

69-20,814

ARENDS, Robert Lewis, 1934-
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE GRADUATES
OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ELEMENTARY INTERN PROGRAM AND THE
REGULAR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969

Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE GRADUATES OF THE MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY INTERN PROGRAM AND THE
REGULAR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

By

Robert Lewis Arends

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE GRADUATES OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY INTERN PROGRAM AND THE REGULAR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

By

Robert Lewis Arends

Since 1959, the College of Education, Michigan State University, has offered an elementary intern program adjunctive to its conventional teacher education program.

The internship program was adopted as a service to the various junior colleges of the state, and because of its potential as an effective means of developing desired teacher competencies. It was assumed that the internship program would provide the following advantages:

1. It would provide an opportunity for more students from lower income situations to enter the education progression.
2. It would provide for a smoother and more effective transition into the teaching profession.
3. It would provide an increased opportunity to bring theory and practice into a closer relationship.
4. It would provide, through the longer and more enriched clinical preparation, a more substantial background for teaching, and thus, result in more effective teachers.

This study was undertaken for the following purposes:

1. To determine if there were significant differences in the situational deployment of the two groups using such criteria as type of school in which teachers served, their teaching positions in relationship to where they received their clinical preparation, and the number remaining in their 1967-68 positions.
2. To determine if there were a significant difference in demonstrated teaching competency between the two groups according to principals' evaluations and/or pupil change as determined by standardized achievement tests.
3. To determine if there were significant differences between married and single teachers according to principals' evaluations.
4. To analyze the feedback from the graduates concerning their self-judged evaluations and the sources from which these competencies were derived.

The population studied was comprised of teachers in the field, who had graduated in 1965-66. These teachers had at least two years in the field, and thus, should have had ample time to be evaluated by their principals.

The principal's evaluative questionnaire contained eighteen items of teacher competence. The questionnaire was based upon those instruments commonly used in the public schools of Michigan.

Pupil change was determined by standardized achievement tests. Provisions were made to keep such variables as SES, racial composition, and ability constant.

An opinionnaire was constructed for the graduates to assess their skill on the eighteen teaching competencies. The instrument also sought to ascertain which competencies the respondents considered to be the most important and from what sources their strengths were perceived to come.

Statistical differences were analyzed using an analysis of variance, and rank-orders were compared using the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient.

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. A statistically significant greater percentage of Intern graduates were teaching in the system and building in which they had received their clinical preparation.
2. A surprisingly low number of graduates were teaching in schools which were predominantly attended by minority groups and low SES students.
3. There was no significant difference between the two groups concerning any of the other situational employment items.
4. There was no significant difference between the Intern graduates and the regular program graduates on any of the eighteen items as determined by principal evaluation.
5. There was no significant difference between married and single teachers as determined by principal evaluation.

6. There was no significant difference between Intern and regular graduates as determined by pupil change.
7. There was a significant difference on several of the eighteen items between the graduates of two of the intern centers.
8. There was a significant rank-order correlation between the two groups concerning their self-judged competencies.
9. There was a significant correlation on the rank-order between self-judged competencies and those perceived as being most important by the graduates in both groups.
10. There was no significant correlation between the rank-order of self-judged competencies and the competencies as adjudged by the principals.
11. The main source of strength for both groups was identified as being intrinsic.
12. The second greatest source of strength was derived from field experience and not from the University.
13. A significantly higher percentage of Intern graduates expressed satisfaction with their training than did the regular graduates.
14. While all graduates were markedly critical of their methods courses and expressed a need for more courses in (a) the teaching of reading, (b) Negro history and culture, and (c) techniques of teaching in the ghetto, the regular graduates did place methods courses fairly high on the list of sources of strength.

The results of this study and the conclusion reached warranted the following recommendations:

1. The Intern Program should be carefully evaluated from several aspects to determine if it should be continued in its present mode.
2. The present study could well be replicated with certain modifications.
3. A regular, systematic follow up of teacher education graduates should be established.
4. The methods courses as now offered should be closely scrutinized to ascertain if they are meeting the needs of the graduates.
5. A careful study of each of the Intern Centers should be made to allow for the sharing of ideas which might be of benefit to all of the centers.
6. A careful re-evaluation of the role of clinical preparation in the total program of teacher education should be undertaken.
7. A study to ascertain the feasibility of placing all first year teachers in an apprenticeship situation for smoother transition into the profession should be undertaken.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the constant help and guidance of Dr. David Smith, chairman of the doctoral committee, and for the assistance of Dr. Dale Alam, Dr. Wilbur Brookover, and Dr. Clyde Campbell who served on the committee.

The writer wishes to thank the Mott Foundation for the year of internship that allowed this writer to complete many of the requirements for the degree.

Deepest appreciation is owed to my wife Barbara, for her continuous support and encouragement; to our children Vicki, Betsy, and Robert, Jr., for their acceptance and understanding of my months of preoccupation with the requirements for the degree; and to my parents who have provided a lifetime of inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	LIST OF TABLES.....	v
 Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM, DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED, AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.....	1
	Introduction	
	Statement of the Problem	
	Descriptions of Terms Used	
	Limitations of the Study	
	Organization of the Study	
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
	General Clinical Preparation	
	The Intern Experience	
	The Michigan State University Intern Program	
	Assessment of Teacher Competence	
	Rating Teacher Effectiveness	
	Principal Evaluation	
	Pupil Change as Measured by Achievement	
	Use of Rating Instruments	
III.	DESIGN AND PROCEDURES.....	42
	Introduction	
	Population and Sample for Principal's	
	Evaluative Questionnaire	
	The Elementary Intern Program Graduates	
	The Regular Teacher Education Program	
	Graduates	
	Development of the Principal's Evaluative	
	Questionnaire	
	Effectiveness as Determined by Pupil Change	
	The Graduate's Opinion Survey	
	Hypotheses and Related Questions	
	Processing, Analysis, and Reporting of	
	the Data	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
IV	RESULTS OF THE STUDY.....	54
	Introduction	
	Analysis of General Data	
	Rating of the Graduates by Their Principals	
	The Comparison of EIP and RTEP Graduates	
	The Comparison of Married and Single Teachers	
	Differences Among EIP Centers	
	Comparison of EIP and RTEP Graduates as Evidenced by Pupil Change	
	Feedback from EIP and RTEP Graduates	
	Graduates' Self-Judged Strengths	
	A Comparison of Self-Judged Strengths with Principals' Evaluations	
	Graduates' Self-Judged Strengths Compared with Those Competencies Judged to be Most Important	
	Graduates' Identification of Sources Which Provided Them Strength	
	The Feelings of the Graduates about Michigan State University	
	Open-Ended Comments	
	Summary	
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	98
	Conclusions	
	Recommendations	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	108
	APPENDIX(ES)	
A.	Cover Letters.....	113
B.	Principal's Evaluation Questionnaire.....	115
C.	Graduate's Opinionnaire.....	118

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Distribution of the 1965-66 Female EIP Population Not in the Study.....	45
II	Distribution of the 1965-66 Regular Teacher Education Program Sample Not Included in the Study.....	46
III	Racial Composition of Schools in Which Graduates Served.....	56
IV	SES Composition of Schools in Which Graduates Served.....	57
V	Grouping Procedures (Homogeneous).....	58
VI	Situational Deployment of Graduates.....	59
VII	Graduates Leaving Their 1967-68 Positions, and Reasons.....	60
VIII	Principals' Ratings of EIP Graduates on Each of Eighteen Teacher Competencies.....	62
IX	Principals' Ratings of RTEP Graduates on Each of Eighteen Teacher Competencies.....	64
X	Differences in Average Ratings and Rank- Orders Assigned EIP and RTEP Graduates in Each of Eighteen Teacher Competencies Adjudged.....	67
XI	Statistical Analysis of Principals' Ratings of EIP and RTEP Graduates on Each of Eighteen Teacher Competencies.....	69
XII	Data Concerning Single and Married Teachers as Reflected by Principal Evaluation.....	72
XIII	Comparison of the Five EIP Centers.....	74
XIV	Comparison of Centers B and D on Eighteen Competencies.....	75

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
XV	Comparison of the EIP and RTEP Graduates as Evidence by Pupil Change.....	78
XVI	Graduates' Self-Judged Strengths in Eighteen Teacher Competencies.....	80
XVII	Comparison of Rank-Order of Principals' Evaluations and Self-Judgment on Eighteen Competencies.....	84
XVIII	Comparison of Teacher Competencies Adjudged to Be Most Important by the Graduates.....	87
XIX	Rank-Order Correlation of Self-Judged Strengths of Graduates and Those Competencies Adjudged to Be Most Important.....	89
XX	Comparison of EIP and RTEP Graduates' Sources of Strength.....	91
XXI	Sources Responsible for the Teaching Competencies Self-Judged by Graduates to Be Their Greatest Strength.....	93
XXII	Feelings of the Graduates Concerning Their Training at Michigan State University.....	94

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED, AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Ever since the advent of formalized instructional institutions, educators have been seeking new and more effective ways to prepare teachers. From the beginning of recorded history, education has been a part of every civilization, and pedagogy has evolved continuously. As civilization has advanced from the simple to the complex, so also has education.

Teaching no longer consists merely of passing on the simple skills, customs, rituals, and art forms of the family tribe; it has developed into the interrelated, sequential, and complex pattern that confronts the highly specilized professionals of the present time.¹

Clinical experience has long been part of the preparation of teachers. It can be traced back as far as the Greeks, to Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. This type of teaching, and training has continued throughout history as evidenced by the guild system of the Middle Ages and the apprentice system of modern trade unions. There are several professions that require clinical preparation for full certification; among these are medical doctors, accountants, and teachers.

¹Walter Beggs, The Education of Teachers (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), p.1.

During the long period of pedagogical evolution, there has been little doubt among most educators about the value of some type of clinical experience.

Whatever their other differences, most of those advocating reform in the preparation of teachers agree on the worth of a period of supervised practice. For Conant, practice teaching is the one 'indisputable essential element'; for Shaplin, any denial of the worth of practice teaching represents a serious underestimation of the complexity of the teaching process; for an NEA task force on teacher education, direct experience is essential if ideas are to be made meaningful, and if 'doing' as well as 'knowing' is to result.¹

Colleges of education have, over the years, developed many different types of programs to meet the needs of their students in the area of clinical preparation. Laboratory schools, multi-experience programs, single-experience programs, and programs which vary the length of service are a few of these practices.

Yet none of these devices has sufficed to insure a smooth induction of the beginner into teaching, and, thus in the most recent period many colleges of education have experimented with some form of internship.²

The concept of an internship is not new, having been first introduced by Brown University in 1895. It has had a long and varied history of development, paralleling for a number of years the economic development of this country. That is, during periods of high employment when teachers were scarce, the programs met with little success; while during periods

¹Bernard Corman, THE INTERNSHIP in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1964), p. 1.

²Ibid. p. 2.

of depression, when there was an over supply of teachers, the internships flourished.

At the present time, there are two primary forms of internships. One is a relatively new program in which a graduate of a liberal arts college is given a short course in educational pedagogy, usually in a summer session, and then is placed in a regular teaching situation, with close supervision by a college coordinator. This type of internship is a crash program designed to place teachers in the classroom to relieve the present shortage of teachers. Another type, which has recently been re-established by such institutions as Central Michigan University, Michigan State University, and others, is one in which a student is given education courses at the undergraduate level, is then placed in a regular student teaching situation, and then finally placed in the field in an internship capacity, under the close supervision of an intern consultant. This latter type of program was not designed primarily for the purpose of emergency staffing of the classroom, but rather, to give the kind of training and closely supervised clinical preparation which may be of the ingredients of a successful teacher training program. The propose of this study was to explore such a training program at Michigan State University.

Statement of the Problem

If one believes that the clinical situation contributes to the effectiveness of teachers, as such eminent educators as Conant, Shaplin, and Goodlad do, then, theoretically, a clinical situation which extends over a long period of time, involves a greater number of outside educational experiences, and provides for a process of teaching under close supervision

should result in better trained, and thus, more effective teachers. This is not to say that the extension of time alone will make more effective teachers, but the time extension plus the other benefits of an intern program should tend to produce better teachers. The purpose of this study was to ascertain if teachers trained in the above described situation were indeed more effective.

It was recognized that the term effective is consistent, somewhat elusive, and has severe limitations. Rather than abandon evaluation of this type of clinical preparation program because of the lack of consensus on teacher effectiveness, two areas were chosen. The first of these criteria was teacher effectiveness as evaluated by the principal. While the author was well aware of the lack of consensus among many educators regarding the validity of this type of evaluation, it was felt that the main concern in this study was "what is real." Principals do evaluate teachers. In fact, one of the most important duties of supervisors and principals is the evaluation of the staff.

Supervision of teachers is one of the prime responsibilities of the school administrator. A cursory review of the literature reveals that most authorities recommend that twenty-five to fifty percent of the elementary principal's work day be devoted to supervision in some form or other.¹

Arthur Combs in commenting on professional judgment, states:

The fact that good teaching cannot be tied down to specific, objective criteria does not remove the necessity of making judgments concerning the quality of teaching. The evaluation of performance is a responsibility no profession can escape,

¹Wayne Herman, "Teacher Observation", National Elementary Principal, XLIII, (April 1964), p. 63.

particularly one that is dependent upon public funds, and charged with so vital a function as the guidance of youth.... The making of professional judgments will never be perfect. But, the search for objective criteria is a blind alley, and psychologists are a long way from providing devices for measuring good teaching from a perceptual orientation. We have no alternative. Professional judgment is the best device we have. To reject the best we can do because it is not perfect is only 'to throw out the baby with the bath water.'¹

Until such time as we have a reliable objective means for teacher evaluation, we must rely upon subjective judgments. One such judgment which is often used is the judgment of the principal.

While there are valid criticisms of administrative ratings, they are still the most frequently obtained evaluation of teacher success, and often the only one available. In spite of the subjective way in which these ratings are made, they sometimes correlate highly with variables in a teacher's undergraduate career, as is noted in several of the previously mentioned studies. Also, it is generally the administrator in the public school system who makes the hiring and firing decisions; it is he who is satisfied or dis-satisfied with a teacher; it is he who does or does not return to the same institution of higher education to obtain future staff members. In this respect his ratings valued or not are at least an operationally useful and practical definition of success in the first years of teaching.²

Therefore, in spite of the lack of consensus among many educators about the validity and value of evaluations by principals, they were used as one measurement of effectiveness.

The second was pupil change as determined by standardized achievement tests. Few educators would argue that pupil change is the final

¹Arthur Combs, "Objective Measurement Is Impossible," National Education Association Journal. LIII, (January 1964), p. 73.

²R. B. Simun, "The Relationship of Variables in Undergraduate School, and School Administrators' Ratings of First Year Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education XV, (September 1964), p. 297.

criterion for judgment of any educational program. There is, however, little agreement about which aspect of growth is more important; that is, the cognitive domain or the effective domain. Many would advocate that attitudes are the most critical targets of educational endeavors. Although tests have been devised which purport to measure what an individual will actually do in any given situation, they are merely self-reporting devices, and do not necessarily relate to the "real" world. Even in the cognitive domain, it is doubtful if many educators would agree that the standardized achievement test is designed to measure all the important areas of academic progress. The inability of achievement tests to measure such things as attitude toward learning, motivation, and the ability to think critically and draw independent conclusions are some of the drawbacks of using achievement tests as a measure of pupil change. In spite of these drawbacks, there are certain axiomatic skills which are measured by these standardized achievement tests that are important to the academic success of students. Therefore, the standardized achievement test was used to measure pupil change as one device for ascertaining teacher effectiveness.

The objectives within the limitations of this study were:

- A. To gather and compare certain basic data relating to the situational employment of the two groups in such areas as type of socioeconomic and racial situation in which they were employed, marriage rate, geographic relationship between present employment and area of clinical preparation, and number who stayed following the 1967-68 academic year.
- B. To compare the graduates of the Elementary Intern Program at Michigan State University with a randomly selected group of graduates of the Regular Teacher Education Program at Michigan State University, to see if there were significant differences in their effectiveness as measured by principal evaluation and as measured by pupil change.

- C. To compare the effectiveness of married teachers with single teachers as determined by principal evaluation.
- D. To ascertain if there is any difference between Intern training centers as determined by principal evaluation.
- E. To evaluate the feelings of the graduates themselves with respect to their self-judged competencies, the sources of these competencies, and their general overall satisfaction with their preparation by Michigan State University.

