

The purpose of
the school system
training program is a
philosophy.

In the study
of teachers, and
of student Teacher I
the opinions held by
teachers, and school
training Program of the

Central Michi
schools have developed
Simulation Model) to

ABSTRACT

TEACHER EDUCATION AS AN INTEGRAL COMPONENT OF A SCHOOL SYSTEM: IMPACT ON THE BANGOR TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS

By

Kenneth R. Wahl

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact upon a school system when the philosophy of the student teaching program is an integral part of the total school philosophy.

In the study the opinions of supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators surveyed in the Student Teacher Impact Study¹ (1969) were compared with the opinions held by the supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the BEAM Student Teaching Program of the Bangor Township Public Schools.

Central Michigan University and Bangor Township Schools have developed the BEAM Program (Bangor Education Affiliation Model) to give the student teachers and

¹Committee of Deans and Directors, Impact of Student Teaching Program upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan.

1

Super Township School

mediation process

an prospective tea

will later be help

The BEAM Pro

and of public schoo

in in teacher educ

in study will help

and systems.

Ten hypotheses

showed that all

hypotheses dealt with

The effect of st
activities w

The effect of st
activities in

The effect of s
ance of super
members.

The investment
in working w

The use of super
materials, a
student teach

The amount of
their student
ent teacher.

The role whi
operation of

The help whi

690204

Kenneth R. Wahl

Bangor Township Schools the greatest possible advantage in the education process. The key to this process is that each prospective teacher, each individual student, and each staff member be helped to develop to his fullest potential.

The BEAM Program is designed for greater involvement of public school teachers and public school administrators in teacher education. It is hoped that the results of this study will help to extend such involvement to other school systems.

Ten hypotheses were formulated and analysis of the data showed that all ten were supported by the data. These hypotheses dealt with:

The effect student teachers had upon certain activities with students.

The effect student teachers had on school activities in addition to classroom instruction.

The effect student teachers had upon the performance of supervising teachers and regular staff members.

The investment which supervising teachers made in working with their student teachers.

The use supervising teachers made of instructional materials, aids, or ideas provided by their student teacher.

The amount of time supervising teachers took from their students because of the presence of a student teacher.

The role which student teachers took on in the operation of the classroom.

The help which the university coordinator provided.

The subjects

assigned by Central

Winter of 1972, 23

adult teachers were

Survey instrument

Study was adapted

of supervising

and administrators

Study were compared

teachers, student teachers

BEAM Program.

The study showed

which resulted in positive

positive results

primary factor is the

and members of the

and special teachers

and his own development

school climate. The

and Bangor Township

The BEAM Program

and success is dependent

the program calls for

Each person

and must be given

and in a team setting

The subjects of the Study were 25 student teachers assigned by Central Michigan University during the fall semester of 1972, 23 supervising teachers to whom these student teachers were assigned, and six building principals. The survey instrument developed for the teachers in the Impact Study was adapted for use in the BEAM survey. Responses of supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators surveyed in the Student Teacher Impact Study were compared with those of the supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the BEAM Program.

The study showed that the hypotheses which were tested resulted in positive reactions to varying degrees. The positive results may be attributed to several factors. The main factor is the philosophy of the BEAM Program in which members of the Program believe that each child is a unique and special being who will develop to his own potential at his own developmental rate if given a proper environmental climate. This philosophy is part of the philosophy of the Bangor Township Schools.

The BEAM Program is based upon the fact that personal success is dependent upon people caring for people. The program calls for total involvement.

Each person in the program has special talents and each must be given an opportunity to develop these special talents in a team situation which will help to build an

prepare where each

time.

Supervising

and education act

and the concept

and the student

Kenneth R. Wahl

atmosphere where each child can develop in his own way in his own time.

Supervising teachers participate in on-going in-service education activities so that they may be able to reinforce the concepts which are developed in the seminars in which the student teachers must participate.

TEACHING

COVER

Mac
in partial

TEACHER EDUCATION AS AN INTEGRAL
COMPONENT OF A SCHOOL SYSTEM:

IMPACT ON THE BANGOR
TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS

By

Kenneth R. Wahl

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1974

The writer
experience given
right. The com
L. Louise Sause,
especially thank
a kind of person
a chairman.

The writer
that Mrs. Ma
to the proje
never worked w
Thanks is
bro, who gave in
this.

Most of a
his wife, Mary
time.

This thes
has always en
deavors. Her a
achievements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the help and cooperation given him by his committee in completing this project. The committee members are Dr. Charles Blackman, Dr. Louise Sause, Dr. James Anderson, and Dr. Arden Moon. I especially thank Dr. Blackman, committee chairman; he is the kind of person everyone would like to have as a committee chairman.

The writer is thankful for the time and encouragement that Mrs. Margaret Jones and Mrs. Elaine MacDonald gave to the project. They are two of the finest people he has ever worked with.

Thanks is also due the writer's sons, Michael and Mark, who gave in many ways so that Dad could work on his thesis.

Most of all, the writer's appreciation is extended to his wife, Mary, for keeping home a happy place during this time.

This thesis is dedicated to the writer's mother, who has always encouraged him in all of his educational endeavors. Her abiding love and support always helped in his achievements.

LIST OF TABLES .

Table

I. INTRODUCTION

Need . . .
The BEPM . . .
The Purpose . . .
Hypotheses . . .
Limitations . . .
Overview . . .

II. REVIEW OF

Perceptual
Educational
Competence
Teacher
Education
Conference
and Stu
Education
Decision-

III. THE DESIGN

Population
The Quest
Development
Data Coll
Procedure
Summary

IV. ANALYSIS

Population
Responses
Responses
Responses
Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need	1
The BEAM Program	3
The Purpose	6
Hypotheses	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Overview of Thesis	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Perceptual Differences between Professional Educators	21
Competencies Needed by Good Supervising Teachers	23
Education for Supervising Teachers	29
Conferences between Supervising Teachers and Student Teachers	34
Education of Student Teacher	36
Decision-Making in Teacher Education	38
III. THE DESIGN	40
Population	40
The Questionnaire	41
Development of the Survey Instrument	42
Data Collection Procedures	47
Procedures for Treatment of Data	47
Summary	50
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	52
Population and Percent of Returns	53
Responses of Student Teachers	54
Responses of the Supervising Teachers	59
Responses of Administrators	65
Summary	192

Page

V. SUMMARY,

Summary .
Conclusion
Summary of
Recommend
Implicati

APPENDICES . . .

A. Application
Educational
Township

B. Student Test

C. Teacher Conference

D. Administrative

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . .

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	193
Summary	193
Conclusions	195
Summary of the Hypotheses	202
Recommendations	204
Implications for Further Research	205
APPENDICES	207
A. Application for Cooperating in Bangor Education Affiliation Model, Bangor Township Schools	207
B. Student Teacher Questionnaire	210
C. Teacher Questionnaire	219
D. Administrator Questionnaire	229
BIBLIOGRAPHY	236

File

1. Student to average.
2. Age of student to student to
3. Number of including
4. Reason why a particular
5. Years of had completed the survey
6. Current teacher teacher . . .
7. Number of teacher has including
8. Number of represented whom you have
9. Number of scheduled
10. Present address
11. Years experience
12. Administrative present business
13. Number of administrator's business

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Student teachers all-college grade point average. Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, E=0 . .	55
2. Age of student teacher at beginning of student teaching contact	56
3. Number of times student teacher has taught, including current assignment	56
4. Reason why student teacher was assigned to a particular situation	58
5. Years of teaching the supervising teacher had completed including the year in which the survey was taken	59
6. Current teaching assignment of supervising teacher	61
7. Number of student teachers supervising teacher has worked with in past five years including current student teacher	62
8. Number of teacher training institutions represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked	64
9. Number of weeks student teacher was scheduled in assignment	64
10. Present administrative assignment	66
11. Years experience as a school administrator .	67
12. Administrators' years of experience in present building	68
13. Number of teachers assigned to administrator's building	69

212

1. Number of pupils assigned to the class is present
2. Change in the class
3. Individual pupils
4. Extent of instruction, instructed, pupils
5. Extent to which individual pupils do not
6. Extent of giving help because of
7. Effect of individual instruction
8. Supervision
9. Effect on pupils
10. Effect of study of exams
11. Effect of study
12. Effect of study of pupils
13. To what extent counseling non-class pupils have been student teachers
14. The extent of visited youth trips, tours

Table	Page
14. Number of years student teachers have been assigned to the building the administrator is presently assigned	70
15. Change in amount of small group instruction	72
16. Individual attention to, or tutoring, of pupils	74
17. Extent student teacher worked with (i.e., instructed, counseled, tutored) individual pupils	76
18. Extent to which supervising teacher worked with individual pupils as compared to when he does not have a student teacher	78
19. Extent of time supervising teacher spent giving help to individual students changed because of student teacher's presence	79
20. Effect student teachers had on the individual instruction or tutoring of pupils	81
21. Supervision of study periods	83
22. Effect on provision for make-up work	84
23. Effect student teachers had on follow-up of exams	86
24. Effect student teachers had on discipline	88
25. Effect student teachers had on the motivation of pupils	90
26. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided your pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not had a student teacher?	92
27. The extent to which student teachers supervised youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.	94

22

11. Extent to
talks to p

12. To what ex
tribute to
hallways,

13. Overall qu
by school

14. Extent stu
vising teach
work in the
staff . . .

15. Added time
assist prin
because of

16. Effect stud
teachers' v
or schools

17. Effect tha
supervising

18. Time affor
profession
result of

19. Effect wor
on the per
teacher .

20. Effect wor
had on the
supervising

21. Effect stu
teaching p

22. Student te
by teachin

23. Student te
by chaper

24. Student te
from super

Table		Page
28.	Extent to which student teachers gave talks to parent groups	96
29.	To what extent did student teachers contribute to the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.	98
30.	Overall quality of instruction as viewed by school administrators	99
31.	Extent student teaching affords supervising teacher added time for committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff	101
32.	Added time the supervising teacher can assist principal or other teachers because of student teaching program	103
33.	Effect student teacher has on supervising teachers' visitations in other classrooms or schools	105
34.	Effect that the student teacher had on supervising teacher's time for research	107
35.	Time afforded supervising teachers for professional reading or writing as a result of student teaching program	109
36.	Effect working with a student teacher had on the performance of the supervising teacher	110
37.	Effect working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your supervising teachers	112
38.	Effect student teachers have had on the teaching performance of your teachers	113
39.	Student teachers relieving regular staff by teaching for them	115
40.	Student teachers relieving regular staff by chaperoning for them	117
41.	Student teachers relieving regular staff from supervision of lunch duty	119

212

6. Student te
from super

6. Student te
so they ma
classrooms

4. Extent stu
staff perm
committee

6. Extent stu
staff perm
research

6. Extent stu
staff perm
professiona

7. Participati
seminars on
dealing wit
student tea

6. Time superv
social obl
teacher's p

6. Time super
additional
student te

3. Effect stu
number of
spent at s
not have a

3. Time super
telephone
ences with

2. Time super
student te

2. Time super
with or fo

3. Time super
tional pre
having a s

Table		Page
42.	Student teachers relieving regular staff from supervision of playgrounds	120
43.	Student teachers relieving regular staff so they may make visitations in other classrooms or schools	122
44.	Extent student teachers relieved regular staff permitting them to participate in committee work in the school	124
45.	Extent student teacher relieved regular staff permitting them to engage in research	126
46.	Extent student teachers relieved regular staff permitting regular staff time for professional reading or writing	127
47.	Participation in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while student teacher was teaching	130
48.	Time supervising teacher spent fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence.	132
49.	Time supervising teacher spent preparing additional reports because of having a student teacher	134
50.	Effect student teachers had on the average number of hours per week supervising teacher spent at school compared to when they did not have a student teacher	136
51.	Time supervising teacher spent holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teacher	138
52.	Time supervising teacher spent evaluating student teacher's progress or activities	140
53.	Time supervising teacher spent planning with or for student teacher	142
54.	Time supervising teacher spent making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher	143

12

8. Amount of materials

9. Aids and suggested materials

10. Use supplementary material teachers

11. Time spent with student for individual

12. Time spent with student for individual

13. To what extent after student

14. Amount of student

15. Number of student teacher

16. Hours per teacher while student classes

17. To what extent teacher student

18. To what extent teacher because of

19. To what extent teachers because of

20. Help university

21. Number of student during the

Table		Page
55.	Amount of new or different instructional materials student teachers introduced	146
56.	Aids and ideas student teachers provided or suggested other than instructional materials	148
57.	Use supervising teachers made of instructional materials, aids, or ideas student teachers developed, provided or suggested . .	149
58.	Time supervising teacher spent conferring with student teacher so she had less time for individual work with pupils	152
59.	Time supervising teacher spent planning with student teacher so she had less time for individual work with pupils	154
60.	To what extent was re-teaching necessary after student teacher taught	155
61.	Amount of material covered changed because of student teacher's presence	157
62.	Number of hours per week on the average student teachers taught assigned classes . .	160
63.	Hours per week on the average supervising teacher was able to be away from classroom while student teacher taught assigned classes	162
64.	To what extent was the time supervising teacher spent teaching changed because of student teacher's presence?	164
65.	To what extent was the time supervising teacher spent lesson planning changed because of student teacher's presence? . . .	166
66.	To what extent was the time supervising teachers spent paper grading changed because of student teacher's presence? . . .	167
67.	Help university coordinator provided	169
68.	Number of times the university coordinator of student teachers visited your school during the student teaching contact	171

22a

8. Has the unit
to you with
concerned with

9. To what extent
of student
administrator and
teacher or

10. Help uninvolved
viewed by

11. Extent to which
other schools
student teacher
concerned with

12. Would you be
offered for
term in which

13. Attitude of
in the school
terms of student
teacher

14. Attitude of
about work

15. Would student
accept or
situation
stances?

16. Extent to which
student teacher
outside the

17. Effect of
quality of

18. What is the
teachers' view
building of

19. Maximum number
visiting teachers
viewed by

Table		Page
69.	Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?	173
70.	To what extent has the university coordinator of student teachers been available to administrator and staff during the student teacher contact	175
71.	Help university coordinator provided as viewed by student teachers	177
72.	Extent to which supervising teacher and/or other school personnel were helpful to student teachers on matters not directly concerned with student teaching	179
73.	Would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching? .	180
74.	Attitude of the administrators and teachers in the school to which you were assigned in terms of student teachers, as viewed by student teachers	182
75.	Attitude of administrators and teachers about working with student teachers	183
76.	Would student teacher and supervising teacher accept or recommend a student teaching situation under the same general circumstances?	185
77.	Extent supervising teachers encouraged student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom	187
78.	Effect student teachers had on overall quality of instruction	188
79.	What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your building each year	189
80.	Maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year as viewed by administrators	191

Teacher ed
ing job. We
of the problem
needs and purp
understandings
or the other.

The comple
velopment of his
ne of change in
re increase in th
might about a c
but changes are
blems in world
blems and crim
might about a c
of life. As a
different ex
open is demand

¹ Arthur W
Boswell (Boston:

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need

Teacher education needs much more than a tinkering job. What is called for is a re-examination of the problem in the light of our changing social needs and purposes on the one hand, and our new understandings about human behavior and learning on the other.

Arthur W. Combs¹

The complexity of today's world necessitates the development of highly qualified teachers. The accelerated rate of change in mass media, the speed of communication, the increase in the production of goods and services, have brought about a change in our way of life. Along with these changes are problems in our involvement in Asia, problems in world economy, and the ever increasing drug problems and crime rates. These changes and problems have brought about a change in the way different people cope with life. As a result, young people come to school with many different experience backgrounds. A teacher education program is demanded which will produce skilled teachers

¹Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965).

is a program

that appears to

not to be diffi

Teacher a

look at their

on there is som

about a partic

in actual labo

in terms more t

parts telling b

student teach

the involvement

Corts say

will be involve

must feel a

times.²

Most tea

to the idea

of children.

and forms of

The stud

become involv

are involved

and service

teaching tea

² Ibid.,

able to program to meet the needs of today's young people. There appears to be little doubt that teacher education needs to be different from what it has been.

Teacher education institutions need to take a careful look at their teacher preparation programs. It appears that there is some agreement among these institutions that at least a portion of teacher preparation should be placed in an actual laboratory classroom setting. Teacher education means more than gathering information and listening to experts telling how to teach. Teacher education must provide the student teacher with opportunities for commitment and close involvement with students in the classroom.

Combs says that students in a professional program should be involved as actors, not simply as spectators. They must feel a part of the process in which they are involved.²

Most teacher education programs reflect a commitment to the idea that teachers-to-be need to be involved with children. This is done through observations and limited forms of participation.

The student teacher should be given the opportunity to become involved in all kinds of settings. He should become involved with other classrooms and other teachers, special service people, and with fellow students. The cooperating teacher and the student teacher should share

²Ibid., p. 50.

planning for
new opportunities
drawing out the
times the total

James B.

The programs
been developed
group but by
basic log-rol
negotiating be
dividing up a
finds a compl
tures a satis
future teacher

Teacher e
by educators as
Society is rea
they be as cer
the right dire

Central M
works have deve
synonym for Ba
system is design
and administra

3
James B.
New York

in planning for the class. The student teacher must be given opportunities to become involved with the excitement of trying out new ideas, and finally the day arrives when he does the total planning and takes over the classroom.

James B. Conant says,

The programs in many institutions seem to have been developed not by careful consideration of a group but by a process that might be called academic log-rolling. (I am not unfamiliar with the bargaining between departments when it comes to dividing up a student's time.) In any event, one finds a complete lack of agreement on what constitutes a satisfactory general education program for future teachers.³

Teacher education is presently in a state of flux. Many educators as well as lay people feel a need for change. If society is ready for a change in teacher education, let society be as certain as possible that they are changing in the right direction.

The BEAM Program

Central Michigan University and the Bangor Township Schools have developed the BEAM Program. The term BEAM is an acronym for Bangor Education Affiliation Model. This program is designed for greater involvement of public school administrators in teacher education. Students who

³James B. Conant, The Education of the American Teacher (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963), p. 209.

up for the
teaching Schools
STUDY in all
in teachers par
nient teaching
all contained,
per level class
types of visitati
personnel and an
three special s
me to spend more

The speci
burt of Education
nurt, school s
service people te
ness, diagnose p
nities, evaluat

Other ser
select to spen
the handicappe
bearing childr
studies.

The stude
ars with the st
bridge between
students in b

sign up for the BEAM Program spend sixteen weeks in Bangor Township Schools. The BEAM student teachers become TOTALLY INVOLVED in all facets of the school operation. BEAM student teachers participate in the following activities: two student teaching classroom experiences which may include self contained, activity centered, open areas, upper level, lower level classrooms and middle school classrooms; two types of visitations--an initial one with special service personnel and an extended visitation with a choice of two or three special service personnel with whom they would like to spend more time.

The special service people who work out of the Board of Education building are the reading and speech consultant, school social worker, and diagnostician. These service people test individual students, interpret the tests, diagnose problems, write prescriptions to remediate problems, evaluate, and do follow-up work.

Other service people with whom the student teachers may elect to spend time are the school counselors, teachers of the handicapped--such as blind children, deaf and hard-of-hearing children, and children who have learning disabilities.

The student teacher coordinator holds weekly seminars with the student teachers. These seminars serve as a bridge between practicum and theory. The seminars involve the students in behavioral objective planning and the

incorporation of
and seminar
under coordination
the student
of the total

An advise
of the BBA
which acting as
which teachers
science related
in schedules.

and efforts of
which performance

The cooperative
in the Pr
Cooperating to
and training
teachers, the
theoretical e
seminars f
ness of their
and activi
how profession

Great ca
teachers. An
are interest

incorporation of the unit methods of teaching in the classroom and seminar experience. In addition, the student teacher coordinator holds other seminars on pertinent topics. The student teacher is encouraged to be an integral part of the total school system.

An advisory board has been active since the origination of the BEAM Program. The function of this committee includes acting as a sounding board and as mediators for student teachers and cooperating teachers, handling correspondence related to the program, and establishing visitation schedules. General planning for and evaluation of the total efforts of all facets of the BEAM Program are also services performed by the advisory board.

The cooperating teachers in BEAM are active participants in the Program's philosophy of TOTAL INVOLVEMENT. All cooperating teachers have participated in the same seminars and training programs that are provided for the student teachers, thus assuring continuity between practical and theoretical experiences. Cooperating teachers meet in weekly seminars for planning, studying, evaluating effectiveness of their combined efforts, sharing professional skills, and acting as leaders in in-service education for fellow professionals.

Great care is given in the selection of supervising teachers. An application form is given to teachers who are interested in BEAM. It is completed and turned in

the advisory
and is then
and to discuss
students who
initially by
number of the
major univers
are selected from

People who
may treat the
business. Super
services to other
is done in
water offers t
the teachers a
gradually, various
service progr
over by the

The purp
ship School
Student Tea
the philosop
of the tota
are the

to the advisory board. A general meeting of the advisory board is then held with all applicants and the advisory board to discuss the BEAM Program and answer any questions. Applicants who are still interested are then interviewed individually by the advisory board and Dr. Allan Quick, Chairman of the Department of Student Teaching, Central Michigan University, and as many as can be accommodated are then selected from this group.

People who become supervising teachers in the BEAM Program treat the appointment as very serious professional business. Supervising teachers in BEAM also offer their services to other classroom teachers who are not in BEAM. This is done in two major ways: First, the supervising teacher offers to take regular teachers' classrooms while these teachers attend some of the in-service programs; secondly, various supervising teachers offer a variety of in-service programs. The supervising teacher's classes are taken over by the student teacher during these times.

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the Bangor Township School System to determine the impact which the BEAM Student Teaching Program had upon the total system when the philosophy of the student teaching program is a part of the total school philosophy. Central to the BEAM Program are the following:

1. Total of
teachers

further

2. The cent

in and b

potential

3. A close

school a

The main

discloser relat

and teachers, s

cooperation wi

ture positive s

comparing the

ners, and sch

Living Impact S

ners, student

SEHM Program.

The follo

1. The prese

have a mo

tional ac

than it h

2. The prese

have a mo

in additi

Program t

1. Total commitment and total involvement of student teachers in all facets of a school situation is furthered.
2. The central philosophy is one of people believing in and helping people develop to their fullest potential.
3. A close relationship exists between the public school and the teacher education institution.

Hypotheses

The main point to be tested in this study is to see if a closer relationship, caused by greater involvement of school teachers, student teachers and school administrators in cooperation with teacher education institutions make for a more positive student teaching situation. This was done by comparing the views held by student teachers, supervising teachers, and school administrators surveyed in the Student Teaching Impact Study with the views held by supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the BEAM Program.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.
2. The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect on school activities in addition to classroom instruction in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.

1. The pres
enhance
more in
in the

4. The pres
enhance
BEAM Pro
Impact St

5. BEAM sup
made a g
student
related
teachers

6. BEAM sup
used inst
provided
supervisi

7. BEAM super
taken less
having a
in the Ing

8. BEAM stud
on a grea
room than

9. The unive
more help
Impact St

10. The prese
be more p
Program t

Informati

enses of stud
nals, who w
ster of 1969.
resented respo

3. The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of supervising teachers more in the BEAM Program than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
4. The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of regular staff in the BEAM Program more than regular staff in the Impact Study.
5. BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have made a greater investment in working with their student teachers and in attending functions related to student teaching than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
6. BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have used instructional materials, aids or ideas provided by their student teachers more than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
7. BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have taken less time from their students because of having a student teacher than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
8. BEAM student teachers are perceived to have taken on a greater role in the operation of the classroom than student teachers in the Impact Study.
9. The university coordinator is perceived as being more helpful in the BEAM Program than in the Impact Study.
10. The presence of student teachers is perceived to be more positive in schools which had the BEAM Program than is reported in the Impact Study.

Limitations of the Study

Information gathered in the Impact Study represented responses of student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals, who worked together during the fall quarter or semester of 1969. Information gathered in the BEAM study represented responses of student teachers, supervising

urers, and pr

All semester of

The time

in Student Tea

guered in the

effect upon

ways were tak

under programs

ular changes t

when that date

Informati

houses of peop

information gathe

people working

Slightly

nders in the B

then through se

supervising t

the same grade

mentary teache

The BEAM

schools' phi

positive. T

own Township s

is one of the

teachers, and principals who worked together during the fall semester of 1972.

The time lapse between the information gathered in the Student Teacher Impact Study of 1969 and the information gathered in the BEAM survey taken in 1972 may have a limiting effect upon differences in the responses than if both surveys were taken in the same year, because the student teacher programs which were surveyed in 1969 may have made similar changes to those described in the BEAM Program between that date and 1972.

Information gathered in the Impact Study represented responses of people working in kindergarten through twelve. Information gathered in the BEAM Study represented responses of people working in kindergarten through eight.

Slightly less than forty percent of the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program were assigned to grades kindergarten through second and approximately eighteen percent of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study were assigned to the same grades. Many educators believe that early elementary teachers tend to be more child-oriented.

The BEAM philosophy is a part of the Bangor Township Schools' philosophy and therefore results may appear more positive. The fact that the superintendent of the Bangor Township Schools is the director of the BEAM Program and is one of the key persons contributing to the philosophy

the Program

participants

There was

advantages in the

long the period

for the total

and number of

and in some cases

respond to the

This study

Chapter

Chapter has shown

study, stated that

of the study.

Chapter

and. The year

of texts, and

operation are

In Chapter

the population,

the collection

data.

In Chapter

the hypotheses

of the Program may have influenced the responses of some of the participants.

There was a small margin of error in some of the percentages in the Impact Study. This was caused by calculating the percentages on the individual questions based upon the total number of respondents rather than on the total number of respondents to that particular question; less in some cases because some people who responded did not respond to the question.

Overview of Thesis

This study will be organized into five chapters.

Chapter I is the introductory chapter. There the writer has shown a need for the study, the purposes of the study, stated the hypotheses, and given some limitations of the study.

Chapter II gives a review of the relevant literature. The yearbooks of the Association for Student Teaching, texts, and professional journals relating to teacher preparation are reviewed.

In Chapter III, descriptions are given including the population, the instrument used to collect the data, data collection procedures, and procedures for treatment of data.

In Chapter IV, findings are presented relative to the hypotheses stated in Chapter I. An analysis is given

time comparisons

man Study and t

In Chapter

paper with rec

med.

of the comparisons found in the questionnaires between the Impact Study and the BEAM Study.

In Chapter V, an overall summary of conclusions, together with recommendations for further research, is presented.

After years of
suddenly discover
ly necessary for
world we live in
of intelligent
Education has b
a consequence,
good hard look
if they truly m

There can be
experience is one of
grant experien
where being given
where should have
actually teach
institutions have
in having a true
partnership experi
the school and the
another's philo
of controls of th

1
Arthur W
Boston:

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

After years of taking it for granted, we have suddenly discovered that education is absolutely necessary for our way of life. To keep the world we live in running requires the production of intelligent people in ever-increasing numbers. Education has become essential to survival! As a consequence, people everywhere are taking a good hard look at our public schools to find out if they truly meet our needs.¹

There can be little doubt that the student teaching experience is one of the most important, if not the most important experience in the initial preparation of teachers. Before being given complete control of a classroom, a teacher should have opportunities under close supervision to actually teach in the classroom. Teacher education institutions have been assigning prospective teachers without having a true partnership with local schools. By true partnership experience the writer means one in which both the school and the institution have a direct input into each other's philosophy and have some say in the make-up and controls of the program.

¹Arthur W. Combs, The Professional Education of Teachers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965).

Whatever w
y. To assure a c
essential to pro
ex that will per
atural of good to
inner education p
review the histo
training programs.

Although one may
record the first
assumed that the
nineteenth cent
is known as stu
adaptation of a
centuries, the
with the master
the major uses
not occur until
ing were accept
lozzi required
development of

While we may as
of student teach
school which wa
did not remain
ties. Records
as early as 18
provision of t
It may be that
dates even ear
seventh annual
Board of Educa
these schools
training. It
minutes of thi
was developed
ity became the

Whatever we do in education depends upon good teaching. To assure a continuance of good teaching practices it is essential to provide the kind of student teaching experience that will perpetuate the best in teaching. If the survival of good teaching depends upon the kinds of student teacher education programs we operate, it becomes necessary to review the history of the use of student teachers in training programs.

