

69-20,818

BARBERI, Carlo Charles, 1916-
A STUDY OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE
SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM
AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, ADMINIS-
TRATORS, PARENTS AND PUPILS IN THE
MT. PLEASANT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MT.
PLEASANT, MICHIGAN.

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

69-20,818

BARBERI, Carlo Charles, 1916-

Michigan State University, Ed.D., 1969
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE SECONDARY
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM AS PERCEIVED BY
FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS, PARENTS AND
PUPILS IN THE MT. PLEASANT PUBLIC
SCHOOLS, MT. PLEASANT, MICHIGAN

By

Carlo C. Barberi

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Administration and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS, PARENTS AND PUPILS IN THE MT. PLEASANT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MT. PLEASANT, MICHIGAN

By

Carlo C. Barberi

The purpose of the study is to investigate the extent to which public school student teachers are accepted by administrators, teachers, parents and pupils of the Mt. Pleasant School System. Four major hypotheses were formulated:

1. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among parents, pupils, teachers and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.
2. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among six pupil groups organized according to grade level.
3. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among cooperating and non-cooperating teachers in the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

4. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among four parent groups organized according to educational background.

A review of the literature revealed studies which focused upon the attitudes of selected school affiliated groups as they pertain to student teacher acceptance. However, none of these studies attempted to examine these groups in relationship to each other. Furthermore, in several instances conflicting results were obtained for two or more studies.

The population consisted of selected parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Attitudes of teacher acceptance were determined by the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire which was administered to all study participants. The instrument was specifically designed for use in this study.

The four hypotheses were statistically treated using the Chi Square Test for "K" independent samples.

Findings of the Study

The profile analysis of response for parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators revealed relatively positive attitudes of student teacher acceptance among all groups. Areas of low positive response concerned the student teacher's subject competence, his ability to cope with

discipline problems, and over-all quality of instruction.

The analysis of the hypotheses revealed the following findings:

The five school affiliated groups did not differ significantly in their attitudes of student teacher acceptance. However, pupils and cooperating teachers expressed the most positive attitudes. Administrators and non-cooperating teachers were moderately positive in their attitudes, and parents were least positive.

The six pupil groups did not differ significantly in their attitudes of student teacher acceptance. Seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth grade pupils were most accepting, whereas eleventh and twelfth grade pupils were moderately accepting.

There were slight differences in the acceptance attitudes of cooperating and non-cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers tended to be more accepting. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

The four parent groups organized according to varying educational backgrounds did not differ significantly in their student teacher acceptance attitudes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to pay tribute to my committee members, Dr. Fred J. Vescolani, Dr. William V. Hicks, Dr. Max Raines, Dr. John Useen, and Dr. Harold J. Dillon for the benefit of their guidance and constructive criticism in writing this dissertation. A special thank you is owed to Dr. Fred J. Vescolani whose able assistance over an extended period of time has been most valuable.

I am indebted to the secondary pupils and parents of the Mt. Pleasant school system, and to the secondary teachers and administrators who were generous of their time in responding to the questionnaire and during the interviews.

I express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Wilbur Brookover, Dr. David E. Murphy, Dr. Wilbur Harris and Mrs. Helen Conaway for their help and guidance in completing this study.

I dedicate this thesis to my wife, Catherine, for her encouragement throughout the doctoral program, and to my children, Joseph, Carl and Mariann, whose interest in the study kept alive the desire to complete it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Need for the Study.	1
The Problem	7
Definitions of Terms	9
Hypotheses to be Tested	12
II. A REVIEW OF THE PERTINENT LITERATURE.	15
Summary	23
III. A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY SECONDARY DIRECTED STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM.	25
IV. THE METHODOLOGY.	42
Source of Data	42
The Population	42
Description of the Instrument	43
Procedures	44
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	47
Profile Analysis	47
Hypothesis I.	63
Hypothesis II	65
Hypothesis III	67
Hypothesis IV	69
Summary	69

Chapter	Page
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	72
Summary	72
Conclusions	75
Suggestions for Further Research	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDICES.	91
Appendix	
A. Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire	92
B. Letter to Parents	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 1. .	48
2. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 2. .	49
3. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 3. .	51
4. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 4. .	52
5. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 5. .	54
6. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 6. .	55
7. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 7. .	56
8. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 8. .	58
9. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 9. .	59
10. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 10 .	60

Table	Page
11. Frequency Responses of Cooperating Teachers, Parents, Non-cooperating Teachers, Pupils and Administrators, Question 11 .	62
12. Frequency of Response of Five School Related Groups in Three Student Acceptance Categories	64
13. Frequency of Response of Pupils from Six Grades in Three Student Teacher Acceptance Categories	66
14. Frequency of Response of Cooperating and Non-cooperating Teachers in Three Student Teacher Acceptance Categories. .	68
15. Frequency of Response of Four Parent Groups in Three Student Teacher Acceptance Categories.	70

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Discussions with members of the administrative services staff of the School of Education, Michigan State University, members of the doctoral committee, and with the Dean and Associate Dean of the School of Education at Central Michigan University led to the development of the idea that a study of the Central Michigan University Secondary Directed Student Teaching Program as practiced in the Mt. Pleasant School District would provide information that would be of benefit to Central Michigan University and the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools. The reactions of various school affiliated groups to the student teaching program in the Mt. Pleasant School District should be studied in more detail.

Need for the Study

For many years Central Michigan University has been sending secondary student teachers to public schools for laboratory training. The Mt. Pleasant Public Schools were the first off-campus public schools contracted by Central Michigan University for this purpose.

In 1891 a number of public-spirited citizens of Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, formed an association for building a normal school. The school was established and managed by that group until 1895, when it was offered to, and accepted by, the State of Michigan.

Total enrollment for the first year of State Central was eighty-four. By 1901 enrollment had grown to 540. The 1968 enrollment figure totaled 11,500 students.

The act by which the Michigan legislature made Central Normal a state institution declares that its purpose shall be, "For preparation and training of persons for teaching in the rural district schools and the primary departments of the graded schools of the State."¹

The Seventh Annual Catalogue of 1901-1902 of Central Normal stated:

. . . its aim is to furnish better teachers for the schools in which the masses are educated. Its influence reaches to the home of the farmer and the mechanic. The best teachers should be employed in the elementary schools, not only because so many children never get beyond them, but because all future work in school must rest on the foundation laid in the elementary grades.²

At this time the school year was divided into three terms of twelve weeks each. The fall term started on

¹Seventh Annual Catalogue of 1901-1902 at Central Normal.

²Ibid., p. 4.

September 30; the winter term on January 6; and the spring term on April 7.

Tuition was free to all students preparing to teach in the rural schools of the state. All other students paid a tuition of \$3 per term.

In 1901 the State Legislature appropriated \$50,000 for a student teacher training school building. Central Normal at that time had building and equipment valued at \$150,000. Present valuation of buildings and equipment is \$57,627,401.

Central Normal's eighth annual catalog of 1902-1903 states:

. . . by an admirable arrangement made between the City of Mt. Pleasant and the State Board of Education, from thirty to forty children from the city are regularly assigned to each grade of the training school.³

The college and the Mt. Pleasant school system have had a long and excellent relationship.

In the early days of Central Michigan Normal School very few degrees were granted. The majority of Central's graduates were given Life Certificates after completing a two-year curriculum. Most of these graduates taught in elementary schools.

As late as 1923 all student teaching was done in the college training school which consisted of a K-6,

³Eighth Annual Catalogue of 1902-1903 at Central Normal.

7-9 organization. Mr. Park G. Lantz was serving as superintendent of the training school in 1923. He felt that as the number of degree teachers increased, the need for more student teacher facilities on the secondary level became more evident. The local public high school seemed the most logical place to implement a student teacher program. Mr. Lantz proposed such a program to Dr. E. C. Warriner, President of Central Normal. Dr. Warriner attended a special meeting of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education on October 20, 1924. The Board minutes read as follows:

The lack of sufficient training facilities for Normal School students was presented by President E. C. Warriner and Superintendent P. G. Lantz. Motion by Hannah S. Vowles, seconded by E. O. Harris that the Board of Education of the City schools signify a willingness to cooperate with the authorities of the Normal School in furnishing additional training facilities for students for the 1925-1926 school year.⁴

The Mt. Pleasant Board minutes of May 19, 1925, state that:

An agreement entered into between the School District of Mt. Pleasant, Party of the first part, and the Central Michigan State Normal School, Party of the second part, for the use of certain rooms in the schools of said city for the training of teachers:

It is hereby agreed:

1. That eight critic teachers, or their equivalent, shall be placed in Fancher School and Central School Buildings as soon as vacancies occur.

⁴Mt. Pleasant Public School Board Minutes, School Year 1924-1925.

2. That critics with not less than four years of training shall be employed for these positions, and that the party of the first part shall pay \$1,000 of their yearly salary, and the party of the second part shall pay the remainders through the Board of Education.
3. That the city superintendent, representing the party of the first part, and the Training School Superintendent, representing the party of the second part, shall cooperate in employing the critic teachers.
4. The party of the first part will supply buildings, equipment, and supplies.
5. That all critic teachers will be under the supervision of city superintendent just as the regular teachers and will be responsible to him for all phases of their work having to do with the instruction of the pupils. They will attend all teachers' meetings called by the city superintendent. The critic teachers, working in the city schools, will be responsible to the superintendent of the Training School only from the standpoint of the training of student teachers.
6. That the same course of study and textbooks will be used in the rooms where critic teachers are placed as in all the city schools.

Motion by Hannah S. Vowles, seconded by W. D. Hood that the following agreement with the State Board of Education be unanimously adopted. It was adopted May 19, 1925.⁵

Park G. Lantz, now retired, stated to the writer in a letter dated August 4, 1962,

. . . in my opinion that it was the financial part of the agreement which really sold itself to the Board. I also feel that the college was getting more than its money's worth.

He further writes:

We contracted to use only critics who had a master's degree and several years of successful experience. This would seem a good guarantee for

⁵Ibid., p. 203.

both parties. It would tend to compensate for any loss of instruction due to the use of student teachers. This was rather a high standard for high schools at that time.⁶

By May 1928, Central's need for more critic teachers on the secondary level was evident. The Mt. Pleasant School District and Central State employed seven additional critics for the secondary program. Of these, four were to serve the Mt. Pleasant school system for many years; namely, E. J. Grambau, G. D. Muyskens, L. E. Orcutt, and Ethel B. LaMore. Salaries for these critics ranged from \$2,300 to \$2,600 of which the Mt. Pleasant School District paid \$1,000.

The number of secondary critics was increased to fourteen by July 11, 1949. The effect of these fourteen critics upon the secondary program has been very positive. Each has served as department head in his major area of training.

It was agreed from the onset of the program, ". . . that the loyalty of these critics was to be to the public schools; college interests were to be secondary."⁷

In June 1959, the secondary directed teaching program was altered to include a program of directed observation, affiliation, and directed teaching. This change resulted in the addition of thirty-one cooperating teachers to the program. Chapter III presents a description of the

⁶Letter of Mr. Park G. Lantz, dated August 4, 1962.

⁷Ibid., p. 2.

program now in effect at Central Michigan University and as practiced in the Mt. Pleasant school system.

The success of secondary directed teacher program involves the combined efforts and support of administrators, teachers, students, and parents alike. It is felt that an examination of the reactions of these groups to the student teacher will be of value in determining ways in which that effort and support may be further strengthened.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study is to investigate the extent to which public school student teachers are accepted by administrators, teachers, parents, and pupils of the school system.

Scope of the Problem

The study focuses upon the perceptions and attitudes of parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant public schools.

The study is specifically concerned with the following tasks:

1. An analysis of parent, pupil, teacher, and administrator evaluations pertaining to various aspects of student teacher performance.

2. A comparison of the degree to which pupils, parents, teachers, and administrators express positive attitudes toward student teachers.
3. A comparison of the degree to which pupils at various grade levels express positive attitudes toward student teachers.
4. A comparison of the degree to which cooperating and non-cooperating teachers express positive attitudes toward student teachers.
5. A comparison of the degree to which parents with different educational background express positive attitudes toward student teachers.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study fall into three categories. The first concerns the choice of population.

The cross-section of parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators represented in the study are taken from one school district. This does limit the extent of generalization from the findings. However, it also enables an in-depth analysis of response.

A second limitation is cited in reference to methodology. The study utilizes the questionnaire technique. This technique is subject to the usual research criticisms.

A third limitation concerns the choice of acceptance factors included in the questionnaire. Although

the instrument used in the study does discriminate among various attitudes toward teacher acceptance, the inclusion of other acceptance factors and/or measurement devices may lead to different conclusions.

Definition of Terms

Student Teacher Acceptance

Refers to an appraisal of the following qualities as they relate to the student teacher situation: (1) student teacher's subject matter proficiency, (2) student teacher's effect on pupils, (3) student teacher's provision of individual attention, (4) quality of instruction provided by student teacher, (5) student teacher's performance in coping with pupil discipline problems, (6) quality of cooperating teacher's instruction when student teacher is assigned to the classroom, (7) effect of observers upon the classroom process, (8) effect of directed teaching program upon total educational program of the school system, and (9) overall quality of directed teaching program.