Descriptions of Terms Used

In order to avoid semantic confusion or ambiguity in the interpretation of this study, the following descriptions of terms were used:

Clinical Preparation includes all types of on-the-job-training for teachers under the supervision of certified personnel.

Elementary Internship explored in this study consisted of only the type which is an extension of the basic teacher preparation program, and not the type which is used as a crash program to fill the classroom. In the case of Michigan State University, it includes one year of teaching under the direction of special personnel following the regular student teaching program. It also includes the following two main deviations from the regular teacher preparation program: Methods classes are taught in a block in the off-campus centers and in conjunction with some observation on the part of the student; and the Elementary Intern spends two summers on campus so that his fourth year is the intern year. The Elementary Intern Program is referred to in this study as EIP.

Principal Evaluation was the type of evaluation made by principals for the establishment of tenure as described in the Michigan Tenure Law. The evaluation was done using a questionnaire which is similar to the

type of instrument used by a majority of the principals in doing evaluations for their district. This instrument will be found in the Appendix.

Pupil Change reflected the growth of a class as measured by standardized achievement tests which had been administered by the district. In order to eliminate other factors connected with pupil achievement, only those classrooms which used heterogeneous ability grouping were included.

Regular Teacher Education Program refers to the regular teacher education program at Michigan State University which consists of the same academic preparation as the Elementary Intern Program. The difference is that methods courses are spread over a three-year period and are received on campus. The student teaching experience which is between ten and fifteen weeks in length, depending on the term, is the only clinical experience which the student receives. The Regular Teacher Education Program is referred to in this study as RTEP.

Teacher Effectiveness included both evaluation by the principal and pupil change as described above.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the following factors:

- A. The lack of accurate, current address and job-placement information regarding the recent Michigan State University teacher education graduates.
- B. The scope of the study which did not permit examination of the influences of such forces as selection processes, extraneous experiences, or intellectual, social, or psychological differences on the demonstrated competencies of the graduates.

- C. The lack of a standardized objective evaluation instrument for measuring teacher effectiveness.
- D. The lack of consistency between school systems regarding the administration of achievement tests.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II presents a review of selected research including evaluation of teacher effectiveness, principal evaluation, pupil change, clinical preparation, the intern program in general, and the Elementary Intern Program at Michigan State University.

Chapter III contains the design of the study, including a description of the two types of instruments used, type of statistical analysis, and the preliminary treatment of data.

Chapter IV consists of the results of the statistical analysis which tested the hypothesis of the study and spoke to the questions raised regarding the graduates of the two types of teacher preparation programs.

Chapter V constitutes a summary of the entire study in which the findings, and in addition, the conclusions are presented. The final chapter also includes the recommendations of the writer.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Two educational components in this study were of major significance and were subjected to special review and scrutiny.

One of these components was the many-sided, often examined problem of assessing teacher competence. Since it provided one of the means through which this comparative study was conducted, its relevancy was self-evident. The clinical phases of the intern and conventional teacher education programs constituted the other element which demanded particular attention.

General Clinical Preparation

Clinical preparation in teacher education goes far back in history. It, like many other educational devices, has had an up and down career. At this point, it should suffice to say that it is fairly well accepted by most educators as an integral part of teacher education. Lindley Stiles had this to say about the clinical phase of teacher education.

Student teaching is generally regarded as an indispensable aspect of programs of preservice teacher education. It was among the first type of professional laboratory experience to be incorporated in the professional preparation for teaching, and holds high priority as one of the basic elements in present day programs. In selecting members for their teaching staffs, school superintendents attach considerable importance to the nature and quality of the beginning teacher's

record in student teaching. Teachers are practically unanimous in the opinion that student teaching was the most valuable experience in their preservice education program.¹

Shaplin lists five benefits of clinical preparation:

1. Teaching is behavior, and as behavior is subject to analysis, change, and improvement.
2. Much of the habitual behavior which individuals have developed in other contexts is inappropriate for the teaching situation.
3. Under present conditions, much teaching is conducted under conditions of stress.
4. Teachers, through practice, can learn to analyze, criticize, and control their own teaching behavior.
5. Practice has the dual purpose of training, and elimination of the unfit.²

Edward Johnson revealed from a survey conducted in the public school that elementary teachers felt "More time should be allowed for professional laboratory experiences in teacher preparation programs."³ The finalist for the 1964 "Teacher of the Year Award" when interviewed by The Phi Delta Kappan made the following comments:

1. The new teacher should spend a full year under the tutelage of a master teacher.
2. Practice teaching should come on a paid basis over a longer period of time.

¹Lindley Stiles, Teacher Education in the United States (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960), p. 260.

²Judson Shaplin, "Practice in Teaching," Harvard Educational Review, XXXI (Winter, 1961), p. 38.

³Edward Johnson, "Teachers Indicate Need of Fifth Year," Michigan Education Journal, XLV (November 1967), p. 40.

3. Prospective teachers should spend a full semester as a teaching intern.¹

Miller,² in studying the graduates of the University of Nebraska Teachers College for the year 1961, found that this group of beginning teachers would go into teaching if they had to make the choice again, rated students teaching as the most valuable part of their professional preparation, and believed overlapping in education courses was the greatest weakness in their professional preparation.

The number of studies which indicates that both the recipients and the professional educator believe in the necessity of the clinical program is infinite. However, when one looks at the research which attempts to measure behavioral change using such devices as the MTAI, the PAM, and other paper and pencil tests, the results are nebulous; that is, there are no clear indications that student teaching does change behavior or attitude. Corrigan,³ found a significant positive change in attitude of sixty-three students as a result of the student teaching experience. Nagle,⁴ in comparing two types of programs for prospective elementary teachers, observed that in every case the change resulting from student teaching

¹The Phi Delta Kappan, XLV, (June 1965), p. 444.

²Evan Miller, "Comprehensive and Analytical Study of All the Graduates of the University of Nebraska Teachers College of the Year 1961," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1963)

³Dean Corrigan, "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers" Journal of Education Research, LVII (October 1963), pp. 93-95.

⁴Marshall Nagle, "Some Effects of Student Teaching Patterns upon Professional Attitudes," Journal of Educational Research, LII (May 1959), pp. 355-357.

was toward a better or more desirable attitude. Sandgren¹ and Troisi,² also found significant changes in attitude as a result of student teaching. On the other hand, Cross³ found no significant change in attitude toward pupil-teacher relations. Price⁴ noted no significant difference between the student's initial and retest MTAI scores. Day,⁵ Dutton,⁶ and Osman⁷ all noted negative results from student teaching. White summarized as follows:

¹Duane Sandgren, "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (May 1956), pp. 673-680.

²Nicholas Troisi, "The Effect of Student Teaching upon Student Teacher's Objectives and Their Relationship to Achievement and Attitudes Toward Children," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959).

³Arthur Cross, "A Comparative Analysis of the Expressed Attitudes of Elementary Education Students, Their University Instruction, and Their Supervising Teachers toward Pupil-Teacher Relations as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959).

⁴Robert Price, "Relations between Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers' Attitudes and Performance," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1960).

⁵Harry Day, "Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers after Initial Teaching Experience," Journal of Teacher Education, X (September 1959), pp. 326-328.

⁶Wilbur Dutton, "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers, and Anxiety," Journal of Educational Research, LV (May 1962), pp. 380-382.

⁷Robert Osman, "Associative Factors in Change of Student Teacher's Attitudes during Student Teaching," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959).

There is no consensus in the direction of expressed attitudinal changes of student teachers as measured by various pre-test and post-test attitude instruments during the student teaching experience.¹

The Intern Experience

The Internship as used in this study constitutes an extension of the regular teacher education program, either at the undergraduate level or at the graduate level. Shaplin² noted that the history of the internship in the United States dates back to 1895 at Brown University. This was a five-year program, and the internship was considered as part of the graduate training. The students were placed half-time at a reduced salary in the Providence, Rhode Island, schools. They received supervisory help from both school and university personnel, and continued course work at Brown while teaching. Other early internship programs were established at Fitchburg Normal School in 1904 and at the University of Cincinnati in 1919. As was previously mentioned, the intern concept followed very closely the economic conditions of the country, increasing during periods of depression and decreasing during periods of affluence. Following World War II, there was a tremendous increase in so-called intern programs, but many of these were, according

¹Jo Ann White, "Changes during Student Teaching as Measured by Pre-Tests, and Post-Tests," Research on Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 5, (Dubuque Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc., 1965), pp. 19-20.

²Judson Shaplin, "A Comparison of Internship Programs," 1963 NCTEPS Columbus Conference Report, (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1963), p. 321.

to Rucker, "...nothing more than an increase in the number of undergraduate programs which so labeled themselves."¹ The "typical" internship of today was described by Shaplin at the 1963 NCTEPS Columbus conference:

...the contemporary internship is sponsored by the university in cooperation with the schools, not by the schools alone. It is shorter, more analogous to real teaching, and more remunerative than its predecessor. The intern today spends less time on the job because he engages in a heavier load of course work. While on the job, however, he is much more a regular teacher, with greater responsibilities than his counterpart in the thirties, though paradoxically he has had less professional preparation for the job.²

There have been very few studies comparing the graduates of intern programs with the graduates of a regular program. Harberman,³ in studying the interns of the type without benefit of the regular training, found, on the Ryans' observation record pattern Y₀--responsible, systematic, businesslike, vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod--that the interns were significantly superior at the .01 level. He explains this as being the result of their having had

¹Winifred Rucker, "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952).

²Judson Shaplin, op. cit., p. 321.

³M. Haberman, "A Comparison of Interns with Regular First Year Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, LIX (October 1965), pp. 92-94.

broader work experiences, broader life experiences, and better motivation. Kershner,¹ in investigating the results of the intern program at the University of Oregon, which is similar in composition to the one at Michigan State, found no statistically significant difference between the graduates of the intern program and graduates of the regular program. He did find, however, that on every point of his twelve-point evaluation instrument, the interns were rated equal or above the teachers from the regular program.

The Michigan State University Intern Program

Michigan State University's College of Education organized an internship program for the preparation of elementary school teachers in the fall of 1959. Called the Student-Teacher Education Project (STEP), the program was conceived as a five-year plan which would include a one-year pre-internship and student teaching experience followed by a two-year internship.²

The initiation of this program was in response to a request from one of Michigan's larger two-year community colleges. The community college wanted a program which would benefit their graduates by allowing them to earn a degree and certification while spending as much time as possible near home. With a grant in excess of one-half million dollars, the program was launched.

¹Roger Kershner, "A Comparative Study of the Teaching Competence of University of Oregon Interns," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Oregon, 1968).

²Bernard Corman, op. cit., p. v.

Each of the centers was to encompass a single community college, and one or more school systems. Students would typically, though not necessarily, attend a community college for their first two years of study. Applicants who had attended Michigan State, or any other accredited school, would also be admitted but, in any case those wishing to be admitted would be expected to meet all regular requirements for transfer into the College of Education with junior class standing.¹

STEP was a five-year program with the following format. After completing two years at a community college, or any accredited institution, the selected student would spend the summer on campus. There he would take courses in the area of liberal arts. In the fall, the student would return to the home center to begin a preinternship year. During the fall, the student would receive methods courses and engage in related activities in the public schools. The winter term would be composed of a regular term of student teaching experience in a school near the home center. In the final term of the academic year, the student would return to the campus for some additional work in the area of liberal arts. The fourth and fifth years would be spent as an intern in the public school. The internship would be done under the direction of an intern consultant.

In 1964 the intern program was revised and the name was changed from STEP to EIP (Elementary Intern Program). In the revised program, the student moves to campus following the first two years

¹Bernard Corman, op. cit., p. 7.

of higher education, for further courses in the liberal arts. The following three terms are devoted to one term in the resident center for the methods block, one term for student teaching, and one term back to campus for liberal arts. This is followed by a second term on campus in the summer, where the student takes his final classes in liberal arts. The fourth year is then spent as an intern under the direction of an intern consultant, with one consultant for each five interns.

Formal course requirements are identical for students in the internship and regular programs. But the internship students take their methods of teaching courses in the centers, and the course 'School and Society' after, rather than before, they complete student teaching.¹

In doing a study of this type, one must ascertain the ways in which the students are alike, and the ways in which they are different. Corman reported the following conclusions in 1964:

Item 1 Socioeconomic Background

The overall conclusion is that, compared to the campus students, the STEP student was less favored economically.

Item 2 Achievement and Aptitude

Despite differences in socioeconomic background, STEP and campus students performed about the same academically.

¹Bernard Corman, op. cit., p. 89.

Item 3 Personality and Interest

The results obtained for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, which purports to measure the press of fifteen 'needs', were representative.¹

The only test which showed significant differences between the two groups was the MTAI, with regular students ranking higher. However, when the EIP students were retested at the end of their experience, the scores of the interns were comparable with the on-campus students. James Conley² in a later study found results similar to those of Corman.

Assessment of Teacher Competence

Man has, through the ages, been remarkably adaptive to his environment. One of the crucial elements of this ability to adapt has been the capacity to learn, and to communicate this learning to his fellow human beings. Every society has had some form of education. During the thousands of years of man's existence, educational institutions have developed from early man's simple teaching of hunting and planting skills to modern man's teaching of the highly complex subjects of the electronic age. While a great deal of pedagogy has evolved during these many years, the basic premise of the simple

¹Barnard Corman, op. cit., p. 95-97.

²James Conley, "Personal Characteristics of Female Elementary Intern Program and Conventional Program Students," (unpublished paper, Michigan State University, 1968).

transfer of knowledge is still paramount. It must be noted, however, that the amount of knowledge and the complexity of knowledge have increased immeasurably during the last few decades and will continue to increase at a fantastic rate. There are also other important aspects connected with education, among which are physical development; the ability to use knowledge, if not for the betterment of mankind, then, at least, not to his detriment; and finally the discovery of new knowledge. Each of these aspects is an important part of education.

When one is assessing the capabilities of a producer, one looks at the product. This is a relatively simple task if the producer is the only one who is connected with the end product. Such trades as carpentry, metal work, masonry, and other specific tasks which have a measurable and finite product are examples. In education, however, we are not dealing in products, but rather, in services. Services, because of their very nature, are extremely hard to judge. One cannot condemn a surgeon if the patient dies from an unrelated complication, nor can one condemn a farmer who loses his crop because of the ravages of nature. One could, however, blame both of the above mentioned efforts if every precaution was not taken to insure success. The same thing is true in the assessment of teachers, except even more so, because in education there is not even complete agreement upon what the end product should be. This is especially true in the United States where there is local control of curriculum, and each school system can set its own philosophical objectives and goals.

In the early days of this country, the assessment of teachers was generally made by lay people, either by a committee in the case of the public school or by the head of the household in the case of the tutor. As the society has become more technical and specialized, so, too, has the educational process. Hawkins and Stoops noted this when they observed:

Within the past century, dramatic changes in the organization and management of the public schools have resulted in the replacement of laymen who directly supervised and evaluated teachers. These responsibilities are now charged to a cadre of school administrators who have come from the ranks of teaching and bring to the evaluation process lists of teaching objectives, written evaluation policies and instruments designed to reduce subjectivity.¹

As the management of public schools has become a special technical undertaking, and as more and more evaluative devices have been developed, the teacher and the job that he does have been subjected to an ever increasing spectrum of assessment. The public has always been interested in having quality teaching in the schools, but, with the recent increase in salaries and the accompanying need for more financial support, this cry is ever louder. This need, however, has not made the job any simpler. As Biddle observed:

The problem is not an idle one. The domestic scene and world outlook both clearly demonstrate the urgent need for more and better education for all men. Of all societies,

¹Hawkins and Stoops, "Objective and Subjective Identification of Outstanding Elementary Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, LIX (April 1966), p. 344.

the free one depends most heavily on quality education for the fulfillment of its destiny. Thus, the teacher and the quality of his teaching are of paramount importance.¹

Smith observed, in a book reappraising teacher education in the United States, that:

There are compelling reasons for a reappraisal of teacher education in America at this time. Along with public clamor for better quality in education, despite the fact that many who ask for quality seem uncertain as to what it is or how it is to be achieved, there is a coincident concern within the profession for the better preparation of teachers. The necessity for more competent teaching grows, in part, out of the nation's efforts to realize more fully its democratic aim of free universal education, and the problems of the school in bringing performance into harmony with social and humanitarian as well as intellectual goals.²

Ryans, in his study Characteristics of Teachers, provided yet another facet to the question of assessing teacher performance. He observed:

Both the lay public and professional educators generally agree that the 'Goodness' of an education program is determined to a large extent by the teaching. The identification of qualified and able teaching

¹Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellean, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, inc., 1964), p. v.