Although one may be unable to find sources which record the first use of student teachers it can be assumed that the concept developed prior to the nineteenth century. It is also apparent that what is known as student teaching today developed as an adaptation of a practice which has existed for centuries, the practice of the beginner working with the master to develop and to prove his ability. The major uses of student teaching, however, did not occur until the Pestalozzian methods of teaching were accepted. The methods introduced by Pestalozzi required more skillful teaching, hence the development of student teaching.²

While we may associate the first major development of student teaching with the model or practice school which was a part of the normal school, it did not remain long within these limited facilities. Records indicate that attempts were made as early as 1873 to use public schools for the provision of the experience of student teaching. It may be that the first use of the public schools dates even earlier than this because the thirty-seventh annual report of the Secretary of the Board of Education in Massachusetts indicates that these schools were being utilized for practical training. It is evident from the reading of the minutes of this body that when a normal school was developed a school or schools in the community became the laboratory for the work of those

²V. L. Mangum, The American Normal School: Its Rise and Development in Massachusetts (Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1928), p. 386.

preparing to t
Massachusetts
normal school
State Board of
provided for p

The tradit
dispersion ha
was assigned by a
was appeared to b
was given to a
rotation base
his situation and
not for the addi
which, the studen
a period of obs
the classroom. T
up one subject a
the so-called "sl
tended to take ov
water relinqui
intent to let t
there was little
ness or instru
a longer use t

preparing to teach. In fact in 1894 the state of Massachusetts required each community in which a normal school was to be located to assure the State Board of Education that facilities would be provided for practice schools.³

The traditional view of student teacher placement and supervision has become one in which the student has been assigned by a college to a supervising teacher; assignments appeared to be just doled out. Sometimes the assignment was given to a "good" teacher, sometimes it was given on a rotation basis, or it might be made because of an overload situation and the teacher might be given some remuneration for the additional duty. Unless there was a serious problem, the student began the assignment by being assigned to a period of observation of the supervising teacher in the classroom. The observation might be followed by teaching one subject area or working with a small group such as the so-called "slow" readers. He or she was finally permitted to take over the class. However, at no time did the teacher relinquish authority. The supervising teacher was content to let the student grow without too much attention. There was little time spent on daily planning on a shared basis or instruction as in a team situation. Most colleges no longer use this system of placing student teachers.

³Association for Student Teaching, "Professional Growth In Service of the Supervising Teacher," Forty-Fifth Year Book (Columbia University, New York, 1966), pp. 1-2.

Within school
my teachers
for more and
become known
teacher educat
formed through
sonnel provide
ity for and
ers. Smith, E
the Trend Toward
Teacher Educat
Association of
for Student Tea

If education

of life it is

now teacher edu

Some of the im
be brought abo
ing better sch
study, new sta
really importa
teachers chang

Dorothy M.

College, Columbia

Even where st
its present f
schools, supp
increased res
members into
arrangement o
professionall
with beginner

⁴James E.
Student Teaching
Association of T
(1973).

⁵Combs, S.

⁶Dorothy
Association for
(1966), p.

Within school systems, administrators and cooperating teachers look to the colleges and universities for more and more active participation in what has become known as the laboratory or clinical phase of teacher education. Cooperative teaching centers formed through efforts of schools and college personnel provide a structure to maximize responsibility for and participation with prospective teachers. Smith, E. Brooks, Promises and Pit Falls in the Trend Toward Collaboration. Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and for Student Teaching. 1968, p. 28.⁴

If education is so essential to the survival of our way of life it is imperative that we take a long hard look at our teacher education practices.

Some of the improvements we seek in education can be brought about by spending more money, by building better schools, by introducing new courses of study, new standards or new equipment. But the really important changes will only come about as teachers change.⁵

Dorothy M. McGeoch, Editor of Yearbooks, Teachers College, Columbia University, says,

Even where student teaching retains something like its present form, it is likely that the public schools, supported by federal funds, will assume increased responsibility for the induction of new members into the profession. Whatever the specific arrangement or title used, there will be need for professionally prepared teachers to work closely with beginners in the schools.⁶

⁴James E. Kerber and Donald W. Protheroe, "Guiding Student Teaching Experiences in a Cooperative Structure," Association of Teacher Educators Bulletin 33 (Washington, D.C., 1973).

⁵Combs, op. cit., p. v.

⁶Dorothy M. McGeoch, ed., Forty-Fifth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching (New York: Columbia University, 1966), p. x.

The writer
seems to be some
way we educate
our teacher education
What is called
in the light of
on the one hand, and
behavior and learning
psychological base
of experimentation

Combs goes
education must depend
on good teaching.
My best definition
move at such decisions
difficult problem

Consensus
has been attained
we continue to search
nothing. Although
lack of the lack
nothing he will
understanding of

⁷ Combs,

⁸ Ibid.,

The writer concludes from the readings that there appears to be some agreement that changes must be made in the way we educate students to be teachers. Combs says that teacher education needs more than just a tinkering job. What is called for is a re-examination of the problem in the light of our changing social needs and purposes on the one hand, and our new understandings about human behavior and learning on the other. A modern philosophical-psychological base is needed on which to base our thinking and experimentation. Fortunately, it seems to be at hand.⁷

Combs goes on to say that whatever we do in teacher education must depend on our having some idea of the nature of good teaching. To plan effective programs we need the very best definition of good teaching we can get. How to arrive at such definitions, however, has proven a most difficult problem.⁸

Consensus about what constitutes good teaching has not been attained. Practitioners, theorists and researchers continue to search for an acceptable definition of good teaching. Although the competent supervising teacher is aware of the lack of agreement as to the components of good teaching he will continuously attempt to increase his understanding of good teaching and the traits,

⁷Combs, op. cit., p. vi.

⁸Ibid., p. 1.

characteristics, and

A review of

has used this work

which made good

exemplary teacher

Combs says

and personality

effective teaching

first and foremost

quant and determin

Some of the

has about particular

underdevelop in teaching

and basic competence

teacher education

with persons rather

that the individual

sought for the

these programs

tion of creativity

and changing teaching

afforded in data

Such a teacher

behavior will

day to day, address

the needs of his

the purposes of his

and materials

⁹ Association
of Teachers, p. 10

¹⁰ Combs, op. cit., p. 10

¹¹ Ibid., p. 10

characteristics, and behaviors which comprise it.⁹

A review of the literature on supervising teachers has caused this writer to conclude that not all good teachers made good supervising teachers; however, all good supervising teachers should be good teachers.

Combs says that a good teacher is primarily a unique personality with certain qualities which contribute to effective teaching. However, he says, "A good teacher is first and foremost 'a person,' and this fact is the most important and determining thing about him."¹⁰

Some of the literature on teacher education programs talks about particular, measurable, competencies which we must develop in teachers, and that all teachers must have these basic competencies. Combs goes on to say,

Teacher education programs must concern themselves with persons rather than competencies. It means that the individualization of instruction we have sought for the public schools must be applied to these programs as well. It calls for the production of creative individuals, capable of shifting and changing to meet the demands and opportunities afforded in daily tasks.

Such a teacher will not behave in a set way. His behavior will change from moment to moment, from day to day, adjusting continually and smoothly to the needs of his students, the situations he is in, the purposes he seeks to fulfill, and the methods and materials at his command.¹¹

⁹Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Year-Book, op. cit., pp. 72-73.

¹⁰Combs, op. cit., p. 6.

¹¹Ibid., p. 9.

The above

1. Do we
speci

2. Do we
role
stude
ers a
woul

3. Do s
about
deve

4. How
bein

5. Do s
of

6. Is
pra

In ans

some quotes

The task of
making, no
caring;
already in
is that of
er, collea

Combs

one on autho

what teache

making about

In te

simulation w

12 Ibi

13 Ibi

The above quote from Combs raises the questions:

1. Do we want supervising teachers to develop specific competencies in student teachers?
2. Do we want supervising teachers to see their role in teacher education as developing a student centered curriculum for student teachers as we would hope these student teachers would someday do in their own classrooms?
3. Do supervising teachers need to be concerned about the self concepts student teachers are developing?
4. How do we best nurture creativity in a human being?
5. Do supervising teachers need to be sensitive of others?
6. Is a good teacher a scholar or a professional practitioner?

In answer to these questions, the writer again refers to some quotes from Combs:

The task of the teacher is not one of prescribing, making, molding, forcing, coercing, coaxing, or cajoling; it is one of ministering to a process already in being. The role required of the teacher is that of facilitator, encourager, helper, assister, colleague and friend of his students.¹²

Combs would have supervising teachers put less importance on authority, proof and evidence but encourage their student teachers to do their own looking, discovering and thinking about professional problems.¹³

In terms of one's self Combs says that any item of information will affect an individual's behavior only in

¹²Ibid., p. 16

¹³Ibid., pp. 37-38

the degree to which he has discovered its personal meaning for him. The production of effective teachers will require helping each student to explore and discover his personal meaning about subject matter, people, purposes, and learning about methods and about himself.¹⁴

In terms of sensitivity, Combs says the teacher education program must develop this in its students. Combs says that sensitivity is a matter of feelings, beliefs, understandings, the ability to put oneself in the other fellow's shoes and to see the way things are with him.¹⁵

Charles Silberman reflects much the same feelings about sensitivity and humanness in teacher education. He quotes from Philip W. Jackson,

Our most pressing educational problem is learning how to create and maintain a human environment in our schools. Technological aids--filmstrips, programmed instruction, instructional television--may help in the process, but they will not substitute for a firm sense of direction and a commitment to the preservation of human values.¹⁶

Silberman goes on to say that we must make sure that teachers are equipped with a firm sense of direction and a commitment to the preservation and enlargement of

¹⁴Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 64.

¹⁶Philip W. Jackson, The Teacher and the Machine (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968) quoted in Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 373.

...values, and

...ment and ser

Teachers are p
the disseminat
tion. It is t
but not in the
the student pr

Robert Sch

study, speaks an

at the present s

arning is such

not be a compete

not be prepared

usual problems,

necessary, curricu

He puts f

cannot "Wind t

ope that he wil

rious scholars

ent education.

derived from dif

models technic

17 Charle
New York: Ran

18 Combs

19 Rober
ny, Perspec
1971), p.

20 Ibid

human values, and that they should be able to transmit that commitment and sense of direction to their students.¹⁷

Teachers are practitioners. Their concern is with the dissemination, application and use of information. It is to be hoped they might be scholars too, but not in the same sense as one would expect of the student preparing to spend his life in research.¹⁸

Robert Schaefer, in The School as the Center of Inquiry, speaks about the teacher as a scholar. He says that the present state of knowledge about teaching and learning is such that the teacher who would live rationally must be a competent scholar of teaching and learning. He must be prepared to create and test out solutions to educational problems, to create and study, and to research, if necessary, curriculum materials prepared by other people.¹⁹

He puts further emphasis on scholarship saying that we cannot "Wind the teacher up like an old victrola and hope that he will play sweet cerebral music forever." Continuous scholarship renews him and adds to his knowledge about education. He masters a range of teaching strategies derived from different views of learning and more important, controls techniques for developing new ones.²⁰

¹⁷Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 374.

¹⁸Combs, op. cit., p. 48.

¹⁹Robert Schaefer, "The School as the Center of Inquiry," Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education (New York, 1971), p. 8.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 12-13

The Unit

equal difference

others in teach

Internal

inter seems s

to others w

his for his o

People-

concerned with

ings and even

Meaning

is concerned

in with the o

ings seem to

and with con

Irmedia

was the cause

making, feeli

in in objecti

now or in

Able-Un

to deal wi

adequate s

to handl

Perceptual Differences Between
Professional Educators

The University of Florida has investigated the perceptual differences between good and poor professional workers in teaching, counseling, and the ministry.

Internal-External Frame of Reference: The good teacher seems sensitive to and concerned with how things seem to others with whom he interacts and uses this as a basis for his own behavior.

People-Things Orientation: The good teacher is concerned with people and their reactions rather than with things and events.

Meanings-Facts Orientation: The good teacher is more concerned with the perceptual experiences of humans than with the objective events. He is sensitive to how things seem to people rather than being exclusively concerned with concrete events.

Immediate-Historical Causation: The good teacher seeks the causes of people's behavior in their current thinking, feelings, beliefs, and understandings, rather than in objective descriptions of the forces exerted upon them now or in the past.

Able-Unable: The good teacher sees others as being able to deal with their problems. He believes they can find adequate solutions. He does not doubt the capacity of people to handle themselves and their lives.

Friendly

being friendly

emotional rather

Worthy

others as being

possessing a

Internal

people and

within rat

valued, dire

more than pas

Depend

style as esse

Helpful

ing potentia

threateni

satisfactio

In se

we must

fluence upon

concerned abo

acts to oth

his for th

the stude

Friendly-Unfriendly: The good teacher sees others as being friendly and enhancing. He sees them as well intentional rather than evil intentional.

Worthy-Unworthy: The good teacher tends to see others as being worthy rather than unworthy. He sees them as possessing a dignity and integrity which must be respected.

Internally-Externally Motivated: The good teacher sees people and their behavior as essentially developing from within rather than as a product of external events to be molded, directed; sees people as creative, dynamic, rather than passive or inert.

Dependable-Undependable: The good teacher sees people as essentially trustworthy and dependable.

Helpful-Hindering: The good teacher sees people as being potentially fulfilling and enhancing to self rather than threatening. He regards people as important sources of satisfaction.²¹

In selecting supervising teachers it would appear that we must select people who will have a warm positive influence upon others. We must select teachers who will be concerned about how the student teacher perceives and reacts to other people and things and can use this as a basis for their own behavior, teachers who seek the causes of the student's behavior in their current feelings and

²¹Combs, op. cit., pp. 54, 55, 56.

ships rather than
ment, teachers will
more than extend
students have the
the problems.

It would
which can create
it will allow him
must be pro
Security cannot

The ear
ment of a scholar
and teach other
is simply not

The For
Student Teaching
each cat
re.

1. Compete
proceed

1. Gi

2. Ac

beliefs rather than focusing upon forces exerted in the past, teachers who see behavior developing from within rather than externally motivated, teachers who believe that students have the capacity to deal with and adequately solve problems.

It would further appear that we must select teachers who can create an atmosphere for the student teacher that will allow him to express his deeper self. An atmosphere must be provided that allows for creativity. Creativity cannot take place in a restricted climate.

Competencies Needed by Good Supervising Teachers

"The earliest conception of the good teacher was that of a scholar. It was assumed that a person who knew could teach others."²² Research has proven that just knowing is simply not enough.

The Forty-Fifth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching gives five categories and the competencies within each category that all supervising teachers should have.

- I. Competencies related primarily to classroom procedure and techniques.
 1. Gives suggestions in matters of discipline.
 2. Acquaints the student with "routine" matters.

²²Combs, op. cit., p. 1.

3. Dis

4. Cre
one
mak

5. Assi
able

6. Enco
pup

II. Competen
relation
the stu

1. Is
whe

2. Ana
exp
cov

3. He
fo

4. Sh

5. Pl
or
do
ac

6. Es
of
po
pe

7. R
ar

8. C
C

9. H
C
b

10. I
t
s

3. Displays accuracy in keeping records.
4. Creates a democratic setting for learning--one in which pupils share in some decision-making experiences.
5. Assists student teachers in setting reasonable standards of performances for his classes.
6. Encourages creative thinking and planning by pupils and by the student teacher.

II. Competencies related primarily to the working relationship between the supervising teacher and the student teacher.

1. Is available for consultation and moral support when needed.
2. Analyzes with the student teacher the value of experiences; helps the student teacher to discover which ones are most worthwhile.
3. Helps the student teacher set his goals and formulate his educational philosophy.
4. Shares in planning with the student teacher.
5. Plans and teaches through another adult; originates and suggests new ideas without dominating the student teacher's thoughts and actions.
6. Establishes a feeling of security on the part of the student teacher by clarifying his responsibilities throughout the student teaching period.
7. Recognizes and helps relieve tension in pupils and in the student teacher.
8. Offers criticism--continuous, specific, and constructive--in a sympathetic manner.
9. Helps the student teacher develop understanding of his own strengths and weaknesses, and to build a healthy self-concept.
10. Invites the student teacher to participate in the professional and social activities of the staff.

11. Sh
tec

III. Compete
from th
teacher
active

1. Gra
inc
resp

2. Help
rela

3. Help
thro
er's

4. Ass
the
log

IV. Compete
teristi
might b

1. Set
per
app

2. Mak
act
con

3. Kno
acc

Carl R

empting one's

son, "I find

zily to myse

& full of w

11. Shows willingness to consider new and different techniques in an open minded manner.
- III. Competencies related primarily to the transition from the relatively inactive status of the student teacher at the beginning of student teaching to his active status later in the assignment.
1. Gradually lets the student teacher accept increasing responsibility until full teaching responsibility is assumed.
 2. Helps the student teacher understand his job in relation to the entire school program.
 3. Helps the student teacher build teaching skills through observation of his (cooperating teacher's) teaching.
 4. Assists the student teacher in recognizing theories in practice--child development, psychological principles, and so forth.
- IV. Competencies related primarily to personal characteristics or traits of the supervising teacher that might be emulated by the student teacher.
1. Sets a good example for the student teacher in personal appearance, grooming, speech and appropriate mannerisms.
 2. Makes rational judgements, takes appropriate action and accepts responsibilities for the consequences.
 3. Knows his own strengths and weaknesses and accepts himself as he is.²³

Carl Rogers discusses the importance of being and accepting one's self. Quoting from his book On Becoming a Person, "I find I am more effective when I can listen acceptantly to myself . . . to realize I am angry, or that I can feel full of warmth and affection . . . I become more

²³ Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Yearbook, pp. 19, 20.

signature in left

4. Per
rea

5. Ex
men

6. Ref
and

7. Competen
profession

1. Is a
tea
the

2. Per
tea

3. Pla
soc

4. Act
dev
to
and
tic

5. Ex
res

6. Par
and

7. Is
jou

8. Ex
wi

The ab

abilities no

24 Carl
Miff

25 Asso
book, p. 2

adequate in letting myself be what I am."²⁴

4. Reflects a positive professional attitude and a real liking and respect for teaching.
 5. Exhibits interest in continuous self improvement and educational advancement.
 6. Reflects a mature personality with enthusiasm and broad interests.
- V. Competencies related primarily to developing broad professional and school responsibilities.
1. Is an active participant in local and state teachers' organizations and is familiar with the purposes and work of the N.E.A.
 2. Perceives the opportunity to work with future teachers as a professional opportunity.
 3. Places primary emphasis upon his service to society rather than upon his personal gain.
 4. Actively participates with his colleagues in developing and enforcing standards fundamental to continuous improvement of his profession, and abides by those standards in his own practice.
 5. Exhibits willingness to accept out-of-class responsibilities.
 6. Participates effectively in faculty meetings and work of professional committees.
 7. Is acquainted with sources of current thinking--journals, conferences, yearbooks, workshops.
 8. Exhibits a cooperative attitude in relations with other members of the staff.²⁵

The above list of competencies covers a broad range of abilities needed by a supervising teacher. If one

²⁴Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), p. 17.

²⁵Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Yearbook, p. 20.

...these o
...them in d
...mental organ
...Education of

A few y

...it was diff
...major areas
...over is so r
...where the wr
...higher education
...develop these
...others. The c
...action of new
...classroom teach
...able today b
...with our best

Recent

...one who sees
...be creative
...indicator or
...velop skills
...ing to ente

Up to t

...not place

studies these competencies carefully, however, and thinks about them in depth, they are very similar to the major perceptual organization Combs speaks about in The Professional Education of Teachers.²⁶

A few years ago the teacher turn-over was so great that it was difficult to select and educate teachers in these major areas of competencies. Now that our teacher turn-over is so much lower (less than 4% in the school system where the writer did his research), public schools and teacher education institutions should be working together to develop these competencies in prospective supervising teachers. The competencies will not only help in the education of new teachers, but will also assure better classroom teachers for our young people. This has become possible today because we can now attract, educate, and retain our best teachers in the field of education.

Recent research tells us that the effective teacher is one who sees his role as freeing students so that they may be creative rather than controlling. He must be a facilitator or learning enabler. We must help teachers develop skills so that they can be personally involved, willing to enter into interaction.

Up to this point it may appear that this writer does not place emphasis on the importance of the good

²⁶Combs, op. cit., p. 20.

under being w
are a thorough
this is one con
We emphasized
experience may
teachers have be
we failed to d
James talked
great influen
and the way t
we taught the

The fol
supervising t

Again, in
Education
for Student
of the qua
McGuskey a
the essent
of student
control of
teaching-l
making; an
fessional.

If stu
teachers who
we and are
the tea

teacher being well informed. It is important that teachers have a thorough knowledge of their subject field. However, this is one competency which teacher education institutions have emphasized to such a degree that the subject matter experience may cause a problem in teacher education. Some teachers have become so subject matter oriented that they have failed to develop some or, possibly, many of the competencies talked about earlier. The way one is taught has a great influence on how he will teach. Students tend to teach the way they have been taught rather than the way we have taught them to teach.

The following quote summarizes the competencies of a supervising teacher.

Again, in 1961, in its yearbook entitled Teacher Education and the Public Schools, the Association for Student Teaching returned to a consideration of the qualifications of the supervising teacher. McCuskey approached the problem by identifying the essential competencies needed by a supervisor of student teaching. These were: (1) scholarly control of knowledge; (2) the expertness in the teaching-learning process; (3) skills in decision making; and (4) insight into one's self as a professional.²⁷

If student teachers are to be guided by supervising teachers who have the qualities and competencies outlined here and are going to keep up to date in the field of education, the teacher education institutions and/or public

²⁷ Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Yearbook, p. 102.

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

1966

1967

1968

1969

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

schools must provide adequate in-service education for the supervising teacher.

Education for
Supervising Teachers

In reviewing the literature dealing with in-service education for supervising teachers, the writer was disappointed that there was not more written on this topic. For years educators have been saying that supervisors of student teachers should have education.

In the article written for the 1939 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Dr. Raleigh Schorling reported on the results of a questionnaire returned to him by five hundred critic teachers. More than 95 percent of the respondents agreed that supervisors of student teachers should have adequate education in professional education. No inquiry was made at that time about the content of adequate education.²⁸

Supervising teachers need to have in-service education during the school year so that they may continue to grow intellectually. If supervising teachers are going to do the kind of job we need to have done with our student teachers, they need to keep up to date regarding new developments in education.

²⁸Ibid., p. 102.

The day
student
sure me
ing and
changes
changes
teacher
odious
already
teacher
teacher
room ye

One

We recog
thing tea
tion of
teachers b
some ca
for it. h
care an
then bef
teacher.
little ev
teacher e
old lea
student t

T

enter wo
elocating
be follo

The supervising teacher who has been working with student teachers for a period of years has seen some marked changes in the availability of teaching aids. The last decade has brought dramatic changes. For the future, it is certain that changes will continue both in the addition of new teaching materials, techniques, devices, and procedures, and in the knowledge of ways to use those already existing. Those who work with student teachers need to keep in mind that the career teacher of the future will be spending his classroom years in the midst of new teaching aids.²⁹

Over the years many teacher education institutions have recognized the need for in-service education for supervising teachers. From time to time a course in the supervision of student teachers has been offered. In some cases teachers have taken such a course at their own expense, and in some cases the teacher education institution has paid for it. However, in no case did the writer find a situation where an institution required that such a course had to be taken before a supervising teacher could have a student teacher. The writer was disappointed that there was so little evidence of organized partnership programs between teacher education institutions and public schools, which would lead to education of supervising teachers as well as student teachers.

The institutions which have expressed a need for a better working program have done very little in terms of educating all supervising teachers on an organized basis. The following quote is an example:

²⁹Ibid., p. 70.

Finally
believe
support
school
teachers
variety
the way
and ease
problem
one is v

The
the impor
spending
informati

The eff
ineffect
the bes
recent
to keep
ments.
ent tea
for who
role th
entrepr
can be
take th
that ar
ment an
teacher

Whe
at superv
dication i
g. This
sent ways

Finally the faculty at Indiana State University believes that it is vitally important that good rapport exist between the student teaching personnel (University supervisors, supervising teachers, and student teachers) and other university and public school personnel. To this end the university makes every effort to provide free and easy lines of communication so that little problems do not become big ones and so that everyone is working toward a common goal.³⁰

The writer noted that Indiana State University puts great importance on communication in terms of working with supervising teachers in public schools; however, more than communication is needed in a good student teacher program.

The efforts of even the most skillful mechanic are ineffective without adequate tools and equipment. The best prepared physician must read the most recent medical journals and attend modern clinics to keep in touch with the latest medical developments. The classroom teacher who welcomes a student teacher as a partner in instructing the pupils for whom he is responsible assumes a leadership role that has no parallel in the entire educational enterprise. The whole level of teacher competency can be raised if each supervising teacher will take the initiative in utilizing the opportunities that are available to him for professional improvement and put them to use in assisting student teachers.³¹

When one studies the above quote it becomes evident that supervising teachers need a great deal of on-going education if they are to be outstanding supervising teachers. This in-service education may be accomplished in different ways.

³⁰Ibid., p. 96.

³¹Ibid., p. 67.

So

interests of

teaching

the course

described.

Report by

The

years of

three.

of the most

teachers

teachers.

So

profession

care pro

teaching

large give

library se

being te

profession

being te

The co

to be

He ne

happ

visin

that v

that l

child.

Some teacher education institutions have formed committees of teachers to give suggestions on how the student teaching program could be improved. These suggestions are then considered by the institutions and in many cases adopted. This partnership relation helps to develop good rapport between schools and teacher education institutions.

The teacher committee in some cases has become a means of in-service education for members within the committee. Experienced supervising teachers can provide one of the most effective means of aiding less experienced teachers in their preparation for serving as supervising teachers.

Some supervising teachers have access to a good professional library. The writer is acquainted with cases where professional library service is furnished in student teaching centers by the college. In other cases the college gives the supervising teachers the right to use the library service within the institution. There are supervising teachers who have been able to build their own professional library. However, it is sad for the supervising teacher who has no access to a professional library.

The competent teacher of children and youth needs to be knowledgeable in his field of specialization. He needs also to be well informed about what is happening in the world around him. For the supervising teacher this requires a personal library that will keep him up to date in these areas so that he will not only be a competent teacher of children but of student teachers as well.³²

³²Ibid., p. 68.

Group conference is another method of keeping supervising teachers up to date. Many times institutions hold one day conferences on the campus for the supervising teachers who have student teachers from their institution. These conferences are held after the student teacher has been in a school system long enough to be able to take over the supervising teacher's class so that she may attend the on-campus conference.

These conferences usually consist of a speaker who talks on a topic relative to supervision. Following the speaker the supervising teachers break up into discussion groups to talk over specific areas of supervision.

Some teacher education institutions have offered courses and/or workshops in teacher education. There are teacher education institutions which pay the tuition for the education courses, and in some cases the supervising teacher has to pay the tuition. How a supervising teacher receives his/her education may vary, but one thing is certain, they do need education.

Individuals who care enough about their work to be selected for the supervision of student teachers are those who have a commitment to improve their professional skills and they will not be content until they feel that they can competently meet the demands. It is important that the institutions involved, public school and college or university, assure the individual teacher that the resources necessary for his self improvement are available. Materials and people that can provide assistance should be easily accessible, and he should be permitted time to make his preparation. Because the regular work of the teacher is becoming more

extens
he will
unless
found
are th
as a p
Since
possib
ing a
teache
logical
part of

The

important i

important p

place is in

The tea
arily i
the con
ween str
is an op
cern of
teaching

The

rather. Th

develop a g

imaging tea

33

34

Assoc
tion, D.C.

extensive and complex, it cannot be expected that he will continually be able to improve himself unless he is provided time to do so. It has been found that the most successful in-service programs are those that provide the time for this purpose as a part of the regular load of the teacher. Since the supervising teacher accepts the new responsibility in order that he may assist in providing a more adequately qualified supply of beginning teachers rather than for personal gain, it is quite logical to request that his preparation time be a part of his regular schedule.³³

Conferences between Supervising Teacher and Student Teacher

The experiences outside of the classroom are also important in terms of a student teacher's development. One important place where professional development may take place is in the student-teacher conference.

The teaching of the student teacher occurs primarily in the individualized teaching situation of the conference. It is during the conference between student teacher and his supervisor that there is an opportunity to talk about the central concern of the student of teaching--the nature of teaching itself.³⁴

The conference should give guidance to the student teacher. This is a time when the supervising teacher should develop a good relationship between student teacher and supervising teacher.

³³Ibid., p. 12.

³⁴"Supervisory Conference as Individualized Teaching," Association for Student Teaching Bulletin 28 (Washington, D.C. , 1969), p. 9.

In
rather sh
talk about
HENDER t
emotions a
individuals
of concern

The
in teacher
ing compete
indsey sug
teacher sho

1. See
theo
2. Gain
and
3. Grow
4. Deve
work
5. Form
of v
6. Seek
by ra
ing,
iment

It is
Mrs. The i
develop the ne

In getting ready for the conference the supervising teacher should have good plans and know what he is going to talk about and how he will approach the situation. He must remember that this is a live teaching situation and that emotions are involved. It must be remembered that both individuals should get a chance to express their thinking and concerns.

The major objective of any conference with a student teacher is to provide guidance in developing the teaching competencies of the beginning teacher. Stratemeyer and Lindsey suggest that through the conference the student teacher should be helped to:

1. See more clearly the relationship between theory and practice.
2. Gain a broad vision of the work of the teacher and the role of the school in the community.
3. Grow in self-analysis and self-improvement.
4. Develop a professional attitude that is a workable guide to action.
5. Formulate a more conscious educational point of view.
6. Seek increasingly better solutions to problems by raising questions, discussing ways of working, and outlining ways to test ideas experimentally.³⁵

It is obvious that the conference serves many purposes. The important thing is that a supervising teacher develop the necessary skills to hold an adequate conference.

³⁵Ibid., p. 7.

the super

relations!

S.

at the ed

entering s

we been

may have

hang.

Teaching
done g
been g
in max
have d
library
we have
availab
stratic
technic
they ne
teachin
us. If
them fo
taught
never g
there i
essenti
have no
discove
that th
ing. P
and bad

Man

stated the

The supervising teacher must realized that a good working relationship contributes to a good program.

