A COMPARISON OF SELECTED MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS BASED UPON THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS, SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS

By

Jerry M. Kaml

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1975

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS BASED UPON THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS, SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS OF COOPERATING SCHOOLS

By

Jerry M. Kaml

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools in the following areas:

a. Individualized instruction.

b. Instructional activities.

c. Contributions to the cooperating school program.

d. Additional professional activities by supervising teacher.

e. Additional professional activities by other staff members.

The comparisons were based on the responses to specific questions by student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools. The following Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs were compared:

a. Conventional Elementary Program.

b. Cluster Elementary Program.

c. Elementary Intern Program.

d. Experimental Elementary Education Program.

e. Teacher Corps Program.

Methodology

The data were collected using questionnaires developed by the Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs in Michigan for a 1969 study. The questionnaires were administered to student teachers, supervising teachers and principals of cooperating schools during the last two weeks of the Winter quarter of 1975. The Michigan State University resident center directors were responsible for the administration and collection of the survey instruments. Of the 752 members of this population 599 responded to the questionnaire. For each response choice to a questionnaire item, the number of respondents, per cent of respondents, mean, and standard deviation was tabulated for each program. Cohen's d formula was used to determine if meaningful differences existed between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program. A meaningful difference of 20 per cent was arbitrarily established for this study.

Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study included:

Research Hypothesis #1: Meaningful differences were perceived by the supervising teachers in the Experimental Elementary Education Program as compared to the supervising teachers in the Conventional program in the amount of time pupils were involved in individualized instruction.

Research Hypothesis #2: Meaningful differences were perceived by the student teachers in both the Elementary Intern and Teacher Corps programs, and the principals in the Teacher Corps program based on

changes in instructional activities for the pupils when compared to the Conventional program.

Research Hypothesis #3: Meaningful differences were perceived by all three groups of respondents in the Experimental Elementary Education program and the student teachers in the Teacher Corps program when compared to the Conventional program based on the contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #4: No meaningful differences were perceived between the selected teacher preparation programs and the Conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #5: Meaningful differences were perceived by the supervising teachers from the Experimental Elementary Education program when compared to the perceptions of the supervising teachers in the Conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher.

The general conclusions reached in this study were that: 1) since no meaningful differences were perceived to exist between the Cluster program and the Conventional, these programs are comparable in the areas investigated; 2) since in only one instance were meaningful differences perceived between the Elementary Intern program and the Conventional program, it seems reasonable to conclude that prior to the internship experience the Elementary Intern program is comparable to the Conventional program in the five areas under investigation; and 3) the four-year field-centered experience of the Experimental

Elementary Education program and the two-year internship of the Teacher Corps program seems to result in meaningful differences when compared to the Conventional program in the areas investigated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The cooperation of others has been essential to the success of this study. The writer wishes to thank the members of the dissertation committee Dr. Janet Alleman-Brooks, Dr. Kenneth Harding, and Dr. Carl Brautigam for their interests and efforts on my behalf in the formulation and completion of this study.

The writer is indebted to the many student teachers, supervising teachers, principals, Michigan State University center directors, and especially Dr. W. Henry Kennedy who made this study possible.

Invaluable help on the design and computer programming of the study was given by Dr. Donald Freeman, Janet Tillman, Bob Wilson, and Jeff Danes.

Dr. Howard Hickey has been my advisor, dissertation chairman, and valued friend throughout my graduate experience at Michigan State University. I am grateful for his guidance, encouragement, and patience. Thank you, Howard.

Special recognition is given to Mrs. Mae McQuaid whose love and unwavering faith in me has been an inspiration throughout this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although Michigan State University was founded in 1855, records reveal it was not until early 1900 that there appeared to be a move to establish a student teaching program. Since then, remarkable progress has been made in a comparatively short period of time in the field of teacher training. In 1908, one professor comprised the entire faculty in Education. In an effort to serve the people of the state, Noll reports that from the beginning the institution has placed a strong emphasis on student teaching where experience is obtained in a real, ongoing, classroom situation - never in a campus or demonstration school.[1] Noll continues:

> It is this belief in the value and importance of learning to teach by going into a regular classroom, observing, consulting, actually teaching; living and participating in all activities of the school and the community; and staying in the situation long enough to achieve a feeling of security and belonging in it - this kind of experience for all undergraduates preparing to teach has probably been the single most important element of strength in the Michigan State program of teacher education.[2]

Even critics of teacher education seem to agree that student teaching is essential to the preparation of teachers, if not the most important part of the professional education sequence of course work

---

[1] Victor H. Noll, The Preparation of Teachers at Michigan State University, (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968) p. 231-234.

[2] Ibid., p. 231

which a future teacher receives. In 1959, Admiral Rickover stated:

> All teachers need some special instruction in pedagogy and a good deal of practice teaching. We might consider copying the internship in education which is common abroad - teacher candidates practicing under the supervision of experienced teachers before they take on a class all by themselves.[3]

Most educators share Conant's view that the value of a period of supervised practice teaching for the aspiring teachers is indisputable, and that both the student and public school could benefit from the relationship.[4] Denemark and Macdonald noted there was widespread agreement that supervised classroom practice is a good thing for prospective teachers, but research is practically nonexistent relative to determining the specific kinds of practice which actually do have demonstrably positive effects.[5] This view is supported by Jackson when he states that student teaching programs exist in many modes of operation, style, types, and program patterns. There is, however, little research to indicate that one mode is more effective than another in the preparation of teachers.[6] The committee on

---

[3]G. K. Hodenfield and T. M. Stinnett, The Education of Teachers, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 14.

[4]James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers, (New York: McGraw-Hill), 1963, p. 142.

[5]G. W. Denemark and J. B. Macdonald, "Preservice and Inservice Education of Teachers", The Journal of Educational Research, 37:233-247, 1967.

[6]Charles Louis Jackson, "A Study of Selected Student Teaching Experiences Reported by Michigan State University Cluster Program and Conventional Program Student Teachers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971, p. 8.

research in student teaching of the Association of Student Teaching stresses the need to observe experimentally the effects of different types of student teaching programs.[7]

An investigation into the nature and effectiveness of teacher preparation programs is necessary to evaluate the quality of programs.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States in its Ninth Yearbook listed six main functions of a program of teacher education. They were briefly described as follows:

a. The first function of a program of teacher education is to provide a reasonable mastery of the subject taught and of subject-matter related to it.

b. The second function of teacher education is to assist each prospective teacher in the formulation of a definite philosophy of education.

c. The third function of teacher education is to provide a thorough understanding of child nature.

d. The fourth function of teacher education is development of powers of evaluation.

e. The fifth function of teacher education is training in professional ethics.

f. The sixth function of teacher preparation is education for life outside the classroom.[8]

These six functions of a program of teacher education were published in 1931. This early study also suggests that programs of

---

[7]Association for Student Teaching, Research on Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 5 (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co. 1965), p. 27.

[8]Department of Superintendence, Ninth Yearbook, Five Unifying Factors in American Education; The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States; Washington, D. C., 1931, pp. 267-268.

teacher education must recognize differing needs of teachers as well as individual needs of pupils. Further, the economy of effort, time, and money is important in planning and administering a program of teacher education.[9]

Need for the Study

According to Ebel, the evaluation of entire teacher education programs, or even of segments of programs, is spotty and inadequate.[10] Ideally, it is assumed that the design of each curriculum for the preparation of teachers adopted by the institution reflects the judgment of appropriate members of the faculty and staff, of students, of graduates, and of the profession as a whole. It is also assumed that these curricula reflect an awareness of research and development in teacher education.[11]

---

[9]Department of Superintendence, Ninth Yearbook, Five Unifying Factors in American Education; The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States; Washington, D.C., 1931, pp. 270-271.

[10]Robert L. Ebel, ed., Encyclopedia of Educational Research (London: Macmillan Co., 1969), p. 1418.

[11]"Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education", National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; Washington, D.C., 1970, p. 3.

In December of 1968, the Council of State College Presidents of Michigan instructed the Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs to investigate the impact of student teaching programs upon the public schools cooperating in teacher education programs. The data were gathered in the Fall Quarter and Semester of 1969 from cooperating teachers, student teachers, and principals of cooperating schools. These data were to be used to measure the effect of student teaching on the school in which student teachers were placed and to provide a basis for the improvement of student teaching and teacher preparation programs in Michigan. This study, commonly referred to as the Student Teaching Impact Study, involved more than 10,000 teachers, student teachers, and school administrators in the most comprehensive study of student teaching ever conducted in Michigan.

The Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs in Michigan incorporated into the survey instruments the means for evaluating student teaching programs. This particular study will utilize only those items of response within the survey which are relevant to the defined topic; namely, comparing the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools based on the perceptions of student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools in which student teachers are placed.

Each teacher preparation program is an endeavor to prepare a more competent, analytical, innovative, and critical teacher who can help master the serious educational problems in our society.[18] Changes

---

[18] Jackson, op. cit., p. 2.

in existing programs and the initiation of new, innovative programs are necessary if they are to include the latest social, technological, and theoretical innovations. Most certainly there is a need for continuous re-examination of student teaching programs.[19]

At Michigan State University student teachers who are assigned to one supervising teacher are considered to be participants of the conventional program of student teaching. This parent program is the result of decades of additions and modifications of educational practices, and is a basic "point of departure" for other new and experimental teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. However, any new program, as well as the traditional program, of teacher preparation must "...be supported by empirical evidence as to its merits and worth to the participants".[20]

In addition to the conventional teacher preparation program at Michigan State University, several other programs are currently involved in the process of preparing teachers at the elementary level. A complete description of these programs is given in Chapter II. Although the proponents of each of these programs praise its merits, no studies have been conducted to actually compare the effectiveness of each of the selected teacher preparation programs.

---

[19]Patrick D. Daunt, "A Follow-up Study of the Michigan State University-Lansing School District SERL Project and the Conventional Program of Student Teaching in the Lansing Public Schools with Comparisons of Teacher Attitudes, Ratings, and Career Progress, (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University) p. 172.

[20]Jackson, Op. Cit., p. 5.

The writings thus far point out that it is necessary that data be obtained to support empirically the claims of the effectiveness of the selected elementary teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to compare the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools in the following areas:

a. Individualized instruction

b. Instructional activities

c. Contributions to the cooperating school program

d. Additional professional activities by supervising teacher

e. Additional professional activities by other staff members

The comparisons will be based on the responses to specific questions by student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools. The following Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs will be compared:

a. Conventional Elementary Program

b. Cluster Elementary Program

c. Elementary Intern Program

d. Teacher Corps Program

e. Experimental Elementary Education Program

Research Hypothesis 3

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher in the following areas:

a. Supervising youth groups.

b. Talking to parent groups.

c. Performing recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duties.

d. Chaperoning social activities for pupils.

e. Supervising study halls.

f. Coaching or assisting in interscholastic or extracurricular activities.

g. Assisting in handling discipline problems.

h. Developing, providing, or suggesting new or different materials to the teachers of the cooperating school.

i. Providing aids or ideas.

j. Amount of time taught for supervising teacher.

k. Affects on staff morale.

l. Change in work load of administrator.

Research Hypothesis 4

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher:

a. Frequency of supervising teacher visits to other classrooms.

b. Amount of committee work conducted by supervising teacher with students and faculty.

c. Amount of research conducted by supervising teacher.

d. Amount of professional reading performed by the supervising teacher.

e. Amount of participation by supervising teacher in student teacher seminars or in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

Research Hypothesis 5

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher:

a. Teaching.

b. Chaperoning.

c. Supervising.

d. Frequency of visits to other classes.

e. Amount of committee work.

f. Amount of research.

g. Amount of professional reading or writing.

Definitions of Terms

Student teaching.--Observation, participation, and actual teaching done by a student preparing for teaching under the direction of a supervising teacher or general supervisor; part of the pre-service program offered by a teacher education institution.[21]

Student teacher.--A person enrolled in a school of education who has been assigned to assist a regular teacher in a real school situation.[22]

---

[21] Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 563.

[22] Ibid., p. 563.

Supervising teacher.--An experienced teacher employed in the local school system to work with pupils and to supervise college students during their student teaching experience.[23]

Principal.--The administrative head and professional leader of a school division or unit.[24]

Pupil.--One who attends a kindergarten or a school of elementary level.[25] The term "student" will be avoided in this study to prevent confusion as to whether it referred to student teachers or pupils.

Field laboratory experience.--Actual practice away from the college campus, within schools or their environment, in dealing with educational problems; part of the program offered by a teacher education institution, usually conducted in schools that are not formally under the direct control of or affiliated with, the teacher education institution; usually more limited, incidental, and less formal and concentrated than the extended internship.[26]

Impact study.--The Michigan "Student Teaching Impact Study"[27] administered in the Fall of 1969. A description is given in Chapter III.

---

[23]Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 572.

[24]Ibid., p. 436.

[25]Ibid., p. 461.

[26]Ibid., p. 227.

[27]The Impact of Student Teaching Programs Upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan (Lansing: Michigan Council of State College Presidents, 1970).

Conventional program.--A teacher preparation program in which students are placed individually or with one supervising teacher and spend a substantial part of the quarter with that particular teacher.[28] For the purposes of this study, student teachers participating in the conventional program are teaching at the elementary level.

Cluster program.--A teacher preparation program which provides for placing groups of 8-12 student teachers in a single building for an individualized and flexibly planned experience with a variety of teachers in that building and with other educational resources in the district and community. A clinical consultant is selected from the building staff for his or her special competency in teaching and in working with student teachers and is assigned for a portion of his or her time to work with the student teachers in the building. He or she helps to plan the individual schedules for student teachers, provides for them necessary instruction and helps to evaluate their performance.[29] The clinical consultant will be considered a supervising teacher for the purposes of this study.