Degree of Student Teacher Acceptance

For the purpose of this study degree of student teacher acceptance is defined as the total combined ratings on the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire for each respondent.

Student Teacher Function

Refers to objectives, processes, and behaviors directly related to the directed student teacher program as defined in Chapter III.

Professional Laboratory Experience

Refers to all those organized and directed contacts with children, youth, and adults which make a direct contribution to an understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching learning process.

Directed Teaching

Is defined as the period of guided instruction by a supervising teacher when the student teacher assumes responsibility for the work with a given group of learners for a given length of time.

Student Teacher

Refers to the individual teacher candidate; a trainee who actively participates in a process of student teaching.

College Laboratory School

Refers to a school which is administered and/or staffed by the college or university, over which the college or university maintains legal control.

Off-Campus Center

Refers to a school system which has joined with Central Michigan University by contractual agreement to have student teachers in its schools.

Cooperating Schools

Refers to the individual schools within the respective systems which make up the Off-Campus Center.

Non-Cooperating Teachers

Refers to teachers on the regular staff who are not assigned to work with student teachers.

Cooperating Teachers

Refers to a regular teacher on the staff of the public school system in whose class or classes the student teacher is assigned to work.

College Coordinator

Refers to that person appointed by the university to direct the activities of the directed teaching program in the Off-Campus Center.

Affiliation

Refers to the period of guided or supervised study when the student assumes responsibility for the work with a given group of learners for a given length of time.

(Same as directed teaching except for the time assigned.)

Directed teaching is usually for an eight-week period all day. Affiliation is usually for one or two hours a day for all or part of a semester.

Affiliate

A student who engages in the affiliation program.

Observation

A program whereby students who are planning to teach will visit classes to observe with clear purposes in mind. These students usually jot down specific things to look for, and also record observations made.

Observer

One who participates in the observation program.

Administrators

Refers to those persons in the school system who spend their entire time in the administration and supervision of the school. These persons are generally superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, and assistant principals.

Hypotheses to be Tested

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among parents, pupils, teachers and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among six pupil groups organized according to grade level.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among cooperating and non-cooperating teachers in the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Hypothesis IV

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among four parent groups organized according to educational background.

Organization of the Study

The thesis is presented in six chapters:

Chapter I: Examines the nature of directed student teaching, the need for the study, the scope of the study, its limitations, and a definition of terms used in the secondary directed teaching program.

Chapter II: Presents a review of the pertinent literature.

Chapter III: Presents a functional description of the Central Michigan University secondary directed student teaching program.

Chapter IV: Details the methodology used to develop the four questionnaires and explains procedures.

Chapter V: Interprets the data obtained from cooperating teachers, non-cooperating teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents.

Chapter VI: Summarizes the study and makes recommendations and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE PERTINENT LITERATURE

Colleges and universities now engaged in a program of teacher training have recognized from the beginning a need for laboratory experience for prospective teachers. Most colleges and universities started with a laboratory or campus school to provide this experience, but because of increased numbers of student teachers and a need for a broader experience, many teacher training institutions in the early 1920's began to contract with the public school systems for off-campus facilities for this experience.⁸

Laboratory experiences provide a resource for students and teachers which gives meaning to ideas and helps the learner to see more clearly the implementation of those ideas.

There is a need for the student teacher to be exposed to a laboratory experience that involves children

⁸ Association for Student Teaching, Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook (Lock Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1951), p. 10.

of varied intellectual abilities, home background, and socio-economic levels. The experience should provide direct contact with the range of activities of today's teacher. The student teacher working closely with pupils in the classroom is not enough. Much of a teacher's work involved the activities of the school as a whole. The student teaching assignment takes on more meaning when the college student shares in assisting in activities such as assembly programs, school paper and student council.

Schorling indicates that:

. . . the concept of student teaching is too limited. We need to think of it as living with pupils in a great variety of situations in which emphasis is on the effort to get a desirable inter-play between individuals and environment that contributes to normal growth. Student teaching should be broadened to include experience with tasks that carry the teacher beyond the classroom.⁹

The editing subcommittee of "Who's in Charge Here?" stated:

Elementary and secondary schools have responsibilities in teacher education since they provide the essential resources for student teaching: pupils, supervising teachers, physical facilities, and an ongoing education program. Schools and colleges have responsibility for joint planning of student teaching, and they benefit mutually from it. The inter-play of collaboration in student teaching prompts examination of present practice and stimulates experimentation in teaching. It also provides opportunities to test relationships between theory and practice, to

⁹Ralliegh Schorling, Student Teaching (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949), p. 10.

reduce the lag between discoveries in research and applications in practice, to learn from results of actual teaching-learning situations, and to contribute to assurances that new teachers will be well prepared.¹⁰

After 1928 many teacher training institutions used college campus secondary schools as well as public schools for student teachers.¹¹ Recently, the responsibility has shifted to public schools.

Foster¹² states that in 1933, the number of campus schools was expanding, while at the same time off-campus contracts were increasing. Brink further substantiates this trend by saying: ". . . even though most colleges and universities had campus schools by 1948, they also had working arrangements with nearby public schools."¹³

Public school systems in the United States have in recent years been demanding that beginning teachers be

¹⁰"Who's in Charge Here?" a discussion paper, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Washington, D. C.

¹¹E. L. Welborn, "Cooperation with Local Schools in Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, VI (November, 1920), 445-470.

¹²Frank K. Foster, "The Training School in the Education of Teachers," Teacher Education Curricula, National Survey of Education of Teachers, Bulletin No. 10 (1933), pp. 367-401.

¹³William G. Brink, "The Administration of Student Teaching in Universities Which Use the Public Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIV (October, 1958), 394-407.

better qualified to teach. Hence, the public schools have been agreeable to enter into contract with teacher training institutions to help qualify beginning teachers by placing them in the typical setting.

Many educators believe that the public school has increased its function as a laboratory to the point where it is of least equal or of greater importance than the campus laboratory school in the education of teachers for our schools.¹⁴

Several studies indicate acceptance of the off-campus student teaching program by parents and pupils. Sharpe¹⁵ in a study of 500 students who had student teachers from Indiana State University, indicated that the "pupils in the off-campus schools vote student teachers some place between 'outstanding' and 'satisfactory'" on all competencies except the one which relates to the help given pupils with their personal problems. In general, pupils believed that student teachers were well prepared to teach their subjects; that they taught democratically; that they made pupils think for themselves, and that they provided considerable individual

¹⁴Ester J. Swenson and Robert C. Hammock, "Off-Campus Laboratory Experiences, Their Growth, Importance and Present Role in Teacher Education," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook (Lock Hauer, Pa.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951), p. 21.

¹⁵Donald M. Sharpe, "The Pupils Look at the Program," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook

help. At the same time, pupils felt that student teachers needed improvement in their ability to help with personal problems; in their ability to keep the class in order; in their ability to keep pupils busy and interested, and in their ability to communicate effectively. The study indicated that pupils do not appear to be highly critical of student-teacher competencies.

Reactions favoring student teachers were in six categories: (1) satisfaction with program but no reason for favorable attitude, (2) approval of the program because student teachers presented new ideas, new approaches, and a new experience, (3) welcome to an opportunity to help future teachers, (4) enjoyment of student teachers because they were young and more nearly their own age, (5) provision for more individual help and a feeling that student teachers understood them better, and (6) approval of a tendency to make class less formal and more interesting.¹⁶

Unfavorable reactions to student teachers were in four categories: (1) student teachers were inferior to regular teachers and pupils' learning was impaired, (2) they do not make class interesting, (3) the class discipline deteriorated, and (4) pupils found it difficult to adjust to more than one teacher.¹⁷

(Lock Hauer, Pa.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951), pp. 104-120

¹⁶Ibid., p. 106.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 107.

Sharpe's¹⁸ interviews with supervising teachers revealed that with few exceptions they felt that pupils liked to have student teachers in the classrooms.

The North Central Association Subcommittee on Student Teaching in its report on current practices in student teaching in 1000 school systems in the North Central Association area stated:

On the whole, the general feeling or attitude of the faculty toward the supervision of student teaching was favorable. More than 80 percent of the respondents said their staff members considered it a professional responsibility and welcomed the opportunity to share in the preparation of a new generation of teachers. About 20 percent more said their staff members for the most part considered supervision of student teachers to be an additional load--burdensome but necessary. A very few admitted that some of their staff members preferred not to have such a responsibility and served only because their principal insisted. It should be kept in mind that these findings came only from those directing student teachers. It could be assumed, perhaps, that this sample of the profession represents the more competent and professionally minded and if all teachers had been included in the study, the percent eagerly assuming responsibility for the training of their successors might be much smaller.¹⁹

Sharpe states in his summary and conclusions:

Almost any point could be 'proved' by the 'right' selection of pupil responses. However, the following conclusions represent insofar as possible the opinions of most pupils who have had student teachers:

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁹ Student Teaching Programs in Certain School Systems of the North Central Association Area, edited by Byron L. Westfall. A study conducted and reported by the Sub-Committee on Student Teaching.

1. Pupils enjoy having student teachers in their classes. They do not want them in every class nor do they want them throughout the whole year. Probably the most important reason for liking student teachers is the fact that having them constitutes a novel, and therefore an interesting experience. Other reasons include the recognition that two teachers are able to provide more help than one teacher alone, and the recognition that the program provides valuable experience to future teachers.
2. Pupils feel that their learning does not suffer when student teachers are assigned to a class. Most of them feel that the total learning situation is improved. The fact that they feel as they do is a high compliment to the cooperating teacher, who plays the crucial role.
3. Pupils recognize that matters of group control and discipline present more difficult problems to the student teacher than to the regular teacher. However, they do not feel that they have suffered because of the student teacher's inexperience.
4. Pupils seem to share the opinion of those persons who have instituted off-campus student teaching programs that such a cooperative arrangement is a desirable practice.²⁰

Coleman²¹ reports on the reaction of parents to the Michigan State University student teaching program in Marshall, Michigan. The report is based upon personal observations and discussions with parents in the community. Findings of the study indicate that: (1) local citizens are happy to have student teachers in the community, (2) teachers are in accord with the student teaching program and devoted to these future teachers, (3) pupils received

²⁰Sharpe, "The Pupils Look at the Program," op. cit., pp. 119-120.

²¹Mary S. Coleman, "The Community Looks at the Program," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Brothers, Inc, 1951), pp. 89-94.

more individual attention, (4) student teachers brought new ideas into the classroom, (5) student teachers helped with many of the non-teaching tasks connected with the daily routine of classroom management, (6) having student teachers allowed for greater participation in extra-curricular activities, and (7) the citizens of Marshall endorsed the student teaching program and felt the program was good for school and community.

Alterman,²² in describing a new program of teacher education at Central Michigan University, indicated that the major contributions of college students were: (1) that the regular teachers were aware that a good example must be set, (2) that some help was given the regular teachers in routine tasks and (3) that college students brought new ideas and energy into the schools.

It was further stated that:

Teacher Education Project schools reported that students (interns) were considered a part of the faculty and that students (interns) adapted as such. Schools from the regular directed teaching program did not make an association more strongly than that college students 'fitted in with the faculty.'²³

Alterman also reports that the administration and cooperating teachers were asked what effect the Teacher

²²Ronald A. Alterman, A New Approach to Teacher Education, Central Michigan University Story (Mt. Pleasant, Mich.: Central Michigan University Press, 1966), pp. 89-90.

²³Ibid., p. 90.

Education Project had upon the administration, teachers and students in the school system. Responses were placed in the following categories:

- I. The program was received favorably by administration, teachers and students.
- II. Students accepted interns (student teachers). Many respondents emphasized how well the interns were accepted as teachers and not just as "student teachers."
- III. Programs resulted in improvement in the school system. Many improvements were mentioned, including the increased professional viewpoint of staff as well as actually relieving teachers of routine tasks so that more time could be spent on professional matters.
- IV. Schools themselves realized that they have a responsibility for preparing teachers. Many school systems found that working with prospective teachers could be an asset rather than a liability.
- V. Program had no effect on administration, teachers or students. Only two participants reported that there were no noticeable effects.

Summary

The foregoing review of literature reveals several studies concerning the appraisal of student teachers by

various school related groups. Perhaps the most significant finding is that parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators alike tend to express positive attitudes with reference to student teachers. However, exceptions to this trend do appear in isolated instances. Some pupils, for example, indicate that learning is impaired in directed teacher programs, that discipline is poor, and that it is difficult for pupils to adjust to such circumstances.

The studies cited in this chapter suggest a high degree of student teacher acceptance by parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators. However, these studies do not examine the groups in relation to each other on the basis of those factors which influence attitudes of acceptance or rejection.

CHAPTER III

A FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY SECONDARY DIRECTED STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

The secondary directed student teaching program is composed of three parts: directed observation, affiliation, and directed teaching. A description of directed observation taken from a Teacher Education Handbook for Mt. Pleasant Secondary Schools and Central Michigan University,²⁴ 1966, is as follows:²⁵

Education 336 - Directed Observation

I. Objectives

- A. Develop readiness for student teaching.
 - 1. Arouse and strengthen positive attitudes toward teaching.
 - 2. Develop an overall understanding of a teacher's activities and responsibilities.
 - 3. Develop the individual to the point where he is a good beginning student teacher and where he can obtain the maximum benefit from his student teaching experience.
- B. Develop skills for studying youth.
 - 1. Ability to understand pupils as individuals--how to discover needs, interests, attitudes, customs, values, rates of growth, differences, typical traits and handicaps.