Education of Student Teacher

Supervising teachers need to look at the experiences and the education the student teacher has encountered before entering student teaching. Many times student teachers have been exposed to information, but this does not mean they have synthesized and made it a part of their total being.

Teaching education, like education, generally has done pretty well in two of its phases. It has been quite successful in gathering information and in making information available to students. We have done this by gathering information in our libraries and in the minds of brilliant teachers. We have learned also to make this information available to other people through lectures, demonstrations and the whole new world of audio-visual techniques. We are experts at telling people what they need to know, and we measure the success of teaching by requiring students to tell it back to us. If they do this satisfactorily we commend them for knowing and rest content that we have taught them well. Much of education practice never gets beyond this level of learning. But there is a third phase of the learning process essential for teacher education, with which we have not done so well. It is helping people to discover the personal meaning of information so that they behave differently as a result of teaching. Research has shown that both good teachers and bad know what they ought to do.³⁶

Many times people in various areas of education have treated the elementary teacher as a second-class citizen.

³⁶Combs, op. cit., p. 27.

they have

subject is

master's

present is

Chap
tion
to be
charg
out,
as be
to be
educa
dead
For e

I

nurses,

the prac

inspecti

rather.

clinical

S

elementar

can do e

never.

to be str

is are n

it are f

They have felt that the elementary teacher lacked depth in subject material. They did not realize that the elementary teacher's background was one of general education. The content for general education is broader.

Unhappily the level of teaching in general education programs in many of our colleges leaves much to be desired. Overwhelmed with students and charged with the responsibility for "weeding them out," harassed instructors often cover the subject as best they can and escape as quickly as possible to teaching the majors. As a consequence, general education programs are often badly taught and deadly dull. This is not good for any student. For education students it is disastrous.³⁷

In reviewing the literature on teacher education courses, the writer found a trend toward making the courses more practical. This was done in many cases by getting the prospective teacher out working with students in one way or another. There was also a trend toward lengthening the clinical experience.

Some of the literature reviews stated that later elementary teachers need more subject material training than do early elementary teachers. This too was debated, however. Men like Combs feel that human development needs to be stressed more at all levels. Combs feels that teachers are not failing because of a lack of subject knowledge, but are failing because of a lack of human understanding.

³⁷Combs, op. cit., p. 43.

the writ

the coll

teacher

needs ex

abroad

The

Mon

edu

sho

will

ter

the

ex

a s

tea

tea

res

tea

eff

cen

for

On

vig

to

involve

making

whether

between

in 1927

1929

Decision-Making in
Teacher Education

In reviewing the literature on student teaching, the writer found that many authors put great emphasis on the college supervisor. He is the main liaison between the teacher training institution and the public school. He needs excellent skill in public relations, and should have a broad knowledge of teacher education.

The supervising teacher should involve himself more in the planning and implementing of teacher education programs. The teaching profession should build attitudes among its members which will enable the supervising teacher to do a better job of preparing teachers. He should be given the status of a professional partner in the teacher education program. He should be provided with a planned setting which will develop a student teaching experience of the highest quality. The teaching profession should re-examine present resources, seeking to provide the supervising teacher the time and opportunity to participate effectively. It should shake itself of a complacent attitude, often expressed as a "practical" point of view, and work for long-range goals. Only vision and courage, applied and implemented vigorously, will enable the teaching profession to take its place of importance in society.³⁸

Other literature stressed the importance of the involvement of the staff in the public school in decision-making as far as teacher education is concerned. However, nowhere did the writer truly find a joint relationship between teacher education institutions and public schools

³⁸Commission on Standards, "The Supervising Teacher," An AST Position Paper, Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1966), p. x.

reading tea

education m

the courses

institution h

with they ch

regarding teacher education. Usually the teacher education institution made all decisions in terms of teacher preparation courses and then when it came to student teaching the institution had little to say about the public school in which they chose to put their student teachers.

The s
udy are des
clude (1) p
collection pr
ira.

This
various group
The following

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

The
my teachers
Bogor Towns
assigned by
teachers. E
group was co
udent teach
urvey which

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN

The steps which were taken while conducting the study are described in this chapter. The sections discussed include (1) population, (2) the data instrument, (3) data collection procedures, and (4) procedures for treatment of data.

Population

This study was concerned with the views held by various groups of people in relation to student teaching. The following groups were included:

1. Teachers
2. Student Teachers
3. Administrators

The subjects of this study consisted of 23 supervising teachers and six administrators who were a part of the Bangor Township Schools staff, and 25 student teachers assigned by Central Michigan University to the supervising teachers. Even though not a part of the population, this group was compared to 4,397 supervising teachers, 4,483 student teachers, and 1,001 principals who responded to the survey which was a part of the Impact Study. The responses

in a que

only an

in the s

by the s

schools

regions

public s

the nat

the par

Pre

stu

was

ing

ver

the

red

born

give

tio

lar

than

adm

the

even

at the
hospital

on a questionnaire which had been taken from the Impact Study and given to the three BEAM groups was then compared to the same three groups in the Impact Study.

The Questionnaire

The original questionnaire was developed for the Impact Study which was done in 1969.

The Impact Study was a result of the laboratory schools going out of existence at teacher education institutions and moving the student teaching experience to the public school. Consequently, questions have arisen as to the nature and extent of the benefits accruing to each of the partners in the school experience.

At a meeting of the Council of State College Presidents of Michigan in December of 1968 when student teaching was under review, the question was asked, 'What is the impact of a student teaching program upon the school cooperating in such a venture?'

Since hard data were not available to answer this question, the investigation commonly referred to as the Student Teaching Impact Study was born.

The assignment to conduct such a study was given to the Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs group which have been meeting regularly in Michigan for the past four years. More than 10,000 teachers, student teachers, and school administrators were involved in what is probably the most comprehensive study of student teaching ever conducted in this country.¹

¹Deans and Directors of Student Teaching in Michigan, The Impact of Student Teaching Programs upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan, p. Forward.

The P
Institute
Deans of
ing to de
programs
nittee es
study was
Chairman
Committee
Quick, D
igan Univ
tor of St
Chairman.

Educa
tions wer
ning of t
service o
tensively
ment of t
given spe
objectivi
gathering

In th
eloped an
teaching
and membe
term of 1
a pilot s
dures. T
corrected

At se
the pilot
the final
Education
on teachi
ers were
Each of t
both grou
instrumen

The s
is also used

Development of the Survey Instrument

The Presidents of state-supported baccalaureate institutions in Michigan last year requested their Deans of Education and Directors of Student Teaching to determine the effect of student teaching programs upon cooperating public schools. The committee established to initiate and conduct such a study was made up of a Dr. Malcolm A. Lowther, Chairman of the School of Education Undergraduate Committee, University of Michigan; Dr. Alan F. Quick, Director of Student Teaching, Central Michigan University; and Dr. W. Henry Kennedy, Director of Student Teaching, Michigan State University, Chairman.

Education researchers from the three institutions were involved by the committee in the planning of the study, and the research consultation service of Michigan State University was used extensively in the design of the study and development of the survey instruments. Among the factors given special attention was the need for complete objectivity in the instruments used for data gathering.

In the winter of 1969, instruments were developed and reviewed by the parent group, student teaching faculties of the various institutions, and members of the profession. During the spring term of 1969, eight institutions participated in a pilot study to test the instruments and procedures. They were then refined, limitations were corrected, and procedures sharpened.

At several stages during the development of the pilot study, as well as in the preparation of the final version of the instruments, Michigan Education Association officials and the committee on teaching from the Detroit Federation of Teachers were involved and appraised of the progress. Each of these groups provided suggestions and both groups made contributions to the items in the instruments.²

The survey instrument developed for the Impact Study was also used in the BEAM survey with a few minor changes.

²Ibid., p. Forward.

No changes v

are in the

1. Which

1. A

2. A

3. A

4. A

5. A

6. A

The BLM sur

1. Which

a. A

b. A

The w

operators in

questionnaire

Quest

the Impact

3. What

1. B

2. B

3. B

4. B

h

The changes were as follows: On the administrator questionnaire in the Impact Study, question one was:

1. Which of the following are you now?
 1. A single student teacher
 2. A married student teacher
 3. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
 4. A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
 5. A single school administrator
 6. A married school administrator

The BEAM survey question one was changed to:

1. Which of the following are you now?
 - a. A single school administrator
 - b. A married school administrator

The writer made this change since only school administrators in the BEAM Program received the administrator's questionnaire.

Question three on the administrator questionnaire in the Impact Study was as follows:

3. What is your present administrative assignment?
 1. Building Principal - elementary school
 2. Building Principal - middle school
 3. Building Principal - junior high school
 4. Building Principal - combined junior-senior high school

in the

3.

was not

are no

Since t

rooms

the BE

in cas

the of

the c

there

the c

5. Building Principal - senior high school

6. Other

Question three in the administrator questionnaire in the BEAM Study was as follows:

3. What is your present administrative assignment?

- ☐ a. Building Principal - elementary school
- ☐ b. Building Principal - middle school
- ☐ c. Building Principal - junior high school
- ☐ d. Building Principal - combined junior-senior high school

The writer made this change since the questionnaire was not given to high school administrators because there are no high school administrators in the BEAM Program. Since there are two classrooms of sixth graders, and four rooms are used by the high school in the junior high where the BEAM Program is held, the writer left the choice,

- ☐ b. Building Principal - middle school
- ☐ c. Building Principal - combined junior-senior high school

in case the Bangor Junior High principal elected to choose one of these instead of

- ☐ c. Building Principal - junior high school

Question four on the administrator questionnaire and question three on both the supervising teacher questionnaire and the student teacher questionnaire which describes the community were omitted from the BEAM survey since all

if the P

the imp

for min

teacher

1.

partic

1.

was c

teac

vey

tion

of the Bangor Township Schools are in the same area.

The survey instrument developed for the teachers in the Impact Study was also used in the BEAM survey with a few minor changes. The changes were as follows: On the teachers questionnaire in the Impact Study question one was:

1. Which of the following are you now?
 1. A single student teacher
 2. A married student teacher
 3. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
 4. A supervising teacher with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
 5. A school administrator

The teachers questionnaire for the BEAM survey question one was changed to:

1. Which of the following are you
 - ___a. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
 - ___b. A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching

The writer made this change since the questionnaire was given only to supervising teachers.

The survey instrument developed for the student teachers in the Impact Study was also used in the BEAM survey with a few minor changes. On the student teacher questionnaire in the Impact Study question one was:

very que

there

with

of the

teacher

felt

towns

or 10

towns

were

in

1. Which of the following are you now?
 1. a single student teacher
 2. A married student teacher
 3. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
 4. A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
 5. A school administrator

The student teacher questionnaire for the BEAM survey question one was changed to read:

1. Which of the following are you now?
 - a. A single student teacher
 - b. A married student teacher

The writer made this change because the questionnaire was given only to student teachers.

Questions eight, ten, eleven, twelve, and thirteen (with all sub-topics) in the student teacher questionnaire of the Impact Study were purposely omitted from the student teacher questionnaire of the BEAM survey because the writer felt that they did not apply to the situation in the Bangor Township Schools. Question eight was omitted because all or 100% of the students in BEAM were assigned to the Bangor Township Schools full time. Questions 10, 11, 12, and 13 were omitted because all or 100% of the student teachers in BEAM were earning elementary teaching certificates.

The final change made affected all three areas

aiming

of the

each s

read o

and in

questi

questi

appear

indivi

and ad

for ad

questi

group

of eac

monna

turned

sheet

at 1

(administrative, supervising teachers and student teachers) of the Impact Study. The writer used letters to identify each sub-topic under the questions in the BEAM survey instead of the whole numbers used in the Impact questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedures

In this section a review is made of the procedures used in collecting the data. Copies of the student teacher questionnaire, teacher questionnaire, and administrator questionnaire used to collect the data from the BEAM people appear in the appendix of this study.³

The BEAM questionnaires were given out to each individual group. A student teacher, supervising teacher, and administrator were given the directions by the writer for administering the questionnaire. They in turn gave the questionnaire to each of the members of their group in a group setting and collected them upon completion. Members of each group were given assurance that no individual questionnaire would be identified. The questionnaires were then turned over to the writer.

The questionnaires were then posted on a ledger sheet designed for tabulating responses for various groups.

Procedures for Treatment of Data

The broad purpose of this study is to take a critical look at the opinions of supervising teachers, student

³See questionnaires in Appendix A.

each

each

the

at

of the

groups

is tab

apoth

signif

percent

struct

it had

percent

has in

ELM P

is perc

higher

the

percent

teachers, and school administrators surveyed in the Student Teacher Impact Study and compare them with the opinions of the supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the BEAM Program.

In order to achieve this purpose, totals were taken on the ledger sheets of each response for each of the groups.

Frequency counts and percentages will be displayed in tables for each response which is related to a particular hypothesis. In some cases chi squares will be run to show significant differences.

The following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis I: The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis II: The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect on school activities in addition to classroom instruction for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had for pupils in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis III: The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of supervising teachers more in the BEAM Program than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis IV: The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of regular staff in

the 1970

Study.

derived

their s

Student

Study.

derived

derived

derived

is per

the p

derived

the a

derived

the a

derived

the a

the a

the BEAM Program more than regular staff in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis V: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have made a greater investment in working with their student teachers and attending functions related to student teaching than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis VI: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have used instructional materials, aids or ideas, provided by their student teachers more than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis VII: The presence of student teachers is perceived to be more positive in schools which had the BEAM Program than in schools which had the Impact Study.

Hypothesis VIII: BEAM student teachers are perceived to have taken on a greater role in the operation of the classroom than student teachers in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis IX: The university coordinator is perceived as being more helpful in the BEAM Program than in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis X: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have taken less time from their students because of having a student teacher than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

this is

body.

and in

making

action

actions

which s

and the

regular

for a m

regular

the type

and the

as has

and, a

the type

regular

the type

the type

the type

the type

the type

the type

the type

Summary

The writer has stated earlier in this chapter that this is a study comparing the BEAM Program with the Impact Study. The hope is that the BEAM Program of TOTAL INVOLVEMENT in all facets of the school operation, which include working with trained cooperating teachers in two student teaching classroom experiences, two types of student visitations with special service personnel, two weekly seminars which serve to bridge the gap between practicum and theory, and the acceptance of the student teacher as a part of the regular staff and a member of the community, tends to make for a more positive teaching situation.

The writer is taking a critical look at the BEAM Program as compared to the Impact Study by testing out the ten hypotheses stated previously. The ten hypotheses deal with the effect which the presence of the student teacher has had upon certain activities for pupils in the BEAM Program, upon activities in addition to classroom instruction, and upon the performance of the supervising teacher and the regular staff members as compared to the Impact Study. The hypotheses deal with the effect of the amount of work done and time spent by the supervisory teacher in working with the student teachers and using materials, aids, and ideas provided by the student as compared with the Impact Study.

From these hypotheses then, the writer concludes that the presence of student teachers enhances the performance

of the Ba

House o

trial sch

(

ment de

of the Bangor Township Schools in a more positive way because of the BEAM Program being an integral part of the total school philosophy.

Chapter III discussed the design of the study which dealt with the following:

1. Defining the population.
2. The history of the development of the instrument for collecting the data.
3. The data collection procedures.
4. The process and the results of the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Findings are presented in this chapter relative to the objectives which were:

1. To see if greater involvement of supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators make for a more positive student teaching situation when the philosophy of the student teaching program is an integral part of the philosophy of the school system.
2. To compare the views held by student teachers, supervising teachers, and school administrators in the BEAM Program to the views held by supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the Student Teaching Impact Study.

The following hypotheses were tested.

1. The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.
2. The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect on school activities in addition to classroom instruction for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had for pupils in the Impact Study.
3. The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of supervising teachers more in the BEAM Program than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
4. The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of regular staff in the BEAM Program more than regular staff in the Impact Study.

5. BEN
MAB
STU
rel
tea

6. BEN
USE
PR
sup

7. BE
ar
th
te
St

8. BE
ta
cl
St

9. TR
be
th

10. TR
te
B
I:

P

As in

may include

1. su

2. st

3. pr

Subjec

supervis

principa

teachers,

5. BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have made a greater investment in working with their student teachers and in attending functions related to student teaching, than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
6. BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have used instructional materials, aids or ideas provided by their student teachers more than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
7. BEAM supervising teachers in the BEAM Program are perceived to have taken less time from their students because of having a student teacher than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.
8. BEAM student teachers are perceived to have taken on a greater role in the operation of the classroom than student teachers in the Impact Study.
9. The University coordinator is perceived as being more helpful in the BEAM Program than in the Impact Study.
10. The presence of student teachers is perceived to be more positive in schools which had the BEAM Program than in schools which had the Impact Study.

Population and Percent of Returns

As indicated in Chapter I, the subjects in this study included:

1. supervising teachers
2. student teachers
3. principals

Subjects of the Impact Study (1969) consisted of 4,397 supervising teachers, 4,483 student teachers, and 1,001 principals. This group was compared to 23 supervising teachers, 25 student teachers and six principals

surveyed during

The imp

student teacher

institutions, a

the student

in which studie

The ED

teachers assign

working with t

his to whom t

The re

questionnaire

questions from

program will

all square wi

significant i

The f

this was done

student teach

in the survey

used to make

Table

the student t

the college o

surveyed during the fall of 1973 in the BEAM Program.

The Impact Study included the entire population of student teachers assigned for student teaching by Michigan institutions, all of the supervising teachers working with these student teachers, and all of the building principals in which student teachers were assigned.

The BEAM population included all of the student teachers assigned to BEAM, all of the supervising teachers working with these student teachers and all of the principals to whom these student teachers were assigned.

The results of the responses from the returned questionnaires will be tabulated on ledger sheets and like questions from like groups in the Impact Study and BEAM Program will be compared by percentages. On major questions, chi square will be done; the .05 level will be considered significant in the study.

Responses of Student Teachers

The first group examined was the student teachers. This was done by comparing the BEAM student teachers to the student teachers in the Impact Study on certain questions in the survey. Questions four, five, six and seven were used to make these comparisons.

Table 1 shows the comparison on question four in the student teacher questionnaire which asks, "What is your all-college grade point average?"

Table 1

Response

Below 2

2.0 - 2

2.5 - 3

3.0 - 3

Above 3

Missing

Errors

Total

Very s

the stu

the at

in the

ident

of the

the or

ident

are yo

Table 1. Student teachers all-college grade point average.
Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, E=0.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Below 2.0	9	.2		
2.0 - 2.5	1,255	28.0	7	28.0
2.5 - 3.0	1,775	39.6	11	44.0
3.0 - 3.5	1,103	24.6	5	20.0
Above 3.5	278	6.2	2	8.0
Omissions	63	1.4		
Errors	-	-	-	-
Total	4,483	100.0	25	100.0

When studying Table 1, one finds the two groups very similar in grade point average.

Table 2 shows the comparison on question five in the student teacher questionnaire which asks, "How old were you at the beginning of this student teaching contact?"

In studying Table 2, one finds the student teachers in the BEAM Program tend to be a little younger than the student teachers in the Impact Study. Forty-four percent of the student teachers in the BEAM program were 21 years old or under as compared to 20.8% in the Impact Study.

Table 3 shows the comparison on question six in the student teacher questionnaire which asks, "How many times have you taught, including the current assignment?"

Table 1

Response

11 Year

11 to 12

12-1 2

11 to 12

Per 21

Missio

Errors

Total

Table 3

Response

11

12

Free

Missio

Errors

Totals

Table 2. Age of student teacher at beginning of student teaching contact.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
21 Years or under	932	20.8	11	44.0
21 to 21-1/2 Years	861	19.2	5	20.0
21-1/2 to 22 Years	686	15.3	3	12.0
22 to 23 Years	1,139	25.4	6	24.0
Over 23 Years	807	18.0		
Omissions	58	1.3		
Errors	-	-	-	-
Total	4,483	100.0	25	100.0

Table 3. Number of times student teacher has taught, including current assignment.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
One	3,842	85.7	24	96.0
Two	493	11.0	1	4.0
Three	85	1.9		
Omissions	63	1.4		
Errors	-	-	-	-
Totals	4,483	100.0	25	100.0

the tea

the first

expect

Eighty-

study a

of the

category

student

assigned

assigned

similar

study s

placed

response

response

July 9.

checked

ended.

inference

life, o

teacher

In studying Table 3, one finds that 96% of the student teachers in the BEAM Program were student teaching for the first time, while 85.7% of the student teachers in the Impact Study were student teaching for the first time. Eighty-five, or 1.9%, of the student teachers in the Impact Study are student teaching for the third time, while none of the student teachers in the BEAM Program fall in this category.

Table 4 shows the comparison on question 74 in the student teacher questionnaire which asks, "Why were you assigned to this particular student teaching situation?"

In studying Table 4, one finds the reasons for assignment of student teachers to prospective schools very similar. However, 52% of the student teachers in the Impact Study said they requested the school or area they were placed in, while 48% of the BEAM student teachers gave this response to the same question. When one looks at the second response which states, "I requested this kind of program," only 9.3% of the student teachers in the Impact Study checked this, while 20% of the BEAM student teachers responded. The response which states, "I really preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one by my college, or university," was checked by 12.7% of the student teachers in the Impact Study and 16% in the BEAM Program.

Title

Response

I require
or a

I require
of p

I had
pref

I prefer
assi
place

I was
this
thou
pref
one

mission

errors

totals

Table 4. Reason why student teacher was assigned to a particular situation.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
I requested this school or area	2,331	52.0	12	48.0
I requested this kind of program	417	9.3	5	20.0
I had no particular preference	986	22.0	4	16.0
I preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one	569	12.7	4	16.0
I was required to accept this assignment even though I express strong preference for another one	99	2.2	-	-
Omissions	81	1.8		
Errors				
Totals	4,483	100.0	25	100.0

Responses of the Supervising Teachers

The responses of the BEAM supervising teachers were compared with those of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study on certain questions in the survey. Questions three, ten, five, four, and nine were used to make these comparisons.

Table 5 shows the comparison on question three in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "How many years of teaching have you completed including this year?"

Table 5. Years of teaching the supervising teacher had completed including the year in which the survey was taken.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Three or Less	378	8.6	3	13.0
Four to Seven	1,108	25.2	11	47.8
Eight to Twelve	1,073	24.4	7	30.4
More than Twelve	1,794	40.8	2	8.7
Omissions	44	1.0		
Errors	-	-	-	.1
Totals	4,397	100.0	23	100.0

When one examines Table 5, it is obvious that the supervising teachers in the Impact Study in general have more years teaching experience than the supervising teachers

in the BEAM Program. It is interesting to note that 78.2% of the supervising teachers in BEAM fall between four and twelve year experience while only 49.6% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study fall in this category, and over 40.8% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study have over twelve years of experience while only 8.5% of the BEAM supervising teachers have had over twelve years teaching experience. The writer believes that the years of experience between the two groups was due to the fact that the only teachers who joined BEAM were teachers who were not already involved in another student teaching program in the Bangor District. Teachers with a number of years experience may have already joined other student teaching programs previous to the starting of BEAM.

Table 6 shows the comparison on question ten in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "What is your own current teaching assignment?"

When one studies Table 6, it is evident that the BEAM Program has more elementary supervising teachers than the Impact Study. In the Impact Study 35% of the supervising teachers were at the Senior High level while there were no senior high supervising teachers in the BEAM Program. Both programs were similar at the junior high level. The BEAM Program had .6% more junior high supervising teachers than the Impact Study.

Table 6. Current teaching assignments of supervising teacher.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Grades K, 1, 2	809	18.4	9	39.1
Grades 3, 4	506	11.5	6	26.1
Grades 5, 6	413	9.4	3	13.0
All Elementary Grades	172	3.9	-	-
Middle School	57	1.3	1	4.3
Junior High School	739	16.8	4	17.4
Senior High School	1,539	35.0	-	-
All grades K-12	48	1.1	-	-
Omissions	114	2.6		
Errors				.1
Totals	4,397	100.0	23	100.0

Table 7 shows the comparison on question five in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "With how many student teachers have you worked in the last five years? (Include your current student teacher)."

Table 7. Number of student teachers supervising teacher has worked within past five years including current student teacher.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
One	1,187	27.0	-	-
Two	778	17.7	3	13.0
Three	611	13.9		
Four	453	10.3	2	8.7
Five	387	8.8	-	-
Six to Ten	629	14.3	10	43.5
More than Ten	299	6.8	8	34.8
Omission	53	1.2		
Errors	-	-	-	-
Totals	4,397	100.0	23	100.0

In studying Table 7, one finds that better than one-fourth or 27% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study were working with their first student teacher at the same time there were no BEAM supervising teachers in this category. Seventy-eight and three tenths percent of the

supervising teachers in the BEAM Program have experienced working with six or more student teachers while only 21.1% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study have worked with six or more student teachers during their career. It is interesting to note that Table 5 indicated that the Impact supervising teachers on a whole had more years teaching experience while Table 7 shows that the BEAM supervising teachers have had more experience working with student teachers even though they have less years teaching experience.

Table 8 shows the comparison on question four in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked?"

Table 8 reveals the fact that BEAM supervising teachers in general have experienced working with more teacher educating institutions than have supervising teachers in the Impact Study. The one exception to this is the fact that .8% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study have worked with more than six different teacher training institutions during their career while no supervising teacher in the BEAM Program has had student teachers from more than six teacher training institutions.

Table 9 shows the comparison on question nine in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "How many weeks is your student teacher scheduled in this assignment?"

Table 8. Number of teacher training institutions represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Only One	2,502	56.9	9	39.1
Two	1,090	24.8	7	30.4
Three	466	10.6	5	21.7
Four to Six	251	5.7	2	8.7
More than Six	35	.8	-	-
Omissions	53	1.2	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	.1
Totals	4,397	100.0	23	100.0

Table 9. Number of weeks student teacher was scheduled in assignment.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
5 weeks or less	26	.6	-	-
6 or 7 weeks	70	1.6	-	-
8 or 9 weeks	558	12.7	3	13.0
10 to 11 weeks	884	20.1	-	-
12 to 14 weeks	1,275	29.0	-	-
More than 14 weeks	1,486	33.8	20	87.0
Omissions	98	2.2	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-
Totals	4,397	100.0	23	100.0

In studying Table 9 one finds that 87% of the student teachers were assigned to the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program fourteen weeks or more while 33.8% of the student teachers in the Impact Study were assigned to their supervising teachers fourteen weeks or more. The writer would like to point out, however, that most BEAM student teachers are assigned for sixteen weeks with half-day assignments. For example, a student teacher may be assigned mornings for sixteen weeks to a first grade and during that same sixteen week period be assigned afternoons to a fourth grade, giving the student two different assignments each sixteen weeks long.

Responses of Administrators

The responses of the BEAM administrators were compared with those of the administrators in the Impact Study on certain questions in the survey. Questions three, four, five, seven and eight were used to make these comparisons.

Table 10 shows the comparison on question three in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "What is your present administrative assignment?"

When one examines Table 10, one finds that all of the BEAM administrators are either elementary or junior high, while 16.1% of the principals in the Impact Study are senior high principals. At the time the survey was taken the BEAM Program was not operating at the high school level.

Far

Res

Bull

E

Bull

M

Bull

J

Bull

J

Bull

Se

Che

Dis

Nota

the a

years

tors

exper

in the

tors h

10.6t

two or

thirty

Table 10. Present administrative assignment.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Building Principal - Elementary School	545	54.4	4	66.7
Building Principal - Middle School	28	2.8	-	-
Building Principal - Jr. High School	140	14.0	2	33.3
Building Principal - Jr.-Sr. High School	29	2.9	-	-
Building Principal - Senior High School	161	16.1	-	-
Other	80	8.0	-	-
Omissions	18	1.8	-	-
Totals	1,001	100.0	6	100.0

Table 11 shows the comparison on question four in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "For how many years have you been a school administrator?"

When one studies Table 11, one finds the administrators in the Impact Study on an average have had more years experience as a school administrator than have administrators in the BEAM Program. Fifty percent of the BEAM administrators have had two or less years of experience while only 10.6% of the administrators in the Impact Study have had two or less years experience as a school administrator. Thirty and three tenths percent of the administrators in

the impact

school at

the BBAW

Table 11.

response

two or less

three to

six to nine

ten to twenty

more than

missions

errors

totals

Table

the administration

years have

long?"

On

majority of

years experience

were administered

BBAW administered

the Impact Study had more than twelve years experience as a school administrator while 16.7% of the administrators in the BEAM group fell in this category.

Table 11. Years experience as a school administrator.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Two or less	106	10.6	3	50.0
Three to five	216	21.6	2	33.3
Six to Nine	232	23.2	-	-
Ten to Twelve	136	13.6	-	-
More than Twelve	303	30.3	1	16.7
Omissions	8	.8		
Errors		-.1		
Totals	1,001	100.0	6	100.0

Table 12 shows the comparison on question five in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "For how many years have you been an administrator in your present building?"

One finds that Table 12 reveals the fact that the majority of administrators in the Impact Study have more years experience as an administrator in the building they were administering at the time of the Study than did the BEAM administrators. Table 11 shows that 30.3% of the

Impact administrators have more than twelve years experience as a school administrator and only 16.7% of the BEAM administrators fall in this category; however, Table 12 reveals the fact that only 11.7% of the administrators in the Impact Study have been an administrator in the building they were in during the time of the study for more than twelve years and 16.7% of the BEAM administrators fall in this category.