---

[28]Hugo David, ed., Toward Excellence in Student Teaching, 3rd edition. (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Co. 1973), p. 1

[29]Ibid., p. 1

Elementary Intern program.--A teacher preparation program where after extensive preparation, the student is a salaried intern teacher during his fourth calendar year of study. He is supervised by an intern consultant selected from the most able teachers in the cooperating school districts.[30] The intern consultant will be considered a supervising teacher for the purposes of this study.

Teacher Corps program.--A teacher preparation program involving a pre-service period of training and assignment to specifically serve children from multiethnic and multiracial backgrounds.[31]

Experimental Elementary Education program.--A teacher preparation program combining public schools, the community, and the university in a competency-based program. A pupil management model is stressed during an internship in the fourth year.[32]

---

[30]Bernard R. Corman and Ann G. Olmsted, The Internship in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, 1964).

[31]"Teacher Corps", brochure by U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

[32]"Experimental Elementary Education Program", brochure for Placement Services, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. The 1975 data collected in this study is limited to the responses of elementary education student teachers and those public school supervising teachers and principals involved in the field laboratory experience of Michigan State University elementary education student teachers during the Winter Quarter of 1975.
2. The study utilizes the questionnaire which is subject to the limitations imposed by such a technique.
3. The data for this study were gathered by a research questionnaire designed by representatives from thirty-one teacher education institutions in Michigan. The writer of the present study did not participate in the construction or validation of the questionnaire. These instruments are particularly well-suited for providing the pertinent information identified in the problem statement on page 8. Only selected response items from the questionnaire will be used in comparing the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools.
4. Questionnaires were disseminated, administered and collected by Michigan State University coordinators of student teaching in the cooperating schools and among the student teachers and supervising teachers with whom they work. It is assumed that this was done in a completely objective manner.
5. No generalizations are intended to future teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University, in other contexts, or in other locations.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature relating to the development of student teaching as an integral part of the preparation of teachers and the development of selected student teaching programs at Michigan State University will be reviewed in this chapter. The uniqueness of each teacher preparation program under study will be presented. Finally, a summary of the literature is presented.

Historical Background While schools have existed for approximately four thousand years, formal teacher education has existed for less than three hundred years. This was probably due, largely, to three factors; first, very few people received a formal education and consequently few teachers were needed; second, it was felt that a teacher only had to know something about that which was to be taught; and third, during the first few centuries A.D., the church assumed the responsibility for education. During this time, education had a religious motive and teaching was carried on by the clergy who had religious training rather than special teacher training.[1]

When the emigrants from Europe came to the shores of the New World they brought with them certain ideas and ideals. Among them

---

[1] James A. Johnson, A Brief History of Student Teaching, (De Kalb, Illinois: Creative Educational Materials) 1968, p. 1.

was the system of training through apprenticeship where a youth was responsible to a master for training in a trade.[2] While it is true that most of the formal teaching during this time was carried on by clergymen, some laymen did conduct private schools as a means of livelihood. These private school teachers usually became teachers by serving a lengthy apprenticeship with master teachers.[3] Writing of the apprenticeship as a method of preparing teachers, Fristoe points out:

> The first attempt to give this practical (teacher) training in an organized and systematic manner on which we have authentic information was the outgrowth of the guild system which flourished in Europe during the latter centuries of the Middle Ages. At a time when merchants and artists and workmen were all organizing and setting up definite limitations and prerequisites to membership in their unions, it was only natural that teachers should form similar organizations. In order to become a master, the beginner was required to serve a rather long period of apprenticeship. During this time he received little or no compensation and served as an assistant and substitute and, finally, taught a class of his own under the supervision of the master to whom he had been assigned.[4]

The apprenticeship embodied the concept of learning by doing, and because of this similarity, it might be considered a forerunner of practice teaching. Also, in the 1400's it was common in the early

---

[2]George R. Cressman and Harold W. Benda, Public Education in America,(New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1956), pp. 21-22.

[3]James A. Johnson, Op. Cit., p. 2.

[4]Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, Readings in Student Teaching (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Book Co., 1967) p. 1.

European teacher training schools to give the students practice in teaching by having them teach demonstration lessons to their fellow students.[5]

Normal Schools

Most authorities agree that the first real normal school was established in 1685 by Jean Baptiste de la Salle at Rheims, France. Cubberley gives the following account of de la Salle's work:

> The first normal school to be established anywhere was that founded at Rheims, in northern France, in 1685, by Abbe de la Salle. He had founded the Order of "The Brothers of the Christian Schools" the preceding year, to provide free religious instruction for children of the working classes in France, and he conceived the new idea of creating a special school to train his prospective teachers for the teaching work of his Order. Shortly afterward he established two similar institutions in Paris. Each institution he called a "Seminary for Schoolmasters." In addition to imparting a general education of the type of the time, and a thorough grounding in religion, his student teachers were trained to teach in practice schools, under the direction of experienced teachers.[6]

If student teaching is essentially defined as that part of preservice teacher education which provides practical teaching experience under the close supervision of an experienced teacher, then there can be little doubt that Jean Baptiste de la Salle deserves the title, "Father of Student Teaching."[7]

---

[5]Dewey Fristoe, "Early Beginnings of Laboratory Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 28 (March 1942), p. 219.

[6]Ellwood P. Cubberley, The History of Education, (New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1920), p. 185.

[7]James A. Johnson, Op. Cit., p. 12.

Prussia, early in the nineteenth century, was the first nation to establish a state-controlled system for the training of teachers. The leaders adopted the pedagogical principles of Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827), who based his instructional methods upon knowing child nature and observing how pupils react to certain learning situations. Teaching had been a fairly simple matter when it was only necessary to know the subject matter. It increased tremendously in technical complexity when the teacher also had to know the child.[8]

Pestalozzi defined education as the "natural, progressive and harmonious development of all the powers and capacities of the human being." In light of this definition, knowledge of the natural development of the child became essential. He recommended attention to the instincts, interests, capacities, and activities of the learner. He rejected the teaching of mere words and shifted the emphasis from the book to the child's experiences and immediate environment. Observation and investigation were to replace memorization and class discussion; thinking was to replace reciting. Widely publicized impressions of Pestalozzian practices resulted in recommendations that American schools adapt portions of the educational practices of Europe.[9]

The first normal school to be established in this country was a private school, established by Samuel Hall in 1823 at Concord, Vermont.

---

[8]Carroll Atkinson and Eugene T. Maleska, The Story of Education, (New York: Chilton Books, 1965) p. 351.

[9]Emma Reinhardt, American Education, (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1960) p. 251.

This school was established one-hundred and fifty years after de la Salle had established the first normal school in Europe. While there had been previous sporadic attempts to train teachers in the United States, Hall's normal school signaled the beginning of practice teaching in this country. A few town children were admitted to Hall's normal school from the very beginning for demonstration and practice teaching purposes.[10]

Speaking of a few dedicated educators in the early 19th century, Johnson and Perry relate,

> "...these men had visited teacher training institutions in Europe and returned full of enthusiasm for the establishment of similar institutions in the United States. It became clear to these educational pioneers that the improvement of education was dependent upon the improvement of teacher preparation. Almost all of these men advocated the use of practice teaching in the normal school program."[11]

In 1839 Massachusetts established the first school for preparing teachers for the common schools. A $10,000 gift by a private citizen persuaded the Massachusetts legislature to start a school at Lexington in July, 1839. In 1850 Massachusetts had three normal schools; New York, Connecticut, and Michigan had one each; Rhode Island, New Jersey, Illinois, Minnesota, California, Maine, and Kansas followed by 1865. By 1900 the state supported normal school had spread into most every state, the list numbering 127. The growth of the normal school

---

[10] Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, Op. Cit., p. 3.

[11] Ibid., p. 3.

was a result of the establishment or the revision of the public school system, beginning in the early part of the nineteenth century.[12]

The first normal school and the first practice teaching program in the Midwest developed at Ypsilanti, Michigan. The Ypsilanti Normal, established in 1849 and opened in 1850, was only the sixth normal school to be established in the entire United States. A model school was operated in conjunction with the normal school at Ypsilanti to give advanced students in the normal school practice in teaching. These practice teachers were required to take charge of one recitation daily throughout an entire term. The practice teachers were closely supervised and were required to make detailed weekly reports of their work.[13]

During the 1920's, there was a marked increase in the use of off-campus practice teaching. One survey showed that from 1917 to 1927 there was an increase of 27 percent in the number of normal schools using only off-campus practice teaching. This increased use of the public school for practice teaching was partially due to the fact that the growth in normal schools resulted in their model schools being incapable of accommodating all the practice teachers. Also, there was a feeling that the public school could provide a more typical teaching situation for the practice teacher.[14]

---

[12]Charles W. Hunt, Teacher Education for a Free People, (Oneonta, New York: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956).

[13]Johnson and Perry, Op. Cit., p. 5.

[14]Johnson, Op. Cit., p. 9.

In the transition to the teachers college, these crucial problems had to be faced.

Harper sums-up the transition of the normal schools to the teachers college:

> The state teacher-education schools spread to almost every state in the Union and established themselves as an indispensable part of the public school system. They made teaching a profession and education a science. They faced the public schools and strove to raise the general level of education for the masses. In the past thirty years they have been generally known as teachers colleges, not because they changed their fundamental nature, but because standardization and the resulting prominence of the degree for high school teachers forced the normal schools to secure the degree-granting privilege, conforming in certain particulars to the established college and university standards.[17]

In February of 1922, a committee of the National Council of Education reached the following conclusions:

1. In the opinion of this committee the teachers college movement is a sound one. The normal schools began as secondary schools with a professional purpose. As public education progressed, they advanced to the rank of junior colleges and with the further progress of public education it is perfectly natural that they should develop into professional colleges. This development is in complete harmony with the general advancement of organized education. Moreover, it is a necessity if we are to have a body of trained teachers with a professional attitude toward their work. Especially is it important that we should have teachers colleges in view of the disposition of teachers in service to continue this education. Thousands of such teachers find the work offered by the teachers colleges during the summer session their greatest single opportunity for academic and professional advancement.

2. The teachers college movement is still in the experimental state. It will take a number of years for them to establish their courses, increase their attendance, and standardize their work on a college basis.

---

[17]Harper, Op. Cit., p. 171.

3. The movement should receive encouragement from all friends of public education.

4. The universities should evince a cooperative spirit toward the teachers college movement. In the great work of education there is room and glory for all. The universities will find their resources taxed to the limit to care for those who desire to enter their doors. The universities and the teachers colleges should be colleagues and firm friends in advancing the interests of education within their respective states.

5. The normal schools which advance to the rank of teachers colleges should take the name of college.

6. The teachers colleges should address themselves to the task of standardization. If they are to be colleges in name, they should be colleges in fact. This means that for entrance requirements, student's load, content of courses, academic preparation of faculty, faculty load, number of weeks teaching a year, et cetera, they should "square" with college standards. Teachers colleges may never hope to have the respect and recognition of the colleges and universities and the public in general until this task of standardization is achieved.

7. And as an aid to this standardization, the committee suggests that a more detailed study be made of the organization and administration of teachers colleges and of the content of the course of study, such report to be made by the present committees or by some other committee authorized for that particular purpose.[18]

While the movement from normal schools to teachers colleges was taking place, new departures in American higher education were also being undertaken. Land grant colleges and state universities were coming into being in greater numbers and assuming new roles. The blurring of distinction between colleges and universities at the turn of the twentieth century can be seen by the fact that everywhere the state universities became the major teacher-training agencies, setting standards for the public schools.[19]

---

[18] American Association of Teachers Colleges, Yearbook 1922, (Oneonta, New York: The Association, 1922) pp. 29-30.

[19] Jackson, Op. Cit., p. 22

During the last quarter century there has been an increased awareness on the part of most members of the teaching profession of the need for better and more realistic facilities in training potential teachers. Since the original normal schools for teacher training, educators have been striving toward the establishment of a system which would offer a prospective teacher the fullest opportunity to observe and be actively engaged in one of the most essential phases of teaching--that of working with children.

Michigan State University, like many other institutions of higher learning throughout the country, has always been very much aware of this problem and has made several significant changes in the type of laboratory experiences offered to those in training for the teacher profession. By virtue of the fact that Michigan State University started as an Agricultural College, the problem of training agricultural teachers arose as early as 1910. Undoubtedly this is a contributing factor toward the early strides forward as can be seen in the history of student teaching at Michigan State University.[20]

Student Teaching at Michigan State University

There is no mention of education in the Constitution of the United States, and accordingly, education has come to be considered a function of the states individually. There is, however, early evidence that the Congress felt a concern for giving education real encouragement. In the Ordinance of 1785, provision was made to reserve one square mile of every township for the maintenance of the

---

[20]Paul N. Clem, "A Study of the Michigan State University Full-time Resident Student Teaching Program" (unpublished dissertation Michigan State University, 1958) p. 2.

public schools of the township. The Ordinance of 1787 laid down the important principle: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." These pieces of legislation gave rise to the federal policy of reserving lands for education.[21]

The Morrill Land-Grant Act, signed by President Lincoln in 1862, provided money through the sale of federal lands for the establishment of at least one college in every state ... to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts ... Michigan Agricultural College, later to become Michigan State University, was founded in 1855 and was the prototype for land-grant institutions established under the Morrill Act. The College's stated purpose was to improve and teach the science and practice of agriculture. There was very likely no thought in the minds of students or faculty of the training of teachers as a function of the new institution. Noll reports "...the College had no organized program for the preparation of teachers. Nor is there any clear evidence that the faculty or administration recognized teacher preparation as one of its functions.[22]

---

[21] George R. Cressman and Harold W. Benda, Op. Cit., pp. 47-48.

[22] Noll, Op. Cit., p. 19.