²Elmer Smith, Ed., Teacher Education: A Reappraisal (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 1.

personnel, therefore, constitutes one of the most important of all educational concerns. Obtaining capable teachers is an intrinsic interest and obligation of education. If competent teachers can be obtained, the likelihood of attaining¹ desirable educational outcomes is substantial.

There are two important reasons for assessing teacher competence. First, the public school needs to assess teachers for such purposes as staff promotions, the granting of tenure, and salary advancement. This process is closely related to what is "real" in the world of the teacher, and is the basis for one of the criteria of this study. Second, is the area of teacher education. Without reasonably accurate means of assessing the quality and character of their graduates, teacher training institutions can do little more than probe for answers to the perplexing problems which are rampant in today's educational field.

Rating Teacher Effectiveness

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is one of the most crucial and perplexing educational problems facing educators today. During the last fifty years, there have been over 2,000 studies in the area of assessing teacher effectiveness, and out of these studies have come only confusion and lack of consensus. For every study that shows the worth of a particular method of assessment, there is a corresponding study to show that the method is questionable.

¹David Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), p.1.

One of the most comprehensive studies in the area of teacher effectiveness was done by Barr¹ who concluded that up to this point there has not been developed any criteria of measurement of effectiveness which correlate positively to any degree with any other criteria. Lins employed three criteria in a study report in 1946.² The three criteria were: (1) supervisory ratings, (2) pupil evaluation, and (3) residual pupil gain. One of his findings was the low correlations among these three criteria:

Lins Intercorrelation Findings

	<u>X₁</u>	<u>X₂</u>	<u>X₃</u>
X ₁ Composite M-Blank Ratings	1.000	.279	.193
X ₂ Pupil Evaluation	.279	1.000	.055
X ₃ Residual Pupil Gain	.193	.055	1.000

One will note that even though the correlations are low, the Composite M-Blank rating (Supervisors) is more closely related to the other criteria than either of the other two. Lins' overall results were consistent with most studies which try to correlate separate factors

¹Arvil Barr, Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, (Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1967).

²Leo Lins, "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, XV (September 1946), pp. 2-60.

of teacher evaluation. Brookover¹ found that teachers with a high degree of interpersonal interaction with their students tended to be rated high by these pupils. However, these ratings correlated near zero with ratings by administrators. Jayne,² from two parallel studies of the relationships between specific teaching procedures and pupil gain, found no single procedure to be significantly correlated with pupil gain. Torrence³ found no statistically significant correlation between teacher effectiveness in agriculture and the following criteria: knowledge of agriculture, manipulative skills, knowledge of professional education, or any combination of these. Anderson⁴ employed eight criteria of teaching success among which no statistically significant correlations were found. Lawler, in an article entitled "Differing Rates of Progress of Classes under the Same and Different Teachers," stated:

¹Wilbur Brookover, "The Relation of Social Factors to Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XIII (June 1945), pp. 191-205.

²D. Jayne, "A Study of the Relations between Teaching Procedures and Educational Outcome," Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (December 1946), pp. 101-134.

³Andrew Torrence, "A Study of the Relationships of Certain Competencies to Success in Teaching Vocational Agriculture," Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (September 1956), pp. 1-31.

⁴Harold Anderson, "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (September 1954), pp. 41-77.

The progress of pupils as measured by achievement tests used in this study seems to have no influence on the ratings of teachers by their principals.¹

Gotham² found a lack of agreement among the criteria of pupil change and tests of qualities commonly associated with teaching success, among pupil change and composite personality measures, and among personality measures and tests of qualities commonly associated with teaching efficiency. Stoelting³ found for University of Wisconsin graduates that if the minimum grade-point average were raised from the 1.3 now employed to the 1.5 formerly employed, the higher minimum would screen out thirteen of twenty-four who were judged to be less than average in teaching ability, but at the same time, would eliminate thirty-one who were average, seven who rated above average, and one who rated superior. In a study by Barr and others, the following results were reported.

Five criteria were employed: (1) Gain in pupil achievement as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test, (2) A composite of scores on seven rating scales, (3) A composite of nine measures of qualities commonly associated with teaching success, (4) A composite of six tests of teaching ability chosen from composite

¹Eugene Lawler, "Differing Rates of Progress of Classes under the Same and Different Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, LVII (October 1964), pp. 84-86.

²R. E. Gotham, "Personality and Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), pp. 157-165.

³Gustave Stoelting, "The Selection of Candidates for Teacher Education at the University of Wisconsin," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIV (December 1955), pp. 115-140.

three, and (5) A composite of all nineteen variables combined variously. The major conclusions were:
 (1) The coefficients of correlation obtained between ten selected measures of teaching ability and pupil achievement were uniformly low. (2) The coefficients of correlation between the nineteen variables employed in the investigation and the five composite criteria provide conflicting evidence.

From a longitudinal study done in Georgia by Shim, the following results were reported:

Four Categories of Teachers

- 1a GPA of 2.50 or above
- 1b GPA of less than 2.50
- 2a Degree
- 2b Non-degree
- 3a Certified
- 3b Non-certified
- 4a Experienced
- 4b Non-experienced

Results with Whole Group

Area	Category Sign. at .05
Increase in I.Q.	3b
Arithmetic Achievement	3b
Language Achievement	1b, 3b, 4a
Reading Achievement	3b

Results with Above Average I.Q.

No difference

¹A. S. Barr, and others, "The Validity of Certain Instruments Employed in the Measurement of Teaching Ability," The Measurement of Teaching Efficiency; edited by Helen M. Walter, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1935).

Results with Below Average I.Q.

Increase in I.Q.	1b
Arithmetic Achievement	1b
Language Achievement	1b, 4a
Reading Achievement	3b
	<u>1</u>

The results would seem to indicate that, in general, non-certified teachers and graduates with a GPA below 2.50 are the most effective teachers. Fattu, writing in the Elementary Principal's Journal, summed up teacher characteristics and their relationships to effectiveness. His summary follows:

Intelligence and Success....In general, there appears to be only a slight relationship between intelligence and rated success of an instructor.

Knowledge of Subject Matter and Success.... Except for occasional studies in mathematics, chemistry, and physics, research findings report little relationship.

Professional Knowledge and Success. It appears that a teacher's rated effectiveness at first increases rather rapidly with experience, and then levels off at five years or beyond....

Cultural Background and Success. There is no substantial evidence that cultural background is significantly related to teaching effectiveness....

Socioeconomic Status and Success. The relationship of socioeconomic status (as measured by such devices as the Sims Socioeconomic Scales) to criteria of instructor effectiveness is low....

Sex and Success. No particular differences have been shown when the relative effectiveness of men and women teachers have been compared.

¹C. P. Shim, "A Study of the Cumulative Effect of Four Teacher Characteristics on Achievement of Elementary School Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, LIX (September 1965), pp. 33-34.

Marital Status and Success. Despite some prejudice to the contrary, there appears to be no evidence that married teachers are in any way inferior to single teachers.

Teaching Aptitude and Success. Results obtained from measures designed to predict teaching ability show great disparity....

Teaching Attitude and Success. Attitude toward teachers and teaching as indicated by the Yeager Scale, which was devised for its measurement, seems to bear a small but positive relationship to teacher success measured in terms of pupil gains.

Job Interest and Success....Correlations resulting from the use of several standard interest tests either cluster around zero, or are so inconsistent as to render such tests of doubtful value as predictors of teaching success....

Special Abilities and Success. Such instructor factors as empathy, professional maturity, general knowledge, mental ability, and social adjustment have been identified through factor analysis by various investigators. The statistical analyses so far reported, however, suffer from inadequacies of criteria, testing instruments, or number of cases.¹

The picture of teacher evaluation looks gloomy indeed judging from the preceding material. All is not negative, however. Some positive results follow. Rostker² found statistically significant coefficients of correlation among twelve tests of intelligence, knowledge of content, mental health and adjustment, and various

¹Nicholas Fattu, "Research on Teacher Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November 1963), pp. 21-221.

²L. E. Rostker, "The Measurement of Teaching Ability, Study No. 1," Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (September 1945), pp. 6-51.

attitudes, with a pupil gain criterion. Jones¹ found from the use of the discriminate function a significant difference between the group of good teachers and of average teachers in terms of the profile of the group means, with the greater differences found in (1) grade-point averages in professional courses, (2) grade-point averages in courses related to the major, (3) flexibility in numerical ability, (4) dispositional rigidity as measured by an alphabet text, and (5) a general activity personality variable. Knox² found a low positive relationship between efficiency ratings and various situational factors. The most satisfied received the highest ratings, with the most dissatisfied receiving the least satisfactory rating. Gowan,³ in assessing the correlation of (1) training ratings, (2) tests, and (3) principals' ratings, found a significant correlation between training ratings and field ratings, and between class evaluation and field evaluation. McCullough⁴ found a significant difference in attitude between those rated good and those rated poor. Daniel Solomon found these results in working with evening college courses in introductory American Government:

¹Margaret Jones, "Analysis of Certain Aspects of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (December 1956), pp. 103-180.

²William Knox, "A Study of the Relationships of Certain Environmental Factors to Teaching Success," Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (December 1956), pp. 95-151.

³J. C. Gowan, "A Follow-up Study of Teaching Candidates," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (May 1961), pp. 353-355.

⁴James McCullough, "A Study of Teacher Attitude and Teacher Rating," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968).

Classroom behavior of twenty-four teachers of evening college courses in introductory American Government was measured with tape recordings and with observers' ratings of two class sessions, student descriptive questionnaires, and teachers' questionnaires. Factor analysis of these measures produced eight factors, which were then related to student's learning (measured by pre- and Post-tests) and to student evaluations. Learning of facts was significantly related to teacher 'clarity,' expressiveness,' and to 'lecturing.' Gains in comprehension related significantly to teacher 'energy,' 'flamboyance,' and a moderate position on a permissives vs. control continuum. Students' evaluations related significantly to 'clarity,' 'expressiveness,' and 'warmth.'¹

Hall,² in his article "Professional Preparation and Teacher Efficiency," found that the number of hours a teacher had taken in professional education was significantly related to pupil achievement in reading and spelling, and that the average pupil gain was higher for certified personnel than for non-certified personnel. Lupone,³ in a study which used principal evaluations in comparing provisionally certified and permanently certified elementary teachers in selected school districts in New York, found that the permanently certified teachers were rated significantly higher in the following areas: (1) preparation, planning, and management, (2) subject matter, (3) instructional techniques, and

¹Daniel Solomon, "Teacher Behavior and Student Learning," Journal of Educational Psychology, LV (February 1964), pp. 23-30.

²H. O. Hall, "Professional Preparation and Teacher Efficiency," Journal of Teacher Education, XV (April 1964), pp. 72-76.

³Orlando Lupone, "A Comparison of Provisionally Certified and Permanently Certified Elementary School Teachers in Selected School Districts in New York State," Journal of Educational Research, LV (October 1961), pp. 53-63.

(4) pupil-teacher relationships. Cooper,¹ in comparing two plans of teacher education--one of concentrated methods courses, the other, of spreading the methods courses out over the four years--found, using principals' evaluations, that the spreading of the methods courses produced better teachers as far as the following qualities were concerned: (1) human relations, (2) personal characteristics, and (3) planning the teaching of elementary subjects. Ackerman² did a review of many studies concerning teacher competence and pupil change. A summary of his study follows:

<u>Types of Criteria</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Age of Teacher	Rolfe	No
	Brookover	Yes up to 38
Attitude of the Teacher to Teachers and Teaching	Rostker	Yes
	La Duke	No
	Rolfe	No
	Brookover	No
	Gotham	No
	Hellfritzsch	Yes
Experience of the Teacher	Rolfe	No
	Davis	Yes
	Betts	Yes
Intelligence of the Teacher	Rostker	Yes
	La Duke	Yes
	Rolfe	No
	Gotham	No
Personality of the Teacher	Rostker	Yes
	Gotham	No
	Rolfe	No

¹James Cooper, "A Comparison of Two Plans of Teacher Education," Journal of Educational Research, LI (May 1958), pp. 643-658.

²Walter Ackerman, "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change," Teachers College Record, XXIV (1954), pp. 273-289.

<u>Types of Criteria</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Social Attitudes of the Teacher	Rostker	Yes
	Gotham	No
	Rolfe	Yes
Teacher-Pupil Relationships	La Duke	Yes Neg.
	Brookover	Yes Neg.

As one can readily observe from the preceding summary, there are studies which find correlation of the several criteria with pupil growth, and there are those which do not. Ryans' study involved about 1,700 schools in 450 school systems, and about 6,000 teachers. He developed three patterns of teacher behavior.

Ryans' Patterns of Teacher Behavior¹

Pattern X _O	Warm, understanding, friendly vs. aloof, egocentric, restricted teacher behavior.
Pattern Y _O	Responsible, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher behavior.
Pattern Z _O	Stimulating, imaginative, surgent vs. dull, routine, teaching behavior.

He found that among elementary school teachers, X_O, Y_O, and Z_O patterns were positively correlated, and each seemed to be correlated with pupil behavior.

One can readily observe that there is no consensus of research about the validity of any rating device in the area of teacher effectiveness. This author chose two, which are quite different--principal evaluation and pupil growth.

¹David Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960), 460 pages.

Principal Evaluation

One of the early and classic studies done in this area was by Wilbur Brookover¹ who found no correlation between principal evaluations and pupil achievement. Lines² and Lawler,³ whose studies were previously mentioned, concurred with these results. Howsam writing in The National Elementary Principal, made the following observation:

Ratings by supervisors are most common in practice and have been the subject of much reported research. The findings lend little support to the practice, however....Further, ratings tend to have a low correlation with student gains. Frequently it has been suggested that administrative personnel base their evaluation on factors which have but little relation to instructional competence.⁴

On the other hand, Hawkins found:

School-associated groups, i.e., principals, district administrators, peer teachers, non-teaching staff members, and informed teachers, generally agree on which elementary teachers are outstanding. There is substantial agreement in the identification of outstanding teachers by formal evaluation processes, the informal evaluation process, and current salary determination practices.⁵

¹Wilbur Brookover, op.cit.

²Leo Lins, op. cit.

³Eugene Lawler, op. cit.

⁴Robert Howsam, "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore," The National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November 1963), p. 17.

⁵Edward Hawkins, "Objective and Subjective Identification of Outstanding Elementary Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, pp. 344-346.

Rostker,¹ Knox,² and Gowan,³ whose studies were previously reviewed, did find significant correlations between principals' ratings and other criteria of effectiveness, including pupil change. Ellinger,⁴ in a study of the procedures of evaluation used in Maryland, found that the most significant criteria in order were; professional growth, pupil-teacher report, knowledge of subject matter, planning, and variety of teaching methods. His recommendation was: "The evaluation of teaching should be the responsibility of a single person, preferably the building principal." Hall⁵ found that the evaluation of teachers is the responsibility of the administration. Fattu made the following observation about assessing teacher behavior:

Overall administrative opinion constitutes the most widely used single measure of teacher competence. Available studies have shown in general that teachers can be reliably rated by administrative and supervisory personnel (usually with correlations of .70 or above).

¹L. E. Rostker, op. cit.

²William Knox, op. cit.

³J. C. Gowan, op. cit.

⁴William Ellinger, "A Study of the Procedures Used to Evaluate Professional School Personnel in the Public Schools of the State of Maryland," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1958).

⁵James Hall, "Selected Aspects of Teacher Evaluation in the Public School Systems in the State of Montana as Compared with Public School Systems throughout the United States," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Montana, 1967).

⁶N. A. Fattu, op. cit., p. 24.

Arthur Combs writes;

What makes a professional worker is a person whose judgment can be relied upon. It is this quality of judgment that separates professional work from mechanical. If it does not exist, there is no profession. Only the profession can judge its effectiveness.

Can we judge ourselves? Of course we can. We make such judgments constantly. Almost all of us can and do make judgments about our colleagues, often with a high degree of accuracy. We know who the good teachers are. Insisting that we cannot judge serves only to frighten the public. Who wants to send his child to a school where the teachers don't know what good teaching is?

Are professional judgments fair? That depends upon how professional are the professional workers who make them. This much is certain. They are more likely to be fair than the objective criteria some have sought as substitutes. Human beings are fallible to be sure. While professional judgment lacks the precision we might like, it is still far more accurate than objective measures of the wrong things! The objective criteria many researchers have been seeking are mere samples of the process and cannot substitute for it.