Table 12. Administrators' years of experience in present building.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Two or Less	271	27.1	4	66.7
Three to Five	333	33.3	1	16.7
Six to Nine	191	19.1	-	-
Ten to Twelve	78	7.8	-	-
More than Twelve	117	11.7	1	16.7
Omissions	11	1.1	-	-
Errors	-	-.1	-	-.1
Totals	1,001	100.0	6	100.0

Table 13 shows the comparison of question seven in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "How many teachers are assigned in your building?"

Table 13. Number of teachers assigned to administrator's building.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
10 or less	36	3.6	1	16.7
11 to 20	253	25.3	-	-
21 to 30	299	29.9	5	83.3
31 to 40	131	13.1	-	-
41 to 50	108	10.8	-	-
51 to 60	57	5.7	-	-
61 to 70	26	2.6	-	-
71 to 80	22	2.2	-	-
81 to 90	13	1.3	-	-
91 or more	48	4.8	-	-
Omissions	8	.8	-	-
Errors	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	1,001	100.0	6	100.0

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

One finds by looking at Table 13 that the majority of BEAM administrators have fewer teachers assigned to their building than do the administrators in the Impact Study. All of the BEAM administrators have thirty or less teachers assigned to their building while just over half or 58.8% of the administrators in the Impact Study have thirty or less teachers assigned to the building they are administering.

Table 14 shows the comparison of question eight in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "For how many years have student teachers been assigned in the building in which you are presently the administrator?"

Table 14. Number of years student teachers have been assigned to the building the administrator is presently assigned.

Response Choices	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Three or less	210	21.0	2	33.3
Four to six	217	21.7	2	33.3
Seven to nine	168	16.8	2	33.3
Ten to twelve	137	13.7	-	-
Thirteen to fifteen	61	6.1	-	-
More than fifteen	183	18.3	-	-
Omissions	25	2.5	-	-
Errors		-.1	-	+.1
Totals	1,001	100.0	6	100.0

In st
have been ass
strators in
however, the
years in the
body.

In s
teachers and
had more ye
administrat
teachers in
ber of stud

Hy
teachers i
certain in
Program th

To
collected
with:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Ta
the student

In studying Table 14 one finds that student teachers have been assigned for more years in the buildings of administrators in the Impact Study than in the BEAM group. However, there was a larger group between four and nine years in the BEAM schools than in the schools in the Impact Study.

In summary, the writer found that supervising teachers and administrators in the Impact Study, in general, had more years experience than did supervising teachers and administrators in the BEAM Program; however, supervising teachers in the BEAM Program had worked with a greater number of student teachers.

Hypothesis I states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Effect change in the amount of small group instruction.
2. Effect on individual instruction.
3. Effect on provisions for make-up work.
4. Effect on discipline.
5. Effect on motivation of pupils.

Table 15 shows the comparisons on question 14 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 19 in the

TABLE 1. CHARGE TO ACCOUNT OF SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION.

STUDENT SUPERVISING

Table 15. Change in amount of small group instruction.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact %	BEAM %	No.
Much More	601	13.4	8	32.0	677	15.4	13	56.6	259	25.9	3	50.0
Somewhat Less	1291	28.8	12	48.0	1697	38.6	7	30.5	523	52.2	3	50.0
No Change	2103	46.9	4	16.0	1768	40.2	2	8.7	200	20.0		4071
Somewhat Less	58	1.3			176	4.0	1	4.3	9	.9		243
Much Less	22	.5			22	.5			1	.1		45
Don't Know	341	7.6	1	4.0								341
Omission	67	1.5			57	1.3			9	.9		133
Error												
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0

-.1

teacher

question

small group

presence

ber of E

administ

tion bec

the same

four ter

was much

somewhat

the pres

group in

same th

15.2% r

tion an

groups

student

tion fo

People

change v

responde

the stud

teacher

teacher questionnaire, and question 26 in the administrator questionnaire which asks, "To what extent was the amount of small group instruction for pupils changed because of the presence of the student teacher?"

In studying Table 15 one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that there was more small group instruction because of the presence of student teachers than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. Forty-four and four tenths percent of the BEAM groups responded that there was much more small group instruction, and 40.7% responded somewhat more, or 85.1% of the BEAM groups responded that the presence of student teachers had caused more small group instruction for their pupils. When one looks at the same three groups in the Impact Study one finds that only 15.2% responded that there was much more small group instruction and 35.5% responded somewhat more, or 50.7% of the groups in the Impact Study responded that the presence of student teachers had resulted in more small group instruction for their pupils. Forty-one and two tenths of the people in the Impact Study responded that there was no change while only 11.1% of the people in the BEAM group responded that there was no change.

Table 16 shows the comparisons on questions 17 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 22 in the teacher questionnaire and question 29 in the administrators

[illegible]

Table 16. Individual attention to, or tutoring, of pupils.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	BEAM No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM No.	%
Much More	838	18.7	12	48.0	813	18.5	10	43.5	197	19.7	4	66.7
Somewhat More	1851	41.3	13	52.0	2304	52.4	13	56.5	640	63.9	2	33.3
No Change	1345	30.0			1029	23.4			146	14.6		
Somewhat Less	63	1.4			154	3.5			5	.5		
Much Less	22	.5			22	.5			1	.1		
Don't Know	300	6.7									300	3.0
Omissions	64	1.4			75	1.7			12	1.2		
Errors												.1
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0
												9881
												100.0
												54
												100.0

question
attenti
student

student
in the
attenti
of stud
Study r
five te
there w
attenti
teacher

in the
the tea
student
individu

when a
the fir
student
tutored

people
of t
that the

questionnaire which asks, "To what extent was individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils changed because of student teachers' presence?"

In studying Table 16 one finds that 100% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program felt that there was more individual attention to, or tutoring of pupils because of the presence of student teachers, and 67.2% of the people in the Impact Study responded to the same question. Twenty-five and five tenths percent of the people in the Impact Study said there was no change, 2.7% said there was less individual attention to, or tutoring of pupils because of student teachers and 3.0% responded that they didn't know.

Table 17 shows the comparisons on question eight in the student teacher questionnaire, and question 13 in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "To what extent did student teachers work with (instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?"

Table 17 does not include administrators; however, when comparing student teachers and supervising teachers, one finds that the people in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers worked with, instructed, counseled, and tutored individual pupils more than did the same groups of people in the Impact Study. It is interesting to note that 72% of the student teachers in the BEAM Program responded that they had worked with, instructed, counseled, and

Table 17. Extent student teacher worked with (i.e., instructed, counseled, tutored) individual pupils.

Table 17. Extent student teacher worked with (i.e., instructed, counseled, tutored) individual pupils.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHERS			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.
A Great Deal	1506	33.6	18	72.0	1196	27.2	12	52.2	2702 30.4 30 62.5
To Some Extent	1780	39.7	6	24.0	1878	42.7	10	43.5	3658 41.2 16 33.3
A Little Bit	982	21.9	1	4.0	1082	24.6	1	4.3	2064 23.2 2 4.2
Not at All	148	3.3	-	-	176	4.0	-	-	324 3.6 - -
Omissions	67	1.5	-	-	65	1.5	-	-	132 1.5 - -
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+1.1 - -
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100 48 100.0

covered in

the student

size ques

responded

terths of

as compar

Impact St

T

the student

teacher q

supervisi

to when y

T

again the

BEAM Prog

with indi

have a st

Impact St

two group

teachers

what more

compared

in the Im

Ta

the student

questionna

tutored individual pupils a great deal and only 33.6% of the student teachers in the Impact Study responded to the same question. It appears that the supervising teachers responded in a similar manner, because fifty-two and two tenths of the BEAM supervising teachers responded favorably as compared to the twenty-seven and two tenths of the Impact Study supervising teachers who responded favorably.

Table 18 shows the comparisons on question nine in the student teacher questionnaire and question 14 in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "To what extent did the supervising teacher work with individual pupils as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?"

Table 18 does not include administrators; however, again the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers worked more with individual students as compared to when they did not have a student teacher than did the same groups in the Impact Study. Seventy-five and one tenth percent of the two groups in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers worked with individual pupils much more or somewhat more than usual when they had a student teacher as compared to when they did not, while 38% of the two groups in the Impact Study felt the same way.

Table 19 shows the comparisons on questions 54 in the student teacher questionnaire and 59 in the teacher questionnaire which asks, "To what extent was the time you

TABLE 10. PERSONS EMPLOYED WITHIN THE DISTRICT WHO HAVE A TEACHING LICENSE		
STUDENT TEACHER	SUPERVISING TEACHER	TOTALS

Table 18. Extent to which supervising teacher worked with individual pupils as compared to when he does not have a student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	%
Much More Than Usual	273	6.1	7	28.0	743	16.9	8	34.8	1016 11.4 15 31.3
Somewhat More Than Usual	785	17.5	7	28.0	1579	35.9	14	60.9	2364 26.6 21 43.8
About the Same as Usual	2085	46.5	6	24.0	1323	30.1	1	4.3	3408 38.4 7 14.6
Somewhat Less Than Usual	76	1.7	-	-	488	11.1	-	564	6.4 - -
Much Less Than Usual	49	1.1	2	8.0	207	4.7	-	256	2.9 2 4.2
Don't Know	1123	25.0	3	12.0	-	-	-	1123	12.6 3 6.3
Omissions	92	2.1	-	-	57	1.3	-	149	1.7 - -
Errors									--.2
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100 48 100

Table 19. Extent of time supervising teacher spent giving help to individual students changed because of student teacher's presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHERS			SUPERVISING TEACHERS			TOTALS		
	No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %	TOTALS
Increased a Great Deal	417	9.3	8	32.0	690	15.7	9	39.1	1107 12.6 17 35.4
Increased to Some Extent	1300	29.0	12	48.0	1979	45.0	14	60.9	3279 36.9 26 54.2
Remained About the Same	1287	28.7	4	16.0	1117	25.4	-	-	2404 27.1 4 8.3
Reduced to Some Extent	672	15.0	-	-	462	10.5	-	-	1134 12.8 - -
Reduced a Great Deal	377	8.4	1	4.0	75	1.7	-	-	452 5.1 1 2.1
Don't Know	358	8.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	358 4.0 - -
Omissions	72	1.6	-	-	74	1.7	-	-	146 1.6 - -
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- -
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100.0 48 100.0

spent h

teacher

men on

teacher

felt th

when th

Eighty-

and sup

teacher

they ha

Impact

of the

dial st

while l

individ

teacher

the BEA

remain

27.13 o

things

the adm.

tent dic

change b

building

spent helping individual students changed because of student teacher presence?"

Table 19 does not include administrators; however, when one looks at the student teachers and supervising teachers, it is evident that the people in the BEAM Program felt that teachers gave more time to individual students when they had a student teacher than when they did not. Eighty-nine and six tenths percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers said that the time that supervising teachers spent helping individual students increased when they had a student teacher, while 49.4% of the people in the Impact Study said it increased. Two and one tenth percent of the people in the BEAM Program said that help to individual students was reduced when they had a student teacher while 17.9% of the people in the Impact Study said help to individual students was reduced when they had a student teacher. Eight and three tenths percent of the people in the BEAM study said that help to individual students remained about the same when they had a student teacher and 27.1% of the people in the Impact Study reported that things remained about the same.

Table 20 shows the comparison on question 37 in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "To what extent did the individual instruction or tutoring of pupils change because of the presence of student teachers in your building."

Table 1

Respon

Much M

Somewh

No Cha

Somewh

Much I

Miss

Error

Total

Table

BEAV

On ti

tors

BEAV

stru

admi

inte

tors

cha

tea

Table 20. Effect student teachers had on the individual instruction or tutoring of pupils.

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Much More	178	17.8	2	33.3
Somewhat More	692	69.1	4	66.7
No Change	112	11.2	-	-
Somewhat Less	5	.5	-	-
Much Less	-	-	-	-
Omissions	14	1.4	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

Table 20 includes only administrators. In studying Table 20, it becomes evident that the administrators in the BEAM survey felt that student teachers had a greater effect on the individual instruction of pupils than did administrators in the Impact Study. All of the administrators in the BEAM survey felt that students received more individual instruction because of student teachers while 86.9% of the administrators in the Impact Study felt this way. It is interesting to note that a greater percentage of administrators in the Impact Study felt that students got more individual instruction because of student teachers than did teachers or student teachers in the Impact Study.

student

question

naire,

periods

Program

give in

involve

that with

'somewhat

impact

in the

teacher

respond

for the

more po

student

question

tionnai

take-up

felt th

sion fo

the Imp

Table 21 shows the comparison on question 18 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 23 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 30 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was supervision of study periods changed because of student teacher presence?"

Table 21 shows that the people involved in the BEAM Program felt more positively about the help student teachers gave in the supervision of study periods than did the people involved in the Impact Study. It was interesting to note that when one combines the responses "much better" and "somewhat better," 30.6% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded and 30.0% of the supervising teachers in the BEAM survey responded. However, the BEAM student teachers and BEAM administrators had a higher percentage respond to "much better" and "somewhat better" which accounts for the total number of people in the BEAM Program being more positive than the people in the Impact Program.

Table 22 shows the comparison on question 15 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 20 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 27 in the administrators' questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent were provisions for make-up work changed because of student teacher presence?"

Table 22 shows that the people in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers had a greater effect on provision for make-up work for students than did the people in the Impact Study. The Impact Study had 39.4% of the people

Table 21. Supervision of study periods.

Response Choices	STUDENT			SUPERVISING			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.
Much Better	372	8.3	7	28.0	484	11.0	4	20.0	161	16.0	2	33.3
												10.3
												13
												25.5
Somewhat Better	753	16.8	6	24.0	862	19.6	2	10.0	347	34.7	2	33.3
												19.9
												10
												19.6
No Change	1484	33.1	3	12.0	1535	34.9	7	35.0	454	45.4	2	33.3
												35.1
												12
												23.5
Somewhat Poorer	143	3.2			202	4.6			10	1.0		3.6
												3.6
Much Poorer	22	.5			35	.8			2	.2		.6
												.6
Does Not Apply	1228	27.4	6	24.0	1121	25.5						
												23.8
												6
												11.8
Don't Know	354	7.9	3	12.0			7	35.0				
												3.6
												10
												19.6
Omissions	127	2.8			158	3.6			27	2.7		3.2
												3.2
Error											.1	-.1
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	20	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0
												98.1
												51
												100.0

1

TABLE 1. - Percent of population for make-up work.

STUDENT	SUPERVISOR	ADMINISTRATIVE	TOTAL
---------	------------	----------------	-------

Table 22. Effect on provision for make-up work.

Response Choices	STUDENT			SUPERVISING			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.				
Much Greater	256	5.7	8	32.0	444	10.1	4	19.0	141	14.1	3	50.0	841	8.5	15	28.8
Somewhat Greater	1018	22.7	12	48.0	1482	33.7	3	14.3	557	55.6	3	50.0	3057	30.9	18	34.6
No Change	2627	58.6	4	16.0	2247	51.1	14	66.7	286	28.6			5160	52.2	18	34.6
Somewhat Less	58	1.3			106	2.4			3	.3			167	1.7		
Much Less	27	.6			22	.5			1	.1			50	.5		
Don't Know	421	9.4	1	4.0									421	4.3	1	1.9
Omis- sion	76	1.7			96	2.2			13	1.3			185	1.9		
Error																.1
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	21	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	52	100.0

respo

much

stude

No on

stude

2.28

for m

teach

stud

ques

tion

exam

prog

effe

peop

the

some

whil

some

exam

teac

felt

stud

respond that provisions for make-up work for students were much greater or somewhat greater because of the presence of student teachers while 63.4% of the BEAM people responded. No one in BEAM felt that provision for make-up work for students was less because of student teachers; however, 2.2% of the people in the Impact Study felt that provision for make-up work was less because of presence of student teachers in the classroom.

Table 23 shows the comparison on question 16 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 21 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 28 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was follow-up of exams changed because of the presence of student teachers?"

Table 23 shows that again the people in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers had a greater positive effect on provisions for follow-up of exams than did the people in the Impact Study. The Impact Study had 32.5% of the people respond that follow-up of exams was much, or somewhat better because of the presence of student teachers while 56% of the BEAM people responded with either much, or somewhat better. No one in BEAM felt that follow-up of exams for students was poorer because of having student teachers; however, 2.7% of the people in the Impact Study felt that follow-up of exams was poorer because of the student teachers.

Table 23. Effect student teachers had on follow-up of exams.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS						
	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.				
Much Better	211	4.7	2	8.3	374	8.5	5	25.0	116	11.6	3	50.0	701	7.1	10	20.0
Somewhat Better	834	18.6	12	50.0	1170	26.6	4	20.0	502	50.1	2	33.3	2506	25.4	18	36.0
No Change	2510	56.0	7	29.2	2480	56.4	11	55.0	363	36.3	1	16.7	5353	54.2	19	38.0
Somewhat Poorer	67	1.5	-	-	154	3.5	-	-	3	.3	-	-	224	2.3	-	-
Much Poorer	27	.6	-	-	13	.3	-	-	1	.1	-	-	41	.4	-	-
Don't Know	717	16.0	3	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	717	7.3	3	6.0
Omission	117	2.6	-	-	206	4.7	-	-	16	1.6	-	-	339	3.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-
Total	4483	100.0	24	100.0	4397	100.0	20	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	50	100.0

under

questi

normal

the re

on the

class

alive

before

respo

had 2

32.6%

what

group

ing t

some

and c

this

had 4

their

the 1

the g

super

felt

Table 24 shows the comparison on question 21 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 26 in the teacher questionnaire and question 33 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did discipline in the room change because of the student teacher's presence?"

In studying Table 24 one finds a more varied opinion on the effect student teachers had on the discipline in the classroom. As a total group the BEAM people felt more positively because 38.9% responded much better or somewhat better, while only 13.6% of the people in the Impact Study responded much better or somewhat better. The BEAM people had 25.9% response to somewhat poorer or much poorer, and 32.9% of the people in the Impact Study responded to somewhat poorer or much poorer. However, in looking at the groups individually, one finds that 52.2% of the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt the discipline was somewhat poorer because of the presence of student teachers and only 39.1% of the people in the Impact Study responded this way to the same question. The BEAM student teachers had 44% feel that discipline was somewhat better because of their presence and only 12.8% of the student teachers in the Impact Study felt this way. It was interesting to note the great difference between the student teachers and the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program as to how they felt student teachers affected discipline in the classroom.

4

Table 24. Effect student teachers had on discipline.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				ADMINISTRATION				TOTALS			
	No.	%	No.	%	Impact	%	No.	%	Impact	%	No.	%	Impact	%	No.	%
Much Better	130	2.9	2	8.0	84	1.9	2	8.7	25	2.5	239	2.4	4	7.4		
Somewhat Better	574	12.8	11	44.0	352	8.0	3	13.0	179	17.9	3	50.0	1105	11.2	17	31.5
No Change	2147	47.9	7	28.0	1992	45.3	6	26.1	584	58.3	3	50.0	4723	47.8	16	29.6
Somewhat Poorer	1067	23.8	2	8.0	1719	39.1	12	52.2	199	19.9			2985	30.2	14	25.9
Much Poorer	85	1.9			185	4.2			1	.1			271	2.7		
Don't Know	399	8.9	3	12.0									399	4.0	3	5.6
Omissions	81	1.8			65	1.5			13	1.3			159	1.6		
Error														.1		
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

S
 T
 C
 C
 S
 I
 A
 W
 T
 C
 S
 H
 A
 T
 S
 F
 I

Table 25 shows the comparison on question 22 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 27 in the teacher questionnaire and question 34 in the administrator questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the motivation of pupils change because of student teacher's presence?"

Table 25 shows that the people in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers caused a more positive effect on the motivation of pupils than did the people in the Impact Study. It is interesting to note that 100% of the administrators in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers in a classroom made far better motivation of pupils. There were 13.1% of the people in the Impact Study who felt that the presence of student teachers made far poorer motivation of pupils while no one in the BEAM Program felt this way.

Tables 15 through 25 support Hypothesis I which states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis II states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect on school activities in addition to classroom instruction for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had for pupils in the Impact Study.

Table 25. Effect student teachers had on the motivation of pupils.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATION			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.				
Much Better	309	6.9	7	28.0	233	5.3	3	13.0	61	6.1	1	16.7	603	6.1	11	20.4
Somewhat Better	1484	33.1	13	52.0	1280	29.1	11	47.8	493	49.3	5	83.3	3257	33.0	29	53.7
No Change	1600	35.7	5	20.0	1842	41.9	9	39.1	360	36.0	-	-	3802	38.5	14	25.9
Somewhat Poorer	256	5.7	-	-	875	19.9	-	-	69	6.9	-	-	1200	12.1	-	-
Much Poorer	18	.4	-	-	79	1.8	-	-	2	.2	-	-	99	1.0	-	-
Don't Know	717	16.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	717	7.3	-	-
Omissions	99	2.2	-	-	88	2.0	-	-	16	1.6	-	-	203	2.1	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-.1	-	-	-	-.1	-	-
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

21

12

21

26

21

21

12

26

21

21

21

21

21

21

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaire which dealt with :

1. Effect on help or counseling provided the student teachers during non-class hours.
2. Effect student teachers had on the supervision of youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.
3. Amount of talks student teachers gave to parent groups.
4. Effect student teachers had on the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.
5. Administrators' opinion on the overall quality of instruction.

Table 26 shows the comparisons on question 10 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 15 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was individual help or counseling provided pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if there had not been student teachers?"

In studying Table 26 one finds that the student teacher and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Study were somewhat similar. The BEAM group had 41.3% of the members who felt there was much more, or somewhat more, individual help or counseling provided pupils during non-class hours because of student teachers and the Impact group had 31%.

11

Table 26. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided your pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not had a student teacher?

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	%		
Much more than usual	273	6.1	2	8.0	413	9.4	3	14.3	686	7.7	5	10.9
Somewhat more than usual	785	17.5	9	36.0	1280	29.1	5	23.8	2065	23.3	14	30.4
About the same as usual	2085	46.5	8	32.0	2392	54.4	12	57.1	4477	50.4	20	43.5
Somewhat less than usual	76	1.7	-	-	172	3.9	1	4.8	248	2.8	1	2.2
Much less than usual	49	1.1	1	4.0	48	1.1	-	-	97	1.1	1	2.2
Don't know	1121	25.0	5	20.0	-	-	-	-	1121	12.6	5	10.9
Omissions	94	2.1	-	-	92	2.1	-	-	186	2.1	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	21	100.0	8880	100.0	46	100.0

1a
 1e
 no
 st
 12
 1a
 70
 18
 10
 10
 10
 11
 10
 10
 e
 10
 10
 10
 10
 10

The BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers had 4.4% of whom felt that there was somewhat less or much less individual help or counseling provided pupils during non-class hours because of student teachers. The Impact student teachers and supervising teachers had 3.9% who felt the same way.

The BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers had 43.5% who felt individual help or counseling provided pupils during non-class hours remained about the same as usual with or without student teachers, while 50.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt this way.

Table 27 shows the comparison on question 23 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 28 in the teacher questionnaire and question 14 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teachers supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?"

Table 27 shows that the people in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers supervised youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc., more than the people in the Impact Study did. There were 50.9% of the people in the BEAM Study who responded that often or sometimes student teachers supervised youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc., while 39.7% of the people in the Impact Study responded. However, it is interesting to note that

Table 27. The extent to which student teachers supervised youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATOR			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.				
Often	287	6.4	3	12.0	215	4.9	2	9.1	102	10.2	1	16.7	604	6.1	6	11.3
Some-times	1322	29.5	12	48.0	1350	30.7	5	22.7	646	64.5	4	66.7	3318	33.6	21	39.6
None	2815	62.8	10	40.0	2612	59.4	14	63.6	193	19.3	-	-	5620	56.9	24	45.3
Does not apply	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	4.0	1	16.7	40	.4	1	1.9
Don't know	-	-	-	-	141	3.2	1	4.5	8	.8	-	-	149	1.5	1	1.9
Omissions	59	1.3	-	-	79	1.8	-	-	12	1.2	-	-	150	1.5	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-.1	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	22	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	53	100.0

1

when one compares the supervising teachers in the Impact Study to the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program, the Impact supervising teachers had 35.6% who responded that often or sometimes their student teacher supervised youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc., while the BEAM supervising teachers had 31.8% who responded this way.

Table 28 shows the comparisons on question 24 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 29 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 15 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teachers give talks to parent groups?"

In studying Table 28 one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers felt that student teachers often or sometimes gave talks to parent groups than did these same groups in the Impact Study. The BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers had 39.6% who responded that they often or sometimes gave talks to parent groups, while only 13.0% of the same groups in the Impact Study responded to the same question. However, when studying the administrators' responses, one finds that none of the administrators in the BEAM Program responded to "often" or "sometimes" the student teachers gave talks to parent groups, but 14.8% of the administrators in the Impact Study responded that often or sometimes student teachers did give talks to parent groups.

1

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

Table 28. Extent to which student teachers gave talks to parent groups.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATOR			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.			
Often	36	.8	-	26	.6	1	4.3	12	1.2	-	74	.7	1		
Some-times	650	14.5	10	440	10.0	8	34.8	136	13.6	-	1226	12.4	18		
None	3730	83.2	14	58.4	3746	85.2	14	60.9	749	74.8	5	83.3	8225	83.2	33
Does not apply	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71	7.1	1	16.7	71	.7	1	
Don't know	-	-	-	101	2.3	-	-	21	2.1	-	122	1.2	-	-	
Omissions	67	1.5	-	84	1.9	-	-	12	1.2	-	163	1.6	-	-	
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+2	-	-1	
Totals	4483	100.0	24	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	53

Table 29 shows the comparisons on question 19 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 24 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 31 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc., change because of student teacher presence?"

In studying Table 29 one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that student teachers helped make for better supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc., than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. The BEAM groups had 61.1% of the people who felt that the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc., was much better or somewhat better because of student teachers, while 22% of the same three groups felt this way in the Impact Study. There were 2.7% of the people in the Impact Study who felt that the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc., was somewhat poorer or much poorer because of the presence of student teachers, while BEAM had 1.9% of the same groups who felt this way.

Table 30 shows the results of using the chi square on question 38 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the overall quality of instruction changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building?"

20. *What extent, if any, do students, teachers, parents, etc., contribute to the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.*

Table 29. To what extent did student teachers contribute to the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATOR			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.				
Much better	202	4.5	5	20.0	347	7.9	4	17.4	62	6.2	1	16.7	611	6.2	10	18.5
Somewhat better	605	13.5	13	52.0	699	15.9	7	30.4	260	26.0	3	50.0	1564	15.8	23	42.6
No change	1901	42.4	5	20.0	1732	39.4	8	34.8	651	65.0	2	33.3	4284	43.4	15	27.8
Somewhat poorer	54	1.2	-	-	141	3.2	-	-	9	.9	-	-	204	2.1	-	-
Much poorer	22	.5	1	4.0	35	.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	57	.6	1	1.9
Does not apply	1291	28.8	-	-	1332	30.3	4	17.4	-	-	-	-	2623	26.5	4	7.4
Don't know	305	6.8	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	305	3.1	1	1.9
Omissions	103	2.3	-	-	111	2.5	-	-	19	1.9	-	-	233	2.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

In studying Table 30 one finds χ^2 significant when comparing the administrators in the Impact Study to the administrators in the BEAM Program. One can plainly see from this that the administrators in the BEAM Program felt more positively about the effect student teachers had on the over-all quality of instruction.

Hypothesis III states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of supervising teachers more in the BEAM Program than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaire which dealt with:

1. Extent to which the student teacher affords supervising teacher added time for committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.
2. Effect the student teacher has on supervising teacher's visitation in other classrooms or schools.
3. Effect student teacher had on supervising teacher's time for research, or professional reading or writing.
4. Effect that working with a student teacher had on the performance of the supervising teacher.

Table 31 shows the comparison on question 32 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 37 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 51 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervising

Table 31. Extent student teaching affords supervising teacher added time for committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.
A Great Deal	605	13.5	7	28.0	400	9.1	3	13.0	52	5.2	-	1057
To Some Extent	1659	37.0	13	52.0	2133	48.5	11	47.8	460	46.0	6	100.0
No Change (not at all)	1112	24.8	3	12.0	1803	41.0	9	39.1	463	46.3	-	3378
Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	.9	-	9
Much Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know	1046	23.3	2	8.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1046
Omissions	61	1.4	-	-	61	1.4	-	-	17	1.7	-	139
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+ .1	-	- .1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0
												9881
												100.0
												54
												100.0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

teacher engage in committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff during the time student teacher was teaching?"

Table 31 shows that the people in the BEAM Program believed that supervising teachers engaged more in committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff during the time that the student teacher was teaching than did people in the Impact Study. There were 74.1% of the people in the BEAM Study who responded that a great deal, or to some extent, supervising teachers engaged in committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff during the time the student teacher was teaching. Fifty-three and seven tenths percent of the people in the Impact Study responded to the same question; however, it is interesting to note that when one compares the supervising teachers in the Impact Study to the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program, the BEAM supervising teachers had 60.8% who responded that a great deal or to some extent they had engaged in committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff during the time the student teacher was teaching and 57.6% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded the same way to the same question.