The first record of any practice teaching done by students of the College was by senior girls begun in 1903. Cooking was taught by them in night classes both on the campus and in the public schools of the vicinity.[23]

The passage by the federal government of the National Vocational Education Act in 1917 provided funds, when matched by state money, for the training of teachers in the fields of agriculture, home economics, and industrial education. Practice teaching in these vocational subjects was required by this law. Also, the Smith-Hughes Act required that a regular program for student teaching be established.[24]

Jackson writes that the post World War I era at Michigan Agricultural College was a period of transition, of growth, of searching for breadth, scope and structure for the College. Enrollments in the sciences and arts soon outnumbered those preparing for teaching in the vocational fields. The early 1930's witnessed the continued movement off-campus to cooperating public schools where the College had students spend half a day teaching and participating in the overall school and community programs. Further, the Board of Agriculture declared that one department, the Department of Education, would be responsible for the preparation of teachers.[25]

---

[23]Noll, Op. Cit., p. 18.

[24]Noll, Op. Cit., pp. 40-41.

[25]Charles L. Jackson, Op. Cit., pp. 24-25.

In 1928, student teaching was approximately a half-time load for which eight credits was earned. Generally, the practice was to have the student teacher observe for a few weeks after which he would prepare a lesson plan for a day or more. After this had been reviewed with the supervising teacher and approved, with whatever modifications seemed necessary, the student teacher would take charge of the class. If the supervising teacher had several student teachers, the time available for each student to teach in a ten weeks term would be quite limited. Where there were two student teachers assigned to a class, the instruction would be given about equally by the supervising teacher on the one hand and the two student teachers on the other. The major portion of a student teacher's experience usually would consist of observation rather than actual teaching.[26]

Speaking of the early student teaching program at Michigan State, Noll relates:

> Typically, each group of student teachers - agriculture, home economics, science and arts - had a resident supervisor or coordinator who was a regular member of the College faculty in the Department of Education. In the vocational fields these were the "resident teacher trainers." In the science and arts it was the head of the department in the early years. Good relationships between the Department of Education and cooperating schools depended to a great extent on these supervisors. They constituted a link between the two agencies that could make student teaching a success or a failure. . .
>
> . . . Student teachers felt that they were being given an opportunity to be a part of the school and often even of the community to which they had been assigned. Supervising teachers felt that they had more time to spend with the student teachers, to get to know them

---

[26]Noll, Op. Cit., p. 77.

This arrangement made possible participation by every student teacher in practically all activities and responsibilities of the typical teacher of vocational agriculture, including home visits, preparation of instructional materials, and part-time and evening classes.[30]

Student teachers in home economics and agriculture were financially supported by state and federal funds. However, funds were not available to initiate a full-time resident student teaching program in science and arts. Early in 1941 the Kellogg Foundation offered to sponsor a small experimental program in which a few student teachers in science and arts (who wished to do so) would have the opportunity for full-time experience in a community high school for a term. The Foundation agreed to pay each volunteer a small honorarium. Most of these volunteers used it to defray the additional costs involved in moving and living off the campus for the term. The Foundation also paid the salary of a replacement for a staff member whose time was released from campus teaching to coordinate and supervise the off-campus program. During the period from 1941-1945, the Kellogg Foundation gave financial support to 68 students from the College for full-time student teaching in science and arts for six to twelve weeks. In addition, the Foundation provided some funds for supervisory activities from the campus.[31]

---

[30] Noll, Op. Cit., p. 96.

[31] Noll, Op. Cit., pp. 97-98.

According to Clem, the program of full-time resident student teaching at Michigan State University had its birth in the Marshall Plan in the fall of 1946. The Marshall Plan was a cooperative venture of the Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, the town of Marshall and Michigan State University. The general purposes of the Marshall Plan were not student teaching, not community study, but realistic living in a community and working with children and adults in a total community situation. By the fall of 1956 the full-time resident student teaching program had been tried and declared so successful that it was required that all teacher education majors take their professional laboratory experience in a full-time resident center.[32]

Clem lists the following basic principles upon which the Michigan State University Full-Time Resident Program was founded:

1. Recognize that the student teacher must be well prepared in the subjects he is teaching.
2. Emphasize the study of the whole child in his total environment.
3. Give prestige to the methodology of teaching.
4. Stress individual needs of the student teacher rather than rigid mass requirements.
5. Provide situations in which the student can find his own competencies and inadequacies.
6. Provide an atmosphere for self-criticism on the part of the student teacher.

---

[32]Clem, Op. Cit., pp. 14-16.

7. Provide the privilege of experimenting with techniques and materials that the supervising teacher may not have tried.

8. Provide excellent supervision and guidance for student teachers. This is accomplished through the efforts of the following people: the resident student teaching coordinator, the supervising teacher, the school principal, the director of elementary or secondary education in the cooperating school system, the director of audio-visual aids, special consultants in the system, the superintendent, and subject-matter specialists from the college.

9. Assign only one student teacher at a time to a supervising teacher.

10. Provide a wide variety of experiences for student teachers.

11. Provide orientation and visitation to schools prior to the actual student teaching experience.

12. Emphasize community study and the importance of school-community resources and relationships.

13. Provide directed opportunities for long-term planning in teaching.

14. Make extended provisions for student teachers to understand and to be of service in meeting the needs of children.

15. Provide supervision and help to student teachers in meeting problems of class management and pupil behavior.

16. Provide favorable conditions and opportunities to meet parents and work with them.

17. Recognize no single best technique of teaching.

18. Give supervised practice in evaluating the work of pupils.[33]

---

[33]Clem, Op. Cit., pp. 21-23.

Kennedy, in the introduction to Toward Excellence in Student Teaching, asserts that by definition, the full-time student teaching program implies these characteristics:

> The student lives in the community for a full college term and is assigned to teach with one or more classroom teachers. His responsibilities are viewed broadly and may include involvement in some community-civic undertaking as well as after school or out-of-school activities with boys and girls. He learns to locate and to use community and school resources in his teaching. He studies the relationship of education to community values. He finds out, by living the life of a teacher, just what the job of a teacher is. The program also implies careful supervision and direction in that the university staff member who coordinates and supervises the student teaching experience lives in the community too.
>
> Michigan State University initiated full-time student teaching in 1955, and since that time about 30,000 students have completed this experience. Currently, the University places students in fourteen off-campus centers involving about 130 cooperating school districts and educational institutions. Since 1955, hundreds of classroom teachers have shared their professional expertise by helping to guide students through this important experience.[34]

Elementary Teacher Preparation Programs at Michigan State University

The program for the preparation of teachers for elementary schools was a new venture for Michigan State. After much planning and expansion of staff and course offerings, the first enrollees in elementary education were accepted in the Fall of 1942. Noll reports it was not unusual to be told by a girl that she had always wanted to come to Michigan State and also become an elementary school teacher and that now for the first time she could do both.[35]

---

[34]Hugo David, Op. Cit., p. xi

[35]Noll, Op. Cit., pp. 105-106.

Since the early nineteen hundreds there had been provisions for training teachers of home economics and agriculture and, since the twenties, for teachers of arts and sciences. Although teachers of vocational subjects (and music, art, and physical education) might have pupils and classes at both elementary and secondary levels, no attempt had been made by the College to offer preparation for classroom teachers at the elementary level. This was regarded as the function of the normal school. Also, the introduction of a program for preparing teachers for elementary schools was a departure from the general practice of land-grant colleges.[36]

There has never been any doubt as to the general acceptance of the elementary preparation program by University students, faculty or the public, including the public schools. In fact, it is evident that teacher education is a joint responsibility of both the public schools and the university. In 1965 Sharpe reported that, "One of the most promising developments in teacher education has been the increasing involvement of elementary and secondary teachers, public school administrators, and even lay boards of education in planning and conducting the student teaching program."[37]

---

[36]Noll, Op. Cit., p. 106.

[37]Patrick D. Daunt, Op. Cit., p. 32.

McGeoch and Olson maintain, "It is now patently clear that the title 'teacher educator' no longer belongs to the college faculty exclusively. It is the rightful possession of all who participate in the professional preparation of teachers."[38]

From 1956 all student teachers in elementary education did their student teaching in approved centers as full-time residents of the community. The only exceptions were married students or others for whom living off-campus would have created hardships. Such cases were, and continue to be, assigned to local schools to and from which they can commute.[39]

Conventional Program - The conventional program for the preparation of teachers at Michigan State University is essentially the basic program which evolved to meet the tremendous demand for qualified teachers. Essentially, students are placed individually or with one supervising teacher and spend a substantial part of the quarter with that particular teacher. The university supervisor meets with the student teachers about one-half day per week and makes frequent visits to the classroom to help plan, provide instruction, and evaluate the work of the student teacher.[40]

---

[38]Dorothy M. McGeoch and Hans Olson, "The Charge to Action", Teacher Education: Future Directions, (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1970) p. 143.

[39]Hugo David, Op. Cit., p. 1.

[40]Ibid., p. 1.

Cluster Program - In an effort to develop improved programs of field experiences for student teachers, the Cluster Program evolved in the late 1960's. Four main principles were considered in designing this student teaching program:

1. The program for student teachers should provide great flexibility so that strengths and weaknesses of individual students will determine the specific program each will follow.

2. The student teacher should be involved in a program which is designed to provide contact with several teachers and various teaching styles.

3. The program should be structured to provide many other kinds of school experiences for the student teacher in addition to classroom teaching.

4. Effective means should be developed to bring practicing teachers and teacher preparation institutions into true partnership in the design and implementation of teacher education programs.[41]

Under this concept, students spend a term full-time in student teaching and are assigned to school buildings in clusters of ten to twelve each. A highly competent member of the regular teaching staff from each of these cluster buildings is selected jointly by the host school district and the university to serve as clinical consultant in that building. This consultant spends one-half of each school day in regular teaching duties and the other half he devotes exclusively to planning and instructing in a highly personalized program of student teaching for each student teacher in that building. The maturity, academic interests, and natural aptitude

---

[41] Leland Dean and W. Henry Kennedy in collaboration with Deans and Directors of Teacher Education of Michigan in Michigan Colleges. "A Position Paper on Student Teaching Programs," in Howard E. Bosley, Teacher Education in Transition, An Experiment in Change, Vol. 1 (Baltimore, Maryland: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, May 1969), pp. 165-166.

for teaching can all be taken into account in developing an individualized program for each student teacher each week of the student-teaching term. Instead of becoming locked into one classroom under one supervising teacher, the student moves freely, working in different classrooms under a variety of teaching styles that enable learning from several teachers as the student seeks to develop teaching techniques.

A unique feature claimed for the cluster concept is that student teachers may not spend all of each day in the classroom but can spend some time learning about activities that go on in the rest of the school and in the outside community. By placing the studnt teacher with the appropriate staff member for classroom experience, the cluster program also provides a carefully planned sequence of activities that enable the student to gain experience at different levels of instruction. Student teachers who develop more slowly may need to be limited to working primarily with one supervising teacher for more extended periods in the same classrooms. Others who readily master early teaching situations may move at a rate that more nearly matches their needs and special abilities.

One advantage claimed for the cluster program is that the college coordinator's time can be more effectively and more efficiently used. Instead of spending many hours traveling from school to school, the coordinator may now center his efforts on specific buildings to which several student teachers are assigned. He can also provide special help and in-service activities for the building consultants

originally named the Student Teacher Education Program (STEP) and was supported by a grant of $585,000 over a five-year span from the Ford Foundation.[44] The program was conceived in a joint effort by several Michigan community colleges and Michigan State University to develop an elementary teacher preparation program for their graduates. It was learned that community college graduates could gain state certification to teach and complete an internship if two conditions were fulfilled. First, the internship had to be combined with pedagogy taught by University faculty in resident centers. Second, students in the program would have to attend Michigan State University for three ten-week summer sessions.

The original program took five years for a student to complete; but in 1964, the internship requirement was reduced from two years to one. This was the year the Elementary Intern Program became a regular part of the College of Education's elementary education curriculum.[45]

The essential characteristics of the Elementary Intern Program are as follows:

First Two Years: The student completes the first two years at any accredited community college or university.

---

[44] Noll, Op. Cit., p. 175.

[45] Elementary Intern Program/Another Way of Learning to Teach, (East Lansing: Michigan State University) Final Report to the Ford Foundation.

Summer Session Following Sophomore Year: The student attends a ten-week summer session at Michigan State University. The course work consists mainly of study in the liberal arts.

Third Calendar Year: During two quarters, the student is off-campus in one of the internship centers. He studies elementary school teaching methods, which are integrated with the student teaching. The course work is taught by Michigan State University faculty assigned to the center. An outstanding classroom teacher and a Michigan State University resident staff member supervise the student teaching. One quarter is spent on the Michigan State University campus studying the liberal arts.

Second Summer Session: The student attends a five-week summer session on the Michigan State University campus for additional work in the liberal arts.

Fourth Calendar Year: The student is now an intern teacher, responsible for a classroom. He is supervised by an intern consultant, the resident University faculty member, and the school principal. The intern teacher is paid a stipend for the year. Course work consists of one evening class a week studying the foundations of education. At the end of the year, the student qualifies for both the bachelor's degree and the teaching certificate.[46]

---

[46] Ibid.

When a new intern teacher assumes the responsibility for a classroom, he has completed the equivalent of more than three and two-thirds of the usual four-year degree program. He has taken most of the required professional courses, including student teaching. He already has had six months of experience in an elementary classroom under the supervision of one or more highly qualified teachers.[47] Those students in the Elementary Intern Program responding to the questionnaire in this study did so during their student teaching but prior to their internship.

Teacher Corps Program - The Teacher Corps, established by Congress in 1965, was implemented at Michigan State University by the Colleges of Education and Urban Development in 1971. This was done in cooperation with the Lansing School District and the Model Cities Program. This program is part of a nationwide effort to give children from low-income families better educational opportunities and to improve the quality of teacher education programs for both certified teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns.