...A profession depends upon judgment. Without judgment it has no reason for existing. Surrendering the judgment of good teaching to an accumulation of objective criteria denies the very basis of professional work and dehumanizes the profession. Human judgment is fallible to be sure, but less so than the false security of numbers that measure things which don't matter.¹

Therefore, because it has been found to be significant upon occasion, because it is professional, and because it is "real," principal evaluation was used as one criterion in this study.

¹Arthur Combs, op. cit.

Pupil Change as Measured by Achievement

Robert Howsam, writing about teacher evaluation, notes:

There is only one fully defensible criterion for judging teacher effectiveness; the ultimate criterion is result. Assessing teacher competence on the basis of result involves almost insurmountable difficulties, however.¹

One criterion of results with pupils is the standardized achievement test. There are many who advocate this type of measurement. There are also many who point out the danger of this type of measurement. Rudman points out that there are three levels of education: (1) educational programs; ie., the textbook approach, (2) education services; ie., enrichment, and (3) values. He further states:

Furthermore, only one-third of the curriculum at this point can be measured, and that one-third consists of those subjects which are the educational program.²

In the same vein, Elizabeth Drews relates:

Unfortunately, most achievement tests available today measure only a small part of what we hope to reach in school. Furthermore, the grade level test is not adequate for all children in a given grade. Too frequently the test can tell us if certain basic facts

¹Robert Howsam, op. cit., p. 15.

²Herbert Rudman, "How Good are Standardized Achievement Tests?" National Elementary Principal, XLIV (November 1964), pp. 32-38.

were learned, but does not help us discover if the child can do the higher level tests, integrative, critical, and creative thinking.¹

Weiner² did a study which brought into question the validity of difference scores as measures of individual pupil growth. He suggests that such scores have only some slight validity, not enough to be used alone as the basis for important judgments about individual pupils. In spite of the problems suggested with this type of evaluation, it was used in this study as a measure of pupil growth.

Use of Rating Instruments

Review of the literature revealed a great number of studies which utilized rating instruments in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Biddle found that, "The vast majority of studies reported on competency have made use of rating forms for one purpose or another."³

¹Elizabeth Drews, Instructor, LXXV (April 1966), p. 20.

²M. Weiner, "Difficulties in the Use of Achievement Test Gains as Measures of Growth," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (April 1964), pp. 781-786.

³Bruce Biddle, op. cit., p. 26.

Representative of the studies which utilized rating instruments were of Almy and Sorenson,¹ Reavis,² Hoover,³ Ryans,⁴ and Haberman.⁵

Reavis studied the rating devices used by over one hundred city school systems in determining merit based on demonstrated competency. The major outcome of that study was the production of a classification system of mutually exclusive tests of rating methods. These included five types of rating methods which were designated as (1) check scales, (2) characterization reports, (3) guided-comment reports, (4) descriptive reports, and (5) ranking reports. Reavis⁶ reported the following distribution in the use of these various rating methods by the school districts surveyed:

<u>Rating Method</u>	<u>Precent Using</u>
Check Scales	75
Guided Comments	31
Characterization Reports	24
Descriptive Reports	6
Ranking Reports	1

¹H. V. Almy and Herbert Sorenson, "A Teacher-Rating Scale of Determined Reliability and Validity," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (1930), pp. 179-186.

²W. C. Reavis, "Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems," Supplementary Educational Monographs No. 59, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945), 65 pages.

³K. H. Hoover, "A Survey of Student Teacher Effectiveness," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (October 1961), pp. 166-169.

⁴David Ryans, op. cit.

⁵M. Haberman, "A Comparison of Interns with Regular First Year Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, LIX (October 1965), pp. 92-94.

⁶W. C. Reavis, op. cit.

Reavis also recorded the number of scale values used in various check scales studies, and found that a five-point scale was a median of sorts, representing as it did forty-two percent of the check scales analyzed. This was substantiated by a report of the NEA,¹ which was released in 1964, in which it was found that the multiple factor check scale was the type of instrument most often used by principals in the evaluation of their teachers (80.4 percent), and that the majority used a five-point scale (48.1 percent), with the next closest being a four-point scale (19.2 percent). It was also reported that many of the check scales had the following general areas: (1) Personal Characteristics, (2) Instructional Skills, (3) Teacher-Staff Relationships, (4) Professional Attitudes, and (5) Community Relationships. These areas were deemed important to principals' evaluations.

In his comprehensive study "Characteristics of Teachers," completed in 1960, Ryans² developed and utilized a rating instrument which he labeled the "Classroom Observation Record." In its initial form, it listed forty specific dimensions of teacher behavior and six dimensions of pupil behavior. The form of the "Record" employed during the major portion of Ryans' research utilized a seven-interval scale and incorporated a revised list of eighteen teacher and four pupil behavior dimensions. Haberman³ utilized Ryans' "Classroom Observation Record" in his study

¹The National Education Association, Evaluation of Classroom Teacher, The American Research Association Research Report 1964-B14, (Research Division, NEA: Washington, D.C., December 1964).

²David Ryans, op. cit.

³M. Haberman, op. cit.

which was completed in 1965. The research involved an evaluation of the intern teaching program at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, and focused on teaching behavior of interns and regular first-year teachers. Procedures employed included the use of a team of three trained observers who used Ryans' "Record" and rated the teachers on each of eighteen characteristics related to teaching behavior.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter has seven purposes. The primary purpose was to describe the design of the study. Other purposes included: a description of the samples selected, the construction of the questionnaires, the nature of the data collected, the statement of the specific hypotheses that were developed, and the statement of other questions which were raised but not developed into hypotheses. It was also the purpose of this chapter to describe the preliminary treatment of the data in preparation of the testing of the hypotheses.

The problem was to compare the graduates of two different teacher training programs offered by Michigan State University, namely, the Elementary Intern Program and the Regular Teacher Education Program. These two programs were compared using two distinct criteria for measuring effectiveness.

The first of these criteria was effectiveness as determined by principals' ratings. This criterion was also used to attempt to measure the difference in effectiveness between married and single teachers and to compare the five EIP training centers.

The second criterion was effectiveness as determined by pupil academic progress as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Two other important areas were covered by this study. They included: the analysis of certain situational data concerning the Michigan State graduates in such areas as employment in relationship

to where they received their clinical preparation, type of school in which they were teaching, as reflected by racial and SES composition, type of grouping procedures used, and number who remained in the same school following the 1967-68 academic year. The last area of concern was an analysis of a survey instrument which had been submitted to the graduates in the study asking for their opinion of their own competencies and where they felt these strengths had originated.

Population and Sample for the Principal's Evaluative Questionnaire

The graduates of the academic year 1965-66 were chosen as the population for this phase of the study. The year 1965-66 was chosen because it was felt that in the area of principal evaluation for effectiveness, it was necessary for the graduates to have been on the job for a period of time which would have allowed them some time to demonstrate their teaching ability. Furthermore, because of the tenure requirements in Michigan, the first two years may be the ones which are most likely to command the closest scrutiny by the building principals who must make recommendations concerning tenure to the central office.

The Elementary Intern Program Graduates

The directors of each of the five Intern Centers operating in 1965-66 were approached. They supplied a list of their graduates of that year. This information was followed up by the use of the Michigan State University Placement Bureau, the Michigan State University Alumni

Office, and the Michigan Department of Education Certification Office in an effort to trace as many of the graduates to their 1967-68 teaching positions as possible. In spite of these efforts, a fairly large percentage of the graduates were unable to be located. (See Table I.)

The total population of graduates from the Elementary Intern Program Centers in existence in 1965-66, which included: Battle Creek, Bay City, Grand Rapids, Macomb, and Port Huron, numbered 107. The 107 included fifteen males and ninety-two females. The males were not included in the study because of their small number, which was not large enough to be significant in itself, but was too large not to have some effect upon the total outcome. Included in the study was every female graduate of the 1965-66 Elementary Intern Program that could be identified who was still teaching in a regular K-6 program in a Michigan public school during the 1967-68 academic year. This number totaled fifty. For the EIP graduates not included in the study, see Table I.

The Regular Teacher Education Program Graduates

A sample of the 1965-66 regular program graduates was selected from the rolls of the student teaching office. The total population on these rolls included 1,964, of which 431 were regular elementary candidates. This 431 included 386 females and forty-five males. Again, the males were eliminated from the study. It was reasoned that because many of the graduates from the regular program would have their permanent residence located in a state other than Michigan, and that in any case it would be much more difficult to find these graduates, a random selection of 125 would be made from the student teaching rolls

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1965-66 FEMALE EIP
POPULATION NOT IN THE STUDY

Reason	Number	Percent of Population	Percent Located
Teaching out of state	10	10.9	14.1
Teaching in non- public schools	0
Teaching in junior high schools	2	2.2	2.8
Teaching in Special Education	3	3.3	4.2
Not teaching	6	6.5	8.5
Unable to locate*	21	23.1
Total	42	46.0	29.6

*This does not indicate that these graduates were not teaching in public schools in Michigan, but merely that it was not possible to trace them.

for the initial sample. Again, the facilities of the Michigan State Placement Bureau, the Michigan State Alumni Office, and the Michigan Department of Education Certification Office were used. In this instance, an even higher percentage of graduates was unable to be reached. (See Table II.) Included in the study was every female graduate of the 1965-66 Regular Teacher Education Program who had been included in the random sample that could be identified, who was still

teaching in a regular K-6 program in a Michigan public school during the 1967-68 academic year. This number totaled sixty-two. For RTEP graduates not included in the study, see Table II.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1965-66 REGULAR TEACHER
EDUCATION PROGRAM SAMPLE NOT INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Reason	Number	Percent of Sample	Percent Located
Teaching out of state	11	8.6	12.9
Teaching in non- public schools	2	1.6	2.4
Teaching in junior high schools	7	5.6	8.2
Teaching in Special Education	3	2.4	3.5
Not teaching	6	4.8	7.1
Unable to locate*	40	32.0
Total	69	55.0	34.1

*This does not indicate that these graduates were not teaching in public schools in Michigan, but merely that it was not possible to trace them.

Development of the Principal's
Evaluative Questionnaire

An important phase of this study was the development of an instrument adequate to secure that information identified as essential. An attempt was made to construct instruments which were easily and clearly understood, simple and convenient to answer, organized for quick and accurate evaluation, and in the case of the principal's evaluative questionnaire, as near as possible to that which is most commonly used in everyday practice.

Following a review of the literature concerning principal evaluation, it was determined that the majority (75 per cent) used a check scale, and that the most common type of check scale was based upon five points.¹ After reviewing many such instruments used in Michigan, the instrument which was used in the study was constructed. This instrument was then submitted to several principals, in order to establish its range and validity, and to solicit their comments. Each principal was asked to use the instrument to evaluate several of his teachers from several grade levels without identifying the teachers. Upon return of the questionnaire from the several principals it was determined from their evaluations that the range was sufficient, and that, in their opinion, the instrument was valid. Several minor changes in wording were made at their suggestions.

The evaluative questionnaire contained eighteen teacher competencies grouped within five major categories. They are as follows:

¹W. C. Reavis, op. cit.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Health and Vitality
2. Personal Appearance
3. Friendliness
4. Flexibility
5. Sincerity
6. Enthusiasm

INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS

7. Constructive Control of Pupils
8. Provisions for Individual Differences
9. Evidence of Pupil Achievement
10. Knowledge of Subject Matter

TEACHER-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

11. Rapport with Co-workers
12. Willingness to Seek and Accept Advice
13. Relationship with the Administration

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE

14. Ethical Attitudes
15. Evidence of Leadership
16. Evidence of Professional Growth

COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

17. Willingness to Participate in Activities
within the Community Outside of School Hours
18. Ability to Meet and Work with Parents

In addition to the evaluative section of the questionnaire, there were two sections which supplied information. The first of these sections was concerned with personal information relative to the teacher. This information included marital status, number of years in the building, whether the teacher had remained in the building following the 1967-68 academic year, and if not, the reason why, and whether the teacher had procured her clinical experience in the system and in the evaluating principal's building. The second part was concerned with the school system, and included questions regarding the racial and economic composition of the school, the type of instructional grouping used, and the frequency with which achievement tests were administered.

Effectiveness as Determined
by Pupil Change

Pupil change in this study was determined by the use of standardized achievement tests. It was felt that the achievement data, like the principals' survey data, should be collected from the natural school setting. This procedure called for using the scores that could be obtained from the tests which were regularly administered by the school system.

In order to eliminate cultural differences between school systems and among individual schools within a given system, the teachers were compared on an intraschool basis. That is, the best scores of their students were compared to the test scores of the students of the other teachers teaching the same grade in the same building. In order to eliminate the

problem of the students' so-called natural ability, only those buildings which used heterogeneous (randomized ability) grouping were included in the study. These comparative scores were then converted by statistical means to Standard T scores.¹ The resultant Standard T scores were then used for the comparison of the groups.

The Graduates' Opinion Survey

The graduates' opinion questionnaire included four areas of concern for the RTEP graduates, and the same four plus a question concerned with the internship were included for the EIP graduates. The first of these areas were concerned with having the graduates choose from the same list of eighteen teacher competencies which were on the principal's evaluative list those three in which they felt that they had the greatest strength.

They were then asked to list in order the three scores of competency which they felt contributed to this strength. The sources of self-identified competency for the RTEP graduates were as follows:

- A. Professional Education Courses
- B. Subject Courses
- C. Supervising Teacher (Student Teaching)
- D. College Coordinator (Student Teaching)
- E. Teaching Associates
- F. Principal or Building Supervisor
- G. Yourself
- H. Other (Specify)

¹N. M. Downie, Basic Statistical Methods, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 65-66.

The sources of self-identified competency for the EIP graduates were the same as for the RTEP graduates with the exception of the addition of Intern Consultant (Internship) as item I.

The graduates were then asked to rank in order the three competencies which they felt were most important to success in teaching.

They were then asked the following question: "Do you feel that the training which you received at Michigan State University adequately prepared you for your career in teaching?" They were also asked to comment on their feelings in relation to the above question.

An added item for the EIP graduates only asked the following question: "If you had to start your program over, would you have participated in the Intern Program or the Regular Teacher Education Program?" They were also asked to comment on their feelings in relation to the above question.

Hypotheses and Related Questions

The following null hypotheses were developed.

Hypothesis I: There are no significant differences between the graduates of the Elementary Intern Program and the graduates of the Regular Teacher Education Program, according to each individual item of the principal's evaluative questionnaire.

Hypothesis II: There are no significant differences between married teachers and single teachers, according to each individual item of the principal's evaluative questionnaire.

Hypothesis III: There are no significant differences in effectiveness between the graduates of the Elementary Intern Program and the graduates of the Regular Teacher Education Program, according to pupil change as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Several timely questions were raised, which were not developed into hypotheses. They are as follows:

1. Are there significant differences between the groups concerning the type of school in which they are teaching, according to race or SES?
2. Are there significant differences between the groups concerning their employment in relationship to where they received their clinical preparation?
3. Are there significant differences between the groups concerning their remaining in their 1967-68 positions?
4. Are there significant differences between the groups concerning their attitudes toward the type and success of training which they received from Michigan State University?

Processing, Analyzing, and Reporting of Data

The next step in this study was the processing, analyzing, and reporting of information collected.

All questionnaires were first manually tabulated, categorized, and marked appropriately. In this process they were also scanned for completeness, comments, and divergence.

After rejecting those questionnaires which could not be used, data on those retained were tabulated.

All data were subjected to a statistical treatment using Analysis of Variance as the technique to establish significance. Rank-order correlations were determined by use of the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient.¹

¹N. M. Downie, op. cit., p. 206.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was conducted to gather data relating to Michigan State University elementary teacher graduates and their activities in the field; to compare the demonstrated teaching competencies of the graduates of the EIP and the RTEP as reported by their building principals and as ascertained by the achievement of their pupils; and, to attempt to identify the sources responsible for the relative strengths of the graduates of the two programs.

The results of the study were divided into four main topics. First, the data collected concerning type of school in which teachers served, situational location in relationship to where teachers received their clinical preparation, number of teachers still in teaching following the 1967-68 academic year, and reasons for leaving their position. Second, analysis of the data collected from the principals' evaluations, in the following areas: a comparison of the difference in reported competency between EIP graduates and RTEP graduates, a comparison between married and single graduates, and a comparison of the five Intern Centers. Third, a comparison of the EIP graduates and the RTEP graduates using the criterion of pupil gain. Finally, an analysis of the feedback from all the Michigan State University graduates concerning their insights regarding their teaching competencies and their preparation for a teaching career.