Table 32 shows the comparison on question 37 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 42 in the teacher questionnaire and question 55 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers assist the principal or other teachers during the time the student teacher was teaching?"

Table 32. Added time the supervising teacher can assist principal or other teachers because of student teaching program.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.				
A Great Deal	448	10.0	8	32.0	339	7.7	1	4.3	55	5.5	-	842	8.5	9	16.7	
To Some Extent	1748	39.0	13	52.0	2423	55.1	21	91.3	480	48.0	5	83.3	4651	47.1	39	72.2
No Change (not at all)	968	21.6	3	12.0	1561	35.5	1	4.3	440	44.0	1	16.7	2969	30.0	5	9.3
Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	.7	-	-	7	.1	-	-
Much Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Don't Know	1251	27.9	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1251	12.7	1	1.9	-
Omissions	68	1.5	-	-	74	1.7	-	-	18	1.8	-	-	160	1.6	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-.1	-	-	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

In studying Table 32 one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that supervising teachers were able to assist the principal or other teachers because of the student teaching program than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. Eighty-eight and nine tenths percent of the people in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers were able to assist the principal or other teachers more because of the student teaching program. When one looks at the same three groups in the Impact Study, one finds that 55.6% responded to the same question in the same way.

Table 33 shows the comparison on question 31 in the student teaching questionnaire, question 36 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 50 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers engage in visitations in other classrooms or schools while student teacher was teaching?"

Table 33 shows that the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers made more visitations in other classrooms and schools because of having a student teacher than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. There were 79.6% of the people in the BEAM Study who responded that a great deal, or to some extent, student teachers had increased the visitations supervising teachers were able to make to other classrooms or schools. Thirty-eight and

Table 33. Effect student teacher has on supervising teachers' visitations in other classrooms or schools.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				ADMINISTRATORS				TOTALS			
	No.	%	No.	%	Impact	No.	%	BEAM	Impact	No.	%	BEAM	Impact	No.	%	BEAM
A Great Deal	175	3.9	5	20.0	141	3.2	-	-	72	7.2	-	-	388	3.9	5	9.2
To Some Extent	1278	28.5	14	56.0	1785	40.5	18	78.3	369	36.9	6	100.0	3432	34.7	38	70.4
No Change (not at all)	1990	44.4	5	20.0	2410	54.8	5	21.7	537	53.7	-	-	4937	50.0	10	18.5
Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	.7	-	-	7	.1	-	-
Much Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Don't Know	977	21.8	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	977	9.9	1	1.9
Omissions	63	1.4	-	-	61	1.4	-	-	15	1.5	-	-	139	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	+1.1	-	-	-	-.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

six tenths percent of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study responded in the same way.

Table 34 shows the comparisons on question 33 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 36 in the supervising teacher questionnaire and question 52 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervising teacher engage in research during the time the student teacher was teaching?"

In studying Table 34 one finds that the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study responded similarly to the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Study when responding to the question: "To what extent did the supervising teacher engage in research during the time the student teacher was teaching?" If one combines the first two responses which were "much more than usual" or "a great deal," and "more than usual" or "to some extent," one finds that both the Impact group and the BEAM group had 53.7%. The Impact people had 29.7% who said there was no change and BEAM had 31.5% responding the same way. None of the BEAM people said that the supervising teacher had done less research, and only .1% of the Impact people said they had done less.

Table 35 shows the comparison on question 34 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 39 in the teacher

Table 34. Effect that the student teacher had on supervising teacher's time for research.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.				
A Great Deal (much more than usual)	354	7.9	3	12.0	523	11.9	1	4.3	15	1.5	1	16.7	892	9.0	5	9.3
To Some Extent (more than usual)	1587	35.4	11	44.0	2533	57.6	12	52.2	296	29.6	1	16.7	4416	44.7	24	44.4
No Change (not at all)	991	22.1	3	12.0	1275	29.0	10	43.5	669	66.8	4	66.7	2935	29.7	17	31.5
Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	.5	-	-	5	.1	-	-
Much Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know	1493	33.3	8	32.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1493	15.1	8	14.8
Omissions	58	1.3	-	-	66	1.5	-	-	16	1.6	-	-	140	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

questionnaire and question 53 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervising teacher engage in professional reading or writing during the time in which the student teacher was teaching?"

In studying Table 35, again one finds that the student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators in the Impact Study responded very similarly to the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Study when responding to the question, "To what extent did the supervising teacher engage in professional reading or writing during the time that the student teacher was teaching?" If one combines the first two responses, which were "much more than usual" or "a great deal," and "more than usual" or "to some extent," one finds that the Impact Study had 56.2% who responded and the BEAM Study had 51.8% who responded. The Impact group had 25% who said there was no change and the BEAM group had 25.9% who responded the same way. No one in BEAM said the supervising teacher had done less professional reading or writing as a result of having a student teacher and only .1% of the people in the Impact Study said they had done less.

Table 36 shows the comparison on question 67 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 72 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on supervising teachers' teaching performance?"

Table 35. Time afforded supervising teachers for professional reading or writing as a result of student teaching program.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.
A Great Deal (much more than usual)	345	7.7	2	8.0	554	12.6	-	26	2.6	-	925	9.4
To Some Extent (more than usual)	1403	31.3	8	32.0	2761	62.8	14	60.9	457	45.7	4	66.7
No Change (not at all)	964	21.5	3	12.0	1016	23.1	9	39.1	488	48.8	2	33.3
Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	1.0	-	10
Much Less Than Usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know	1708	38.1	12	48.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1708	17.3
Omissions	63	1.4	-	-	66	1.5	-	-	20	2.0	-	149
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0
									9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 36. Effect working with a student teacher had on the performance of the supervising teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Much More Effective Teacher	202	4.5	6	24.0	497	11.3	5	21.7	699	7.9	11	22.9
More Effective Teacher	1421	31.7	13	52.0	2959	67.3	17	73.9	4380	49.3	30	62.5
No Effect On Teaching	1058	23.6	5	20.0	840	19.1	1	4.3	1898	21.4	6	12.5
Less Effective Teacher	36	.8	-	-	44	1.0	-	-	80	.9	-	-
Much Less Effective Teacher	13	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	.1	-	-
Unable to Judge	1668	37.2	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	1668	18.8	1	2.1
Omissions	85	1.9	-	-	57	1.3	-	-	142	1.6	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 36 shows that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers had a more positive effect on the supervising teachers' teaching performance than did the people in the Impact Study. The BEAM supervising teachers and student teachers had 85.4% of their people who said the student teacher had made the supervising teacher much more effective or more effective, and the Impact student teachers and supervising teachers had 57.2% respond the same way to the same question. There were no student teachers or supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who felt that having a student teacher had made the supervising teacher a less effective teacher; however, 1% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Program felt that the supervising teacher was a less effective teacher because of having a student teacher.

Table 37 shows the comparison on question 75 in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your teachers?"

When one studies Table 37 one finds that the administrators in both the Impact Study and the BEAM Program feel that student teachers have had a positive effect on the teaching performance of their supervising teachers. All or 100% of the BEAM administrators felt that student teachers had made the supervising teachers in their building much more effective or more effective. There were 87.4% of the

Impact administrators who felt this way, 10% felt that the student teacher had no effect on the supervising teachers, and .7% felt student teachers had made the supervising teacher less effective.

Table 37. Effect working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your supervising teachers.

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %
Made them much more effective	144	14.4	3	50.0
Made them more effective	731	73.0	3	50.0
Has had no effect	100	10.0	-	-
Made them less effective	7	.7	-	-
Made them much less effective	-	-	-	-
Omissions	19	1.9	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

Table 38 shows the results using the chi square of question 75 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks: What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on teaching performance of your teachers?

Table 38. Effect student teachers have had on the teaching performance of your teachers.

Group	Has Made Them More Effective			Has Had No Effect			Has Made Them Less Effective		
	O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2
Impact	875	875.65	-	100	99.38	-	7	6.97	.01
BEAM	2	5.35	.08	-	.61	.61	-	.04	.04
Chi Square = .74 d.f. = 2									

In studying Table 38 one finds χ^2 is not significant when comparing the administrators in the Impact Study to the administrators in the BEAM Program concerning the effect working with student teachers has had on teaching performance. One might note that both groups of administrators felt positively; however, one group of administrators did not feel significantly more positively than the other. The writer would like to note that responses (a) "has made them much more effective," and (b) "has made them more effective" were combined for this table.

Hypothesis IV states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of regular staff (those teachers not having a student teacher assigned to them) in the BEAM Program more than regular staff in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis, data were used from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Amount student teachers relieved regular staff by teaching, chaperoning, taking lunch duty, supervising study halls, supervising playgrounds for them.
2. Amount student teachers relieved regular staff so that they could make visitations in other classrooms or schools.
3. Amount student teacher relieved regular staff permitting them to participate in committee work in the school.
4. Amount student teacher relieved regular staff permitting them to do research, professional reading, or professional writing.

Table 39 shows the comparison on question 39 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 44 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the student teacher relieve regular staff members from teaching?"

Table 39 does not include administrators; however, in studying the responses from student teachers and supervising teachers in both the BEAM Program and the Impact Study, one finds some interesting results. None of the BEAM supervising teachers or student teachers responded that they had relieved regular staff "many times" by teaching for them; however, 44% of the BEAM student teachers responded that they had relieved regular staff "once or a few times" by teaching for them. It is interesting to note that only 21.7% of the BEAM supervising teachers responded to this same question in the same way since the two groups would have been working together on a one-to-one basis.

Table 39. Student teachers relieving regular staff by teaching for them.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Many Times	188	4.2	-	-	163	3.7	-	-	351	4.0	-	-
Once or a few times	1305	29.1	11	44.0	1108	25.2	5	21.7	2413	27.2	16	33.3
Not at all	2927	65.3	14	56.0	2946	67.0	18	78.3	5873	66.1	32	66.7
Don't know	-	-	-	-	114	2.6	-	-	114	1.3	-	-
Omissions	63	1.4	-	-	66	1.5	-	-	63	.7	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66	.7	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

The Impact student teachers had 4.2% who said they had relieved regular staff by teaching for them many times and 29.1% who said they had relieved regular staff once, or a few times. The supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded similarly to their student teachers, 3.7% responded that student teachers had relieved regular staff many times and 25.2% responded once or a few times.

Both groups of student teachers saw themselves as relieving regular staff more than their supervising teachers saw them relieving regular staff.

Table 40 shows the comparison on question 40 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 45 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teachers relieve regular staff members by chaperoning for them?"

In studying Table 40 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded very similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. If one combines the first two responses, which were: "many times," and "once or a few times," one finds that the Impact Study had 22% respond and the BEAM Program had 23% respond. The Impact people had 74.5% who said student teachers did not chaperon at all for other staff members and BEAM had 70.8% who responded the same way. It is evident from the above table that student teachers did not do a great deal of

Table 40. Student teachers relieving regular staff by chaperoning for them.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.
Many Times	94	2.1	2	8.0	88	2.0	-	-	4.2
Once or a few times	950	21.2	5	20.0	827	18.8	4	17.4	18.8
Not at all	3367	75.1	18	72.0	3249	73.9	16	69.6	70.8
Don't know	-	-	-	-	163	3.7	3	13.0	6.3
Omissions	72	1.6	-	-	70	1.6	-	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	48

chaperoning for other staff members in either program.

Table 41 shows the comparison on question 41 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 46 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teacher relieve regular staff members from supervision of lunch duty?"

Table 41 shows that the supervising teachers and student teachers in the BEAM Program felt that student teachers in the BEAM Program relieved regular staff from supervision of lunch duty much more than did the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. The BEAM people had 20.8% who responded "many times" and 31.3% who responded to "once or a few times," while the Impact group had 1% who responded to "many times" and 1.5% who responded to "once or a few times."

The Impact people had 86.8% who said that student teachers did not take supervision of lunch duty for regular staff at all and the BEAM people had 45.8% who responded this way.

Table 42 shows the comparison on question 42 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 47 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teacher relieve regular staff members from supervision of playgrounds?"

In studying Table 42 one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers felt

Table 41. Student teachers relieving regular staff from supervision of lunch duty.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM No. %
Many Times	184	4.1	5	20.0	163	3.7	5	21.7	347 3.9 10 20.8
Once or a few times	318	7.1	10	40.0	264	6.0	5	21.7	582 6.6 15 31.3
Not at all	3918	87.4	10	40.0	3790	86.2	12	52.2	7708 86.8 22 45.8
Don't know	-	-	-	-	92	2.1	1	4.3	92 1.0 1 2.1
Omissions	63	1.4	-	-	88	2.0	-	-	151 1.7 - -
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	- - - -
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100.0 48 100.0

Table 42. Student teachers relieving regular staff from supervision of playgrounds.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM %
Many Times	453	10.1	13	52.0	422	9.6	5	21.7	875 9.9 18 37.5
Once or a few times	529	11.8	6	24.0	506	11.5	8	34.8	1035 11.7 14 29.2
Not at all	3430	76.5	6	24.0	3267	74.3	9	39.1	6697 75.4 15 31.3
Don't know	-	-	-	-	101	2.3	1	4.3	101 1.1 1 2.1
Omissions	71	1.6	-	-	101	2.3	-	-	172 1.9 - -
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+1.1	- - - -
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100.0 48 100.0

that student teachers relieved regular staff from supervision of playgrounds than did the same two groups in the Impact Study. There were 66.7% of the student teachers and supervising teachers who responded that student teachers relieved regular staff from supervision of playgrounds and only 3.2% of the same groups in the Impact Study responded the same way. There were 75.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded that student teachers never relieved regular staff from supervision of playgrounds, and 31.3% of the same two groups in the BEAM group responded the same way.

Table 43 shows the comparison on question 44 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 49 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teachers relieve regular staff members so that they could make visitations in other classroom or schools?"

In studying Table 43, again one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers felt that student teachers relieved regular staff so that the regular staff could make visitations in other classrooms or schools than did the same two groups in the Impact Study. There were 62.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers relieved regular staff "many times" or "to some extent" so that the regular staff could make visitations in other classrooms or schools, and 19.4% of the

Table 43. Student teachers relieving regular staff so they may make visitations in other classrooms or schools.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
Many Times	67	1.5	3	12.0	84	1.9	-	-	151	1.7	3	6.3
To Some Extent	538	12.0	12	48.0	1033	23.5	15	65.2	1571	17.7	27	56.3
Not at All	2358	52.6	6	24.0	2256	51.3	4	17.4	4614	52.0	10	20.8
Don't know	1439	32.1	4	16.0	941	21.4	4	17.4	2380	26.8	8	16.7
Omissions	81	1.8	-	-	83	1.9	-	-	164	1.8	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way. There were only 20.8% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers never relieved regular staff so that the regular staff could make visitations in other classrooms or schools; however, 52% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded this way.

Table 44 shows the comparison on question 45 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 50 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did student teachers relieve regular staff permitting them to participate in committee work in the school?"

Table 44 again shows that a greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers felt that student teachers relieved regular staff permitting them to participate in committee work in the school than did the same two groups in the Impact Study. There were 37.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers relieved regular staff "many times" or "to some extent" permitting regular staff to participate in committee work in the school and 18% of the same two groups in the Impact Study who responded in the same way. There were 35.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers never relieved regular staff permitting the regular staff to participate in committee work in the school,

Table 44. Extent student teachers relieved regular staff permitting them to participate in committee work in the school.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
Many Times	58	1.3	5	20.0	66	1.5	-	-	124	1.4	5	10.4
To Some Extent	489	10.9	5	20.0	1025	23.3	8	34.8	1514	17.0	13	27.1
Not at All	2193	48.9	8	32.0	2295	52.2	9	39.1	4488	50.5	17	35.4
Don't Know	1677	37.4	7	28.0	923	21.0	6	26.1	2600	29.3	13	27.1
Omissions	66	1.5	-	-	88	2.0	-	-	154	1.7	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

and 50.5% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way.

Table 45 shows the comparison on question 46 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 51 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent were regular staff members able to engage in research because of the presence of student teachers in the building?"

In studying Table 45 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded more similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study than they did in Tables 42 through 44. There were 23% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers relieved regular staff "many times" or "to some extent" permitting regular staff to engage in research, and 15.8% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded in the same way. There were 35.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that student teachers never relieved regular staff permitting regular staff to engage in research, and 48.9% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way.

Table 46 shows the comparison on question 47 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 52 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent were regular staff able to engage in professional reading or writing

Table 45. Extent student teacher relieves regular staff permitting them to engage in research.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
Many Times	45	1.0	3	12.0	88	2.0	-	-	133	1.5	3	6.3
To Some Extent	368	8.2	4	16.0	901	20.5	4	17.4	1269	14.3	8	16.7
Not at All	2183	48.7	8	32.0	2155	49.0	9	39.1	4338	48.9	17	35.4
Don't know	1811	40.4	10	40.0	1165	26.5	10	43.5	2976	33.5	20	41.7
Omissions	76	1.7	-	-	88	2.0	-	-	164	1.8	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 46. Extent student teachers relieved regular staff permitting regular staff time for professional reading or writing.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	
A Great Deal	36	.8	2	8.0	97	2.2	-	-	133	1.5	2	4.2
To Some Extent	332	7.4	4	16.0	950	21.6	2	8.7	1282	14.4	6	12.5
Not at All	2143	47.8	8	32.0	2005	45.6	10	43.5	4148	46.7	18	37.5
Don't Know	1896	42.3	11	44.0	1258	28.6	11	47.8	3154	35.5	22	45.8
Omissions	76	1.7	-	-	87	2.0	-	-	163	1.8	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

because of the presence of student teachers in the building?"

In studying Table 46 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded very similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. If one combines the first two responses, which were "a great deal" and "to some extent," one finds that the Impact Study had 15.9% respond and the BEAM Program had 16.7% respond. The Impact people had 46.7% who said student teachers did not relieve regular staff permitting them time for professional reading and writing and BEAM had 37.5% who responded in the same way.

Hypothesis V states: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have made a greater investment in working with their student teachers and in attending functions related to student teaching than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Participation in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching.
2. Time supervising teacher spent fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence.

3. Time supervising teacher spent preparing additional reports because of having a student teacher.
4. Effect student teacher had on the average number of hours per week supervising teacher spent at school compared to when they did not have a student teacher.
5. Time supervising teacher spent holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teacher.
6. Time supervising teacher spent evaluating student teacher's progress or activities.
7. Time supervising teacher spent planning with or for student teacher.
8. Time supervising teacher spent making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher.

Table 47 shows the comparisons on question 36 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 41 in the teachers questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers participate in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching during the time student teacher was teaching?"

In studying Table 47 one finds that a much greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers felt that supervising teachers participated in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while their student teacher was teaching than did student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. There were 95.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded

Table 47. Participation in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while student teacher was teaching.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	BEAM %
A Great Deal	399	8.9	16	64.0	198	4.5	15	65.2	597 31 64.6
To Some Extent	1457	32.5	9	36.0	1706	38.8	6	26.1	3163 15 31.3
Not at All	1493	33.3	-	-	2418	55.0	2	8.7	3911 2 4.2
Don't Know	1063	23.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1063 12.0 -
Omissions	71	1.6	-	-	75	1.7	-	-	146 1.6 -
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	- -.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 48 100.0

that supervising teachers participated "a great deal" or "to some extent" in seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while their student teacher was teaching. When one looks at student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study, one finds that 4.6% responded to the same question in the same way.

There were 44% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who said supervising teachers did not participate at all in seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while their student teacher taught, and only 4.2% of the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers responded to this same question in the same way.

The writer expected that a great number of people in the BEAM Program would respond to the fact that supervising teachers do attend seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching, as most Fridays are set aside, after student teachers are able to take over the classroom, for this purpose.

Table 48 shows the comparison on question 58 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 63 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers engage in fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence?"

In studying Table 48, again one finds that a greater number of BEAM student teachers and supervising

Table 48. Time supervising teacher spent fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
Many Extra Hours	72	1.6	1	4.0	35	.8	-	-	107	1.2	1	2.1
Some Extra Hours	1125	25.1	16	64.0	1579	35.9	18	81.8	2704	30.5	34	72.3
No Extra Hours	1668	37.2	3	12.0	2678	60.9	4	18.2	4346	48.9	7	14.9
Don't Know	1547	34.5	5	20.0	-	-	-	-	1547	17.4	5	10.6
Omissions	71	1.6	-	-	105	2.4	-	-	176	2.0	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	22	100.0	8880	100.0	47	100.0

teachers felt that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence than did student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. There were 74.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence and 3.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded the same way to the same question.

There were 48.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded that supervising teachers spent no extra time fulfilling social obligations resulting from student teacher's presence, and only 14.9% of the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers responded to the same question in the same way.

Table 49 shows the comparison on question 60 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 65 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervising teacher spend extra hours preparing additional reports because of the presence of the student teacher?"

In studying Table 49 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded more similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study than they did in the two

Table 49. Time supervising teacher spent preparing additional reports because of having a student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	BEAM	Impact No.	%	No.	%	BEAM	Impact No.	%
Many Extra Hours	63	1.4	3	12.0	84	1.9	1	4.3	147	1.7	4	8.3
Some Extra Hours	2129	47.5	12	48.0	3329	75.7	18	78.3	5458	61.5	30	62.5
No Extra Hours	1246	27.8	5	20.0	928	21.1	4	17.4	2174	24.5	9	18.8
Don't Know	977	21.8	5	20.0	-	-	-	-	977	11.0	5	10.4
Omissions	68	1.5	-	-	56	1.3	-	-	124	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

previous tables. If one combines the first two responses, which were "many extra hours" and "some extra hours," one finds that 70.8% of the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers responded and 63.2% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded. The Impact student teachers and supervising teachers had 24.5% who said that supervising teachers spent no extra time preparing additional reports because of having a student teacher, and 18.8% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program responded the same way.

Table 50 shows the comparison on question 49 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 54 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "How did the presence of a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week supervising teachers spent at school compared to when they did not have a student teacher?"

Table 50 shows that 56.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers spent extra time at school each week that they had a student teacher as compared to when they did not have one and 17.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt the same way.

There were 62% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded that student teachers had no effect on the time they spent at school as compared to when they did not have a student

Table 50. Effect student teachers had on the average number of hours per week supervising teacher spent at school compared to when they did not have a student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	No.	%	No.	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.
Added more than 6 hrs.	27	.6	2	75	1.7	3	102	1.1	5
Added 3-6 hrs.	45	1.0	3	264	6.0	8	309	3.5	11
Added 1-3 hrs.	126	2.8	4	602	13.7	7	728	8.2	11
Added up to 1 hr.	139	3.1	-	277	6.3	-	416	4.7	-
Had no effect	2717	60.6	6	2792	63.5	5	5509	62.0	11
Reduced up to 1 hr.	157	3.5	-	136	3.1	-	293	3.3	-
Reduced up to 3 hrs.	188	4.2	1	141	3.2	-	329	3.7	1
Reduced 3-6 hrs.	94	2.1	5	35	.8	-	129	1.5	5
Reduced more than 6 hrs.	63	1.4	1	4	.1	-	67	.8	1
I am unable to judge	834	18.6	3	-	-	-	834	9.4	3
Omissions	93	2.1	-	71	1.6	-	164	1.8	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	4397	100.0	23	8880	100.0	48

BEAM %

teacher and 22.9% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program felt the same way.

There were 14.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that they had spent less time at school per week when they had a student teacher as compared to when they did not have a student teacher, and 9.3% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way to the same question.

It is interesting to note that the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers had a greater percentage (56.2% as compared to 17.5%) who felt that supervising teachers spent more time at school per week when they had a student teacher as compared to when they did not have one, and the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers also had the largest percentage (14.6% compared to 9.3%) who felt that supervising teachers' time was reduced at school because of having a student teacher.

Table 51 shows the comparison on question 62 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 67 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers hold telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teacher?"

Table 51 shows that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers spent more time holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teachers than did the

Table 51. Time supervising teacher spent holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Many Extra Hours	112	2.5	2	8.0	132	3.0	5	21.7	244	2.7	7	14.6
Some Extra Hours	2013	44.9	16	64.0	2203	50.1	13	56.5	4216	47.5	29	60.4
No Extra Hours	2170	48.4	7	28.0	1992	45.3	5	21.7	4162	46.9	12	25.0
Don't Know	121	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	121	1.4	-	-
Omissions	67	1.5	-	-	70	1.6	-	-	137	1.5	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

same two groups in the Impact Study. There were 75% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teachers and 50.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded the same way to the same question.

There were 46.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who said that supervising teachers spent no extra time holding telephone conversations or other conferences with their student teachers and 25% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program responded the same way.

Table 52 shows the comparison on question 56 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 61 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers spend time evaluating student teachers' progress or activities?"

In studying Table 52 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded somewhat similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program. There were 85% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" evaluating student

Table 52. Time supervising teacher spent evaluating student teacher's progress or activities.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact	No.	%	No.	Impact	No.	%	No.	Impact	No.	%	No.
Many Extra Hours	278	6.2	6	24.0	264	6.0	6	26.1	542	6.1	12	25.0
Some Extra Hours	3299	73.6	18	72.0	3707	84.3	16	69.6	7006	78.9	34	70.8
No Extra Hours	834	18.6	1	4.0	356	8.1	1	4.3	1190	13.4	2	4.2
Omissions	72	1.6	-	-	70	1.6	-	-	142	1.6	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

teachers' progress or activities and 95.8% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded the same way to the same question.

There were 13.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded that supervising teachers spent no extra hours evaluating the student teacher's progress or activities and 4.2% of the same groups in the BEAM Program responded in the same way.

Table 53 shows the comparison on question 55 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 60 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did supervising teachers engage in planning with or for student teachers?"

In studying Table 53 one finds that all or 100% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" planning with or for student teachers, while 81.2% of the same two groups felt the same way in the Impact Study. There were 17.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who felt supervising teachers spent no extra hours planning with or for student teachers.

Table 54 shows the comparison on question 61 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 66 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did the supervising teacher spend time in making additional preparation for teaching because of the presence of a student teacher?"

Table 53. Time supervising teacher spent planning with or for student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS		
	No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %
Many Extra Hours	251	5.6	7	28.0	457	10.4	7	30.4	708 8.0 14 29.2
Some Extra Hours	3031	67.6	18	72.0	3465	78.8	16	69.6	6496 73.2 34 70.8
No Extra Hours	1139	25.4	-	-	418	9.5	-	-	1557 17.5 - -
Omissions	62	1.4	-	-	57	1.3	-	-	119 1.3 - -
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- - - -
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880 100.0 48 100.0

Table 54. Time supervising teacher spent making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
Many Extra Hours	76	1.7	2	8.0	140	3.2	1	4.5	216	2.4	3	6.4
Some Extra Hours	870	19.4	12	48.0	2238	50.9	18	81.8	3108	35.0	30	63.8
No Extra Hours	2618	58.4	9	36.0	1948	44.3	3	13.6	4566	51.4	12	25.5
Don't Know	847	18.9	2	8.0	-	-	-	-	847	9.5	2	4.3
Omissions	72	1.6	-	-	71	1.6	-	-	143	1.6	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	22	100.0	8880	100.0	47	100.0

Table 54 reveals the fact that student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that supervising teachers spend more time making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher than did the same groups in the Impact Study. There were 70.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that supervising teachers spent "many extra hours" or "some extra hours" making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher and 37.4% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way to the same question.

There were 51.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and 25.5% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program who responded that supervising teachers spent "no extra hours" making additional preparations for teaching because of having a student teacher.

Hypothesis VI states: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have used instructional materials, aids, or ideas provided by their student teachers more than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Amount of new or different instructional material student teacher introduced.
2. Aids and ideas student teachers provided or suggested other than instructional materials.
3. Use supervising teachers made of instructional materials, aids, or ideas student teachers developed, provided or suggested.

Table 55 shows the comparisons of question 26 on the student teacher questionnaire, question 31 on the teacher questionnaire and question 21 on the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "Did the student teacher bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?"

Table 55 shows that BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that student teachers introduced more new or different instructional materials than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. There were 98.2% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program and 77.1% of the same three groups in the Impact Study who responded that "a great many," "quite a few" or "some" new or different instructional materials had been introduced by student teachers.

There were 14.7% of the student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators in the Impact Study and only 1.9% of the people in the same three groups in the BEAM Program who felt that student teachers introduced no new or different instructional materials.

Table 55. Amount of new or different instructional materials student teachers introduced.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.				
A Great Many	529	11.8	8	32.0	545	12.4	7	30.4	37	3.7	-	1111	11.2	15	27.8	
Quite A Few	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	181	18.1	4	66.7	181	1.8	4	7.4
Same	3008	67.1	16	64.0	2788	63.4	16	69.6	538	53.7	2	33.3	6334	64.1	34	63.0
A Very Few	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	195	19.5	-	-	195	2.0	-	-
None	417	9.3	1	4.0	1007	22.9	-	-	30	3.0	-	-	1454	14.7	1	1.9
I Am Not Sure	466	10.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	466	4.7	-	-
Omissions	63	1.4	-	-	57	1.3	-	-	20	2.0	-	-	140	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 56 shows the comparison of question 27 on the student teacher questionnaire, question 32 on the teacher questionnaire, and question 22 on the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "Did student teachers provide or suggest any aids and ideas other than instructional materials?"