Teacher Corps is an undergraduate program with the student-intern entering the program in their junior year of college. At the end of a two-year training cycle, the intern is graduated with teacher certification and a bachelor's degree from Michigan State University. Efforts are made to recruit interns representative of

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] "Teacher Corps", brochure of the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

the major ethnic groups found in Michigan - American Indian, Mexican-Americans, Afro-Americans, and Caucasians.[49]

The Teacher Corps program includes components designed to accomplish understanding and acceptance of those from diverse cultural backgrounds. These components are bi-lingual/bi-cultural training, social and emotional education, and urban-ethnic studies. McIntyre points out:

> The bi-lingual/bi-cultural component is especially noteworthy when one considers that Lansing has a minority student enrollment of 22 percent, and more than 2,500, or about eight percent, are Spanish-speaking students. On the other hand, approximately one percent of the teaching staff in the Lansing School District have Spanish surnames. These two factors point up the exigency faced by the Lansing School District to hire teachers with bi-lingual/bi-cultural training. Involvement with Teacher Corps is one effort on the part of the Lansing School District to ameliorate this condition.[50]

Continuing, McIntyre lists the objectives to be met by the interns to accomplish the bi-lingual/bi-cultural component of the program:

1. The intern will have a working understanding of a bi-lingual education philosophy.

2. The intern will develop oral language skills in Spanish at a minimum rating of FSI 1 (Foreign Service Institute Scale).

3. The intern will have an understanding of the historical background of the Spanish-speaking people in the United States.

---

[49] Lonnie D. McIntyre, The Unique Variables of the Lansing Teacher Corps, mimeograph, Michigan State University, March 4, 1974, p. 7.

[50] Ibid., p. 9.

4. The intern will be able to translate knowledge of the Spanish-speaking culture into meaningful classroom experiences for children.

5. The interns will be able to teach English as a second language to both children and adults.

6. The (bi-lingual) interns will be able to teach Spanish as a second language.

7. The interns will be familiar with materials and resources available in bi-lingual education.

8. The intern will be able to design and develop a bi-lingual curriculum to meet the individual needs of the students.

9. The intern will develop diagnostic skills for determining language dominance (English-Spanish) of Spanish-speaking children and will be able to diagnose and develop a strategy for working with language interference problems.

10. The intern will be able to combine the skills obtained in the bi-lingual component with the general pedagogical skills obtained in the other teacher training components to create a harmonious learning atmosphere for all children.[51]

The plan for achieving the stated objectives of the bi-lingual component is spread over the two year internship. The first year emphasizes obtaining a working understanding of the needs of the Spanish-speaking children in the schools and the second year is a combination of field/theory as it applies to bi-lingual education.

Teacher Corps interns and team leaders are involved in team teaching at the elementary school level in Lansing, Michigan. The schools involved in the program serve children who are predominately from multiethnic and multiracial backgrounds. Initially, the interns

---

[51] McIntyre, Ibid., pp. 9-10.

are involved in a period of preservice training to become acquainted with the Lansing schools, the community, and the resources available through Michigan State University. The interns are trained in all phases of competency based education which includes development of skills in the areas of human relations, reading, classroom management and planning as well as the historical and cultural values of different ethnic groups.

The program pays for travel to the program site for the intern, tuition is provided and the intern receives a stipend of $120.00 per week and $15.00 per dependent. The participants of this two year program are in an urban school during their first year for approximately one-half day every day. During this time, each participant is required to demonstrate teaching skills and behaviors. The second year is the internship year, also in an urban setting. Approximately half of each school day for the year or half of the days of the school year is spent teaching. These experiences are within a team teaching setting.[52]

Experimental Elementary Education Program - The Experimental Elementary Education program is an outgrowth of the national Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) project. The grant proposal lists three major goals of the elementary component of the TTT project:

1. Development of a new kind of elementary school teacher who is basically well-educated, engages in teaching as clinical practice, is an effective student of the capacities and environmental characteristics of human learning, and functions as a responsible agent of social change.

---

[52]"Dear Teacher Corps Applicant", mimeograph of Department of Elementary and Special Education, College of Education (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973), pp. 1-4.

2. Systematic use of research and clinical experience in decision-making processes at all levels.

3. A new laboratory and clinical base, from the behavioral sciences, on which to found undergraduate and in-service teacher education programs, and re-cycle evaluations of teaching tools and performance.[53]

The Experimental Elementary Education program is a four year program which is field centered and competency based. Freshmen participants are recruited from a listing of all accepted freshmen who have declared their major as elementary or special education. An overview of the planned EEE program, including a response card, is mailed to these students. Those responding attend orientation sessions that describe the program. Information packets are provided those students interested in participating in EEE. Qualified applicants are randomly selected to fill the available positions; however, special consideration is given to all male and minority group applicants.[54]

During the four year program the students are continually involved in public school teaching, community activities, interpersonal skill development and integrated course work. The program is a cooperative effort of the Lansing School District and Michigan State University with financial support from the U. S. Office of Education TTT Project. The courses provide an integration of content, teaching methods and university supervised field experience. The program emphasizes consistent use of instructional design and the instructional processes of assessment, goal setting, determining objectives, developing teaching strategies and evaluating.

---

[54]"TTT", Trainers of Teacher Trainers Project, Annual Report 1971-72 (East Lansing: Michigan State University) pp. 52-53.

The fourth year consists primarily of an internship, supervised by the program staff, in which the teaching model, management procedures and methodology are applied comprehensively for an extended period of time.[55]

Summary

The "learn by doing" concept has permeated teacher education programs since their early development. During the middle ages the apprenticeship embodied this concept and, because of this similarity, can be considered a forerunner of practice teaching.

The historical development of student teaching in the early European schools is summarized and eventually traced to colonial America where programs grew and were modified to keep pace with the needs of a rapidly expanding America.

The major emphasis of the development of teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University has been learning through experiences in the most realistic setting available. Various teacher preparation programs have been described and their uniqueness identified. Leland Dean best summarizes the available literature when he states:

> "...we believe that there are no panaceas in education, especially in the area of teacher preparation. All variations in the preparation of teachers have their unique advantages and disadvantages, and all have their problems."[56]

---

[55] Michigan State University Placement Services brochure, Op.Cit.

[56] Leland W. Dean in Foreword of Elementary Intern Program brochure, Op. Cit.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools in the following areas:

a. Individualized instruction.

b. Instructional activities.

c. Contributions to the cooperating school program.

d. Additional professional activities by supervising teacher.

e. Additional professional activities by other staff members.

The comparisons were based on the responses to specific questions by student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools. The following Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs were compared:

a. Conventional Elementary Program (Conv.)

b. Cluster Elementary Program (Clus.)

c. Elementary Intern Program (EIP)

d. Experimental Elementary Education Program (EEE)

e. Teacher Corps Program (TCP)

These comparisons were to determine if there were meaningful differences among the selected teacher preparation programs in the

areas identified based on the responses of student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools to selected items on a questionnaire.

Instrumentation

The original questionnaire was the result of a request by the Council of State College Presidents in Michigan to conduct a study analyzing the effect of student teaching programs on the public schools in Michigan. All of the teacher preparation colleges and universities in the state cooperated in the study which came to be known as the Impact Study.[1]

The Impact Study surveyed the entire population of student teachers assigned for student teaching by Michigan institutions during the Fall Quarter or Semester of 1969, all the supervising teachers working with these student teachers, and all of the principals of buildings to which student teachers were assigned.

Educational researchers from Central Michigan University, the University of Michigan, and Michigan State University were involved in the planning of the study, with research advice being provided by consultants from Michigan State University College of Education. The instruments were developed and reviewed by the parent group, as well as by other educators and representatives of the teacher

---

[1] "The Impact of Student Teaching Programs upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan, A Survey of Opinions of Supervising Teachers, Student Teachers and School Administrators", Conducted by Deans and Directors of Teacher Education in Michigan, June 1970.

preparation institutions. During the Spring term of 1969, eight institutions participated in a pilot study to test the instruments and procedures. Limitations were corrected and procedures were refined. Contributions and suggestions from the Student Teaching Committee of the Detroit Federation of Teachers and the Michigan Education Association were sought and incorporated into the instruments.

The questionnaires were administered to the total population of fall quarter or semester student teachers, corresponding supervising teachers and building principals in all Michigan public and private cooperating schools. The results of this study were published in June of 1970, incorporating the responses of nearly 10,000 individuals.

The Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs in Michigan incorporated into the original survey instruments the means for evaluating student teaching programs. The questionnaires have been used by Marcus[2], and Brady[3] in studies of a similar nature.

---

[2]Clifford M. Marcus, "Contributions of Student Teaching Programs to Michigan Cooperating Schools as Perceived by Student Teachers, Supervising Teachers and Administrators" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970).

[3]Hugh P. Brady, "A Comparison of the Student Teaching Experience of Michigan State University Student Teachers Assigned to Overseas American Schools with that of Michigan State University Student Teachers Assigned to Public Schools in Michigan" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971).

In the current study, the researcher used the same questionnaire devised for the 1969 Impact Study. A cover page was added explaining the purpose of the current study. A copy of the cover letter and the questionnaires are attached as Appendix A.

The separate questionnaires for student teachers, supervising teachers and principals of cooperating schools each contained 80 items and were designed so that the respondents marked only the one response they considered applicable. An IBM answer sheet was provided with each questionnaire. These answer sheets were machine scored at the Michigan State University Testing Center and tabulated by the Data Processing Center.

The original questionnaires contained 80 items on each form of the survey instrument. Although respondents completed all items for this study, only those items which related directly to the hypotheses of this study, were analyzed. Tables 3.1 through 3.5 identify these specific items used to test the specific hypotheses. Items not analyzed provided demographic and other data not pertinent to this study. From these tables, it can be seen that some questions were asked of all three groups of respondents, while only one or two groups of respondents were asked others.

TABLE 3.1.--Questionnaire items used to test Research Hypothesis #1.

HYPOTHESIS #1 - There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in individualized instruction for the pupils in the following areas:	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO.	
	St. Tchr.	Supv. Tchr. Prin.
a. Instructing, counseling, and tutoring individual pupils by the student teacher.	14	14
b. Instructing, counseling, and tutoring individual pupils by the supervising teacher.	15	15
c. Amount of individual help or counseling for pupils during non-class hours.	16	16
d. Re-teaching of pupils by supervising teacher.	19	19

HYPOTHESIS #2 - There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in instructional activities for the pupils in the following areas:	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO.		
	St. Tchr.	Supv. Tchr.	Prin.
a. Amount of small group instruction.	20	20	27
b. Provision for make-up work.	21	21	28
c. Follow-up exams.	22	22	29
d. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.	23	23	38
e. Supervision of study periods.	24	24	31
f. Supervision of playgrounds and hallways.	25	25	32
g. Amount of material covered.	26	26	
h. Discipline.	27	27	34
i. Motivation of pupils.	28	28	35

TABLE 3.3.--Questionnaire items used to test Research Hypothesis #3.

HYPOTHESIS #3 - There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher in the following areas:	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO.		
	St. Tchr.	Supv. Tchr.	Prin.
a. Supervising youth groups.	29	29	15
b. Talking to parent groups.	30	30	16
c. Performing recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duties.	31	31	17
d. Chaperoning social activities for pupils.			18
e. Supervising study halls.			19
f. Coaching or assisting in interscholastic or extra-curricular activities.			20
g. Assisting in handling discipline problems.			21
h. Developing, providing, or suggesting new or different materials to the teachers.	32	32	22
i. Providing aids or ideas.	33	33	23
j. Amount of time taught for supervising teacher.	35	35	25
k. Affects on staff morale.			57
l. Change in work load of administrator.			61

TABLE 3.4.--Questionnaire items used to test Research Hypothesis #4.

HYPOTHESIS #4 - There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher:	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO.		
	St. Tchr.	Supv. Tchr.	Prin.
a. Frequency of supervising teacher visits to other classrooms.	37	37	51
b. Amount of committee work conducted by supervising teacher with students and faculty.	38	38	52
c. Amount of research conducted by supervising teacher.	39	39	53
d. Amount of professional reading performed by the supervising teacher.	40	40	54
e. Amount of participation by supervising teacher in student teacher seminars or in-service activities dealing with student teaching.	42	42	

TABLE 3.5.--Questionnaire items used to test Research Hypothesis #5.

HYPOTHESIS #5 - There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher:	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM NO.	
	St. Tchr.	Supv. Tchr. Prin.
a. Teaching.	45	45
b. Chaperoning.	46	46
c. Supervising.	49	49
d. Frequency of visits to other classes.	50	50
e. Amount of committee work.	51	51
f. Amount of research.	52	52
g. Amount of professional reading or writing.	53	53

Population

The population of the current study was composed of all Michigan State University elementary student teachers who were student teaching during the Winter Quarter of 1975, and the supervising teachers and principals of cooperating schools participating in the preparation of these student teachers. The student teaching center location and potential population from each center for the current study are detailed in Table 3.6.

The potential population for the Conventional program was 99 student teachers, 99 supervising teachers and 61 principals. For the Cluster program it was 110 student teachers, 18 supervising teachers, and 13 principals. Due to the nature of the Cluster program (see Chapter 11), more supervising teachers are expected to respond to the questionnaire than is indicated by the potential population. It is possible for several supervising teachers to work with one student teacher in addition to the assigned supervising teacher (cluster consultant).

The potential population for the Elementary Intern program was 67 student teachers, 67 supervising teachers and 44 principals. For the Experimental Elementary Education program (EEE) it was 25 student teachers, 10 supervising teachers and 3 principals, and for the Teacher Corps program it was 21 student teachers, 18 supervising teachers and 5 principals. The total potential student teacher respondents was 322, for supervising teachers it was 212, and for principals it was 126. The total potential respondents was 660.

TABLE 3.6.--CENTER LOCATION AND POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.