The principal's evaluative questionnaire was submitted to the principals of all of the graduates in the study. The number sent included fifty for the EIP graduates and sixty-two for the RTEP graduates. After three weeks, a reminder letter was sent to those who had not returned the questionnaires. Forty-eight questionnaires were returned by the principals of the EIP graduates, which represented a 96 per cent return. Forty-four questionnaires were returned by the principals of the RTEP graduates, which represented an 87 per cent return.

The teacher self-evaluative questionnaire was sent to seventy-four graduates who were still teaching in the same schools as in 1967-68. This number included thirty-seven EIP graduates and thirty-seven RTEP graduates. After two weeks, a follow-up letter was sent to all of the graduates. The returns from the EIP graduates numbered twenty-eight, which was 76 per cent. The returns from the RTEP graduates numbered twenty-three, which was 62 per cent.

Analysis of General Data

Several categories of a general nature were explored during the course of the study. The first of these was the type of school in which the teacher served, according to racial composition, SES composition, and grouping procedures. While it might be hypothesized that due to the location of the EIP training centers, a larger proportion of these graduates might be teaching in the inner-city, such was not the case. Of the 102 Michigan State University graduates in the study, ninety-one were teaching in all-white schools; six were teaching in mixed schools; and five were teaching in all-Negro schools. All-white schools were defined as those

with a less than 5 per cent non-white population. All-Negro schools were those with less than a 5 per cent white population, and mixed schools were those in between. There was very little difference between EIP graduates and RTEP graduates in regard to teaching in any of the three racial categories.

In regard to the SES factor, five teachers were in upper-class schools, fifty-five in middle-class schools, and eleven in lower-class schools. The remaining twenty-seven were in mixed schools. Again, there was very little difference between the EIP graduates and the RTEP graduates in any of the various SES categories. From these data, one might conclude that the graduates of Michigan State University are not gravitating to the inner-city. Perhaps the recent press for inner-city teachers and the programs designed to promote the idea of inner-city teaching have not yet taken effect.

TABLE III
RACIAL COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS
IN WHICH GRADUATES SERVED

Racial Composition*	EIP		RTEP		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	42	87.5	49	90.7	91	89.2
Negro	2	4.2	3	5.6	5	4.9
Mixed	4	8.3	2	2.7	6	5.9

*White Schools, less than 5% Negro
Negro Schools, less than 5% White
Mixed Schools, greater than 5% of each race

TABLE IV

SES COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS
IN WHICH GRADUATES SERVED

SES Composition*	EIP		RTEP		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Upper	1	2.0	4	7.4	5	4.9
Middle	27	56.3	32	59.2	59	57.8
Lower	5	10.2	6	11.1	11	10.8
<u>Mixed</u>						
Upper-Middle	3	5.6	3	2.9
Upper-Lower	2	4.2	2	2.0
Middle-Lower	10	20.8	8	14.8	18	17.7
All Three	3	6.3	1	1.9	4	3.9

*Approximations as reported by the principals

In the area of grouping procedures, it was reported that nineteen of the 102 graduates were teaching in schools which used homogeneous grouping. This number represented 18.6 per cent. However, when this number was examined by race and SES, it was found that homogeneous grouping was used in a disproportionately large percentage of Negro and lower SES schools. (See Table V.) This percentage must be approached with caution, however, because of the small number of Negro schools in the study. Of the mixed schools, 33 per cent reported homogeneous grouping; of the lower class schools, 45 per cent reported homogeneous grouping. It was also noted that a disproportionately large percentage of EIP graduates taught in homogeneous schools.

TABLE V

GROUPING PROCEDURES
(Homogeneous)

School Composition*	EIP		RTEP		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Racial</u>						
White	9	21.4	6	11.1	15	16.3
Negro	1	50.0	1	33.3	2	40.0
Mixed	2	50.0	2	33.0
<u>SES</u>						
Middle-Class	6	22.2	5	15.6	11	18.6
Lower-Class	4	80.0	1	16.7	5	45.5
Middle-Lower-Class	2	20.0	1	12.5	3	16.7
<u>All Schools</u>	12	25.0	7	13.0	19	18.6

*SES with no homogeneous grouping were left out.

The second category of general data was concerned with the situational deployment following graduation. (See Table VI.) In this area there was a significant difference between the EIP and RTEP graduates. This difference was not unexpected because of the nature of the EIP program which offers the clinical preparation in the home area of the graduates. Of the forty-two EIP graduates, twenty-seven were employed in the same system in which they had done their clinical preparation, with seventeen of these being employed in the same school in which they received their clinical preparation. These numbers represent 56.3 and 35.4 per cent,

TABLE VI
SITUATIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF GRADUATES

Employment in Relation to Clinical Preparation	EIP		RTEP		Difference ¹	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Same System	27	56.3	11	20.3	16	36.2 ²
Same School	17	35.4	4	7.4	13	28.0 ²

¹All differences favor Intern graduates.

²Differences in per cent significant at the .01 level.

respectively. The graduates of RTEP were much lower in this area, with only eleven of the fifty-two graduates teaching in the same system in which they had received their clinical preparation, while only four were in the same school in which they received their clinical preparation. This represents 20.3 and 7.4 per cent, respectively. The difference in percentage was significant at the .01 level in both cases. This significant difference would indicate that those school systems which participate in the EIP are reaping the benefits of this participation in terms of personnel recruitment for their systems.

The third category of general concern was in the area of retention within the same school. Of the 102 graduates, seventy-four remained in the same school following the 1967-68 academic year. These seventy-four were equally divided between EIP and RTEP graduates, with each group having thirty-seven. None of the differences were significant at the .05 level. Of those who left their 1967-68 teaching positions, all did

TABLE VII

GRADUATES LEAVING THEIR
1967-68 POSITIONS AND REASONS

Reasons for Leaving	EIP		RTEP		Difference		Significant
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Moved	5	10.4	13	24.1	8	13.7	No
Family	4	8.3	2	3.7	2	4.6	No
Transfer within system	1	1.9	1	1.9	No
Didn't like teaching	1	1.9	1	1.9	No
Deceased	1	2.1	1	2.1	No
Total	9	18.7	17	31.5	8	12.8	No

so at their own volition, and all of the graduates in the study who were eligible were granted tenure. Of those who left their former positions, only one of the 102 left because she did not like teaching. The rest left for a variety of reasons, the greatest number leaving because they moved from the district (the majority of these because of the transfer of their husbands).

Rating of the Graduates by Their Principals

Principals judged the graduates in each of eighteen teacher competencies designated. The rating system used was a five-point check scale which ranged from "Excellent" (one point) to "Poor" (five points). The

resultant ratings were used in three areas of the study--to compare the EIP and RTEP graduates, to compare the married teachers vs. the single teachers, and to compare the five EIP centers.

The Comparison of EIP and RTEP Graduates

The overall mean of the eighteen competencies for the EIP graduates was 1.91, while the RTEP graduates' corresponding score was 1.93. Both of these scores were slightly better than "Good." The EIP graduates' mean scores on each of the categories ranged from 1.42 on the category of sincerity to 2.37 on the category of leadership which, even though it was the lowest on the scale, was well above average. The RTEP graduates' mean scores on each of the categories ranged from 1.63 on the category of friendliness to 2.12 on the category of evidence of pupil growth. It will be noticed that the range of scores for RTEP is much narrower than the range for the EIP graduates. The lowest score of 2.12 for the RTEP graduates was just slightly below "Good." One might conclude that from the principals' point of view, both groups of the Michigan State University graduates are doing very well in the field. (See Tables VIII and IX.)

The principals rated interns higher than the regular graduates on eight of the eighteen categories. These differences ranged from .03 to .27. The RTEP graduates were rated higher in nine of the eighteen categories, with the differences ranging from .04 to .31. The remaining category showed no difference in comparative rating. (See Table X.)

TABLE VIII
PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF EIP GRADUATES
ON EACH OF EIGHTEEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	1	2	<u>Rating</u> 3	4	5	Weighted Total	Mean	Rank-Order
Health and Vitality	17	19	10	1	1	94	1.96	10
Personal Appearance	14	23	7	4	0	97	2.02	14.5
Friendliness	22	17	8	0	1	85	1.77	5
Flexibility	16	18	13	2	0	96	2.00	12
Sincerity	31	14	3	0	0	68	1.42	1
Enthusiasm	27	14	5	2	0	78	1.63	2
Constructive Control of Pupils	18	25	3	2	0	85	1.77	5
Provisions for Individual Differences	14	21	12	1	0	96	2.00	12
Evidence of Pupil Growth	13	21	13	1	0	98	2.04	16
Knowledge of Subject Matter	17	24	6	1	0	87	1.81	7
Rapport with Co-workers	19	19	8	1	1	90	1.87	8.5
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	18	22	5	2	1	90	1.87	8.5

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	1	2	<u>Rating</u> 3	4	5	Weighted Total	Mean	Rank-Order
Relationship with the Administration	23	19	4	0	1	78	1.65	3
Ethical Attitude	23	15	9	1	0	84	1.77	5
Leadership	8	20	15	4	1	114	2.37	18
Professional Growth	16	18	12	1	1	97	2.02	14.5
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	11	19	12	4	1	105	2.26	17
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	16	16	12	2	0	92	2.00	12
Totals	323	345	156	29	8	1634	1.91	
Precentage	38	41	19	3	1			

TABLE IX
PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF RTEP GRADUATES
ON EACH OF EIGHTEEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	1	2	<u>Rating</u> 3	4	5	Weighted Total	Mean	Rank-Order
Health and Vitality	22	23	8	1	0	96	1.77	7
Personal Appearance	26	18	8	1	1	95	1.76	6
Friendliness	29	17	4	1	1	88	1.63	1
Flexibility	22	20	10	2	0	100	1.85	9
Sincerity	30	14	8	1	1	91	1.69	3
Enthusiasm	25	21	6	2	0	93	1.71	4
Constructive Control of Pupils	16	22	13	3	0	111	2.06	15
Provisions for Individual Differences	15	24	10	4	1	114	2.10	17
Evidence of Pupil Growth	13	23	15	1	1	113	2.12	18
Knowledge of Subject Matter	18	24	10	1	0	100	1.89	10
Rapport with Co-workers	26	16	8	3	1	99	1.83	8
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	21	21	9	1	2	104	1.93	11

TABLE IX (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	1	2	<u>Rating</u> 3	4	5	Weighted Total	Mean	Rank-Order
Relationship with the Administration	30	17	4	2	1	89	1.65	2
Ethical Attitude	28	16	7	2	1	94	1.73	5
Leadership	16	22	12	4	0	108	2.00	12
Professional Growth	15	24	12	2	0	107	2.02	13
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	14	19	18	1	0	110	2.09	16
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	17	22	9	5	0	108	2.03	14
Totals	383	365	171	37	10	1824	1.93	
Percentage	40	38	18	4	1			

Statistical comparisons using an analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant difference in the principals' rating of the two groups; therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference between the EIP and RTEP graduates according to principal evaluation was accepted for all eighteen of the listed competencies. (See Table XI.) The above data were also subjected to further statistical analysis in the form of the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient to ascertain if there was a significant correlation between the rank-orders. The above analysis generated a correlation of .73 which was significant at the .001 level. This high correlation points to the overall similarity of the two groups. (See Table X.)

The Comparison of Married and Single Teachers

There has been much written about the efficiency of married teachers as opposed to single teachers. Some of this research was reviewed in Chapter II. No significant difference was found in the percentage of EIP and RTEP graduates who were married, the percentages being 70.8 for EIP and 74.1 for RTEP.

The principals rated single teachers higher in twelve of the eighteen categories, with these differences ranging from .01 to .26. The married teachers were given comparatively higher ratings in five of the categories, with the remaining category showing no difference.

TABLE X

DIFFERENCES IN AVERAGE RATINGS AND RANK-ORDERS ASSIGNED EIP AND RTEP GRADUATES
IN EACH OF EIGHTEEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES ADJUDGED

Teacher Competencies	MEAN		Differ- ence	RANK-ORDER		Differ- ence	Differ- ence
	EIP	RTEP		EIP	RTEP		
Health and Vitality	1.96	1.77	.19*	10	7	3	9
Personal Apperance	2.02	1.76	.26*	14.5	6	8.5	72.25
Friendliness	1.77	1.63	.14*	5	1	4	16
Flexibility	2.00	1.85	.15*	12	9	3	9
Sincerity	1.42	1.69	.27	1	2	1	1
Enthusiasm	1.63	1.71	.08	2	3.5	1.5	2.25
Constructive Control of Pupils	1.77	2.06	.29	5	14.5	9.5	90.25
Provisions for Individual Differences	2.00	2.10	.10	12	17	5	25
Evidence of Pupil Growth	2.04	2.12	.08	16	18	2	4
Knowledge of Subject Matter	1.81	1.89	.08	7	10	3	9
Rapport with Co-workers	1.87	1.83	.04*	8.5	8	.5	.25
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1.87	1.93	.06	8.5	11	2.5	6.25

TABLE X (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	EIP	MEAN RTEP	Differ- ence	RANK-ORDER		Differ- ence	Differ- ence
				EIP	RTEP		
Relationship with the Administration	1.65	1.71	.06	3	3.5	.5	.25
Ethical Attitude	1.77	1.73	.04*	5	5
Leadership	2.37	2.06	.31*	18	14.5	3.5	12.25
Professional Growth	2.02	2.02	14	12	2	4
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	2.26	2.09	.17*	17	16	1	1
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	2.00	2.03	.03	12	13	1	1
TOTALS							262.75 Rho.73

*Differences which favor the RTEP graduates

TABLE XI

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF EIP AND RTEP GRADUATES
ON EACH OF EIGHTEEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	DF	F needed at .05	F derived	Significant
Health and Vitality	1/100	3.94	1.41	No
Personal Appearance	1/100	3.94	2.33	No
Friendliness	1/100	3.94	1.33	No
Flexibility	1/100	3.94	No
Sincerity	1/100	3.94	1.82	No
Enthusiasm	1/100	3.94	No
Constructive Control of Pupils	1/100	3.94	2.99	No
Provisions for Individual Differences	1/100	3.94	No
Evidence of Pupil Growth	1/100	3.94	No
Knowledge of Subject Matter	1/100	3.94	No
Rapport with Co-workers	1/100	3.94	No
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1/100	3.94	No

TABLE XI (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	DF	F needed at .05	F derived	Significant
Relationship with the Administration	1/100	3.94	No
Ethical Attitude	1/100	3.94	No
Leadership	1/100	3.94	2.33	No
Professional Growth	1/100	3.94	No
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	1/100	3.94	1.11	No
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	1/100	3.94	No
TOTALS				

....Indicates that the MS within and the MS between were too similar to compute.

When the preceding differences were analyzed using an analysis of variance, no significant differences were found in any of the eighteen categories. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between married and single teachers as determined by principal evaluation was accepted.

The data comparing single and married teachers were also subjected to the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient to ascertain if there was a significant correlation between the rank-orders. The analysis generated a correlation of .86 which was significant at the .001 level. This high rank-order correlation would indicate that there was a great deal of similarity between the reported competencies of married and single teachers.

Differences among EIP Centers

The final analysis of the data derived from the principal's evaluative questionnaire concerned a comparison of the five Intern Centers which were in existence in 1965-66.

