

71-31,223

HELDER, William James, 1932-
AN EVALUATION OF THE PREPARATION OF JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AT MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1971
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

AN EVALUATION OF THE PREPARATION OF JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AT MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY

By

William J. Helder

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1971

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some Pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.**

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE PREPARATION OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

William J. Helder

Since its beginnings in the first decade of the century, the junior high school and its more recently emerging counterpart, the middle school, have grown impressively.

Programs to prepare teachers for the junior high or middle school have not been developed with parallel vitality.

This has resulted in a teaching milieu which has little self-identity; one which is too often a grey area where some are waiting for "promotion" to senior high schools and some, prepared for elementary teaching, find themselves in junior high by default.

Students in the age group served by the junior high or middle school have done nothing to deserve this type of educational second-class citizenship. They are, for the most part, a spirited, curious group of early

adolescents who deserve leadership prepared to meet their needs.

Michigan State University has developed a program for the preparation of junior high school teachers. It was the purpose of this study to determine what graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program of the College of Education, Michigan State University, judge to be the most significant areas of preparation for a junior high school teaching position; to determine the effectiveness of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program as judged by graduates of the program; to determine the areas in which the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program needs to be strengthened; to determine the number of graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program who actually teach at that level; to determine the factors which influence their choice of the Junior High Preparation Program; and to determine the factors causing qualified graduates to reject a career in the junior high classroom.

A questionnaire was developed which would provide an opportunity for graduates to evaluate eighteen components of a pre-service program which they felt were most significant to a junior high school teacher's effectiveness and to rate the Michigan State University program on the quality of preparation in each of the areas listed.

Two opportunities were provided for open-ended responses concerning additional areas of preparation

considered necessary for a pre-service program and any comments respondents might want to make on the nature of the junior high school.

In order to provide comparative data, the areas of significance listed on the questionnaire paralleled those developed by Dean in his 1956 study of a preparation program for junior-high-school teachers.¹

In addition, respondents were asked a variety of questions concerning their teaching careers and their reasons for choosing the Junior High Preparation Program.

All of the graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program between the years 1960 and 1967 were sent copies of the questionnaire. Of the 120 graduates, 78 responded.

From the analysis of the opinions expressed by the graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

1. The junior high or middle school is a distinctive enough teaching situation to require a specialized preparation program. This conclusion is confirmed by the Dean study.
2. Student teaching in a junior high school or middle school situation, pre-student teaching experience with junior high or middle school students in situations provided by the university, and a seminar focusing on the nature of the junior high

school and its students should be a part of the preparation program for every student.

3. As viewed by the respondents in this study, the following five areas of preparation are most significant for junior high school teachers: human growth and development, guidance and counseling, special methods of teaching, reading methods, and general education.

(These areas are identical to those reported in the Dean study although the internal ranking varies.²

The application of these areas of preparation to the middle school situation is significantly strengthened by the Dean study which reports the same five areas rank at the top for upper-elementary-school teachers although in a different internal order.)³

4. The area of reading methods is the single most critical area for strengthening the Michigan State University Preparation Program.
5. Classroom management, guidance and counseling, and special methods of teaching are additional areas which should be considered for revision to increase their effectiveness.
6. Greater emphasis should be given to audio-visual techniques and human relations experiences in the total Junior High Preparation Program.

7. The Junior High Preparation Program should be given greater visibility in the College of Education since the influence of faculty members seems to be the most important university-controlled factor in the selection of the junior high program.
8. The number of graduates teaching at the junior high school level is not below national averages.
9. The factors causing rejection of a junior high career are most often related to a preference for the elementary age group or the more generalized elementary teaching situation.

¹Leland W. Dean, "A Preparation Program for Junior-High-School Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956). (Hereinafter referred to as "Preparation Program.")

²Ibid., p. 74.

³Ibid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study could never have been completed without the patience and assistance provided by Dr. Charles A. Blackman who served as chairman of the guidance committee. The debt of gratitude is willingly acknowledged.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Keith P. Anderson, Dr. William K. Durr, Dr. John B. Harrison, and Dr. Daniel Jacobson for their cooperation as members of the guidance committee.

Acknowledgment is also due Dr. Charles G. Eberly of the Office of Evaluation Services for his suggestions and advice concerning the statistical treatment of the data and to Mrs. Gail E. Nutter for providing background information.

To my wife, Leonore, my deepest thanks are due for the depth of her understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem.	5
Strengths of the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	8
Overview.	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Functions of the Junior High School.	12
Preparation of the Junior High School Teacher	14
Summary	24
III. METHODOLOGY	26
Development of the Rating Form	26
Obtaining the Ratings	30
Summary	33
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	36
Description of the Population.	36
Need for Junior High Preparation Program	38
Preparation Areas of Greatest Significance.	39
Critical Areas.	44
Student Teaching	47
Correlation Coefficients Between Ratings of Significance and Effec- tiveness	48
Factors Influencing Choice of Junior High Program.	48
Previous Experience with Junior High Age Students.	52
Graduates as Teachers	54
Reasons for Never Entering Junior High Teaching	55

Chapter	Page
Reasons for Leaving Junior High School Teaching	56
Summary	57
V. UNSTRUCTURED RESPONSES.	61
Negative Experiences.	65
Specific Recommendations for Program Change.	68
Nature of Junior High School Teacher Certification	73
Summary	75
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	77
Conclusions.	79
Recommendations	82
Suggestions for Further Research.	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. Questionnaire Developed to Gather Data	93
B. Initial Cover Letter	97
C. Second Cover Letter.	98
D. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Each of the Eighteen Program Components Submitted to Respondents	99
E. Michigan State University, College of Education, Junior High School Teacher Preparation Program, Revised Winter, 1966.	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1. Total Graduates and Respondents by Year . .	37
4.2. Geographic Distribution of Respondents by Frequency	38
4.3. Ranking of the Eight Preparation Areas of Greatest Importance	41
4.4. Comparative Significance Ratings of Fifteen Preparation Areas.	43
4.5. Comparison of Significance Ratings with Ineffectiveness of Preparation Ratings. .	45
4.6. Correlation Coefficients Between Ratings of Significance and Effectiveness	49
4.7. Factors Influencing Choice of the Junior High Preparation Program	50
4.8. Experience with Junior High Age Group Prior to Program Choice.	53
D.1. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for General Education, i.e., Survey Courses .	99
D.2. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Specialized Subject Matter.	100
D.3. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Guidance and Counseling.	101
D.4. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Audio-Visual	102
D.5. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Sociology of Education	103

Table	Page
D.6. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for History and Philosophy	104
D.7. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Special Methods of Teaching	105
D.8. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Human Growth and Development	106
D.9. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Learning Theory	107
D.10. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Special Education.	108
D.11. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Reading Methods	109
D.12. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Core Curriculum	110
D.13. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Classroom Management.	111
D.14. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Human Relations	112
D.15. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Tests.	113
D.16. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Junior High Seminar	114
D.17. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Pre-Student Teaching Experience	115
D.18. Significance and Effectiveness Ratings for Student Teaching	116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education released in 1918 recommended:

We . . . recommend a reorganization of the school system whereby the first six years shall be devoted to elementary education designed to meet the needs of pupils approximately 6 to 12 years of age; and the second six years to be secondary education designed to meet the needs of pupils approximately 12 to 18 years of age.

The six years to be devoted to secondary education may well be divided into two periods which may be designated as the junior and senior periods. In the junior period emphasis should be placed upon the attempt to help the pupil explore his own aptitudes and make at least provisional choice of the kinds of work to which he shall devote himself. In the senior period emphasis should be given to training in the fields thus chosen. This distinction lies at the basis of the organization of the junior and senior high schools.

In the junior high school there should be a gradual introduction of departmental instruction, some choice of subjects under guidance, promotion by subjects, prevocational courses, and a social organization that calls forth initiative and develops the sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of the group.¹

¹Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, Bulletin No. 35 (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1918), pp. 12-13.

Despite a lack of consensus on the merits of the junior high as a separate institution and the lack of teachers trained specifically for the junior high, its growth was impressive. In 1934 there were 1,948 separate junior high schools in the United States. By the 1963-64 school year, that number had risen to 6,606. Of these totals, the state of Michigan counted 91 separate junior high schools in 1934 and 399 in the 1963-64 school year.²

This rapid growth rate is not completely a result of the appeal of the junior high school as an institution. Since the early part of the century, schools have increased their holding power and the population as a whole has steadily increased. Still, the need for teachers to staff these junior high schools has increased with the rising number of separate junior high schools being built.

In its Guidelines for Junior High and Middle School Education, the National Association of Secondary School Principals states that ideally:

The junior high or middle school is staffed by teachers, principals, and other staff members who are interested and have special competence in working with this age group. Salary and personnel policies of the school system reflect the need to attract and retain specialized teachers for this level.³

²William Van Til, Gordon Vars, and John Lounsbury, Modern Education for the Junior High School Years (2nd ed.; Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967), p. 40. (Hereinafter referred to as Modern Education.)

³Gordon F. Vars, ed., Guidelines for Junior High and Middle School Education (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1966), p. 16. (Hereinafter referred to as Guidelines.)

They go on to recommend that:

Colleges and universities provide programs specifically designed to prepare staff members for the junior high or middle schools. State education departments promote this aim through appropriate policies and procedures.⁴

To digress briefly at this point, one might note that the title of the publication from which the preceding quotation was taken treats the junior high school and the middle school as sufficiently congruent to permit the guidelines to apply interchangeably. This is, perhaps, significant in view of the quantity of material which has been written in recent months to differentiate between the two methods of organization. For, in the final analysis, the middle school is little more than a restructuring of age groups and buildings with the rationale for curriculum a restatement of the original goals of the junior high.

The North Central Association has proposed that consideration be given in staffing the junior high school, "to the selection of staff members prepared specifically for and/or having teaching experience in the junior high school."⁵ This would seem to be quite unrealistic in light of the fact that there is a conspicuous lack of undergraduate programs designed to prepare teachers

⁴Ibid., p. 17.

⁵North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Policies, Principles, and Standards for the Approval of Junior High Schools (Proposed) (Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1966), p. 13.

specifically for the junior high school. Indeed, there is doubt in the minds of some administrators about the practicality of a program which provides credentials which will limit a prospective teacher to a relatively narrow grade/age range in seeking employment.

The College of Education, Michigan State University, is one of the institutions of higher learning which has sought to implement a program for the preparation of teachers for the junior high school years.

Dean concluded, in a study of preparation programs for junior high school teachers, that a majority of teachers who have had experience in the junior high school believed that a separate preparation program for teachers at this instructional level should be offered but that of the two common types of teacher preparation programs then available, the elementary training program offered the better possibilities for producing adequately prepared junior high school teachers.⁶

In March of 1958, the College of Education, Michigan State University, requested permission from the State Board of Education to offer, on a five-year experimental basis, a teacher preparation program that would give greater emphasis to the junior high school level of instruction. This permission was granted to the College of Education and a program was inaugurated. The main

⁶Dean, "Preparation Program."

elements of this newly inaugurated program were cited in a memorandum to Michigan State University coordinators in April, 1959, as: "A strengthening of the preparation in majors and minors, a modification of the professional course requirements, and a student teaching experience at the junior high school level."

At Michigan State University there have been, since 1958, three routes to a teaching position in the junior high school, i.e., elementary, secondary, and the junior high program itself.

There is some feeling that the Junior High Preparation Program is in need of an evaluation and that it should be given greater visibility.

The emergence of the middle school concept will undoubtedly raise some questions concerning teacher preparation. This tends to reinforce the need for evaluation of teacher preparation for the junior high/middle school age group.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this study: (1) to determine what graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program of the College of Education, Michigan State University, judge to be the most significant areas of preparation for a junior high school teaching position; (2) to determine the effectiveness of the Junior High

Teacher Preparation Program as judged by graduates of the program; (3) to determine the areas in which the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program needs to be strengthened; (4) to determine the number of graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program who actually teach at that level; (5) to determine the factors which influence the choice of the Junior High Preparation Program; (6) to determine the factors causing qualified graduates to reject a career in the junior high classroom.

Importance of the Study

Few teacher preparation institutions have shown evidence that they consider the preparation of teachers for the junior high school as distinctive enough to merit a specialized program. As a result, it is difficult for a school administrator to hire a teacher prepared specifically for junior high school teaching.

This situation persists despite the fact that it is during the junior high years that most students enter adolescence.

In delineating the nature of adolescence, John E. Horrocks presents the following:

1. Adolescence tends to be a time of seeking status as an individual. There is a tendency to attempt emancipation from childish submission to parental authority, and in general a struggle against relationships with adults where the adolescent is subordinated on the basis of inferiority in age, experience, and skill. It is a period of emerging and developing vocational interests and striving toward economic independence.

2. Adolescence tends to be a time when group relationships become of major importance. The adolescent is usually most anxious to attain status with, and recognition by, his age mates. He tends to desire intensely to conform to the actions and standards of his peers. It is also a time of emerging heterosexual interests that bring complexity and sometimes conflict to emotions and activities.
3. Adolescence is a time of physical development and growth that forms a continuous pattern common to the race, but idiosyncratic to the individual. During this period there is a rapid altering of the body, and revision of the body image and habitual motor patterns. It is during this time that physical maturity is attained.
4. Adolescence tends to be a time of intellectual expansion and development, and academic experience. The individual finds himself in the position of having to adjust to increasing academic and intellectual requirements. He is asked to acquire many skills and concepts useful at some future time but often lacking immediate motivation. It is a time when an individual is gaining experience and knowledge in many areas and is interpreting his environment in the light of that experience.
5. Adolescence tends to be a time of development and of evaluation of values. The quest for the controlling values around which the individual may integrate his life is accompanied by an increasing awareness of "self," development of self ideals, and acceptance of self in harmony with those ideals. It is a time of conflict between youthful idealism and reality.⁷

Thus, we have a situation in which the student group is undergoing a time of tremendous stress, a time of struggle against subordinate relationships with adults, a time of intellectual expansion often lacking immediate motivation and we provide no clearly defined preparation program for the teachers who are to guide this student group.

⁷John E. Horrocks, The Psychology of Adolescence (2nd ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962), pp. 25-26.

By identifying elements of preparation judged as significant by graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program, some direction can be suggested for the continued development of such programs.

By rating the effectiveness of preparation in given areas of the program at Michigan State University, specific areas can be identified as in need of strengthening.

Strengths of the Study

A particular strength of this study is the opportunity it affords to compare the ratings of identical sets of program components by two populations of experienced teachers separated in time by over a decade. The similarity of the ratings despite the passage of over ten years gives increased importance to the components identified as significant for the preparation of junior high school teachers.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation inherent in the sample is the fact that all respondents were graduates of the same institution. While this provides maximum effectiveness in generating recommendation for change at that institution, it limits the generalizations from these data to other institutions within the state and throughout the country.