Center Location	Conventional			Cluster			Elementary Intern			Experimental			Teacher Corps		
	Stu.	Supv.	Prin.	Stu.	Supv.	Prin.	Stu.	Supv.	Prin.	Stu.	Supv.	Prin.	Stu.	Supv.	Prin.
Battle Creek	11	11	3	6	1	1									
Detroit	23	23	20				26	26	18						
Flint	2	2	1	12	1	1									
Grand Rapids	3	3	2	11	1	1	27	27	17						
Lansing	25	25	17	37	5	5				25	10	3	21	18	5
Livonia							14	14	9						
Macomb/ Walled Lake	3	3	1	15	2	2									
Pontiac				23	2	2									
Saginaw	20	20	7												
Southwest	12	12	10												
Traverse City				6	6	1									
TOTALS	99	99	61	110	18	13	67	67	44	25	10	3	21	18	5

Summary

Chapter III described the instrumentation, population, and methods used to compare the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs upon cooperating schools. Items for comparison were selected from the 1969 Impact Study questionnaires. The instruments were administered to the student teachers, supervising teachers and principals of cooperating schools participating in the preparation of student teachers during the Winter Quarter of 1975.

The data from the returned IBM answer sheets were compiled and analyzed. Comparisons of selected elementary teachers preparation programs at Michigan State University were made from these data. An analysis of the data collected is described in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The data collected by the survey instruments are presented in this chapter. These data compared the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating public schools in the following areas:

a. Individualized instruction.

b. Instructional activities.

c. Contributions to the cooperating school program.

d. Additional professional activities by supervising teacher.

e. Additional professional activities by other staff members.

The comparisons were based on the responses to specific questions by student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating public schools. The following Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs were compared:

a. Conventional Elementary Program (Conv.).

b. Cluster Elementary Program (Clus.).

c. Elementary Intern Program (EIP).

d. Experimental Elementary Education Program (EEE).

e. Teacher Corps Program (TCP)

Table 4.0 lists the number of respondents to the questionnaire by group and by teacher preparation program.

A total of 599 responded to the survey questionnaire. This represents 79.6 per cent of the potential population of 752. The difference in the potential respondents of supervising teachers in the cluster program (18) and the actual respondents of supervising teachers in the cluster program (100) was discussed in chapter III.

The data collected by the survey instruments are presented in Appendix B. For each response choice to a questionnaire item, the number or respondents, per cent of respondents, mean, and standard deviation has been tabulated for each teacher preparation program. The analysis of these data is presented in this chapter. The restatement of each research hypothesis is followed by a presentation of the data and the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis.

A mean difference of twenty per cent (20%) of the total response distribution from the conventional teacher preparation program was used to determine if meaningful differences existed between it and the other teacher preparation programs.

The formula used to calculate the meaningful difference between programs is as follows:

$$d = \frac{m_A - m_B}{\sigma} \quad \text{where}$$

m_A = means of conventional program
m_B = means of cluster (or EIP, EEE, TCP) program, and
σ = the standard deviation of the entire population

This formula is recommended by Cohen where raw units are used which are quite arbitrary or lack meaning outside the investigation or

TABLE 4.0.--Total number and per cent respondents to questionnaire.

Program	Student Teachers			Supervising Teachers			Principals		
	Potential Respondents	Actual Respondents	Per cent Response	Potential Respondents	Actual Respondents	Per cent Response	Potential Respondents	Actual Respondents	Per cent Response
Conventional	99	77	78	99	100	101*	61	27	44
Cluster	110	102	93	110	100	91	13	12	92
Elem. Intern	67	45	67	67	47	70	44	21	48
Exp. Elem. Ed.	25	22	88	10	10	100	3	1	33
Teacher Corps	21	16	76	18	15	83	5	4	80
Totals	322	262	81	304	272	89	126	65	52

*More than one supervising teacher may be assigned to a student teacher.

both.[1] The difference (d) is then multiplied by .34 (one standard deviation from the mean in a normal distribution) to obtain a percentage score. This percentage score represents the difference between the selected teacher preparation program and the conventional program and must exceed twenty per cent (20%) for a meaningful difference to exist between programs.

Research Hypothesis #1

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in individualized instruction for pupils in the following areas:

a. Instructing, counseling, and tutoring individual pupils by the student teacher.

b. Instructing, counseling, and tutoring individual pupils by the supervising teacher.

c. Amount of individual help or counseling for pupils during non-class hours.

d. Re-teaching of pupils by supervising teacher.

TABLE 4.1.--Means and standard deviations of responses to questionnaire items relating to Research Hypothesis #1.

	Student Teachers		Supervising Teachers	
Program	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Conventional	7.701	2.666	5.270	1.841
Cluster	6.618	2.894	5.500	1.767
EIP	6.622	2.516	5.106	1.658
EEE	6.455	2.198	4.100	1.663
Teacher Corps	6.375	2.527	4.400	1.957
Entire Population Totals	6.908	2.721	5.235	1.803

[1] Jacob Cohen, Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York: Academic Press) 1969, pp. 18-19.

Table 4.1 lists the means and standard deviations of responses to the questionnaire items relating to research hypothesis #1. Table 4.2 shows the per cent differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program.

TABLE 4.2.--Per cent differences between selected teacher preparation programs and conventional program relating to Hypothesis #1.

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers
Cluster	13.26%	4.08%
EIP	13.26%	3.06%
EEE	15.30%	21.76%*
Teacher Corps	16.32%	16.32%

*denotes meaningful difference.

It was indicated in Table 4.2, that in this study, there were no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the area of individualized instruction as perceived by the student teachers. However, the supervising teacher respondents in the Experimental Elementary Education program did exceed the 20% meaningful difference level in the area of individualized instruction. Accordingly, Hypothesis #1 is rejected.

Research Hypothesis #2

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in instructional activities for the pupils in the following areas:

a. Amount of small group instruction.

b. Provision for make-up work.

c. Follow-up exams.

d. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.

e. Supervision of study periods.

f. Supervision of playgrounds and hallways.

g. Amount of material covered.

h. Discipline.

i. Motivation of pupils.

Table 4.3 shows the means and standard deviations of responses to the questionnaire items relating to research hypothesis #2.

TABLE 4.3.--Means and standard deviations of responses to questionnaire items relating to Research Hypothesis #2.

	Student Teachers		Supervising Teachers		Principals	
Program	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Conventional	18.195	7.327	14.850	5.493	9.296	3.688
Cluster	16.824	6.443	15.810	5.193	9.667	4.397
EIP	12.733	5.557	14.681	5.843	8.333	3.812
EEE	15.545	8.727	15.500	7.792	10.000	0.000
Teacher Corps	11.688	4.438	11.600	6.185	12.250	6.185
Population Totals	16.103	6.988	15.018	5.619	9.246	4.008

Using Cohen's d formula, the per cent differences were calculated and are listed in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4.--Per cent differences between selected teacher preparation programs and conventional program relating to Hypothesis #2.

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers	Principals
Cluster	6.46	5.78	3.06
EIP	26.52*	1.02	8.16
EEE	12.58	3.74	5.78
Teacher Corps	31.62*	19.38	24.82*

*denotes meaningful difference.

Table 4.4 indicates supervising teachers perceived no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in instructional activities for the pupils. Meaningful differences were perceived by student teachers in both the Elementary Intern and Teacher Corps programs, and for principals in the Teacher Corps program. Therefore, Hypothesis #2 is rejected.

Research Hypothesis #3

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher in the following areas:

a. Supervising youth groups.

b. Talking to parent groups.

c. Performing recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duties.

d. Chaperoning social activities for pupils.

e. Supervising study halls.

f. Coaching or assisting in interscholastic or extra-curricular activities.

g. Assisting in handling discipline problems.

h. Developing, providing, or suggesting new or different materials to the teachers of the cooperating school.

i. Providing aids or ideas.

j. Amount of time taught for supervising teacher.

k. Affects on staff morale.

l. Change in work load of administrator.

Table 4.5 shows the means and standard deviations of responses to the questionnaire items relating to research hypothesis #3.

TABLE 4.5.--Means and standard deviations of responses to questionnaire items relating to Research Hypothesis #3.

	Student Teachers		Supervising Teachers		Principals	
Program	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
Conventional	10.143	2.252	9.700	1.883	20.889	4.136
Cluster	9.833	1.873	10.100	1.883	18.750	3.137
EIP	9.178	2.103	9.617	1.871	19.762	3.767
EEE	8.727	1.804	8.200	2.044	18.000	0.000
Teacher Corps	7.938	1.340	8.800	2.366	20.250	1.708
Population Totals	9.603	2.078	9.728	1.949	20.046	3.731

Using Cohen's d formula, the per cent differences were calculated and are shown in Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6.--Per cent differences between selected teacher preparation programs and conventional program relating to Hypothesis #3.

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers	Principals
Cluster	4.76	6.80	19.38
EIP	15.64	1.36	10.20
EEE	23.12*	25.84*	26.18*
Teacher Corps	36.04*	15.64	5.78

*denotes meaningful difference.

Table 4.6 indicates meaningful differences were perceived by all three groups of respondents in the Experimental Elementary Education program and by the student teachers in the Teacher Corps program. Based on these perceptions of the contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher, Hypothesis #3 is rejected.

Research Hypothesis #4

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher:

a. Frequency of supervising teacher visits to other classrooms.

b. Amount of committee work conducted by supervising teacher with students and faculty.

c. Amount of research conducted by supervising teacher.

d. Amount of professional reading performed by the supervising teacher.

e. Amount of participation by supervising teacher in student teacher seminars or in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

Table 4.7 reports the means and standard deviations of responses to the questionnaire items relating to research hypothesis #4.

TABLE 4.7.--Means and standard deviations to responses to questionnaire items relating to Research Hypothesis #4.

	Student Teachers		Supervising Teachers		Principals	
Program	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
Conventional	7.325	2.844	6.170	2.137	6.000	2.094
Cluster	7.941	2.735	6.940	1.705	5.833	1.749
EIP	7.044	2.696	6.979	1.775	5.500	1.732
EEE	7.545	3.609	5.900	2.514	5.000	0.000
Teacher Corps	8.125	3.594	5.000	2.035	5.500	1.732
Population Totals	7.584	2.899	6.518	1.994	5.862	1.903

Again, the per cent differences were calculated using the Cohen d formula and are listed in Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.8.--Per cent differences between selected teacher preparation programs and conventional program relating to Hypothesis #4.

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers	Principals
Cluster	7.14	12.92	2.72
EIP	3.06	13.60	8.84
EEE	2.38	4.42	19.38
Teacher Corps	9.18	19.72	8.84

Table 4.8 shows no meaningful differences were perceived between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher spends on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher. Accordingly, Hypothesis #4 is accepted.

Research Hypothesis #5

There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on the following professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher:

a. Teaching.

b. Chaperoning.

c. Supervising.

d. Frequency of visits to other classes.

e. Amount of committee work.

f. Amount of research.

g. Amount of professional reading or writing.

Table 4.9 shows the means and standard deviations of responses to the questionnaire items relating to research hypothesis #5.

TABLE 4.9.--Means and standard deviations to responses to questionnaire items relating to Research Hypothesis #5.

	Student Teachers		Supervising Teachers	
Program	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Conventional	12.818	3.382	12.910	2.756
Cluster	12.745	3.155	12.350	3.195
EIP	13.822	3.582	12.979	2.13.
EEE	13.091	4.482	10.500	4.649
Teacher Corps	13.063	3.214	11.800	3.950
Population Totals	13.000	3.422	12.566	3.013

The Cohen d formula was used to calculate the per cent differences which are listed in Table 4.10.

TABLE 4.10.--Per cent differences between selected teacher preparation programs and conventional program relating to Hypothesis #5.

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers
Cluster	0.68	6.12
EIP	9.86	0.68
EEE	2.38	26.86*
Teacher Corps	1.70	12.24

*denotes meaningful difference.

Table 4.10 indicates student teachers perceived no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher. Meaningful differences were perceived by supervising

teachers in the Experimental Elementary Education program. Accordingly, Hypothesis #5 is rejected.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the analysis and findings from the data collected from 262 student teachers, 272 supervising teachers and 65 principals from cooperating schools. This represents a return of 79.6 per cent from the potential population of those student teachers, supervising teachers and principals involved in elementary teacher preparation programs from Michigan State University during the Winter quarter of 1975.

Five research hypotheses were analyzed and the findings can be summarized as follows:

Research Hypothesis #1

Research Hypothesis #1: Rejected.

Findings:

a. Based on changes in individualized instruction for pupils, no meaningful differences were perceived by student teachers in any of the Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs.

b. The supervising teachers involved in the Experimental Elementary Education program perceived meaningful differences between their program and the Conventional program in the area of individualized instruction for pupils.

Research Hypothesis #2

Research Hypothesis #2: Rejected.

Findings:

a. Student teachers from the Elementary Intern program and the Teacher Corps program perceived meaningful differences between their programs and the Conventional program in the area of changes in instructional activities for pupils.

b. No meaningful differences were perceived by supervising teachers in any of the programs in the area of changes in instructional activities for pupils.

c. Principals perceived meaningful differences between the Conventional program and the Teacher Corps program in the area related to changes in instructional activities for pupils.

Research Hypothesis #3

Research Hypothesis #3: Rejected.

Findings:

a. Student teachers from the Experimental Elementary Education and Teacher Corps programs perceived meaningful differences between their programs and the Conventional program in the area of student teacher contributions to the cooperating school program.

b. Both the supervising teachers and principals in the Experimental Elementary Education perceived meaningful differences in this area.

Research Hypothesis #4

Research Hypothesis #4: Accepted.

Findings:

a. No meaningful differences were perceived by any of the groups in any of the programs in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #5

Research Hypothesis #5: Rejected.

Findings:

a. Student teachers perceived no differences in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

b. The supervising teachers involved in the Experimental Elementary Education program perceived meaningful differences between their program and the Conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

Chapter V presents a summary of this study along with the report of the findings and conclusions. Recommendations are made for further study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the impact of selected Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs on cooperating schools in the following areas:

a. Individualized instruction.

b. Instructional activities.

c. Contributions to the cooperating school program.

d. Additional professional activities by supervising teacher.

e. Additional professional activities by other staff members.

The comparisons were based on the responses to specific questions by student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools. The following Michigan State University elementary teacher preparation programs were compared:

a. Conventional Elementary Program.

b. Cluster Elementary Program.

c. Elementary Intern Program.

d. Experimental Elementary Education Program.

e. Teacher Corps Program.