²⁴Teacher Education Handbook for Mt. Pleasant Secondary Schools and Central Michigan University (Mt. Pleasant, Mich.: Central Michigan University, 1966). The writer served on the committee that prepared this handbook.

²⁵Reprinted by permission of the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

2. Ability to understand pupils as groups--
group dynamics, social structures, controls,
discipline, leadership, fellowship, friend-
ship roles, customs and values.
- C. Develop skills for studying and evaluating
teaching-learning situations.
 1. Ability to identify and evaluate different
methods and techniques of teaching with
respect to objectives, planning assignments,
grouping, evaluation, materials, and resources,
individual differences, motivation.
 2. Ability to recognize the importance of such
physical surroundings as types of buildings,
furniture, grounds, equipment, temperature,
light, moisture, seating, ventilation, utili-
zation of space and equipment.
- D. Develop skill in evaluating such routine tasks
as the following:
 1. Absences, tardiness, reporting and recording
marks, health and safety factors, distributing
and collecting materials, announcements, use
of library, bulletin boards.
 2. Study halls, homework, extra duties, after-
school functions, field trips.
- E. Develop skill for evaluating one's fitness for
entering the teaching profession.
 1. Do I have the necessary abilities and interests
for teaching?
 2. What grade level or subjects should I teach?
 3. Observation and participation experiences
should be of such a nature that they contri-
bute to the guidance of prospective teachers.
- F. Develop skill for evaluating personal and pro-
fessional characteristics of teachers.
 1. Appearance, voice, friendliness, thoughtfulness,
fairness, sense of humor, willingness to be
helpful, professional attitude.

II. Principles of Observation

- A. Observations should be carefully directed, well
organized, and followed up with discussions and
reports. Observers must have definite purposes,
must understand how to select and organize obser-
vations that are related to these purposes, and
must understand their responsibilities.
- B. Some observations should be general and overall,
and some should be specific and concentrated--
some should be longitudinal and some should be
latitudinal. The principle of continuity sug-
gests the desirability of observing for some
time in the same classroom. Frequently, more
is gained from observation for several days in
the same situation than observing for the same
amount of time in a number of situations.

- C. In preparation for student teaching, the directed observation should be correlated with the studies of principles of teaching and with a study of adolescents.*
- D. The quality, depth, and range of the observations should receive more emphasis than the number of observations. Flexibility should be provided.*
- E. Discussions and reports following observations should be treated on an ethical and courteous basis at all time.*
- F. Observations should be carried out under conditions which are professional, courteous, and comfortable for all concerned. The total instructional functions and responsibilities of supervising teachers must be considered at all times.*
- G. Arrangements for scheduling and supervising observations must be made in accordance with policies that will avoid inconvenience to, or imposition upon, coordinating teachers or the schools.*
- H. Normal classroom situations are expected for observations. The teachers need not make any special preparation.

III. General Description of the Observation Program

- A. Emphasis will be placed upon quality, depth, and range of observations rather than just quantity.
- B. Directed Observation classes will meet on campus once each week, on Tuesday or Thursday, as indicated by the instructor. Students should keep both scheduled meeting times open for activities related to the course.
- C. Each student will complete 24 observations. These observations will be distributed over the four following areas:
 - 1. Growth and development
 - 2. Secondary program (general school overview)
 - 3. Major field of interest
 - 4. Minor fields of interest
- D. For students doing affiliation, a maximum of one observation may be used from the affiliation assignment.
- E. Observations will be made in the Mt. Pleasant Junior and Senior High Schools and in the University Laboratory School, unless the instructor of the Directed Observation course specifies otherwise.

*Mainly for college instructor's information.

IV. Scheduling of Observations

- A. It will be the responsibility of the student to make the selection of observations he will make in accordance with instructions provided in the Directed Observation course meetings.
- B. Students must not be admitted to classes as observers without the proper admission ticket and observation permits.
- C. Observation tickets for class admission will be placed on a board near the principal's office in the Junior and Senior High Schools and in the University Laboratory School. Before observing a class, each student selects the appropriate ticket from the board. The ticket must be turned in to the teacher of the class which is observed.
 - 1. Select a ticket from the board only a few minutes in advance of the start of the class to be observed.
 - 2. Tickets are taken from the board only when the printed side is exposed.
 - 3. No student is permitted or authorized to secure an observation ticket for any other student observer.
 - 4. Each ticket must be used on the day that it is secured from the board. Observers are requested not to accumulate tickets for future use.
- D. Not more than 5 observers can be allowed to observe in a classroom at one time. Therefore, no more than 5 tickets will be available for any course for a given class period.
 - 1. When a teacher has a full-time student teacher and/or affiliates assigned, the number of observers could be adjusted so that there will not be more than a total of 5 college students during one class hour.
 - 2. This adjustment might be made by turning some of the tickets.
 - 3. Special arrangements may be made in classes with room for more college students.
- E. When a classroom teacher finds it necessary to close a class to observers for a day, the admission tickets for that class for that day will be turned to face the board.
 - 1. Such closing may be under the following circumstances:
 - a. When the regular teacher is away.
 - b. When a full-period test is given.
 - c. When student teachers or affiliates are teaching.*

*While it is not generally desirable for observers to see student teachers teaching too many times, it is

- d. When there is some particular reason, not included in the first three points, if the regular teacher has received the approval of the principal.
- 2. Each day, before leaving, the office clerk should turn all tickets face out. If any class is to be closed the next day, the teacher must turn the tickets before class-time.
- F. For instructions of scheduling observations in the University Laboratory School, see the appropriate information sheet which has been given you.

V. Observer Responsibilities

- A. Each observer is in a sense a guest of the school; it is hoped that there will be no instance of conduct by an observer which fails to reflect maturity, courtesy, and sound judgment.
- B. It is necessary that observers be prompt and report to the classroom prior to the start of the class meeting. The observer should remain with the class until the end of the period unless arrangements have been made with the teacher to leave early.
- C. Observers will refrain from gum chewing, sleeping, reading magazines and newspapers, writing letters and any distracting or unprofessional behavior while observing in a classroom. Not only will such behavior be reported to the observation instructor, but the cooperating teacher shall have the right to dismiss the observer from the classroom.
- D. Observers should be dressed in a manner appropriate for adults in public school situations.
- E. An "Observation Permit" card will be furnished by the Directed Observation instructor for each observation. Fill in the card completely and hand it to the teacher of the class to be observed. These cards will be returned by each school to the University where they will be filed by the instructor of the Directed Teaching Observation section in which you are registered.

hoped that the cooperating teachers will at times use their own judgment as to when a student teacher might be observed. The supervisor, the student teacher, and the observer should approve the situation when a student teacher is to be observed. Perhaps one or two observations of the student teacher's teaching would be desirable.

1. Cards are to be initialed by the classroom teacher and returned to the office daily.
 2. Unbecoming conduct should be reported in a separate envelope which will be routed directly (campus mail) to the observation instructor the same day.
- F. Observers are asked to remember that the principal obligation of each classroom teacher is to his class. Unless it is specifically authorized by the teacher, don't move around the classroom nor attempt to give assistance to students or to the teacher.
- G. Each observer is expected to prepare observation notes and reports in accordance with instructions provided by the instructor of the Directed Observation class.

- VI. Duplicated materials distributed for use in the Directed Observation program will include:
- A. Floor plans of the Junior and Senior High Schools.
 - B. Class schedules of the Junior and Senior High Schools.
 - C. Instructions for scheduling observations in the University Laboratory School.
 - D. Observation permit cards.

Education 338 - Educational Affiliation

I. General Principles

- A. The affiliation program is designed to augment student teaching experience and, whenever possible, to increase opportunities for participation in professional activities.
- B. If elected, affiliation assignments for each student is determined on an individual basis, in relation to the student's capacities, interests, and needs as a prospective teacher.
- C. The affiliation program is conducted in keeping with the principles that flexibility in the program is desirable and that experimentation should be encouraged.

II. Types of Assignments

- A. On-Campus: A number of the Departments of Central Michigan University accept selected majors for affiliation assignments on the University campus. The professional experience offered in the various departmental affiliation programs are oriented to the capacities and interests of affiliates chosen for such assignments. Representative activities include assisting in University classrooms and campus laboratories, preparing instructional materials, planning and presenting demonstrations, and instructing individual students

and groups of students in various departmental courses.

Students who are interested in a departmental affiliation assignment on the campus are advised to check with the Head of the Department in which the student is completing his major for information concerning affiliation projects in that department. Application for such assignments must be made to the School of Education, in accordance with policies presented later in this section.

- B. In Secondary Schools: All students who elect affiliation in the secondary level will be assigned to projects in the junior and senior high schools. In general, two types of assignments in the secondary schools are made:
1. Affiliates may do supervised student teaching in regularly scheduled courses in the secondary schools. Such assignments will be given to all students who wish to supplement the classroom and course work experience which directed teaching provides.
 2. On a selective basis, affiliates may be assigned to function under supervision in positions appropriate to their interests and capacities, such as:
 - a. Assistant in one or more athletic activities, including football, basketball, baseball, track or field, golf, and tennis.
 - b. Assistant in intramural program.
 - c. Assistant school librarian.
 - d. Laboratory assistant in science courses.
 - e. Assistant in the adult education program.
 - f. Aide in the school testing program.
 - g. Participant in general guidance activities, such as orientation programs, assistance to students in selecting courses, vocational guidance projects.
 - h. Assistant in audio-visual program.
 - i. Assistant in athletic program in later elementary grades.
 - j. Assistant in driver education program (for affiliates who are qualified).
 - k. Assistant to the school attendance counselor.
 - l. Aide to faculty sponsor or director in extra-curricular activities as dramatics.
 - m. Assistant in administrative and research projects.
 - n. Assistant in directing and supervising programs of noon-hour activities.
 - o. Others.

- C. Others: The affiliation assignment may be completed through participation in other approved programs, such as in counseling and instructional activities in summer camps and in community recreation programs. All arrangements for receiving credit in Education 338 in such selected assignments are subject to approval by the Associate Dean, School of Education.

III. Policies

A. General Policies:

1. Each activity and assignment in the Affiliation Program shall be selected for its worth in contribution to the professional preparation of the secondary school teacher.
2. The scope, schedule, and sequences of opportunities offered each student enrolled in the Affiliation Program shall be determined on the basis of what experiences are most appropriate to the needs and interests of that student.
3. Provisions of experiences in such instructional activities as planning, demonstrating, preparing materials, conducting discussion sessions, directing student activities, and projects, making critical analyses of student work, evaluating, and in handling various responsibilities associated with these activities shall be the primary aim of the Affiliation Program. Such activities as checking papers, supervising use of equipment and materials, monitoring, and various routine duties that may be included in the affiliation program assignments shall not constitute a principal part of any student's work experience in the program.
4. Each department on campus has been encouraged to organize and offer a program of affiliation for majors who wish to complete the assignment on campus. Each student who receives such an assignment shall be regarded by the department concerned as a student participant in the learning and instructional activities of that department. Precaution shall be taken to safeguard this status and to insure against permitting any student to function in any capacity or assignment in which the principal result may be either to exploit or capitalize on his services or to fail to offer experiences and opportunities which are professionally rewarding.

5. All responsibilities and privileges pertaining to student teachers in the secondary schools shall apply as well to students who are assigned in the affiliation program of the secondary schools.
 6. No affiliate in the secondary schools may receive pay or compensation for services resulting from his participation in the Affiliation Program; any exceptions to this must be approved by the School of Education and the Superintendent of Schools.
 7. At the end of the semester or whenever the affiliation assignment has been completed, a detailed evaluative report and a grade shall be submitted by the affiliate's supervisor. Such reports should be made on the forms available to all supervisors in Rowe 106 and should be returned to Rowe 106 when due. Supervising teachers are urged to make reports to the superintendent, principal, or coordinator on affiliates at any other times when desiring to call attention to the caliber of the student's work.
- B. Policies on Participation:
1. A minimum for the semester of 60 class hours of supervised participation is required of all affiliates.
 2. Each affiliate who is assigned to public school classes or activities meeting five days each week is expected to attend all regularly scheduled meetings of that class for twelve weeks from the start of campus classes for the semester.
For the fall semester, 1961, the affiliation period will be from September 5 through December 8 (the equivalent periods in succeeding years); for the spring semester, 1962, the affiliation period will be from February 8 through May 11 (the equivalent periods in succeeding years). Exceptions to this policy cannot be made without the approval of the Superintendent of Schools.
 3. All affiliates on assignments not covered by Item 2 above (principally, affiliates assigned on campus) attend class meetings for a minimum of 60 class hours in accordance with a schedule prepared by the supervisor at the start of the affiliation assignment. A copy of this schedule is to be sent to the School of Education (for University campus affiliates) or to the Superintendent of Schools (where assignments in the public schools are involved).