A second limitation results from the nature of the population. Ratings were solicited only from graduates of

the program. While this provides a valuable insight into program areas which are in need of strengthening, it represents only one point of view since comparable ratings were not solicited from Michigan State University faculty nor from junior high school administrators.

Findings of this study were based upon, and stated within the limitations of the assumed validity of, data obtained from the questionnaire method. It should be pointed out, however, that signing the questionnaire was optional. This was intended to assure the respondent that there was no latent threat should he return to Michigan State University to continue his education after returning a negative questionnaire.

Overview

In Chapter II of this study, the literature related to the objectives of the junior high and the middle school is briefly reviewed. The literature related to preparation programs for junior high/middle school teachers is reviewed in greater detail.

In Chapter III, the methodology employed in gathering the data and the procedures of reporting them is described. A rating instrument was developed which sought an evaluation of eighteen components of a pre-service program for junior high school teachers.

Respondents were also asked to rate the effectiveness of their preparation in each of the eighteen areas by Michigan State University.

In addition, respondents were asked a variety of questions concerning their teaching careers and their reasons for choosing the Junior High Preparation Program.

All of the graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program between the years 1960 and 1967 were sent copies of the questionnaire.

In Chapter IV the findings of the questionnaire are reported.

Percentages of respondents who felt that the junior high school was a distinctive enough teaching situation to merit a specialized preparation program and those who felt they would take the Michigan State University program again are calculated.

The five areas of greatest significance to junior high teachers are tabulated and compared with findings of an earlier study.

Areas in critical need of strengthening are identified.

Factors influencing the choice of the junior high program and prior experience with the junior high age group are tabulated and rated in terms of degree of influence.

The percentage of graduates currently teaching in the junior high school is calculated and reasons for never

entering junior high school teaching or for leaving it are explored.

Data obtained from a rating scale, while more readily accessible, often does not reveal a personalized dimension which can sometimes be obtained from an open-ended question. Respondents were given two opportunities for unstructured responses. The first opportunity permitted them to add areas of preparation which they judged important to the list of eighteen provided in the questionnaire. The second opportunity encouraged responses to an open-ended question on the entire area of the junior high school and the preparation required for junior high teachers.

The data generated from these two unstructured opportunities are categorized and reported in Chapter V.

In Chapter VI, the study is summarized, conclusions are drawn, and recommendations are made. The final segment of this chapter contains suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to prepare teachers for the junior high school, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the functions of the junior high school as an institution. Once these functions have been identified, the nature of the preparation program can be better prescribed.

Functions of the Junior High School

An excellent historical survey of the functions of the junior high school can be found in Van Til, Vars, and Lounsbury. As they trace the evolution of the roles of the junior high school from its beginnings in 1909, they are able to state the following broad purposes:

(1) to continue the common education needed by all citizens in a democracy (general education) and (2) to provide experiences especially suited to the diverse abilities, needs, and interests of widely varying individual young adolescents (education for diversity). Fulfillment of these purposes imposes on the modern junior high school responsibility for the following more specific functions:

1. Continuing and extending the general education program of the elementary school, including development of the basic skills.
2. Providing for a transition between the organization and approach of the elementary school and that of the senior high school.

3. Introducing new subject areas and additional specialization within basic areas.
4. Providing opportunities for students to discover and pursue their special interests and aptitudes.
5. Providing appropriate experiences to assist and guide the rapid physical development that is characteristic of early adolescence.
6. Providing experiences that will develop the social competence needed as students enter young manhood and womanhood.
7. Providing experiences that will assist individuals in developing values and building a philosophy of life.
8. Providing ample opportunities for self-management and the development of leadership under supervision.¹

Van Til and his colleagues acknowledge that disputes over the function of the junior high school still go on but maintain that essentially the functions of the junior high school are, "the same as those of other schools. Differences are matters of degrees, not kind, and stem primarily from the age group involved."²

This statement is elaborated upon in Guidelines for Junior High and Middle School Education:

The purposes and functions of the junior high school are essentially the same as those of any other school. However, the unique characteristics of the age group require special emphasis on guidance and exploratory experiences, as well as increased attention to individual differences. As an institution intermediate between the elementary school and the senior high school, the junior high also gives particular attention to the articulation of its program with those above and below.³

¹Van Til, et al., Modern Education, p. 35.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Vars, Guidelines, p. 4.

Dean, in his summary of the literature related to the function of the junior high school includes the following:

Counseling and guidance; bridging the gap between elementary and secondary schools; integration of learning experiences; exploration of pupil aptitudes, abilities, and interests; meeting individual differences of students; providing a suitable educational environment for children approximately 12 to 16 years of age; and the development of qualities of good citizenship.⁴

Attention to individual differences seems to be a commonly agreed upon objective of the junior high school. The complexity of carrying out this charge is pinpointed by the anthropologist, Margaret Mead, when she writes, "junior high school students are more unlike each other than they have ever been before or ever will be again in the course of their lives."⁵

Preparation of the Junior High School Teacher

Even a casual review of the literature will reveal a dissatisfaction with the manner in which junior high school teachers are prepared.

Prospective junior high school teachers are prepared either as elementary or as secondary teachers. It

⁴Dean, "Preparation Program," p. 27.

⁵Margaret Mead, "Early Adolescence in the United States," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIX, No. 300 (April, 1965), 10.

was this situation which led Dean to conduct his 1956 study in which he concluded that "of the two common types of teacher preparation programs . . . available, it seems evident that the elementary training program offers the best possibilities for producing adequately-prepared junior-high-school teachers."⁶

Yet, in this same study, a majority of teachers who had had experience teaching in the junior high school believed that a separate preparation program for teachers at that instructional level should be offered. When asked that question directly, 55 per cent felt that the preparation program should be specialized.⁷

In 1964, teacher education institutions were still being charged with failure to provide special programs for the adequate preparation of professional personnel to teach and guide junior high students.⁸

Two years later, it could still be said that:

Perhaps the most serious obstacles to the educational development of the junior high school has been the lack of teachers specifically prepared for work at this level. . . . Only a handful of the hundreds of institutions that educate teachers have definite

⁶Dean, "Preparation Program," p. 75.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Nelson L. Bossing and Roscoe V. Cramer, The Junior High School (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 315.

programs for preparing junior high school teachers. A sprinkling of summer-school courses is about all that most of the college catalogs contain.⁹

Michigan State University was one of the teacher preparation institutions which did offer a program especially for the preparation of junior high school teachers as a major in elementary education. In a memorandum dated May 19, 1969, this program was discontinued effective with students entering July 1, 1969. This was done because the new Michigan Teacher Certification Code provided that students entering Michigan State University in July of 1969 or thereafter would receive Elementary Teacher Certificates valid through grade nine. Until then, Elementary Certificates were valid only through grade eight.

The National Association of Secondary-School Principals has some rather specific recommendations for the pre-service preparation of junior high and middle school teachers. They feel such preparation should consist of:

. . . approximately 40% general education, 40% study in the teaching field(s), and 20% professional education, including student teaching. Ideally, junior high and middle school teachers not only know their subject areas well, but also understand and accept young adolescents. They possess a sound background in psychology, anthropology, sociology, and human relations, which they are both willing and able to apply in working with this age group.

The recommended professional education sequence includes study, but not necessarily separate courses, in the following: philosophy, purposes, and current

⁹Van Til, et al., Modern Education, p. 35.

developments in junior high school education; characteristics of young adolescents; principles of teaching and learning; methods of teaching reading and communication in the chosen subject field(s); observation and student teaching under competent guidance in junior high schools; and skills in counseling and group guidance.¹⁰

The 1960 Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Junior High School Education held at Cedar Falls, Iowa, urged that preparation programs for junior high school teachers include courses in the teaching of reading, instruction in guidance, and information on conducting practical experience projects. Participants felt that appropriate major-minor combinations, in addition to provisions for a broad general background, should be considered. The study of psychology, with emphasis on the adolescent, was considered essential as were student teaching experiences at the junior high school level.¹¹

Brimm is of the opinion that the transitional role of the junior high school requires specialized preparation. He advocates a type of teacher education which balances the basic skills orientation of the elementary school and the subject matter specialization of the senior high. He notes a trend toward the employment of secondary teachers with

¹⁰Vars, Guidelines, pp. 16-17.

¹¹Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Junior High School Education. Proceedings of the Regional Conference (Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1960). Printed in Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV, No. 266 (September, 1961), 18-48.

the possibility of over-emphasis on subject matter specialization.¹²

Noar¹³ suggests that in addition to such courses as Educational History, Theory, Philosophy and Psychology, Human Growth and Development and Social Science, college departments of education must offer courses in Classroom Techniques and in the Nature of Unit Construction and Teaching if the junior high school is to be well served. Not only must these new courses emphasize curriculum content and methods, "the courses themselves will have to be conducted in such fashion that the members of the classes will experience the kinds of learning experiences that they in turn will be required to use with children."¹⁴

Eichhorn,¹⁵ in describing the preparation of middle school teachers, is rather general. Except for the use of a fairly contrived term which designates pupils served by the middle school as "transescents," there is

¹²R. P. Brimm, The Junior High School (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963), p. 72.

¹³Gertrude Noar, The Junior High School--Today and Tomorrow (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961).

¹⁴Ibid., p. 87.

¹⁵Donald H. Eichhorn, The Middle School (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966).

nothing which could not apply to a junior high school teacher's preparation. He maintains that the prospective teacher should have a thorough professional preparation which should give the teacher an extensive understanding of both the physical and mental growth processes of students, particularly as their growth patterns relate to our culture. Teacher preparation should provide competence in a subject area which includes, "not only a comprehensive knowledge of subject content but also a knowledge of the function of the thought processes relative to the area of specialization."¹⁶

Popper puts a premium on "teachers who, regardless of the teaching field, have mastered skills of the Core curriculum"¹⁷ but goes on to assert that "because the professional preparation of middle school teachers is still 'a no man's land' in America, most middle school teachers in the United States are neither equipped with the required skills for the role nor have they internalized an institutional commitment to the role."¹⁸

Maynard devised a model pre-service program for the preparation of junior high school teachers which was

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 91-92.

¹⁷Samuel H. Popper, The American Middle School, An Organizational Analysis (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing, 1967), p. 329.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 306.

acceptable to and considered desirable by a representative sampling of 143 junior high school principals representing a minimum of thirty states.¹⁹

Considering the opinions of respondents, he concludes that a separate and specific program for junior high school teachers is necessary and desirable.

His program suggested thirty-eight semester hours of general education broken down into twenty-six hours of required courses and twelve hours of elective courses. For the junior high school major, seventy semester hours were required. These seventy hours were divided among thirty hours of professional education and psychology and forty hours of subject matter specialization. This left twenty semester hours free for electives. The program totalled 128 semester hours.

The problem of forcing a choice between elementary and secondary preparation programs for junior high school teachers is further dramatized by a study conducted by Callaway. In this study junior high administrators were asked to rate a sample of teachers in terms of:

- 1) the quality of the teacher's subject matter background and preparation; 2) the teacher's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter; 3) the teacher's ability to relate to the age group; 4) an overall rating of the teacher's effectiveness. Data were

¹⁹H. Glenn Maynard, "A Study of the Professional Preparation of Junior High School Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1960).

also collected on the nature of the certification program experienced by the teacher.

Analysis of these data indicates that the preponderance (78 per cent) of the nearly 500 teachers involved were prepared as secondary school teachers, and that this group displayed significantly better subject matter background and preparation. On the other hand, the 22 per cent who were prepared as elementary school teachers were rated as significantly better teachers of the subject and possessed higher overall ratings of teacher effectiveness.²⁰

Further support for a separate program for the preparation of junior high school teachers is provided in a study by Kirby.²¹ The focus of his study was the preparation of social studies teachers in selected junior high schools in Colorado, but his findings led to the conclusion that while junior high school social studies teachers have not developed a common point of view regarding the content of preparation programs for prospective junior high school teachers, a majority of the respondents in his study indicated that they favored accreditation of the junior high school as a separate entity and favored special certification of junior high school teachers.

The study most closely allied to the current one was conducted by Schmidt who explored the preservice

²⁰Rolland Callaway, "Selecting a Teacher for Junior High," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1966, p. 84.

²¹Darrell Francis Kirby, "Factors Relating to the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers in Selected Junior High Schools in Colorado" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1964).

professional preparation of junior high school teachers in Kansas.²²

He determined that specific preparation for junior high school teachers was almost nonexistent in public colleges and universities in Kansas. He concluded that the quality of preparation could be improved with a specific curriculum and that there was dissatisfaction with the present block-of-time and methods courses.

Subject area evaluations of the teachers and experts in his study led to the recommendation of the following areas of preparation for potential junior high school teachers: junior high school student teaching, psychology of learning, theory and functions of the junior high school, reading instruction, child growth and development and/or psychology of adolescence, methodology of the subject, junior high school curriculum development, audio-visual instruction, guidance and counseling, extra-curricular activities, observation in a junior high school, individual differences related to gifted and remedial, sociological factors related to early adolescents.

Sheehan,²³ in a study conducted in thirty-seven junior high schools in suburban St. Louis, Missouri, found

²²Gerald Lee Schmidt, "Preservice Professional Preparation of Junior High School Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1965).

²³Melbourne Richard Sheehan, "Junior High School Teachers' Evaluation of Pre-Service Preparation"

that pre-service preparation as it related to a teaching experience at the junior high school level was rated unsatisfactory. The group expressed the opinion that teaching at this level required special training not normally provided in the traditional elementary or secondary training programs.

"Student Teaching," "English Composition and Literature," and three psychology courses were rated the most valuable of those courses taken during undergraduate training.

Since English Composition and Literature was cited in the preceding study as having been of value, a comment from a Michigan State University graduate should be noted:

I feel that M.S.U. did not adequately prepare me to teach junior high English. Far too much time is spent in taking all types of literature classes. Some were helpful, but for junior high, one needs to know how to effectively teach grammar--not the history of the language. One needs to present literary material which stimulates students--not necessarily Chaucer, Whitman or Melville.²⁴

Sheehan lists the following expressed needs of junior high school teachers following their entrance into

(unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1969). (Hereinafter referred to as "Teachers' Evaluation.")