Table 56 shows that BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that student teachers provided or suggested more aids and ideas other than instructional materials than did the same three groups in the Impact Study. There were 96.7% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program and 78.9% of the same three groups in the Impact Study who responded that "a great many or often," "some or sometimes," student teachers provided or suggested aids and ideas other than instructional materials.

There were 13.2% of the student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators in the Impact Study and 3.7% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program who felt that student teachers provided or suggested no aids or ideas other than instructional materials.

Table 57 shows the comparison of question 28 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 33 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 23 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "What use were supervising teachers able to make of instructional materials, aids or ideas student teachers developed, provided or suggested?"

Table 56. Aids and ideas student teachers provided or suggested other than instructional materials.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				ADMINISTRATORS				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%	Impact No.	%	No.	%
A Great Many (often)	444	9.9	7	28.0	431	9.8	6	26.1	82	8.2	2	33.3	957	9.7	15	27.8
Some or Some-times	3255	72.6	17	68.0	2942	66.9	16	69.6	643	64.2	4	66.7	6840	69.2	37	68.5
Seldom	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	235	23.5	-	-	235	2.4	-	-
Never or No	314	7.0	1	4.0	963	21.9	1	4.3	23	2.3	-	-	1300	13.2	2	3.7
I Am Not Sure	412	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	412	4.2	-	-
Omissions	58	1.3	-	-	61	1.4	-	-	18	1.8	-	-	137	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 57. Use supervising teachers made of instructional materials, aids, or ideas student teachers developed, provided or suggested.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			ADMINISTRATORS			TOTALS						
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.				
They Were Used	3658	81.6	25	100.0	3131	71.2	22	95.7	98	9.8	2	33.3	6887	69.7	49	90.7
They Were Sometimes Used																
(Administrators)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	799	79.8	4	66.7	799	8.1	4	7.4
They Were Not Used	130	2.9	-	-	308	7.0	1	4.3	18	1.8	-	-	456	4.6	1	1.9
Were Discouraged from Making Such Contributions	215	4.8	-	-	22	.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	237	2.4	-	-
They Did Not Have Much to Offer	363	8.1	-	-	769	17.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1132	11.5	-	-
Omissions	117	2.6	-	-	167	3.8	-	-	86	8.6	-	-	370	3.7	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 57 shows that a greater number of BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators felt that supervising teachers used instructional materials, aids, or ideas which student teachers had developed, provided, or suggested than did student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators in the Impact Study. Ninety and seven tenths percent of the student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators in the BEAM Program responded that instructional materials, aids, or ideas student teachers developed, provided, or suggested were used and 69.7% of the same three groups in the Impact Study responded in the same way. Seven and four tenths percent of the three groups in the BEAM Program said "they were sometimes used," and 1.9% responded that "they were not used." The Impact Study had 8.1% of their three groups who responded that instructional materials, aids, or ideas student teachers developed, produced, or suggested were "sometimes used" and 4.6% of the three groups in the Impact Study responded that "they were not used."

Hypothesis VII states: BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have taken less time from their students because of having a student teacher than supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Time supervising teacher spent conferring or planning with student teacher so that the supervising teacher had less time for individual work with pupils.
2. To what extent did the supervising teacher find it necessary to re-teach after student teacher taught.
3. Amount of material covered.

Table 58 shows the comparison on question 11 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 16 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did conferring with the student teacher take the supervising teacher's time so they had less time for individual work with pupils?"

Table 58 shows that 87.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 80.1% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded "seldom" or "never" when asked the question, "To what extent did conferring with student teacher take supervising teachers' time so they had less time for individual work with pupils?"

Table 58 also shows that 10.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 16.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded "frequently" or "sometimes" when asked the same question.

Table 58. Time supervising teacher spent conferring with student teacher so she had less time for individual work with pupils.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHERS				SUPERVISING TEACHERS				TOTALS			
	No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Frequently	36	.8	2	8.0	185	4.2	-	-	221	2.5	2	4.2
Sometimes	287	6.4	-	-	950	21.6	3	13.0	1237	13.9	3	6.3
Seldom	1690	37.7	9	36.0	1930	43.9	7	30.4	3620	40.8	16	33.3
Never	2215	49.4	13	52.0	1275	29.0	13	56.5	3490	39.3	26	54.2
Don't Know	179	4.0	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	179	2.0	1	2.0
Omissions	76	1.7	-	-	57	1.3	-	-	133	1.5	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

One might assume from the above responses that much of the conferring that supervising teachers did with student teachers was done during the time that students were not in class.

Table 59 shows the comparison on question 12 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 17 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent did planning with student teachers take the supervising teacher's time so that the supervising teacher had less time for individual work with pupils?"

In studying Table 59 one finds the results are very similar to Table 58. It shows that 91.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 82.3% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded "seldom" or "never" to the question.

Table 60 shows the comparison on question 13 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 18 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was re-teaching necessary after the student teacher taught?"

In studying Table 60 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and the Impact Study gave very similar responses to the question. The Impact Study had 19.5% of the student teachers and supervising teachers who responded that re-teaching was "frequently" or "sometimes" necessary after the student

Table 59. Time supervising teacher spent planning with student teacher so she had less time for individual work with pupils.

Response Choice	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	%	
Frequently	18	.4	1	4.0	171	3.9	-	-	189	2.1	1	2.1
Sometimes	211	4.7	1	4.0	862	19.6	1	4.3	1073	12.1	2	4.2
Seldom	1399	31.2	8	32.0	1834	41.7	8	34.8	3233	36.4	16	33.3
Never	2627	58.6	14	56.0	1447	32.9	14	60.9	4074	45.9	28	58.3
Don't Know	152	3.4	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	152	1.7	1	2.1
Omissions	76	1.7	-	-	83	1.9	-	-	159	1.8	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 60. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after student teacher taught.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Frequently	54	1.2	1	4.0	123	2.8	-	-	177	2.0	1	2.1
Sometimes	444	9.9	2	8.0	1108	25.2	8	34.8	1552	17.5	10	20.8
Seldom	1224	27.3	13	52.0	1873	42.6	14	60.9	3097	34.9	27	56.3
Never	1959	43.7	7	28.0	1196	27.2	1	4.3	3155	35.5	8	16.6
Don't Know	717	16.0	2	8.0	-	-	-	-	717	8.1	2	4.2
Omissions	85	1.9	-	-	97	2.2	-	-	182	2.0	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

teacher taught, while 22.9% of the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers responded the same way to the same question.

Table 60 also shows that 70.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and 72.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded "seldom" or "never" when asked the question, "To what extent was re-teaching necessary after the student teacher taught?"

Table 61 shows the comparison on question 20 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 25 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the amount of material covered changed because of the student teacher's presence?"

Table 61 shows that 62.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that "much more" or "somewhat more" material was covered because of the student teacher's presence and 29% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt the same way.

One finds that 29.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 47% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded that there was "no change" in the amount of material covered because of the student teacher's presence.

Table 61. Amount of material covered changed because of student teacher's presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	Impact %	No.	BEAM %
Much More	220	4.9	5	20.0	233	5.3	4	13.4	453	5.1	9	18.8
Somewhat More	1121	25.0	11	44.0	998	22.7	10	43.5	2119	23.9	21	43.8
No Change	2116	47.2	6	24.0	2058	46.8	8	34.8	4174	47.0	14	29.2
Somewhat Less	417	9.3	1	4.0	972	22.1	1	4.3	1389	15.6	2	4.2
Much Less	18	.4	-	-	66	1.5	-	-	84	.9	-	-
Don't Know	516	11.5	2	8.0	-	-	-	-	516	5.8	2	4.2
Omissions	75	1.7	-	-	70	1.6	-	-	145	1.6	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-.2
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Four and two-tenths percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded that they covered "somewhat less" material because of the student teacher's presence and 15.6% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way.

Hypothesis VIII states: BEAM student teachers are perceived to have taken on a greater role in the operation of the classroom than student teachers in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis, the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Average hours per week that the student teachers taught assigned classes.
2. Average hours per week that the supervising teacher was able to be away from the classroom while student teacher taught assigned classes.
3. Change in the time the supervising teacher spent teaching because of student teacher's presence.
4. Change in the time the supervising teacher spent lesson planning because of student teacher's presence.
5. Change in the time supervising teacher spent paper grading changed because of student teacher's presence.

Table 62 shows the comparison on question 29 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 34 in the teacher questionnaire and question 24 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "How many hours per week, on the

average, did student teacher teach supervising teacher's assigned classes?"

In studying Table 62 one finds that the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program responded somewhat similarly to the same three groups in the Impact Study.

One finds that 29.5% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study and 29.6% of the same three groups in the BEAM Program responded that student teachers taught the supervising teachers' assigned classes on an average of 11 to 15 hours per week.

Table 62 also shows that 41.3% of the administrators, supervising teachers, and student teachers in the Impact Study and 26% of the same three groups in the BEAM Program responded that student teachers taught supervising teachers' assigned classes on an average of less than ten hours per week. The same three groups in the Impact Study had 27% and BEAM had 44.4% who responded that student teachers taught the supervising teacher's assigned class sixteen or more hours per week on an average.

One might conclude from the above data that student teachers in the BEAM Program taught supervising teacher's assigned classes more than did student teachers in the Impact Study.

Table 62. Number of hours per week on the average student teachers taught assigned classes.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				ADMINISTRATORS				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%
Less than one hour per week	345	1.0	-	-	31	.7	-	-	9	.9	-	-	85	.9	-	-
1-5 hrs. per wk.	354	7.9	1	4.0	602	13.7	2	8.7	188	18.8	-	-	1144	11.6	3	5.6
6-10 hrs. per wk.	1089	24.3	3	12.0	1403	31.9	8	34.8	357	35.7	-	-	2849	28.8	11	20.4
11-15 hrs. per wk.	1349	30.1	3	12.0	1341	30.5	10	43.5	266	26.6	3	50.0	2956	29.9	16	29.6
16-20 hrs. per wk.	847	18.9	5	20.0	655	14.9	2	8.7	124	12.4	3	50.0	1626	16.5	10	18.5
More than 20 hrs. per wk.	722	16.1	13	52.0	286	6.5	1	4.3	34	3.4	-	-	1042	10.5	14	25.9
Omissions	77	1.7	-	-	79	1.8	-	-	23	2.3	-	-	179	1.8	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 63 shows the comparison on question 30 in the student teacher questionnaire, question 35 in the teacher questionnaire, and question 25 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "How many hours per week on the average was the supervising teacher able to be away from the classroom while student teacher was teaching supervising teacher's assigned classes?"

In studying Table 63 one finds that 14.1% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study and 7.5% of the same three groups in the BEAM Program responded that supervising teachers were able to be away from the classroom on an average of eleven to fifteen hours per week while student teacher taught assigned classes.

Table 63 also shows that 72.6% of the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study and 76% of the same three groups in the BEAM Program responded that supervising teachers were able to be away from the classroom on an average of less than ten hours per week. The same three groups in the Impact Study had 11.3% and the BEAM Program had 16.7% who responded that the supervising teachers were able to be away from the classroom on an average of sixteen or more hours per week while the student teacher taught the supervising teacher's assigned classes.

Table 63. Hours per week on the average supervising teacher was able to be away from classroom while student teacher taught assigned classes.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				ADMINISTRATORS				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%	Impact No.	BEAM %	No.	%
Less than one	305	6.8	-	-	563	12.8	1	4.3	108	10.8	-	-	976	9.9	1	1.9
1-5	1013	22.6	1	4.0	2005	45.6	13	56.5	501	50.0	2	33.3	3519	35.6	16	29.6
6-10	1273	28.4	12	48.0	1165	26.5	8	34.8	235	23.5	4	66.7	2673	27.1	24	44.5
11-15	892	19.9	4	16.0	409	9.3	-	-	92	9.2	-	-	1393	14.1	4	7.4
16-20	538	12.0	3	12.0	119	2.7	1	4.3	30	3.0	-	-	687	7.0	4	7.4
More than 20	359	8.0	5	20.0	53	1.2	-	-	10	1.0	-	-	422	4.3	5	9.3
Omissions	103	2.3	-	-	83	1.9	-	-	25	2.5	-	-	211	2.1	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	1001	100.0	6	100.0	9881	100.0	54	100.0

Table 64 shows the comparison on question 51 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 56 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the time supervising teachers spent teaching changed because of student teacher's presence?"

In studying Table 64 one finds that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded similarly to the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. One finds that 8.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded that the time supervising teachers spent teaching "increased a great deal" or "increased to some extent" because of student teacher presence, and 6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded the same way to the same question. Ten and four-tenths percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 11.1% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded that the supervising teachers' time teaching "remained about the same" during the time their student teacher was present.

There were 79.8% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and 81.3% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that the time the supervising teachers spent teaching was "reduced to some extent" or "reduced a great deal" because of the student teacher's presence.

Table 64. To what extent was the time supervising teacher spent teaching changed because of student teacher's presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact	No.	%	BEAM	Impact	No.	%	BEAM	Impact	No.	%	
Increased a great deal	27	.6	1	4.0	66	1.5	-	93	1.0	1	2.1	
Increased to some extent	94	2.1	-	-	352	8.0	3	13.0	446	5.0	3	6.3
Remained about the same	296	6.6	3	12.0	686	15.6	2	8.7	982	11.1	5	10.4
Reduced to some extent	1551	34.6	9	36.0	2216	50.4	17	73.9	3767	42.4	26	54.2
Reduced a great deal	2300	51.3	12	48.0	1020	23.2	1	4.3	3320	37.4	13	27.1
Don't know	148	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	148	1.7	-	-
Omissions	67	1.5	-	-	57	1.3	-	-	124	1.4	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 65 shows the comparison on question 52 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 57 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the time the supervising teacher spent lesson planning changed because of the student teacher's presence?"

Table 65 shows that 77.1% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that the supervising teachers' time spent lesson planning was reduced because of the presence of a student teacher and 51.4% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way.

Table 65 also shows that 17.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and 12.5% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program felt that the time supervising teachers spent lesson planning was increased because of the presence of a student teacher.

Table 66 shows the comparison on question 53 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 58 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the time that the supervising teacher spent paper grading changed because of the student teacher's presence?"

Table 66 shows that 70.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that the supervising teachers' time spent paper grading was reduced because of the presence of a student teacher and 58.8% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded the same way.

Table 65. To what extent was the time supervising teacher spent lesson planning changed because of the student teacher's presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %		
Increased a great deal	67	1.5	-	-	229	5.2	4	17.4	296	3.3	4	8.3
Increased to some extent	211	4.7	-	-	1020	23.2	2	8.7	1231	13.9	2	4.2
Remained about the same	923	20.6	3	12.0	1438	32.7	2	8.7	2361	26.6	5	10.4
Reduced to some extent	1511	33.7	13	52.0	1288	29.3	13	56.5	2799	31.5	26	54.2
Reduced a great deal	1408	31.4	9	36.0	356	8.1	2	8.7	1764	19.9	11	22.9
Don't Know	273	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	273	3.1	-	-
Omissions	90	2.0	-	-	66	1.5	-	-	156	1.8	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 66. To what extent was the time supervising teachers spent paper grading changed because of student teachers' presence.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHERS				SUPERVISING TEACHERS				TOTALS			
	No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	Impact %	BEAM No.	BEAM %	No.	%	No.	%
Increased a great deal	54	1.2	-	-	101	2.3	-	155	1.7	-	-	-
Increased to some extent	112	2.5	-	-	211	4.8	-	323	3.6	-	-	-
Remained about the same	619	13.8	6	24.0	1060	24.1	8	36.4	1679	18.9	14	29.8
Reduced to some extent	1484	33.1	8	32.0	2058	46.8	11	50.0	3542	39.9	19	40.4
Reduced a great deal	1874	41.8	11	44.0	835	19.0	3	13.6	2709	30.5	14	29.8
Don't Know	260	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	260	2.9	-	-	-
Omissions	80	1.8	-	-	132	3.0	-	212	2.4	-	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	22	100.0	8880	100.0	47	100.0

Table 66 also shows that 5.3% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt that the time the supervising teachers spent grading papers was increased because of the presence of a student teacher and no one in the BEAM Program felt the same way.

Hypothesis IX states: The university coordinator is perceived as being more helpful in the BEAM Program than in the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaires which dealt with:

1. Amount of help which the university coordinator provided.
2. Number of times the university coordinator of student teachers was in the school during the student teacher contact.
3. Amount of help which the university coordinator provided in any matters not directly concerned with student teaching.
4. The extent the university coordinator was available to administration and staff during the student teaching contact.

Table 67 shows the comparison on question 71 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 76 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "How much help did the university coordinator provide student teachers and supervising teachers?"

Table 67 shows that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that the university

Table 67. Help university coordinator provided.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER				SUPERVISING TEACHER				TOTALS			
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
All the held necessary	2080	46.4	15	60.0	2335	53.1	12	52.2	4415	49.7	27	56.3
Most the help needed	722	16.1	8	32.0	706	16.1	8	34.8	1428	16.1	16	33.3
Some of the help needed	865	19.3	2	8.0	541	12.3	3	13.0	1406	15.8	5	10.4
Little of help needed	296	6.6	-	-	207	4.7	-	-	503	5.7	-	-
No help at all	444	9.9	-	-	523	11.9	-	-	967	10.9	-	-
Omissions	76	1.7	-	-	85	1.9	-	-	161	1.8	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

coordinator was more helpful than did the same two groups in the Impact Study. There were 89.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who responded that the university coordinator provided "all the help necessary" or "most of the help necessary," and 65.8% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded the same way.

Ten and four-tenths percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 15.8% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded that the university coordinator provided "some of the help needed."

Table 67 also shows that 16.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt that the university coordinator provided "little help needed" or "no help needed." None of the student teachers or supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt this way.

Table 68 shows the comparison on question 70 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 75 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "How many times has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been in your school during this student teaching contact?"

In studying Table 68 it appears that on an average, the university coordinator of student teachers visited the schools where student teachers were placed more times in the Impact Study than in the BEAM Program. However, 1.8% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the

Table 68. Number of times the university coordinator of student teachers visited your school during the student teaching contact.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Not at all	103	2.3			57	1.3			160	1.8		
One to two times	1071	23.9	10	40.0	831	18.9	9	39.1	1902	21.4	19	39.6
Three to four times	1659	37.0	12	48.0	1627	37.0	9	39.1	3286	37.0	21	43.8
Five to Six times	556	12.4	1	4.0	673	15.3	4	17.4	1229	13.8	5	10.4
Seven to eight times	242	5.4	-	-	303	6.9	1	4.3	545	6.1	1	2.1
Nine to ten times	197	4.4	-	-	207	4.7	-	-	404	4.5	-	-
Eleven to twelve times	94	2.1	2	8.0	119	2.7	-	-	213	2.4	2	4.2
Thirteen to fifteen times	103	2.3	-	-	132	3.0	-	-	235	2.6	-	-
Sixteen or more times	372	8.3	-	-	352	8.0	-	-	724	8.2	-	-
Omissions	86	1.9	-	-	96	2.2	-	-	182	2.0	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	.2	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Impact Study reported that the coordinator had never visited their school during the student teacher contact, and no one in the BEAM Program responded in this way.

There were 39.6% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 21.4% of the same two groups in the Impact Study who reported that the university coordinator had visited "one or two times."

Table 68 also shows that 56.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study and 56.3% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program responded that the university coordinator had visited their building between three and eight times during the student teacher contact.

One finds that 17.7% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded that the university coordinator had visited their building nine or more times during the student teacher contact and 4.2% of the same two groups in the BEAM Program reported the same way.

Table 69 shows the comparison on question 77 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?"

Table 69 reveals the fact that the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program felt that the university coordinator was more helpful with matters not directly

concerned with student teaching than did the supervising teachers in the Impact Study.

Table 69. Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?

Response Choices	Supervising Teacher			
	Impact No.	%	BEAM No.	%
Gone out of the way to be helpful	682	15.5	9	39.1
Has helped when asked	1068	24.3	11	47.8
Has not helped	198	4.5	-	-
No such help was needed	2361	53.7	3	13.0
Omissions	88	2.0	-	-
Errors	-	-	-	.1
Totals	4397	100.0	23	100.0

When asked the question, "Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?" 39.1% of the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded, "gone out of his way to be helpful," 47.8% responded with "has helped when asked," and no one responded that he "has not helped." The Impact Study showed that 15.5% of the supervising

teachers responded "gone out of his way to be helpful," 24.3% "has helped when asked," and 4.5% "has not helped."

It is interesting to note that 53.7% of the supervising teachers in the Impact Study and only 13% of the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program responded that "no such help was needed."

Table 70 shows the comparison on question 73 in the administrators questionnaire which asks, "To what extent has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been available to you and your staff during the student teaching contact?"

Table 70 reveals the fact that the administrators in the BEAM Program felt that the university coordinator was more available to the administrators and staff during the student teacher contact than did the administrators in the Impact Study. Eighty-three and three-tenths percent of the administrators in the BEAM Program responded, "has always been available" or "has usually been available," and 16.7% responded "has been available when needed," while the administrators in the Impact Study had 58.1% respond, "has always been available" or "has usually been available," and 32.2% responded "has been available when needed."

There were no administrators in the BEAM Program who responded with "has been generally unavailable" or "has never been available;" however, 7.9% of the administrators in the Impact Study did respond to the university coordinator

Table 70. To what extent has the university coordinator of student teachers been available to administrator and staff during the student teacher contact.

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Has always been available	269	26.9	3	50.0
Has usually been available	312	31.2	2	33.3
Has been available on call when needed	322	32.2	1	16.7
Has been generally unavailable	69	6.9	-	-
Has never been available	10	1.0	-	-
Omissions	19	1.9	-	-
Error	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

"has been generally unavailable" or "has never been available."

Table 71 shows the results using the chi square of question 71 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?"

In studying Table 71 one finds X^2 significant when comparing the student teachers in the Impact Study to the student teachers in the BEAM Program in relation to the help they felt the university coordinator provided them. The student teachers in the BEAM Program felt they had been provided more help from the university coordinator than did the student teachers in the Impact Study.

Hypothesis X states: The presence of student teachers is perceived to be more positive in schools which had the BEAM Program than in schools which had the Impact Study.

To test this hypothesis, the writer used data collected from questions in the questionnaire which dealt with:

1. The extent to which supervising teachers and/or other school personnel were helpful to student teachers on matters not directly concerned with student teaching.
2. The acceptance of a teaching position if offered in the building or system in which the student teacher did student teaching.

Table 71. Help university coordinator provided as viewed by student teachers.

		All or most of the help I felt was necessary		Some of the help I felt I needed		Little or no help I felt I needed		Total
		O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2	
				χ^2			χ^2	
Impact	2802	2809.02	.02	.01	865	862.01	.02	4407
BEAM	23	15.94	3.13	1.71	2	4.89	4.17	25
					Chi Square = 9.06		d.f. = 2	

3. The attitude of the administrators and supervising teachers on acceptance and working with student teachers.
4. The extent to which supervising teachers encouraged student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside of the assigned classroom.
5. The effect that the student teacher had on the overall quality of instruction.
6. The optimum number of student teachers that can be accommodated in the building.
7. The optimum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year.

Table 72 shows the comparison on question 72 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent have your supervising teachers and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters not directly concerned with student teaching?"

Table 72 shows that the BEAM student teachers felt more positively about the help they received from the supervising teachers and other school personnel on matters not directly concerned with student teaching than did student teachers in the Impact Study.

In studying Table 72 one finds that 92.0% of the student teachers in the BEAM Program and 73.8% of the student teachers in the Impact Study responded that supervising teachers and other school personnel had "gone out of their way to be helpful" or "they helped when asked" on matters not directly concerned with student teaching.

Table 72. Extent to which supervising teacher and/or other school personnel were helpful to student teachers on matters not directly concerned with student teaching.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHERS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Gone out of their way to be helpful	1811	40.4	17	68.0
They helped when asked	1497	33.4	6	24.0
They have not helped	170	3.8	-	-
No such help was needed	915	20.4	2	8.0
Omissions	90	2.0	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0

Three and eight-tenths percent of the student teachers in the Impact Study responded that supervising teachers and other personnel "did not help" on matters not directly concerned with student teaching; none of the student teachers in the BEAM Program felt this way.

Table 73 shows the comparison on question 73 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "Would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching?"

Table 73. Would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching?

Response Choices	STUDENT		TEACHERS	
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	2681	59.8	19	79.2
No, I intend to go to graduate school	242	5.4	-	-
No, I plan to live in another area	955	21.3	3	12.5
No, for personal reasons	224	5.0	1	4.2
No, for professional reasons	238	5.3	1	4.2
No, I have decided not to teach	49	1.1	-	-
Omissions	94	2.1	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	24	100.0

Table 73 shows that 79.2% of the student teachers in the BEAM Program and 59.8% of the student teachers in the Impact Study responded that they would accept a teaching position if offered for the next year in the building or system in which they did their student teaching. This left about two-fifths of the student teachers in the Impact Study and about one-fifth in the BEAM Program who preferred not to teach in the system they had done their student teaching in for a number of reasons.

Table 74 shows the results using the chi square of question 68 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "What do you think should be the attitude of the administrators and teachers in the school to which you were assigned about working with student teachers?"

In studying Table 74 one finds χ^2 is significant when comparing the student teachers in the Impact Study to the student teachers in the BEAM Program in relation to the above question. The BEAM student teachers felt that more effort should be given to seeking student teachers than did the student teachers in the Impact Study.

Table 75 shows a comparison on question 68 in the student teacher questionnaire and question 73 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "What do you think should be the attitude of the administrators and teachers in your school about working with student teachers?"

Table 74. Attitude of the administrators and teachers in the school to which you were assigned in terms of student teachers, as viewed by student teachers.

Should Seek Student Teachers		Should Accept Student Teachers			Should Resist or Refuse Student Teachers			I Am Unable to Judge				
O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2	O	E	χ^2	
Impact	2735	2742.50	.02	1130	1125.50	.02	81	80.74	-	466	463.26	.02
BEAM	23	15.54	3.58	2	6.38	3.01	0	.46	.46	0	2.63	2.63
Chi Square = 9.74											d.f. = 2	
182												

Table 75. Attitude of administrators and teachers about working with student teachers.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHERS			SUPERVISING TEACHERS			TOTALS					
	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.	Impact	%	No.			
Aggressively seek student teachers	715	15.9	18	72.0	620	14.1	7	30.4	1335	15.0	25	52.1
Seek student teachers	2022	45.1	5	20.0	1583	36.0	11	47.8	3605	40.6	16	33.3
Accept student teachers	1130	25.2	2	8.0	2097	47.7	5	21.7	3227	36.3	7	14.6
Resist having student teachers	54	1.2	-	-	18	.4	-	-	72	.8	-	-
Refuse having student teachers	27	.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	.3	-	-
Unable to judge	466	10.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	466	5.2	-	-
Omissions	69	1.5	-	-	79	1.8	-	-	148	1.7	-	-
Errors	-	.1	-	-	-	-	-	.1	-	.1	-	-
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

Table 75 shows that the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program had a more positive attitude about working with student teachers than did the same two groups in the Impact Study.

There were 85.4% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 55.6% of the same two groups in the Impact Study who responded that administrators and teachers should "aggressively seek student teachers" or "seek student teachers."

Fourteen and six-tenths percent of the BEAM student teachers and supervising teachers and 36.3% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded that administrators and teachers should "accept student teachers."

There were no student teachers or supervising teachers in the BEAM Program who felt that administrators and teachers should resist or refuse having student teachers; however, 1.1% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt administrators and teachers should resist or refuse having student teachers.

Table 76 shows the comparisons on question 69 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "What recommendation would you give your friends about accepting a student teaching assignment in the same school with the same supervising teacher (or in the same project)?" and question 74 in the teacher questionnaire, which asks, "If you were starting over, would you accept another student

Table 76. Would student teacher and supervising teacher accept or recommend a student teaching situation under the same general circumstances.

Response Choices	STUDENT TEACHER			SUPERVISING TEACHER			TOTALS					
	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %	Impact No.	%	No.	BEAM %
Accept with enthusiasm	2757	61.5	21	84.0	1974	44.9	12	52.2	4731	53.3	33	68.8
Would accept	919	20.5	3	12.0	1804	41.0	10	43.5	2723	30.7	13	27.1
Be neutral	336	7.5	-	-	277	6.3	1	4.3	613	6.9	1	2.1
Probably decline or try for different assignment	282	6.3	1	4.0	198	4.5	-	-	480	5.4	1	2.1
Reject or refuse	117	2.6	-	-	79	1.8	-	-	196	2.2	-	-
Omissions	72	1.6	-	-	65	1.5	-	-	137	1.5	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.1
Totals	4483	100.0	25	100.0	4397	100.0	23	100.0	8880	100.0	48	100.0

teacher with similar credentials from the same institution under the same general circumstances?"

Table 76 shows that 95.9% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 84% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded that they would "accept with enthusiasm" or "would accept" a student teaching situation under the same general circumstances.

Two and one-tenth percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and 6.9% of the same two groups in the Impact Study responded that they would "be neutral" on accepting or recommending a student teaching situation under the same general circumstances. No one in the BEAM Program said that they would reject or refuse; however, 2.2% of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study responded that they would "reject or refuse" a student teaching situation under the same general circumstances.