The mean for all EIP graduates was 1.91. The various centers ranged from a low of 1.64 to a high of 2.26. The data from the five centers were analyzed using an analysis of variance. This test generated an F score of 4.95 which was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XII

DATA CONCERNING SINGLE AND MARRIED TEACHERS
AS REFLECTED BY PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS

Teacher Competencies	M	Mean Rating		Signifi- cant	M	Rank-Order		Diff ^{sq}
		S	Diff			S	Diff	
Health and Vitality	1.83	1.93	.10*	No	5.5	12	6.5	42.25
Personal Appearance	1.88	1.87	.01	No	9	10.5	1.5	2.25
Friendliness	1.71	1.67	.04	No	3	3
Flexibility	1.83	1.83	...	No	5.5	8	2.5	6.25
Sincerity	1.63	1.47	.16	No	1	1
Enthusiasm	1.90	1.73	.17	No	10	4.5	5.5	30.25
Constructive Control of Pupils	1.94	1.87	.07	No	12	10.5	1.5	2.25
Provisions for Individual Differences	2.04	2.10	.06*	No	15	17	2	4
Evidence of Pupil Growth	2.13	2.00	.13	No	16	13.5	2.5	6.25
Knowledge of Subject Matter	1.86	1.83	.03	No	8	8
Rapport with Co-workers	1.87	1.80	.07	No	7	6	1	1
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1.93	1.83	.10	No	11	8	3	9

TABLE XII (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	M	Mean Rating		Signifi- cant	M	Rank-Order		Diff ^{sq}
		S	Diff			S	Diff	
Relationship with the Administration	1.65	1.63	.02	No	2	2
Ethical Attitude	1.75	1.73	.02	No	4	4.5	.5	.25
Leadership	2.18	2.30	.12*	No	17	18	1	1
Professional Growth	2.01	2.03	.02*	No	14	15	1	1
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	2.26	2.00	.26	No	18	13.5	4.5	20.25
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	2.00	2.07	.07*	No	13	16	3	9
TOTALS								135
							Rho	.86

*Differences which favor the married graduates

TABLE XIII
COMPARISON OF THE FIVE EIP CENTERS

EIP Center	Center Mean	Variation from EIP Mean ¹	Outside of Confidence ²
A	1.81	.10	No
B	1.64	.27	Yes
C	1.73	.18	No
D	2.26	.35	Yes
E	2.14	.23	No

¹EIP mean 1.91

²Confidence interval mean \pm .26

A confidence interval test related that two centers were outside of the confidence interval, Center B at 1.64 and Center D at 2.26. The centers were not placed in alphabetical order for this analysis, and it is not the purpose of this study to identify these centers by name.

An analysis of variance was then computed comparing Centers B and D. While Center D was judged better on competency one, it was not statistically significant. Center B was judged better on the other seventeen competencies, and the difference was found to be significant at the .05 level on ten of the seventeen items. (See Table XIV.) A Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was then computed to ascertain if there were significant differences between ranks. The computed Rho of .35 indicates that there was a significant difference in the rank-orders of the two centers, further indicating a difference between the two centers.

TABLE XIV
COMPARISON OF CENTERS B AND D ON EIGHTEEN COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	(B)	(D)	<u>Mean Rating</u> Diff .05		F	Signifi- cant	(B)	<u>Rank-Order</u> (D) Diff		Diff
Health and Vitality	2.22	2.13	.09*	4.49	No	17	5	12	144
Personal Appearance	2.33	2.38	.05	4.49	No	18	11.5	6.5	42.25
Friendliness	1.33	2.38	1.05	4.49	20.0	Yes	5.5	11.5	6	36
Flexibility	1.89	2.00	.11	4.49	No	14.5	4	10.5	110.25
Sincerity	1.11	1.63	.52	4.49	5.26	Yes	1.5	1	.5	.25
Enthusiasm	1.11	2.25	1.24	4.49	12.00	Yes	1.5	7.5	6	36
Constructive Control of Pupils	1.22	1.88	.66	4.49	3.25	No	3.5	2.5	1	1
Provisions for Individual Differences	1.56	2.25	.69	4.49	6.82	Yes	10	7.5	2.5	6.25
Evidence of Pupil Growth	1.56	2.50	.94	4.49	8.00	Yes	10	15	5	25
Knowledge of Subject Matter	1.22	2.25	1.03	4.49	11.36	Yes	3.5	7.5	4	16
Rapport with Co-workers	1.67	2.25	.58	4.49	2.08	No	12.5	7.5	5	25
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1.33	2.50	1.17	4.49	15.79	Yes	5.5	15	9.5	90.25

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	(B)	(D)	<u>Mean Rating</u>		F	Signifi- cant	(B)	<u>Rank-Order</u>		Diff
			Diff	.05				(D)	Diff	
Relationship with the Administration	1.33	1.88	.55	4.49	3.22	No	5.5	2.5	3	9
Ethical Attitude	1.33	2.38	1.05	4.49	10.52	Yes	5.5	11.5	6	36
Leadership	2.11	2.61	.50	4.49	2.63	No	16	17	1	1
Professional Growth	1.56	2.50	.94	4.49	6.35	Yes	10	15	5	25
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	1.89	2.62	.73	4.49	4.55	Yes	14.5	18	3.5	12.25
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	1.67	2.38	.7	4.49	4.00	No	12.5	11.5	1	1
TOTALS										616.50 Rho .35

*Difference which favors center (D). All other favor center (B).

It would be presumptuous of the author to make any specific assumptions regarding the differences between the two centers. There are, however, several possibilities which might partially explain the findings. Among these are: a difference in the quality of the training programs, a difference in the quality of the product from the junior college which services these centers, or a difference in the quality of the candidates who were enrolled that particular year.

Comparison of EIP and RIEP Graduates as Evidenced by Pupil Change

The second area of measurement concerned the use of the achievement scores of the students who were in the classes of the EIP and the RIEP graduates. Following the procedure which was outlined in Chapter III, a comparison was made using the Standard T scores which were computed from the raw data. The scores which reflected the growth of the students under an EIP graduate ranged from 46.1 to 53.0, with a mean of 50.7. It will be noticed that the mean of 50.7 reflects a position very near the Standard T mean, indicating near average achievement.

The scores which reflected the growth of the students under a RIEP graduate ranged from 45.3 to 58.3, with a mean of 51.3. Again, one can see that this is very near the Standard T mean of 50, indicating near average achievement.

Subjecting the Standard T scores to an analysis of variance, the difference was not significant. Therefore, hypothesis III of no significant difference between the EIP and RIEP graduates according to pupil achievement was accepted. These results agree with the earlier findings derived from the principals' evaluations.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF THE EIP AND RTEP GRADUATES
AS EVIDENCED BY PUPIL CHANGE

<u>Range on Standard T</u>		<u>Mean</u>		<u>Differ- ence</u>	<u>Signifi- cant</u>
<u>EIP</u>	<u>RTEP</u>	<u>EIP</u>	<u>RTEP</u>		
46.1-53.9	45.3-58.3	50.7	51.3	.6	No

The results of no difference in achievement are not surprising in light of the recent research of Pettigrew,¹ Coleman,² and McDill³ who found strong evidence that when variables such as the following were held constant, neighborhood SES, school SES, and school climate, there will be little difference in achievement.

Feedback from EIP and RTEP Graduates

The final data which were collected for this study were concerned with the opinions of the graduates of the two programs under study. The graduates were provided a list of eighteen teacher competencies from which they designated those which they felt provided them the greatest teaching strength. They were then asked to give their opinion on which competencies they felt were the most important. They were then asked to

¹Thomas Pettigrew, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1967.

²James Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, Office of Education Survey, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1966.

³Edward McDill, et. al., "Institutional Effects on the Academic Behavior of High School Youth," Sociology of Education, XL (Summer 1967), pp. 181-199.

identify those sources which they felt had contributed to their self-judged strengths. Finally, they were asked for their opinion concerning the adequacy of the training afforded them by Michigan State University. The Intern graduates were also asked if they would choose the Intern program again if they had to start over in their professional preparation program.

Graduates' Self-Judged Strengths

The graduates designated their first, second, and third greatest strengths from among the eighteen competencies listed. Table XVI provides a summary of their response on the basis of first choice-3 points, second choice-2 points, and third choice-1 point. Total values of tallies in each competency were then computed and the competencies were rank-ordered.

The Intern graduates designated the five following competencies as their greatest strengths:

1. Flexibility
2. Enthusiasm
3. Provisions for Individual Differences
4. Knowledge of Subject Matter
5. Constructive Control of Pupils

The regular graduates designated the same five in a slightly different order. The RTEP strengths were as follows:

1. Flexibility
2. Constructive Control of Pupils
3. Enthusiasm
4. Provisions for Individual Differences
5. Knowledge of Subject Matter

TABLE XVI

GRADUATES' SELF-JUDGED STRENGTHS IN EIGHTEEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	<u>Entries</u>								<u>Rank-Order</u>				Diff ^{sq}
	1st	<u>EIP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	1st	<u>RTEP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	EIP	<u>RTEP</u>	Diff		
Health and Vitality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16.5	.5	.25	
Personal Appearance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16.5	.5	.25	
Friendliness	1	1	2	4	0	1	1	3	11	11.5	.5	.25	
Flexibility	7	6	4	37	5	2	3	22	1	1	
Sincerity	4	1	1	15	0	4	2	10	6	7	1	1	
Enthusiasm	6	1	2	22	3	2	3	16	2	3	1	1	
Constructive Control of Pupils	1	5	3	16	5	1	0	17	5	2	3	9	
Provisions for Individual Differences	4	3	3	21	3	2	2	15	3	4	1	1	
Evidence of Pupil Growth	2	1	0	7	2	1	0	7	9.5	10	.5	.25	
Knowledge of Subject Matter	4	2	2	18	3	0	2	11	4	5	1	1	
Rapport with Co-workers	1	1	2	7	0	2	6	10	9.5	7	2.5	6.25	
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1	4	3	14	1	3	1	10	7	7	

TABLE XVI (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	<u>Entries</u>								EIP	<u>Rank-Order</u>		Diff ^{sq}
	1st	<u>EIP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	1st	<u>RTEP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total		<u>RTEP</u>	Diff	
Relationship with the Administration	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	14.5	11.5	3	9
Ethical Attitude	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	14.5	16.5	2	4
Leadership	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16.5	.5	.25
Professional Growth	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	2	12	13	1	1
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	13	14	1	1
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	0	1	7	9	0	2	4	8	8	9	1	1
TOTALS												36.75
											Rho	.96

Each entry was multiplied by its weighted value to arrive at the total values 1st-3, 2nd-2, 3rd-1.

Rank-order correlation coefficients (Rho) were then determined comparing the EIP and RTEP graduates' responses. This process resulted in a highly significant rank-order correlation of .94, which indicates a significant similarity in the self-judged strengths of the two groups.

A Comparison of Self-Judged Strengths with Principals' Evaluations

The comparison of self-judged strengths with principals' evaluations must be approached in this study with some degree of caution because of the fact that the principals were asked to judge, on a Likert scale, each of the competencies listed, while the graduates were asked to rank-order their own perceptions of their top three strengths. With this distinction in mind, a comparison of the rank-orders was made. This comparison resulted in a correlation between EIP graduates and principals' evaluations of .24, which is not significant and would indicate that there is a difference in the opinions of these groups concerning the EIP graduates' greatest teaching strengths.

A comparison of the RTEP graduates and the principals' evaluations on a rank-order correlation resulted in a computed Rho of $-.14$. This would indicate that there is an even greater difference in the adjudged strengths of RTEP graduates as ascertained by the graduates themselves and their principals.

One can only speculate whether the differences found between principals' evaluation and graduates' self-judged strengths are as real as they appear to be or whether the difference in technique and instruments used accounts for the computed difference.

Of the five top self-judged EIP strengths, three were in the category of Instructional Skills and two were in the category of Personal Characteristics; while the principals' evaluations found the top five with only one in the category of Instructional Skills, three in the category Personal Characteristics, and one in the category Teacher-Staff Relationships.

Of the five top self-judged RTEP strengths, which were the same for RTEP as EIP, the principals judged two in the category of Instructional Skills and one each in the categories of Personal Characteristics, Professional Attitude, and Community Relationships.

The apparent difference in assessment of competence between the principals' evaluations and the self-judged evaluations might possibly indicate a feeling on the part of the graduates that their strengths should reside in the five chosen rather than where they actually reside, or it might indicate a difference in perception.

Graduates' Self-Judged Strengths Compared with Those
Competencies Judged to Be Most Important

The graduates designated the three teacher competencies they considered most important. Table XVIII provides a summary of their responses. Those data were then rank-ordered from one--that competency considered most important--to eighteen--that competency considered least important. The rank-order correlation of those data produced a correlation of .79. It is suggested on the basis of these facts that Interns and regular program graduates possess similar values in reference to the relative importance of the several teacher competencies listed.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF RANK-ORDER OF PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS AND SELF-JUDGMENT
ON EIGHTEEN COMPETENCIES

Teacher Competencies	Principal	<u>EIP</u> Self	Diff	Diff ^{sq}	Principal	<u>RTEP</u> Self	Diff	Diff ^{sq}
Health and Vitality	10	17	7	49	7	16.5	9.5	90.25
Personal Appearance	14.5	17	2.5	6.25	6	16.5	10.5	110.25
Friendliness	5	11	6	36	1	11.5	10.5	110.25
Flexibility	12	1	11	121	9	1	8	64
Sincerity	1	6	5	25	2	7	5	25
Enthusiasm	2	2	3.5	3	.5	.25
Constructive Control of Pupils	5	5	14.5	2	12.5	156.25
Provisions for Individual Differences	12	3	9	81	17	4	13	169
Evidence of Pupil Growth	16	9.5	6.5	42.25	18	10	8	64
Knowledge of Subject Matter	7	4	3	9	10	5	5	25
Rapport with Co-workers	8.5	9.5	1	1	8	7	1	1
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	8.5	7	1.5	2.25	11	7	4	16

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	Principal	<u>EIP</u> Self	Diff	Diff ^{sq}	Principal	<u>RTEP</u> Self	Diff	Diff ^{sq}
Relationship with the Administration	3	14.5	11.5	132.25	3.5	11.5	8	64
Ethical Attitude	5	14.5	9.5	90.25	5	16.5	11.5	132.25
Leadership	18	17	1	1	14.5	16.5	2	4
Professional Growth	14	12	2	4	12	13	1	1
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	17	13	4	16	16	14	2	4
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	12	8	4	16	13	9	4	16
TOTALS				632.25				1052.50
				Rho .24				Rho .14

Rank-order correlation coefficients were then determined comparing the rank-orders of the competencies adjudged to be most important with those adjudged to be the greatest strengths of the two groups of graduates. The results of those comparisons are shown in Table XIX. Correlation coefficients obtained in comparing these two sets of rankings were both significant at the .01 level (.83 for EIP graduates and .77 for RIEP graduates). The high correlations which were found would indicate that the graduates at least felt that they were fairly competent in those areas which they judged to be important to teaching success.

Graduates' Identification of Sources Which
Provided Them Strength

The graduates were provided a list of eight sources of teacher competency (nine for EIP including the addition of Intern Consultant) from which they designated those which they felt provided them the greatest strength.

As with most of the other data relating to the two groups, the identification of sources of strength were very similar. Both groups mentioned the category Yourself (intrinsic) most often. The EIP graduates followed this with Intern Consultant, Teaching Associates, Supervising Teacher, Professional Education Courses, the Principal, Others, and a tie for last between Subject Courses and College Coordinator. The RIEP graduates followed Yourself with Professional Education Courses, Teaching Associates, Supervising Teacher, the Principal, Subject Courses, Others, and the College Coordinator.

TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES ADJUDGED TO BE MOST
IMPORTANT BY THE GRADUATES

Teacher Competencies	<u>Entries</u>											
	1st	<u>EIP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	1st	<u>RTEP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	EIP	<u>Rank-Order</u> RTEP	Diff	Diff ^{sq}
Health and Vitality	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	9.5	15.5	6	36
Personal Appearance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5	15.5	1	1
Friendliness	0	2	3	7	0	0	1	1	7	12	5	25
Flexibility	2	4	1	15	2	1	2	10	2.5	4.5	2	4
Sincerity	4b	0	1	13	3	3	3	18	5	1	4	16
Enthusiasm	3	0	4	13	2	1	2	10	5	4.5	.5	.25
Constructive Control of Pupils	1	3	3	15	1	4	3	14	2.5	3	.5	.25
Provisions for Individual Differences	3	5	4	29	3	3	1	16	1	2	1	1
Evidence of Pupil Growth	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	6	9.5	8	1.5	2.25
Knowledge of Subject Matter	3	2	0	13	2	0	1	7	5	7	2	4
Rapport with Co-workers	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	14.5	9.5	5	25
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	1	1	1	6	0	0	2	2	8	11	3	9

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	<u>Entries</u>											
	1st	<u>EIP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	1st	<u>RTEP</u> 2nd	3rd	Total	EIP	<u>Rank-Order</u> RTEP	Diff	Diff ^{Sq}
Relationship with the Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5	15.5	1	1
Ethical Attitude	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	14.5	6	8.5	72.25
Leadership	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5	15.5	1	1
Professional Growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5	15.5	1	1
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5	15.5	1	1
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	0	0	3	3	0	1	3	5	11	9.5	1.5	2.25
TOTALS												202.25 Rho .79

Each tally was multiplied by its weighted value to arrive at the total values 1st-3, 2nd-2, 3rd-1.