²⁴Elizabeth H. Rusk, "A Study of Secondary School Teachers of English Who Graduated from Michigan State University" (unpublished study for the College of Arts & Letters Teacher Preparation Committee and for the Humanities Teaching Institute, Michigan State University, 1967), p. 49. (Hereinafter referred to as "Secondary Teachers of English.")

the teaching field. They provide valuable suggestions for the strengthening of the preparation program:

1. Accommodating individual differences in the classroom.
2. Methods of evaluating one's own teaching effectiveness.
3. Special teaching techniques appropriate to junior high.
4. Availability of texts appropriate for low ability students.
5. Evaluating pupil progress.
6. Availability of resource materials.
7. Curriculum development and/or evaluation.
8. Developing valid and reliable teacher-made tests.
9. Selection and use of audio-visual materials and equipment.
10. Better understanding of pre-adolescent child.²⁵

Summary

A review of the literature suggests that there has been a recognition of the problems involved in preparing junior high school teachers. Before examining preparation programs that best meet the needs of teachers at this level of instruction, a brief survey of the functions of the junior high school was undertaken.

A number of studies have been made in an effort to identify these functions. Essentially, they are the same as those of any other school but an emphasis is placed on guidance and exploratory experiences which reflect the unique characteristics of the age group to be served. Great stress is placed on providing for

²⁵Sheehan, "Teachers' Evaluation."

individual differences since such a wide maturational span is found in this age group.

Most sources consulted agreed on the need for a specialized preparation program for teachers who will staff the junior high and middle schools. There is also agreement that present programs are not meeting the professional needs of junior high and middle school teachers.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In the fall of 1958, the College of Education, Michigan State University, instituted a program designed to prepare teachers more adequately for the junior high school. Graduates of this program are in a unique position to judge the quality of their preparation. Therefore, this study was based on the opinions of graduates of the program.

In order to determine the opinions of graduates concerning the desirable components of a preparation program, it was necessary to develop a rating instrument which could be submitted to them.

Development of the Rating Form

Since the study undertaken by Dean was instrumental in launching the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program at Michigan State University, it was the list of program components generated by that study which was used as the basis for the list submitted to the graduates of the program.

Dean developed his program components by submitting a preliminary component list to thirty-eight teachers

chosen from seven different Michigan school systems. These seven systems were selected after consideration of size, location, and organizational structure. The teachers were identified by an administrator in their system as competent and willing to give thoughtful consideration to such a study.¹

Revisions were made on the basis of the suggestions derived from this survey.

The revised list was submitted to a panel of ten faculty experts in the College of Education, Michigan State University. Their additions and clarifications were incorporated into the final list.

The fifteen areas of preparation ultimately identified can be summarized as follows:

1. General Education
2. Specialized Subject Matter
3. Counseling and Guidance
4. Audio-Visual Materials and Techniques
5. Sociology of Education
6. History and Philosophy of Education
7. Special Methods of Teaching
8. Human Growth and Development
9. Learning Theory
10. Special Education

¹Dean, "Preparation Program," pp. 95-97.

11. Reading Methods
12. Core Curriculum
13. Classroom Management
14. Human Relations
15. Tests

In order to permit comparisons with the data reported in the Dean study to the greatest possible extent, the items were retained in original sequence and wording, with three new elements appended to the end of the listing.

The three new elements related more to structure than to content, i.e., "seminar situation focusing on the nature of the junior high school and its students," "pre-student teaching experience with junior high school students in situations provided by the university," and "student teaching." The three new items were included to determine their importance to the prospective junior high school teacher.

Respondents were given two opportunities for unstructured responses. The first opportunity permitted them to add areas of preparation which they judged important to the list of eighteen provided in the questionnaire. The second opportunity encouraged responses to an open-ended question on the entire area of the junior high school and the preparation required for junior high school teachers.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their present teaching position, the number of years they had taught, the number of years taught in the junior high and at other levels, and their reasons for either leaving the junior high school or for never accepting a junior high teaching position.

In addition, respondents were asked if they felt the junior high teaching situation was distinctive enough to require a specialized program, whether they would choose the junior high preparation again, and whether or not they had done their student teaching in a junior high school.

In an attempt to gain some insight into the reasons for choosing the junior high school program, graduates were given an open-ended list of possible factors influencing their choice and were asked to rate each applicable factor in terms of importance.

A listing of possible previous experiences with the junior high age group was also developed. It, too, was open-ended and graduates were asked to rate each applicable experience in terms of its influence on their choice of the Junior High Preparation Program.

A draft of the instrument was submitted to the students of the 1966 Spring Term Seminar for Junior High School Teachers. As a result of this trial, ambiguous

wording was corrected and revisions in format were made.²

Obtaining the Ratings

A search of the records in the College of Education and the Office of the Registrar yielded 120 graduates who were listed as having received the junior high provision on their teaching credentials between the years 1960 and 1967.

Addresses were obtained by a search of the records of the Alumni Office. Returns have indicated that in a number of cases the addresses obtained from the Alumni Office were, understandably, not current. In some cases, questionnaires were forwarded but there is strong reason to believe that many were not.

Accompanying each questionnaire was a letter co-signed by Dr. Leland Dean, Assistant Dean of the College of Education and Director of the School of Teacher Education and the principal investigator. This letter explained the purpose of the study and the need for it. Questionnaires were mailed out on April 5, 1968.³ In order to make the percentage of returns as complete

²See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire used.

³See Appendix B for a copy of the initial cover letter sent.

as possible, a second letter was sent out on May 13, 1968.⁴

Of the 120 graduates of the junior high program to whom questionnaires were sent, 78 or 65 per cent responded.

Data secured from the questionnaire determined what graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program of the College of Education, Michigan State University judged to be the most important areas of preparation for a junior high school teaching position. This was accomplished by providing an opportunity for respondents to rate each of the eighteen components on a five-point scale ranging from, "A = Extremely significant" for a junior high school teacher's effectiveness to, "E = Of practically no significance" for a junior high school teacher's effectiveness. These ratings are reported both by numerical frequency and percentage of frequency.

Data secured from the questionnaire determined the effectiveness of the Michigan State University program by providing an opportunity for respondents to rate each of the eighteen components on a five-point scale ranging from "1 = Very effective" to "5 = Very poor." An additional response was permitted in that respondents were asked to leave blank any described course content which

⁴See Appendix C for a copy of the second cover letter sent.

they felt they had never had. These ratings are reported both by numerical frequency and percentage of frequency.

Both of the preceding sets of data are reported as tables using the model suggested by Rusk.⁵

Preparation areas in critical need of strengthening are defined a priori for the purposes of this study as those areas whose significance ratings of A + B equal or exceed 50 per cent while the Michigan State University preparation rating of 4 + 5 equal or exceed 50 per cent. This would mean that over half of the respondents rated an area of preparation as either "extremely significant" or "quite significant" to a junior high school teacher while at the same time they rated the University's program for preparation in that area as either "ineffective" or "very poor." These two ratings are designated as significance ratings and ineffectiveness ratings in Chapter IV of this study.

Correlation coefficients of the significance ratings and the ineffectiveness ratings have also been calculated and are reported in Chapter IV.

Areas of concern will further be indicated by "no ratings." Such ratings mean that the respondent felt he received no preparation in the area so rated during his program at Michigan State University.

⁵Rusk, "Secondary Teachers of English."

Data secured from the questionnaire yield the number of respondents who actually teach at the junior high school level.

Further, the responses will determine some factors which influence the choice of the Junior High Preparation Program and the factors causing qualified graduates to reject a career in the junior high classroom. These factors will be reported in rank order of importance.

Summary

A rating instrument was developed which sought an evaluation of eighteen components of a pre-service program for junior high school teachers.

Respondents were also asked to rate the effectiveness of their preparation in each of the eighteen areas by Michigan State University.

Data secured from the questionnaire determined what graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program of the College of Education, Michigan State University judged to be the most important areas of preparation for a junior high school teaching position. This was accomplished by providing an opportunity for respondents to rate each of the eighteen components on a five-point scale ranging from, "A = Extremely significant" for a junior high school teacher's effectiveness to, "E = Of practically no significance" for a junior high school

teacher's effectiveness. These ratings are reported both by numerical frequency and percentage of frequency.

Data secured from the questionnaire determined the effectiveness of the Michigan State University program by providing an opportunity for respondents to rate each of the eighteen components on a five-point scale ranging from "1 = Very effective" to "5 = Very poor." An additional response was permitted in that respondents were asked to leave blank any described course content which they felt they had never had. These ratings are reported both by numerical frequency and percentage of frequency.

Preparation areas in critical need of strengthening are defined a priori for the purposes of this study as those areas whose significance ratings of A + B equal or exceed 50 per cent while the Michigan State University preparation rating of 4 + 5 equal or exceed 50 per cent. This would mean that over half of the respondents rated an area of preparation as either "extremely significant" or "quite significant" to a junior high school teacher while at the same time they rated the University's program for preparation in that area as either "ineffective" or "very poor." These two ratings are designated as significance ratings and ineffectiveness ratings in Chapter IV of this study.

Correlation coefficients of the significance ratings and the ineffectiveness ratings have also been calculated and are reported in Chapter IV.

Areas of concern will further be indicated by "no ratings." Such ratings mean that the respondent felt he received no preparation in the area so rated during his program at Michigan State University.

Respondents were given two opportunities for unstructured responses concerning any aspects of the junior high school teaching situation which they felt had not been covered in the questionnaire. These responses are categorized and reported in Chapter V of this study.

Data secured from the questionnaire yield the number of respondents who actually teach at the junior high school level.

Further, the responses will determine some factors which influence the choice of the Junior High Preparation Program and the factors causing qualified graduates to reject a career in the junior high classroom.

In addition respondents were asked a variety of questions concerning their teaching careers and their reasons for choosing the Junior High Preparation Program. These data are tabulated and reported in Chapter IV of this study.

All of the graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program between the years 1960 and 1967 were sent copies of the questionnaire. Of the 120 graduates, 78 responded.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The instrument prepared to gather the data for this study was mailed to the 120 graduates of the Junior High School Teacher Preparation Program at Michigan State University between the years 1960-1967. The number of respondents was seventy-eight for a 65 per cent return. According to Rusk, this is more than is usual in this kind of survey.¹

Description of the Population

A tabulation of the graduates of the junior high school preparation program, the number of respondents by year of graduation, and the percentage of return for each year is shown in Table 4.1.

A chi-square goodness of fit comparison demonstrated there were no proportional differences between the number of potential and actual responses to the questionnaire by class year of graduation. This result helped to support the assumption that the reaction of actual

¹Rusk, "Secondary Teachers of English," p. 5.

respondents could be considered representative of the reaction of potential respondents. The value of the chi-square statistic for these data was 0.903; a value of 14.067 at 8 degrees of freedom was needed to reach the .05 level of significance in difference between the two distributions of responses by class year.²

TABLE 4.1
TOTAL GRADUATES AND RESPONDENTS BY YEAR

Year	Graduates	Respondents	Percentage
1960	11	9	82
1961	9	5	56
1962	14	7	50
1963	10	6	60
1964	17	11	65
1965	16	12	75
1966	15	9	60
1967	<u>28</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>68</u>
	120	78	65%

A geographic distribution of respondents by state is provided in Table 4.2. The fifty-six Michigan respondents break down into six from Detroit, six from the Lansing-East Lansing area, five from Grand Rapids, and the remainder scattered throughout the state.

A seventy-ninth respondent is currently living in American Samoa and not teaching. Unfortunately, this was

²William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), pp. 850-54.

all the information included in her response so it could not be reported with the other respondents.

TABLE 4.2
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS
BY FREQUENCY

State	Frequency	State	Frequency
Michigan	56	Georgia	1
California	4	Illinois	1
New York	3	Puerto Rico	1
Ohio	3	South Carolina	1
Arizona	2	Tennessee	1
Indiana	2	Washington, D.C.	<u>1</u>
Pennsylvania	2		78

Need for Junior High Preparation Program

In response to the question, "Do you feel that the junior high school is a distinctive enough teaching situation to require a specialized program," seventy-six of the seventy-eight respondents answered affirmatively for a percentage of 98. Of the seventy-six affirmative responses, eleven were emphasized with stars, triple checks, or comments such as "definitely." Two respondents were undecided. None responded negatively.

There was not, however, such near-unanimity in responses to the item which gave graduates the opportunity to choose the Junior High Preparation Program if they were

to begin again. Nineteen indicated that they would not do so. The most frequent reason given for not taking the program again was that it was inadequate.

Seven of the respondents were undecided as to whether they would choose the program again. Among those seven undecided respondents, a 1967 graduate furnishes a significant if negative clue when he says, "Can't say either one (yes or no) because I feel that although I was enrolled in the Junior High Program, there really wasn't one as far as preparation goes."

Thus, only fifty-two of the seventy-eight respondents or 67 per cent would take the program again even though 98 per cent feel that the junior high school is a distinctive enough teaching situation to require a specialized program.

Preparation Areas of Greatest Significance

Dean, in his 1956 study, identified fifteen components of a Junior High Teacher Preparation Program.³ In order to permit comparisons with the data reported in Dean's study to the greatest possible extent, these program components were retained in their original sequence and wording with three new elements appended to the end of the listing.

³Dean, "Preparation Program," pp. 95-97.

The three new elements: "Student teaching," "Pre-student teaching experience with junior high school students in situations provided by the university," and "Seminar situation focusing on the nature of the junior high school and its students," were among the eight most highly rated items ranked by importance using the total of respondents rating them as "A = Extremely significant" for a junior high teacher's effectiveness.

Although their positions are slightly modified when the total of respondents rating them "A" is combined with those rating them "B = Quite significant" for a junior high teacher's effectiveness, they remain within the eight most highly rated items. The only change is found in the pre-student teaching experience which drops from fourth to seventh position as shown in Table 4.3.

Since these three items have been so highly rated, there can be little doubt of their perceived importance to the junior high program graduates and therefore should be recommended for inclusion in future program planning.

Omitting the three program components not listed in the Dean study, all of which related more to structure than to content, let us consider the rankings in comparison to those found by Dean. The five areas ranked of greatest importance to the prospective junior-high-school teachers in that study were: guidance and counseling,

TABLE 4.3

RANKING OF THE EIGHT PREPARATION AREAS OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE

Area	Total "A" Ratings*	Area	Total "A" + "B" Ratings*
1. Student Teaching	64	1. Student Teaching	72
2. Guidance and Counseling	50	2. Human Growth and Development	71
3. Reading Methods	47	3. Guidance and Counseling	69
4. Pre-student Teaching Experience	44	4. Special Methods of Teaching	65
5. Special Methods of Teaching	43	5. Reading Methods	61
6. Human Growth and Development	40	6. General Education	61
7. Specialized Subject Matter	39	7. Pre-student Teaching Experience	60
8. Junior High Seminar	38	8. Junior High Seminar	59

*Possible 78.

special methods of teaching, general education, human growth and development, and reading methods.⁴

The respondents in the current study ranked four out of the five areas designated in the Dean ranking: guidance and counseling, reading methods, special methods of teaching, and human growth and development, among the five most highly rated program components using the total of "A" ratings as the criteria. The single substitution is that of specialized subject matter which replaces Dean's, general education.