4. The work of each affiliate shall be adequately supervised by a member of the department for those affiliates who have on-campus assignments, or by a coordinator for those affiliates who have assignments in the secondary schools.
 5. Each affiliate is expected to attend periodic supervisory meetings or conferences as scheduled by his coordinating teacher.
- C. Policies on Assignments:
1. Application for affiliation assignments must be made no later than mid-term of the semester preceding the semester of affiliation. The form needed in filing application can be secured from Rowe 106 and should be completed and returned to Rowe 106 no later than the deadline date announced each semester in the campus newspaper.
 2. Students are eligible to apply for an affiliation assignment (Education 338) any time after admission to candidacy for the degree and certificate. In general, however, students will not be given assignments prior to the semester in which they register in the first semester block of the Secondary Education Program (Education 335, 336, and Psychology 312).
 3. Each student will need to determine, in relation to his own program which semester appears to be best for the affiliation assignment. In instances where such scheduling is possible, the student may secure valuable professional experience in his affiliation assignment by scheduling it for the semester in which he has completed his student teaching.
 4. The School of Education, Central Michigan University, is responsible for general supervision of students assigned to the affiliation program of the secondary schools.
 5. The Superintendent of Schools supervises the assignment of affiliates who are to participate in the affiliation program of the secondary schools.
 6. In some instances, affiliates in the secondary schools may be assigned to a department or area of the school program rather than to a specific course, class or activity. In all cases, however, one supervising teacher is to be designated as the coordinator of the affiliate's work.

7. Where circumstances warrant, an affiliate may be assigned to more than one type of activity, area of study or level of work in the course of his affiliation.
8. Any affiliate in the secondary school shall be assigned to a position as assistant or aide in an activity in the school concerned.
9. When student teaching is scheduled on an eight-weeks basis, affiliation may be scheduled in the other eight-weeks segment of the semester if an appropriate assignment is possible.
10. In exceptional circumstances, affiliation may be scheduled concurrently with the student teaching assignment. This does not apply to student teachers assigned on the eight-weeks basis.

4. The work of each affiliate shall be adequately supervised by a member of the department for those affiliates who have on-campus assignments, or by a coordinator for those affiliates who have assignments in the secondary schools.
5. Each affiliate is expected to attend periodic supervisory meetings or conferences as scheduled by his coordinating teacher.

C. Policies on Assignments:

1. Application for affiliation assignments must be made no later than mid-term of the semester preceding the semester of affiliation. The form needed in filing application can be secured from Rowe 106 and should be completed and returned to Rowe 106 no later than the deadline date announced each semester in the campus newspaper.
2. Students are eligible to apply for an affiliation assignment (Education 338) any time after admission to candidacy for the degree and certificate. In general, however, students will not be given assignments prior to the semester in which they register in the first semester block of the Secondary Education Program (Education 335, 336, and Psychology 312).
3. Each student will need to determine, in relation to his own program which semester appears to be best for the affiliation assignment. In instances where such scheduling is possible, the student may secure valuable professional experience in his affiliation assignment by scheduling it for the semester in which he has completed his student teaching.
4. The School of Education, Central Michigan University, is responsible for general supervision of students assigned to the affiliation program of the secondary schools.
5. The Superintendent of Schools supervises the assignment of affiliates who are to participate in the affiliation program of the secondary schools.
6. In some instances, affiliates in the secondary schools may be assigned to a department or area of the school program rather than to a specific course, class or activity. In all cases, however, one supervising teacher is to be designated as the coordinator of the affiliate's work.

7. Where circumstances warrant, an affiliate may be assigned to more than one type of activity, area of study or level of work in the course of his affiliation.
8. Any affiliate in the secondary school shall be assigned to a position as assistant or aide in an activity in the school concerned.
9. When student teaching is scheduled on an eight-weeks basis, affiliation may be scheduled in the other eight-weeks segment of the semester if an appropriate assignment is possible.
10. In exceptional circumstances, affiliation may be scheduled concurrently with the student teaching assignment. This does not apply to student teachers assigned on the eight-weeks basis.

COMPARISON OF AFFILIATION PROGRAM AND STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

Affiliation	Student Teaching
a. Affiliate registers in Education 338 for 2 semester hours credit. b. Assigned to minimum of 60 hours of participation during semester. c. Assigned to work on one course or in one activity in secondary school (or in a few instances at elementary level) or to serve as assistant teacher in a university class on campus, or to provide counseling and instruction in camping programs, etc. d. Assigned usually to work with one class or group only; attend all meetings (usually one period a day, five days a week or equivalent for twelve weeks). e. May be expected, as considered appropriate in judgment of affiliate's cooperating teacher, to observe in the course of activity, to prepare various instructional materials, plan teaching activities, assist individual students or group, and assist in handling other teaching functions in the course or activity to which affiliate is assigned. f. Attends periodic supervisory conferences as scheduled by the cooperating teacher or the university departmental staff member who serves as affiliate's cooperating teacher. In the secondary school, some affiliates may also be asked by their cooperating teachers to attend regularly scheduled "critic meetings" for Student Teachers. g. Quality of participation as an affiliate is evaluated and graded by affiliate's cooperating teacher and the results reported on an "Affiliation Evaluation Sheet" to be submitted at close of affiliation assignment. h. Affiliation assignment can be made any time after student is admitted to candidacy but not prior to registration in first semester block of Secondary Education Program. Some students complete affiliation before student teaching; other students complete their student teaching prior to affiliation.	a. Student teacher registers in Education 364 for 5 semester hours credit or Education 374 for 3. b. Assigned for full-time participation for 8-weeks (few exceptions within commuting distance are assigned 2 hours each day a semester.) c. Assignment limited to secondary school only (and to elementary level for some fields such as music, art, special education, physical education). d. Assigned usually to work with several classes in various courses on a schedule planned in consultation with cooperating teacher at start of assignment. e. May be expected to and required to plan, prepare for, and handle various instructional duties of the classroom teacher in the several courses included in his student teaching schedule, and to participate in related professional activities and school functions. f. Receives evaluations and suggestions from cooperating teacher as an integral part of each day's directed teaching experience; student teacher may also be required to attend regularly scheduled or periodic "critic meetings" as specified by cooperating teacher. g. Quality of participation as a student teacher is evaluated and graded by the cooperating teacher and the results reported on the form, Report on Student Teacher, to be submitted at close of student teaching assignment. h. Student teaching assignment can be made only after admission to candidacy plus completion of the three prerequisite courses; Education 335, Education 336, and Psychology 312.

Assignment: _____

By: _____

APPLICATION FOR EDUCATION 338--EDUCATION AFFILIATION

Note: Please discuss this application with your Professional Advisor before submitting it to the Department of Psychology and Education Office.

1. Name _____ 2. Age _____
3. Local Address _____ 4. Telephone _____
5. Home Address _____
6. Have you been admitted to candidacy for a degree & certificate _____
7. Overall grade point average _____
8. Major field _____ Hours completed to date _____
9. Minor field _____ Hours completed to date _____
10. Minor field _____ Hours completed to date _____
11. During which year and semester do you wish to register for Education 338?

12. When did, or will, you take Education 335, 336 and Psychology 312?

13. When do you plan to take Education 364-Directed Teaching? (If you have completed or are taking Education 364, so state.)

14. When do you expect to graduate? _____
15. List courses completed in major field, including those you are now taking:

16. What kind of affiliation assignment would you like? Indicate whether your preference is for an assignment on-campus or in a secondary school and, as specifically as possible, the nature of the assignment you would prefer.

17. To assist in determining the most worthwhile and appropriate assignment, please indicate what factors and conditions, such as your interests, your previous experiences, your professional needs you feel should be considered in planning your affiliation assignment.

Will you please evaluate the affiliate at the end of the semester and return this form to the Department of Psychology and Education?

	Outstanding	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
Personal Characteristics					
1. Appearance					
2. Enthusiasms					
3. Self-confidence					
4. Dependability					
5. Cooperativeness					
6. Adjusts emotionally					
7. General scholarship					
8. Profits from suggestions					
Professional Readiness					
1. Speech and usage of English					
2. Mastery of specific subject matter					
3. Attitude toward teaching					
4. Originality and resourcefulness					
5. Interest in school life					
Professional Techniques					
1. Planning					
2. Presentation of materials					
3. Control of situation					
4. Ability to organize instruction					
5. Understanding of individual students					
6. Adaptability					
Student Growth					
1. Relations with students					
2. Student participation					
3. Understanding of materials taught					
Other Characteristics (identify)					
1.					
2.					
3.					

On the back of the sheet:

1. List a few of the major activities of the affiliate.
2. Summarize your impression of the affiliate's work, identifying any especially strong or weak areas you have noted.

Signature _____
Cooperating Teacher

Education 364-Directed Teaching

I. General Principles

- A. Directed Teaching shall be regarded as a very important phase of the teacher preparation program.
- B. All policies and procedures of the Directed Teaching Program shall be in keeping with the objective of providing a strong program of preparation for secondary school teachers.
- C. All policies and procedures of the Directed Teaching Program in the secondary schools shall be consistent with the principle that the needs and welfare of the students in these schools must receive first consideration.
- D. The Directed Teaching Program in the secondary schools shall be conducted in keeping with the policies that flexibility in the program is desirable and that experimentation should be encouraged.

II. Assignment of Student Teachers

- A. Student teachers shall be assigned to the regularly scheduled courses in the secondary schools.
- B. Policies and procedures on assignments.
 - 1. The School of Education shall be responsible for general supervision of students assigned to the Directed Teaching Program of the secondary schools.
 - 2. The Superintendent of Schools shall supervise the assignment of student teachers who are to participate in the secondary schools Directed Teaching Program.
 - 3. Student teachers shall be assigned as far as possible to eight weeks of full-time Directed Teaching.
 - 4. Those who can not be assigned to the full-time, 8 weeks program will be assigned to two hours a day for the entire semester.
 - 5. Assignments are made after considering the following:
 - a. Request of student
 - b. Recommendations of School of Education
 - c. Recommendations of secondary school staff
 - 6. A cooperating teacher will have, as far as possible, only one student teacher during an eight-week period.
 - 7. Two student teachers may be assigned to a cooperating teacher during one period upon the mutual consent of the cooperating teacher, the School of Education, and the administration of the secondary school.

8. Each student teacher to be assigned to the secondary schools shall submit, through the School of Education an application and personal data sheet for use by the superintendent and principals in determining an appropriate assignment. This application and personal data sheet shall be filed by the student early in the semester prior to the one in which he desires to do Directed Teaching.
9. Personal data sheets should be available to the cooperating teacher at least one week before the student teachers are to arrive.
10. In unusual circumstances, student teachers may be assigned to a department or area of the school program rather than to a specific teacher. In all cases, however, one staff member is to be designated as supervisor of the student teacher's work.
11. The student teacher shall plan to devote his full time to the directed teaching program. Exceptions to this shall be determined by the School of Education.
12. It is the responsibility of the cooperating teacher to schedule periodic conferences with the student teacher at a time when the teacher has no other specific assigned responsibilities.
13. A detailed evaluative report and grade shall be submitted to the school of education by the cooperating teacher at the close of the directed teaching assignment.
14. Provision shall be made for a continuing evaluation of the Directed Teaching Program.

DIRECTED TEACHING ENROLLMENT CARD

Assignment for _____ Semester 19 _____

1. Name _____ Age _____
 Last First Middle
2. Campus Address _____
3. Home Address _____
4. Mailing address three weeks prior to assignment _____

5. Circle one: Married Single Number of Children _____
6. From what high school graduated? _____ Year _____
7. When do you expect to receive your degree? Year _____ Month _____
8. Have you been admitted as a candidate for degree and certificate?
 _____ If not, explain.
9. On what curriculum are you enrolled? _____
 If elementary, what plan C D (Circle one)
10. Years experience in teaching _____ High School _____ Grades _____
 Rural _____
11. What directed teaching or affiliation have you done? Where? _____
 Grades? _____
 Subjects _____
12. Major subject _____ Hours _____ Minor _____ Hours _____
 (as of date you began this assignment)
13. Choice of subjects _____
14. Choice of grades _____
15. Choice of time (circle one) last 8 weeks 2nd 8 weeks AM PM
16. Choice of School System _____
 1st choice 2nd choice 3rd choice

Assignment: (do not fill this out)

Grade or subject	Hours	Supervisor	School
------------------	-------	------------	--------

CHAPTER IV

THE METHODOLOGY

Source of Data

Nineteen administrators, 59 teachers, 1418 pupils, and 79 parents affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools provide the source of data used in this study.

The Population

All administrative personnel participated in the study as did all secondary school teachers. The teacher participants were organized on the basis of their role in the directed student teacher program. This resulted in two groups consisting of thirty-nine cooperating teachers and twenty non-cooperating teachers respectively. Pupils from grades 7 through 12 participated in the study and were organized according to grade level.

The sample of parent participants consisted of seventy-nine adult citizens of the community who had children enrolled in the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools. This group represented 79 per cent of a preliminary sample group selected at random from the total parent population. Twenty-one members of the original sample failed to respond to two requests for their participation. All participants remained anonymous.