TABLE XIX

RANK-ORDER CORRELATION OF THE SELF-JUDGED STRENGTHS OF GRADUATES
AND THOSE COMPETENCIES ADJUDGED TO BE MOST IMPORTANT

Teacher Competencies	EIP		Diff	Diff ^{sq}	RIEP		Diff	Diff ^{sq}	
	Self-Judged Strengths	Adjudged Important			Self-Judged Strengths	Adjudged Important			
Health and Vitality	17	9.5	7.5	56.25	16.5	15.5	1	1	
Personal Appearance	17	14.5	2.5	6.25	16.5	15.5	1	1	
Friendliness	11	7	4	16	11.5	12.0	.5	.25	
Flexibility	1	2.5	1.5	2.25	1	4.5	3.5	12.25	∞
Sincerity	6	5	1	1	7	1	6	36	
Enthusiasm	2	5	3	9	3	4.5	1.5	2.25	
Constructive Control of Pupils	5	2.5	2.5	6.25	2	3	1	1	
Provisions for Individual Differences	3	1	2	4	4	2	2	4	
Evidence of Pupil Growth	9.5	9.5	0	0	10	8	2	4	
Knowledge of Subject Matter	4	5	1	1	5	7	2	4	
Rapport with Co-workers	9.5	14.5	5	25	7	9.5	2.5	6.25	
Ability to Seek and Accept Advice	7	8	1	1	7	11	4	16	

TABLE XIX (Continued)

Teacher Competencies	EIP				RTEP			
	Self-Judged Strengths	Adjudged Important	Diff	Diff ^{sq}	Self-Judged Strengths	Adjudged Important	Diff	Diff ^{sq}
Relationship with the Administration	14.5	14.5	0	0	11.55	15.5	4	16
Ethical Attitude	14.5	14.5	0	0	16.5	6	10.5	110.25
Leadership	17	14.5	2.5	6.25	16.5	15.5	1	1
Professional Growth	12	14.5	2.5	6.25	13	15.5	2.5	6.25
Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours	13	14.5	1.5	2.25	14	15.5	1.5	2.25
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents	8	11	3	9	9	9.5	.5	.25
TOTALS				111.75				224.00
			EIP Rho	.83			RTEP Rho	.77

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF EIP AND RTEP GRADUATES'
SOURCES OF STRENGTH

Source of Strength	Rank-Order		Diff	Diff
	EIP	RTEP		
Professional Education Courses	4	2	2	4
Subject Courses	7.5	6	1.5	2.25
Supervising Teacher	3	4	1	1
College Coordinator	7.5	8	1.5	2.25
Teaching Associates	2	3	1	1
Principal	5	5	0	0
Yourself (intrinsic)	1	1	0	0
Others (specify)	6	7	1	1
Total				11.25
			Rho	.87

Note: The category Intern Consultant which was placed second by EIP graduates was removed for comparative purposes.

When the item Intern Consultant was removed from the EIP group for comparative purposes, one can see that there was very little difference between the two groups. A correlation coefficient revealed that the correlation was .87 which was significant at the .001 level. The category Others included such things as family, the church, parents, and various experiences. The category College Coordinator was mentioned

only twice by EIP graduates, and not at all by RTEP graduates. The low rating of the College Coordinator was not unexpected as there is very little contact between the student teacher and the coordinator.

When the data were analyzed by teaching competency, it was found, as one would expect, that different competencies were supported by different sources. (See Table XXI.)

In summary concerning this data, it can be concluded that as far as the graduates themselves are concerned, the most important single source of strength is from Yourself (intrinsic). Persons in the field, i.e., Intern Consultants, Supervising Teachers, and Teaching Associates, played a very important role in developing teaching competencies, in the opinions of the graduates. The RTEP graduates placed the category of Professional Education Courses high on the list of sources of strength.

Feelings of the Graduates about
Michigan State University

Of the twenty-eight returns from the EIP graduates, twenty-three indicated satisfaction with their program at Michigan State University; four indicated that they did not feel that they had received adequate training; and one questionnaire was not complete. The percentage of satisfaction recorded was 85 per cent. Of the twenty-three returns from the RTEP graduates, ten were positive; eleven were negative; and two did not answer. These returns generated a satisfaction percentage of 48 per cent. The difference in percentage was significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXI

SOURCES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TEACHING COMPETENCIES
SELF-JUDGED BY GRADUATES TO BE THEIR GREATEST STRENGTHS

Teacher Competencies	<u>Source of Strengths</u>	
	EIP	RTEP
Flexibility	You (intrinsic) Intern Consultant Teaching Associates	You (intrinsic) Professional Education Courses Supervising Teachers
Enthusiasm	Intern Consultant You (intrinsic)	You (intrinsic) Teaching Associates Supervising Teachers
Provisions for Individual Differences	Intern Consultant Supervising Teacher *Professional Education Courses *Teaching Associates	You (intrinsic) Teaching Associates Professional Education Courses
Knowledge of Subject Matter	*Professional Education Courses *Subject Courses *Teaching Associates	You (intrinsic) Subject Courses Professional Education Courses
Constructive Control of Pupils	Supervising Teachers *Professional Education Courses *Intern Consultant *Teaching Associates *You (intrinsic)	*Teaching Associates *You (intrinsic) Supervising Teachers

*Indicates equal source of strength.

TABLE XXII

FEELINGS OF THE GRADUATES CONCERNING
THEIR TRAINING AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Professional Program	Responses	Positive Reaction	
		No.	%
EIP	27	23	85
RTEP	21	10	48
Difference	6	13	37*

*Difference in per cent significant at .05.

Of the twenty-eight EIP graduates, twenty-seven indicated that they would take the intern training if they had to start over. The one who would not indicated that she felt she had missed a great deal by not having spent more time on campus.

Open-Ended Comments

Both groups were asked to make open-ended comments about their training. Below are some of the more frequently listed positive comments about their training at Michigan State University:

EIP

"Without the year of internship, I might not have followed through with being a teacher. The help I received that year from my Intern Consultant was invaluable."

"The most practical help I received was the intern year. I feel that every first year teacher needs someone really in her corner to lend support and constructive criticism."

"If it were not for the Intern Program, I would not have finished four years of college."

"I feel my training was adequate, but I also know I was one of the lucky ones. I had capable instructors for my methods courses, a chance as an EIP student to see a classroom in action while I was taking methods, and an excellent student teaching supervisor and intern consultant."

"The Intern Program shouldn't be just a choice for a new teacher, but a requirement."

"I feel that professional courses were very good except in presenting the true rather than the theoretical concepts of the classroom. However, many worthwhile materials were added to my repertoire of teaching aids."

The praises of the Intern Program and the Intern Consultants go on and on. These graduates seemed really to feel that the EIP launched them on a successful teaching career.

RTEP

"I gained more from my student teaching contact and from actual classroom contact. I feel a prospective should have as much student contact as possible before becoming a teacher."

"I particularly enjoyed the classes where there was a mixture of graduate as well as undergraduate students. As I look back, I sincerely believe that MSU adequately prepared me for my teaching career."

A positive comment by the RTEP graduates usually meant a grudging admission that they might have picked up a few things from the methods courses, and a general approval of the student teaching program.

Following are some of the negative comments. The negative comments for both EIP and RTEP graduates were similar. In general, they felt that the professional courses were not realistic. They felt that many of the

instructors had not been in the classroom for so long that they had forgotten what it was really like. The lack of courses in the teaching of reading was mentioned by several graduates. In general, the RTEP graduates were much more negative than the EIP graduates. They were especially critical of the lack of more opportunity to be in the classroom. Many suggested a longer clinical experience, and several suggested that a clinical experience should include more than one school.

The lack of exposure to Negro culture and the lack of training to work in the ghetto were also mentioned several times.

It is interesting to note that the suggestion of the graduates about longer clinical experiences are met by the Intern Program, but there was no difference in the outcome according to the data gathered for this study.

Summary

It was established that there were no significant differences between EIP and RTEP graduates' effectiveness as far as either principal evaluation or pupil change was concerned. There were no significant differences between married and single teachers' effectiveness as determined by the principals' evaluations.

There was a significant difference in situational deployment in relationship to area of clinical preparation, with the EIP graduates staying in the same system or school. There was no significant difference in type of schools in which teachers served, with regard to racial or SES composition. There was no significant difference in the percentage of graduates who stayed in the same school following the 1967-68 academic year.

There was an unexplained difference between two of the EIP training centers as determined by the principal evaluations.

Both groups of graduates felt that the greatest help came from the clinical situation and their teaching associates.

There was a significant difference percentage-wise in the feelings of the graduates toward their training, and toward the help provided by the university, with the EIP graduates being very positive and the RTEP graduates being about half positive and half negative. Almost all of the RTEP graduates felt that more clinical preparation was needed.

While the RTEP graduates were very critical of the methods courses which they had received, they did place Professional Education Courses high on the list of sources of strength.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based upon the results of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. The vast majority of Michigan State University graduates from both the EIP and the RTEP were performing adequately in the field.

This conclusion was supported by the judgment of the building principals, in that the average rating for both groups was "Good." Of all the graduates in the study, none was dismissed from her job nor was any denied tenure. The data from the achievement gains showed that the pupils of these graduates were doing as well if not better than the pupils of their peers in the field.

2. The Michigan State University Intern graduates were not significantly different in performance in the field from the Regular Program graduates.

Although there were some differences in individual competencies as judged by the building principals, none of these differences were statistically significant. The rank-order correlation coefficient between the two groups was significant, which further indicates the similarity in principals' ratings of the two groups. These findings were in accord with the results of the data regarding achievement gains of the pupils of these teachers and with the results of the self-judged competencies of the graduates themselves.

3. There was an unexplained significant difference between two of the EIP training centers.

When these two centers were compared, there was a significant difference on ten of the eighteen items of the principals' questionnaire. The computed significant difference would suggest that the quality of the graduates of these two centers differs as judged by the building principals. Whether this difference was a result of the programs of the two centers or the result of the particular individuals in the two centers during the year that the sample population was selected is not known.

4. The graduates of the EIP were more likely to teach in the system which provided the clinical preparation than were the RTEP graduates.

This conclusion was supported by the data which revealed that a significantly higher percentage of the EIP graduates than the RTEP graduates were teaching in the system which had provided the clinical preparation. This finding was not surprising in light of the fact that most EIP students chose that particular type of training because they were not able to leave their home area for a prolonged period, because of either family or financial reasons.

5. There were no differences between the EIP and RTEP graduates in regard to other items connected with situational deployment.

This finding was supported by the data which revealed that approximately the same numbers were teaching in schools of minority group makeup, in lower SES schools, and in mixed schools in spite of the fact that all of the EIP training centers were located within or fairly near a large metropolitan area which had significant

minority populations. There was also no significant difference between the groups concerning the numbers who were engaged in the teaching profession and in the numbers who remained in the same school following the 1967-68 academic year.

6. There were no differences in marriage rate of the two groups, nor were there any differences in the competency of married compared with single teachers, according to the principals' evaluations.
7. There was a low percentage of schools in the study which reported using ability grouping in the form of homogeneous classrooms.

It was found that less than 20 per cent of the schools in the study used ability grouping. However, there was a disproportionately large percentage of such grouping in schools identified as minority group schools, mixed schools, and lower SES schools. However, caution should be applied to this conclusion because of the small number of such schools in the study.

8. There was a significant difference in the rank-order correlation coefficient between the reported competencies of the graduates according to the principals' and the self-judged competencies of the graduates themselves.

This finding must be approached with caution as the types of instrument used in each evaluation differed. However, the teachers ranked themselves much higher on those competencies related to instructional skills than did the principals. This finding might indicate that the teachers felt these skills were more important, and thus reported their competencies in these areas. The principals, however, did rate the teachers as better than average in these skills.

9. There was a significant difference in the attitude of the groups relative to the training which they received from Michigan State University.

The data revealed that almost all of the EIP graduates were satisfied with the training received, while only half of the RIEP graduates were satisfied with their training. Both groups revealed a distaste for the methods courses which they received. They were particularly critical because of what they regarded as the lack of relationship between the topics discussed in methods classes with what they found in the classroom. They were also critical because of the lack of exposure to such areas as the "Teaching of reading," "Negro culture," and "Problems of the ghetto."

It was suggested by the RIEP graduates that more clinical preparation is needed, and that a variety of situations would be helpful. The EIP graduates had a great deal of praise for the Intern Consultants who worked with them during their year of internship.

10. The main source of strength for a career in teaching, according to the graduates of both programs, was intrinsic.

The data revealed that as far as the graduates themselves were concerned, their main strength was from themselves, and not from something learned either at the university or in the field. This is not to say that good teachers are born this way, but rather that behavioral patterns and personality patterns which are developed over a long period of time are of significant importance in the teaching profession.

11. The main secondary sources of strength necessary for success in teaching are provided for the most part in the field, including the clinical phase, rather than in the university classroom.

The data revealed that sources which were identified as being most helpful included Intern Consultants, Supervising Teachers, and Teaching Associates. However, in spite of the negative feelings toward the professional education courses expressed by the graduates of both programs, these courses were rated high on the list of sources of strength. The lack of consistency in these data might be the result of the almost legendary disdain that teachers are supposed to have for methods courses.

Recommendations

Based upon the results and conclusions reached from this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The College of Education should determine the goals of the EIP. If the goals are the training of superior teachers, then the program needs to be restructured, as the results of the study indicate that there are no differences in the EIP graduates and graduates in the RTEP as determined by the criteria of this study.

To expand upon this theme, one needs to look at the program itself. While one of the main objectives of the EIP is a close working relationship with the local system, the only real connection is in the clinical phase of the program. Perhaps more use

should be made of the expertise of the local school system. The fact that the methods courses are taught at the local center rather than on campus means very little if it is coupled observations rather than actual practice in the classroom. One of the findings from the graduates' feedback seems to be the irrelevance of methods courses, although there was inconsistency in these findings. This perceived irrelevance might be the result of the scheduling of methods courses before student teaching, rather than the content of the methods courses. The student in the methods courses has little to relate to in trying to assimilate the theory which is presented. If the methods courses could be offered in conjunction with the clinical phase of the work, they might be more meaningful. There is credibility gap between the so-called theory and practice in education; and moving the methods courses from the campus does not seem to eliminate this gap. The instructors are, for the most part, the same people who teach these classes on campus.

If the goals of the program are to train teachers who otherwise would not be able to go to college, and to train teachers to service a particular area of the state, then the program could be called a success. However, it should be explored to ascertain if the present program is the most effective method to reach these goals, or if the same goals could not be reached more expediently by another method.

It should be noted that the graduates of the EIP are much more satisfied with their training than the graduates of the RTEP. This satisfaction seems to be the result of the Internship, or the longer

clinical preparation, rather than the difference in methods courses. The role of the Intern Consultant seems to be significant in this satisfaction. Perhaps all teachers should have a year of apprenticeship at a reduced salary. The savings on the salaries could be used to pay for a consultant to work with these people to give them the needed support which seems to play such an important part in their first year on the job.

2. The present study might well be replicated with the following modifications:
 - a. A longitudinal study should be made of each of the Intern centers to ascertain if there is a difference in the quality of the programs from center to center. This procedure should be done not to find fault and place blame, but for the establishment of good uniform practices which could be shared by all.
 - b. A comparison should be made between EIP graduates and RTEP graduates using other criteria of teacher effectiveness, such criteria as pupil feedback, independent observation, and interaction analysis.
 - c. An attempt should be made to ascertain why EIP students choose the Intern method of training. If it is chosen because the student thinks that it is designed to give him the best possible training, the educational outcomes might be different than if the student chooses it only because it is convenient.
 - d. Focus of further investigation should be on those areas of competency which were identified in the present study as being among the greatest strengths and weaknesses of the two groups.

The intention of this recommendation is the remediation of critical weaknesses or the proliferation of notable strengths.