By using the criterion of "A" + "B" ratings, the five are identical to the five identified by Dean although the internal ranking is not the same.

In Table 4.4 the Dean rankings for prospective junior high school teachers appear in the first column. The rankings of the junior high graduates using "A" ratings as the criterion appear in the second column. The rankings of the junior high graduates using "A" + "B" ratings as the criterion appear in the third column. Unlike Table 4.3, all fifteen areas appearing in the Dean study are listed and the three new program components are omitted.

⁴Ibid., p. 54.

TABLE 4.4

COMPARATIVE SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS OF FIFTEEN PREPARATION AREAS

Dean Ranking ^a		Total "A" Rating*	Total "A" + "B" Rating*	
1. Guidance and Counseling	Guidance and Counseling	50	Human Growth and Development	71
2. Special Methods of Teaching	Reading Methods	47	Guidance and Counseling	69
3. General Education	Special Methods of Teaching	43	Special Methods of Teaching	65
4. Human Growth and Development	Human Growth and Development	40	Reading Methods	61
5. Reading Methods	Specialized Subject Matter	39	General Education	61
6. Classroom Management	Classroom Management	37	Classroom Management	58
7. Learning Theory	General Education, i.e., survey courses	34	Specialized Subject Matter	57
8. Human Relations	Learning Theory	27	Audio-Visual	54
9. Tests	Audio-Visual	23	Tests	48
10. Specialized Subject Matter	Tests	21	Human Relations	46
11. Audio-Visual	Sociology of Education	15	Learning Theory	45
12. Sociology of Education	Human Relations	15	Sociology of Education	44
13. Core Curriculum	Special Education	9	Core Curriculum	36
14. Special Education	Core Curriculum	6	Special Education	24
15. History and Philosophy	History and Philosophy	4	History and Philosophy	19

^aLeland W. Dean, "A Preparation Program for Junior-High-School Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956), p. 55.

*Possible 78.

Critical Areas

The areas of the preparation program which are in critical need of strengthening are defined a priori for purposes of this study as those areas whose significance ratings of "A" + "B" equal 50 per cent or more while the Michigan State University preparation rating of 4 + 5 equal 50 per cent or more. Separate comment will be made about "no ratings" which indicate that the graduate felt that he had received no preparation at all in the area.

A complete bivariate frequency distribution for each of the eighteen areas rated by the respondents is included as Appendix D.

Table 4.5 shows combined "A" + "B" rating percentages, combined 4 + 5 rating percentages, and "no rating" percentages for each of the eighteen items. The items appear in the order in which they appeared in the questionnaire.

Table 4.5 indicates that the area of preparation in greatest need of strengthening is the area of Reading Methods which shows a significance rating of 78 per cent with an ineffectiveness rating of 51 per cent. This means that while 78 per cent of the graduates rated the course as "extremely significant" or "quite significant," 51 per cent rated the Michigan State University offering as "ineffective" or "very poor." When one adds to this the finding that an additional 11 per cent feel they have had no such course content at all, it yields a total of 62

TABLE 4.5

COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS WITH
INEFFECTIVENESS OF PREPARATION RATINGS

	Significance Rating "A" + "B"	Ineffectiveness Rating 4 + 5	"No Rating" (No Prepa- ration)
1. General Education	79%	9%	5%
2. Specialized Subject	73%	22%	13%
3. Guidance & Counseling	79%	39%	13%
4. Audio-visual	68%	23%	36%
5. Sociology of Education	58%	22%	11%
6. History & Philosophy	24%	24%	13%
7. Special Methods of Teaching	84%	30%	5%
8. Human Growth & Development	91%	13%	8%
9. Learning Theory	58%	21%	21%
10. Special Edu- cation	30%	20%	65%
11. Reading Methods	78%	51%	11%
12. Core Curriculum	47%	21%	29%
13. Classroom Management	74%	41%	22%
14. Human Relations	59%	26%	34%
15. Tests	62%	24%	32%
16. Junior High Seminar	76%	22%	53%
17. Pre-student Teaching Experience	78%	24%	53%
18. Student Teaching	92%	6%	11%

per cent of the respondents who were not well prepared in an area which they rated as significant.

Although the area of Reading Methods is the only area which meets the criterion established in this study for those preparation areas needing strengthening, perhaps consideration should be given to the area of Classroom Management which has a significance rating of 74 per cent and an ineffectiveness rating of 41 per cent, with a "no rating" of 22 per cent. Concern should also be shown for Guidance and Counseling with a significance rating of 70 per cent, an ineffectiveness rating of 39 per cent, and "no rating" of 13 per cent. Less critical perhaps but still a cause for concern is the highly rated Special Methods of Teaching with a significance rating of 84 per cent, but an ineffectiveness rating of 30 per cent and a "no rating" of 5 per cent.

Another type of concern is reflected in the 53 per cent of the respondents who were never enrolled in the Junior High Seminar and the 53 per cent who were never afforded a pre-student teaching experience under the auspices of the University despite the fact that these two areas received significance ratings of 76 per cent and 78 per cent respectively. It should be noted that the Junior High Seminar was not required until spring of 1966 which explains the high percentage of respondents who gave it a "no rating." Although it was not required until

spring term, 1966, it was available as early as spring of 1965.

Two other areas with significance ratings of over 50 per cent which received a substantial "no rating" were Audio-Visual with a significance rating of 68 per cent and a "no rating" of 34 per cent. In each case, the combination of ineffectiveness rating and "no rating" would more than meet the 50 per cent or more criterion set in this study for areas needing strengthening. Such a combined rating for A-V would yield 59 per cent while Human Relations would yield 60 per cent. In both cases, Michigan State University preparation was either ineffective, very poor, or non-existent.

Student Teaching

Since student teaching is consistently rated as the most significant component in the preparation program as shown in Table 4.3, it is assumed that a student teaching experience in a junior high situation will be most useful for a prospective junior high teacher.

The data indicate that nineteen of the seventy-eight respondents did not do their student teaching in a junior high school situation. This means that 24 per cent, or nearly one-quarter of the respondents were not in a junior high school situation during the most significant area of the preparation program.

Correlation Coefficients Between Ratings of Significance and Effectiveness

An alternate way of analyzing the data presented as significance ratings and ineffectiveness ratings in the preceding sections of this chapter is by means of correlation coefficients. Table 4.6 shows the correlation coefficients for each of the eighteen areas of preparation which were rated by the program graduates in terms of significance to a junior high school teacher and in terms of effectiveness of the Michigan State University program in that area.

Bivariate frequency charts for each of the eighteen areas for which correlation coefficients are shown are included as Appendix D.

The correlation coefficients shown in Table 4.6 would seem to indicate that a statistically non-significant relationship exists between importance to the student and effectiveness of instruction in at least the thirteen areas of preparation showing a correlation of .20 or less.⁵

Factors Influencing Choice of Junior High Program

Respondents were asked to indicate factors which influenced their choice of the junior high preparation

⁵Walter R. Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: David McKay Company, 1963), p. 281. (Hereinafter referred to as Educational Research.)

TABLE 4.6

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RATINGS OF
SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS^a

1. General Education	.44
2. Sociology of Education	.29
3. History and Philosophy	.28
4. Pre-student Teaching	.25
5. Human Growth & Development	.24
6. Specialized Subject Matter	.20
7. Student Teaching	.20
8. Special Methods of Teaching	.12
9. Special Education	.09
10. Reading Methods	.06
11. Guidance and Counseling	.06
12. Audio-Visual	.05
13. Learning Theory	.02
14. Human Relations	-.01
15. Tests	-.02
16. Core Curriculum	-.03
17. Junior High Seminar	-.11
18. Classroom Management	-.14

^aHelen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods (3rd ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), p. 218.

program and to rate relevant factors in order of importance. The factors listed for their choice were: "I enjoyed working with junior high age people"; "There seemed to be favorable job prospects in the junior high field"; I was influenced by parents or friends"; I was influenced by supervising teacher(s)"; "I was influenced by a college faculty member"; and "Other (Please specify)."

Responses to the factors influencing the choice of the junior high preparation program are reported in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7
FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF THE JUNIOR
HIGH PREPARATION PROGRAM

Factors	Rank Order of Importance						No Ranking	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Enjoyed working with age group	39	7	1	1	1	0	10	59
Job prospects	2	14	5	5	0	0	5	31
Parental or peer influence	1	3	3	3	7	0	1	18
Supervising teacher influence	0	5	7	3	1	1	2	19
College faculty influence	11	9	5	5	3	0	3	36

These data would indicate that interest in working with this age group is clearly the most important reason

for choosing the junior high preparation program. Appropriate as this is, it is not a factor over which the University has much control.

Far more useful is the evidence which suggests that the second most important factor in choosing the junior high program is the influence of a college faculty member. This evidence suggests that faculty members of the College of Education should have the most complete information possible about the program since they appear to be the single best avenue of recruitment.

A second area which can be influenced by the College of Education is that relating to job prospects. The number of responses (31) indicate that a wide dissemination of junior high school placement information could be of value to students who are making choices within the College of Education.

The responses of those who chose to indicate an unlisted factor can be broken down as follows:

Those who wanted the flexibility of the junior high program. (Nine responses.)

Those who saw the junior high as filling special needs of children. (Four responses.)

Those whose own junior high experience led them to see the need for better junior high school teachers. (Four responses.)

Those who saw the junior high as the most challenging area for teaching. (Two responses.)

Four respondents provided no data for this item.

Previous Experience with Junior High
Age Students

Respondents were given an opportunity to list the experiences which they had had with the junior high age group and rate each experience in terms of its influence on their choice of the Junior High Preparation Program using the following scale:

- 1 = Of very great influence
- 2 = Of great influence
- 3 = Of moderate influence
- 4 = Of little influence
- 5 = Of no influence

Types of experiences were listed as follows:

none; work with summer camps or recreation programs; church work; scout work; coaching athletics or dramatics; MSU Student Education Corps; general observation of this age group; Future Teacher Corps; MSU required "September Experience"; and other (please list).

Data reveal that seventeen of the respondents or 22 per cent had no previous experience with the junior high age group prior to choosing the program.

An additional twelve respondents had no experience other than "general observation of this age group" prior to choosing the program.

Collectively, this means twenty-nine or 37 per cent of the respondents had no structured experience of any kind prior to choosing the program.

Experience with the junior high age group prior to choosing the Junior High Preparation Program and a rating of the influence of this experience on the choice of the program is reported in Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.8
EXPERIENCE WITH JUNIOR HIGH AGE GROUP PRIOR
TO PROGRAM CHOICE

Experience	Influence Rating					No Ranking	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Summer camp or recreation	7	5	14	1	1	1	29
Church work	0	2	7	2	1	2	14
Scout work	1	3	3	0	2	0	9
Coaching	2	3	4	0	2	2	13
MSU Student Education Corps	0	0	2	0	3	0	5
General observation	18	17	6	1	1	1	44
Future Teachers Corps	1	1	1	0	2	0	5
MSU "September Experience"	1	2	5	1	3	0	12

In addition to the choices listed, the following experience factors were reported: 4-H with two responses, both of which were rated as of great influence; the raising of children through the junior high years with two responses, one of very great significance and the other with no ranking of significance. Substitute teaching, teaching in a rural school, and having a husband teaching at the junior high level were each listed once but did not receive a significance rating.

The evidence suggests that the choice of the Junior High Preparation Program is seldom based on direct or structured experience with the junior high age group. Although 63 per cent of the graduates of the program had had some experience with the age group, only twelve, or 15 per cent can point to any single experience as being of very great influence.

From the data shown in Table 4.8, it would seem that only summer camps or recreation programs would be a potential field for recruitment activities.

Graduates as Teachers

Returns indicate that thirty-five of the seventy-eight respondents or 45 per cent were currently teaching in the junior high school. Although this is in line with a national survey which reports that "over half of those receiving teaching certificates are not teaching two

years later,"⁶ it is far from achieving the results of the Elementary Intern Program, another special program of teacher preparation sponsored by the College of Education, Michigan State University which reported nearly 93 per cent of its graduates still teaching after two to six years of experience.⁷

Only one respondent never taught at all. In addition, twenty-six of the respondents, or a total of 35 per cent never taught in the junior high school.

All but one of those who never taught at the junior high level taught in a K-6 situation. The lone exception taught at the senior high school level.

Of those who taught in the junior high and at other levels, eighteen out of twenty-three or 78 per cent taught in the elementary grades (K-6).

Reasons for Never Entering Junior High Teaching

Reasons given for never entering junior high school teaching can be broken down into two general categories: preference for younger children or the elementary situation (11 responses), and lack of job availability

⁶Robert N. Bush, The Real World of the Beginning Teacher (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1966), p. 7.

⁷Robert W. Houston, A Study of the Teaching Status of Graduates of the Elementary Intern Program at Michigan State University (East Lansing: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967). (Mimeographed.)

(11 responses). Two respondents indicated that they simply did not want to go into the junior high school but elaborated no further.

These responses suggest that earlier contact with junior high school age children would help students formulate career plans more effectively.

Reasons for Leaving Junior High School Teaching

Reasons given for leaving the junior high school are more diversified than those given for never entering. The most frequent reason given (4) is to raise a family. Other reasons relating to family responsibilities include one respondent who prefers the teaching hours provided by adult education teaching.

Two other general categories into which reasons for leaving could be placed would be transfer to some other educational level or a move to a new location in which no opening was available.

Few who leave do so out of dissatisfaction with the junior high. Only one respondent expressed disgust with the administrative detail and disciplinary problems.

Two respondents gave no reason for leaving. One indicated a better paying job outside the field of education.

Summary

The instrument prepared to gather the data for this study was mailed to the 120 graduates of the Junior High School Preparation Program at Michigan State University between the years 1960-1967. The number of respondents was seventy-eight for a return of 65 per cent.

Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents felt that the junior high school was a distinctive enough teaching situation to merit a specialized preparation program.

Fifty-two per cent of the respondents felt that they would take the Michigan State University program again now that they have graduated.

The five areas of greatest significance to junior high teachers as measured by "A" + "B" ratings are: Human Growth and Development, Guidance and Counseling, Special Methods of Teaching, Reading Methods, and General Education.

These five areas are identical to those ranked as of greatest importance to prospective junior high school teachers in the Dean study although the internal ranking is not the same.

The areas of the preparation program which are in critical need of strengthening were defined for purposes of this study as those areas whose significance rating of "A" + "B" equal 50 per cent or more while their effectiveness of the Michigan State University program rating of 4 + 5 equal 50 per cent or more.

Reading Methods received a significance rating of 78 per cent and an ineffectiveness rating of 51 per cent. This means that while 78 per cent of the respondents rated Reading Methods as "extremely significant" or "quite significant," 51 per cent of them rated their Michigan State University preparation as "ineffective" or "very poor."