A review of related literature relevant to the study was presented. A historical background of the development of student teaching and student teaching programs at Michigan State University

was described and a description was presented of the five elementary teacher preparation programs utilized in this study.

To compare the impact of the selected teacher preparation programs upon the cooperating schools, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

Research Hypothesis #1

> There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in individualized instruction for pupils.

Research Hypothesis #2

> There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in instructional activities for the pupils.

Research Hypothesis #3

> There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #4

> There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #5

> There are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher.

The survey questionnaires were developed by the Deans and Directors of Teacher Education Programs in Michigan for a prior study in 1969. The means for evaluating student teaching programs was incorporated into the survey instruments. Among the 80 items

on each form of the questionnaire were included specific questions which related directly to the research hypotheses. Michigan State University staff were responsible for the administration of the questionnaires. The population of the current study was composed of all Michigan State University elementary student teachers who were student teaching during the Winter quarter of 1975, and the supervising teachers and principals of cooperating schools participating in the preparation of these student teachers. Almost 80 per cent of the potential population responded to the questionnaire.

Meaningful differences were said to exist if the mean difference of the total response distribution from the conventional teacher preparation program exceeded twenty per cent (20%). Means and standard deviations for each item response on the survey questionnaire were compiled by the CDC 6500 computer at Michigan State University. These data were collapsed and comparisons made for each research hypothesis using the d formula suggested by Cohen.[1]

The findings are summarized in Table 5.1.

---

[1]Cohen, Op. Cit.

TABLE 5.1.--Summary of findings for Research Hypotheses. (per cent differences).

	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers	Principals
Hypothesis #1			
Cluster	13.26	4.08	- -
EIP	13.26	3.08	- -
EEE	15.30	21.76*	- -
Teacher Corps	16.32	16.32	- -
Hypothesis #2			
Cluster	6.46	5.78	3.06
EIP	26.52*	1.02	8.16
EEE	12.58	3.78	5.78
Teacher Corps	31.62*	19.38	24.82*
Hypothesis #3			
Cluster	4.76	6.80	19.38
EIP	15.64	1.36	10.20
EEE	23.12*	25.84*	26.18*
Teacher Corps	36.04*	15.64	5.78
Hypothesis #4			
Cluster	7.14	12.92	2.72
EIP	3.06	13.60	8.84
EEE	2.38	4.42	19.38
Teacher Corps	9.18	19.72	8.84
Hypothesis #5			
Cluster	0.68	6.12	- -
EIP	9.86	0.68	- -
EEE	2.38	26.86*	- -
Teacher Corps	1.70	12.24	- -

*denotes meaningful difference.

Findings and Conclusions

Research Hypothesis #1 postulated that there were no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in individualized instruction for pupils. The data did not support the hypothesis. The total response distribution of the supervising teachers in the Experimental Elementary Education program exceeded the 20 per cent meaningful difference level from the Conventional program. The Experimental Elementary Education program supervising teachers perceived as greater the amount of time pupils were involved in individualized instruction compared to the perceptions of supervising teachers in the Conventional program in this area.

Research Hypothesis #2 postulated that there were no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on changes in instructional activities for the pupils. The data did not support the hypothesis. The 20 per cent meaningful difference level was exceeded by the student teachers in the Elementary Intern program and the student teachers and principals in the Teacher Corps program. The student teachers in the Elementary Intern program and the Teacher Corps program perceived as greater the amount of changes in instructional activities when compared to the responses of the student teachers in the conventional program. However, the principals in the Teacher Corps Program perceived the changes in instructional activities for pupils as not as great when compared to the responses of the principals in

the conventional program. The small number of principal respondents from the Teacher Corps program (N = 4) must be considered when drawing conclusions. The perceptions by the student teachers of the EIP and Teacher Corps programs cannot be accounted for based on the responses of the supervising teachers of the same programs. However, meaningful differences were perceived based on the limits set by this study and it must be concluded that the internship preparation common to these two programs results in perceptions of greater changes in instructional activities for the pupils.

Research Hypothesis #3 postulated that there were no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program based on the contributions to the cooperating school program by the student teacher. The hypothesis was rejected because the perceptions of all three groups of respondents in the EEE program and the student teachers in the Teacher Corps program exceeded the 20 per cent meaningful difference level. Based on these perceptions, it is concluded that the contributions to the cooperating school program by the EEE and Teacher Corps programs are greater than the conventional program in their contributions to the cooperating school program. This is not surprising when one considers the length of time the student teachers from these programs must serve at the cooperating school (see Chapter II).

Research Hypothesis #4 postulates that there are no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher. The hypothesis was accepted. None of the teacher

preparation programs exceeded the 20 per cent meaningful difference level when compared to the conventional program. Based on the data from this study, it appears that there are no meaningful differences between any of the programs tested in the amount of time the supervising teacher must spend on professional duties due to the presence of a student teacher.

Research Hypothesis #5 postulated that there were no meaningful differences between the selected teacher preparation programs and the conventional program in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher. The hypothesis was rejected. The supervising teachers from the Experimental Elementary Education program perceived a greater difference in the amount of time other staff members spend on professional duties due to the presence of the student teacher.

It is interesting to note that no meaningful differences were perceived by the respondents between the cluster and conventional programs in any of the hypothesized areas. In only one instance were meaningful differences found between the Elementary Intern Program and the conventional program. However, it should be pointed out that the major differences between the two programs occur during the internship year for EIP (see Chapter II). Since the internship comes after the student teaching experience, one would not expect the advantages claimed for the Elementary Intern program to appear in this study. Because these three programs of teacher preparation

represent 88 per cent of the total respondents to the questionnaire, it would appear:

1. The research hypotheses are generally supported as they relate to the conventional, cluster, and Elementary Intern Program.
2. Due to the small populations of the participants in the Experimental Elementary Education program and the Teacher Corps program, the perceptions of these respondents must be weighed carefully. Means and standard deviations can be misleading when responses are obtained from a small population and compared with a large population.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented based on the results of this investigation:

1. Michigan State University should maintain an on-going evaluation of its teacher preparation programs with the objective of improving existing programs. For example, the survey questionnaire utilized in this study could be administered each quarter to monitor teacher preparation programs. Trends could be noted and modifications initiated to meet the changing needs of the educational enterprise.
2. Experimental and innovative programs of teacher preparation should be encouraged and resources made available to implement them.

9. Administrators and teachers in the public schools involved with teacher preparation programs should constantly be encouraged to assess the procedures, operations, and effectiveness of the programs.
10. More valid instruments to measure the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs are needed and warrant extensive research.
11. The College of Education should be encouraged to develop a model teacher preparation program which would incorporate the most promising, efficient, and effective aspects of each of the existing programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Teachers Colleges. Yearbook 1922. Oneonta, New York: The Association, 1922.

Association for Student Teaching. Research on Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 5. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1965.

Atkinson, Carroll, and Maleska, Eugene T. The Story of Education. Chilton Books, 1965.

Brady, Hugh P. "A Comparison of the Student Teaching Experience of Michigan State University Student Teachers Assigned to Overseas American Schools with that of Michigan State University Student Teachers Assigned to Public Schools in Michigan." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Clem, Paul N. "A Study of the Michigan State University Fulltime Resident Student Teaching Program." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1958.

Cohen, Jacob. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1969.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Corman, Bernard R., and Olmsted, Ann G. The Internship in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Education, 1964.

Cragun, John, et al. Cluster Consultant Monograph. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1972.

Cressman, George R., and Benda, Harold W. Public Education in America. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1956.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. The History of Education. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1920.

Cyphert, Frederick R. "An Analysis of Research in Teacher Education." The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, Summer 1972.

Daunt, Patrick D. "A Follow-up Study of the Michigan State University-Lansing School District SERL Project and the Conventional Program of Student Teaching in the Lansing Public Schools with Comparisons of Teacher Attitudes, Ratings, and Career Progress. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University.

David, Hugo, (ed.). Toward Excellence in Student Teaching, 3rd edition. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Co., 1973.

Dean, Leland, and Kennedy, W. Henry in collaboration with Deans and Directors of Teacher Education of Michigan in Michigan Colleges. "A Position Paper on Student Teaching Programs," in Howard E. Bosley, Teacher Education in Transition, An Experiment in Change, Vol. I. Baltimore, Maryland: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, May 1969.

"Dear Teacher Corps Applicant." Mimeograph of Department of Elementary and Special Education, College of Education, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973.

Denemark, G. W., and Macdonald, J. B. "Preservice and Inservice Education of Teachers." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 37, 1967.

Department of Superintendence, Ninth Yearbook. Five Unifying Factors in American Education; The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States. Washington, D. C., 1931.

Ebel, Robert L., (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. London: Macmillan Co., 1969.

Elementary Intern Program/Another Way of Learning to Teach. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Final Report to the Ford Foundation.

"Experimental Elementary Education Program." Brochure for Placement Services, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Fristoe, Dewey. "Early Beginnings of Laboratory Schools." Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 28, March 1942.

Good, Carter V., (ed.). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.

Harper, Charles A. A Century of Public Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1939.

Hodenfield, G. K., and Stinnett, T. M. The Education of Teachers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961.

Hunt, Charles W. Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, New York: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.

Jackson, Charles Louis. "A Study of Selected Student Teaching Experiences Reported by Michigan State University Cluster Program and Conventional Program Student Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

APPENDIX A

Johnson, James A. A Brief History of Student Teaching. De Kalb, Illinois: Creative Educational Materials, 1968.

Johnson, Jim, and Perry, Floyd. Readings in Student Teaching. Dubuque: William C. Brown Book Co., 1967.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963.

Marcus, Clifford M. "Contributions of Student Teaching Programs to Michigan Cooperating Schools as Perceived by Student Teachers, Supervising Teachers and Administrators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

Mayor, John R. "Accreditation in Teacher Education: Its Influence on Higher Education." National Commission on Accrediting, 1965.

McGeoch, Dorothy M., and Olson, Hans. "The Charge to Action." Teacher Education: Future Directions. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1970.

McIntyre, Lonnie D. The Unique Variables of the Lansing Teacher Corps. Mimeograph, Michigan State University, March 4, 1974.

Noll, Victor H. The Preparation of Teachers at Michigan State University. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968.

Price, William J. "The Student Teacher as Indentured Servant." The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, Fall, 1972.

Reinhardt, Emma. American Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960.

Smith, B. Othanel. Research in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

"Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education." National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: Washington, D. C., 1970.

Stiles, Lindley J. "Attitudes Toward Education Courses." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 10, 1959.

"Teacher Corps." Brochure by U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

The Impact of Student Teaching Programs Upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Council of State College Presidents, 1970.

"TTT." Trainers of Teacher Trainers Project. Annual Report 1971-72 East Lansing: Michigan State University.

APPENDIX A

STUDY OF STUDENT TEACHING

The attached questionnaire was administered statewide in 1969 to investigate the impact of student teachers upon the public schools cooperating in teacher education programs. Over 1300 student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators of cooperating schools responded to the Michigan State University segment of the Impact Study. The instrument was developed by educators, parent groups, and teacher preparation institutions. It incorporated suggestions and contributions from the Detroit Federation of Teachers and the Michigan Education Association. The data were used to measure the effect of student teaching upon the school in which student teachers were placed and provided a basis for the improvement of student teaching and teacher education programs.

In an effort to update these data, the same instrument is again being administered to the teacher candidates in the various teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. All student teachers, supervising teachers, and principals of cooperating schools involved in the field laboratory experience with Michigan State University during the Winter Quarter of 1975 will be asked to respond to the questionnaire. Your participation is vital to the success of this survey and your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

The directions to respondents on the next page is the same except the IBM answer sheets are not pre-coded and any lead pencil may be used to mark your response. Your identity will remain unknown, however, you will be asked to identify on the answer sheet the center and teacher preparation program in which you are participating. The person administering this survey will give you specific instructions on how to do this and will answer any questions you may have regarding the survey.

STUDY OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

This study is being conducted at the request of the Council of State College Presidents for the purpose of analyzing the effect of student teaching programs on the schools of Michigan. The study is being conducted by all the teacher preparation institutions in Michigan and will involve all student teachers, supervising teachers, and building principals working with student teachers during the fall quarter or semester of 1969.

The instruments were developed with guidance from the research departments of three Michigan institutions, and have been reviewed by Michigan Education Association officials, and the Student Teaching Committee of the Detroit Federation of Teachers. Both groups have made contributions to the items in the instrument and have expressed interest in the findings.

It is expected that the results of this study will be given wide distribution and no doubt will provide a basis for the improvement of student teaching and teacher education programs in Michigan over the next decade.

DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

1. Use the IBM answer sheet provided. The pre-coding in the upper right block in the answer sheet identifies the teacher education institution and the instrument number for purposes of statistical analysis. There will be no way for your specific answer sheet to be identified once you turn it in. The responses will be machine scored and tabulated on Michigan State University equipment. Since your responses will be combined with those from other institutions it is essential that all respondents use the same procedure.

2. Use the scoring pencil provided and mark the spaces to indicate your answer to each item. Blacken the space completely. Be careful not to put any other marks on the answer sheet.

3. Mark no more than one answer for each item. Please answer every item unless instructed otherwise on the instrument.

4. In the instrument "University" means either "college" or "university" as appropriate. "Supervising teacher" also means "cooperating teacher," "sponsoring teacher," or "critic teacher." Student teacher also means "associate teacher."

STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

Teacher Questionnaire

1. Which of the following are you now?

   1. A single student teacher
   2. A married student teacher
   3. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
   4. A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
   5. A school administrator

2. What is your sex?

   1. Male
   2. Female

3. Which statement below best describes the community in which you teach?

   1. Large central city (e.g., Detroit, Grand Rapids)
   2. Large suburban community (e.g., Livonia, Flint Carmen)
   3. Small suburban community (e.g., Okemos, Essexville)
   4. Medium sized city (e.g., Battle Creek, Kalamazoo)
   5. Small city or rural area (e.g., Niles, Ithaca)

4. How many years of teaching have you completed including this year?

   1. Three or less years
   2. Four to seven years
   3. Eight to twelve years
   4. More than twelve years

5. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked?