3. The College of Education should establish and provide for a regular, systematic follow up of teacher education graduates. This process should begin before the student leaves the campus, by the establishment of an individual file which would include:

- a. Basic biographical data
- b. Related academic and qualification data
- c. Place-of-residence information
- d. Job-placement facts

This follow up would necessitate a program of close cooperation with the placement bureau, or the establishment of a special placement bureau for the College of Education. As the largest college within the university and one which is engaged in a special type of education, the latter might be well worth while. The suggested follow-up records would be useful in:

- a. Determining desirable changes in the teacher education curricula.
 - b. Projecting enrollments in post-graduate programs.
 - c. Compiling essential reports and statistics relating to teacher education functions.
 - d. Assessing and evaluating current programs.
4. More courses should perhaps be offered at the under graduate level in such areas as reading, working with disadvantaged children, and educational sociology. The first two are needed to strengthen certain teaching skills, while the latter is necessary to prepare

teachers for leadership in the field of education. As more and more research is pointing to the fact that the environment of the home and the school are the critical factors in achievement growth and attitudes, then it is imperative that prospective teachers be aware of this research.

5. Clinical preparation has been well accepted over the years as an integral part of teacher education. The graduates of both the EIP and RTEP concurred with this practice. In view of the results of this study, it might be concluded that the length of the preparation is not the critical factor. The importance of the clinical phase may actually be in the timing rather than in the length.

Clinical preparation in actual practice has two distinct functions, and these functions are not always in harmony with each other. The two functions are on-the-job training and a period of proving one's capability in handling the classroom situation. The problem with having all the clinical phase at the end of the academic training is that if the student finds that he is unable to work effectively with people, he is already so far along on the program that it is difficult to choose an alternate goal.

While academic knowledge is of importance in the teaching profession, the ability to relate to people in a meaningful way is of crucial importance. It is recommended that a period of clinical training be arranged at the beginning of the professional sequence to screen out through observation, counseling, and evaluation those people who cannot effectively relate to others. The present program of observation is not sufficient to do the job.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the concept of the internship, like most other concepts, is neither good nor bad in itself. It allows an opportunity for longer clinical preparation, but the quality of this clinical preparation is left up to the individual intern center and to the Intern Consultant in that center. Length in itself is not sufficient to provide the necessary ingredients for a successful teaching career, unless this length is enriched by those experiences which are meaningful. It is time that the myth of quantity equaling quality be exposed. All programs should be continually evaluated to ascertain if the programs are attaining those goals which are important.

While the question of what makes an effective teacher is still unanswered, there is a strong indication that being a good teacher is not "what one knows," but "what one is"; and if the quality of the teaching profession is to improve, there must be a continual search for those attributes which are important in teaching, and a successful effort to design and develop programs which will either provide an opportunity for teachers to acquire those qualities or which will eliminate from the teaching profession those people who do not possess those qualities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Walter. "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change." Harvard Educational Review, XXIV (1954), 273-289.
- Almy, H. V., and Sorenson, Herbert. "A Teacher-Rating Scale of Determined Reliability and Validity." Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (1930), 179-186.
- Anderson, Harold. "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII, (September 1954), 41-47.
- Barr, Arvil. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness. Madison: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1967.
- Beggs, Walter. The Education of Teachers. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.
- Biddle, Bruce and Ellena, William. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Brookover, Wilbur. "The Relation of Social Factors to Teaching Ability." Journal of Experimental Education, XIII (June 1945), 191-205.
- Coleman, James, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Office of Education Survey, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Combs, Arthur. "Objective Measurement Is Impossible." National Education Association Journal, LIII (January 1964), 34-36.
- Conley, James. "Personal Characteristics of Female Elementary Intern Program and Conventional Program Students." (Unpublished paper, Michigan State University).
- Cooper, James. "A Comparison of Two Plans of Teacher Education." Journal of Educational Research, LI (May 1958), 643-658.
- Corman, Bernard. THE INTERNSHIP in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1964.

- Corrigan, Dean. "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LVII (October 1963), 93-95.
- Cross, Arthur. "A Comparative Analysis of the Expressed Attitudes of Elementary Education Students, Their University Instructors, and Their Supervising Teachers Toward Pupil-Teacher Relations as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.)
- Day, Harry. "Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers After Initial Teaching Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, X (September 1959), 326-328.
- Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods.
- Drews Elizabeth. Instructor, LXXV (April 1966), 20+.
- Dutton, Wilbur. "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers, and Anxiety." Journal of Educational Research, LV (May 1962), 380-382.
- Ellinger, William. "A Study of the Procedures Used to Evaluate Professional School Personnel in the Public School of the State of Maryland." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1968.)
- Fattu, Nicholas. "Research on Teacher Evaluation." The National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November 1963), 21-22.
- Gotham, R. E. "Personality and Teaching Efficiency." Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 157-165.
- Gowan, J. C. "A Follow-up Study of Teaching Candidates." Journal of Educational Research, LIV (May 1961), 353-355.
- Haberman, M. "A Comparison of Interns with Regular First Year Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LIX (October 1965), 92-94.
- Hall, James. "Selected Aspect of Teacher Evaluation in the Public School Systems in the State of Montana as Compared with Public School Systems Throughout the United States." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Montana, 1967.)
- Hall, H. O. "Professional Preparation and Teacher Efficiency." Journal of Teacher Education, XV (April 1964), 72-76.
- Hawkins, Edward and Stoops, George. "Objective and Subjective Identification of Outstanding Elementary Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LIX (April 1966), 344-346.

- Herman, Wayne. "Teacher Observation." National Elementary Principal, XLIII, (April 1964), 63-64.
- Hoover, K. H. "A Survey of Student Teacher Effectiveness." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (October 1961), 166-169.
- Howsam, Robert. "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore." The National Elementary Principal, (November 1963), 6-18.
- Jayne, Clarence. "A Study of the Relations in Between Teaching Procedures and Educational Outcomes." Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (December 1946), 101-134.
- Johnson, Edward. "Teachers Indicate Need of Fifth Year." Michigan Education Journal, XLV (November 1967) 40.
- Jones, Margaret. "Analysis of Certain Aspects of Teaching Ability." Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (December 1956), 103-180.
- Kershner, Roger. "A Comparative Study of the Teaching Competence of University of Oregon Interns." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Oregon, 1968.)
- Knox, William. "A Study of the Relationships of Certain Environmental Factors to Teaching Success." Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (December 1956), 95-151.
- Lawler, Eugene. "Differing Rates of Progress of Classes Under the Same and Different Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (October 1964), 84-86.
- Lins, Leo. "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency." Journal of Experimental Education, XV (September 1946), 2-60.
- Lupone, Orlando. "A Comparison of Provisionally Certified and Permanently Certified Elementary School Teachers in Selected School Districts in New York State." Journal of Educational Research, LV (October 1961), 53-63.
- McCullough, James. "A Study of Teacher Attitude and Teacher Rating." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968.)
- McDill, Edward, Meyers, Edmund, and Rigsby, Leo. "Institutional Effects on Academic Behavior of High School Students." Sociology of Education, XL (Summer 1967), 181-199.
- Nagle, Marshall. "Some Effects of Student Teaching Patterns Upon Professional Attitudes." Journal of Educational Research, LII (May 1959), 355-377.
- National Education Association. Evaluation of Classroom Teachers, The American Research Association Report 1964-B14, Washington, D.C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1964.

- Osman, Robert. "Associative Factors in Change of Student Teachers' Attitudes During Student Teaching." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.)
- Pettigrew, Thomas, et. al., Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1967.
- Phi Delta Kappan, XIV (June 1965), 444.
- Price, Robert. "Relations Between Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers' Attitudes and Performance." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1960.)
- Reavis, William. "Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems." Supplementary Educational Monographs, No.59, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945.
- Rostker, Leon. "The Measurement of Teaching Ability, Study No. 1." Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (September 1945), 6-51.
- Rucker, Winifred. "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.)
- Rudman, Herbert. "How Good Are Standardized Achievement Tests?" The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (November 1964), 32-38.
- Ryans, David. Characteristics of Teachers, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Sandgren, Duane. "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (May 1956), 673-680.
- Shaplin, Judson. "A Comparison of Internship Programs." 1963 NCTEPS Columbus Conference Report. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.
- Shaplin, Judson. "Practice in Teaching." Harvard Educational Review, XXXI (Winter, 1961), 33-57.
- Shim, C. P. "A Study of the Cumulative Effect of Four Teacher Characteristics on Achievement of Elementary School Pupils." Journal of Educational Research, LIX (September 1965), 33-34.
- Simun, R. B. "The Relationship of Variables in Undergraduate School, and School Administrators' Ratings of First Year Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, XV (September 1964), 293-302.
- Smith, Elmer., Ed., Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Solomon, Daniel. "Teacher Behavior and Student Learning." Journal of Educational Psychology, LV (February 1964), 23-30.

- Stiles, Lindley. Teacher Education in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960.
- Stoelting, Gustave. "The Selection of Candidates for Teacher Education at the Univeristy of Wisconsin." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIV (December 1955), 115-140.
- Torrence, Andrew. "A Study of the Relationships of Certain Competencies to Success in Teaching Vocational Agriculture." Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (September 1956), 1-31.
- Troisi, Nicholas. "The Effect of Student Teaching upon Student Teacher's Objectives and Their Relationship to Achievement, and Attitudes Toward Children." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University 1959.)
- Weiner, M. "Difficulties in the Use of Achievement Test Gains as Measures of Growth." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (April 1964), 781-786.
- White, Jo Ann. "Changes During Student Teaching as Measured by Pre-Tests and Post-Tests." Research on Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 5, Dubuque, Iowa: 1965.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS

TO:

FROM: Robert L. Arends, Director
Michigan State University Student Training Center, Flint
314 Avon Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

We are attempting a follow-up evaluation of the teacher education programs at Michigan State University. We are asking your help because we feel that you are in a position to give us an accurate evaluation of the Michigan State Graduates.

_____, who according to our information was on your staff during the school year 1967-68, has been selected to be included in this study.

Enclosed is an evaluation form which is a composite of many such forms used in Michigan. Will you please fill out the form based upon the above teacher's performance through June of 1968?

We are interested in how often you give achievement tests, as we would like to do a follow-up based upon achievement of the students.

The information which you submit will be kept in the strictest confidence, and no individual in the study will be mentioned by name, school system, or by any other identifying criteria. The teacher will only be included as a statistic in the over-all study.

While we know that you are very busy, we would appreciate your cooperation in this study.

Please return by December 8th if possible.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Arends

RLA:mw
11-29-68

TO:

FROM: Robert L. Arends, Director
MSU Student Teaching Center, Flint
314 Avon Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

Dear Michigan State Graduate:

We are attempting a follow-up study of the Teacher Education Programs at Michigan State University. As a recent graduate, who has had a couple of years in the field, your opinion will be of great value.

The information which you submit will be kept in the strictest confidence and no individual in the study will be mentioned by name, school system, or by any other identifying criteria.

Will you please fill out the attached form, and return as soon as possible?

INSTRUCTIONS

- Step I From the TEACHER COMPETENCIES listed on the attached page, select those THREE in which you adjudge yourself STRONGEST. Write the number of each in first (the strongest), second and third order on the lines so designated under STRENGTHS.
- Step II From the SOURCES OF COMPETENCY listed on the attached page, select those which provide you strengths in the areas noted. Write the letter of each pertinent source on the lines so designated.
- Step III Consider the TEACHER COMPETENCIES listed on the attached page. Adjudge the three you consider the most important. Mark "1" on the line preceding the most important, "2" on the line preceding the second most important, and "3" on the line preceding the third most important.
- Step IV Complete the final portion of the questionnaire. Please make the appropriate comments on the back of the form.

While we know that as a teacher you are very busy, we would appreciate you completing this questionnaire and sending it back as soon as possible.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Arends, Director
MSU Teacher Education Center - Flint

RLA:cb

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL'S EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINCIPAL'S EVALUATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Personal Information

 (name-teacher) (system) (school) (grade)

Is this teacher married? Yes _____ No _____

Years teaching in your building: Please circle: 1966-67 1967-68

Is this teacher still in your building? Yes _____ No _____

If above is no, why _____

Did she do her student teaching in your system? Yes _____ No _____

Building Yes _____ No _____

II. Information relating to the school

A. External conditions

1. Socio-economic conditions

Please estimate the percentage for each

Upper class _____

Middle class _____

Lower class _____

2. Racial mixture

Please estimate the percentage for each

White _____

Non-white _____

B. Internal conditions

1. Type of grouping used: Homogeneous _____ Heterogeneous _____

If Homogeneous, what type of class did the above teacher have?

Upper _____

Middle _____

Lower _____

2. How often are achievement tests given in your school? _____

III. Evaluation

KEY TO RATING: 1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Average 4. Fair
 5. Poor

(Please circle the appropriate response)

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Health and Vitality-----	1	2	3	4	5
Personal Appearance-----	1	2	3	4	5
Friendliness-----	1	2	3	4	5
Flexibility-----	1	2	3	4	5
Sincerity-----	1	2	3	4	5
Enthusiasm-----	1	2	3	4	5

INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS

Constructive Control of Pupils-----	1	2	3	4	5
Provisions for Individual Differences-----	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of Pupil Achievement-----	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of Subject Matter-----	1	2	3	4	5

TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

Rapport with Co-workers-----	1	2	3	4	5
Willingness to Seek and Accept Advice-----	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship with the Administration-----	1	2	3	4	5

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE

Ethical Attitudes-----	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of Leadership-----	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of Professional Growth-----	1	2	3	4	5

COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours-----	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to Meet and Work with Parents-----	1	2	3	4	5

CONCLUSION

Give an Overall Assessment of this Teacher's Effectiveness-----	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

TENURE

Was this teacher eligible for tenure in June of 1968?

If above is yes, was she placed on tenure?

If above is no, was she placed on a third year probation?

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE'S OPINIONNAIRE

RTEP

QUESTIONNAIRE

STRENGTHS

First _____ Sources: _____

Second _____ Sources: _____

Third _____ Sources: _____

TEACHER COMPETENCIES

- | | |
|--|---|
| _____ 1. Health and Vitality | _____ 10. Knowledge of Subject Matter |
| _____ 2. Personal Appearance | _____ 11. Rapport with Co-workers |
| _____ 3. Friendliness | _____ 12. Ability to Seek and Accept Advice |
| _____ 4. Flexibility | _____ 13. Relationship with the Administration |
| _____ 5. Sincerity | _____ 14. Ethical Attitude |
| _____ 6. Enthusiasm | _____ 15. Leadership |
| _____ 7. Constructive Control of Pupils | _____ 16. Professional Growth |
| _____ 8. Provisions for Individual Differences | _____ 17. Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours |
| _____ 9. Evidence of Pupil Growth | _____ 18. Ability to Meet and Work with Parents |

SOURCES OF COMPETENCY

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| A. Professional Education Courses | E. Teaching Associates |
| B. Subject Courses | F. Principal or Building Supervisor |
| C. Supervising Teacher (Student Teaching) | G. Yourself |
| D. College Coordinator (Student Teaching) | H. Others (Specify) |

Do you feel that the training which you received at Michigan State University adequately prepared you for your career in teaching?

Yes _____ No _____ (Please comment)

QUESTIONNAIRE

STRENGTHS

First _____ Sources: _____
 Second _____ Sources: _____
 Third _____ Sources: _____

TEACHER COMPETENCIES

- | | |
|--|---|
| _____ 1. Health and Vitality | _____ 10. Knowledge of Subject Matter |
| _____ 2. Personal Appearance | _____ 11. Rapport with Co-workers |
| _____ 3. Friendliness | _____ 12. Ability to Seek and Accept Advice |
| _____ 4. Flexibility | _____ 13. Relationship with the Administration |
| _____ 5. Sincerity | _____ 14. Ethical Attitude |
| _____ 6. Enthusiasm | _____ 15. Leadership |
| _____ 7. Constructive Control of Pupils | _____ 16. Professional Growth |
| _____ 8. Provisions for Individual Differences | _____ 17. Willingness to Participate in Activities within the Community Outside of School Hours |
| _____ 9. Evidence of Pupil Growth | _____ 18. Ability to Meet and Work Parents |

SOURCES OF COMPETENCY

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| A. Professional Education Courses | F. Teaching Associates |
| B. Subject Courses | G. Principal or Building Supervisor |
| C. Supervising Teacher (Student Teaching) | H. Yourself |
| D. College Coordinator (Student Teaching) | I. Others (Specific) |
| E. Intern Consultant (Internship) | |

Do you feel that the training which you received at Michigan State University adequately prepared you for your career in teaching?

Yes _____ No _____ (Please comment)

If you had to start your program over, would you have participated in the Intern Program, or the Regular Teacher Education Program?

Intern _____ Regular _____ (Please comment)