Other areas showing a wide disparity between perceived significance and effectiveness of Michigan State University preparation were Classroom Management with a significance rating of 74 per cent and an ineffectiveness rating of 41 per cent, Guidance and Counseling with a significance rating of 79 per cent and an ineffectiveness rating of 39 per cent, and Special Methods of Teaching with a significance rating of 84 per cent and an ineffectiveness rating of 30 per cent.

Another type of concern is reflected in the 53 per cent of the respondents who were never enrolled in the Junior High Seminar but this can be attributed to the fact that the Seminar was not a program requirement until 1966 even though it was available as early as spring term of 1965. A pre-student teaching experience under the auspices of the University was another highly rated preparatory experience which was not available to 53 per cent of the respondents.

Two other areas where a combination of ineffectiveness and "no ratings" yielded a total of 50 per cent or more were Audio-Visual with a combined total of 59 per cent and Human Relations with a combined total of 60 per cent.

Student teaching is rated as the most significant component of the preparation program, yet 24 per cent of the respondents were not in a junior high school situation for their student teaching experience.

Of the factors influencing choice of the junior high preparation program, the responses indicated that an interest in working with the age group was the most frequent reason given for choosing the program.

More useful is the evidence which suggests that the second most important factor in choosing the junior high program is the influence of a college faculty member.

Only a summer camp or recreation program involving the junior high age group was rated as a significant prior experience in choosing the program.

Returns indicated that 45 per cent of the graduates were currently teaching in the junior high school. Only one respondent never taught at all. All but one of those who never taught at the junior high level taught in a K-6 situation. The lone exception taught at the senior high level.

Reasons for never entering junior high school teaching fell largely into two categories: a preference for younger children and lack of job availability.

Reasons for leaving the junior high school showed no clear pattern. The most frequent reason given was to raise a family. Transfers to other educational levels and a move to a new location in which no opening was available were other reasons given for leaving the junior high situation.

Only one respondent left because of the junior high situation itself. Two gave no reason for leaving and one indicated a better paying job outside of education.

CHAPTER V

UNSTRUCTURED RESPONSES

Data obtained from a rating scale, while more readily accessible, often does not reveal a personalized dimension which can sometimes be obtained from an open-ended question. In order to gain this expanded view of the situation, respondents were given two opportunities for unstructured responses. The first opportunity permitted them to add areas of preparation which they judged important to the list of eighteen provided in the questionnaire. The second opportunity encouraged responses to an open-ended question on the entire area of the junior high school and the preparation required for junior high school teachers.

Of the seventy-eight respondents, twenty-five chose to respond to Item 15:

Now that you have had teaching experience, is there any area in addition to those listed in Question 14 which you feel was lacking in your undergraduate preparation? If so, please list it (them) below and rate it (them) according to the above scale of significance to teachers (continue on enclosed sheet if necessary).¹

¹See Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire used.

The twenty-five graduates who chose to respond to this item yielded thirty-two responses. With one possible exception, however, none of the responses represented a real addition to the eighteen areas provided in the questionnaire, since all could be subsumed under those areas. The possible exception would be the recommendation that some coverage be given to the matter of professional negotiations, although this topic could be subsumed under "present issues in education."

The responses are significant, though, since they highlight concerns of experienced teachers. The responses have been broken down into seven categories which contain two or more similar responses and an eighth category of responses appearing only once. Responses are listed under the eight categories, with the categories arranged according to frequency.

Practical experience in addition to student teaching:
(8 responses)

"More student teaching experiences--perhaps for 2 or 3 terms."

"I feel that possibly two or more semesters of student teaching would be beneficial."

"More emphasis on the practical and actual teaching situations rather than theory!!"

"Internship as a teacher's aid for maybe 3 hours a week."

"Practical experience in all areas."

"More observation of junior high students in school setting."

"None, but I would like to stress the area indicated by the arrow. (Pre-student teaching experience with junior high school students in situation provided by the University.)

"Stronger emphasis on curriculum development. The Block is weak. More practical experience needed in course of study."

Adolescent psychology or counseling: (6 responses)

"Adolescent Psychology."

"Psychology (Junior High Age Children)."

"Guidance and Counseling."

"More training in treatment of specific learning disabilities."

"Emotional problems from poor or unstable backgrounds."

"Courses exposing a teacher to some of the emotional and family problems she will meet in an inner city school."

Discipline: (3 responses)

"Discipline--How to do it."

"Classroom Management--discipline."

"Classroom discipline tempered with understanding. (This has not been a problem with me, probably because of experience.) Many teachers are completely unprepared."

Reading or literature: (3 responses)

"Much more study in field of reading."

"A course in phonics."

"Literature geared to junior high level (for English or Reading majors)."

Testing: (2 responses)

"A better knowledge of tests--both achievement and psychological."

"More practical experience in making and administering tests and evaluation of the tests."

Creativity: (2 responses)

"Methods of more creative teaching."

"Course in how to be a creative teacher--creative techniques course over typical methods course."

Maintaining and interpreting student records:
(2 responses)

"Evaluation of student records and relation to planning."

"Individual student record keeping."

Responses appearing only once:

"Class dealing with team-teaching, departmentalization and self-contained classrooms in 7th-9th level."

"General Philosophies related to Education."

"Ways to present material in a problem solving way."

"Methods of grading--essays, homework, how much homework, final grades."

"Curriculum planning for year of teaching--very little experience in getting organized to teach subject matter."

"Required: Class in negotiation."

Of the seventy-eight respondents in the sample, thirty-six availed themselves of the optional reaction

sheet which was enclosed with the questionnaire to comment on the closing statement:

Thank you most sincerely for taking time to fill out this questionnaire. If you should wish to make any general comments about the nature of the junior high school as an institution, the students, the teachers or the junior high teachers preparation program, please feel free to do so on the enclosed sheet.

Comments fell into the following general categories:

1. Negative experiences.
2. Specific recommendations for program change.
3. Nature of Junior high school teacher certification.

Negative Experiences

If pleas for a separate junior high preparation program can be interpreted as evidence of dissatisfaction, exactly 50 per cent of those who chose to supplement their questionnaire with comments, feel a strong dissatisfaction with the present treatment of potential junior high school teachers. The comments below represent the degree and nature of their dissatisfaction:

The junior high program would be much better if they had a different methods class than that of Elementary Education. I feel the methods bloc was mostly a waste of my time and has not greatly influenced my junior high teaching. There should be courses for middle school teachers and they should not be in the same sections as elementary education students.

²See Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire used.

In my own preparation, since my only choice was between an elementary or secondary certificate, I wasted many hours in classes highly suitable for elementary children but of little value to me as a junior high teacher. The secondary program would have been equally ineffective, I'm sure, since it would have been beyond the capabilities of these students except in rare instances.

I would also like to comment on the ineffectiveness of the Block for such a program. I can see it's necessary since we do have an elementary certificate, but as far as the program goes, it offers little toward our interest in the junior high school student.

Since in the junior high school a teacher is required to teach in a major area, I think a separate block methods program of study should be set up for the junior high. It is not effective to take the same methods courses as the Elementary people because they must teach in all areas. (This was the procedure when I graduated in 1965.)

To me, the main fault in M.S.U.'s junior high program was its similarity to the elementary education program. I felt, and still do feel, that taking the Elementary Education block was a complete waste of a term of school. I don't think I've used anything that I was taught in those courses.

Junior high is a much more specialized field than the Elementary Education preparation calls for. I would feel better prepared had I been required to take the "Methods" courses required of Secondary Education majors in my major and minor fields. I do not regret selecting the junior high school as my teaching level, but I do regret having taken that program (which I felt was thrown together and mostly irrelevant) as opposed to the Secondary Education Program.

For instance, although I was enrolled in this Preparation Program I had to take the Elementary Block which was a waste of time as far as my preparation for junior high school teaching. It seemed as though very few of us enrolled in the Junior High Plan received much help with elementary school discipline and teaching techniques. There should be definite method courses for those enrolled in the same program as I in their specialty fields such as Social Studies, Science, Math, etc. Elementary social studies methods simply do not work at the junior high level.

It would have helped if we who were enrolled in the Junior High School Program could have at least

been grouped together in one section of the Elementary Block so that we might have exchanged ideas on something that concerned us. I got a lot of ideas about how to teach elementary children but nothing on how to teach junior high students--who, somehow, even though they are still children, are completely different from elementary youngsters--especially on the disciplinary level.

I would have appreciated a deeper and more thorough background in subject area. I felt the "block" methods courses were of very questionable value and theory courses too basic and repetitious.

The MSU program gave much lip service to "individual differences," but no real instruction in how to cope with them within the classroom. Unless this is done I feel we will continue to have frustrated beginning teachers and/or frustrated students of those who persist on one method for all children. The time when this could be effectively accomplished --the block--was the most wasted. I hope the program has undergone change.

I feel that I wasted a lot of my time taking such courses as 301 [School and Society]--and a few from the block.

Junior high program should be separated from the elementary curriculum because junior high teachers should have more attention given them regarding the particular problems at the junior high level. Too much attention is given to the elementary preparation and junior high teachers are ignored.

Put elementary methods up to 6th grade as Elementary Block. Put junior high with secondary or by itself. All the "trivial" courses don't apply to a Junior High Specialist. Junior High methods need concentration on the major area of the student, not a spattering as in Elementary Block. If one is to teach plain English, for example, how does Modern Math Methods Class ever help? Elementary Block should have 1. pre-school 2. early primary 3. middle primary breakdown for methods. Then junior high methods should start away from the standard elementary block.

Reactions to Michigan State University instructors were mixed. Respondents were generally negative toward graduate teaching assistants, and positive toward full-time faculty. One criticism of teaching assistants from an anonymous respondent is included below. This criticism is included to serve as a caution against the use of graduate students who put personal priorities above professional obligations:

I felt that most of my instructors in the College of Education were a mediocre lot. Most of them were working on a degree and the class was of secondary importance. Of the instructors (approximately 15) only one was intellectually respectable and he was too busy with "research" to be concerned with the class.

In contrast, four full-time faculty members were praised by name and in two instances the respondents felt that the College of Education faculty had prepared them well.

Specific Recommendations for Program Change

As might be expected from the negative feelings expressed toward the elementary methods block, the most frequently recommended change was the creation of a special junior high methods block. Comments which follow are representative:

We hear how we (the teacher) should individualize our instruction, yet our universities do not practice what they preach. The least they could do is to develop a program for the junior high or middle school.

Let's have courses specifically designed for junior high teachers (or middle school or whatever it might be called), but let's acknowledge that these are students with specific characteristics unlike their younger or older brothers and sisters, and not treat them as step-children, or consign them to the fringes of the elementary or secondary curriculum.

I feel there should be a definite Junior High Methods Course rather than the elementary methods courses which was required when I went through the junior high program. This was one of the reasons I was afraid to enter junior high teaching.

I have felt for some time that there is a "must" for revision in the Junior High Preparation program. There should be a special Junior High Methods Course.

The program should be individualized, not in conjunction with Elementary or Secondary Methods. The junior high is unique, and so are its students; and so should the teachers be unique.

If there is to be a Junior High Preparation Program there should be method courses for those people enrolled in it that relate strictly to the junior high schools.

Have a course reviewing various types of junior high schools--middle schools, etc. (We did this in our Junior High Seminar and it was beneficial.)

Form a definite Junior High Curriculum. It's now too wishy washy--a major can either go up or down--junior high plus elementary or junior high plus secondary. I took junior high plus elementary and feel very unprepared. Elementary is too different than subject per hour junior high. Junior high definitely is more similar to Secondary due to subject concentration per teacher.

I feel that there are unique problems that the junior high faces and that this area should be treated as a specific area of study. It should not be part of the elementary program or the high school program, but as a program of its own.

Not all respondents were negative toward the block. In at least three instances, teachers felt a degree of satisfaction either with the block or with the existing program as indicated below:

In my situation I find that my background in teaching physical education, art and music is very inadequate, but because of the Michigan State University basics [the four general education courses required of all students] I feel competent in science and the humanities.

Personally, I feel the educational block was the most helpful to me in the classroom. A discussion or class instructing education majors of the different methods of teaching in the 7th through 9th grades might be helpful. For instance, some schools use departmentalization, some team teaching, some are self-contained. A look at the pros and cons of these types of classrooms would be helpful to the new teacher deciding where to begin a teaching career.

I liked the junior high elementary program because it gave me an opportunity to teach other grades and I've found the area of teaching I like best. I'd like to see all students spend time in all grades so they can choose the area that satisfies them.

The junior high specialization allowed me to study in areas outside the field of Education. At the same time I was exposed, as an elementary teacher, to child development, learning processes and the creativity needed in teaching a subject area.

Although those who proposed a separate junior high school methods block represented the most frequently advocated program change, five respondents advocated more contact with pupils prior to student teaching. Two of the five comments are included below; the first because it seems so heartfelt--the second because of the nature of the suggested remedy, tinged with sarcasm though it may be!

The student interested in teaching should feel, sense and judge personal situations with those he will soon influence and "educate." If possible, he should be "thrown into every combination" and complexity possible with time allotted, under constant supervision and with a handy ready advisor to assist in understanding and resolving situation. (On one-to-one basis, small group situation, total class.)

In other words, one learns by feeling (personally), and observing subjectively. I repeat, these meetings and exposures with junior high students should occur at varying junctures as student finds it necessary--other than solely the Student Teaching situation.

So many, many pupils in the grades need individual attention or tutoring (perhaps cannot afford it). Why not utilize the tremendous potential available in the university student?

My first real conviction that I would be a teacher, on any level, occurred, unfortunately, during my Student Teaching experience. A trifle too late to fully appreciate and enjoy my courses prior to it.

Please, consider my plea! Don't lose any prospective teachers for this reason.

Perhaps, had I had more exposure to the junior high level of students (student teaching and above mentioned) I may have had a more valid set of choices to draw from. . . . Perhaps I would now be teaching on the junior high school level.

My experiences in the inner-city schools of Washington, D.C., have convinced me that on-campus teachers' education programs are too remote from the real thing. I feel an apprentice-type situation tied to one school in any city should be arranged as early as the sophomore year. One faculty member would be assigned to teach two or three courses in the afternoons or evenings in the school. The students would be required to immediately apply their course work during the school day.

The rewards to the student would include free tuition (including full time summer school on campus) and a chance to decide if they would like to graduate as teachers. For the faculty member a chance to find out what it's really "all about" would be provided. The school system would benefit from the talented, energetic, and inexpensive help of the students.

Most of the courses mentioned in your survey could be brought to life under my program. These same courses offered on campus merely prepare a student for designing surveys or graduate work in general!