   1. Only one
   2. Two
   3. Three
   4. Four to six
   5. More than six

6. With how many student teachers have you worked in the last 5 years? (Include your current student teacher)

   1. One
   2. Two
   3. Three
   4. Four
   5. Five
   6. Six to ten
   7. More than ten

7. How well do you feel your present student teacher was prepared to enter student teaching?

   1. Extremely well prepared
   2. Well prepared
   3. Adequately prepared
   4. Minimally prepared
   5. Inadequately prepared

8. In this assignment (contact), how was your student teacher scheduled in student teaching?

   1. Full-time
   2. Full-time except he was also enrolled in a non-student teaching credit course
   3. Half-days
   4. Less than half-days

9. In this assignment (contact) how was your student teacher placed?

1. With you as the single supervising teacher.
2. In a team-teaching situation (two or more team members).
3. With two or three different teachers (but not team-teaching).
4. In a flexible cluster arrangement.
5. In a campus laboratory school.
6. In a special program or project different from any of the above.

10. How many weeks is your student teacher scheduled in this assignment (contact)?

1. 5 weeks or less
2. 6 or 7 weeks
3. 8 or 9 weeks
4. 10 or 11 weeks
5. 12 to 14 weeks
6. More than 14 weeks

11. What is your own current teaching assignment?

1. Grades K, 1, 2
2. Grades 3, 4
3. Grades 5, 6
4. All elementary grades
5. Middle School
6. Junior High School
7. Senior High School
8. All grades K - 12

12. To what subject area or teaching field are you primarily assigned? (Check one answer only from item 12 and 13.)

1. All elementary subjects K-5 or K-6
2. Art
3. Business Education
4. English
5. Elementary departmental or block program
6. Elementary ungraded program
7. Foreign Language
8. Home Economics
9. Mathematics
10. Music

13.

1. Physical Education (Elementary)
2. Physical Education (Secondary)
3. Science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
4. Science (General, Natural, Earth)
5. Social Studies (including History)
6. Social Science – English combination
7. Special Education
8. Speech
9. Vocational or Industrial Arts Education
10. Other

QUESTIONS 14 THROUGH 18 deal with any changes in individualized instruction for the pupils which may have resulted from your student teacher's presence.

14. To what extent did your **student teacher** work with (instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. A little bit
4. Not at all

15. To what extent did **you** work with individual pupils as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual

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

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual

26. Amount of material covered

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

27. Discipline

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

28. Motivation of pupils

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

QUESTIONS 29 THROUGH 31 deal with the contributions your student teacher may have made to the school program. Did your student teacher make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as

29. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

30. Give talk to parent's group?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

31. Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duty?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

32. Did your student teacher bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No

33. Did your student teacher suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No

34. What use were you able to make of the contributions (32 & 33) of your student teacher?

1. I used them.
2. I did not use them.
3. I had to discourage him from contributing too freely.
4. My student teacher really did not have much to offer.

35. How many hours per week on the average did your student teacher teach your assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour a week.
2. One to five hours per week.
3. Six to ten hours per week.
4. Eleven to fifteen hours per week.
5. Sixteen to twenty hours per week.
6. More than twenty hours per week.

36. How many hours per week on the average were you able to be away from the classroom while your student teacher was teaching your assigned classes?

1. Less than one
2. 1 – 5
3. 6 – 10
4. 11 – 15
5. 16 – 20
6. More than 20

To what extent did you engage in any of the following additional activities during the time your student teacher was teaching?

37. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

38. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

39. Research.

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

40. Professional reading or writing

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

41. Work with staff of school or department

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

42. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

43. Assisting the principal or other teachers

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

44. Social or recreational activities

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

QUESTION 45 THROUGH 49

To what extent did your student teacher relieve other regular staff members who did not have student teachers of the following activities?

45. Teaching

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

46. Chaperoning

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

47. Supervision of lunch duty

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

48. Supervision of study hall

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

49. Supervision of playground

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

QUESTION 50 THROUGH 53

To what extent were other staff members able to engage in any of the following activities because of the presence of student teachers in the building?

50. Visitation in other classrooms or schools

1. Many times
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

51. Committee work in the school

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

52. Research

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

53. Professional reading or writing

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

54. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your student teacher?

1. Less than 10
2. 10 to 15
3. 16 to 20
4. 21 to 25
5. 26 to 30
6. 31 to 35
7. 36 to 40
8. More than 40

55. How did the presence of a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week you spent at school as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?

1. Added more than six hours per week
2. Added three to six hours per week
3. Added one to three hours per week
4. Added up to one extra hour per week
5. Had no effect
6. Reduced by up to one hour per week
7. Reduced by one to three hours per week
8. Reduced by three to six hours per week
9. Reduced more than six hours per week

56. How did your student teacher's presence affect the average number of hours per week you worked on job-related activities away from school?

1. Added more than six hours per week
2. Added three to six hours per week
3. Added one to three hours per week
4. Added up to one hour per week
5. Had no effect
6. Reduced by up to one hour per week
7. Reduced by one to three hours per week
8. Reduced by three to six hours per week
9. Reduced more than six hours per week

QUESTION 57 THROUGH 60

To what extent was the time you spent on any of the following activities changed because of your student teacher's presence?

57. Teaching

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

58. Lesson Planning

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

59. Paper Grading

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

60. Help to individual students

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

QUESTION 61 THROUGH 69

To what extent did you engage in the following activities because of the presence of the student teacher?

61. Planning with or for your student teacher

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

62. Evaluating your student teacher's progress or activities

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

63. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

64. Fulfilling the social obligations resulting from your student teacher's presence.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

65. Finding housing for your student teacher.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

66. Preparing additional reports.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

67. Making additional preparation for teaching.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

68. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with your student teacher.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

69. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your student teacher outside of regular working hours at school? (Telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.)

1. Less than one
2. One to three
3. Four to six
4. Seven to nine
5. Ten or more

70. How many days during student teaching did your student teacher handle classes for you while you were away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal or other people, personal or private affairs outside of school) in which a substitute would have had to be hired if the student teacher had not been there?

1. None
2. Less than one
3. One to three
4. Four to seven
5. Eight to ten
6. More than ten

71. During student teaching how many days did your student teacher handle classes for any teacher other than yourself while that teacher was away from his class?

1. None
2. One or less
3. Two to four
4. Five to seven
5. Eight to ten
6. More than ten

72. How many hours do you estimate your student teacher spent doing volunteer work in the community where he was assigned for student teaching (youth groups, home service, church work and the like) during his student teaching period?

1. None at all
2. One to five hours
3. Six to fifteen hours
4. Sixteen to thirty hours
5. More than thirty hours

73. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on your own teaching performance?

1. Has made me a much more effective teacher
2. Has made me a more effective teacher
3. Has had no effect on my teaching
4. Has made me a less effective teacher
5. Has made me a much less effective teacher

74. What do you think should be the attitude of the administrators and teachers in your school about working with student teachers?

1. Should aggressively seek student teachers
2. Should seek student teachers
3. Should accept student teachers
4. Should resist having student teachers in the school
5. Should refuse to have student teachers in the school

75. If you were starting over, would you accept another student teacher with similar credentials from the same institution under the same general circumstances?

1. I would accept with enthusiasm
2. I would accept
3. I feel neutral about it
4. I would probably decline
5. I would refuse

76. How many times has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been in your school during this student teaching contact?

1. Not at all
2. One to two times
3. Three to four times
4. Five to six times
5. Seven to eight times
6. Nine to ten times
7. Eleven to twelve times
8. Thirteen to fifteen times
9. Sixteen or more times

77. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?

1. All the help I felt was necessary
2. Most of the help I felt was needed
3. Some of the help I felt I needed
4. Little of the help I felt was needed.
5. No help at all

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

1. He has gone out of his way to be helpful
2. He has helped when asked
3. He has not helped
4. No such help was needed

79. Would you want your student to teach in your building or system next year?

1. Yes
2. No, but would recommend him in a different system or building
3. No

80. Why was this student teacher assigned to you?

1. I volunteered since I feel a professional obligation to help prepare future teachers.
2. I volunteered but only because I felt pressure from an administrator to do so.
3. I volunteered because I thought a student teacher would be helpful to me in performing my school duties.
4. I did not volunteer but was requested by an administrator to take the student teacher.
5. I was forced to work with the student teacher against my will.

STUDY OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

This study is being conducted at the request of the Council of State College Presidents for the purpose of analyzing the effect of student teaching programs on the schools of Michigan. The study is being conducted by all the teacher preparation institutions in Michigan and will involve all student teachers, supervising teachers, and building principals working with student teachers during the fall quarter or semester of 1969.

The instruments were developed with guidance from the research departments of three Michigan institutions, and have been reviewed by Michigan Education Association officials, and the Student Teaching Committee of the Detroit Federation of Teachers. Both groups have made contributions to the items in the instrument and have expressed interest in the findings.

It is expected that the results of this study will be given wide distribution and no doubt will provide a basis for the improvement of student teaching and teacher education programs in Michigan over the next decade.

DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

1. Use the IBM answer sheet provided. The pre-coding in the upper right block in the answer sheet identifies the teacher education institution and the instrument number for purposes of statistical analysis. There will be no way for your specific answer sheet to be identified once you turn it in. The responses will be machine scored and tabulated on Michigan State University equipment. Since your responses will be combined with those from other institutions it is essential that all respondents use the same procedure.

2. Use the scoring pencil provided and mark the spaces to indicate your answer to each item. Blacken the space completely. Be careful not to put any other marks on the answer sheet.

3. Mark no more than one answer for each item. Please answer every item unless instructed otherwise on the instrument.

4. In the instrument "University" means either "college" or "university" as appropriate. "Supervising teacher" also means "cooperating teacher," "sponsoring teacher," or "critic teacher." Student teacher also means "associate teacher."

STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

Student Teacher Questionnaire

1. Which of the following are you now?

   1. A single student teacher
   2. A married student teacher
   3. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
   4. A supervising teacher but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
   5. A school administrator

2. What is your sex?

   1. Male
   2. Female

3. Which statement below best describes the community in which you are doing student teaching?

   1. Large central city (e.g., Detroit, Grand Rapids)
   2. Large suburban community (e.g., Livonia, Flint Carmen)
   3. Small suburban community (e.g., Okemos, Essexville)
   4. Medium sized city (e.g., Battle Creek, Kalamazoo)
   5. Small city or rural area (e.g., Niles, Ithaca)

4. What was your status as a student in your college or university when you began this student teaching assignment (contact)?

   1. Had junior standing
   2. Had senior standing
   3. Had the BA or BS degree

5. What is your all-college grade point average?
   (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0)

   1. Below 2.0
   2. 2.0 – 2.5
   3. 2.5 – 3.0
   4. 3.0 – 3.5
   5. Above 3.5

6. How old were you at the beginning of this student teaching assignment (contact)?

   1. 21 years or under
   2. 21 to 21½ years
   3. 21½ to 22 years
   4. 22 to 23 years
   5. Over 23 years

7. How many times have you student taught including the current assignment (contact)?

   1. One
   2. Two
   3. Three

8. In this assignment (contact), how much time were you scheduled in student teaching?

   1. Full-time
   2. Full-time except was also enrolled in a non-student teaching credit course
   3. Half-days
   4. Less than half-days

17. To what extent did conferring with you take time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

18. To what extent did planning with you take the time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

19. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after you taught?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

QUESTIONS 20 THROUGH 28

To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for the pupils in your supervising teachers assigned classes changed because of your presence?

20. Amount of small group instruction.

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

21. Provision for make-up work.

1. Much greater
2. Somewhat greater
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

22. Follow-up of exams.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

23. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

24. Supervision of study periods.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

9. In this assignment (contact), how were you placed?

1. With a single supervising teacher
2. In a team-teaching situation (two or more team members)
3. With two or three different teachers (but not team-teaching)
4. In a flexible cluster arrangement
5. In a campus laboratory school
6. In a special program or project different from any of the above

10. How many weeks long is your current assignment (contact)?

1. 5 weeks or less
2. 6 or 7 weeks
3. 8 or 9 weeks
4. 10 or 11 weeks
5. 12 to 14 weeks
6. More than 14 weeks

11. What is your primary current student teaching assignment (contact)?

1. Grades K, 1, 2
2. Grades 3, 4
3. Grades 5, 6
4. All elementary grades
5. Middle School
6. Junior High School
7. Senior High School
8. All grades K - 12

12. To what subject area or teaching field were you primarily assigned for student teaching (check one answer only from item 12 and 13)

1. All elementary subjects (K-5 or K-6)
2. Art
3. Business Education
4. English
5. Elementary departmental or block program
6. Elementary ungraded program
7. Foreign language
8. Home Economics
9. Mathematics
10. Music

13.

1. Physical Education (Elementary)
2. Physical Education (Secondary)
3. Science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
4. Science (General, Natural, Earth)
5. Social Studies (including History)
6. Social Science — English combination
7. Special Education
8. Speech
9. Vocational or Industrial Arts Education
10. Other

QUESTIONS 14 THROUGH 18 deal with any changes in individualized instruction provided for the pupils which may have resulted from your presence.

14. To what extent did **you** work with (e.g., instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. A little bit
4. Not at all

15. To what extent did **your supervising teacher** work with individual pupils as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual
6. Don't know

16. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided the pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not been present?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual
6. Don't know

25. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

26. Amount of material covered.

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

27. Discipline.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

28. Motivation of pupils.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

QUESTIONS 29 THROUGH 33 deal with the contributions you may have made to the school program. Did you make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

29. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

30. Give talks to parent's group?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

31. Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground, or hall duty?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

32. Did you bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

33. Did you suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

34. How do you feel your contributions (32 and 33) were received?

1. They were used
2. They were not used
3. I was discouraged from making such contributions
4. I really did not have much to offer

35. How many hours per week on the average did you teach your supervising teacher's assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour a week
2. One to five hours per week
3. Six to ten hours per week
4. Eleven to fifteen hours per week
5. Sixteen to twenty hours per week
6. More than twenty hours per week

36. How many hours per week on the average was your supervising teacher able to be away from the classroom while you were teaching his assigned classes?