Table 77 shows the comparison on question 74 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent do your supervising teachers encourage student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom?"

Table 77 shows that all of the administrators in the BEAM Program responded that supervising teachers encouraged student teachers "a great deal" to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classrooms.

Table 77. Extent supervising teachers encouraged student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom.

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
A great deal	383	38.3	6	100.0
To some extent	490	49.0	-	-
To a limited degree	93	9.3	-	-
Not at all	9	.9	-	-
Omissions	26	2.6	-	-
Error	-	-.1	-	-
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

The administrators in the Impact Study had 38.3% who responded in the same way and 49% who responded that supervising teachers encouraged student teachers "to some extent" to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom. Nine and three-tenths percent of the Impact administrators responded "to a limited degree."

Table 78 shows the comparison on question 38 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent was the overall quality of instruction changed because of the presence of student teachers in your building?"

In studying Table 78 one finds that the BEAM administrators felt more positively about the effect the student

teachers had on the overall quality of instruction than did the administrators in the Impact Study.

Table 78. Effect student teachers had on overall quality of instruction.

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
Much better	57	5.7	2	33.3
Somewhat better	527	52.6	4	66.7
No change	321	32.1	-	-
Somewhat poorer	79	7.9	-	-
Much poorer	1	.1	-	-
Omissions	16	1.6	-	-
Error	-	-	-	-
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

One finds that 100% of the administrators in the BEAM Program and 58.3% of the administrators in the Impact study responded that the overall quality of instruction was "much better" or "somewhat better" because of the presence of student teachers. Thirty-two and one-tenth percent of the administrators in the Impact Study said there was "no change" in the overall quality of instruction because of the presence of student teachers and 7.9% said it was "somewhat poorer."

Table 79 shows a comparison on question 10 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks, "What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your building each year?"

Table 79. What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your building each year?

Response Choices	ADMINISTRATORS			
	Impact		BEAM	
	No.	%	No.	%
None	1	.1	-	-
One to Three	174	17.4	-	-
Four to Six	370	37.0	-	-
Seven to Nine	158	15.8	1	16.7
Ten to Twelve	139	13.9	3	50.0
Thirteen to Fifteen	47	4.7	-	-
Sixteen to Eighteen	29	2.9	-	-
Nineteen to Twenty-one	18	1.8	1	16.7
Twenty-two to Twenty-five	17	1.7	-	-
More than Twenty-five	34	3.4	1	16.7
Omissions	14	1.4	-	-
Error	-	-.1	-	-.1
Totals	1001	100.0	6	100.0

In studying Table 79 one finds that the administrators in the BEAM Program felt that they could accommodate a larger number of student teachers in their buildings each year than did the administrators in the Impact Study.

There were 70.3% of the administrators in the Impact Study and 16.7% of the administrators in the BEAM Program who responded that the optimum number of student teachers they could accommodate in their building each year was nine or less.

Table 79 also shows that 50% of the administrators in BEAM and 21.5% of the administrators in the Impact Study responded that they could accommodate from 10 to 18 student teachers in their buildings each year. Thirty-three and four-tenths percent of the administrators in BEAM and 6.9% of the administrators in the Impact Study said they could accommodate more than 19 student teachers each year.

Table 80 shows the results using the chi square of question 76 in the administrators questionnaire, which asks: What is the maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year?

In studying Table 80 one finds χ^2 is significant when comparing the administrators in the Impact Study to administrators in the BEAM Program in regard to the maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year.

Table 80. Maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year, as viewed by administrators.

		One		Two		Three		Four or More		Total			
		O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E				
		X ²		X ²		X ²		X ²					
Impact	376	374.09	.01	519	517.36	.01	64	64.65	.01	19	21.91	.39	978
BEAM	-	1.91	1.91	1	2.65	1.03	1	.33	1.36	3	.11	75.93	5
Chi Square = 82.90													

Summary

This chapter gives the results of the ten hypotheses which dealt with the effect the presence of student teachers had upon certain activities for pupils in the BEAM Program, upon activities in addition to classroom instruction, and upon the performance of the supervising teacher and the regular staff members as compared to the Impact Study. The hypotheses dealt with the effect of the amount of work done and time spent by the supervising teachers in working with the student teachers and using materials, aids, and ideas provided by the student teachers as compared with the Impact Study.

From these hypotheses, then, the writer concludes that the presence of student teachers enhances the performance of the Bangor Township Schools in a more positive way because the BEAM Program is an integral part of the total school philosophy.

1

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The broad purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the BEAM Student Teaching Program upon the total Bangor Township School System when the philosophy of the program is a part of the total school philosophy.

The opinions of supervising teachers, student teachers, and administrators in the BEAM Program were compared with the opinions recorded by the supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in The Student Teaching Impact Study.

Since the philosophy of the BEAM Program is designed for greater involvement of public school teachers, student teachers, and administrators in cooperation with teacher education institutions for the purpose of developing better teachers, it was felt that the results of this study might suggest changes in teacher education. The complexity of today's world necessitates the education of highly qualified teachers.

The BEAM Program is an integral part of the philosophy of the Bangor Township Schools. This philosophy is

based upon the idea that all human beings are unique and important. Each of these human beings has a responsibility to the other in terms of developing and respecting this uniqueness.

The writer believes that this philosophy is a major factor in accounting for the fact that the respondents involved in the BEAM Program were more positive than the respondents in the Impact Study. The writer would hope that in reading this study other people involved in education might want to examine their philosophy in terms of the philosophy of the Bangor Township Schools and see a need for making change.

Chief reliance for this study was placed upon the responses of the questionnaire used in the Impact Study. This questionnaire was also given to a group of BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators.

The subjects of the BEAM Program consisted of 25 student teachers, 23 supervising teachers, and six administrators. The 25 student teachers were assigned to the Bangor Township Schools by Central Michigan University during the fall semester of 1972. These groups were compared with the same three groups in the Impact Study which consisted of 4,397 supervising teachers, 4,483 student teachers and 1,001 principals surveyed in the Student Teacher Impact Study during the fall semester of 1969.

The original questionnaire was developed by the authors of the Impact Study. The same instrument was used in the BEAM survey with a few minor changes.¹

Frequency counts and percentages were displayed in tables for each response which is related to a particular hypothesis. In some cases chi squares were run to show significant differences.

Conclusions

A student teaching philosophy which is a part of a total school philosophy, one which advocates the development of all human beings to their fullest potential and calls for greater involvement of supervising teachers, student teachers, and school administrators with teacher education institutions in teacher preparation, is related to a more positive teaching situation.

Ten hypotheses were formulated and analysis of the data suggests the following conclusions:

Hypothesis I: "The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a more positive effect upon certain instructional activities in the BEAM Program than it had in the Impact Study." The first hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed. Tables which dealt with the individual instruction of

¹For changes see The Questionnaire in Chapter III.

students were particularly high in the BEAM survey as viewed by student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators. The writer believes that the main reason for this is the fact that part of the philosophy of the BEAM Program was to help develop each individual pupil and adult to his own fullest unique potential. This philosophy is not only a part of the BEAM Program, but has spread to most of the staff members. Such a philosophy is reflected in the attitude the total staff has towards the students.

Hypothesis II: "The presence of student teachers is perceived to have a positive effect on school activities in addition to classroom instruction for pupils in the BEAM Program than it had for pupils in the Impact Study." The second hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed. However, the BEAM student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators responded more similarly to the student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators in the Impact Study on the tables in Hypothesis II than they did on the tables in Hypothesis I.

It is interesting to note that Table 29 in Hypothesis II, which showed the greatest difference, was dealing with the extent to which student teachers were involved in the supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc. The writer felt that one reason why the BEAM groups responded with, "showing more participation" of BEAM student teachers, supervising activities other than classroom instruction was

because a greater percentage of the BEAM students were in elementary education than were the Impact students and elementary education tends to lend itself more readily to this type of supervision. A second reason would be to remind the reader again of the BEAM philosophy referred to previously. If this philosophy is truly practiced, the writer believes that individual needs in all school activities will be better served.

Hypothesis III: "The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of supervising teachers more in the BEAM Program than supervising teachers in the Impact Study." The third hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed.

It is interesting to note, however, that Table 34, "Effect that the student teacher had on supervising teacher's time for research" and Table 35, "Time afforded supervising teachers for professional reading or writing as a result of student teaching program," had a greater percentage of supervising teachers in the Impact Study who responded "A great deal more" or "To some extent" on these tables than did the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program.

Hypothesis IV: "The presence of student teachers is perceived to enhance the performance of regular staff (those teachers not having a student teacher assigned to them) in the BEAM Program more than regular staff in the

Impact Study. The third hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed. One finds, however, that in studying the tables in Hypothesis IV, the student teachers in the BEAM Program tend to show that they gave more service to the regular staff in the building they were assigned to than did the responses from the supervising teachers in the BEAM Program.

Hypothesis V: "BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have made a greater investment in working with their student teachers and in attending functions related to student teaching than supervising teachers in the Impact Study." The fifth hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed.

Table 47, one of the tables in Hypothesis V, titled "Participation in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching while student teacher was teaching," had a much greater percentage of student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program respond "a great deal" or "to some extent" than did the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study. The writer believes that this response was influenced by the fact that one of the goals of the BEAM Program is to have a continuous training plan to help the supervising teachers refine their teaching skills in order to become better supervising teachers. Weekly seminars are held and resource people are brought in to

discuss new trends, new techniques, and new materials.

Hypothesis VI: "BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have used instructional materials, aids, or ideas provided by their student teachers more than supervising teachers in the Impact Study." When the data was analyzed it appeared that the sixth hypothesis was true. The writer learned that 100 percent of the student teachers in Table 57 responded that the instructional materials, aids, or ideas which they had developed, provided, or suggested were used.

Hypothesis VII: "BEAM supervising teachers are perceived to have taken less time from their students because of having a student teacher than supervising teachers in the Impact Study." The seventh hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed. It is interesting to note that 62.6 percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program and only 29 percent of the student teachers and supervising teachers in the Impact Study felt they had covered more material because of the student teachers' presence. The writer believes that the main reason for the larger percentage of student teachers and supervising teachers in the BEAM Program feeling that more material was covered is because of the philosophy of BEAM. BEAM teachers work on the philosophy that this is our room and our group of students so how can we best work together to serve their

needs. Since all people are unique and have something special to offer, how do we form the best team to offer these special talents to students as well as developing them in students? The BEAM philosophy tries to avoid the idea that "this is my room so you watch me and then I will turn the room over to you and I will observe you." BEAM philosophy is one of a team approach.

Hypothesis VIII: "BEAM student teachers are perceived to have taken on a greater role in the operation of the classroom than student teachers in the Impact Study." Hypothesis eight appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed. Tables 62 and 63, which deal with the number of hours student teachers taught supervising teachers' assigned classes, show a noticeable difference in the way BEAM supervising teachers responded in comparison to the way BEAM student teachers responded. The BEAM student teachers viewed themselves as teaching their supervising teacher's class a greater number of hours per week than did the supervising teachers. The writer feels that one reason for this might be the fact that in the BEAM Program supervising teachers are encouraged to develop great amounts of teaching materials, and the supervising teachers may not consider themselves away from the room while they are developing materials for the class. However, on the other hand, the student teachers are directly in the class working with the students.

Hypothesis IX: "The university coordinator is perceived as being more helpful in the BEAM Program than in the Impact Study." The ninth hypothesis appeared to be true when the data relative to this hypothesis was analyzed.

The writer believes that it appears that this hypothesis is true because the university coordinator is the superintendent of schools and is an important factor in developing the Bangor Township School philosophy of which the BEAM Program is a part.

Hypothesis X: "The presence of student teachers is perceived to be more positive in schools which had the BEAM Program than in schools which had the Impact Study."

Tables 73 through 79 were used to test Hypothesis X. All of these tables indicated a more positive response from the members in the BEAM Program as compared with the members in the Impact Study.

Table 72 shows the comparison on question 72 in the student teacher questionnaire, which asks, "To what extent have your supervising teachers and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters not directly concerned with student teaching?" This table shows that the BEAM student teachers felt considerably more positively about the help they received from the supervising teachers and other school personnel on matters not directly concerned with student teaching than did student teachers in the Impact Study.

In studying Table 72 one finds that 92 percent of the students in the BEAM Program, as compared with 73.8 percent of the students in the Impact Study, responded that the supervising teacher had "gone out of their way to be helpful," or "helped when asked" on matters not directly concerned with student teaching.

Three and eight-tenths percent of the students in the Impact Study as compared to none in the BEAM Program responded with "did not help" on matters not directly concerned with student teaching.

Another very interesting factor was noted in Table 77, which reads, "Extent supervising teacher encouraged student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside of the assigned classroom."

One hundred percent of the BEAM student teachers responded positively to the above statement with "a great deal," as compared with the student teachers in the Impact Study who responded with 38.3 percent to "a great deal."

Summary of the Hypotheses

The first and most important concern of any teacher education program should be "what is the program doing for the children in the schools?"

The writer has found that the ten hypotheses which were tested in this study have all resulted in positive reactions to varying degrees. The positive results may be

attributed to several factors. The first factor is the philosophy of the BEAM Program in which members of the Program believe that each child is a unique special being who will develop to his own potential at his own developmental rate if given a proper environmental climate. Of course, this philosophy is also an integral part of the philosophy of the school district.

The program is based on the fact that personal success is dependent upon people caring for people.

The success of a student teacher program is based upon total involvement. Each person in the program has special talents and each one must be given an opportunity to develop these special talents in a team situation which will help to build an atmosphere where each child can develop in his own way in his own time.

Supervising teachers participate in an on-going inservice training so that they may be able to reinforce the training concepts which are developed in the seminars in which the student teachers must participate.

BEAM supervising teachers consider it an honor to be a member of the BEAM training team. A comprehensive selection process has been developed to screen BEAM supervising teachers who wish to become a part of this team. A sampling of the questions will indicate how comprehensive the screening has become.

What is your philosophy of education? Has it

changed during the past two years?

Do you have a professional responsibility to teacher training? Please explain.

What change do you feel there would be in your professional role should you become a cooperating teacher in the BEAM Program?

The complete application may be found in the appendix of this study.

Recommendations

Teacher education should become an area of important study in our teacher education institutions. It should be emphasized again that the complexity of today's world necessitates the development of highly qualified teachers.

The student teacher should be given the opportunity to become involved in all kinds of settings.

1. Teacher education needs to be more concerned about the study and practice of human behavior and development at all age levels (youth through adult).
2. The prospective teacher must be helped to see his role as one of a learning enabler, facilitator, or encourager, not one of making, forcing, coercing or molding. This can be accomplished by all who are involved being concerned about the student teacher's self concept,

nurturing his creativity, and all people being sensitive to each other.

3. Teacher education must be a process of helping people to become truly involved and to learn how to create and maintain a human environment in our schools.
4. Supervising teachers and prospective teachers must be willing to give such a strong commitment to the love and value of human beings that commitment is transferred to their students.
5. All people involved in teacher education directly, or indirectly, must practice the idea that success breeds success.
6. All segments of the teaching profession (especially teachers) must be involved in the teacher education process.

Implications for Further Research

1. Research is needed to determine the effect the supervising teacher's attitude has on the student teacher and insure the effect this has on the pupils.
2. Research is needed to determine the role student teachers serve as change agents.
3. Research is needed to determine the differences in elementary and secondary student teaching

programs. This raises the question, "Was the BEAM Program more positive because a greater percentage of the student teachers were elementary?"

4. Research is needed to study the impact that the affective domain has upon student teaching.
5. More research is needed to determine the effect that public school involvement at the decision level with teacher education institutions had on teachers' education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Application for Cooperating in
Bangor Education Affiliation Model,
Bangor Township Schools

B E A MApplication for Cooperating Teacher
inBANGOR EDUCATION AFFILIATION MODEL
BANGOR TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

GRADE LEVEL _____

The completion of this application form indicates my interest and professional readiness to become a cooperating teacher with BEAM. According to the contract it is necessary to have tenure to be eligible for cooperating teacher status.

Please return the completed form to Kenneth Wahl, Coordinator of BEAM. You will be contacted by the Advisory Committee at a later date.

I. What is your philosophy of education?

II. Has this philosophy been changing during the past two years? Yes ___ No ___ If so, how?

III. What is the current structure of your classroom?

IV. How do you see the role of Special Services within the school system?

Application for Cooperating Teacher
BEAM
page 2

IV.- continued -

How have you utilized these resources during this school year?

- V. How have the following effected your classroom, your role as an educator?

Behavioral objectives:

Unit Methods:

- VI. Do you feel you have a professional responsibility to teacher training? Yes ☐ No ☐ Please explain:

- VII. In your opinion, what has been the effect of BEAM within our school system?

- VIII. In your opinion, what has been the effect of BEAM as a teacher training program?

Application for Cooperating Teacher
BEAM
page 3

IX. What do you feel needs to be changed in teacher training?

X. What change do you feel there would be in your professional role should you become a cooperating teacher in the BEAM Program?

XI. How would you use a student teacher?

XII. How do you feel - having a student teacher - would effect your classroom?

Signature: _____

Date Completed:

APPENDIX B

Student Teacher Questionnaire

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following are you now?
 - ☐ (a) A single student teacher
 - ☐ (b) A married student teacher
2. What is your sex?
 - ☐ (a) Male
 - ☐ (b) Female
3. What was your status as a student in your college or university when you began this student teaching assignment (contact)?
 - ☐ (a) Had junior standing
 - ☐ (b) Had senior standing
 - ☐ (c) Had the BA or BS degree
4. What is your all-college grade point average?
 - ☐ (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0)
 - ☐ (a) Below 2.0 ☐ (d) c.0 - 3.5
 - ☐ (b) 2.0 - 2.5 ☐ (e) Above 3.5
 - ☐ (c) 2.5 - 3.0
5. How old were you at the beginning of this student teaching assignment (contact)?
 - ☐ (a) 21 years or under ☐ (d) 22 to 23 years
 - ☐ (b) 21 to 21½ years ☐ (e) Over 23 years
 - ☐ (c) 21½ to 22 years
6. How many times have you student taught including the current assignment (contact)?
 - ☐ (a) One
 - ☐ (b) Two
 - ☐ (c) Three
7. In this assignment (contact, how were you placed?
 - ☐ (a) With a single supervising teacher
 - ☐ (b) In a team-teaching situation (two or more team members)
 - ☐ (c) With two or three different teachers ((but not team-teaching)
 - ☐ (d) In a flexible cluster arrangement
 - ☐ (e) In a campus laboratory school
 - ☐ (f) In a special program or project different from any of the above

QUESTIONS 8 THROUGH 13 deal with any changes in individual instruction provided for the pupils which may have resulted from your presence.

8. To what extent did you work with (e.g., instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?
 - ☐ (a) A great deal ☐ (c) A little bit
 - ☐ (b) To some extent ☐ (d) Not at all
9. To what extent did your supervising teacher work with individual pupils as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?
 - ☐ (a) Much more than usual ☐ (d) Somewhat less than usual
 - ☐ (b) Somewhat more than usual ☐ (e) Much less than usual
 - ☐ (c) About the same as usual ☐ (f) Don't know

10. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided the pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not been present?
- ___ (a) Much more than usual ___ (d) Somewhat less than usual
 ___ (b) Somewhat more than usual ___ (e) Much less than usual
 ___ (c) About the same as usual ___ (f) Don't know
11. To what extent did conferring with you take time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?
- ___ (a) Frequently ___ (d) Never
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (e) Don't know
 ___ (c) Seldom
12. To what extent did planning with you take the time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?
- ___ (a) Frequently ___ (d) Never
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (e) Don't know
 ___ (c) Seldom
13. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after you taught?
- ___ (a) Frequently ___ (d) Never
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (e) Don't know
 ___ (c) Seldom

QUESTIONS 14 THROUGH 22

To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for the pupils in your supervising teachers assigned classes changed because of your presence?

14. Amount of small group instruction.
- ___ (a) Much more ___ (d) Somewhat less
 ___ (b) Somewhat more ___ (e) Much less
 ___ (c) No change ___ (f) Don't know
15. Provision for make-up work.
- ___ (a) Much greater ___ (d) Somewhat less
 ___ (b) Somewhat greater ___ (e) Much less
 ___ (c) No change ___ (f) Don't know
16. Follow-up of exams.
- ___ (a) Much better ___ (d) Somewhat poorer
 ___ (b) Somewhat better ___ (e) Much poorer
 ___ (c) No change ___ (f) Don't know
17. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.
- ___ (a) Much more ___ (d) Somewhat less
 ___ (b) Somewhat more ___ (e) Much less
 ___ (c) No change ___ (f) Don't know
18. Supervision of study periods.
- ___ (a) Much better ___ (e) Much poorer
 ___ (b) Somewhat better ___ (f) Does not apply
 ___ (c) No change ___ (g) Don't know
 ___ (d) Somewhat poorer

19. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ (a) Much better | ☐ (e) Much poorer |
| ☐ (b) Somewhat better | ☐ (f) Does not apply |
| ☐ (c) No change | ☐ (g) Don't know |
| ☐ (d) Somewhat poorer | |

20. Amount of material covered.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ (a) Much more | ☐ (d) Somewhat less |
| ☐ (b) Somewhat more | ☐ (e) Much less |
| ☐ (c) No change | ☐ (f) Don't know |

21. Discipline.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ (a) Much better | ☐ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ☐ (b) Somewhat better | ☐ (e) Much poorer |
| ☐ (c) No change | ☐ (f) Don't know |

22. Motivation of pupils

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ (a) Much better | ☐ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ☐ (b) Somewhat better | ☐ (e) Much poorer |
| ☐ (c) No change | ☐ (f) Don't know |

QUESTIONS 23 THROUGH 30 deal with the contributions you may have made to the school program. Did you make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

23. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

- | |
|--|
| ☐ (a) Often |
| ☐ (b) Sometimes |
| ☐ (c) No |

24. Give talks to parent's group?

- | |
|--|
| ☐ (a) Often |
| ☐ (b) Sometimes |
| ☐ (c) No |

25. Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground, or hall duty?

- | |
|--|
| ☐ (a) Often |
| ☐ (b) Sometimes |
| ☐ (c) No |

26. Did you bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (a) A great many | ☐ (c) No |
| ☐ (b) Some | ☐ (d) I am not sure |

27. Did you suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (a) A great many | ☐ (c) No |
| ☐ (b) Some | ☐ (d) I am not sure |

28. How do you feel your contributions 26 and 27 were received?

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) They were used | ☐ (c) I was discouraged from making such contributions |
| ☐ (b) They were not used | ☐ (d) I really did not have much to offer |

29. How many hours per week on the average did you teach your supervising teacher's assigned classes?

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) Less than an hour a week | ☐ (d) Eleven to fifteen hours per week |
| ☐ (b) One to five hours per week | ☐ (e) Sixteen to twenty hours per week |
| ☐ (c) Six to ten hours per week | ☐ (f) More than twenty hours per week |

30. How many hours per week on the average was your supervising teacher able to be away from the classroom while you were teaching his assigned classes?

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ (a) Less than 1 | ☐ (d) 11 - 15 |
| ☐ (b) 1 - 5 | ☐ (e) 16 - 20 |
| ☐ (c) 6 - 10 | ☐ (f) More than 20 |

QUESTIONS 31 THROUGH 38

To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in any of the following additional activities during the time you were teaching his assigned classes?

31. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

32. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

33. Research.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

34. Professional reading or writing.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

35. Work with staff or school or department.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

36. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

37. Assisting the principal or other teachers.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

38. Social or recreational activities.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great deal | ☐ (c) Not at all |
| ☐ (b) To some extent | ☐ (d) Don't know |

QUESTION 39 THROUGH 43

To what extent did you relieve other regular staff members who did not have student teachers of the following activities?

39. Teaching.

- | |
|--|
| ☐ (a) Many times |
| ☐ (b) Once or a few times |
| ☐ (c) Not at all |

40. Chaperoning.
 ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all
41. Supervision of lunch duty.
 ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all
42. Supervision of study hall.
 ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all
43. Supervision of playground.
 ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all

QUESTIONS 44 THROUGH 47

To what extent were other staff members able to engage in any of the following activities because of your presence in the building?

44. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.
 ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know
45. Committee work in the school.
 ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know
46. Research.
 ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know
47. Professional reading or writing.
 ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know
48. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your supervising teacher?
 ___ (a) Less than 10
 ___ (b) 10 to 15
 ___ (c) 16 to 20
 ___ (d) 21 to 25
 ___ (e) 26 to 30
 ___ (f) 31 to 35
 ___ (g) 36 to 40
 ___ (h) More than 40

49. How did your presence as a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher spent at school as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

- ☐ (a) Added more than six hours per week.
- ☐ (b) Added three to six hours per week.
- ☐ (c) Added one to three hours per week.
- ☐ (d) Added up to one hour per week.
- ☐ (e) Had no effect.
- ☐ (f) Reduced by up to one hour per week.
- ☐ (g) Reduced by one to three hours per week.
- ☐ (h) Reduced by three to six hours per week.
- ☐ (i) Reduced by more than six hours per week.
- ☐ (j) I am unable to judge.

50. How did your presence affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher worked on job related activities away from school?

- ☐ (a) Added more than six hours per week.
- ☐ (b) Added three to six hours per week.
- ☐ (c) Added one to three hours per week.
- ☐ (d) Added up to one hour per week.
- ☐ (e) Had no effect.
- ☐ (f) Reduced by up to one hour per week.
- ☐ (g) Reduced by one to three hours per week.
- ☐ (h) Reduced by three to six hours per week.
- ☐ (i) Reduced by more than six hours per week.
- ☐ (j) I am unable to judge.

QUESTION 51 THROUGH 54

To what extent was the time your supervising teacher spent on the following activities changed because of your presence?

51. Teaching

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) Increased a great deal | ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent |
| ☐ (b) Increased to some extent | ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal |
| ☐ (c) Remained about the same | ☐ (f) Don't know |

52. Lesson Planning

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal
- ☐ (f) Don't know

53. Paper grading

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal
- ☐ (f) Don't know

54. Help to individual students
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) Increased a great deal | ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent |
| ☐ (b) Increased to some extent | ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal |
| ☐ (c) Remained about the same | ☐ (f) Don't know |

QUESTION 55 THROUGH 62

To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in the following activities because of your presence?

55. Planning with you
- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | |
| ☐ (c) No extra hours | |
56. Evaluating your progress and activities
- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | |
| ☐ (c) No extra hours | |
57. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.
- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | |
| ☐ (c) No extra hours | |
58. Fulfilling social obligations resulting from your presence
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | ☐ (c) No extra hours |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | ☐ (d) Don't know |
59. Finding housing for you
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | ☐ (c) No extra hours |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | ☐ (d) Don't know |
60. Preparing additional reports
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | ☐ (c) No extra hours |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | ☐ (d) Don't know |
61. Making additional preparations for teaching
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | ☐ (c) No extra hours |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | ☐ (d) Don't know |
62. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with you
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ (a) A great many extra hours | ☐ (c) No extra hours |
| ☐ (b) Some extra hours | ☐ (d) Don't know |
63. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your supervising teacher outside of regular working hours at school? (Telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.)
- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ (a) Less than one | ☐ (d) Seven to nine |
| ☐ (b) One to three | ☐ (e) Ten or more |
| ☐ (c) Four to six | |

- 1

- 70.. How many times has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been in your school during your student teaching contact?
- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| ___ (a) Not at all | ___ (f) 9 to 10 times |
| ___ (b) 1 to 2 times | ___ (g) 11 to 12 times |
| ___ (c) 3 to 4 times | ___ (h) 13 to 15 times |
| ___ (d) 5 to 6 times | ___ (i) 16 times or more |
| ___ (e) 7 to 8 times | |
71. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?
- ___ (a) All the help I felt was necessary
- ___ (b) Most of the help I felt was needed
- ___ (c) Some of the help I felt I needed
- ___ (d) Little of the help I felt was needed
- ___ (e) No help at all
72. To what extent have your supervising teacher and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters not directly concerned with student teaching?
- ___ (a) They have gone out of their way to be helpful
- ___ (b) They have helped when asked
- ___ (c) They have not helped
- ___ (d) No such help was needed
73. Would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching?
- ___ (a) Yes
- ___ (b) No, because I intend to go to graduate school
- ___ (c) No, because I plan to live in another geographic area
- ___ (d) No, for personal reasons
- ___ (e) No, for professional reasons
- ___ (f) No, because I have decided not to teach
74. Why were you assigned to this particular student teaching station?
- ___ (a) I requested this school or area.
- ___ (b) I requested this kind of program or project.
- ___ (c) I had no particular preference and was placed in this assignment by my college or university.
- ___ (d) I really preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one by my college or university.
- ___ (e) I was required to accept this assignment even though I expressed a strong preference for a different one.