Two suggestions seem particularly relevant in the light of the newly developed Triple T Project.³ Unfortunately, in both instances the comments reflect negatively on the staff of the College of Education. Both comments are included in their entirety to insure the flavor of the response:

I think the College of Education would be more helpful to future teachers if they would recruit practicing Master teachers at the junior high level to teach class while remaining on a junior high school staff. The university and public school systems are overrun with "expert theoreticians" who are "experts" because they couldn't stand the humdrum routine of teaching and were not willing to be hard working and innovative enough to keep stimulating young adolescents. It is very demanding work which requires a rare combination of talents. State should use their research facilities to find master teachers and use their services to help young teachers. Ideally this is the purpose of practice teaching but I have seen the best teachers at our school (a class "A") refuse to take a student teacher because "I have too much to teach my students to allow someone to develop or practice methodology."

Hopefully the quality of instruction within the college has changed since I left. In short, more advice from practicing master teachers.

One class that should be mandatory for English and/or Social Science, etc. potential teachers: CREATIVITY. Given such situations as the following which are frighteningly REAL: Problem: Show, tell, explain, how one would teach a 3-5 week or longer unit on the most critical area in the world--South-east Asia (for example, a very important one), with the following hitches:

1. There are no textbooks available for the class.
2. The books available in the library are very advanced, very boring (for this age level).

³Trainers of Teacher Trainers Project, a joint project of Michigan State University and the Lansing School District supported in part by the U.S. Office of Education through the Education Professions Development Act, 1969-70.

3. No individual maps available, etc.
4. A teacher does have access to a ditto machine, but doesn't want to spend her whole time typing or writing on them.

How do you make a fun, exciting, informative learning situation here?

I've been put in this position many times, in English class as well as Social Studies. For instance, the class set of "readers" is lousy and it would be an insult to them to use them--what do you, and how do you give them other people's experiences through reading?

I must say I feel pretty successful--but for the first four months I could hardly stay on my feet, and was miserable.

This course should also utilize the teachers in the community, first year and many year veterans, who have been successful (you know who they are). Just one session with questions and/or demonstration is valuable (different teachers for different techniques).

Also, incorporate or have as a separate course, one on the problem-solving method in the classroom. Have a professional (salesman) and teachers in to speak about it. This could be a life-saver for many teachers and kids.

Nature of Junior High School Teacher Certification

Seven of the respondents express concern for the certification of junior high school teachers. There is agreement that separate certification is a desirable thing:

I feel strongly that the junior high program rates its own special certification. These are neither elementary nor secondary (high school) students. They are in a crucial, difficult stage of growth, mentally and physically, and need a curriculum designed to take these facts into consideration, and teachers trained to cope with their moods, laziness, their flashes of maturity one moment and childishness the next.

However, if separate certification should become a reality, major efforts will need to be made to publicize such a program. Concern is being expressed about inadequate visibility of the current program.

I had a serious, unexpected problem. Since the Junior High School Program is not offered in many

areas, out-of-state certification is an extremely confusing affair. Many school systems were skeptical. I feel it necessary to inform students on the problem of securing certification. In my case, I received certification in both high school English and Elementary Education, but other "job-seekers" may not be as fortunate as I. Those students who are interested or may possibly consider teaching outside of Michigan should be better informed about certification procedures and job interviews. I was not and went through a lot of unnecessary anxiety.

There seems to be very little publication about the MSU Junior High Program. Most educators and many people interviewing prospective teachers had never heard of the junior high major when I explained my major. Would it be possible to send letters or brochures to the schools or the people interviewing for the schools to let them know that MSU is training teachers specifically for junior high teaching? I think many schools are continuing to hire people trained for secondary schools because they are unaware of the junior high program at MSU.

I mentioned that I was quite concerned as to the reaction of Personnel Director in hiring a teacher with an elementary certificate in the junior high school. I wish that there might be a brief description of the junior high program that could accompany your transcript so that they would have a better understanding of the background that we have had.

Although a K-9 certificate looks good, I really think it is meaningless because one can't really be prepared to teach ten grades; therefore I would like to see specialized programs that will produce teachers able to teach grades in quality, not just quantity.

In regard to my answer for question (10). There is too much correlation between a secondary certificate and the junior high curriculum. For instance, I was forced to take (30) credits minimum for a minor and 45 plus for my major. This actually allowed me secondary accreditation with only a little deviation, such as, the methods bloc and requirements of art in the elementary curriculum. Yet, my teaching certificate allowed me to teach only through 8th grade, while most junior high schools run from 7 through 9. Consequently, there is no distinction between an elementary certificate and the junior high program except for the requirements.

And one lone dissent:

School Administrators don't care very much if you've had a special junior high program or not--just whether you're certified in the areas that they happen to need a teacher for.

Taking a positive view of what seems to be a negative situation, is the following suggestion:

Start building up junior high teaching via M.S.U. course booklets, etc. Propagandize! Right now, junior high is made to sound like the last resort, the last grade to ever teach. If students were prepared for junior high teaching, it would prove most a rewarding age group--at least that's how I found it.

Summary

Graduates were given an opportunity to comment on the nature of the junior high school as an institution, the students, the teachers, or the junior high teacher preparation program. Of the seventy-eight respondents, thirty-six availed themselves of the opportunity.

Exactly 50 per cent of those responding expressed dissatisfaction with the present program. The most frequent recommendation for change was the creation of a methods block unique to the junior high. Another recommendation for change made by five respondents was the incorporation into the preparation program of more contact with pupils prior to student teaching.

Certification was of special concern to seven of the respondents. There is agreement that separate

certification is desirable but concern that such certification be given greater publicity and that other states establish reciprocal certification.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Since its beginnings in the first decade of the century, the junior high school and its more recently emerging counterpart, the middle school, have grown impressively.

Programs to prepare teachers for the junior high or middle school have not been developed with parallel vitality.

This has resulted in a teaching milieu which has little self-identity; one which is too often a grey area where some are waiting for "promotion" to senior high schools and some prepared for elementary teaching find themselves in junior high by default.

Students in the age group served by the junior high or middle school have done nothing to deserve this type of educational second-class citizenship. They are, for the most part, a spirited, curious group of early adolescents who deserve leadership prepared to meet their needs.

Michigan State University has developed a program for the preparation of junior high school teachers. It was the purpose of this study to seek evaluative data from the graduates of this program so that recommendations could be made for its improvement.

To that end, a questionnaire was prepared which would provide an opportunity for graduates to indicate the areas which they felt were most significant to a junior high school teacher's effectiveness and to rate the Michigan State University program on the quality of preparation in each of the areas listed.

In order to provide comparative data, the areas of significance listed on the questionnaire paralleled those developed by Leland Dean in his 1956 study of a preparation program for junior-high-school teachers.

Thus, it was the purpose of this study to determine what graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program of the College of Education, Michigan State University, judge to be the most significant areas of preparation for a junior high school teaching position; to determine the effectiveness of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program as judged by graduates of the program; to determine the areas in which the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program needs to be strengthened; to determine the number of graduates of the Junior High Teacher Preparation Program who actually teach at that level; to

determine the factors which influence their choice of the Junior High Preparation Program; and to determine the factors causing qualified graduates to reject a career in the junior high classroom.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the opinions expressed by the graduates of the Junior High Preparation Program, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

1. The junior high or middle school is a distinctive enough teaching situation to require a specialized preparation program. This conclusion is confirmed by the Dean study.¹
2. Student teaching in a junior high school or middle school situation, pre-student teaching experience with junior high or middle school students in situations provided by the University, and a seminar focusing on the nature of the junior high school and its students should be a part of the preparation program for every student.
3. As viewed by the respondents in this study, the following five areas of preparation are most significant for junior high school teachers: human growth and development, guidance and counseling, special methods of teaching, reading methods, and general education.

¹Dean, "Preparation Program," pp. 74-75.

(These areas are identical to those reported in the Dean study although the internal ranking varies.²

The application of these areas of preparation to the middle school situation is significantly strengthened by the Dean study which reports the same five areas rank at the top for upper-elementary-school teachers although in a different internal order.)³

4. The area of reading methods is the single most critical area for strengthening the Michigan State University Preparation Program.
5. Classroom management, guidance and counseling, and special methods of teaching are additional areas which should be considered for revision to increase their effectiveness.
6. Greater emphasis should be given to audio-visual techniques and human relation experiences in the total Junior High Preparation Program.
7. The correlation coefficients shown in Table 4.6 would seem to indicate that a statistically non-significant relationship exists between importance to the student and effectiveness of instruction in

²Ibid., p. 74.

³Ibid.

at least the thirteen areas of preparation showing a correlation of .20 or less.⁴

(These correlations must be interpreted with caution. Elements such as History and Philosophy of Education, which received consistently low significance ratings (see Table 4.4), will show a satisfactory correlation because they were not rated as effectively taught either.

It is reassuring, however, to note that General Education, with a correlation coefficient of .44, was also rated as effectively taught.

One value of the data reported in Table 4.6 is to reinforce the apparent disparity between the perceived importance of what is being taught and the effectiveness with which it is taught.)

8. The Junior High Preparation Program should be given greater visibility in the College of Education since the influence of faculty members seems to be the most important university-controlled factor in the selection of the junior high program.
9. The number of graduates teaching at the junior high school level is not below national averages but is considerably below EIP, another special preparation program of the College of Education.

⁴Borg, Educational Research, p. 281.

10. The factors causing rejection of a junior high career are most often related to a preference for the elementary age group or the more generalized elementary teaching situation.

(The middle school, with a younger student body and a more exploratory curriculum, may decrease the importance of these rejection factors.)

Recommendations

A preparation program should continue to be offered especially for junior high and middle school teachers. By neglecting the further development and improvement of such a program or by abandoning it altogether, the College of Education is abdicating its responsibility to provide a positive influence on the choice of the junior high school level of instruction as a worthy career.

If, for reasons of certification, the College finds it impractical to continue to offer an undergraduate program in the junior high or middle school, it should consider graduate offerings in the area which could lead to a Master's degree.

In addition, some consideration could be given to the development of in-service modules designed for school districts which are interested in upgrading their junior high or middle school staff.

The College of Education should build a pre-student teaching experience with junior high or middle school age students into the program of each participant. Student teaching coming near the end of the college career as it currently does, is not sufficient to give college students an opportunity to assess their interest in the age group nor does it lend relevance to the courses taken in preparation for teaching. This experience should come as early in the college career of each student as possible.

The College of Education should ensure that student teaching, when it is undertaken, will be in a junior high or middle school situation.

The College of Education should require a seminar situation focusing on the nature of the junior high school and its students of all program participants. Ideally this would be conducted in conjunction with the pre-student teaching experience with junior high or middle school students.

The following areas of preparation should form the basis of the program:

1. Experiences which develop an understanding of the physical, psychological, and social development of the child and the relation of his environment to his development.

The purpose of such preparation would be to provide junior high and middle school teachers with an

understanding of the needs and interests of adolescent students. By providing teachers with an understanding of the wide variations which psychologists have discovered among early adolescents, teachers will be better able to provide intelligently for the individual differences among the children they will teach.

Courses providing such understandings are often titled: Human Growth and Development; Child Psychology; or, perhaps more appropriate for the teacher group in question, Adolescent Psychology.⁵

2. Experiences which help the prospective teacher learn more about understanding the individual and counseling with him about his problems.

The principal purpose of this area of preparation would be to help the teacher to further develop an understanding of individual differences and their relationship to actual teaching situations. This area of preparation should develop in the teacher the ability to help students understand themselves and their problems.

Courses designed to develop such understandings often carry such titles as: Principles of Guidance and Personnel Services.⁶

⁵See Appendix E, "Michigan State University College of Education, Junior High School Teachers Preparation Program, Revised Winter 1966."

⁶Ibid.

3. Experiences designed to show objectives, materials, and teaching techniques in particular subject areas which a student is preparing to teach.

Such experiences should develop skill in the presentation of the subject matter to be learned, knowledge of teaching materials appropriate to the planned objectives, and the ability to formulate objectives clearly and in behavioral terms whenever appropriate. Such experiences are reflected in courses titled: Special Methods (in the major teaching field) or Professional Methods Block.⁷ Consideration should be given to a separate Methods Block for junior high or middle school teacher candidates.

4. Experiences designed to teach the basic principles and techniques of reading improvement. Causes of reading difficulties, diagnostic testing, materials, and instructional procedures.

This is an area which has come under both state and national consideration within the past few years.

Although Children's Literature is required, there is no adequate provision for developing skill in the teaching of reading at the junior high school level despite the fact that reading is a fundamental skill without which not much success can be achieved by any student.

⁷Ibid.

5. Courses which give the prospective teacher a broad general background in the principal fields of organized knowledge.

Such courses are often termed general or liberal education. They would include physical and natural science, the humanities, social sciences, philosophy, and communication skills.

Thorough study in these areas is precluded by the limitations of time in the normal four-year program of pre-service teacher education. In addition, the junior high or middle school teacher is not usually required to teach only one subject in isolation nor subject matter of such complexity that a detailed mastery is imperative.

Providing breadth instead of depth should better prepare the teacher to aid his students in the exploration of various fields of knowledge. This is consistent with the nature of both the junior high and the emergent middle school.

Recommendations up to this point can be generalized to programs of junior high or middle school teacher preparation anywhere in the country, since respondents include those teaching in ten states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as well as Michigan.

From this point, however, recommendations must apply exclusively to Michigan State University.

The area of the preparation program which is in most critical need of strengthening is the area of Reading Methods. It is recommended that such a course be developed specifically for the junior high or middle school age group and that each prospective teacher be required to take it.

It is further recommended that the course Principles of Guidance and Personnel Services be reassessed for effectiveness and that elements relating to classroom management be given greater emphasis in the appropriate course context. The Junior High Seminar could afford such opportunities.

Two other areas of preparation which should be given greater emphasis are those which provide training in the use of instructional media and experiences which provide insights into working with parents, administrators, and peers.

Both of these elements could be more effectively presented if prospective teachers were introduced to classroom experience prior to student teaching.

The Junior High School Teacher Preparation Program should be given greater visibility within the College of Education. The influence of faculty members on student choice of program seems to be the most important factor under the control of the University. Such visibility and support could help combat the too-pervasive view of the junior high school as an educational step-child.

The Dean study⁷ noted that one of the largest stumbling blocks to the specialized preparation of junior high school teachers was the certification codes under which most states operate.

Hearings are currently being held on a proposed new Middle School Certificate Endorsement. It is possible that the resulting changes in the certification code will provide direction for future program changes in the preparation of teachers for this age group. Such changes in the Michigan Certification Rules will not, unfortunately, resolve the problem of the teacher who seeks employment in other states.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study was undertaken for the purpose of evaluating the program which the College of Education, Michigan State University has developed for the preparation of junior high school teachers. There are many other related questions which need more adequate answers.