1. Less than 1
2. 1 – 5
3. 6 – 10
4. 11 – 15
5. 16 – 20
6. More than 20

QUESTION 37 THROUGH 44

To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in any of the following additional activities during the time you were teaching his assigned classes?

37. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

38. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

39. Research.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

40. Professional reading or writing.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

41. Work with staff of school or department.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

42. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

43. Assisting the principal or other teachers.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

44. Social or recreational activities.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

QUESTION 45 THROUGH 49

To what extent did you relieve other regular staff members who did not have student teachers of the following activities?

45. Teaching.

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all

46. Chaperoning.

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all

47. Supervision of lunch duty.

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all

48. Supervision of study hall.

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all

49. Supervision of playground.

1. Many times
2. Once or a few times
3. Not at all

QUESTION 50 THROUGH 53

To what extent were other staff members able to engage in any of the following activities because of your presence in the building?

50. *Visitation in other classrooms or schools.*

1. Many times
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

51. Committee work in the school.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

52. Research.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

53. Professional reading or writing.

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

54. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your supervising teacher?

1. Less than 10
2. 10 to 15
3. 16 to 20
4. 21 to 25
5. 26 to 30
6. 31 to 35
7. 36 to 40
8. More than 40

55. How did your presence as a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher spent at school as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

1. Added more than six hours per week.
2. Added three to six hours per week.
3. Added one to three hours per week.
4. Added up to one hour per week.
5. Had no effect.
6. Reduced by up to one hour per week.
7. Reduced by one to three hours per week.
8. Reduced by three to six hours per week.
9. Reduced by more than six hours per week.
10. I am unable to judge.

56. How did your presence affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher worked on job related activities away from school?

1. Added more than six hours per week.
2. Added three to six hours per week.
3. Added one to three hours per week.
4. Added up to one hour per week.
5. Had no effect.
6. Reduced by up to one hour per week.
7. Reduced by one to three hours per week.
8. Reduced by three to six hours per week.
9. Reduced by more than six hours per week.
10. I am unable to judge.

QUESTION 57 THROUGH 60

To what extent was the time your supervising teacher spent on the following activities changed because of your presence?

57. Teaching

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

58. Lesson Planning

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

59. Paper grading

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

60. Help to individual students

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

QUESTION 61 THROUGH 68

To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in the following activities because of your presence?

61. Planning with you

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

62. Evaluating your progress and activities

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

63. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

64. Fulfilling social obligations resulting from your presence

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours
4. Don't know

65. Finding housing for you

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours
4. Don't know

66. Preparing additional reports

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours
4. Don't know

67. Making additional preparations for teaching

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours
4. Don't know

68. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with you

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours
4. Don't know

69. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your supervising teacher outside of regular working hours at school? (Telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.)

1. Less than one
2. One to three
3. Four to six
4. Seven to nine
5. Ten or more

70. How many days during student teaching did you handle classes for your supervising teacher while he was away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal or other people, personal or private affairs outside of school) in which a substitute teacher would have had to be hired if you had not been there?

1. None
2. Less than one
3. One to three
4. Four to seven
5. Eight to ten
6. More than ten

71. During student teaching how many days did you handle classes for any teacher(s) other than your supervising teacher, while that teacher was away from class?

1. None
2. One or less
3. Two to four
4. Five to seven
5. Eight to ten
6. More than ten

72. How many hours do you estimate you spent doing volunteer work in the community where you were assigned for student teaching (youth groups, home service, church work and the like) during your student teaching period?

1. None at all
2. One to five hours
3. Six to fifteen hours
4. Sixteen to thirty hours
5. More than thirty hours

73. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the performance of your supervising teacher?

1. Has made him a much more effective teacher
2. Has made him a more effective teacher
3. Has had no effect on his teaching
4. Has made him a less effective teacher
5. Has made him a much less effective teacher
6. I am unable to judge

74. What do you think should be the attitude of the administration and teachers in the school to which you were assigned about working with student teachers?

1. Should aggressively seek student teachers
2. Should seek student teachers
3. Should accept student teachers if asked
4. Should resist having student teachers in the school
5. Should refuse to have student teachers in the school
6. I am unable to judge

75. What recommendation would you give your friends about accepting a student teaching assignment in the same school with the same supervising teacher (or in the same project)?

1. Accept with enthusiasm
2. Accept
3. Be neutral
4. Try for a different assignment
5. Reject the assignment

76. How many times has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been in your school during your student teaching contact?

1. Not at all
2. 1 to 2 times
3. 3 to 4 times
4. 5 to 6 times
5. 7 to 8 times
6. 9 to 10 times
7. 11 to 12 times
8. 13 to 15 times
9. 16 times or more

77. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?

1. All the help I felt was necessary
2. Most of the help I felt was needed
3. Some of the help I felt I needed
4. Little of the help I felt was needed
5. No help at all

78. To what extent have your supervising teacher and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters not directly concerned with student teaching?

1. They have gone out of their way to be helpful
2. They have helped when asked
3. They have not helped
4. No such help was needed

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

1. Yes
2. No, because I intend to go to graduate school
3. No, because I plan to live in another geographic area
4. No, for personal reasons
5. No, for professional reasons
6. No, because I have decided not to teach

80 Why were you assigned to this particular student teaching station?

1. I requested this school or area.
2. I requested this kind of program or project.
3. I had no particular preference and was placed in this assignment by my college or university.
4. I really preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one by my college or university.
5. I was required to accept this assignment even though I expressed a strong preference for a different one.

STUDY OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

Administrator Questionnaire

This study is being conducted at the request of the Council of State College Presidents for the purpose of analyzing the effect of student teaching programs on the schools of Michigan. The study is being conducted by all the teacher preparation institutions in Michigan and will involve all student teachers, supervising teachers, and building principals working with student teachers during the fall quarter or semester of 1969.

The instruments were developed with guidance from the research departments of three Michigan institutions, and have been reviewed by Michigan Education Association officials and the Student Teaching Committee of the Detroit Federation of Teachers. Both groups have made contributions to the items in the instrument and have expressed interest in the findings.

It is expected that the results of this study will be given wide distribution and no doubt will provide a basis for the improvement of student teaching and teacher education programs in Michigan over the next decade.

DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

1. Use the IBM answer sheet provided. Do not write anything in the name or student number spaces at the top of the sheet. Thus, there will be no way for your specific answer sheet to be identified once you turn it in. The responses will be machine scored and tabulated on Michigan State University equipment. Since your responses will be combined with those from other institutions it is essential that all respondents use the same procedure.

2. Use the scoring pencil provided and mark the spaces to indicate your answer to each item. Blacken the space completely. Be careful not to put any other marks on the answer sheet.

3. Note that the answer spaces alternate to the left and right columns of the answer sheet.

4. Mark no more than one answer for each item. Please answer every item.

5. In the instrument "University" mea either "college" or "university" as appropriate. "Supervising teacher" also means "cooperating teacher," " sponsoring teacher," or "critic teacher." Student teacher also means "associate teacher."

STUDENT TEACHING IN MICHIGAN

Administrator Questionnaire

1. Which of the following are you now?

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

2. What is your sex?

   1. Male
   2. Female

3. What is your present administrative assignment?

   1. Building Principal - elementary school
   2. Building Principal - middle school
   3. Building Principal - junior high school
   4. Building Principal - combined junior-senior high school
   5. Building Principal - senior high school
   6. Other

4. Which statement below best describes the community in which your school is located?

   1. Large central city (e.g., Detroit, Grand Rapids)
   2. Large suburban community (e.g., Livonia, Flint Carmen)
   3. Small suburban community (e.g., Okemos, Essexville)
   4. Medium sized city (e.g., Battle Creek, Kalamazoo)
   5. Small city or rural area (e.g., Niles, Ithaca)

5. For how many years have you been a school administrator?

   1. Two or less
   2. Three to five
   3. Six to nine
   4. Ten to twelve
   5. More than twelve

6. For how many years have you been an administrator in your present building?

   1. Two or less
   2. Three to five
   3. Six to nine
   4. Ten to twelve
   5. More than twelve

7. How many pupils are assigned to your building?

1. 0 - 300
2. 301 - 500
3. 501 - 700
4. 701 - 900
5. 901 - 1100
6. 1101 - 1300
7. 1301 - 1500
8. 1501 - 1700
9. 1701 - 1900
10. 1901 or more

8. How many teachers are assigned in your building?

1. 10 or less
2. 11 to 20
3. 21 to 30
4. 31 to 40
5. 41 to 50
6. 51 to 60
7. 61 to 70
8. 71 to 80
9. 81 to 90
10. 91 to more

9. For how many years have student teachers been assigned in the building in which you are presently the administrator?

1. Three or less
2. Four to six
3. Seven to nine
4. Ten to twelve
5. Thirteen to fifteen
6. More than fifteen

10. How many student teachers are assigned to your building at the present time?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six
7. Seven
8. Eight
9. Nine
10. Ten or more

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

1. None
2. One to three
3. Four to six
4. Seven to nine
5. Ten to twelve
6. Thirteen to fifteen
7. Sixteen to eighteen
8. Nineteen to twenty-one
9. Twenty-two to twenty-five
10. More than twenty-five

12. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers assigned to your building in the last two years?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four to six
5. More than six

13. How well do you feel the student teacher(s) presently assigned to your building were prepared to enter student teaching?

    1. Extremely well prepared
    2. Very well prepared
    3. Adequately prepared
    4. Minimally prepared
    5. Inadequately prepared

14. For what proportion of their time are the majority of the student teachers assigned to your building scheduled by their institution to student teaching?

    1. Full days
    2. Half days
    3. Less than half days

Question 15 through 26 deal with the contributions student teachers may have made to the school program in your building. Use the following code for question 15 through 21:

    1. Often
    2. Sometimes
    3. No
    4. Does not apply
    5. Don't know

Have student teachers made any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

15. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

16. Give talks to parents group?

17. Perform recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground or hall duty?

18. Chaperone social activities for pupils?

19. Supervise study halls?

20. Coach or assist in interscholastic or extracurricular activities?

21. Assist in handling discipline problems?

* * * * *

22. How many new or different instructional materials have student teachers brought, developed, provided, or suggested to the school teachers?

    1. A great many
    2. Quite a few
    3. Some
    4. A very few
    5. None

23. To what extent have student teachers suggested or provided any other kinds of aids or ideas?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never

24. What use have your teachers been able to make of the contributions (22 & 23) of student teachers?

1. They always use them
2. They sometimes use them
3. They do not use them
4. They discourage student teachers from contributing too freely
5. Student teachers really do not have much to offer

25. How many hours per week on the average do student teachers in your building teach their supervising teachers assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour a week
2. One to five hours per week
3. Six to ten hours per week
4. Eleven to fifteen hours per week
5. Sixteen to twenty hours per week
6. More than twenty hours per week

26. How many hours per week on the average are your teachers able to be away from their classroom while student teachers teach their assigned classes?

1. Less than one
2. One to five
3. Six to ten
4. Eleven to fifteen
5. Sixteen to twenty
6. More than twenty

Questions 27 through 39 - To what extent are any of the following instructional activities for pupils changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building?

27. Amount of small group instruction.

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

28. Provision for make-up work.

1. Much greater
2. Somewhat greater
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

38. Individual instruction or tutoring of pupils.

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

39. Overall quality of instruction.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

Questions 40 through 50 - How do you feel the availability of the following university services has influenced the attitude of your staff concerning working with student teachers?

Use the following code for questions 40 through 50:

1. Has had a very positive effect
2. Has had a positive effect
3. Has had no effect
4. Has had a negative effect
5. Has had a very negative effect
6. This service has not been available and would have had no effect if available
7. This service has not been available but would have had a positive effect if available
8. This service has not been available but would have had a very positive effect if available
9. I do not know whether or not this service is available

40. Tuition free university credit courses.

41. University library privileges.

42. Faculty identification cards.

43. Recognition certificate from the University.

44. Consultant services from the University.

45. Instructional materials from the University.

46. Tickets to university events - athletics, cultural events, etc.

47. Hospitalization services.

48. Cash stipends to the supervising teacher.

49. Seminars, workshops or meetings in your school or school area.

50. Seminars, workshops or meetings on the University campus.

74. To what extent has the university coordinator or supervisor of student teaching been available to you and your staff during the student teacher contact?

1. Has always been available
2. Has usually been available
3. Has been available on call when needed
4. Has been generally unavailable
5. Has never been available

75. To what extent do your supervising teachers encourage student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside the assigned classroom?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. To a limited degree
4. Not at all

76. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your teachers?

1. Has made them much more effective
2. Has made them more effective
3. Has had no effect
4. Has made them less effective
5. Has made them much less effective

77. What is the maximum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four or more

78. Which of the following do you consider to be the most important contribution of supervising teachers to student teachers?

1. Providing cognitive information in the psychology and sociology of teaching and learning.
2. Sharing the classroom and pupils to provide teaching experiences for the student teachers.
3. Providing instruction and experience in lesson planning and methods of teaching.
4. Providing a climate for developing a wholesome professional attitude.
5. Providing informal counseling and advice in one-to-one conference sessions.

79. What is your reaction to assigning student teachers on a very flexible basis to get experience in the total school program rather than with one supervising teacher?

1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative

80. How representative of the teachers in your building are those who serve as supervising teachers?

1. They are among my most outstanding teachers
2. They are above average for my staff
3. They are about average
4. They are below average for my staff
5. They are among my least effective teachers

Question 81 to 86. Important: Please go to the reverse side of your answer sheet and provide the information requested.