Description of the Instrument

The measurement device is titled the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire.²⁶ This instrument was developed specifically for use in this study.

This inventory was developed specifically for use in the current study. It is designed to appraise parent, pupil, teacher and administrator attitudes toward student teachers.

The instrument consists of statements regarding nine major aspects of the student teacher function. These categories were established on the basis of previous research findings and the results of a pilot project conducted prior to the study.

Each question contains a series of responses on a continuum from positive to negative. These responses are assigned corresponding numerical values ranging from 3 to 1. The values are summed to provide a total score index for each participant. This process of combining rating scores is justified on the premise that each category is directly pertinent to the general concept upon which the measurement device is based.

Three sub-groups (high, moderate and low) organized according to acceptance level were established on the basis of total score indexes. The medians and quartile

²⁶See Appendix A.

deviations associated with the range of score indexes in each group were used to make the division. Thus, the parent, pupil, teacher, and administrator groups were each divided into three sub-groups based on total responses to the questionnaire. The high acceptance sub-group was most positive in its responses, whereas the moderate acceptance sub-group was less positive and the low acceptance sub-group was least positive.

The validity of the questionnaire is based on the following assumptions: (a) that the questions represent major aspects of the student teacher function, (b) that one's attitude of student teacher acceptance is directly related to his appraisal of the student teacher function.

The first assumption is justified on the premise that all of the questions included in the instrument are derived directly from the dimensions of the student teacher function which are defined in Chapter III. The second assumption is justified on the basis of follow-up interviews with a randomly selected sample of teachers and administrators who completed the questionnaire. These interviews revealed that verbal attitudes do tend to coincide with responses to the questionnaire.

Procedures

Pilot Project

A pilot project was conducted prior to the study as a means of testing the adequacy of the questionnaire.

The instrument was administered to a number of faculty members, administrators, parents, and pupils affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools. Participants were then interviewed to obtain recommendations for improving the instruments. These recommendations were incorporated in the final questionnaire used in the study.

Collection of Data

Data regarding the hypotheses under investigation were collected by written correspondence with the participants. This correspondence took place from May 19, 1966 to June 1, 1966.

All names and positions have been kept anonymous to protect the rights and privacy of participants.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained in this study were analyzed in two dimensions. The first involved a demographic summary of responses to the questionnaire in order to obtain a general profile of attitudes and perceptions.

The second analysis tests the four hypotheses set forth in Chapter I. The Chi Square Test for "K" Independent Groups²⁷ was used to treat the data statistically. This non-parametric technique was selected because the

²⁷Sidney Siegal, Non-parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 175-179.

following assumptions regarding the use of parametric statistics cannot be met:

1. No guarantee exists that the population is normally distributed with reference to the variables under investigation.
2. The conditions of homogeneity of sample variances has not been met.
3. The variables involved in the study are measured on an ordinal scale rather than on interval scale.

Group participants were organized into three categories (high, moderate and low acceptance) based upon total score indexes on the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire. These categories were established on the basis of group medians and quartile deviations.²⁸ This procedure facilitated the statistical treatment of the data.

²⁸Ibid., p. 176.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis of data is presented in two parts. The first involves the development of a profile of responses to the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire. The second part focuses upon the results of each hypothesis under investigation.

Profile Analysis

The following presentation examines the patterns of parent, pupil, teacher and administrator responses to each question included in the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire.

Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents indicate that student teachers are capable of handling the usual discipline problems in a classroom. Cooperating teachers and administrators were the most positive in their responses. The parent respondents tended to be least positive.

The findings in Table 2 reveal a strong pattern of support for the proposition that pupils were academically benefited by the work of student teachers. However,

TABLE 1.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 1. In general, what proportion of student-teachers do you think can handle the usual discipline problems of a classroom?

	All Can	Most Can	Less Than Half Can	Small Proportion Can	No Opinion	None Can	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q1	0%	78.48	12.82	5.12	2.56	---	
No. of Respondents	0	31	5	2	1		39
Non-Coop. Q1	0%	60.00	20.0	5.0	15.0	---	
No. of Respondents	0	12	4	1	3		20
Pupils Q3	3.38%	57.64	20.6	10.93	5.78	.91	
No. of Respondents	48	817	293	165	82	13	1418
Parents Q8	1.30%	54.54	10.38	22.07	11.68	---	
No. of Respondents	1	42	8	17	9		77
Administration Q1	0%	78.94	10.52	5.26	5.26	---	
No. of Respondents	0	15	2	1	1		19

TABLE 2.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 2. Do you think the typical pupil has been academically benefited by the work of student teachers or not?

	Benefited Him	Not Benefited	Harmed Him	Neither Benefited or Harmed Him	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q2	50.0%	18.42	2.63	26.31	2.63	
No. of Respondents	19	7	1	10	1	38
Non-Coop. Q2	40.0%	10.0	0	25.0	25.00	
No. of Respondents	8	2	0	5	5	20
Pupils Q4	43.34	0	10.48	27.83	18.34	
No. of Respondents	612	0	148	393	259	1412
Parents Q9	38.66	0	14.66	34.66	12.0	
No. of Respondents	29	0	11	26	9	75
Administrators Q2	57.9	15.8	0	21.0	5.26	
No. of Respondents	11	3	0	4	1	19

many participants indicated that the student teachers' work neither benefited nor harmed pupils. Again cooperating teachers and administrators provided the most positive patterns of response whereas the parent group response tended to be least positive.

Table 3 shows that cooperating teachers and administrators react most positively to the question concerning individual attention given to pupils by student teachers. Non-cooperating teachers, pupils and parents indicate by almost the same percentage that pupils receive about the same amount of individual help when there is no student teacher in the classroom. The most negative responses to this question were given by the student and parent groups.

Table 4 shows that 63 per cent of the administration indicated that the cooperating teacher's work was of a better quality when student teachers were in the classroom whereas, 46 per cent of the cooperating teachers felt their work was of a better quality when student teachers were in the classroom. However, nearly 50 per cent of the pupils indicated that the cooperating teacher's work was of the same quality. It would seem that the pupils are in a better position to judge. This observation is a compliment to the cooperating teacher. Almost 25 per cent of the parents expressed no opinion, as was expected.

TABLE 3.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 3. How much individual attention do you feel the pupils generally receive when student teachers are in the classroom?

	More Than When No Student Teacher	About Same As When No Student Teacher	Less Attention	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q3 No. of Respondents	69.23% 27	23.07 9	5.12 2	2.56 1	39
Non-coop Q3 No. of Respondents	35.0% 7	35.0 7	5.0 1	25.0 5	20
Pupils Q5 No. of Respondents	32.20% 455	45.29 640	11.39 161	11.11 157	1413
Parents Q10 No. of Respondents	40.79% 31	40.79 31	10.52 8	7.87 6	76
Administrators Q3 No. of Respondents	73.68% 14	21.05 4	0 0	5.26 1	19

TABLE 4.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 4. In general, how do you think student teachers affect quality of the regular teacher's work in the classroom?

	Better Than When There is No Stu- dent Teacher	Same Qual- ity as When There is No Student Teacher	Lower Qual- ity Than When There is No Stu- dent Teacher	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q4 No. of Respondents	46.15 18	41.02 16	12.82 5	0 0	39
Non-coop. Q4 No. of Respondents	30.0 6	45.0 9	5.0 1	20.0 4	20
Pupils Q6 No. of Respondents	20.41 288	49.75 702	16.37 231	13.47 190	1411
Parents Q6 No. of Respondents	35.52 27	26.31 20	14.47 11	23.68 18	76
Administration Q4 No. of Respondents	63.15 12	31.57 6	0 0	5.81 1	19

Table 5 reveals that cooperating teachers, non-cooperating teachers and administration indicated that observation of classes by college students did not disturb the classes a great deal, but all groups indicated some class disturbance. The majority of cooperating teachers and pupils indicated that the observations had no effect. Since pupils and teacher were in the classroom during observations, one would assume that their responses to this question are most valid.

Table 6 shows that the majority of cooperating teachers and administrators indicated that the student teacher had a good effect upon the total instructional program. Most other group members either gave similar opinions, or neutral opinions. Approximately 10 per cent of the non-cooperating teachers, the students, and the parents indicated that the student teacher program has adversely affected the total instructional program of the school.

The results of Table 7 show that the majority of most groups felt that student teacher subject matter proficiency was at least satisfactory. However, a significant percentage of cooperating teachers, non-cooperating teachers, and administrators indicated that student teachers lacked adequate subject matter proficiency. It is difficult to determine whether these opinions refer to lack of knowledge, experience, or both.

TABLE 5.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 5. How disturbing do you think college student observers are to pupils in the classroom?

	Disburb a Great Deal	Disturb Somewhat	No Effect	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q5	0	35.89	64.10	0	
No. of Respondents	0	14	25	0	39
Non-coop Q5	0	50.00	25.00	25.00	
No. of Respondents	0	10	5	5	20
Pupils Q7	3.61	26.22	65.13	5.03	
No. of Respondents	51	370	919	71	1411
Parents Q7	5.19	32.46	38.96	23.37	
No. of Respondents	4	25	30	18	77
Administration Q5	0	78.94	15.78	5.26	
No. of Respondents	0	15	3	1	19

TABLE 6.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 6. What effect do you think the student teaching program has had on the total instructional program?

	Good Effect	Bad Effect	Neither Good Nor Bad	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q9 No. of Respondents	64.86 24	5.40 2	24.32 9	5.40 2	37
Non-coop Q9 No. of Respondents	35.00 7	5.0 1	35.00 7	25.00 5	20
Pupils Q10 No. of Respondents	42.77 598	9.94 139	26.89 376	20.38 285	1398
Parents Q11 No. of Respondents	52.70 39	10.81 8	20.27 15	16.21 12	74
Administration Q8 No. of Respondents	63.15 12	5.26 1	15.78 3	15.78 3	19

TABLE 7.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 7. How much subject matter background do you think student teachers have?

	Unusually High	Above Average for Teachers in General	Satis- factory Amount	Unsatis- factory Amount	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q11	0	10.25	56.41	33.33	0	
No. of Respondents	0	4	22	13	0	39
Non-coop Q11	0	20.0	35.0	20.0	25.0	
No. of Respondents	0	4	7	4	5	20
Pupils Q12	10.22	24.47	51.48	5.27	6.42	
No. of Respondents	145	347	730	74	91	1387
Parents Q12	5.19	14.28	62.33	7.79	10.38	
No. of Respondents	4	11	48	6	8	77
Administration Q10	5.26	36.84	31.57	15.78	10.52	
No. of Respondents	1	7	6	3	2	19

Table 8 shows that student and parent responses to this question were most positive. The majority of responses from administrators and non-cooperative teachers ranged from good to fair. Cooperating teachers were least positive in their responses. It is interesting to note that none of the teachers responded in the high positive category whereas 13 per cent of the pupils, 9 per cent of the parents, and 5 per cent of the administrators did indicate that the quality of instruction provided by the student teacher is very good.

Table 9 shows that the majority of all participants rated the question as good or excellent. Administrators were most positive in their appraisal. The academic phase of the student teaching program tended to be moderately positive, whereas pupils were least positive. Three of the cooperative teachers rated the academic phase as poor. This question may have been confusing but had to do with the formal presentation of subject matter in teaching.

The pattern of responses given in Table 10 indicates that cooperating teachers have strong feelings desiring a change in length of time student teachers are assigned. Since the questionnaire was issued, the student teaching program has been changed to allow student teachers to be assigned to cooperating teachers all day for eight weeks. Non-cooperating teachers and administrators seem to favor one hour a day for a semester--a

TABLE 8.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 8. How would you rate the quality of instruction pupils receive from student teachers?

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q12	0	47.36	50.0	2.63	0	
No. of Respondents	0	18	19	1	0	38
Non-coop Q12	0	50.0	20.0	5.0	25.0	
No. of Respondents	0	10	4	1	5	20
Pupils Q13	13.46	48.44	27.92	4.86	3.10	
No. of Respondents	191	687	396	69	44	1387
Parents Q14	9.21	50.0	30.26	3.94	6.57	
No. of Respondents	7	38	23	3	5	76
Administration Q12	5.26	52.63	36.84	0	5.26	
No. of Respondents	1	10	7	0	1	19

TABLE 9.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 9. In general, how do you rate the academic phase of the student teaching program in our school?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q6	2.77	66.66	19.44	8.33	2.77	
No. of Respondents	1	24	7	3	1	36
Non-coop Q6	0	52.6	21.1	5.2	21.1	
No. of Respondents	0	10	4	1	4	19
Pupils Q8	9.34	53.56	26.46	5.34	5.27	
No. of Respondents	131	751	371	75	74	1402
Parents Q14	9.21	50.00	30.26	3.94	6.57	
No. of Respondents	7	38	23	3	5	76
Administration Q6	15.78	57.89	21.05	0	5.26	
No. of Respondents	3	11	4	0	1	19

TABLE 10.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 10. What length of time would you prefer pupils to have student teachers?

	1 Hour Per Day One Semester	1 Hour Per Day for 8 Weeks	1 Hour a Day Longer Than 8 Weeks	No Opinion	Other Plans	Total Response
Coop. Teachers Q10 No. of Respondents	23.10 9	5.10 2	7.69 3	10.25 4	53.84 21	39
Non-coop Q10 No. of Respondents	50.00 10	15.00 3	5.00 1	30.00 6	--- ---	20
Pupils Q11 No. of Respondents	21.21 296	46.23 645	9.96 139	22.58 315	--- ---	1395
Parents Q13 No. of Respondents	26.02 19	35.98 27	10.98 8	26.02 19	--- ---	73
Administration Q11 No. of Respondents	42.10 8	15.78 3	15.78 3	21.05 4	5.26 1	19

plan that they were familiar with and had worked under as student teachers themselves. Pupils and parents reacted in a like manner.

Table 11 indicates that approximately 90 per cent of the student respondents like student teachers to some degree; whereas less than 8 per cent indicated some degree of dislike. It is noted that as the pupil advances in grade and the number of student teacher contacts increases the degree of liking the student teacher decreases. One might assume that the pupil's increasing maturity is a significant factor in that the pupil is becoming more discriminating of student teachers and is able to evaluate them better.

The profile analysis of responses to the questionnaire reveals a relatively positive attitude of student teacher acceptance by all school affiliated groups included in the study. The areas of greatest concern centered upon: (a) the student teacher's subject matter proficiency and his ability to handle discipline problems, and (b) the general quality of instruction as related to the student teacher function.

Although the general pattern of response was positive, fluctuations in group response did occur in relation to each other. The remainder of this chapter examines these group differences.

TABLE 11.--Frequency responses of cooperating teachers, parents, non-cooperating teachers, pupils and administrators.

Question 11. Comparison of degree of acceptance by classes.

Grade	Liked All Very Well	Liked Most Very Well	Liked Some Well, Others Less Well	Did Not Like Most of Them	Did Not Like Any of them	No Opinion	Total
7th	52	76	80	9	0	9	226
Per Cent of Total	23.01	33.63	35.40	3.98	0	3.98	100%
8th	37	84	102	6	3	6	238
Per Cent of Total	15.55	35.29	42.86	2.52	1.26	2.52	100%
9th	19	92	144	26	3	9	293
Per Cent of Total	6.48	31.40	49.15	8.88	1.02	3.07	100%
10th	8	72	161	12	3	6	262
Per Cent of Total	3.05	27.48	61.45	4.58	1.15	2.29	100%
11th	5	58	131	22	5	7	228
Per Cent of Total	2.19	25.44	57.45	9.65	2.19	3.08	100%
12th	2	44	99	19	2	5	171
Per Cent of Total	1.17	25.73	57.9	11.11	1.17	2.92	100%
Total	123	426	717	94	16	42	1418
	8.68	30.04	50.57	6.63	1.12	2.96	100%

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among parents, pupils, teachers and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Results of the Chi Square Analysis, Table 12, revealed no significant differences in level of student teacher acceptance for five school related groups. The obtained Chi Square value, 6.26 with 8 degrees of freedom specifies differences which fail to equal the .05 level of significance.

Table 12 shows that observed frequencies for the parent group are less than expected frequencies in the high and moderate acceptance categories; and are greater than expected frequencies in the low acceptance category. Observed frequencies for the pupil group exceed expected frequencies in the high and moderate acceptance categories, and fail to equal expected frequencies in the low acceptance category. Observed frequencies for the cooperating teacher group exceed expected frequencies in the high and moderate acceptance categories, and fail to equal expected frequencies in the low acceptance category. Observed frequencies for the administrator and non-cooperating teacher groups approximated expected frequencies in most instances.

TABLE 12.--Frequency of response of five school related groups in three student teacher acceptance categories.

Group	Acceptance Level			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Parents	(35.3)** 29*	(25.78) 24	(17.96) 26	79
Pupils	(632.9) 638	(462.76) 465	(322.31) 315	1418
Administrators	(8.48) 9	(6.20) 6	(4.32) 4	19
Non-cooperating Teachers	(8.93) 8	(6.53) 6	(4.55) 6	20
Cooperating Teachers	(17.41) 19	(12.73) 13	(8.86) 7	39
Total	703	514	358	1575
Degrees of Freedom	χ^2		Level of Significance	
8	6.26		--	

*Observed

**Expected

Findings concerning the Chi Square test indicate that differences among school related groups although not statistically significant, are accounted for by:

(a) the tendency of the parent group towards a low positive level of student teacher acceptance, (b) the tendency of the pupil group towards a high positive level of student teacher acceptance, (c) the tendency of the cooperating teacher group towards a high positive level of student teacher acceptance, and (d) the tendencies of the administrator and non-cooperating teacher groups to be evenly distributed in terms of their acceptance of student teachers.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among six pupil groups organized according to grade level.

Results of the Chi Square Analysis, Table 13, revealed no significant differences in level of student teacher acceptance for six pupil groups based on grade level. The obtained Chi Square value, 4.919, with 10 degrees of freedom fails to equal the .05 level of significance.

Table 13 shows that observed frequencies for the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th grade groups exceed expected frequencies in the high acceptance category. Observed frequencies for the 11th and 12th grade groups are less

TABLE 13.--Frequency of response of pupils from six grades in three student teacher acceptance categories.

Group	Acceptance Level			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Grade 7	(101.07)** 104*	(75.44) 71	(45.49) 47	222
Grade 8	(106.08) 112	(79.18) 73	(47.74) 48	233
Grade 9	(133.39) 137	(99.57) 105	(50.03) 51	293
Grade 10	(115.64) 117	(86.31) 81	(52.05) 56	254
Grade 11	(100.16) 90	(74.76) 81	(45.08) 49	220
Grade 12	(77.40) 75	(57.77) 60	(34.83) 35	170
Total	635	471	286	1392
Degrees of Freedom	χ^2		Level of Significance	
10	4.919		---	

*Observed

**Expected

than expected in the high acceptance category, are above expected in the moderate and low acceptance categories.

Findings concerning the Chi Square test indicate that differences among pupil groups, although not statistically significant, are accounted for by: (a) the tendencies of the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th grade groups toward a high level of student teacher acceptance, and (b) the tendencies of the 11th and 12th grade groups toward a moderate level of student teacher acceptance.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among cooperating and non-cooperating teachers in the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Results of the Chi Square Analysis, Table 14, revealed no significant differences in level of student teacher acceptance for the two teacher groups. The obtained Chi Square value, 1.13, with two degrees of freedom fails to equal or exceed the .05 level of significance.

Although no significant differences in student teacher acceptance were found between cooperating and non-cooperating teachers, the results did indicate that cooperating teachers tend to be more accepting than non-cooperating teachers.

TABLE 14.--Frequency of response of cooperating and non-cooperating teachers in three student teacher acceptance categories.

Group	Acceptance Level			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Cooperating Teachers	(17.85)** 19*	(12.50) 13	(8.59) 7	39
Non-Cooperating Teachers	(9.15) 8	(6.44) 6	(4.41) 6	20
Total	27	19	13	59
Degrees of Freedom	χ^2		Level of Significance	
2	1.13		---	

*Observed

**Expected

Hypothesis IV

There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among four parent groups organized according to educational background.

Results of the Chi Square Analysis, Table 15, revealed no significant differences in level of student teacher acceptance for the four parent groups organized according to educational background. The obtained Chi Square value, 1.40, with six degrees of freedom failed to equal or exceed the .05 level of significance.

Summary

The foregoing analyses show that the five school affiliated groups do not differ significantly in their attitude of acceptance toward student teachers. However, pupils and cooperating teachers do tend to express the most positive attitudes; administrators and non-cooperating teachers were moderately positive; and parents tended to be least positive in their attitudes.

The pupil groups based on grade level were not found to differ significantly in their attitudes. The seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth grades expressed the most positive attitudes of student teacher acceptance. The eleventh and twelfth grades were moderately positive.

There were no significant differences in attitudes of student teacher acceptance among (a) parents, pupils,

TABLE 15.--Frequency of response of four parent groups in three student teacher acceptance categories.

Group	Acceptance Level			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
8th Grade and/or High School	(7.24)** 9*	(6.13) 5	(8.63) 8	22
High School Graduate	(7.89) 7	(6.68) 7	(9.42) 10	24
Attended and/or Graduated from College	(5.92) 5	(5.01) 5	(7.06) 8	18
Graduate Study	(4.94) 5	(4.18) 5	(5.89) 5	15
Total	26	22	31	79
Degrees of Freedom	χ^2		Level of Significance	
6	1.40		---	

*Observed

**Expected

teachers, and administrators, (b) six pupil groups organized according to grade level, (c) cooperating and non-cooperating teachers, and (d) parents with varying educational backgrounds.

On the basis of the above analysis, Hypotheses I, II, III, and IV were not rejected.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the extent to which public school student teachers are accepted by administrators, teachers, parents, and pupils of the Mt. Pleasant School System. Four major hypotheses were formulated:

1. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.
2. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among six pupil groups organized according to grade level.
3. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among cooperating and non-cooperating teachers in the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.
4. There is no significant difference in degree of student teacher acceptance among four parent

groups organized according to educational background.

A review of the literature revealed studies which focused upon the attitudes of selected school affiliated groups as they pertain to student teacher acceptance. However, none of these studies attempted to examine these groups in relationship to each other. Furthermore, in several instances conflicting results were obtained for two or more studies.

Methodology

The population consisted of selected parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators affiliated with the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools.

Attitudes of teacher acceptance were determined by the Student Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire which was administered to all study participants. The instrument was specifically designed for use in this study.

The four hypotheses were statistically treated using the Chi Square Test for "K" independent samples.

Findings of the Study

The profile analysis of response for parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators revealed relatively positive attitudes of student teacher acceptance among all groups. Areas of low positive response concerned the student teacher's subject competence, his ability

to cope with discipline problems, and over-all quality of instruction.

The analysis of the hypotheses revealed the following findings:

The five school affiliated groups did not differ significantly in their attitudes of student teacher acceptance. However, pupil and cooperating teacher groups did tend to express the most positive attitudes. Administrators and non-cooperating teachers were moderately positive in their attitudes, and parents were least positive.

The six pupil groups failed to differ significantly in their attitudes of student teacher acceptance. Seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth grade pupils were most accepting; eleventh and twelfth grade pupils were moderately accepting.

There were slight differences in the acceptance attitudes of cooperating and non-cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers tended to be more accepting. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

The four parent groups organized according to varying educational backgrounds did not differ significantly in their student teacher acceptance attitudes.

Conclusions

One might expect the parents, pupils, administrators, and teachers to reveal positive attitudes of student teacher acceptance because of the following:

1. Age of student teachers more nearly approximate the age of secondary pupils and suggests better understanding of their problems and better rapport. Student teachers generally make an extra effort to be liked by their pupils, and have chosen teaching as a career because they like young people.
2. Student teachers generally have a fresh approach to teaching, have new ideas, are innovative; to some pupils the student teaching program was a new experience.
3. With two people in the classroom the student teacher was able to give individual attention to pupils, and also to relieve the cooperating teacher of many routine tasks so that the cooperating teacher could spend more time in actual teaching which would benefit pupils. However, 45 per cent of the pupils responded that they received as much individual attention when just the cooperating teacher was present.

4. The study indicated that student teachers generally were prepared to teach, have an ample knowledge of subject matter, and that classroom instruction does not suffer when student teachers are in the classroom. Many pupils felt that student teachers were less formal and more interesting than the regular teacher.
5. The study indicated that the regular teacher did better teaching when the student teacher and observers were in the classroom. One might assume the regular teacher is setting a good example. However, approximately 50 per cent of the pupils indicated that the quality of the cooperating teacher's work was the same when there was no student teacher in the classroom.
6. Acceptance of student teachers by teachers and administrators could be motivated by a sincere desire to help future teachers.

Criticisms that student teachers were inferior to the regular teacher could be justified on the ground that the student teacher should not be expected to have in-depth command of subject matter at the beginning of his teaching career and that quality of instruction generally improves with experience.

It can be assumed that the student teacher should not have a high level of classroom discipline because he is not the regular teacher in charge. However, the student teacher should be expected to handle the usual discipline problems that arise in the classroom. The majority of respondents indicated that student teachers are capable of handling the usual discipline problems in a classroom.

That some groups were more positive toward student teachers than others might be explained by the fact that they were in a position to observe the day-to-day operation of the student teacher program, understood it better, and reacted favorably toward it. Too, some groups are affected positively by a desire to help the beginning teacher as a contribution to the teaching profession.

The acceptance of student teachers by cooperating teachers, non-cooperating teachers, and administrators generally would not be affected by: (a) the fairness of student teachers with pupils, (b) a pupil's bad experience with a student teacher, or (c) a pupil's difficulty in adjusting to more than one teacher in the classroom.

The teaching group responses would not be affected by parents who were desirous of the regular teacher teaching the class at all times. Also some parents had not had student teachers while in school, and could not

be in a position to pass judgment on the student teacher program.

The findings would indicate that student teachers have relatively positive acceptance in the public school setting, and that they are making a contribution to pupils while gaining needed laboratory experience. Under proper supervision, the student teachers have much to offer a school system. The cooperating teacher in guiding and advising the student teacher is making a valuable contribution to the teaching profession.

Parents, pupils, administrators, and teachers seem to share the opinion of those persons who have instituted off-campus student teaching programs that such a cooperative arrangement is a desirable practice.

Suggestions for Further Research

The study should be replicated on a regional or state basis. Since the study was done in one school system there would be advantage in further study of a larger population of respondents to determine whether these findings would generally hold true. Too, there would be merit in having student teachers from many colleges and universities studied as to their acceptance by pupils, parents, etc.

Further investigation should be done to identify other factors which influence one's attitude toward student teachers. Length of student teacher assignment,

not having student teachers in all classes, whether student teachers made pupils think for themselves, and whether student teachers teach democratically might be other areas of investigation.

Another area revealed by this study is the need to determine how we can improve those pupils who tend to be negative in their attitudes toward student teachers. Should some identification be made of these pupils and an in-service program be established to better orient them about the student teacher program as to its purpose and objectives?

Another problem revealed by this study is the need to investigate how student teachers can be better prepared before the directed teaching experience. Should more classroom observations be made before starting directed teaching? Or should more subject matter be required or more methods courses in teaching be required before the beginning teaching experience?

Further research is also needed in reference to whether a more thorough screening might be done of prospective student teachers. The screening could focus on emotional stability and readiness for directed teaching.

Finally, would similar findings also be revealed in a study which included private school systems as well as public school systems?

These and other questions do merit further investigation if the problems associated with directed teaching are to be fully explicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Harold P.; and Dickey, Frank G. Basic Principles of Student Teaching. New York: American Book Company, 1956.
- Alterman, Ronald A. A New Approach to Teacher Education. Central Michigan University Story. Mt. Pleasant: Central Michigan University Press, 1966.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Revised Standards and Policies for Accrediting Colleges for Teacher Education. Oreonta, N. Y.: The Association, 1951.
- American Association of School Administrators. Paths to Better Schools. Twenty-third Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1951.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences in Student Teaching and Evaluative Criteria. Oneonta, N. Y.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1949.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. Yearbook, 1922. Oneonta, New York: The Association, 1922.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. "Standards for Accrediting Teachers Colleges." Yearbook, 1926. Oneonta, N. Y.: The Association, 1926.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. Yearbook, 1927. Oneonta, N. Y.: The Association, 1927.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. Standards for Accrediting Teachers Colleges. Twenty-fourth Yearbook. Oneonta, N. Y.: The Association, 1948.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. School and Community Laboratory Experiences. Forty-fourth Yearbook. Oneonta, N. Y.: The Association, 1948.

Arbuckle, Dugald, S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953.

Armstrong, W. E.; and Hollis, E. V. The College in Teacher Education. Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C., 1944.

Association for Student Teaching. The Evaluation of Student Teaching. Twenty-eighth Yearbook. Lock-Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1949.

Association for Student Teaching. Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook. Lock Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1951.

Association for Student Teaching. Curriculum Trends in Teacher Education. Thirty-second Yearbook. Lock-Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1953.

Association for Student Teaching. Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Thirty-third Yearbook. Lock-Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1954.

Association of Student Teaching. Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. Thirty-fourth Yearbook. Lock-Haven, Pa.: The Association, 1955.

Barr, A. S.; Burton, William H.; and Bruckner, Leo J. Supervision. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1947.

Benjamin, Harold, ed. "Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education." Tenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Blyer, Dorothea. "Student Teaching in the American Association of Teachers College." Educational Administration and Supervision (February, 1947).

Brink, William G. "The Administration of Student Teaching in Universities Which Use the Public Schools." Educational Administration and Supervision (October, 1945), 394-402.

Brinton, Mary Frances. "Organization and Administration of Guidance Facilities in Teacher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1948.

- Brumbaugh, A. J. "The Place of the Teachers College, the Liberal Arts College, and the University in Teacher Education." Second Yearbook. Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1949.
- Burnett, Lewis W.; and Dickson, George E. "Cooperative Improvement of Off-Campus Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education (December, 1950), 287-290.
- Burr, James B.; Harding, Louiry W.; and Jacobs, Leland B. Student Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: Appleton-Century Croft, Inc., 1950.
- Chase, Daniel. "Student Teaching Programs Require Effective Cooperation." California Journal of Secondary Education (April, 1955), 200-201.
- Clayton, A. Stafford. "The Organization of the School of Education, Indiana University, for Policy Development." Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 30, No. 2. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, March, 1954, 43 pp.
- Clem, Paul N. "A Study of the Michigan State University Full-Time Resident Student Teaching Program." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1958.
- Colebank, George H. "Practice Teaching in the Colleges of the North Central Association." The North Central Association Quarterly (December, 1928), 376-431.
- Coleman, Mary S. "The Community Looks at the Program, Off-Campus Student Teaching." Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc.
- Cooper, R. M. Better Colleges--Better Teachers. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.
- Curtis, Dwight K.; and Andrews, Leonard C. Guiding Your Student Teacher. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1956.
- Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1938.

Dixson, Paul T. "Some Guiding Principles for Student Teaching Programs." North Central Association Quarterly (October, 1957), 193-196.

Eighth Annual Catalogue of 1902-1903 at Central Normal.

Engle, Shirley and Sharpe, Donald M. "The Cooperating School: Current Functions in Teacher Education." Thirty-fourth Yearbook. Lock-Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1955.

Feyereisen, Kathryn and Dieckman, Verna. "Guiding Student Teacher Experiences." Bulletin No. 1. Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1952.

Flowers, John. "School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education." American Association of Teachers Colleges (1948), 304.

French, S. J., ed. Accent on Teaching: Experiments in General Education. New York: Harper Brothers, 1954.

Foster, Frank K. "The Training School in the Education of Teachers." Teacher Education Curricula. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, 1933, pp. 367-401.

Garrison, Noble L. The Improvement of Teaching. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955.

Gates, Mary Frances and Currie, Donald M. "Survey of Supervision of Student Teaching in Michigan." Journal of Educational Research (March, 1953), 497-504.

Gray, Rex C.; Musgrave, Paul N., Wilburn, D. Banks. "Full-Time Student Teaching." Marshall College, Huntington, West Virginia, 1957.

Grim, Paul and Michaelis, John. The Student Teacher in the Secondary School. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.

Hammock, Robert C. "Student Teaching in the Programs of Prospective Secondary-School Teachers in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1942.

- Hansen, C. W. "Principles and Criteria for the Selection of Critic Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision (October, 1948), 377-383.
- Harry, Shizuko N. "Some Trends in Teacher Education." Educational Research Bulletin. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, September 10, 1958, pp. 158-160.
- Hicks, William V.; and Garner, Ray. Mimeographed form distributed by the Student Teaching Office, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1957.
- Hicks, William V.; and Jameson, Marshall C. The Elementary School Principal at Work. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Hicks, William V. "Information About Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs in Big Ten Universities." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Bulletin 1959. (Mimeographed.)
- Hicks, William V. "Where Do Student Teaching Centers Secure Teachers?" East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, Bulletin 1958. (Mimeographed.)
- Hicks, William V.; and Walker, Clare C. Full-Time Student Teaching. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1957.
- Hill, Clyde. A Decade of Progress in Teacher Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.
- Holstine, Garold D.; and Steeves, Frank L. "The Identification of Good Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences." Thirty-third Yearbook. Association for Student Teaching, 1954.
- Hunt, Charles W. Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, N. Y.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.
- Jones, Rodney M. "An Investigation of Practices of Teacher Preparing Institutions in Extending Recognition to Off-Campus Cooperating Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.
- Kelley, E. C.; and Rasey, M. I. Education and the Nature of Man. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

- Kelley, F. J., ed. Improving College Instruction. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1951.
- Lawson, Douglas E. "Implications of a Survey of Teacher Training Practices in Illinois." Educational Administration and Supervision (October, 1939), 523-531.
- Lindsey, Margaret. "Foreword." Thirty-third Yearbook. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954.
- Lindsey, Margaret. "Jamor Findings and Recommendations in the Study of Professional Experiences." First Yearbook. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.
- Lindsey, Margaret. "Standard VI--Five Years After." Seventh Yearbook. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther and Smith, Margaret R. Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Loveinger, W. C. General Education in Teachers Colleges. Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.
- Low, Camilla. The Child and the Community. Madison, Wisconsin: Brown's Book Store, 1953.
- Merriman, Pearl and Fair, Gladys. Helping Student Teachers Through Evaluation. Lock-Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1953.
- Michaelis, John and Grim, Paul. The Student Teacher in the Elementary School. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
- Monroe, W. S. "Teaching Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1950." Urbana National Society for the Study of Education. Learning and Instruction. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1952; Forty-ninth Yearbook. Chicago, Ill.: The Society, 1950.
- Moon, A. C. "A High Quality Student Teaching Program." Cedar Falls, Iowa: Iowa State Teachers College, Bulletin 1959. (Mimeographed.)

- Morris, Evart Paul. "The Organization and Administration of Student Teaching as Conducted in the Public Schools (Off-Campus) of Nebraska." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, 1957.
- Morse, H. T., ed. General Education in Transition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Mosher, H. H.; and Bruno, D. P. "Methods of Improving the Student Teaching Program." American School Board Journal (March, 1955), 55.
- Mt. Pleasant Public School Board Minutes, School Year 1924-1925.
- Newsletter of the Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education. Normal, Illinois: Illinois State Normal University, January, 1957.
- Perrodin, Alex F. "The Development of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education." Thirty-fourth Yearbook. Oneonta, N. Y.: Association of American Teachers Colleges, 1955.
- Prall, C. E. State Programs for the Improvement of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1946.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Rucker, Ray W. "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.
- Rucker, Roy W. "Trends in Student Teaching, 1932-1952." Journal of Teacher Education (December, 1953), 260-263.
- Sands, John E. "Off-Campus Student Teaching Practices in 112 Institutions." Education (June, 1953), 636-644.
- Schorling, Raleigh. Student Teaching. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1949.
- Schorling, Raleigh and Wingo, Max. Elementary School Student Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Seventh Annual Catalogue of 1901-1902 at Central Normal.

Sharpe, Donald M. "Professional Laboratory Experiences." Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, N. Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.

Sharpe, Donald M. "The Pupils Look at the Program." Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook. Lock Hauer, Pa.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951.

Siegal, Sidney. Non-parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956.

Sprague, H. A. A Decade of Progress in the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Stearnes, Troy L. "Off-Campus Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education." Unpublished report, Michigan State University, 1957.

Stearns, Troy L. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Off-Campus Laboratory Experiences Offered Elementary Education Majors in Marshall, Michigan, 1946-1954." A report to all the All University Research Committee. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1957.

Stiles, Lindley J. "Organization of Student Teaching in Universities." Journal of Educational Research (May, 1947), 706-712.

Story, M. A. "Student Teachers are Subsponsors." School Activities (April, 1951), 243.

Stratemeyer, F. B.; Forkner, H. L.; and McKim, M. G. Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.

Swenson, Esther J.; and Hammock, Robert C. "Off-Campus Laboratory Experiences: Their Growth, Importance and Present Role in Teacher Education." Off-Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook. Lock Hauer, Pa.: The Association for Student Teacher, 1951.

Taylor, Harold. Essays on Teaching. New York: Harper Brothers, 1950.

- Teacher Education Handbook for Mt. Pleasant Secondary Schools and Central Michigan University. Mt. Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan University, 1966.
- Tead, Ordway. Trustees, Teachers, Students: Their Role in Higher Education. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1951.
- Troyer, M.; and Pace, R. Evaluation in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education, 1944.
- Welborn, E. L. "Cooperation with Local Schools in Student Teaching: Elementary Schools." The Education of Teachers as Viewed by the Profession. Bowling Green Conference, Bowling Green, Ohio: Official Group Reports.
- Welborn, E. L. "Cooperation with Local Schools in Student Teaching." Educational Administration and Supervision, VI (November, 1920), 445-470.
- Westfall, Byron L., ed. Student Teaching Programs in Certain School Systems of The North Central Association Area. A study conducted and reported by the Sub-Committee on Student Teaching.
- "Who's in Charge Here?" A discussion paper. National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Washington, D. C.
- Wiggins, Sam P. "Improving Off-Campus Student Teaching." Education (June, 1953), 622-629.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
- Wiles, Kimball. Teaching for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS WHO
NOW HAVE OR HAVE HAD STUDENT TEACHERS

Your class has been selected as one from which we would like to secure information about the directed teaching program in which your school and Central Michigan University have been cooperating. In answering the following questions, please think of student teachers in general, not a particularly good or bad student teacher. Circle the number after the phrase that most nearly identifies your answers.

1. What grade are you in now?

- | | |
|-------------------|----|
| Seventh | 1. |
| Eighth | 2. |
| Ninth. | 3. |
| Tenth. | 4. |
| Eleventh. | 5. |
| Twelfth | 6. |

2. How many student teachers have worked with
classes you have been in over the past several
years?

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| One teacher. | 1. |
| Two teachers | 2. |
| Three teachers. | 3. |
| Four teachers | 4. |
| Five to nine teachers | 5. |
| Ten or more teachers. | 6. |

3. In general, what proportion of student teachers do you think can handle the usual discipline problems that arise in the classroom?