1. What balance should be recommended between a four-year preparation program and a five-year preparation program for junior high or middle school teachers?
2. How can the junior high-middle school teaching situation be given greater professional prestige?

⁷Dean, "Preparation Program," p. 83.

3. How well is the junior high school performing the function for which it was created?
4. Has the middle school solved any of the problems faced by the junior high school?
5. Acknowledging that some of the weaknesses of the pre-service preparation identified in this study will have been overcome through formal or informal means subsequent to graduation, what areas remain of concern? Based on these areas of concern, what is the most useful in-service program which Michigan State University can make available to Michigan junior high and middle school teachers?

The problem of preparing the junior high or middle school teacher will never be completely solved, but investigation of the preceding questions will provide valuable direction as programs are designed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, 1963.
- Bossing, Nelson L., and Cramer, Roscoe V. The Junior High School. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Brimm, R. P. The Junior High School. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
- Bush, Robert N. The Real World of the Beginning Teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education, 1966.
- Callaway, Rolland. "Selecting a Teacher for Junior High." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII, No. 2 (October, 1966), 84.
- Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Bulletin No. 35. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1918.
- Dean, Leland W. "A Preparation Program for Junior-High-School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956.
- Eichhorn, Donald H. The Middle School. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Horrocks, John E. The Psychology of Adolescence. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.

- Houston, Robert W. "A Study of the Teaching Status of Graduates of the Elementary Intern Program at Michigan State University." East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Education, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Kirby, Darrell Francis. "Factors Relating to the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers in Selected Junior High Schools in Colorado." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1964.
- Maynard, H. Glenn. "A Study of the Professional Preparation of Junior High School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1960.
- Mead, Margaret. "Early Adolescence in the United States." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLIX, No. 300 (April, 1965), 10.
- Noar, Gertrude. The Junior High School--Today and Tomorrow. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Policies, Principles, and Standards for the Approval of Junior High Schools (Proposed). Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1966.
- Popper, Samuel H. The American Middle School--An Organizational Analysis. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967.
- Rusk, Elizabeth H. "A Study of Secondary School Teachers of English Who Graduated from Michigan State University." Study for the College of Arts and Letters Teacher Preparation Committee and for the Humanities Teaching Institute of Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967.
- Schmidt, Gerald Lee. "Preservice Professional Preparation of Junior High School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1965.
- Sheehan, Milbourne Richard. "Junior High School Teachers' Evaluation of Preservice Preparation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1969.

- Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Junior High School Education. Proceedings of the Regional Conference. Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1960. Printed in Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV, No. 266 (September, 1961), 18-48.
- Van Til, William; Vars, Gordon; and Lounsbury, John. Modern Education for the Junior High School Years. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.
- Vars, Gordon F., ed. Guidelines for Junior High and Middle School Education. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1966.
- Walker, Helen M., and Lev, Joseph. Elementary Statistical Methods. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPED TO GATHER DATA

Questionnaire for Graduates of the Junior High School Teacher Preparation Program

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Sex Male _____ Female _____
2. Year of MSU graduation _____
3. In what subject fields are you certified?

4. Major at MSU if different from certification areas:

5. What subjects are you currently teaching?
- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Subject _____ | Grade(s) _____ |
| Subject _____ | Grade(s) _____ |
| Subject _____ | Grade(s) _____ |
6. Number of years in teaching prior to the present year? _____
7. Number of those years in grades 10, 11, and/or 12? _____
8. Number of those years in grades K-6? _____
9. Number of those years in grades 7, 8, and/or 9? _____
- 9A. If the answer to #9 was "0", what is the single most important reason that you not go into junior high teaching?

10. Are you currently teaching in grades 7, 8, and/or 9?
YES _____ NO _____
- 10A. If the answer to #10 was "NO" why aren't you teaching at that level now?

- 10B. If the answer to #10 was "YES" what grades are included in your junior high sch
6-8 _____ 7-8 _____ 7-9 _____ Other (Please specify) _____
11. Given the choice, would you choose the junior high preparation program again?
YES _____ NO _____ Why do you say this? _____
12. Do you feel that the junior high school is a distinctive enough teaching situat
to require a specialized program? YES _____ NO _____
13. Did you do your student teaching in a junior high school? YES _____ NO _____

14. Below you will find a set of statements. Each statement describes courses or course content which could be considered appropriate preparation for a junior high school teacher. In Column I please indicate how significant you believe each type of course could be to a junior high school teacher's effectiveness. Circle the letter corresponding to the phrase that best describes your reaction:

- A = Extremely significant
- B = Quite significant
- C = Somewhat significant
- D = Of relatively little significance
- E = Of practically no significance

Regardless of your statements on significance, indicate in Column II how effective you believe your MSU program was in teaching the content described.
 IF YOU NEVER HAD A COURSE WHICH INCLUDED THE CONTENT DESCRIBED, PLEASE LEAVE

- 1 = Very effective
- 2 = Good
- 3 = Satisfactory
- 4 = Ineffective
- 5 = Very poor

	I Significance to teachers	II Rating of MSU Program
Courses which give the prospective teacher a broad general background in the principal fields of organized knowledge. For example, survey courses in science, literature, the humanities, etc.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Courses designed to give a thorough and complete background of training on the subject matter specialty or specialties of the teacher. For example, advanced English courses for the English teacher, or advanced mathematics courses for the teacher of mathematics.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Courses of study which help the prospective teacher learn more about understanding the individual and counseling with him about his problems.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Audio-visual materials and techniques. For example, projector operation, selection sources and elements of effective utilization of such teaching tools as flat pictures, slides, film strips, sound picture films, and field trips.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Course work which gives the prospective teacher a better understanding of the school as a social institution and the structure of school society. For example, cliques, social classes, etc.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Study of the historical background of present issues in education and an analysis of educational theory and practice.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5

	I Significance to teachers	II Rating of MSU Program
Courses showing objectives, material, and teaching techniques in particular subject areas which a student is preparing to teach.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Physical, psychological and social development of the child and the relation of his environment to his development.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Courses which develop an understanding of the theories of learning as they apply to the classroom.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Training in working with children with special problems. Methods of facilitating growth and development of children who are crippled, hard of hearing, defective in vision, mentally handicapped, etc.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Basic principles and techniques of reading improvement. Causes of reading difficulties, diagnostic testing, materials and instructional procedures.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Courses designed to develop an understanding of various ways of developing the core or fused curriculum.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Classroom management such as techniques for classroom organization, record keeping, teacher-pupil planning, handling disciplinary problems, etc.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Techniques for working with parents, administrators and other teachers.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
An understanding of the construction, selection, administration and uses of tests.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Seminar situation focusing on the nature of the junior high school and its students.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Pre-student teaching experience with junior high school students in situations provided by the university.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
Student teaching.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
15. Now that you have had teaching experience, is there any area in addition to those listed in Question 14 which you feel was lacking in your undergraduate preparation? If so, please list it (them) below and rate it (them) according to the above scale of significance to teachers. (Continue on back if necessary.)	A B C D E	
	A B C D E	

16. What factors influenced your choice of the junior high preparation program?
(Indicate relevant factors in order of importance using 1 as most important)

- _____ I enjoyed working with junior high age people.
- _____ There seemed to be favorable job prospects in the junior high field.
- _____ I was influenced by parents or friends.
- _____ I was influenced by supervising teacher(s).
- _____ I was influenced by a college faculty member.
- _____ Other (Please specify) _____

17. Check each previous experience you had with the junior high age group which influenced your choice of the junior high preparation program. In the parentheses which follow the items rate each experience which you checked in terms of its influence on your choice of the junior high preparation program using the following scale:

- 1 = Of very great influence
2 = Of great influence
3 = Of moderate influence
4 = Of little influence
5 = Of no influence

- | | |
|---|---|
| _____ None | _____ MSU STUDENT EDUCATION CORPS |
| _____ Work with summer camps or recreation programs () | _____ General observation of this group () |
| _____ Church work () | _____ Future Teachers Corps () |
| _____ Scout work () | _____ MSU required "September Experience" () |
| _____ Coaching athletics or dramatics () | _____ Other (Please list) _____ |

Your answers will be treated confidentially. However, in order to get the largest possible number of returns, we will be making a second mailing in the near future. To help us avoid inconvenience to you with this second mailing, your signature would be appreciated.

OPTIONAL

(signature is optional)

OPTIONAL

If you wish us to send you a summary of the results of this survey in the address blank below:

(street & number)

(city)

(state)

Thank you most sincerely for taking time to fill out this questionnaire. If you should wish to make any general comments about the nature of the junior high school as an institution, the students, the teachers or the junior high teachers preparation program, please feel free to do so on the ~~back of this page~~ enclosed sheet:

APPENDIX B

INITIAL COVER LETTER

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • BRICKSON HALL

April 5, 1968

Dear

The College of Education is interested in strengthening its preparation program for junior high school teachers. Since our own graduates are a major source of information, we hope you will be willing to give the 10-15 minutes required to fill out this questionnaire. It will enable you to have a very real part in improving the preparation of teachers for a most critical age group.

We shall appreciate very much your sincere and honest reactions. They will be considered confidential and will be summarized without identification.

You will note that provision has been made on the questionnaire should you wish a copy of a summary of the results of this study.

Sincerely,

L.W. Dean
Assistant Dean and Director
School of Teacher Education

William Helder
Coordinator
Social Science Teaching Institute

APPENDIX C

SECOND COVER LETTER

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • BRICKSON HALL

May 13, 1968

x
x
x

Dear x

Several weeks ago you may have received a copy of the enclosed questionnaire. Perhaps you have already returned yours, exercising the option to return it unsigned. If this is the case, we thank you most sincerely and ask that you excuse the duplication.

If you have not had an opportunity to complete the questionnaire, we hope that you will be willing to give the 10-15 minutes required to fill it out. As a graduate of the junior high preparation program, your opinion represents a valuable contribution to the efforts of the College of Education to strengthen that program.

Your reactions will be considered confidential and will be summarized without identification.

Should you wish a copy of a summary of the results of this study, please include both name and address in the optional section at the end of the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

L.W. Dean
Assistant Dean and Director
School of Teacher Education

William Helder
Coordinator
Social Science Teaching Institute

APPENDIX D

**SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
EACH OF THE EIGHTEEN PROGRAM COMPONENTS
SUBMITTED TO RESPONDENTS**

TABLE D.1

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
GENERAL EDUCATION, i.e., SURVEY COURSES

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	34	44%	15	44%	9	26%	6	18%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%
B	27	35%	7	26%	9	33%	9	33%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%
C	10	13%	0	0%	5	50%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%
D	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
No Rating	2	2%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
TOTAL	78	100%	22	28%	24	31%	21	27%	6	8%	1	1%	4	5%

TABLE D.2

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
SPECIALIZED SUBJECT MATTER

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	39	51%	5	13%	13	33%	9	23%	9	23%	0	0%	3	.8%
B	18	23%	1	5%	9	50%	1	5%	5	30%	0	0%	2	10%
C	10	13%	1	10%	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%
D	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	5	62%	1	13%	0	0%	2	25%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
No Rating	2	2%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
TOTAL	78	100%	7	9%	26	33%	18	23%	16	21%	1	1%	10	13%

TABLE D.3

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	50	65%	5	10%	6	12%	13	26%	17	34%	4	8%	5	10%
B	19	24%	0	0%	4	20%	6	32%	6	32%	1	5%	2	11%
C	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	1	1	1	17%	1	17%
D	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
E	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	5	5%	10	13%	23	30%	24	31%	6	8%	10	13%

TABLE D.4
SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
AUDIO-VISUAL

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	23	29%	2	9%	3	13%	6	26%	2	9%	4	17%	6	26%
B	31	39%	2	7%	6	19%	3	10%	5	15%	3	10%	12	39%
C	12	17%	1	9%	2	16%	3	25%	2	16%	1	9%	3	25%
D	8	10%	0	0%	1	12%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	4	50%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	5	5%	12	17%	15	19%	10	13%	8	10%	28	36%

TABLE D.5

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	15	19%	5	34%	3	20%	3	20%	3	20%	0	0%	1	1%
B	29	39%	2	7%	12	41%	7	26%	3	10%	1	3%	4	13%
C	27	35%	3	12%	4	16%	10	35%	7	25%	1	4%	2	8%
D	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%
E	1	1%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	10	12%	20%	26%	22	29%	13	17%	4	5%	9	11%

TABLE D.6

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	4	5	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
B	15	19%	3	20%	4	26%	3	20%	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%
C	30	39%	0	0%	4	13%	15	50%	4	13%	3	11%	4	13%
D	22	28%	2	9%	5	23%	7	31%	5	23%	1	5%	2	9%
E	6	8%	0	0%	1	16	1	16	1	16	3	50%	0	0%
No Rating	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	5	6%	16	21%	28	36%	11	14%	8	10%	10	13%

TABLE D.7

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
SPECIAL METHODS OF TEACHING

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	43	56%	7	16%	7	16%	12	27%	12	27%	4	11%	1	3%
B	22	28%	0	0%	9	40%	8	36%	3	14%	0	0%	2	100%
C	10	13%	0	0%	0	0%	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%
D	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
E	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	7	9%	16	21%	27	35%	18	23%	6	7%	4	5%

TABLE D.8

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	40	52%	10	25%	11	27%	12	30%	3	8%	1	2%	3	8%
B	31	39%	1	4%	11	35%	11	35%	6	18%	1	4%	1	4%
C	6	8%	0	0%	1	17%	4	66%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%
D	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
E	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0		1	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	11	14%	23	30%	27	35%	9	11%	2	2%	6	8%

TABLE D.9

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
LEARNING THEORY

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	27	35%	1	4%	5	18%	8	30%	7	26%	2	7%	4	15%
B	18	23%	1	5%	7	37%	5	31%	2	11%	1	5%	2	11%
C	23	29%	0	0%	4	17%	12	52%	1	4%	0	0%	6	27%
D	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%
E	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	2	2%	16	21%	28	35%	12	16%	4	5%	16	21%

TABLE D.10

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
SPECIAL EDUCATION

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	9	11%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	2	22%	2	22%	3	34%
B	15	19%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	5	33%	0	0%	8	55%
C	26	34%	0	0%	2	8%	5	19%	3	12%	1	4%	15	57%
D	9	11%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%	6	67%
E	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%
No Rating	16	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	1	1%	5	6%	6	8%	11	14%	5	6%	50	65%

TABLE D.11

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
READING METHODS

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	47	60%	2	4%	5	10%	10	21%	18	40%	10	21%	2	4%
B	14	18%	0	0%	1	8%	5	35%	5	35%	1	8%	2	14%
C	12	17%	0	0%	0	0%	7	58%	3	25%	0	0%	2	17%
D	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
E	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
No Rating	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	2	2%	6	8%	22	28%	26	34%	13	17%	9	11%

