicate your reaction by marking the answer sheet with your choice from the key.

Key

Space 1. I was able to
Space 2. I was not able to

In the non-participation or observation portion of the visitation experience I:

| Fall | | Winter | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| 167 | 54 | 150 | 39 | 1. acquire knowledge concerning skills of planning and conducting learning activities that implement specific, identifiable goals. |
| 157 | 66 | 142 | 47 | 2. learn techniques for motivating students. |
| 181 | 42 | 169 | 20 | 3. learn techniques for handling classroom organization and procedures. |
| 140 | 83 | 143 | 46 | 4. learn techniques for handling small group instruction. |
| 138 | 83 | 126 | 62 | 5. learn techniques for handling individualization of instruction. |
| 25 | 198 | 61 | 127 | 6. have the opportunity to observe the teaching of all subject matter areas during the term. |
| 98 | 125 | 124 | 65 | 7. learn techniques for handling discipline problems. |

| Fall 1 | Fall 2 | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43 | 180 | 57 | 132 | 8. | learn a variety of evaluative techniques. |
| 171 | 49 | 158 | 31 | 9. | learn techniques for building rapport with children. |

Acquire skills in the use of the following, where they are the basic instructional aid:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 141 | 82 | 141 | 46 | 10. | Textbooks |
| 1 | 222 | | 188 | 11. | Radio Programs |
| 22 | 201 | 63 | 125 | 12. | Television Programs |
| 118 | 103 | 146 | 43 | 13. | Incidental materials |
| 88 | 135 | 60 | 128 | 14. | "Modern Curriculum Materials" (AAAS, SMSG, etc.) |
| 118 | 105 | 133 | 56 | 15. | Teacher Assembled Materials |
| 12 | 209 | 97 | 92 | 16. | The Library |

B. My status relative to my participation in the visitation experience.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99 | 123 | 16 | 173 | 17. | to be strictly an observer without any active participation. |
| 76 | 147 | 128 | 60 | 18. | to participate mainly as a student assistant, without any independent responsibilities. |
| 16 | 207 | 71 | 117 | 19. | to participate mainly as a student assistant, without any independent responsibilities. |

To the student:

The following are a list of activities in which you may have had an opportunity to participate. Please apply the key to the degrees of involvement listed in each case.

| Fall | | Winter | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | | Audio-visual presentation(s) |
| 43 | 179 | 81 | 104 | 20. Plan |
| 43 | 180 | 116 | 73 | 21. Assist with |
| 31 | 192 | 84 | 102 | 22. Direct alone |
| | | | | Games |
| 89 | 134 | 75 | 113 | 23. Plan |
| 63 | 159 | 125 | 62 | 24. Assist with |
| 24 | 197 | 88 | 98 | 25. Direct alone |
| | | | | Supplying supplementary materials |
| 34 | 178 | 137 | 51 | 26. Plan |
| 59 | 164 | 124 | 63 | 27. Assist with |
| 5 | 217 | 137 | 51 | 28. Direct alone |
| | | | | Marking of papers |
| 76 | 145 | 46 | 141 | 29. Plan |
| 70 | 153 | 136 | 51 | 30. Assist with |
| 17 | 206 | 93 | 94 | 31. Direct alone |
| | | | | Handling special situations-group singing, folk dancing, etc. |
| 35 | 187 | 43 | 143 | 32. Plan |
| 47 | 175 | 84 | 105 | 33. Assist with |
| 24 | 199 | 50 | 137 | 34. Direct alone |
| | | | | Personal assistance to pupils |
| 87 | 136 | 115 | 73 | 35. Plan |
| 150 | 73 | 171 | 17 | 36. Assist with |
| 7 | 215 | 146 | 42 | 37. Direct alone |
| | | | | Setting up apparatus |
| 46 | 177 | 58 | 129 | 38. Plan |
| 37 | 186 | 99 | 90 | 39. Assist with |
| 14 | 209 | 68 | 119 | 40. Direct alone |
| | | | | Reading to students |
| 33 | 188 | 70 | 117 | 41. Plan |
| 99 | 124 | 99 | 88 | 42. Assist with |
| 7 | 215 | 103 | 85 | 43. Direct alone |
| | | | | Making of bulletin board(s) |
| 36 | 186 | 51 | 136 | 44. Plan |
| 26 | 193 | 75 | 112 | 45. Assist with |
| 5 | 218 | 57 | 130 | 46. Direct alone |
| | | | | Poster construction |
| 15 | 208 | 30 | 156 | 47. Plan |
| 15 | 208 | 28 | 158 | 48. Assist with |
| 4 | 217 | 27 | 160 | 49. Direct alone |

| Fall 1 | Fall 2 | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Handling of discipline problems |
| 50 | 173 | 43 | 144 | 50. Plan |
| 34 | 189 | 115 | 72 | 51. Assist with |
| 7 | 216 | 90 | 98 | 52. Direct alone |
| | | | | Analyzing pupil work for creativity |
| 48 | 173 | 43 | 143 | 53. Plan |
| 30 | 193 | 84 | 104 | 54. Assist with |
| 8 | 214 | 50 | 137 | 55. Direct alone |
| | | | | Drill work |
| 92 | 131 | 70 | 117 | 56. Plan |
| 76 | 146 | 139 | 49 | 57. Assist with |
| 13 | 210 | 108 | 79 | 58. Direct alone |
| | | | | Helping pupils solve problems |
| 77 | 146 | 97 | 90 | 59. Plan |
| 93 | 130 | 168 | 20 | 60. Assist with |
| 22 | 201 | 131 | 56 | 61. Direct alone |
| | | | | Creative activities - poetry, plays, etc. |
| 36 | 187 | 42 | 146 | 62. Plan |
| 33 | 189 | 56 | 131 | 63. Assist with |
| 6 | 217 | 37 | 151 | 64. Direct alone |
| | | | | Planning and conducting field trips |
| 14 | 204 | 5 | 182 | 65. Plan |
| 6 | 217 | 19 | 168 | 66. Assist with |
| 3 | 220 | 4 | 183 | 67. Direct alone |
| | | | | Incidental learning situations-current affairs |
| 35 | 188 | 22 | 164 | 68. Plan |
| 13 | 207 | 71 | 116 | 69. Assist with |
| 20 | 203 | 29 | 158 | 70. Direct alone |
| | | | | Individualization of instruction |
| 56 | 166 | 111 | 77 | 71. Plan |
| 100 | 123 | 154 | 34 | 72. Assist with |
| 2 | 219 | 141 | 47 | 73. Direct alone |
| | | | | Planning parties and picnics |
| 12 | 211 | 13 | 174 | 74. Plan |
| 4 | 218 | 35 | 152 | 75. Assist with |
| 2 | 221 | 10 | 177 | 76. Direct alone |
| | | | | Pupil publications |
| 4 | 217 | 5 | 181 | 77. Plan |
| 3 | 220 | 12 | 175 | 78. Assist with |
| 4 | 219 | 4 | 183 | 79. Direct alone |

| Fall 1 | Fall 2 | Winter 1 | Winter 2 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Parent teacher conferences | |
| 6 | 217 | 2 | 185 | 80. | Plan |
| 3 | 218 | 6 | 181 | 81. | Assist with |
| 12 | 211 | 2 | 185 | 82. | Direct alone |
| | | | | Conducting class discussions | |
| 48 | 194 | 122 | 65 | 83. | Plan |
| 59 | 164 | 134 | 54 | 84. | Assist with |
| 6 | 212 | 130 | 58 | 85. | Direct alone |
| | | | | Supervising students during recess, lunch, etc. | |
| 84 | 136 | 44 | 144 | 86. | Plan |
| 53 | 169 | 117 | 70 | 87. | Assist with |
| 11 | 212 | 70 | 118 | 88. | Direct alone |
| | | | | Administering and interpreting standarized test data | |
| 39 | 184 | 5 | 181 | 89. | Plan |
| 53 | 169 | 22 | 165 | 90. | Assist with |
| | 223 | 11 | 176 | 91. | Direct alone |
| | | | | Teaching specific skills in various subject areas | |
| 15 | 208 | 138 | 50 | 92. | Plan |
| 6 | 214 | 161 | 27 | 93. | Assist with |
| 16 | 207 | 153 | 35 | 94. | Direct alone |

C. Goals achieved relative to interaction with school personnel.

I (1) was able (2) was not able to talk with the following personnel connected with the school operation:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43 | 179 | 185 | 4 | 95. | other teachers |
| 56 | 167 | 101 | 88 | 96. | subject area consultants |
| 128 | 87 | 72 | 117 | 97. | visiting teacher |
| 50 | 172 | 144 | 45 | 98. | principal |
| 32 | 189 | 34 | 155 | 99. | counselor(s) |
| 118 | 103 | 94 | 95 | 100. | custodial staff |

Through discussions with various personnel I (1) was able (2) was not able to:

| Fall | | Winter | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 14 | 200 | 72 | 116 | 101. | Obtain insights into the nature and role of various professional organizations. |
| 32 | 189 | 152 | 37 | 102. | Examine the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom. |
| 38 | 184 | 85 | 104 | 103. | Gain insights into the role of special consultant staff connected with the school system. |
| 101 | 121 | 129 | 60 | 104. | Become aware of special programs for special groups of children. |
| 43 | 176 | 100 | 89 | 105. | Become aware of the diagnostic procedures for identifying special children. |
| I (1) was able (2) was <u>not</u> able to examine: | | | | | |
| 116 | 106 | 87 | 102 | 106. | Cumulative folders. |
| 73 | 149 | 88 | 101 | 107. | Methods of reporting to parents. |
| 93 | 129 | 172 | 17 | 108. | Teachers manuals used in subject matter areas. |
| 78 | 134 | 175 | 12 | 109. | School facilities. |
| 147 | 75 | 108 | 81 | 110. | Methods of record keeping. |

D. <u>Changes that occurred in me as a result of the visitation experience</u>.

<u>Key</u>

1. I am able to
2. I am not able to

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 139 | 83 | 182 | 7 | 111. | feel <u>more</u> at ease in working with children in a classroom situation. |
| 91 | 131 | 167 | 22 | 112. | identify <u>more</u> precisely the characteristics of a given age group. |
| 183 | 28 | 142 | 46 | 113. | construct, on my own, daily lesson plans appropriate to a given grade level. |

| Fall | | Winter | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 193 | 29 | 122 | 65 | 114. | construct, on my own, daily lesson plans so that I could work with one group while the rest of the class was engaged in another activity. |
| 82 | 138 | 114 | 74 | 115. | judge how long a planned lesson would take to implement. |
| 70 | 152 | 75 | 113 | 116. | have a "storehouse" of techniques that are usually motivating to this age group. |
| 83 | 133 | 161 | 27 | 117. | identify specific reasons why I was, or was not, suited to work at this grade level. |
| 73 | 149 | 159 | 30 | 118. | identify specific reasons why teaching was or was not a suitable career choice for me. |
| 179 | 42 | 129 | 60 | 119. | feel more competent in deciding what curricular pattern is most satisfying to the children of this age group. |

E. Achieved relationship between the methods course and the school visitation program.

Key

1. I was able to
2. I was not able to

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 55 | 133 | 120. | Be introduced to the school and its program by the methods instructors. |
| 91 | 93 | 121. | To have the role that I am to play in the school explained to me. |
| 62 | 127 | 122. | To have the experiences I should get in the school outlined to me. |
| 157 | 32 | 123. | To have the opportunity to discuss with methods instructors questions that arise as a result of the school visitations. |

| Fall | | Winter | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | 157 | 32 | 124. To have the opportunity to discuss in class questions that arise as a result of the school visitations. |
| | | 62 | 125 | 125. To be given direction relative to a focus for each week's visitation. |
| | | 106 | 79 | 126. To be able to receive help in planning lessons from my methods instructors. |

PRE-SERVICE STUDENT
SCHOOL VISITATION EXPERIENCE
QUESTIONNAIRE III

FALL TERM

"Goals attained by students as a result of the school visitation experience"

A. Goals attained as a result of the non-participation portion of the visitation experience.

To the student:

Please react to the following statements. Indicate your reaction by marking the answer sheet with your choice from the key.

Key:
1. I was able to
2. I was not able to

In the non-participation or observation portion of the visitation experience I:

1 2 1. acquire knowledge concerning skills of planning and conducting learning activities that implement specific, identifiable goals.

1 2 2. learn techniques for motivating students.

1 2 3. learn techniques for handling classroom organization and procedures.

1 2 4. learn techniques for handling small group instruction.

1 2 5. learn techniques for handling individualization of instruction.

1 2 6. have the opportunity to observe the teaching of all subject matter areas during the term.

1 2 7. learn techniques for handling discipline problems.

1 2 8. learn a variety of evaluative techniques.

1 2 9. learn techniques for building rapport with children.

Acquire skills in the use of the following, where they are the basic instructional aid:

1 2 10. Textbooks

1 2 11. Radio Programs

1 2 12. Television Programs

1 2 13. Incidental Materials

1 2 14. "Modern curriculum Materials" (AAAS, SMSG, etc.)

1 2 15. Teacher Assembled Materials

1 2 16. The Library

B. My status relative to my participation in the visitation experience.

1 2 17. to be strictly an observer without any active participation.

1 2 18. to participate as a co-worker with the teacher in the planning and implementation of learning experience.

1 2 19. to participate mainly as a student assistant, without any independent responsibilities.

To the Student

The following are a list of activities in which you may have had an opportunity to participate. Please apply the key to the degrees of involvement listed in each case.

Audio-visual presentation(s)

20. Plan
21. Assist with
22. Direct alone

Games

23. Plan
24. Assist with
25. Direct alone

Supplying supplementary materials

26. Plan
27. Assist with
28. Direct alone

Marking of papers
29. Plan
30. Assist with
31. Direct alone

Handling special situation-group singing, folk dancing, etc.
32. Plan
33. Assist with
34. Direct alone

Personal assistance to pupils
35. Plan
36. Assist with
37. Direct alone

Setting up apparatus
38. Plan
39. Assist with
40. Direct alone

Reading to students
41. Plan
42. Assist with
43. Direct alone

Making of bulletin board(s)
44. Plan
45. Assist with
46. Direct alone

Poster construction
47. Plan
48. Assist with
49. Direct alone

Handling of discipline problems
50. Plan
51. Assist with
52. Direct alone

Analyzing pupil work for creativity
53. Plan
54. Assist with
55. Direct alone

Drill work
56. Plan
57. Assist with
58. Direct alone

Helping pupils solve problems
59. Plan
60. Assist with
61. Direct alone

Creative activities - poetry, plays, etc.
62. Plan
63. Assist with
64. Direct alone

Planning and conducting field trips
65. Plan
66. Assist with
67. Direct alone

Incidental learning situations-current affairs
68. Plan
69. Assist with
70. Direct alone

Individualization of instruction
71. Plan
72. Assist with
73. Direct alone

Planning parties and picnics
74. Plan
75. Assist with
76. Direct alone

Pupil publications
77. Plan
78. Assist with
79. Direct alone

Parent teacher conferences
80. Plan
81. Assist with
82. Direct alone

Conducting class discussions
83. Plan
84. Assist with
85. Direct alone

Supervising students during recess, lunch, etc.
86. Plan
87. Assist with
88. Direct alone

Administering and interpreting standardized test data

89. Plan
90. Assist with
91. Direct alone

Teaching specific skills in various subject areas

92. Plan
93. Assist with
94. Direct alone

C. Goals achieved relative to interaction with school personnel.

I (1) was able (2) was not able to talk with the following personnel connected with the school operation:

1 2 95. other teachers

1 2 96. subject area consultants

1 2 97. visiting teacher

1 2 98. principal

1 2 99. counselor(s)

1 2 100. custodial staff

Through discussions with various personnel I (1) was able (2) was not able to:

1 2 101. Obtain insights into the nature and role of various professional organizations.

1 2 102. Examine the responsibilities of teachers beyond the classroom.

1 2 103. Gain insights into the role of special consultant staff connected with the school system.

1 2 104. Become aware of special programs for special groups of children.

1 2 105. Become aware of the diagnostic procedures for identifying special children.

I (1) was able (2) was not able to examine:

1 2 106. Cumulative folders.

1 2 107. Methods of reporting to parents.

1 2 108. Teachers manuals used in subject matter areas.

1 2 109. School facilities.

1 2 110. Methods of record keeping.

D. Changes that occurred in me as a result of the visitation experience.

Key
1. I am able to
2. I am not able to

1 2 111. feel more at ease in working with children in a classroom situation.

1 2 112. identify more precisely the characteristics of a given age group.

1 2 113. construct, on my own, daily lesson plans appropriate to a given grade level.

1 2 114. construct, on my own, daily lesson plans so that I could work with one group while the rest of the class was engaged in another activity.

1 2 115. judge how long a planned lesson would take to implement.

1 2 116. have a "storehouse" of techniques that are usually motivating to this age group.

1 2 117. identify specific reasons why I was, or was not, suited to work at this grade level.

1 2 118. identify specific reasons why teaching was or was not a suitable career choice for me.

1 2 119. feel more competent in deciding what curricular pattern is most satisfying to the children of this age group.

E. Achieved relationship between the methods courses and the school visitation program.

Key
1. I was able to
2. I was not able to

1 2 120. be introduced to the school and its program by the Methods instructors.

1 2 121. have the role that I am to play in the school explained to me.

1 2 122. have the experiences I should get in the school outlined to me.

1 2 123. have the opportunity to discuss with Methods instructors questions that arise as a result of the school visitations.

1 2 124. have the opportunity to discuss in class questions that arise as a result of the school visitations.

1 2 125. be given direction relative to a focus for each week's visitation.

1 2 126. receive help in planning lessons from my Methods instructors.