APPENDIX C

Teacher Questionnaire

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following are you now?
 - ☐ (a) A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
 - ☐ (b) A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
2. What is your sex?
 - ☐ (a) Male
 - ☐ (b) Female
3. How many years of teaching have you completed including this year?
 - ☐ (a) Three or less years ☐ (c) Eight to twelve years
 - ☐ (b) Four to seven years ☐ (d) More than twelve years
4. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked?
 - ☐ (a) Only one ☐ (d) Four to six
 - ☐ (b) Two ☐ (e) More than six
 - ☐ (c) Three
5. With how many student teachers have you worked in the last 5 years? (Include your current student teacher)
 - ☐ (a) One ☐ (e) Five
 - ☐ (b) Two ☐ (f) Six to ten
 - ☐ (c) Three ☐ (g) More than ten
 - ☐ (d) Four
6. How well do you feel your present student teacher was prepared to enter student teaching?
 - ☐ (a) Extremely well prepared ☐ (d) Minimally prepared
 - ☐ (b) Well prepared ☐ (e) Inadequately prepared
 - ☐ (c) Adequately prepared
7. In this assignment (contact), how was your student teacher scheduled in student teaching?
 - ☐ (a) Full-time ☐ (c) Half-days
 - ☐ (b) Full-time except he was also enrolled in a non-student teaching credit course ☐ (d) Less than half-days
8. In this assignment (contact) how was your student teacher placed?
 - ☐ (a) With you as the single supervising teacher.
 - ☐ (b) In a team-teaching situation (two or more team members).
 - ☐ (c) With two or three different teachers (but not team-teaching).
 - ☐ (d) In a flexible cluster arrangement.
 - ☐ (e) In a campus laboratory school.
 - ☐ (f) In a special program or project different from any of the above.
9. How many weeks is your student teacher scheduled in this assignment (contact)?
 - ☐ (a) 5 weeks or less ☐ (d) 10 or 11 weeks
 - ☐ (b) 6 or 7 weeks ☐ (e) 12 to 14 weeks
 - ☐ (c) 8 or 9 weeks ☐ (f) More than 14 weeks

- QUESTIONS 13 THROUGH 17 deal with any changes in individualized instruction for the pupils which may have resulted from your student teacher's presence.

- 2-

18. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after the student teacher taught?

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| ___ (a) Frequently | ___ (c) Seldom |
| ___ (b) Sometimes | ___ (d) Never |

QUESTION 19 THROUGH 28

To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for your pupils changed because of your student teacher's presence?

19. Amount of small group instruction

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ___ (a) Much more | ___ (d) Somewhat less |
| ___ (b) Somewhat more | ___ (e) Much less |
| ___ (c) No change | |

20. Provision for make-up work

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| ___ (a) Much greater | ___ (d) Somewhat less |
| ___ (b) Somewhat greater | ___ (e) Much less |
| ___ (c) No change | |

21. Follow-up of exams

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ___ (a) Much better | ___ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ___ (b) Somewhat better | ___ (e) Much poorer |
| ___ (c) No change | |

22. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ___ (a) Much more | ___ (d) Somewhat less |
| ___ (b) Somewhat more | ___ (e) Much less |
| ___ (c) No change | |

23. Supervision of study periods

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ___ (a) Much better | ___ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ___ (b) Somewhat better | ___ (e) Much poorer |
| ___ (c) No change | ___ (f) Does not apply |

24. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ___ (a) Much better | ___ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ___ (b) Somewhat better | ___ (e) Much poorer |
| ___ (c) No change | ___ (f) Does not apply |

25. Amount of material covered

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ___ (a) Much more | ___ (d) Somewhat less |
| ___ (b) Somewhat more | ___ (e) Much less |
| ___ (c) No change | |

26. Discipline

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ___ (a) Much better | ___ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ___ (b) Somewhat better | ___ (e) Much poorer |
| ___ (c) No change | |

27. Motivation of pupils

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ___ (a) Much better | ___ (d) Somewhat poorer |
| ___ (b) Somewhat better | ___ (e) Much poorer |
| ___ (c) No change | |

QUESTIONS 28 THROUGH 30 Deal with the contributions your student teacher may have made to the school program. Did your student teacher make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as

28. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?
 ___ (a) Often ___ (c) No
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (d) Don't know
29. Give talk to parent's group?
 ___ (a) Often ___ (c) No
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (d) Don't know
30. Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duty?
 ___ (a) Often ___ (c) No
 ___ (b) Sometimes ___ (d) Don't know
31. Did your student teacher bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?
 ___ (a) A great many
 ___ (b) Some
 ___ (c) No
32. Did your student teacher suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?
 ___ (a) A great many
 ___ (b) Some
 ___ (c) No
33. What use were you able to make of the contributions (31 & 32) of your student teacher?
 ___ (a) I used them.
 ___ (b) I did not use them.
 ___ (c) I had to discourage him from contributing too freely.
 ___ (d) My student teacher really did not have much to offer.
34. How many hours per week on the average did your student teacher teach your assigned classes?
 ___ (a) Less than an hour a week ___ (d) Eleven to fifteen
 ___ (b) One to five hours per week
 ___ (c) Six to ten hours per week
 ___ (d) Eleven to fifteen hours per week
 ___ (e) Sixteen to twenty hours per week
 ___ (f) More than twenty hours per week
35. How many hours per week on the average were you able to be away from the classroom while your student teacher was teaching your assigned classes?
 ___ (a) Less than one ___ (d) 11 - 15
 ___ (b) 1 - 5 ___ (e) 16 - 20
 ___ (c) 6 - 10 ___ (f) More than 20

To what extent did you engage in any of the following additional activities during the time your student teacher was teaching?

36. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

37. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

38. Research.

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

39. Professional reading or writing

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

40. Work with staff of school or department

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

41. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

42. Assisting the principal or other teachers

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

43. Social or recreational activities

- ___ (a) A great deal
 ___ (b) To some extent
 ___ (c) Not at all

QUESTIONS 44 THROUGH 49

To what extent did your student teacher relieve other regular staff members who did not have student teachers of the following activities?

44. Teaching

- ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know

45. Chaperoning

- ___ (a) Many times
 ___ (b) Once or a few times
 ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (d) Don't know

QUESTIONS 44 THROUGH 48 - continued

46. Supervision of lunch duty
 ___ (a) Many times ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) Once or a few times ___ (d) Don't know
47. Supervision of study hall
 ___ (a) Many times ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) Once or a few times ___ (d) Don't know
48. Supervision of playground
 ___ (a) Many times ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) Once or a few times ___ (d) Don't know

QUESTION 49 THROUGH 52

To what extent were other staff members able to engage in any of the following activities because of the presence of student teachers in the building?

49. Visitation in other classrooms or schools
 ___ (a) Many times ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) To some extent ___ (d) Don't know
50. Committee work in the school
 ___ (a) A great deal ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) To some extent ___ (d) Don't know
51. Research
 ___ (a) A great deal ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) To some extent ___ (d) Don't know
52. Professional reading or writing
 ___ (a) A great deal ___ (c) Not at all
 ___ (b) To some extent ___ (d) Don't know
53. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your student teacher?
 ___ (a) Less than 10 ___ (e) 26 to 30
 ___ (b) 10 to 15 ___ (f) 31 to 35
 ___ (c) 16 to 20 ___ (g) 36 to 40
 ___ (d) 21 to 25 ___ (h) More than 40
54. How did the presence of a student teacher affect the average numbers of hours per week you spent at school as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?
 ___ (a) Added more than six hours per week
 ___ (b) Added three to six hours per week
 ___ (c) Added one to three hours per week
 ___ (d) Added up to one extra hour per week
 ___ (e) Had no effect
 ___ (f) Reduced by up to one hour per week
 ___ (g) Reduced by up to three hours per week
 ___ (h) Reduced by three to six hours per week
 ___ (i) Reduced more than six hours per week

55. How did your student teacher's presence affect the average number of hours per week you worked on job-related activities away from school?

- ☐ (a) Added more than six hours per week
- ☐ (b) Added three to six hours per week
- ☐ (c) Added one to three hours per week
- ☐ (d) Added up to one hour per week
- ☐ (e) Had no effect
- ☐ (f) Reduced by up to one hour per week
- ☐ (g) Reduced by one to three hours per week
- ☐ (h) Reduced by three to six hours per week
- ☐ (i) Reduced more than six hours per week

QUESTIONS 56 THROUGH 59

To what extent was the time you spent on any of the following activities changed because of your student teacher's presence?

56. Teaching

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal

57. Lesson Planning

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal

58. Paper Grading

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal

59. Help to individual students

- ☐ (a) Increased a great deal
- ☐ (b) Increased to some extent
- ☐ (c) Remained about the same
- ☐ (d) Reduced to some extent
- ☐ (e) Reduced a great deal

QUESTION 60 THROUGH 68

To what extent did you engage in the following activities because of the presence of the student teacher?

60. Planning with or for your student teacher

- ☐ (a) A great many extra hours
- ☐ (b) Some extra hours
- ☐ (c) No extra hours

61. Evaluating your student teacher's progress or activities

- ☐ (a) A great many extra hours
- ☐ (b) Some extra hours
- ☐ (c) No extra hours

62. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.

- ☐ (a) A great many extra hours
- ☐ (b) Some extra hours
- ☐ (c) No extra hours

QUESTIONS 60 THROUGH 68 - continued

63. Fulfilling the social obligations resulting from your student teacher's presence.
- ___ (a) A great many extra hours
- ___ (b) Some extra hours
- ___ (c) No extra hours
64. Finding housing for your student teacher.
- ___ (a) A great many extra hours
- ___ (b) Some extra hours
- ___ (c) No extra hours
65. Preparing additional reports
- ___ (a) A great many extra hours
- ___ (b) Some extra hours
- ___ (c) No extra hours
66. Making additional preparation for teaching.
- ___ (a) A great many extra hours
- ___ (b) Some extra hours
- ___ (c) No extra hours
67. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with your student teacher.
- ___ (a) A great many extra hours
- ___ (b) Some extra hours
- ___ (c) No extra hours
68. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your student teacher outside of regular working hours at school? (Telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.)
- ___ (a) Less than one ___ (c) Seven to nine
- ___ (b) One to three ___ (d) Ten or more
69. How many days during student teaching did your student teacher handle classes for you while you were away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal or other people, personal or private affairs outside of school) in which a substitute would have had to be hired if the student teacher had not been there?
- ___ (a) None ___ (d) Four to seven
- ___ (b) Less than one ___ (e) Eight to ten
- ___ (c) One to three ___ (f) More than ten
70. During student teaching how many days did your student teacher handle classes for any teacher other than yourself while that teacher was away from his class?
- ___ (a) None ___ (d) Five to seven
- ___ (b) One or less ___ (e) Eight to ten
- ___ (c) Two to four ___ (f) More than ten
71. How many hours do you estimate your student teacher spent doing volunteer work in the community where he was assigned for student teaching (youth groups, home service, church work and the like) during his student teaching period?
- ___ (a) None at all ___ (d) Sixteen to thirty hours
- ___ (b) One to five hours ___ (e) More than thirty hours
- ___ (c) Six to fifteen hours

72. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on your own teaching performance?
- ☐ (a) Has made me a much more effective teacher
 - ☐ (b) Has made me a more effective teacher
 - ☐ (c) Has had no effect on my teaching
 - ☐ (d) Has made me a less effective teacher
 - ☐ (e) Has made me a much less effective teacher
73. What do you think should be the attitude of the administrators and teachers in your school about working with student teachers?
- ☐ (a) Should aggressively seek student teachers
 - ☐ (b) Should seek student teachers
 - ☐ (c) Should accept student teachers
 - ☐ (d) Should resist having student teachers in the school
 - ☐ (e) Should refuse to have student teachers in the school
74. If you were starting over, would you accept another student teacher with similar credentials from the same institution under the same general circumstances?
- ☐ (a) I would accept with enthusiasm
 - ☐ (b) I would accept ☐ (d) I would probably decline
 - ☐ (c) I feel neutral about ☐ (e) I would refuse
75. How many times has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been in your school during this student teaching contact?
- ☐ (a) Not at all ☐ (f) Nine to ten times
 - ☐ (b) One to two times ☐ (g) Eleven to twelve times
 - ☐ (c) Three to four times ☐ (h) Thirteen to fifteen times
 - ☐ (d) Five to six times ☐ (i) Sixteen or more times
 - ☐ (e) Seven to eight times
76. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?
- ☐ (a) All the help I felt was necessary
 - ☐ (b) Most of the help I felt was needed
 - ☐ (c) Some of the help I felt I needed
 - ☐ (d) Little of the help I felt was needed.
 - ☐ (e) No help at all
77. Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?
- ☐ (a) He has gone out of his way to be helpful.
 - ☐ (b) He has helped when asked
 - ☐ (c) He has not helped
 - ☐ (d) No such help was needed
78. Would you want your student to teach in your building or system next year?
- ☐ (a) Yes
 - ☐ (b) No, but would recommend him in a different system or building
 - ☐ (c) No

79. Why was this student teacher assigned to you?

- ☐ (a) I volunteered since I feel a professional obligation to help prepare future teachers.
- ☐ (b) I volunteered but only because I felt pressure from an administrator to do so.
- ☐ (c) I volunteered because I thought a student teacher would be helpful to me in performing my school duties.
- ☐ (d) I did not volunteer but was requested by an administrator to take the student teacher.
- ☐ (e) I was forced to work with the student teacher against my will.

APPENDIX D

Administrator Questionnaire

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following are you now?
 - ☐ a. A single school administrator
 - ☐ b. A married school administrator
2. What is your sex?
 - ☐ a. Male
 - ☐ b. Female
3. What is your present administrative assignment?
 - ☐ a. Building Principal - elementary school
 - ☐ b. Building Principal - middle school
 - ☐ c. Building Principal - junior high school
 - ☐ d. Building Principal - combined junior-senior high school
4. For how many years have you been a school administrator?
 - ☐ a. Two or less
 - ☐ b. Three to five
 - ☐ c. Six to nine
 - ☐ d. Ten to twelve
 - ☐ e. More than twelve
5. For how many years have you been an administrator in your present building?
 - ☐ a. Two or less
 - ☐ b. Three to five
 - ☐ c. Six to nine
 - ☐ d. Ten to twelve
 - ☐ e. More than twelve
6. How many pupils are assigned to your building?

☐ a. 0 - 300	☐ f. 1101 - 1300
☐ b. 301 - 500	☐ g. 1301 - 1500
☐ c. 501 - 700	☐ h. 1501 - 1700
☐ d. 701 - 900	☐ i. 1701 - 1900
☐ e. 901 - 1100	☐ j. 1901 or more
7. How many teachers are assigned in your building?

☐ a. 10 or less	☐ f. 51 to 60
☐ b. 11 to 20	☐ g. 61 to 70
☐ c. 21 to 30	☐ h. 71 to 80
☐ d. 31 to 40	☐ i. 81 to 90
☐ e. 41 to 50	☐ j. 91 to more
8. For how many years have student teachers been assigned in the building in which you are presently the administrator?

☐ a. Three or less	☐ d. Ten to twelve
☐ b. Four to six	☐ e. Thirteen to fifteen
☐ c. Seven to nine	☐ f. More than fifteen

9. How many student teachers are assigned to your building at the present time?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| ☐ a. One | ☐ f. Six |
| ☐ b. Two | ☐ g. Seven |
| ☐ c. Three | ☐ h. Eight |
| ☐ d. Four | ☐ i. Nine |
| ☐ e. Five | ☐ j. Ten or more |
10. What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your building each year?
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ a. None | ☐ f. Thirteen to fifteen |
| ☐ b. One to three | ☐ g. Sixteen to eighteen |
| ☐ c. Four to six | ☐ h. Nineteen to twenty-one |
| ☐ d. Seven to nine | ☐ i. Twenty-two to twenty-five |
| ☐ e. Ten to twelve | ☐ j. More than twenty-five |
11. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers assigned to your building in the last two years?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| ☐ a. One | ☐ d. Four to six |
| ☐ b. Two | ☐ e. More than six |
| ☐ c. Three | |
12. How well do you feel the student teacher(s) presently assigned to your building were prepared to enter student teaching?
- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ a. Extremely well prepared | ☐ d. Minimally prepared |
| ☐ b. Very well prepared | ☐ e. Inadequately prepared |
| ☐ c. Adequately prepared | |
13. For what proportion of their time are the majority of the student teachers assigned to your building scheduled by their institution to student teaching?
- | |
|---|
| ☐ a. Full days |
| ☐ b. Half days |
| ☐ c. Less than half days |

Question 14 through 25 deal with the contributions student teachers may have made to the school program in your building. Use the following code for questions 14 through 20:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ a. Often | ☐ d. Does not apply |
| ☐ b. Sometimes | ☐ e. Don't know |
| ☐ c. No | |

Have student teachers made any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

14. ☐ Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc
15. ☐ Give talks to parents group?
16. ☐ Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duty?
17. ☐ Chaperone social activities for pupils?
18. ☐ Supervise study halls?
19. ☐ Coach or assist in interscholastic or extracurricular activities?
20. ☐ Assist in handling discipline problems?

21. How many new or different instructional materials have student teachers brought, developed, provided, or suggested to the school teachers?
- ___ a. A great many ___d. A very few
 ___ b. Quite a few ___e. None
 ___ c. Some
22. To what extent have student teachers suggested or provided any other kinds of aids or ideas?
- ___ a. Often ___c. Seldom
 ___ b. Sometimes ___d. Never
23. What use have your teachers been able to make of the contributions (21 & 22) of student teachers?
- ___ a. They always use them
 ___ b. They sometimes use them
 ___ c. They do not use them
- ___ d. They discourage student teachers from contributing too freely
 ___ e. Student teachers really do not have much to offer
24. How many hours per week on the average do student teachers in your building teach their supervising teachers assigned classes?
- ___ a. Less than an hour a week
 ___ b. One to five hours per week
 ___ c. Six to ten hours per week
 ___ d. Eleven to fifteen hours per week
 ___ e. Sixteen to twenty hours per week
 ___ f. More than twenty hours per week
25. How many hours per week on the average are your teachers able to be away from their classroom while student teachers teach their assigned classes?
- ___ a. Less than one ___d. Eleven to fifteen
 ___ b. One to five ___e. Sixteen to twenty
 ___ c. Six to ten ___f. More than twenty

Questions 26 through 38 - To what extent are any of the following instructional activities for pupils changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building?

26. Amount of small group instruction:
- ___ a. Much more ___d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat more ___e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
27. Provision for make-up work.
- ___ a. Much greater ___d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat greater ___e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
28. Follow-up of exams.
- ___ a. Much better ___d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change

Questions 26 through 38 - continued

29. Individual counseling of pupils.
 ___ a. Much more ___ d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat more ___ e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
30. Supervision of study periods.
 ___ a. Much better ___ d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___ e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change
31. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.
 ___ a. Much better ___ d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___ e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change
32. Amount of reteaching necessary.
 ___ a. Much more ___ d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat more ___ e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
33. Discipline.
 ___ a. Much better ___ d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___ e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change
34. Motivation of pupils.
 ___ a. Much better ___ d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___ e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change
35. Use of audio visual materials
 ___ a. Much more ___ d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat more ___ e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
36. Use of field trips.
 ___ a. Much more frequent ___ d. Somewhat less frequent
 ___ b. Somewhat more frequent ___ e. Much less frequent
 ___ c. No change
37. Individual instruction or tutoring of pupils.
 ___ a. Much more ___ d. Somewhat less
 ___ b. Somewhat more ___ e. Much less
 ___ c. No change
38. Overall quality of instruction.
 ___ a. Much better ___ d. Somewhat poorer
 ___ b. Somewhat better ___ e. Much poorer
 ___ c. No change

Questions 39 through 49 - How do you feel the availability of the following university services has influenced the attitude of your staff concerning working with student teachers?

Use the following code for questions 39 through 49.

- a. Has had a very positive effect
- b. Has had a positive effect
- c. Has had no effect
- d. Has had a negative effect
- e. Has had a very negative effect
- f. This service has not been available and would have had no effect if available
- g. This service has not been available but would have had a positive effect if available
- h. This service has not been available but would have had a very positive effect if available
- i. I do not know whether or not this service is available

- 39. ___ Tuition free university credit courses.
- 40. ___ University library privileges.
- 41. ___ Faculty identification cards.
- 42. ___ Recognition certificate from the University.
- 43. ___ Consultant services from the University.
- 44. ___ Instructional materials from the University.
- 45. ___ Tickets to university events - athletics, cultural events, etc.
- 46. ___ Hospitalization services.
- 47. ___ Cash stipends to the supervising teacher.
- 48. ___ Seminars, workshops or meetings in your school or school area.
- 49. ___ Seminars, workshops or meetings on the University campus.

Questions 50 through 55 - To what extent does the presence of a student teacher change the supervising teacher's participation in the following activities:

Use the following code for questions 50 through 55:

- a. Much more than usual
- b. More than usual
- c. No change
- d. Less than usual
- e. Much less than usual

- 50. ___ Visitation in other classrooms or schools.
- 51. ___ Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.
- 52. ___ Research.
- 53. ___ Professional reading and/or writing.
- 54. ___ Work or meet with staff members of school or department.
- 55. ___ Assistance to the principal or to other teachers.

Use the following code for questions 56 through 59:

1. Very positively
 2. Somewhat positively
 3. Neutral
 4. Somewhat negatively
 5. Very negatively
56. ___ How has the presence of student teachers in your building affected staff morale?
57. ___ Generally, how do parents of your pupils react to having student teachers in the building?
58. ___ Generally, how do the custodial, cafeteria and clerical staff react to having student teachers in the building?
59. ___ Generally, how do the pupils react to having student teachers in the building?

Questions 60 through 72 deal with any changes in your own work load because of having student teachers in your building.

60. To what extent has having student teachers in your building affected the average number of hours per week you work?
- ___ a. Added more than six hours per week
 - ___ b. Added two to five hours per week
 - ___ c. Added one hour or less per week
 - ___ d. Made no change
 - ___ e. Reduced by one hour or less per week
 - ___ f. Reduced by two to five hours per week
 - ___ g. Reduced by six or more hours per week

Questions 61 through 72 - What has been the cause of any change in your own work load brought about by student teachers?

Use the following code for questions 61 through 72:

1. Increased your work load
 2. Made no change
 3. Decreased your work load
 4. Does not apply.
61. ___ Additional reports regarding student teaching or student teachers.
62. ___ Finding housing and transportation for student teachers.
63. ___ Counseling student teachers.
64. ___ Selection of supervising teachers.
65. ___ Orientation of student teachers.
66. ___ Finding instructional materials.
67. ___ Counseling supervising teachers.
68. ___ Communication with parents about activities related to student teachers.
69. ___ Student teacher's assistance in counseling students.
70. ___ Student teacher's assistance with routine clerical tasks in the school.
71. ___ Time of supervising teachers being made available by the student teachers' teaching of classes.
72. ___ Time of other teachers being made available by student teachers' handling some of their assigned responsibilities.

73. To what extent has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been available to you and your staff during the student teacher contact?
- ☐ a. Has always been available
 - ☐ b. Has usually been available
 - ☐ c. Has been available on call when needed
 - ☐ d. Has been generally unavailable
 - ☐ e. Has never been available
74. To what extent do your supervising teachers encouraged student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom?
- ☐ a. A great deal
 - ☐ b. To some extent
 - ☐ c. To a limited degree
 - ☐ d. Not at all
75. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your teachers?
- ☐ a. Has made them much more effective
 - ☐ b. Has made them more effective
 - ☐ c. Has had no effect
 - ☐ d. Has made them less effective
 - ☐ e. Has made them much less effective
76. What is the maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year?
- ☐ a. One
 - ☐ b. Two
 - ☐ c. Three
 - ☐ d. Four or more
77. Which of the following do you consider to be the most important contribution of supervising teachers to student teachers?
- ☐ a. Providing cognitive information in the psychology and sociology of teaching and learning.
 - ☐ b. Sharing the classroom and pupils to provide teaching experience for the student teachers.
 - ☐ c. Providing instruction and experience in lesson planning and methods of teaching.
 - ☐ d. Providing a climate for developing a wholesome professional attitude.
 - ☐ e. Providing informal counseling and advice in one-to-one conference sessions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrew, Michael D. "Teachers Should Be Human Too," Association of Teacher Educators. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1972.
- Association for Student Teaching. "Professional Growth in Service of the Supervising Teacher," Forty-Fifth Yearbook. Edited by Dorothy M. McGeoch. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966, 154 pp.
- Bebb, Aldon M.; Low, Arlene F.; and Waterman, Floyd T. "Supervisory Conference As Individualized Teaching." Association for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: 1969, 36 pp.
- Blackmore, Dorothy S. "Integration of Theory and Practice in Internship," Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1968. 41-63.
- Cartwright, William H. "Improving the Preparation of Teachers," Educational Forum 28, January 1964, 187-197.
- Casper, Cecil. Student Teaching Theory and Practices. New York: Greenwich Book Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Chase, Francis S. "Teacher Education for the Next Decade," School and Society, 92, March 21, 1964. 140-142.
- Clothier, Grant and Kingsley, Elizabeth. "Enriching Student Teaching Relationships," Midwest Educational and Resource Organization, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, 1913. 66 pp.
- Combs, Arthur W., ed. "Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming," Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: 1962.
- Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965, 134 pp.

- Combs, Arthur W. "Some Basic Concepts for Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education 28, (Fall 1972), 286-290.
- Commission on Standards. "The Supervising Teacher," an AST Position Paper, Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1966, 9 p.
- Conant, James B. "The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach. Charles W. Hunt Lecture," Freedom with Responsibility, Seventeenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964.
- Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963, 273 pp.
- Crow, Lester D. and Crow, Alice. The Student Teacher in the Elementary School. New York: David McKay Company, 1965, 480 pp.
- Curtis, Dwight K. Achieving Quality Off Campus Professional Laboratory Experiences. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957.
- Edelfelt, Roy A. "The Reform of Education and Teacher Education: A Complex Task," Journal of Teacher Education, 23 (Summer, 1972), 117-125.
- Edwards, Karl D. "Competencies of the Supervising Teacher," Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1966, 1-14.
- Elam, Stanley. Improving Teacher Education in the United States. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1967.
- Evjen, Myrtle. "Role of the Cooperating School," Journal of Teacher Education, XVIII (Winter, 1967), 411-416.
- Executive Committee. "Clinical Experience in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: 1970, 48 pp.
- Flanders, Ned A. "Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fourth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1965, 59-68.

- Fulp, Kenneth E. "What is the Effect of Student Teaching on the Achievement of Pupils?" Association for Student Teaching Bulletin No. 22. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association, 1964.
- Hayes, Robert B. "Involving Teachers in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Fifth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1966, 1-14.
- Iannons, Ronala V. and Carline, John L. "A Humanistic Approach to Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 22, (Winter 1971), 429-433.
- Impact of Student Teaching Programs upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan, Deans and Directors of Teacher Education in Michigan: 1970.
- Jackson, Philip W. The Teacher and the Machine. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968.
- Johnson, James Allen. "A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs," Multi-State Teacher Education Project. Baltimore, Maryland, 1968.
- Kerber, James E., and Protheroe, Donald W. "Guiding Student Teaching Experience in a Cooperative Structure," Association of Teacher Educators Bulletin 33. Washington, D.C.: 1973, 44 pp.
- Lamb, Pose. The Student Teaching Process in Elementary Schools. Columbus, Indiana: Charles E. Merrill Brooks, 1965.
- Lange, Donald N. "Relevance and Accountability in a Teacher Education Program," Journal of Teacher Education, 28, (Winter, 1972), 446-452.
- Lauby, Cecelia J., Chairman, 1965 Yearbook Writing Committee, "Theoretical Bases for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education," Forty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: 1965, 15 pp.
- Lindsey, Margaret, Chairman. "The Teacher Education: Future Direction," Association of Teacher Educators. Washington, D.C.: 1970, 145 pp.
- Loftis, Helen A. "The Student Teacher and Professional Activities," Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: State College of Iowa, 1966, 20 pp.

- Mangum, V. L. The American School: Its Rise and Development in Massachusetts. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1928.
- Michaelic, John. "Teacher Education, Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Education Research, 3rd. ed., New York: MacMillan, 1960.
- Nash, Robert J. "In the Summer of '71: An Experiment in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 23, (Spring 1972), 11-20.
- Nelson, Leslie and MacDonald, Blanche. Guide to Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1952.
- Nelson, Miles A. "Cooperating Teacher Training," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.: 1972, 415 pp.
- Pyatte, Jeff A. "Notions on Teaching Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 28, (Winter 1972), 442-445.
- Research Committee. "Alternative Approaches to Student Involvement in Teacher Education: Three Research Studies." Association of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C. 1973, 36 pp.
- Research Committee. "Guidelines to Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education," A Position Paper 3, Association of Teacher Education Educators, Washington, D.C. 1970, 49 pp.
- Research Committee. "The Director of Student Teaching: Characteristics and Responsibilities," Association for Student Teaching, n. pub., 1968, 82 pp.
- Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961, 420 pp.
- Schaefer, Robert. "The School as the Center of Inquiry" in Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education. n.p. New York, 1971.
- Shea, Joseph. "Organizational Patterns: Experimentation and Patterns," The Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1968, 1-28.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970, 553 pp.

Spanjer, R. Allan. "Teacher Preparation: Supervision and Performance," Washington, D.C.: The Association of Teacher Educators, 1972.

Southworth, Horton C., Chairman. "Internships in Teacher Education," Association for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: 1968, 220 pp.

Tanruther, Edgar M. Clinical Experiences in Teaching for the Student Teacher or Intern. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1967.

Woodruff, Asahel. "Student Teaching Today," The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1960.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03177 8149