All can 1.
 Most can. 2.
 Less than half can 3.
 Small proportion can. 4.
 None can. 5.
 No opinion 6.

4. In general, what effect do you feel the teaching you have received from student teachers has had on your academic achievement?

Benefited me 1.
 Harmed me 2.
 Neither benefited nor harmed me 3.
 No opinion 4.

5. In general, how much individual attention do you feel you receive when student teachers are assigned to your classroom?

More individual attention than when there is no student teacher 1.
 About the same amount of individual attention as when there is no student teacher 2.
 Less individual attention than when there is no student teacher 3.
 No opinion 4.

6. In general, what do you think of the quality of the regular teacher's work when student teachers are in the classroom?

Better quality than when there is no student teacher 1.

Same quality as usual as when there is no student teacher 2.

Lower quality than when there is no student teacher 3.

No opinion 4.

7. In general, how do you think college student observers affect a class that they observe?

Disturb it a great deal. 1.

Disturb it some what. 2.

No effect 3.

No opinion 4.

8. In general, how would you rate the academic phase of the student teaching program in your school?

Excellent 1.

Good 2.

Fair 3.

Poor 4.

No opinion 5.

9. In general, how well have you liked student teachers you have known?

I have liked all very well. 1.

I have liked most very well 2.

I have liked some well and others less well . 3.

I have not liked most of them. 4.

I have not liked any of them 5.

No opinion 6.

10. In general, what effect do you think the student teaching program has had upon the total instructional program in your school?

Good effect 1.
 Bad effect 2.
 Neither good nor bad 3.
 No opinion 4.

11. Under which of the following arrangements would you prefer to have student teachers?

One hour a day all semester. 1.
 One hour a day for an eight week period. 2.
 One hour a day for longer than an eight week period 3.
 No opinion 4.

12. In general, how much background in subject matter do you think student teachers have?

Unusually high amount. 1.
 Above average for teachers in general 2.
 Satisfactory amount 3.
 Unsatisfactory amount. 4.
 No opinion 5.

13. In general, how would you rate the quality of instruction in subject matter you received from student teachers?

Very good. 1.
 Good 2.
 Fair 3.
 Poor 4.
 No opinion 5.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS WHO
HAVE CHILDREN IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF THE MT. PLEASANT
SCHOOL SYSTEM

It is important that we evaluate the degree of acceptance and contributions of student teachers to the Mt. Pleasant School System. This evaluation will coincide with the Citizen's Committee evaluation of the total school program. Questionnaires will also be given to pupils, teachers, and administrators. This study has the approval of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education and Central Michigan University.

In answering the following questions, please think of student teachers in general, not a particularly good or bad student teacher. Circle the number after the phrase that most nearly identifies your answers.

1. How much formal education have you had?

- Attended grade school 1.
- Finished 8th grade 2.
- Attended high school 3.
- Graduated from high school 4.
- Attended college. 5.
- Graduated from college. 6.
- Added post-graduate college work 7.

2. Circle the number of each of the following organizations you belong to.

- P. T. A. 1.
- Junior High Congress 2.
- Senior High Congress 3.
- None of these. 4.

3. What contact have you had with our student teaching program? Circle more than one number if appropriate.

I am a professor in the secondary education division of the School of Education at Central Michigan University 1.

I am a professor at Central Michigan University 2.

I have a child who has or has had student teachers 3.

I am a cooperating teacher on the student teaching program. 4.

I am a regular teacher in the Mt. Pleasant School System. 5.

I have had no contact with the student teaching program in the Mt. Pleasant School System 6.

Others: Explain _____

4. Did you ever have student teachers in any of your classes when you attended school? Circle appropriate number.

Yes 1.

No 2.

5. If yes to the above question, what was your reaction to having student teachers?

I generally liked having them 1.

It made no difference either way 2.

I did not like having them 3.

6. In general, what do you think of the quality of the regular teacher's work when student teachers are in the classroom?

Better quality than when there is no student teacher 1.

Continued

Same quality as usual as when there is no
student teacher 2.

Lower quality than when there is no
student teacher 3.

No opinion. 4.

7. In general, how do you think college student
observers affect a class that they observe?

Disturb it a great deal 1.

Disturb it somewhat. 2.

No effect 3.

No opinion. 4.

8. In general, what proportion of student teachers
do you think can handle the usual discipline
problems that arise in the classroom?

All can. 1.

Most can 2.

Less than half can 3.

Small proportion can 4.

No opinion. 5.

9. If you have children under student teachers, what
academic effect has the teaching received from
student teachers had upon your children?

Good effect 1.

Bad effect. 2.

Neither good nor bad 3.

No opinion. 4.

10. In general, how much individual attention do you feel your child receives when student teachers are in the classroom?

More individual attention than when there is no student teacher 1.

About the same amount of individual attention as when there is no student teachers 2.

Less individual attention than when there is no student teacher 3.

No opinion. 4.

11. In general, what effect do you think the student teaching program has had upon the total instructional program?

Good effect 1.

Bad effect. 2.

Neither good nor bad 3.

No opinion. 4.

12. In general, how much background in subject matter do you think student teachers have?

Unusually high amount 1.

Above average amount for teachers in general. 2.

Satisfactory amount. 3.

Unsatisfactory amount 4.

No opinion. 5.

13. Under which of the following arrangements would you prefer that your child have student teachers?

One hour a day all semester 1.

One hour a day for an eight week period 2.

One hour a day for longer than an eight week period 3.

No opinion. 4.

14. In general, how would you rate the quality of instruction in subject matter your child has received from student teachers?

Very good 1.

Good 2.

Fair 3.

Poor 4.

No opinion 5.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS IN THE MT. PLEASANT SCHOOL SYSTEM

It is important that we evaluate the degree of acceptance and contribution of student teachers to the Mt. Pleasant School System. This evaluation will coincide with the Citizen's Committee evaluation of the total school program. Questionnaires will also be given to pupils, parents, and administrators. This study has the approval of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education and Central Michigan University.

In answering the following questions, please think of student teachers in general, not a particularly good or bad student teacher. Circle the number after the phrase that most nearly identifies your answers.

1. In general, what proportion of student teachers do you think can handle the usual discipline problems that arise in the classroom?

All can 1.

Most can. 2.

Less than half can 3.

Small proportion can. 4.

No opinion 5.

2. In general, do you think the typical pupil in your classroom has been academically benefited by the work of the student teachers or not?

Benefited him 1.

Not benefited him. 2.

Harmed him 3.

Neither benefited nor harmed him. 4.

No opinion 5.

3. How much individual attention do you feel the pupils generally receive when student teachers are in the classroom?

More individual attention than when there is
no student teacher 1.

About the same amount of individual attention
as when there is no student teacher 2.

Less individual attention than when there
is no student teacher 3.

No opinion. 4.

4. In general, how do you think student teachers affect the quality of the regular teacher's work in the classroom?

Better quality than when there is no
student teacher 1.

Same quality as usual as when there is no
student teacher 2.

Lower quality than when there is no
student teacher 3.

No opinion. 4.

5. In general, how do you think college student observers affect a class that they observe?

Disturb it a great deal 1.

Disturb it somewhat. 2.

No effect 3.

No opinion. 4.

6. In general, how would you rate the academic phase of the student teaching program in our school?

Excellent 1.

Good. 2.

Fair. 3.

Poor. 4.

No opinion. 5.

7. For cooperating teachers:

As a cooperating teacher, what is your reaction, other than the financial reimbursement, to having student teachers?

I like having them very much 1.

They cause some problems, but they are worth the trouble. 2.

Somebody has to have them, but I wish we didn't 3.

I would abolish the program 4.

No opinion 5.

8. For non-cooperating teachers:

What would your reaction be to having student teachers? (Disregard the financial reimbursement)

I would like having them very much 1.

They would cause some problems, but they are worth the trouble 2.

Somebody has to have them, but I wish we didn't 3.

I would abolish the program 4.

No opinion 5.

9. In general, what effect do you think the student teaching program has had upon the total instructional program?

Good effect. 1.

Bad effect 2.

Neither good nor bad. 3.

No opinion 4.

10. Which of the following arrangements would you prefer to have student teachers?

One hour a day all semester 1.
 One hour a day for an eight week period . . . 2.
 One hour a day for longer than an eight
 week period 3.
 No opinion. 4.

11. In general, how much background in subject matter do you think student teachers have?

Unusually high amount 1.
 Above average amount for teachers in
 general 2.
 Satisfactory amount. 3.
 Unsatisfactory amount 4.
 No opinion. 5.

12. In general, how would you rate the quality of instruction that pupils receive in subject matter from student teachers?

Very good 1.
 Good. 2.
 Fair. 3.
 Poor. 4.
 No opinion. 5.

13. For cooperating teachers:

In your opinion, what aspect of working with student teachers is the most rewarding to you?

14. In your opinion, what aspect of working with student teachers is the most frustrating to you?

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS, DIRECTORS, SUPERVISORS, AND COORDINATORS

It is important that we evaluate the degree of acceptance and contributions of student teachers to the Mt. Pleasant School System. This evaluation will coincide with the Citizen's Committee evaluation of the total school program. Questionnaires will also be given to pupils, parents, and teachers. This study has the approval of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education and Central Michigan University.

In answering the following questions, please think of student teachers in general, not a particularly good or bad student teacher. Circle the number after the phrase that most nearly identifies your answers.

1. In general, what proportion of student teachers do you think can handle the usual discipline problems that arise in the classroom?

All can 1.

Most can. 2.

Less than half can 3.

Small proportion can. 4.

None can. 5.

No opinion 6.

2. In general, what effect has the teaching received from student teachers had upon pupils in the schools?

Benefited him 1.

Harmed him 2.

Neither benefited nor harmed him. 3.

No opinion 4.

3. How much individual attention do you feel the pupil receives when student teachers are in the classroom?

More individual attention than when there is
no student teacher 1.

About the same amount of individual attention
as when there is no student teacher 2.

Less individual attention than when there is
no student teacher 3.

No opinion 4.

4. What do you think of the quality of the regular teacher's work when student teachers are in the classroom?

Better quality than when there is no student
teacher. 1.

Same quality as usual as when there is no
student teacher 2.

Lower quality than when there is no
student teacher 3.

No opinion. 4.

5. In general, how disturbing do you think college student observers are to pupils in the classroom?

Disturb it a great deal 1.

Disturb it somewhat. 2.

No effect 3.

No opinion. 4.

6. How would you rate the directed teaching program in the schools?

Excellent 1.

Good. 2.

Fair. 3.

Poor. 4.

No opinion. 5.

7. What is your reaction generally to having student teachers in the Mt. Pleasant School System?

I like having them very much 1.

They cause some problems, but they are worth the trouble. 2.

Somebody has to have them, but I wish we didn't 3.

I would abolish the program 4.

No opinion 5.

8. In general, what effect do you think the student teaching program has had upon the total instructional program?

Good effect. 1.

Bad effect 2.

Neither good nor bad effect 3.

No opinion 4.

9. In general, do you think the presence of student teachers in your building causes you extra work or not?

Very much 1.

Some 2.

None at all. 3.

No opinion 4.

10. In general, how much background in subject matter do you think student teachers have?

Unusually high amount 1.

Above average amount. 2.

Satisfactory amount 3.

Unsatisfactory amount 4.

No opinion 5.

11. What length of time would you prefer pupils to have student teachers?

One hour a day all semester 1.

One hour a day for an eight week period . . . 2.

One hour a day for longer than an eight week period 3.

No opinion. 4.

12. In general, how would you rate the quality of instruction pupils receive from student teachers?

Very good 1.

Good. 2.

Fair. 3.

Poor. 4.

No opinion. 5.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PARENTS

May 19, 1966

Dear Parents:

The Mt. Pleasant Junior and Senior High Schools are working with Central Michigan University in a directed teaching program. In this program a student teacher is assigned to one of our cooperating teachers, usually for a period of eight weeks. Some student teachers are assigned for one hour a day for all semester. Others for two hours a day for a lesser time. The beginning of this practice teaching is spent observing the cooperating teachers instruct; and when the cooperating teachers feel the student teachers are ready, they are allowed to teach the class for a specified time.

The classes of our cooperating teachers are also open to college students for observation. During these observations the college students take notice of the techniques of teaching, observe growth and development of pupils, etc. The observers are limited to five per classroom and are to sit at a designated place in the back of the classroom. Generally, only one or two college students observe each class.

As a parent of children in school, you are interested in their education and in securing the best possible instruction for them. I am doing a study of the secondary directed teaching program in the Mt. Pleasant school system. It is hoped that the result of this study can be used to gain better instruction for all children.

Both Central Michigan University and the Mt. Pleasant Public Schools are interested in discovering what effect the student-teaching program has upon the instruction of children in the public schools. We believe that as a parent of children who have had student teachers, your knowledge of and opinions about the student-teacher program will be valuable.

Would you take a few minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by May 28, 1966. Please feel free to add any comments relative to the student-teaching program. We are interested in securing your frank opinion. Please do not sign your name.

Page 2

This study has the approval of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education and Central Michigan University. Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Carlo Barberi,
Superintendent
Mt. Pleasant Public Schools

CB:ns

Enclosure