TABLE D.12

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
CORE CURRICULUM

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%
B	30	39%	0	0%	1	3%	16	54%	4	13%	5	17%	4	13%
C	28	35%	0	0%	2	7%	17	61%	2	7%	0	0%	7	25%
D	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	3	50%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
No Rating	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	0	0%	3	4%	36	46%	10	13%	6	8%	23	29%

TABLE D.13

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	37	47%	3	8%	2	5%	8	22%	8	22%	10	27%	6	16%
B	21	27%	0	0%	2	9%	4	19%	3	15%	8	38%	4	19%
C	10	13%	0	0%	3	30%	5	50%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%
D	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	3	4%	7	9%	19	24%	13	17%	19	24%	17	22%

TABLE D.14

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
HUMAN RELATIONS

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	15	19%	3	20%	1	7%	4	27%	2	13%	2	13%	3	20%
B	31	40%	0	0%	1	4%	11	35%	4	14%	7	22%	8	25%
C	17	22%	0	0%	1	6%	7	41%	3	18%	1	6%	5	29%
D	6	8%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	16%	0	0%	3	50%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	4	5%	3	4%	24	31%	10	13%	10	13%	27	34%

TABLE D.15

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
TESTS

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	21	27%	1	5%	1	5%	5	22%	4	19%	3	15%	7	34%
B	27	35%	3	11%	6	22%	5	19%	3	11%	3	11%	7	26%
C	20	25%	1	5%	2	10%	9	45%	2	10%	2	10%	4	20%
D	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	5	6%	9	12%	20	26%	11	14%	8	10%	25	32%

TABLE D.16

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
JUNIOR HIGH SEMINAR

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	38	49%	6	15%	2	5%	1	3%	8	23%	6	15%	15	39%
B	21	27%	1	5%	1	5%	5	22%	2	10%	1	5%	11	53%
C	7	9%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	5	72%
D	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	10	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	7	9%	4	5%	9	11%	10	13%	7	9%	41	53%

TABLE D.17

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	44	57%	6	14%	4	9%	3	7%	1	2%	11	25%	19	43%
B	16	21%	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	10	64%
C	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	12%	1	12%	2	25%	4	50%
D	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
E	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
No Rating	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	7	9%	6	8%	5	6%	4	5%	15	19%	41	53%

TABLE D.18

SIGNIFICANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS FOR
STUDENT TEACHING

Significance to Junior High Teachers			Rating of MSU Program by MSU Graduates											
			1		2		3		4		5		No Rating	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	64	82%	41	64%	11	17%	5	8%	5	8%	0	0%	2	3%
B	8	10%	0	0%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3	37%
C	3	4%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
D	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
E	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Rating	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
TOTAL	78	100%	42	55%	15	19%	7	9%	5	6%	0	0%	9	11%

APPENDIX E

**MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION
PROGRAM, REVISED WINTER, 1966**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

Students wishing to prepare for teaching at the junior high school level may qualify for a teaching certificate valid in grades K-9 (teaching in major and minor fields only in grade nine). The program leading to this modified elementary provisional certificate may also be of interest to those wanting to teach in grades five and six.

For students intending to qualify for an elementary provisional certificate with emphasis upon teaching in the junior high school, two important requirements should be considered:

- (1) There are two major and minor patterns which can be followed in subject matter areas taught in junior high schools:
 - (a) One major of at least 40 hours (preferably 45) and one minor of at least 30 hours.
 - (b) One major of at least 36 hours and two minors of at least 23 hours each.

A student at Michigan State University following this program must have a major in one of the following fields: General Science, English, or Social Science. A major in Social Science must be accompanied by a minor in English and vice versa. A major in General Science must be accompanied by a minor in Mathematics.

In addition, students are encouraged to select at least 15 hours of work of a general liberal nature, under the guidance of their advisor.

- (2) In addition to the preparation required in subject matter fields, it is necessary to complete the following professional education courses:

ED 200	Individual and the School	5
*ED 301	School and Society	6
ED 325C	Children's Literature	3
ED 321A, B, C	Professional Methods Block	15
ED 436	Student Teaching	15
PSY 348	Adolescent Psychology	3
ED 815B	Principles of Guidance and Personnel Services	3
*ED 482	Junior High Seminar	3
		<u>53</u>

*ED 301 will become ED 450 Fall Term, 1966 and will have 5 credits.

ED 450 should be taken after ED 436 (Student Teaching).

*ED 482 can be taken at any time in your program as either a required or elective course.

Revised Winter, 1966

For the student wishing to take professional electives, the following are suggested:

ART 201	Arts and Crafts	4
ED 312	Human Growth and Development	4
ED 327	Special Methods (in the major teaching field)	3
ED 431	Audio-Visual Instruction	3
ED 465	Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation in the Classroom	3
ED 821B	Core Curriculum	3

Requirements for subject matter area majors and minors are attached.

POSSIBLE MAJORS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

ENGLISH MAJOR		Credits
American Thought and Language 111, 112, 113		9
English 206, 207, 208 (Forms of Literature)		9
Five credits from: English 213, 214, 228A, 228B (Expository, Essay, and Creative Writing)		5
English 402 (Modern English Grammar)		5
English 465 or 466 or 470 or 471 or 472 (English Literature)		5
Speech 101 (Public Speaking) or 108 (Voice and Articulation) or 116 (Group Discussion) or 260 (Oral Reading)		3
TOTAL		36

If one major and one minor, add from the following:

English 480 (Literary Criticism)	5
English 446 or 447 or 448 (American Literature)	5
English 421 or 422 or 423 (Shakespeare)	5
	45+

SOCIAL SCIENCE MAJOR

Social Science 231, 232, 233	12
History 220, 221 (U.S. History Federal Union and Nation State)	8
Political Science 300, 301 (American National and State Gov't)	10
Geography 204 (World Regional Geography)	4
Emphasis upon a discipline such as: Sociology, Geography Economics, History	(6 or more)
OR	
Emphasis upon a multi-disciplinary grouping of courses with a focus such as: Latin America, Asia, Africa, U.S.	(6 or more)
TOTAL	40
If one major and one minor, add (at least 6) credits related to one of the disciplines or multi-disciplinary groupings listed above	6
	45+

GENERAL SCIENCE MAJOR

Natural Science 181, 182, 183	12
Geology 200, 200L (Foundations of Earth Science) OR 201, 202 (General Geology--Physical and Historical)	4 8
Chemistry 111, 112, 103 (Comprehensive Basic Concepts)	11
Biological Science 211, 212 (General Biology)	10
TOTAL	37 to 41
If one major and one minor, add (at least 8) credits from:	
Physics and Astronomy 247, 248, 249 (General Physics)	12
OR	
Physics and Astronomy 119 (General Astronomy)	4
Fisheries and Wild Life 402 (Conservation Education)	4
Geology 421 (Mineralogy)	4
Zoology 341 (Human Heredity)	4
TOTAL	45+

Majors in other fields may be developed in consultation with the advisor

POSSIBLE MINORS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

ENGLISH MINOR		Credits
American Thought and Language 111, 112, 113		9
English 213 or 214 or 228A or 228B (Expository, Essay, and Creative Writing)		3 or 5
English 206 and 208 (Forms of Literature)		6
English 402 (Modern English Grammar)		5
English 381 (English Literature)		3
	TOTAL	<u>26+</u>
If one major and one minor, add:		
English 207 and 380 (Forms of Literature and American Literature)		6
	TOTAL	<u>30+</u>

SOCIAL SCIENCE MINOR		
Social Science 231, 232, 233		12
History 220, 221 (U.S. History Federal Union and Nation State)		8
Geography 204 (World Regional Geography)		4
	TOTAL	<u>24</u>
If one major and one minor, add:		
Political Science 300 and 301 (American National & State Gov't) or a course chosen from: Economics, Sociology, Geography or History instead of 300 <u>or</u> 301		10
	TOTAL	<u>32+</u>

GENERAL SCIENCE MINOR		
Natural Science 181, 182, 183		12
<u>Sixteen</u> hours from the following:		
Biological Science 202 (Foundations)	4	
Physical Science 203 (Foundations)	4	
Geology 200, 200L (Foundations of Earth Science)	4	
Physics and Astronomy 119 (General Astronomy)	4	
Fisheries and Wild Life 402 (Conservation Education)	4	
	TOTAL	<u>16</u> 28

MATHEMATICS MINOR		
Mathematics 108, 109 (College Algebra and Trigonometry)		10
Mathematics 112, 113 (Analytic Geometry and Calculus)		10
Mathematics 301 (Foundations of Mathematics)	3	
OR		
Mathematics 201, 202 (Foundations of Arithmetic and Algebra)	8	
	TOTAL	<u>23+</u>
If one major and one minor, add 7 hours:		
	TOTAL	<u>7</u> 30+

Minors in other fields may be developed in consultation with the ad

Revised Winter, 1966

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM SUMMARY

Name _____ Major _____ Minor(s) _____

REQUIREMENTS:

<u>University College</u>		<u>Professional</u>	
9 _____	ATL 111, 112, 113	5 _____	ED 200
12 _____	NS 181, 182, 183	6 _____	ED 301 (ED 450)(5)
3 _____	HPR (3 terms)	3 _____	ED 325C
12 _____	SS 231, 232, 233	15 _____	ED 321A,B,C
12 _____	HUM 241, 242, 243	15 _____	ED 436
		3 _____	PSY 348
		3 _____	ED 815B
		3 _____	ED 482
(48) _____	TOTAL	(53) _____	TOTAL

Some Suggested Electives (20 to 30 credit hours necessary beyond required work to reach the minimum total of 183 term hours). Some of these courses can be used to strengthen major or minor teaching fields.

<u>General Liberal</u>		<u>Professional</u>	
4 _____	BS 202	4 _____	ART 201
3 _____	COM 100	4 _____	ED 312
4 _____	MTH 201	3 _____	ED 327
3 _____	PHIL 137	3 _____	ED 431
4 _____	PHS 203	3 _____	ED 465
_____	Other units for total	3 _____	ED 821B
		_____	Other Electives
() _____	TOTAL	() _____	TOTAL

Major _____ Minor _____ Minor _____ Professional _____

University College Not Counted Elsewhere _____ Professional Electives _____

Total Credits Toward Graduation _____

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

ENGLISH MAJOR

3 _____ ATL 111
 3 _____ ATL 112
 3 _____ ATL 113
 3 _____ ENG 206
 3 _____ ENG 207
 3 _____ ENG 208
 6 _____ ENG 213 & 214
 OR _____ OR 228A or 228B
 5 _____ ENG 402
 5 _____ ENG 465 or 466 or
 _____ 470 or 471 or 472
 3 _____ SPH 101 or 108 or
 _____ 116 or 260

(36) _____ TOTAL (For 2
minors)

5 _____ ENG 480
 5 _____ ENG 446 or 447 or
 _____ 448
 5 _____ ENG 421 or 422 or
 _____ 423
 (45+) _____ TOTAL

SOCIAL SCIENCE MINOR

4 _____ SS 231
 4 _____ SS 232
 4 _____ SS 233
 4 _____ HST 220
 4 _____ HST 221
 4 _____ GEO 204

(24) _____ TOTAL (For
2 minors)

5 _____ PLS 300
 5 _____ PLS 301
 _____ ECON, SOC.
 _____ GEO, or HST. in
 place of 300 or
 301
 (32+) _____ TOTAL

ENGLISH MINOR

3 _____ ATL 111
 3 _____ ATL 112
 3 _____ ATL 113
 3 _____ ENG 213 or 214
 OR _____ OR
 5 _____ ENG 228A or 228B
 3 _____ ENG 206
 3 _____ ENG 208
 5 _____ ENG 402
 3 _____ ENG 381

(24+) _____ TOTAL (For 2
minors)

3 _____ ENG 207
 3 _____ ENG 380

(30+) _____ TOTAL

SOCIAL SCIENCE MAJOR

4 _____ SS 231
 4 _____ SS 232
 4 _____ SS 233
 4 _____ HST 220
 4 _____ HST 221
 5 _____ PLS 300
 5 _____ PLS 301
 4 _____ GEO 204
 6 _____ Discipline
 _____ Emphasis

(40) _____ TOTAL (For
2 minors)

6 _____ Other
 _____ Emphasis
 _____ Related
 _____ Units
 (45+) _____ TOTAL

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

GENERAL SCIENCE MAJOR

4 _____ NS 181
 4 _____ NS 182
 4 _____ NS 183
 4 _____ GLG 200 and 200L
 OR _____ OR
 8 _____ GLG 201 and 202
 4 _____ CEM 111
 4 _____ CEM 112
 3 _____ CEM 103
 5 _____ BS 211
 5 _____ BS 212

(37-41) _____ TOTAL (For 2 minors)

at least 8 units from:

4 _____ PHY 247
 4 _____ PHY 248
 4 _____ PHY 249

OR

4 _____ PHY 119
 4 _____ FW 402
 4 _____ GLG 421
 4 _____ ZOL 341

(45+) _____ TOTAL

MATHEMATICS MINOR

5 _____ MTH 108
 5 _____ MTH 109
 5 _____ MTH 112
 5 _____ MTH 113
 3 _____ MTH 301
 OR _____ OR
 8 _____ MTH 201
 202

(23+) _____ TOTAL
2 min

7 _____ Other
For To

(30+) _____ TOTAL

GENERAL SCIENCE MINOR

4 _____ NS 181
 4 _____ NS 182
 4 _____ NS 183

Sixteen units from:

4 _____ BS 202
 4 _____ PHS 203
 4 _____ GLG 200 and 200L
 4 _____ PHY 119
 4 _____ FW 402

(28) _____ TOTAL

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

Course Schedule Plan

Name _____

FALL TERM			GRADES	WINTER TERM			GRADES	SPRING TERM			GRADES
FROSH.	ATL 111	3		ATL 112	3			ATL 113	3		
	NS 181	4		NS 182	4			NS 183	4		
	HPR	1		HPR	1			HPR	1		
	TOTAL	_____		TOTAL	_____			TOTAL	_____		
SOPH	SS 231	4		SS 231	4			SS 233	4		
	HUM 241	4		HUM 242	4			HUM 243	4		
	TOTAL	_____		TOTAL	_____			TOTAL	_____		
JUNIOR											
	TOTAL	_____		TOTAL	_____			TOTAL	_____		
SENIOR											
	TOTAL	_____		TOTAL	_____			TOTAL	_____		

Revised Winter, 1966

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

Waiver and Substitution Record

Name _____

Student Number _____

<u>Course</u>	<u>Substitute</u> (list courses used)	<u>Waive</u>	<u>Advisor</u>	<u>Date</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

OTHER: